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This dissertation analyzes Shakespeare’s role in American education from colonial times through the Progressive Era. The history is divided into four overlapping historical periods, each represented in its own chapter and derived from four different sets of primary sources. The first chapter provides a synopsis of Shakespeare’s presence in American education in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and then, through case studies of the records of two nineteenth-century university literary societies – the Hasty Pudding Club of Harvard University and the Sherwood Rhetorical Society of Kalamazoo College – examines the role extracurricular activity played in first introducing Shakespeare at the university level and creating a foundation for the formal study of his plays which would come later in the century. The second chapter evaluates the evolution of nineteenth-century school readers, the primary texts used in schools for teaching reading, and their incorporation of Shakespeare. Early in the nineteenth century, readers included brief Shakespearean excerpts to be read aloud in class as students studied elocution and learned the skills of proper public speaking. American theater had a dubious and lowbrow reputation in the nineteenth century, and to distance themselves from
theatrical association, reader editors only rarely attributed these passages to Shakespeare. As the century progressed, though, and both Shakespeare and theater’s reputation increasingly became the property of highbrow culture, reader editors gradually included longer passages and even entire scene sequences. The third chapter compares the school Shakespeare editions edited by Henry Norman Hudson and William James Rolfe in the late nineteenth century, and finds despite superficial differences and editorial conflict, both series demonstrate a focus on literary and textual scholarship absent in the readers that had preceded them. The fourth chapter is an analysis of early contributions from 1912 through 1930 to English Journal, the first professional periodical to record the collective voice of American teachers. These reveal innovative dramatization approaches to teaching Shakespeare that had been shunned in the previous century, as well as the use of new visual (i.e. picture books, postcards, etc.) and auditory (i.e. phonograph) technologies popular in the first decades of the twentieth century.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following work would not have been possible without the help of a number of people. Several librarians have proven invaluable in steering me toward necessary resources, most notably Lisa Murphy at the Kalamazoo College archives and Edward Copenhagen of the Gutman Library at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The library staffs at the Harvard University Archives, the Folger Shakespeare Library, and the Library of Congress also provided excellent guidance in the research necessary for Chapters One and Three.

A number of professors have served as guides and mentors to me over the years. The English faculty of Western Michigan University consists of dedicated and gifted professors and includes some of the most intelligent and compassionate individuals I have ever known. Of these, I would like to thank Dr. Jon Adams, Dr. Beth Bradburn, Dr. Jonathan Bush, Dr. Arnold Johnston, Dr. Richard Katrovas, Dr. Todd Kuchta, Dr. Jil Larsen, Dr. Christopher Nagle, Dr. Eve Salisbury, Dr. Jana Schulman, Dr. Gweneth Tarbox, Dr. Karen Vocke, Dr. Daneen Wardrop, and Dr. Nicholas Witschi. Our Shakespeare professors have been particularly influential to me: Dr. C.J. Gianakaris (now retired), Dr. Grace Tiffany, Dr. Margaret Dupuis, and Dr. Anthony Ellis. Through coursework and discussion, they provided opportunities that shaped my understanding of
Acknowledgments – continued

how Shakespeare should be studied and taught. I would especially like to thank Dr. Ellis for reading several drafts of the dissertation and spending countless hours discussing and editing my work in addition to serving as a reader on the dissertation committee. I consider him a dear friend. I would also like to thank retired English education professor, Dr. Ellen Brinkley, for her work with my writing, including serving as a reader on my dissertation committee.

Some of the professors who influenced me were not from Western. Dr. Sharon Whitehill, retired English professor at Grand Valley State, first instilled in me a love of Shakespeare as an undergraduate. I would also like to thank Dr. Jill VanAntwerp, also at Grand Valley State, and Dr. Donald Hagen of California State San Bernardino. Dr. Edward Rocklin, of California State Polytechnic, deserves special recognition. I first met Dr. Rocklin several years ago in a session in which we were both participating at the 2006 Shakespeare Association of America annual meeting. We first talked then about my graduate work and in the years since he has generously offered his time and support, including most recently serving as a reader on my dissertation committee.

Of the professors who have been influential to my success, I am most indebted to Dr. Allen Webb. He has always believed in me. He has been more to me than the chair on my dissertation committee; he has
Acknowledgments – continued

become a close friend and confidant, and I cannot thank him enough for all he has done for me as a mentor through my education.

A number of family and friends have also been supportive, too many names to mention individually here, but my wife, Brandy Haughey, deserves special recognition. She has read countless drafts of the dissertation and has supported me throughout the writing process. She has been a loving partner for many years, and as we open the next chapter of our lives together following the dissertation, I look forward to the bright future that lies before us.

Joseph P. Haughey
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS..............................................................................................................ii

LIST OF FIGURES..................................................................................................................viii

LIST OF TABLES.....................................................................................................................ix

INTRODUCTION.....................................................................................................................1

CHAPTER ONE: Before Shakespeare: Nineteenth-Century Literary Societies and Shakespeare.........................................................................................................................13

“Tis Too Early”: Education in the Colonial Period..............................................................14

“Our Forefathers Had No Other Books”: The Absence of Shakespearean Texts in the Colonial Period.........................................................................................................................21

“Greek, Latin, and Other Languages”: Curriculum and Instruction in Early America.................................................................................................................................25

“All That Are Assembled In This Place”: The Influence of Literary Societies..........................................................................................................................28

“You Play’d Once i’ th’ University, You Say?”: Shakespeare at Harvard, 1770-1807..............................................................................................................................39

“It Shrunk In Haste Away”: The Decline of Literary Societies........................................43

Case Study I: The Hasty Pudding Club and Harvard University.................................44

Case Study II: James Cadman and Kalamazoo College’s Sherwood Rhetorical Society.........................................................................................................................62

Chapter One Conclusions.................................................................................................78

CHAPTER TWO: “Speak the Speech As I Proune’d It To You”: The Rise and Fall of Oratorical Shakespeare Study in Historical American Readers.................................................81

“A Whole School of Tongues”: The Rise of Oratorical Shakespeare Study..........................................................86

“Men Shall Swear I’ve Discontinued School”: Absent Shakespeare.................98
Table of Contents – continued

“Cut Out Your Tongue”: The Fall of Oratorical Shakespeare Study......120

Chapter Two Conclusions.................................................................141

CHAPTER THREE: “These Testy Rivals”: The Shakespeare School Editions of Henry Norman Hudson and William James Rolfe, 1870-1905..............143

“Honorable Men”: Hudson and Rolfe Battle Over Words.................146

“Volumes That I Prize”: Un-Expurgating School Shakespeare and Establishing a National Canon.........................................................162

“Do it in Notes”: Annotating School Shakespeare...............................167

“Of Teaching and of Learning”: Finding an Appropriate Classroom Tone.................................................................176

“O Noble English”: Moving Away From Elocution and the Classics.....179

“I Must Examine Thee”: Shakespeare and the University Admission Examinations..............................................................182

“‘Tis My Limited Service”: The Impact of *Julius Caesar*, *Merchant of Venice*, and *Macbeth* on the Curriculum........................................190

Chapter Three Conclusions...........................................................203

CHAPTER FOUR: “Beauty’s Tutors”: Early *English Journal* Contributors and Learning to Appreciate Shakespeare, 1912-1930------------------------206

“A Wise Council”: The Founding of NCTE........................................211

“Look Here Upon This Picture”: Using Art in the Teaching of Shakespeare..................................................................................215

“Let Music Sound”: The Phonograph and the Teaching of Shakespeare..................................................................................221

“The Play’s the Thing”: Advocating for Drama in Schools.................231
Table of Contents – continued

Chapter Four Conclusions...............................................................................................................243

CONCLUSION.................................................................................................................................244

APPENDICES.................................................................................................................................256

A: Shakespeare Readings Given by Harvard’s Speaking Club, 1770-1790.........................................................256

B: Excerpt from HPC Class of 1853 Farewell Address (written by RP Rantoral and spoken by Mr. Dutton)............................................................................................................261

C: Theodore Lyman’s HPC Meeting Minutes from October 20, 1854 Depicting the Visit of Shakespeare’s Ghost to an HPC Performance of Macbeth.........................................................263

D: The Hasty Pudding Club Hamlet Song.......................................................................................269

E: James Cadman’s Sophomore Essay on Macbeth...............................................................273

F: Selected Sherwood Rhetorical Society Debate Topics Related to Education and the Study of Literature.........................................................................................................................284

G: Selected Sherwood Rhetorical Society Debate Topics Related to Secession, Slavery, and Race..........................................................285

H: Shakespeare Lessons in Selected Nineteenth-Century Readers............................................286

I: Shakespeare Lesson Movement in the McGuffey’s.................................................................295

J: William J. Rolfe’s Friendly Shakespeare Editions.........................................................................299

K: Shakespeare Plays Included in Harvard University Entrance Exams, 1870-1905..........................302

L: Shakespeare Plays Included in Univ. of Michigan Entrance Exams, 1878-1905............................................306

BIBLIOGRAPHY..............................................................................................................................308
LIST OF TABLES

1: Harvard Speaking Club Shakespearean Readings, 1770-1779............41
2: Harvard Speaking Club Shakespearean Readings, 1780-1789..........42
3: Hasty Pudding Club Shakespearean Performances..........................45
4: Early Twentieth-Century Illustrated Editions of Shakespeare.........218
5: Early Twentieth-Century Victor and Columbia Shakespeare
   Recordings...................................................................................227
LIST OF FIGURES

1: Stoughton Hall Room at Harvard .................................................................52

2: Excerpt from the play shingle detailing the 1854 Macbeth Pudding production ..........................................................................................53

3: Excerpt from the play shingle of the 1893 Pudding Hamlet performance........................................................................................................58

4: Cover page to McGuffey's Rhetorical or Fifth Reader..............................81

5: William Holmes McGuffey ........................................................................84

6: Sanders’ Lesson on Personation from his Fifth Reader ............................116

7: George Hillard’s “Wolsey and Cromwell” Lesson from his First Class Reader...............................................................................................130

8: Henry Norman Hudson ................................................................................146

9: William James Rolfe .....................................................................................150

10: Modern edition cover of Arthur Rackham’s 1908 children's illustrated A Midsummer Night's Dream ..........................................................220

11: A February 1922 English Journal advertisement for the Victor Talking Machine Co. ..................................................................................222

12: July 1922 English Journal advertisement for the Victor Talking Machine Co. ............................................................................................223

It is difficult to conceive of an educational problem of any depth or significance which does not have a history. There is scarcely an idea in the so-called “new education” which has not found expression in the practice or theory of the past. In order, then, to comprehend the possibilities as well as the limitations of any latter-day problem it is necessary to know of the attempts, successes, and failures of the past. In fact, from such attempts, failures, and successes present educational conditions have resulted. Hence the importance of the study of the history of education in general and of the historical setting of any important problem.

– Edwin Broome, 1902
INTRODUCTION

Shakespeare’s role in American education has a rich and complex history. It is a story of uncertainty, of how best to teach his plays and poetry, and even whether they should be taught at all. It is a dynamic and in some ways recursive history that reflects America's evolving views of education, the book, literature, spoken and dramatic performance, and technology. It is a history connected to America’s evolving population, its cultural and social movements and the rise of its academic institutions. Indeed, this history involves America’s teachers across the nation from the East to the West, from the colonial schoolmasters of the seventeenth century to the teachers of the present, and across levels from the primary and secondary to the university. It is a story central to the emergence and development of English as a discipline of study. However, despite an abundance of scholarship on the teaching of Shakespeare – teachers, students, and editors who have reflected upon and recorded their ideas for teaching Shakespeare – there is relatively little that summarizes and synthesizes this rich tradition. There are no recent book-length studies that draw a comprehensive picture of how the study of Shakespeare in American schools has evolved from the colonial period to the present.

This dissertation then seeks to begin to fill that gap and provide a springboard for other related projects. Each of its four chapters examines, through distinct primary sources, a different period in educational history, and Shakespeare’s role in that period. Chapter One reveals the overlooked influence that extracurricular university literary societies played in the
eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in a time before Shakespeare was part of the formal curriculum, later in the century on curriculum, including first introducing Shakespeare to university study. Chapter Two shifts focus from the university to the secondary level, using school readers, the ancestors to modern textbooks, and examines their changing implementation of Shakespeare through the nineteenth century. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Shakespearean excerpts, when they were included at all, served in school readers only as an exemplar for the study of elocution, but in the second half of the century, they were gradually expanded and became material for literary study. Chapter Three focuses on the school Shakespeare editions of competing editors Henry Norman Hudson and William James Rolfe in the closing three decades of the nineteenth century. Though the two superficially disagreed on the function of a school Shakespeare text and how Shakespeare should be taught on schools, their common beliefs about education and Shakespeare reveal an altered classroom experience with the Bard from earlier in the century. Chapter Four moves into the early twentieth century, in the Progressive Era, and examines early English Journal contributions. These represent the first time public school English teachers voices were heard in print describing their own classroom practices and responding to issues in their field. Their innovative approaches in teaching Shakespeare, in using illustration, recording, and dramatization demonstrate the innovativeness of these vanguard teachers over a century ago.
Several twentieth-century studies provided the framework for this study. The only previous book-length historical study of Shakespeare’s presence in American education is Henry W. Simon’s 1932 book *The Reading of Shakespeare in American Schools and Colleges: an Historical Survey*, which addresses the role of Shakespearean drama in American schools and universities from the colonial period through the early 1930s. By the book’s conclusion, Simon incorrectly predicts that the role of Shakespeare in American education will decline and “that in another half century [by about 1982] Shakespeare in the high school curriculum may have gone the way of Greek and Latin” (155). It is easy to look back in hindsight today and see that Shakespeare remains, some eighty years after Simon’s book, a central part of the American high school curriculum. Indeed, Shakespeare is the only author specifically mentioned in the Common Core Standards now adopted by over 40 states. Just as Simon could not accurately predict the future from 1932, there are several other aspects to Simon’s work that require updating. Simon was mostly unfamiliar with the impact that university literary societies played in the nineteenth century. He suggests that the early extracurricular interest in Shakespeare died out quickly and that “by 1820 we find little evidence that Shakespeare was read at all in colleges” (8). He incorrectly believed that between 1820 and 1860 the students’ extracurricular interest in Shakespeare disappeared from college campuses. In fact, though, there was a burgeoning extracurricular interest in literature during this time.
Despite its flaws, though, Simon's work provided a basic framework and a starting point for my own work.

Other scholars following Simon offer insight into the influence of that early extracurricular interest in literature. Frederick Rudolph wrote two books: *The American College and University* (1962) and *Curriculum* (1977). *The American College and University* includes a chapter titled “The Extracurriculum” in which he analyzes the influence of the university literary societies in the nineteenth century. He writes:

> when the students were finished they had planted beside the curriculum an extracurriculum of such dimensions that ... there would develop generations of college students who would not see the curriculum for the extracurriculum. (137)

Rudolph describes the nineteenth-century university literary societies bringing influential, sometimes even controversial, speakers to the college campuses, publishing literary magazines that printed students' writing, and holding impressive library collections that “often outstrip the college libraries in numbers of volumes” and in their “wide range of subject matter” (142-43).

Arthur Applebee's 1974 *Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: a History*, though not focused on Shakespeare *per se*, also addresses the extracurricular activities of university literary societies in the nineteenth century. Applebee's work shapes our understanding of how English developed as a subject for study in American schools and
colleges. Applebee outlines three important early traditions between 1750 and 1865 that influence how English developed as a school subject: an ethical tradition, a classical tradition, and a nonacademic tradition. Neither literature nor Shakespeare was valued in either the ethical or classical traditions, but literature did find a foothold in the nonacademic tradition, most notably in the literary societies. Literature generally, and Shakespeare specifically, was not afforded a place in the classroom, though it was allowed outside of the formal instruction. Applebee adds, “in the college preparatory curriculum, as in the colleges themselves, the literary interests of the student were left to the extracurriculum” (13). Applebee, in contrast to Simon, implies that this interest in Shakespeare was steady through to 1870 and beyond.

Gerald Graff is another historian of English studies who, drawing on Applebee, focuses on the development of English as a subject of study at the college level. In *Professing Literature* (1987) Graff is unimpressed with most tenets of the nineteenth-century college system, but does acknowledge the literary societies. He suggests, “no institution better offset the aridity of the college classroom than the cluster of literary societies, debating clubs, student literary publications, and public lectures and lyceums” (44). He saw the literary societies as a highlight of an otherwise dismal university system; he writes that “without the student literary and societies ... the old college literary education would make a very poor showing indeed” (51).
Another historian, Thomas S. Harding, wrote a useful book in 1970 titled *College Literary Societies: Their Contribution to Higher Education in the United States 1815-1876*. While not specifically about Shakespeare, this book has over one hundred tables that include a variety of information about nineteenth-century literary societies. This data proved invaluable in my research for Chapter One. Whereas Applebee, Graff, and Rudolph make broad, sweeping statements about the nineteenth-century literary societies and their role in shaping students’ experience with literature, Harding includes specific information on the actual activities of the societies. For example, in several tables, he compiles lists of the literary societies by geographic region, as well as information about noteworthy members. He also includes tables outlining their library collections and the topics they debated in their meetings.

While not as authoritative as that of Applebee, Graff, or Rudolph, my work emulates the specificity of his research. Applebee, Graff, and Rudolph together refute Simon's claim that extracurricular activity and interest in Shakespeare had vanished by the 1820s. They do not, though, address the role Shakespearean drama specifically played in extracurricular activities. Neither does Harding. My research addresses this missing component and builds upon their findings.

Simon, Applebee, and Graff also provide a framework for Chapter Two in their discussion of nineteenth-century school readers, the antecedent to today's textbooks. Applebee writes that the *McGuffey*
Readers, the most influential and popular of these, “provided a common background” and “a common heritage for a nation too young to have any other” (5). The readers were fundamental in shaping fledgling American education and Henry W. Simon details over 35 different series of readers and analyzes their Shakespeare content. He emphasizes the influence of William Enfield's The Speaker, a British reader, which was influential in determining the Shakespeare content of later American readers. He writes, “the Shakespearian passages [in The Speaker] include almost all of those that were later found suitable for American schools” (Simon 12). [Gerald Graff concurs, adding that it is possibly Enfield's reader that “should be blamed or credited with first immortalizing Mark Antony's funeral oration” (Graff 41).]

Simon points out, though, that Lindley Murray's popular American readers of the early nineteenth century included “not a line of Shakespeare” and that Murray “did more than anyone else to keep Shakespeare out of the schools for a long time” (Simon 13). Such trends would shift, though, by the middle of the nineteenth century as editors increasingly emphasized public speaking, also known as elocution or declamation. By the 1860s, though, this trend would evolve further, and the study of elocution would gradually be replaced with the study of literature. Throughout this period following Murray, many editors included Shakespearean passages, first as examples for proper speaking, and later as exemplars of literature. Simon writes that “the study of
Shakespeare, which had been carried through the major portion of the nineteenth century by the study of elocution, now also achieved a new dignity” in which his plays were studied as literature (Simon 42). As the study of elocution evolved into the study of literature, larger and more complete passages of Shakespeare were included. By the end of the nineteenth century full sequences of multiple scenes appeared, accompanied by supporting biographical and critical information.

Esther Cloudman Dunn, in her 1939 book, *Shakespeare in America*, seven years after Simon, adds to the discourse, dedicating a chapter to the history of Shakespeare in schools and colleges. She explains that Shakespeare found his place at the secondary level before eventually gaining acceptance at the college level. She argues, “prior to the American Revolution, Shakespeare as a formal part of education in the colonies is non-existent” (220). It was not until much later that Shakespeare would be accepted into traditional school curriculum. Her work further reinforces the role that school readers played in elevating the status of Shakespeare in American education. Dunn explains, “the history of the school reader is also the history of Shakespeare in American school education for years to come” (225). Dunn explains that Shakespeare first became popular with the editors of these readers because of a national emphasis on elocution and speaking skills. The young nation provided countless opportunities for those who could speak well and schools strove to provide such skills.
According to Dunn “speeches from Shakespeare” were considered “among the best passages for practicing declamation” (226).

Dunn, like Simon, mentions the influence of eighteenth-century British readers, including *The Speaker* and *Lectures on the Art of Reading*, on nineteenth-century American readers. The *McGuffey Readers*, beginning in the 1830s, were popular and influential in American schools until nearly the end of the nineteenth century. Editors were careful, though, in incorporating Shakespeare, who was still considered risqué. They included only important speeches and passages deemed best suited as standalone items. Shakespeare's name was rarely used. Dunn poetically refers to these as “a series of beautiful shreds and purple passages, a set of rhetorical speeches” (234). Dunn laments the fragmented pieces of Shakespeare, but also commends their editors for shaping Shakespeare into a “national classic” (238).

Simon, Applebee, and Graff also provide the basis for Chapter Three in my discussion of the school Shakespeare editions of Henry Norman Hudson and William James Rolfe. The closing three decades of the nineteenth century were a period in which an increased interest in literature and a waning interest in elocution pushed classroom experience with Shakespeare in different pedagogical directions. Simon writes, “after 1870, the custom of teaching the history of English Literature ... became more general, and by 1885, it was the exceptional high school that did not include the subject in its curriculum” (Simon 103). By the beginning of
the twentieth century, the study of literature written in English, instead of Greek and Latin, had become paramount in the schools and colleges (Simon 133).

This was a period in which the study of Shakespeare was not dependent upon the readers. School readers like those addressed in Chapter Two were still influential through the end of the nineteenth century and even into the first decades of the twentieth, but single-play school editions of Shakespeare also became popular, particularly the editions edited by Henry Norman Hudson and William James Rolfe. Simon describes Hudson’s influence, suggesting that Hudson is “one of the acknowledgedly few great American names associated with Shakespeare in the nineteenth century” and that his methods seem “practicable still and much more modern than Victorian” to Simon even fifty years later when he wrote in 1932 (108). Applebee concurs, listing Hudson as an agent in the movement toward new methods (55).

Applebee also addresses the influence of university entrance exams on school curriculum and his analysis informs my understanding of these tests. As universities began to teach literature, they started including literature sections on their college entrance exams. There was no universal college entrance exam – such as the ACT or the SAT – as there is today. Instead, individual colleges and universities administered their own examinations, each with their own unique set of reading requirements. As a result, the secondary curriculum, in order to prepare students for these
tests, responded to the reading lists set by the colleges (Applebee 29-30). These reading lists tended to include Shakespeare. Graff explains that in 1874 Harvard included three Shakespeare plays, in addition to three non-Shakespeare readings, for its entrance exam: *The Tempest*, *Julius Caesar*, and *Merchant of Venice* (Graff 43). Universities began to consolidate their separate exams, though, into one standardized entrance exam, with one uniform list of texts for student study. These lists helped shape the literary canon and still influence which texts are taught today in American high schools and colleges. In response to these lists and the new pressures they placed on teachers and schools, a group of English teachers came together and created the NCTE in 1910. NCTE was pivotal, according to Applebee, in a larger movement that brought drama to the forefront of the educational tradition; for example, *English Journal* regularly published student- and teacher-written plays until the mid-1920s (Applebee 63). During this time, the school and class play became a national tradition (Applebee 63).

Franklin T. Baker, mentor to Simon, also influenced my work. He described a new movement, just in its infancy, in the teaching of Shakespeare as works to be performed that became the spark for Chapter Four. Baker describes a movement in an *English Journal* contribution – albeit small – inside the classroom where teachers had “entered upon a new kind of Shakesperian [sic] study – the dramaturgic ... the study of his plays as dramas, written to be acted” (Simon 150). Baker writes of a “wide
use of dramatic action” in the schools that led to “little plays,” “folk dances,” and “festivals” (38). Others were also writing of performance in their classrooms in the early twentieth century: Charles Swain Thomas, in his 1917 book, *The Teaching of English*, suggests an approach in “visualization” where students think about the “relative position of the actors, their personal appearance, the costuming, the sound of the voice ...” (Simon 139). Other voices from the 1910s advocating performance-based approaches to Shakespeare were Henry Thew Stephenson, Emma Miller Bolenius, and George L. Marsh. This movement that Baker describes demonstrates that students in the early twentieth century were learning Shakespeare through performance. These strategies precede the modern performance-based movement in education by some sixty years and are one of the earliest recorded examples of Shakespeare being taught through performance.

While no recent book length study of Shakespeare’s evolving influence on American education currently exists, the studies of Simon, Dunn, Harding, Applebee, and Graff have provided preliminary foundations for my research. This dissertation seeks to partially fill this missing gap in Shakespearean and educational scholarship.
CHAPTER ONE

BEFORE SHAKESPEARE: NINETEENTH-CENTURY LITERARY SOCIETIES AND SHAKESPEARE

This opening chapter provides an overview of Shakespeare’s role in American education from the colonial period to the mid-nineteenth century, a time before his plays were included in the formal curriculum of American schools and colleges. It establishes that Shakespeare’s plays did not play a role in the establishment and early development of the curriculum in colonial and antebellum colleges, but that because of student interest in the late eighteenth century and throughout most of the nineteenth century – in the form of extracurricular literary societies – Shakespeare’s plays would hold a dominant role in college curricula by the end of the nineteenth century. Citing two case studies – the first an examination of Harvard’s Hasty Pudding Club and its student members’ writing related to Shakespeare, the second a close reading of a *Macbeth* essay written by James Cadman of Kalamazoo College’s Sherwood Rhetorical Society – the chapter demonstrates how Shakespeare in the mid-nineteenth century served both to challenge and reinforce sociocultural norms related to gender, race, class, and education, and also help establish Shakespeare’s place in the literary canon and American education.
“Tis Too Early”: Education in the Colonial Period

Since Shakespeare is the only author required by the new Common Core State Standards, it would perhaps surprise most English teachers to learn that from his death in 1616 until relatively recently, Shakespeare was not taught and his works played almost no role whatsoever in schools, neither in the United States nor in England, nor anywhere else in the world. In fact, the study of modern languages and literatures is a relatively recent phenomenon; it is only in the past century and a half that schools have provided instruction in English language and literature. Even before American colonization, for centuries in England boys attending grammar school had not studied mathematics, geography, history, or any modern language, instead focusing intensely on Latin and the basics of Greek. When the first English settlers arrived in North America, their grammar schools closely copied the British tradition (Morison, Intellectual 89).

Samuel Morison writes:

These New England grammar schools, so far as we have any record of them, were very close copies of the English. They kept long hours throughout the greater part of the year, took boys at the age of seven or eight, and in seven years’ time prepared them for college, whose entrance requirements were about the same as those of Oxford and Cambridge. (89)

The modern educational model, in which English has replaced Latin, has been in vogue only since the late nineteenth century, whereas the older
model that almost entirely ignored English as a subject of study, and upon which the first American schools and colleges were based, had endured for many centuries. This was the time before Shakespeare.

Harsh living conditions were a staple of life in the newfound American colonies until well into the eighteenth century. Several historians and scholars point to these as an explanation for Shakespeare’s absence amongst the first settlers. As Henry Simon suggests, “far from learning anything about Shakespeare, the colonists’ children scarcely learned to read” (6). In fact, Frederick Rudolph believes that just to have taught one’s children to read and some basic arithmetic was an admirable aspiration for colonial parents: “if they could manage a little instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, [they] felt they had done well by their children, as indeed they had” (21). While Charles Frey believes that several of the first Jamestown colonists had likely attended Shakespearean plays at the Globe Theater before they emigrated, he concedes that any interest in Shakespeare would have quickly have become “constricted by the harsh environmental conditions of the early settlements,” and as a result, “our country was founded without him” (544). Oscar and Mary Handlin point out the colony’s main priorities lay in other areas: “the important tasks in America were the establishment of settlements, the advance upon the frontier, and the development of a viable economy” and consequently “comparatively little energy went to education at any level” (5). Andrew Murphy writes, “the harsh reality of life in the American
colonies dictated that these territories were not a fertile ground for literature or theatre” (142). The study of Shakespeare, even if early colonists had desired it, proved impractical if not impossible.

Education in colonial New England, though, developed earlier (Rudolph 21). There, within ten years of the first Puritan settlements, grammar schools did arise. Some were free while others charged a small tuition, though generally waived for poor families (Morison, *Intellectual* 59, 107). The Massachusetts Act of 1642 required parents to teach their children and servants to read, and the Massachusetts Act of 1647 went even further, requiring towns of fifty or more families to appoint a schoolmaster; towns with one hundred or more families were required to establish grammar schools (Morison, *Intellectual* 66-68). The Connecticut colony adopted similar legislation in 1650 and adapted the law in 1665 to require one grammar school in each of its four counties. Legislatures in New Hampshire and Maine, both under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts law at different times in the seventeenth century, also required their towns to provide education. Communities that did not satisfy these requirements were fined by the colonial government (Morison, *Intellectual* 69). Such legislation, at least in New England, attempted to guarantee an elementary education for all white male colonists.

The first New England grammar schools were funded and controlled by secular sources, not religious; they survived through local tax levies, tuition payments, and rents. Like their British counterparts, they
maintained long hours, the school day lasting about twelve hours, generally from sunrise until six in the evening, with a two-hour midday recess (Morison, *Intellectual* 87-91). The object was to make a student “completely at home in reading, writing, and speaking Latin as a living language and to give him a good start in Greek; nothing else mattered” (Morison, *Intellectual* 88-89).

The nine colonial universities – today known as Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Brown, Dartmouth, Rutgers, and Pennsylvania¹ – also had no room for Shakespeare. These early universities, like the colonial grammar and common schools, more closely followed the classical model of seventeenth-century England than the modern conception of the university. The first of the colonial colleges, Harvard, was established in 1636, only fifteen years after the arrival of the Puritans. Approximately one hundred Cambridge and some 30 Oxford graduates had emigrated from England to the colonies by 1646, among them the founders and first presidents of Harvard, as well as many of the parents of its first generation of students (Rudolph 4; Handlin 6). John Thelin writes that these schools were “historically associated with England” and the “American heritage included a formidable strand of Anglophilia” in which the colonial college founders attempted to “have transplanted the Oxford-Cambridge ideal to America” (7). Even the names of the four college classes – freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior –

---

¹ Five of the nine colonial universities have changed their names since first opening. Princeton was originally known as the College of New Jersey, Columbia as King’s College, Brown as the College of Rhode Island, and Rutgers as Queen’s College.
derive from English origin (Rudolph 26). Harvard was modeled after Emmanuel College of Cambridge, where Puritan theology and Puritan aspiration had been featured prominently (Rudolph 5; Handlin 7-8). These men sought to create a university in Cambridge, Massachusetts inspired by Cambridge University in England. William and Mary, founded in 1693, likewise was modeled after Queen’s College of Oxford (Rudolph 24; Handlin 7-8). Neither Cambridge nor Oxford had featured Shakespeare as a subject for study, and not having studied Shakespeare themselves, the founders of Harvard and William and Mary consequently did not incorporate Shakespeare into the colonial college curricula they established either.

Even though the colonial colleges were influenced by religion, like contemporary grammar schools, they were not religious institutions; Oxford and Cambridge had not been either. Theirs was a classical curriculum in Latin, Greek, and sometimes Hebrew, not a study of theology. Likewise, funding was secular, not religious. Harvard, for example, was controlled by the government of the Massachusetts Colony through a charter provision that guaranteed state representation on their board of overseers (Rudolph 15-16). William and Mary, held a royal charter and was substantially funded by the British crown (Thelin 12-17). Morison concludes that “the two cardinal principals of English Puritanism which most profoundly affected the social development of New England and the United States were not religious tenets, but educational ideals: a
learned clergy, and a lettered people” (Morison, *Founding* 45). Rudolph explains, “the strength of religious ties varied” amongst universities, and in some of the colonial universities “diversity and toleration had become values of such importance that colleges could be founded that claimed only an incidental interest in religion” (Rudolph 16). While each of the colonial colleges was generally connected to a particular branch of Protestant faith and approximately half of their graduates did go on to become clergymen, scholars adamantly argue that it would be incorrect to suggest that the colleges existed solely for the purpose of educating future clergy (Morison, *Intellectual* 31-32, 42; Rudolph 11; Thelin 27). Morison points out, “the purpose of the first New England college was higher education in the broadest sense, not a specialized training in Protestant theology” (*Intellectual* 32). In 1647, Harvard President Dunster expressed his hope that Harvard graduates “would go on to practice all the professions” and Handlin finds that “a substantial number” did, becoming “physicians, schoolmasters, ... merchants ... gentlemen ... [and] even a few lawyers” (9).

Colonial colleges also modeled themselves after the British collegiate system of living and learning together. The university campus served as both school grounds and home for its students (Thelin 8; Rudolph 26). Once enrolled in the university, students from colonial times until well into the nineteenth century spent their college years together with their peers taking the same classes with the same instructors, in the
same order, and reading from the same textbooks (Graff 22). There were no majors and no specialization. In fact, well into the nineteenth century, the colleges existed “in an atmosphere hostile to specialization” (Graff 26). Students did not major in English. Terms like “Renaissance” and “Early Modern” did not exist yet. Shakespeare was not an object of study.

Higher education in colonial times was not accessible to the vast majority of people. Only one of every thousand colonists went to college, and few attended a full four years (Rudolph 21-22). The overwhelming majority of young men stayed home, farmed, or went West, most without the benefit of a college education (Rudolph 22). Further, there were no female students or any evidence that any African American students were allowed to attend the colonial colleges (Thelin 30). A limited number of Native Americans did attend the universities through philanthropic scholarships by donors interested in inculcating Protestant doctrine; overall, though, these attempts proved unsuccessful (Thelin 30). Handlin concludes that “despite all the rhetoric about the value of learning, the colonists showed little solicitude for education at the levels at which it might have affected substantial numbers of people” (7). Thelin concurs, “the family background of the students at colonial Harvard, Yale, and Princeton tended to be of mercantile wealth” (24). Even for those who did attain access, there were prominent markers of social class. For example, college rolls did not list students alphabetically, but by family rank. Further, students wore academic robes that identified social class.
Commoners, who dined in the commons, wore long robes. Servitors, poorer scholarship students who served them, wore short robes (Thelin 23).

Though limited evidence indicates an attempt to include a more diverse section of the colonial population, the colonial colleges primarily existed to identify and ratify a colonial elite. They were conservative institutions essential to transmitting a relatively fixed order (Thelin 24-26). One colonial commencement orator suggested that “without the college [Harvard], Massachusetts would have been overwhelmed by lewd persons of baser sort and its laws made by ‘plebiscites, appeals to base passions, and revolutionary rumblings” (Handlin 16; Morison, *Founding* 228, 249-50). King George III, seeing the colleges as anchors of social stability, in 1762, appealed to colonists to maintain the colleges and their ability to instill values against ignorance and in support of the English constitution (Handlin 16). The colonial colleges served as a training ground for future colonial leaders. As Thelin explains, “they existed to ensure that these favored young men acquired a sense of leadership and service by their twentieth birthday” (26).

“Our Forefathers Had No Other Books”: The Absence of Shakespearean Texts in the Colonial Period

Even outside of the colleges, colonists did not have access to Shakespeare either. New England publishers and booksellers occasionally made secular works available, though few, if any, of Shakespeare’s plays were included until well into the eighteenth century. The first printing
press in the colonial America was established in Cambridge in 1638. In
1675, a second was established in Boston. In their first decades of
operation, these presses printed annual almanacs, commencement
broadsides, and even a 1200-page Bible in 1663, but no literature until
1681 when an edition of John Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress was printed
(Morison, Intellectual 120-23). There were also New England booksellers,
seven in Boston by 1700, and others scattered in Salem, New Haven, and
perhaps other towns. In addition to established shops, peddlers also
traveled from town to town selling books. The shops and peddlers carried
a handful of books printed in either Cambridge or Boston, but mostly they
sold books imported from London. Generally, the books they sold were of
a religious nature, but there is evidence that they also made some secular
authors available to the colonists, including Bacon, More, Sidney, and
Milton (Morison, Intellectual 132). There is no evidence, though, that
books of Shakespeare or any other English dramatist were included
(Morison, Intellectual 132). Simon quotes C.E. Norton who said that Anne
Bradstreet believed that there was “no evidence that there was a copy of
Shakespeare’s plays in Massachusetts during the seventeenth century”
(Simon 6-7; qtd in Murphy 142).

Some seventeenth-century colonial wills detail private book
collections too. Generally, these collections consisted of primarily
theological works, but sometimes included books from Bacon, Sir Walter
Raleigh, Machiavelli, Cervantes, and other modern language authors;
there is no record, though, that any of these collections included Shakespeare (Morison, *Intellectual* 133-150). Because no known extant records include Shakespeare texts, though, does not necessarily mean that there could not have been books of Shakespeare in the colonies in the seventeenth century. Sometimes the records include ambiguous entries. For example, the 1699 will of Arthur Spicer, of Virginia, bequeaths a copy of *Macbeth* from his library to one of his heirs. This likely refers to the 1674 adaptation by Davenant popular in England at the time, but could refer to a bonafide quarto version of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* (Dunn 29-30; Murphy 142).

Other records indicate that “two ... English dramas” were stolen from Francis Eppes, a wealthy Virginia planter, during Bacon’s Rebellion about 1676, but did not specify whether these were Shakespearean; they may very well have been (Bruce 418). The extensive 375-title collection of Ralph Wormely, Secretary to the Colony of Virginia, contained many literary titles in both Latin and English; Philip Bruce states, “the English classics, including numerous tragedies and comedies, were well represented” (Bruce 425-26). The will itself records “fifty Comodys & tragedies in folio” but does not provide specific titles (*William and Mary Quarterly* 170). It seems plausible that such a collection might have included Shakespeare. Regardless of such speculation, though, Shakespeare’s works were not prominent pieces in private colonial
libraries in the seventeenth century. Colonists simply did not have access to Shakespeare. Dunn concludes that

… thinking people of all parties were not stocking their libraries with stage-plays. They were not interested in them… popular stage-plays had not sufficient dignity and standing yet to win admission to … most gentlemen’s libraries … in a library of cultural and improving books, Shakespeare’s collected plays were not likely, in that period, to have a place. (Dunn 15-18)

College libraries, like private libraries, were also unlikely to include volumes of Shakespeare. Though colonial and antebellum colleges took pride in their libraries, they were not very useful by twenty-first century standards. Graff describes a professor, who in 1908, called the college libraries of the eighteenth century “largely haphazard collections” with “books of fundamental importance … often lacking” (qtd in Graff 26). Harvard University did not even acquire copies of Shakespeare's plays until the 1720s, some eighty years after its founding (Simon 46).

College library collections were limited, consisting primarily of theological works with little or no literature, available to students only a few hours each week, with limited or no borrowing privileges for students (Harding 56-57; Thelin 21). Harding writes that “in the old days at Columbia College, freshman and sophomores were only allowed to visit the library once a month” but were not allowed to check books out
Juniors were allowed once a week, but only seniors had borrowing privileges: “they could draw from the library during one hour on Wednesday afternoons” (Harding 56). Harding cites a long list of rules at Harvard in 1790 that seemed to “have been designed more to discourage potential readers ... than to facilitate their use of the college library” (Harding 56-57; Jackson 53). As a result of these restrictions, college libraries through most of the nineteenth century played a negligible role in the education of students, leaving a gaping educational hole that by the middle of the nineteenth century would begin to be filled by students themselves and student literary societies.

“Greek, Latin, and Other Languages”: Curriculum and Instruction in Early America

Often the only books readily available to students in colonial and antebellum universities were textbooks, most of which were written in Latin. By the time students entered a university program, it was assumed that they had already learned Latin and were ready to take on the medieval arts and philosophies, the more serious study of Greek and Hebrew, and also the lighter study of classical belles-lettres (Morison, Intellectual 42). Even after the Revolutionary War, there were few or no volumes of Shakespeare in colleges, and acquiring his plays could prove tedious. Simon writes:

Undergraduate courses in the colleges gave little encouragement or incentive to the reading of Shakespeare.

What reading in English literature the students did, had to
be done independently and could be done only with some effort.” (Simon 49)

Generally, a class read from only one textbook, a tradition that persisted into the nineteenth century. The Yale Report of 1828 defended this practice, its authors arguing that “we know of no method which will more effectually bewilder and confound the learner ... than to refer him to half a dozen different authors” (10). Paper was a valuable commodity and books were expensive. This was a time before the traditions of written examinations, a time when oratory and declamation dominated the curriculum.

Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century declamation, though, was not conversation. Classwork involved little or no discussion, but relied instead on an onslaught of daily recitations. The tutor or professor would sit students in alphabetical order – or have them stand – and then read a passage aloud, translate it, or answer questions regarding its grammatical structure. Students were to answer the questions presented, but never pose their own. It was a practice inherited in colonial times that would endure until the mid-nineteenth century. Andrew D. White, reflecting on his education at Yale in the 1850s, wrote “there was never even a single lecture on any subject in literature, either ancient or modern: everything was done by means of ‘recitations’ from text-books” (364). The basis for such study was that “grammar and etymology could unlock the special culture embodied in a literary work” and that such difficult work
engendered in students a mental discipline that would be useful throughout their lives in any field (Graff 30). Noah Porter, a nineteenth-century Yale professor, believed that “to commit to memory, and to master by thought, the words and principles which the text-books present for study” was crucial to “the training of the man to the power and habit of successfully concentrating and controlling his powers” (139; qtd in Graff 32).

Further, and of significance to the social system colleges reinforced, this process fostered fellowship among classmates. Graff adds, “even at their most dreary, recitations solidified the social bond that was more important than anything students might learn” (33). Graff explains that at this time, “educators felt the social bonds of college life were more important than anything a student might actually learn” (27). Not all students, though, found the process so bonding or enlightening, and the classical curriculum had its critics. Graff quotes an 1880s memoir of student life by Fred Lewis Patee: after studying the classics, Patee explains that he “had no suspicion they were great literature” but instead saw them as “simply conglomerations of ablative absolutes, vocatives, gerunds and gerundives, caesural pauses, conjunctions and inflections, [and] maddening irregular verbs” (29).

In the eighteenth century, the curriculum did not remain stagnant, though. There was experimentation and evolution, though nothing so radical as to include Shakespeare. Influenced by the Enlightenment, there was increased interest in mathematics, physical sciences, and more
practical subjects (Handlin 15). In 1754, for example, New York and Philadelphia offered courses useful to eighteenth-century professions, such as surveying, navigation, geography, history, and physics (Rudolph 29). In 1756, the College of Philadelphia even offered a course in English Literature (Rudolph 32). William Smith, with the aid of Benjamin Franklin, put the emphasis at Philadelphia on English, science, and practical studies. Their experimentation with English and practical studies met strong resistance, though, and had little success (Rudolph 32). Yet, from the late eighteenth century onwards, some room was allocated in college curricula for the study of science and mathematics, though the study of classical languages and literatures continued to dominate the curriculum well into the nineteenth century. Graff describes “the standard [nineteenth-century] college curriculum” as consisting of “two to four years of Greek and Latin, plus mathematics, history, logic, theology, and a bit of natural science,” with a culminating course in moral philosophy taught by the college president in the senior year (22).

“All That Are Assembled In This Place”: The Influence of Literary Societies

Though neither the formal curriculum nor popular culture afforded a place for Shakespeare in the colonial and antebellum periods, there is evidence that some colonial university students took an extracurricular interest in his writings. Many colonial students kept commonplace notebooks; in these, they reflected on their daily lives and classes and would sometimes copy out favorite passages from books. Thomas
Jefferson, for example, revealed in his an interest in the fields of science, law, and medicine (Thelin 19-20; Morison, *Intellectual* 49-50). Few of these from the colonial period, though, have survived to the present day, but some of those that do reveal interest in Shakespeare’s poetry. Seaborn Cotton, so named because he was born while on an early voyage from England in 1633, recorded in his a song from *Measure for Measure* that he most likely copied from a 1640 anthology of verse that had made its way to the colony (Dunn 20; Morison, *Intellectual* 49-50). Another seventeenth-century Harvard student, Elnathan Chauncy, copied out a passage in his from “Venus and Adonis” (Dunn 20-21). That the first of these examples is a song and the second comes from a narrative poem suggests that these young men did not have access to Shakespeare’s dramatic works, but only excerpted songs and narrative poetry. Given the strong Puritan distaste for theater, they would likely have had little interest in Shakespeare as a dramatist even if they would have had access to his dramatic writings. They were, though, interested enough in Shakespeare as a poet to include these selections in their commonplace books.

By the end of the eighteenth century, this type of extracurricular literary interest would culminate in the formation of university literary societies. These literary societies, also known as debating societies, began to form partly as a collective response to various aspects of university life. The eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries had witnessed an outbreak of student riots protesting “poor food, poor teaching, an inadequate
curriculum, rigid laws, haughty tutors, partial professors, and lack of redress for ... grievances” (Jackson 56). Between the 1780s and the 1830s, there were cases of student violence and hijinks: windows and clocks were broken; candles, bibles, and food stolen; tutors and professors assaulted with stones, whips and fists. In 1789, the Harvard water supply was tainted with laxatives the day before examinations (Jackson 63). The magnitude of antebellum student revolts at Princeton and the University of Virginia – which included “burnings, bombings, semiorganized shootouts, and armed assault and murder” – left both schools on the verge of collapse (Sloan 4). Sometimes disturbances were isolated events, but more often they were part of longer series of disruptions that sometimes went on for months at a time with daily incidents of violence and vandalism.

University officials responded with punishments that ranged from fines, suspensions, and rustication, to expulsion (Jackson 54-56). Administrators sometimes sponsored religious revivals in an attempt to instill a deeper sense of submissiveness and “arouse new religious sensitivities” in students (Sloan 5). Students, though, felt they were being treated as children, but the chaotic brand of violence and vandalism that ensued did little to further their cause (Jackson 50-51, 67). There is little evidence to suggest that student rioting had any meaningful impact on the administration of the colleges.

The early literary societies, though, would prove a much more effective agent of change. Over the course of several decades, their impact
redefined the university in several ways, not the least of which was that their interest in literature and Shakespeare helped secure the Bard’s plays a place afterward in the American school curriculum. Prior to the literary societies, individual academic classes (i.e. freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) had generally been the only sanctioned mode of student social organization. Outside of the classroom, even the academic classes were rarely allowed to meet as a whole group (Jackson 70). With the formation of literary societies, students found a legitimized social network outside approved academic classes (Jackson 72). The literary societies afforded students opportunities that did not exist in the curriculum to address contemporary social, political, and educational issues. By 1770, university students had become more thoughtful on political matters as demonstrated by “a growing student interest in Republicanism and ideas outside the academic orthodoxy” (Thelin 22).

Phi Beta Kappa was one such early and influential literary society. First established at William and Mary in 1776, later chapters were established at Yale in 1780 and Harvard in 1781. Not all university students, though, were happy about Phi Beta Kappa. It was initially condoned by the faculty but condemned by many students. Because Phi Beta Kappa opposed student riots and violence, some students perceived the group as an agent of university administration instead of one opposed to the injustices and failings of that administration (Jackson 74). In fact, though, “Phi Beta Kappa acknowledged many, if not all, of the grievances
expressed by the dissident students” (Jackson 74). Instead of supporting rioting, Phi Beta Kappa, like later literary societies, instituted a social organization that both imitated and improved upon traditional seventeenth- and eighteenth-century university models. It had its own presidents and officers, and its own library and curriculum. At Butler University in the nineteenth century, the literary societies even issued their own diplomas; graduating students received both a diploma from the college and also from their literary society (Weidener 6-7). But where the university created a paternalistic hierarchy, the literary societies typically entailed a more democratic and egalitarian system based on fraternity and brotherhood. While the university library and university curriculum held to the limited tenets of the classical curriculum, Phi Beta Kappa addressed contemporary social, political, and educational issues relevant to its members. In doing so, they challenged the basic assumptions of university administration in a way that was both gradual and effective, which the rioting had never been (Jackson 75). By the 1830s, the riots had ended. Harvard saw its last great rebellion in 1834 (Jackson 78). The literary societies, though, would evolve into the prominent social feature of university life well into the nineteenth century.

Critical of nearly every component of the nineteenth-century college model, Gerald Graff praises the college literary societies. He writes, "without the student literary societies and magazines ... the old college literary education would make a very poor showing indeed” (Graff
Socializing and bonding students, these societies were similar to modern fraternities, sororities, and even athletics in modern universities. The literary societies also provided opportunities for students to assemble and discuss literature in the sense that a modern English class would, and their impact upon the study of literature and Shakespeare, though hard to measure formally, would help usher in curricular change. Frederick Rudolph summarizes

... the literary societies and their libraries, the clubs, journals, and organizations which compensated for the neglect of science, English literature, history, music, and art in the curriculum – this vast developing extracurriculum was the student response to the classical course of study.

(144)

Arthur Applebee concludes that the “extracurriculum of the students’ creation became after 1870 a major part of the curriculum itself” (12). Several important authors of the modern American literary canon are themselves rooted in this tradition: “college literary societies were the formative literary education for numerous nineteenth-century American writers, including Emerson, Hawthorne, Dana, Holmes, Lowell, and Henry Adams” (Graff 44). Within the boundaries of the official university curriculum, students had no avenue to critically address the social and cultural issues of their time, listen to authors speak, analyze English literature or even borrow books, but literary and debating societies
provided a venue for these activities, activities that would begin to evolve into the standard fare of the university by the end of the century.

Literary societies also influenced curricular change through their libraries. Literary society libraries – which “almost everywhere were larger, more accessible, and broader in range of interest than the college libraries” – provided college students access to books and literature that the college libraries did not (Graff 44). Frederick Rudolph writes:

> Not only did the literary societies often outstrip the college libraries in numbers of volumes, but the wide range of subject matter allowed far greater opportunity for the play of intellect than did the narrow religious fare of the usual college library. (143)

Because most colleges had two literary societies, there was often rivalry to build bigger book collections, resulting in the growth of both society’s libraries, though it did lead to some wasteful duplication of titles (Harding 83). Society libraries were often superior to college libraries. Catherine Penniman Storie concludes from her research of the literary societies in 1830 that “nearly half had collections larger than those of their college libraries” (242). For example, at Yale in 1839, the college library held 10,500 volumes while the literary society libraries held 15,000 (Harding 67). At Dartmouth in 1839, the college library held 3,500 volumes while the literary societies held 8,000 (Harding 67). At North Carolina in 1839, the college library held 3,000 volumes, while the literary societies held
Societies also tended to make their collections more available to students than the college libraries. Whereas the college libraries were oftentimes open only an hour or two each week – Yale, open sometimes as long as four hours a day, was an exception – and had strict rules about borrowing and reading books, the literary society libraries adopted by-laws meant to make books accessible to students (Storie 242). Library catalogs from nineteenth-century literary societies also reveal a wide and contemporary selection: novels, plays, classics, poetry, as well as non-fiction such as histories, biographies, politics, sciences, arts, books on travel and others (Harding 72-83; Rudolph 143; Storie 244). Literary societies also collected periodicals such as the Spectator, the Tattler, the American Quarterly Review, The North American Review, and others (Harding 72-73). Novels were an important part of the collections. Everett Hale, from the Harvard Class of 1839, wrote:

    One great object of joining a literary society was to have a steady supply of novels. For my part I undoubtedly averaged eighty novels a year in my college course ... and I know I received great advantage from the time I devoted to reading them (Hale 16; qtd in Harding 58).

By making books accessible, literary society libraries helped fill another gap in nineteenth-century students’ college experience. As college library collections grew toward the end of the nineteenth century, though, this
need gradually diminished, and society library books were oftentimes
donated to and mixed into college collections.

Literary societies also published periodic literary journals and
invited literary figures to university campuses. Harvard literary societies
published *Lyceum, Register, Collegian,* and *Harvardiana*; Yale published
*Yale Lit* (Graff 45). Other societies at other universities published similar
periodicals. Literary societies also invited authors to speak at college
campuses who otherwise would not have been invited. Ralph Waldo
Emerson, for example, had been banned at Williams University by its
conservative faculty, but was able to speak to its students nonetheless on
three different occasions; he had been invited by the student societies
themselves and spoke at off-campus venues (Applebee 12; Graff 45;
Rudolph 142). Whitman, “considered suspect” by college authorities, was
also invited to speak at college campuses (Graff 45). Other controversial
speakers invited by the literary societies included Rufus Choate, Henry
Graff suggests that “by bringing the local culture into contact with
contemporary currents of taste, public readings and lectures and the
activities of the literary societies and student magazines had an important
influence in breaking down genteel moral opposition to secular literature”
(45). He adds that “the literary societies did far more than formal classes
to situate students in relation to the cultural issues of their time” (46).
Debate was the prominent feature of most literary society meetings. The typical meeting featured a scheduled formal debate. John Engle explains that “membership meant frequent, formalized debate” and that “literary societies felt free to examine nearly any issue, often taking on problems many of their elders ignored: slavery, xenophobia, capital punishment, suffrage, secession, [and] Indian rights” (Engle 39-40). David Potter writes, “as they solidified their hold on campus extracurricular life, they confidently passed judgment on many of the problems that faced their elders and on several that educators and statesmen had passed by” (251). Graff adds that “the societies provided something that was not fully recreated by the later universities – a context of cultural debate through which students could make sense of their studies” (46).

Slavery and secession, for example, were important issues that became increasingly controversial as the Civil War approached. Initially, and surprisingly, the literary societies of the South did not wholeheartedly support slavery. In 1812, the Clariosophic Society of South Carolina College affirmed that the slaves of the United States should be emancipated (Potter 250). In 1828, the Georgia University chapter of Phi Kappa Beta found that the enslavement of human beings was not justifiable (Potter 251). However, such lofty conclusions disappeared as the Civil War approached. B. Evelyn Westbrook, analyzing the votes of the Clariosophic Society of South Carolina between 1842 and 1848, found that the literary societies of the South had adapted more conservative
viewpoints on slavery and secession by the 1840s (345). For example, in 1842, the students of the Clariosophic Society concluded that the spirit of liberty was higher in countries where there were slaves; in 1843, they found that slaves should be debased of the means of knowledge and learning; in 1846, they decided that a state has the right to secede from the union; and in 1848 they predicted that slavery would endure (Westbrook 345). The analysis of such literary society debates reveals students’ changing attitudes and beliefs over time and provides a glimpse into the changing sociopolitical contexts that shaped those debates. Without the literary societies, student debate about crucial contemporary topics would likely have been absent from the nineteenth-century university experience.

Literary societies also took an active interest in issues related to education, an interest, that though gradual, would impact reform in education and help pave the way for Shakespeare to enter the curriculum. Second only to their interest in current political events, matters of education played a prominent role in many literary society debates (Engle 40). Literary societies consistently challenged the old educational model and its unrelenting focus upon Latin and Greek. A 1782 debate by the Athenian Society of Rutgers debated “whether [there is] advantage arising from the study of the dead languages” (Potter 249). The United Fraternity at Dartmouth debated in 1798 whether it might be as advantageous to study French as Greek (Harding 25). The Linonian Society at Yale determined in 1810 that students destined to different professions should
have an opportunity to pursue different courses of study (Engle 40; Harding 25; Potter 250). The Adelphic Society at Western Reserve University decided in 1830 that a classical education was not a necessary prerequisite for eminence in any profession (Potter 252). The Philolexian Society of Columbia found that the system of college education in 1834 was not calculated for entrance into practical life (Potter 252). In 1859, Phi Delta at Western Reserve University argued as to whether a larger part of the curriculum should be devoted to the study of English language and literature (Potter 253). The next year, in 1860, the Dialectic Society at Oberlin resolved that a student should pursue his college course with reference to some profession (Potter 255). In 1871, the Philolexian Society at Columbia determined that all studies should be made elective during the junior and senior years (Potter 255). Through their debates, students were actively pleading their case for educational reform to one another, to their university administration, and to the educational community at large. Though it would take decades before the universities eventually adopted a more flexible curriculum based on student needs, one that not only permitted but eventually grew to venerate the study of English language and literature, the persistent voices of the literary societies, steady and gradual, made themselves heard.

“You Play’d Once i’ th’ University, You Say?”:
Shakespeare at Harvard, 1770-1807

It is not surprising, given their interest in the study of English language and literature, that literary societies also took an interest in
Shakespeare. By the end of the eighteenth century, volumes including Shakespeare’s plays had become available in the fledgling United States, and literary society students took an interest in his plays. Harvard’s Speaking Club was one of the first societies for which evidence exists of a serious engagement with Shakespeare. Albert Goodhue, Jr., an undergraduate student of the well-known Harvard historian Samuel Morison in the 1930s, researched the readings of the early society, and reported his findings in a term paper for a Morison history class. The typewritten paper, available in the Harvard University Archives, analyzes society reading trends from 1770 until 1781, finding the one constant throughout the decade to be Shakespeare: there “are definite and consistent literary tastes which extended throughout the ten years under consideration [of which] the most readily apparent example [is] the reading [of] Shakspeare [sic]” (Goodhue 22). Society members read soliloquies aloud to the group or joined together with two or three other members for the reading of a short scene. Goodhue suggests that the members generally limited themselves to a select few plays: *Julius Caesar, Hamlet, As You Like It*, both parts of *Henry IV, Henry V, Othello*, and *Macbeth*. Goodhue included an appendix detailing the frequency with which certain authors were read in each of the years of his study; the following table shows the numbers of Shakespearean readings each year from 1770 through 1779:
Table 1: Harvard Speaking Club Shakespearean Readings, 1770-1779

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>1771</th>
<th>1772</th>
<th>1773</th>
<th>1774</th>
<th>1775</th>
<th>1776</th>
<th>1777</th>
<th>1778</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though Goodhue limited his research to the first volume of the Speaking Club archives, later volumes dating to 1790 are also available in the Harvard University Archives. The secretaries’ handwriting was not always legible and some pages from the minutes are damaged, which made research difficult for some meetings. Further, the secretaries oftentimes did not provide specific information about the play or passage, instead merely writing “Shakespeare” or “Dialogue from Shakespeare” making it impossible to know precisely what was read. These later records confirm that when the secretaries did specify the play, students continued through 1790 to read from the same plays that Goodhue had mentioned: *Julius Caesar, Hamlet, As You Like It, Henry IV, Henry V, Othello*, and *Macbeth*. (See Appendix A.)

Moreover, Shakespeare continued to be as much a subject of interest for members of Harvard’s Speaking Club through the 1780s as he was in the 1770s. In fact, it is likely that student interest in Shakespeare increased in the 1780s: while Goodhue reports 23 instances of Shakespeare being read before the Speaking Club between November
1770 and 1779, there were 35 instances of Shakespearean readings in the years between 1780 and 1789.

Table 2: Harvard Speaking Club Shakespearean Readings, 1780-1789

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further research might reveal an interest in Shakespeare’s plays during this period in other Harvard societies or also in the literary societies of other colonial and antebellum universities.

Harvard student interest in Shakespeare remained steady at least through 1807, when 99 of 175 undergraduates subscribed to *Munroe and Francis’ Complete Shakespeare*. At Brown University there were 28 subscribers, seventeen at Union College, and seven at Dartmouth (Applebee 12; Dunn 239; Simon 8). Simon suggests that because Shakespeare’s plays fell outside the traditional Latin and Greek canon of the early nineteenth century, they were “a forbidden fruit” for university students and it “was fashionable for undergraduates to indulge their appetites” (8). Interest in the reading of Shakespeare was typically neither ordained by the universities nor forbidden. In the early years of the nineteenth century, university officials wanted students to be familiar with the works of Shakespeare and other important English authors; they
simply had not believed that such reading was suitable for formal classroom study (Applebee 12).

“It Shrunk In Haste Away”: The Decline of Literary Societies

In the years following the American Civil War, gradually replaced by fraternities and organized athletics, literary societies began to decline. By the 1870s, they had largely disappeared in the East. They would endure longer in the West, but their status there too gradually diminished as the end of the century approached. Fraternities and athletics maintained and further developed the social structures that the literary societies had originally fostered, but without the academic features that had been their distinguishing characteristic. This was largely because literary societies, through their influence over the decades of the mid-nineteenth century, had been successful in influencing university policy and practice. Many of the features lacking at the beginning of the nineteenth century – libraries; a varied and differentiated curriculum; as well as a less rigid structure for student social life – became university standards (Rudolph 145-47, 156). It had taken decades, but the literary societies had significantly influenced higher education. By the 1870s, Shakespeare had begun moving from the extracurricular literary societies to the formal curriculum.

The second half of this chapter will look at five samples of student writing: four from students of Harvard’s Hasty Pudding Club, the first three written between 1852 and 1854, and the last in 1893; and an essay from Kalamazoo College’s Sherwood Rhetorical Society written in
1860. These student writing samples offer unique opportunities for analysis of Shakespeare’s role in nineteenth-century college and university education, a lens through which modern day researchers can see students both accept and challenge the sociocultural and educational norms present in their daily lives. On issues related to gender and anti-Semitism, students not only accepted but reinforced contemporary sexist and racist views in their writing. On the political issues of race and secession related to the Civil War, though, student writing demonstrates a much richer and more complex interest.

Case Study I: The Hasty Pudding Club and Harvard University

The Hasty Pudding Club, a literary society of Harvard College founded in 1795, first took an active interest in dramatic performance in 1844. Unlike its contemporaries, though, the Pudding was able to adapt and survive not only in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, but also through the twentieth and twenty-first, and their theatrical interest continues still today. By the end of the nineteenth century, the club had earned international renown for its student-written productions and performances, but early in its history, the club performed a handful of Shakespearean productions. Between 1852 and 1869, there were six, including three based on Macbeth, two from Othello, and one from Richard III (see Table 3). There was then no Shakespeare over the next twenty years, until in 1890, the HPC produced included act two scene two of Twelfth Night in a Christmas production. In 1893, the club performed a
spoof based loosely on the story of *Hamlet*, in which Queen Gertrude tries to push Hamlet into an unwanted marriage with an un-drowned Ophelia, and then in 1895 the club again included act two scene two from *Twelfth Night* in a Christmas production. This 1895 scene, though, would be the last time that Shakespeare would be performed by the Hasty Pudding Club.

Table 3: Hasty Pudding Club Shakespearean Performances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 1852</td>
<td><em>Travestie of Macbeth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 20, 1854</td>
<td><em>Macbeth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 21, 1860</td>
<td><em>Othello</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17, 1864</td>
<td><em>Richard ye Third</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26, 1868</td>
<td><em>Macbeth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 8, 1869</td>
<td><em>Othello the Moor</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 18, 1890</td>
<td><em>Twelfth Night</em> (Act II, Scene 2 – as part of a Christmas program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13, 1893</td>
<td><em>Hamlet, Prince of Denmark; Or, The Sport, The Spook, and the Spinster</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 22, 1895</td>
<td><em>Twelfth Night</em> (Act II, Scene 2 – also part of a Christmas program)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One challenging aspect of researching the history of the Hasty Pudding Club is that their secretaries maintained a tradition of recording minute meetings in verse instead of the business-like prose typical of most literary societies and clubs. Such artistic style may have added to
the glee and secrecy of the club in its day, but for the modern researcher, the verse can sometimes prove a nearly impenetrable code. In the introduction to *An Illustrated Hasty Pudding Theatricals*, an 1897 visual record of the club’s playbills, J.T. Wheelwright writes, “The traditional obligation of the Pudding secretaries to write their minutes in verse is often cause for rage and grief in seekers of facts” (17). Despite these challenges, though, the club’s history is fascinating because of its long and successful theatrical heritage.

Some entries were occasionally written in prose, and though rare, can be useful. On one such occasion, the secretary gives this clear picture in 1852 of the vigor of the society and its theatrical productions:

> The affairs of the Hasty Pudding Club have been conducted ... with that energy ... and that success which ever attends harmonious and well-directed effort. The department of the Drama has been managed with consummate skill .... The scenic displays have always been appropriate, and often magnificent .... Convenient wardrobes for our rapidly increasing paraphernalia have been provided. The Library has been enriched by many valuable donations ... [and] we are now in possession of an admirable Catalogue of the Library. The debt incurred in fitting up our rooms as they are at present, has been entirely cancelled with the donations collected .... It is safe
to say that the Club was never before so flourishing, and
never more respectable. (Harvard, HPC Secretary’s
Records, 1852-55, p. 47)

This rare prose entry reveals in matter-of-fact language the club’s own self-perception. Verse entries, on the other hand, though they lack the clarity of prose, provide more lively insight. For example, in a farewell address of the Pudding Class of 1853, written primarily in rhyming couplets by Robert Rantoul and delivered by Ormond Dutton, the brevity of temporal theater becomes an extended metaphor for the ephemeral college career, which is brief like the scene of a play (See Appendix B). Though the HPC will endure, the upcoming graduation, like the fall of a curtain, will soon bring to a close the college careers of its seniors:

The Hasty Pudding Club shall stand secure! ...
To us, the scenes must wear a different phase.
How brief and waning are our college days!
How soon we scatter from this peaceful field!
The warmest hand we press may soon be cold.

(Prompter’s whistle.)

But Lark! Methought I heard the prompter’s call;
To o’er the future, let the curtain fall!

(Slow curtain.)
Earlier in the address, Rantoul had echoed the laments of contemporary nineteenth-century critics and defended the club’s theatrical performances, claiming them to be “as simple as in Shakespeare’s day.” He alludes to the modern “sage” and the “poet” who “groan in essay” and “sigh in verse” to “reform the drama [and] reassert the stage.” Such critics bewail:

“The stage is growing worse and worse”

“Away!” they [contemporary scholars] cry, “the tinsels and the glow.

“Of empty pomp – of gold-beleaguered show!

“Restore the simple of Shakespeare’s age

“And drive the painted harlot from the stage!”

While the mid-nineteenth-century American stage had been infested with prostitution and drunken visiting actors (as will be discussed more fully in Chapter Two), its nineteenth-century English counterpart had been one of pomp and extravagance. Victorian Shakespeare productions had strived to outdo one another with bigger, heavier, and more elaborate sets, with as many as three hundred extras for a battle scene, and several inches of salt dumped on the stage to create the appearance of snow. In his book, *The Shakespeare Revolution*, J.L. Styan recounts several Victorian performances that indulged in such extravagance. He describes “panoramic forum scenes ... in *Julius Caesar*, an overwhelming storm in *The Tempest*, magnificent sea-fights in *Antony*
and Cleopatra, and an unending procession ... in Henry IV, Part II” (16).

In an 1859 performance of Henry V, the line “How London doth pour out her citizens” prompted “an actual mob of 300 extras to welcome Henry back to London after Agincourt” (Styan 16). It was this extravagance, and not the language of Shakespeare, that drove these elaborate performances. It brought thousands in the nineteenth century to the theater to see Shakespeare, but also engendered criticism from Shakespearean critics and purists, men of letters including Coleridge, Lamb, and Hazlitt, who believed it undermined the true nature of Shakespeare. Coleridge wrote that he “never saw any of Shakespeare’s plays acted but with a degree of pain, disgust, and indignation” (qtd in Styan 34). Charles Lamb wrote, “when the novelty is past, we find to our cost that instead of realizing an idea, we have only materialized and brought down a fine vision to the standard of flesh and blood” (qtd in Styan 34). Because language did not drive performance in the nineteenth century, Coleridge and Lamb – invested in the language of Shakespeare – loathed a brand of performance driven by spectacle.

The Pudding Class of 1853, though, in its farewell address defended its own performances against such criticism:

No groundlings here shall feel the guilty glow
Of such as revel in their seats below ...
But all is simple as in Shakespeare’s day.
Save carpets on our boards instead of hay, –
As plain as Hamlet’s, which was just the thing,

Wherein to catch the conscience of the king.

Though the HPC would eventually earn a reputation for its farces, in the nascent stages of its development its members were attempting a traditional and conservative approach in their productions, one founded soundly in the literary criticism of the nineteenth century, and as serious students of literature, they truly hoped to recreate the simplicity of theatrics they believed had existed in Shakespeare’s time but had been lost in mainstream nineteenth-century theater.

An October 20, 1854, entry in the Hasty Pudding Club minutes, less than a year later, further illuminates club members’ attitudes concerning the nature of Shakespeare and theater. Also written in verse, this entry is the official record of their second Macbeth performance in just two years. Theodore Lyman, the Pudding secretary, recorded an imagined visit from the ghost of William Shakespeare to see the production. His minutes, and an advertisement shingle, are the only extant documentation of the staging of this early Pudding production (see Appendix C). Lyman’s whimsical verse suggests a traditional performance of the play. In a series of sixteen septets with varying rhyme schemes, Lyman depicts the ghost of Shakespeare coming through a window in the shape of a book, a quarto, with “leathern coat,” “marbled
pages,” and “fortified with pastelboard straight and strong.”

Shakespeare’s ghost laments to Lyman for the past:

“Oh for the glory of those brilliant days!”

“When even monarchs rushed to see my plays”

“When in the aisle an Earl was glad to sit,”

“And Dukes and Barons filled the crowded pit.”

“When England’s greatest minds were wont to praise:

“Proud Hamlet’s moody grief; great Falstaff’s wit;”

“And weep, for sympathy with Juliet’s moan.”

“Where, in this age of histrionic dearth,"

“Throughout the length and breadth of English earth,"

“Are my great dramas cherished, once so famed?”

“Now wretched farces, scarcely to be named”

“As plays at all; but such as rouse the mirth”

“Of country bumpkins, who, with looks uncharmed”

“By stupid wonderment, do sit and stare.”

The ghost’s romantic notion of the past echoes the earlier farewell address of the Pudding class of 1853, bemoaning contemporary theater and its shortcomings: if it was not extravagance and spectacle, it was unsophisticated farce, slapstick that had none of the imagined grace and simplicity that those of the nineteenth century believed theater once had. Theater had lost touch with its Shakespearean roots. While much has
been revealed about Elizabethan and Jacobean theater history in the
century and a half since Lyman, his verse here recreates the prejudices
against which early Hasty Pudding Club productions were staged.

Both the 1852 and 1854 productions of
*Macbeth* were
small-scale, but
serious, renditions
of Shakespeare with
only minor
adaptations; students
may have made
editorial cuts to the text in order to shorten the play, but theirs was a
serious reading and performance, not the type of farce for which the
group would later become famous. These were also not the large-scale
public events for which the Pudding would later be known, but instead
small, private affairs in which Pudding members gathered together as
classmates to watch one another perform; the first public performance of
a Hasty Pudding Club production would not occur until 1855. ² These

² In his introduction to *An Illustrated History of the Hasty Pudding Theatricals*,
Wheelwright explains that the first Pudding public performance was *Tom Thumb* in 1855,
which was also the first musical play by the Pudding. Such public performances, though,
did not become customary until after the Civil War. *Tom Thumb* was adapted from a
Henry Fielding play, the first time Pudding members took such an active role in
playwriting. Other more ambitious student-adapted and student-written projects would
follow in the late 1850s, 60s and 70s. The first student-written production to gain national
fame was *Dido and Aeneas*, written in 1882 by Owen Wister. From 1882 on, the Hasty
would perform at least one student-written production annually (27-29).
were also not the well-known student-written productions for which the Hasty Pudding Club would later gain fame; the student-written productions did not begin until the 1870s and they did not become a mainstay in Pudding tradition until 1882.

In its early days in 1854, the Hasty Pudding Club was still in its nascent stages, and performing Shakespeare in a traditional style in order to prove its versatility and ability to take on more lofty and serious productions. In inviting Shakespeare himself, even if only metaphorically, to the club’s production of *Macbeth*, Lyman is defending the notion that Pudding performances could be sophisticated and serious affairs. And if one is to bring in a fictional judge to determine the merits of a show, there is none better than the ghost of Shakespeare. Lyman responds to the ghost’s laments and invites him to judge the Pudding show:

“Good ghost,” I cried, “you make a great mistake,”

“Come down to me my friend; your shelf forsake,”

“And if, before the morning’s first dim light,”

“I show you not a play that’s played aright;”

“To you a fitting present will I make”
“Of new morocco binding, gilded bright”

“The best that wise John Bartlett may prepare.”

John Bartlett was a well-known nineteenth-century Boston writer and book-publisher, and the promise of a new binding is tempting enough to entice the book-shaped ghost of Shakespeare from his shelf to the Pudding room to see the production of Macbeth. Lyman’s verse reveals nuances of the performance. Boxing took the place of swordplay, at least in some scenes, as Macbeth is described as “striving against Macduff with boxing glove,” and two septets later when Lyman calls Macduff the “straight left-hander,’ which assails his [Macbeth’s] jaw, / And drops him lifeless, on his kindred ground.” The Pudding also found other ways to make the production their own, adapting the Shakespearean language for comedic effect: Lyman describes the three young men playing the parts of witches as “cooking a collegiate stew,” made up of “Tutor’s ears, and wise Professor’s nose / Of Proctor’s fingers, and of Parson’s toes.” Lyman suggests some simple special effects: from beneath their cauldron, “brightly the fire ... glows, / And bats and howlets flap their wings above.” The Pudding actors blend modernity and tradition, with a pinch of the comic, and stage a conservative performance. In Lyman’s final septet, even the ghost of Shakespeare can approve:

And, as the curtain fell upon the end,

I turned to see how fared my spirit friend:

Upon the self same shelf on high he sat,
Flapping his covers, waving round his hat.

“Tis well,” he cried, “in peace my way I wend;”

“Ne’er will I call your modern drama flat.”

Then out of window sprung, with agile bound.

With the ghost of Shakespeare content, the performance is deemed a success, even if only in the annals of the Hasty Pudding Club records. Little else is known of this small student performance.

Nineteenth-century literary society students were performing Shakespeare, and Shakespeare was meant for the stage. Shakespeare’s performance tradition is one to be celebrated; Lyman describes monarchs, dukes, and earls all enjoying Shakespeare in performance in Shakespeare’s own time, and again in the mid-nineteenth century it is performance that wakes the ghost of Shakespeare from the dusty bookshelf to life. The students of the Pudding recognized the vigor that the stage brought to Shakespearean drama. Further, Shakespearean drama was adaptable to a degree, and meant to be altered for a modern stage in subtle ways. Students incorporated elements from boxing in the staging of the play and adapted Shakespeare’s words to include fingers, toes, and noses from college officials. At the same time, though, the students recognized that there were limits to such textual play, that turning Shakespeare into a farce could be taken too far. Lyman, at least in his writing, seems most cautious of this, to turn Shakespeare’s plays into “wretched farces” would turn away their intellectuality and effectiveness.
and make the productions into something fit for only “country bumpkins.”

Another example of a Pudding piece from the same period, also inspired from Shakespeare, is “The Hamlet Song” (see Appendix D) which opens with the lines:

A hero’s life I sing,
His story shall my pen mark.
He was not the king
But Hamlet, Prince of Denmark.

One interesting facet is that the song accuses Gertrude, not Claudius, of plotting to take the crown and poison King Hamlet:

His [Hamlet’s] mamma was young.
The crown she had her eyes on
Her husband stop’d her tongue,
She stopped his ears with poison.

Blaming the wife for the deeds of the husband will prove a common theme in nineteenth-century college student writing, and also in some nineteenth-century scholarly criticism. In other student writing samples to be addressed later in the chapter, including the script of the 1893 performance of *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark; Or, The Sport, The Spook, and the Spinster*, and also in the 1861 student essay of James Cadman, there are similar easy shifts in blame from husband to wife for the murders of King Hamlet and King Duncan respectively even though
Shakespeare’s text does not explicitly state that Gertrude was involved in her husband’s murder or even confirm that she knew of the conspiracy.

Another facet of the song – and another recurring theme that will be visited again later in the chapter in the analysis of other student writings – is the treatment of Ophelia. Ophelia, in both, is portrayed as an undesirable prude. The song explains in its sixth stanza that “Calumny had passed her / She never had played hicks / ‘Cause nobody had asked her.” Little sympathy is shown when Ophelia slips into madness and commits suicide. Instead the moment becomes an opportunity in the song for further comic treatment:

Madness seized her wits
Poor Lord Chamberlain’s daughter
She jumped into a pond,
And went to heaven by water.

The seventh stanza transitions dispassionately, “No matter now for that” and moves on to a humorous rendering of the play scene in which Hamlet catches the conscience of the king. The poem reveals Pudding members’ attitudes toward women and theater in the mid-1850s: first, that students easily blamed Gertrude for the actions of Claudius and also disregarded the tragic Ophelia and used her as stock for their jokes, and second, that students maintained a balance between traditional and farcical treatments of Shakespeare’s plays. They may have taken the performance of a
Shakespeare play seriously, but they also enjoyed textual play, transforming Shakespeare’s tragic drama into comic song.

By 1893, though, it is clear that the club fully embraced comic parody. *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark; Or, The Sport, The Spook, and the Spinster*, was not a traditional performance, but instead a spoof composed by three of the club’s seniors: George Blake, James Wilder, and Samuel Batchelder. The comic nature of the performance is clear both because of the play’s subtitle, and also because of an extant promptbook from the show housed in Harvard’s Houghton Library as part of the Harvard Theater Collection. The promptbook reveals three comedic acts, which flip Shakespeare’s original plot on end. Juliet, from *Romeo and Juliet*, makes

---

3 While the promptbook itself does not credit the three men with authorship of the play, their names appear in the *Thirteenth Catalogue and History of the Hasty Pudding Club* as its authors.
her way into the script, and Hamlet, Horatio, and Laertes all vie for her hand. None of the three, though, especially Hamlet, are interested in Shakespeare’s original heroine, Ophelia. Claudius is absent from the action; like his brother, he is dead, apparently at the hands of Gertrude, but there is no desire for revenge from the Ghost, “Your uncle and I are great friends now ... Your twice widowed mother was too much of a hustler for me, my boy” (17). Queen Gertrude, once again a widow, as the chorus points out several times, is left the sole monarch of Denmark. Gertrude plays matchmaker, deciding who will marry who – “You all know that marriages (except my own) are made by me” – and arranges for Hamlet and Ophelia to marry the following day, to which Hamlet laments, “I am brave – but marry that! I simply – I can’t” (13). Vehemently opposed to the match, Hamlet takes his father’s ghostly advice and feigns madness in hopes of avoiding marriage to Ophelia on the grounds that it would be wrong to match an insane groom to a sane bride. Initially oblivious to his intentions, Ophelia responds, “I fear my good beauties are the cause of Hamlet’s madness” (23) and later “Oh what a noble mind is here o’erthrown for love of me” (24).

Several other familiar lines from Shakespeare’s original, adapted to various degrees, also find their way into the script. At one point, Hamlet says, “The nose of time is out of joint / Oh cursed spite that ever I was born to set it right” (15). Later in the play, he says, “Well, I guess I’ll soliloquize. Degree or not degree, that is the question –” (41). The
parody, though, is not just a spoof upon *Hamlet*. Other plays are parodied too. Juliet brings with her elements from *Romeo and Juliet*: when Horatio attempts to court her, she says, “Oh swear not by the inconstant star which nightly changes, and so forth, and so forth, and so forth.” Hamlet takes a line from *Julius Caesar*, when after taking a drink, he says, “Not that I love Caesar less / But Rum more” (40). Near the end of the play, an agitated Ophelia parodies a famous line from *Twelfth Night*, “Some are born wall-flowers, some achieve the wall, others have the wall thrust upon them” (46).

Several jabs are also directed towards Yale. Laertes boasts of his fencing, “Yaas. I’m quite a fencer – was a week on the Yale fence.” When the queen questions whether Ophelia has truly too gone mad later in the play like Hamlet, Horatio proves it so, saying “Quite certain. She has just accepted to lead the Junior Lemonade at Yale” (35). Hamlet, skull in hand, recites, “To what base uses must we all return. This skull once lit with Yorick’s flashing jest / May adorn some Yale man’s flashy chest” (40).

One troubling aspect of the script is the portrayal of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, who are depicted as Jewish peddlers, developing humor upon anti-Semitic undertones. The pair are first seen trying to sell “trousseaux” (bridal garments and linen) to Ophelia, despite the fact they do not have the product or know what it is – Rosencrantz asks, “Can we make it, Guildernstern [sic],” to which Guildenstern replies, “What will
you pay?” – before being chased away by Queen Gertrude. She chastises Ophelia, “Offering your hand to a Jew peddler! Are you daft child?” (20). Later in the play, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern even try to sell wares to the audience (38).

The climax comes when, as in Shakespeare’s original finale, Hamlet and Laertes are to fence. In contrast to Shakespeare’ original, though, Polonius is still alive, saved from Hamlet’s “mad” sword thrust by his “bruder’s hymnbook” he had kept under his robe and he stands ready to provide further comic relief (32). Horatio has plotted the event, and intends to profit most of all from the duel. He soliloquizes: “I forgot to mention that we will poison both rapiers. Oh I’m a real villain. That rids me of both my rivals and Juliet is mine!” (33). In the last lines of the play, though, when Horatio reveals that the rapiers had been poisoned, Rosencrantz confesses, “That poison you bought was only saleratus” and everybody lives (50). Saleratus is baking soda. The ghost returns for the final scene and decrees that Hamlet is to marry Juliet, Horatio to marry Ophelia, and the Queen to marry Laertes. Even the queen cannot evade his edict and feebly counters, “Spooky – don’t match us off in this uncomfortable way” (51). But the ghost is gone, and Hamlet’s line, “Yes. Virtue is triumphant, villainy punished and the chorus happy” ends the action (51).

These pieces show little attention to or understanding of female characters. In both “The Hamlet Song” and also again in the 1893 spoof
performance of Hamlet, the blame for King Hamlet’s murder is placed primarily upon Gertrude and not Claudius. Though there is little textual evidence that would suggest so, the young men of the Hasty Pudding Club assume that it was she who “stopped her husband’s ears” with the poison. Also, there is little sympathy at any point with Ophelia’s plight in either case. And while the song and the play are meant to be humorous, it is troubling that both treat Ophelia with no sympathy whatsoever, instead garnering laughs by poking fun at her mental illness and suicide. Similar misogynistic undertones appear again in the next nineteenth-century student writing sample.

Case Study II: James Cadman and Kalamazoo College’s Sherwood Rhetorical Society

In 1860, at the age of seventeen, James Piper Cadman wrote a critical essay on Macbeth during the spring term of his sophomore year at Kalamazoo College (formerly a branch campus of the University of Michigan) that reveals his and his peers’ experiences and beliefs (see Appendix E). Cadman’s essay is the only known extant Kalamazoo College student essay on Shakespeare. It reveals his literary education, as well as the role that Shakespeare played in that education. Handwritten in a hardbound notebook alongside journal entries and other essays, Cadman’s Macbeth essay was written for oral presentation; he reports in its conclusion having read it aloud both before his English class and in part as a chapel essay.
Kalamazoo College, founded in 1833 with Baptist roots, had just begun offering an English Literature class in the 1856-57 academic year, just three years prior to Cadman’s composition. The college’s preparatory department for younger students also included English literature in its program. The Sherwood Rhetorical Society, of which Cadman was an active member, had formed in 1851 with the encouragement of President James Stone and was chartered in 1860 (Francis 47). The Sherwood was one of three active literary societies at Kalamazoo College during the years Cadman attended: the others were the Philolexium Lyceum – a second literary society for young men established in 1855 – and the Eurodelphian, established in 1856 for young women (Francis 47). All three collected their own library of books; the Sherwood’s library included 400 titles, which they shared with all students (Francis 47). The three college literary societies, alongside the newly added English Literature course, provided Kalamazoo College students rich opportunities for the study of literature and other topical subjects, opportunities that had not been available in Kalamazoo even ten years before.

The young men of Sherwood Rhetorical Society, typical of literary societies in the nineteenth century, were actively interested in the role of schools and universities in the United States. They often debated topics related to education, demonstrating an intellectual involvement in their own learning processes, a process in later centuries that might fall
under the heading of student-centered learning. Sherwood members debated educational topics such as whether common schools or universities were more valuable to society, whether the State should provide a free education for all children, whether prizes should be given in school, whether the Classical course or the scientific course of Kalamazoo College was preferable, whether or not students should keep up on current events even if at the expense of their studies, and others (See Appendix F). As the Civil War approached, debates on educational issues waned while issues related to the war moved to the forefront: secession, slavery, and race. Even in the midst of the war, though, questions on educational issues occasionally peppered the Friday evening debates. Cadman and the students of Kalamazoo College were not passive learners; they took an active interest in their own education and had opinions on how best that education should be achieved.

Analysis of Cadman’s criticism of *Macbeth* further reveals the opinions and beliefs of Kalamazoo College students in the years leading up to the American Civil War. For one, students were trained to revere Shakespeare. Cadman’s opening paragraph, for example, adulates Shakespeare’s ability to draw upon a range of different characters in his plays, from the “prattling child” to the “wisest philosopher.” His praise echoes the adulation found in the text studied at the college at that time. College catalogs reveal that students of Kalamazoo College’s English Literature classes until the mid-1860s read William Spaulding’s *The
History of English Literature. Spaulding strongly influenced Cadman’s thinking and writing, and elements of Cadman’s writing echo Spaulding’s Romantic style and ideals. For example, Spaulding considers the age of Spenser, Shakespeare, Bacon, and Milton to be the summit in the history of English literature, describing it at length as “the most brilliant [period] in the literary history of England” in which “thought, and imagination, and eloquence, combine to illuminate it with their most dazzling light” (195). This lofty praise continues through several chapters, generously mingled alongside more concrete analysis of the historical period. Spaulding’s text identifies Shakespeare specifically as “the greatest of the great men who have created the imaginative literature of the English language” (251). According to Spaulding, “the name of Shakespeare is the greatest in our literature: it is the greatest in all literature ... no man ever came near him in the creative powers of the mind” (260).

Spaulding’s praise informs Cadman’s writing. For example, Spaulding describes Shakespeare as a painter of:

The grand pictures of life ... pictures which group all their characters, whether elevated or mean, in situations exciting universal sympathies ... pictures which ... we cannot behold without being forced to meditate on some of the most important problems of human life and action.

(259)
Compare this to Cadman’s reverent description of Shakespeare’s character development:

Shakespeare seems to have gathered the whole world in one mighty sweep and placed it before us ... we may consider him raised above the common level and from his eminence viewing the characters of those below him ... none can ever see more, since within the range of this poet’s eye all men seem to have appeared.

For Cadman, like Spaulding, Shakespeare stood above all other men as a deity and peered down into their very souls as he created his characters. Cadman writes, “Thus we behold Shakespeare in his true position as regards his fellow men.” Shakespeare creates not just characters in his plays, but recreates the very nature of humanity. At Kalamazoo College, as early as 1860, Shakespeare had already taken his place atop the throne of the English canon.

Spaulding was not the only secondary source with which Cadman was familiar, though. Nineteenth-century college students were typically expected to read from only one text in each of their college courses. Cadman, however, in addition to having read Spaulding, also cites August Wilhelm von Schlegel, a nineteenth-century German poet and scholar. Schlegel had translated several of Shakespeare’s works into German at the turn of the eighteenth century. His Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature, in which Schlegel speaks extensively on Shakespeare,
was first published in 1808, and is the only secondary source that Cadman cites in his composition. In the opening of his lecture on *Macbeth*, Schlegel, much like Spaulding, flatters Shakespeare, asking, “who could exhaust the praises of this sublime work?” (407). Schlegel was popular with nineteenth-century college literary societies, and his works were frequently included in their library collections, including Harvard’s Institute of 1770⁴ and Hasty Pudding Club⁵, Yale’s Calliopean Society⁶, Dartmouth’s United Fraternity⁷, Wake Forest’s Philomathesian Society,⁸ and others.

The young men of Kalamazoo College were trained to honor and revere Shakespeare as the pinnacle of the English literary canon. This can be seen in what they read, but also in what they wrote. It can also be seen, though, that this view was one in which gender disparities still held sway.

⁴Harvard archives hold a series of society library catalogs from the Institute of 1770. The 1854-55 volume lists “Schlegel’s Dramatic Literature” but the previous 1841 catalog does not, indicating the society acquired the Schlegel text between 1841 and 1854. (Records of the Institute of 1770. Library Catalogs, 1823-1855, Library Catalogs 1841 & 1854-55. HUD 3461.750. Harvard University Archives.)

⁵Harvard archives also hold several society library catalogs from the Hasty Pudding Club. One of these – likely from 1851 – include a listing for “Schlegel – Dramatic Art and Literature.” The date is not listed in the text itself, but is instead listed in the archive’s finding guide as 1851. (Records of the Hasty Pudding Club. HPC Library Catalogue. HUD 3447.750.11. Harvard University Archives.)

⁶Google Books has archived a digital copy of *The Catalogue of the Library of the Calliopean Society, Yale College, 1846*. The volume lists a copy of Schlegel’s *Dramatic Art and Literature*. Another version, from 1873, also in Google Books, includes the Schlegel text too.


⁸Thomas Harding reports that the Philomathesian Society had $150 to spend on books in the spring of 1846 and asked President William Hooper to make the selection for them. Amongst his selections was included Schlegel’s *Lectures on Drama and Literature* (Harding 207).
Schlegel, in his criticism, lays a foundation for a misogynistic reading of the play upon which Cadman would build. In his writing, Schlegel suggests the three witches of *Macbeth* to be “merely instruments ... governed by an invisible spirit” (408). Cadman elaborates, adding that the witches are the “Devil ... in woman form.” The stronger example, though, is Schlegel’s analysis of Lady Macbeth. Schlegel blames Lady Macbeth most of all for her husband’s downfall, which Cadman quotes, “of all the human participators in the king’s murder,” Lady Macbeth “is the most guilty” (409). Schlegel finds Macbeth to be guilty only of the deed, a lesser crime than that of Lady Macbeth and the witches, who goad Macbeth and push him to murder. Schlegel writes, “little more than the mere execution falls to the share of Macbeth; he is driven to it ... in a tumult of fascination ... [but] repentance immediately follows” (409). Like Eve from the Garden of Eden, it is the temptress who is most to blame for man’s fall.

Cadman traces this logic in his own argument and concludes that if not for Lady Macbeth’s urgings Macbeth would have remained loyal to King Duncan. The primary difference between Macbeth and Banquo, according to Cadman, are the “external” forces in their lives. Cadman writes, “had there been a Lady Banquo of a nature similar to Lady Macbeth, we should have had in Banquo another Macbeth.” He underlines this passage, meaning that when speaking before class and chapel, he would likely have emphasized this particular line, arguing
emphatically for Lady Macbeth’s guilt. It seems that for Cadman, Macbeth’s tragic fault is not ambition, but instead having an ambitious wife. Even when Schlegel sympathizes with Lady Macbeth, attributing her suicide at the end of the play to a “remorse of conscience,” Cadman concludes that “after careful consideration of the matter” he “can find no reason for attributing ... such a cause.” Not even Lady Macbeth’s death can elicit sympathy in Cadman for the fallen heroine.

Cadman’s misogynistic undertone is developed further when he generalizes Lady Macbeth’s wrongdoings as an allegory for the imagined historical wrongdoings of women throughout history. Believing that through his genius Shakespeare had created a compendium of universal human character types in his plays, Cadman paints Lady Macbeth symbolically as the female monster driving the ambitions of every tyrant that has ever ruled. While he concedes that there is no such evidence in the historical record – that history rarely has “drawn aside the curtain and allowed us to view castle halls and see there the real corridors of human affairs” – he concludes regardless that for every real-life Macbeth that has existed in history, there has been behind the scenes a real-life Lady Macbeth driving him toward his ambitions, and responsible for his misdeeds. He writes, “we may be sure of one thing: that as often as we have seen a Macbeth just so often have we seen a Lady Macbeth.” In saying so, Cadman overgeneralizes, further developing Macbeth as a
Garden of Eden allegory in which womankind is blamed for the crimes of mankind.

Cadman was not alone amongst the men of the Sherwood in such views. The Sherwood men collectively doubted the intellectual equality of men and women. In a December 10, 1858, debate of the Sherwood Rhetorical Society, its members decided that “the mental faculties of the sexes” were not “equivalent.” At that time, Cadman served as the society’s secretary; the debate results are written in his handwriting. Over a hundred year’s later, in 1967, the Sherwoods began admitting female members to their ranks, but such thoughts of equal opportunity were far from the minds of the Sherwood men of Cadman’s era (Francis 269). Cadman’s willingness to entirely divert the blame for Duncan’s murder to Lady Macbeth and his broad overgeneralization of Lady Macbeth as a symbolic scapegoat for history’s tyrannical men represent the general misogynistic leanings of Sherwood members in the 1850s and 60s.

Cadman’s views regarding race, though, were relatively progressive. He was the product of nineteenth-century thinking and values, and also a product of the region of the United States in which he lived. Thomas Harding divides nineteenth-century literary societies into three broad geographic regions: Northern, Southern, and Western. The expansive western frontier included Oregon and California, but also included states typically considered Midwestern today: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan. The student societies of Western colleges, such as
Kalamazoo College, generally held anti-secessionist and anti-slavery views in the years just preceding the Civil War, though because of their geographical distance from the conflict, theirs was generally a more dispassionate discussion than those that ensued in Northern and Southern literary societies (Harding 234).

The faculty and students of Kalamazoo College also held anti-secession and anti-slavery views, and were sympathetic to the plight of African Americans in the South (Francis 37). The longstanding college president, Dr. James Stone, and his influential wife, Lucinda Stone, were both vocal abolitionists; the couple’s twenty-year tenure from 1843 until 1863 serves as a cornerstone to the history of Kalamazoo College, and their influence upon the college in this period cannot be understated (Francis 37). In 1860-61, the year after Cadman finished his *Macbeth* essay, Kalamazoo College enrolled its first African American student, Rufus Perry, who had previously been a slave (Francis 46). Such influences shaped Cadman’s views and writing. As a result, Cadman was disposed to sympathize with black Shakespearean characters. He even includes a few brief lines on *Othello* near the end of his essay, in which he “lament[s] that such a noble soul as the Moor should have fallen beneath deceitfulness of Iago.”

Several of the Sherwood Rhetorical Society’s weekly debate topics involved issues related to slavery, secession, and the plight of African Americans in the South (see Appendix G). Occasionally, two
different debates would seem to contradict one another. For example, on May 7, 1859, the society debated whether intemperance or slavery was a greater evil, and determined the greater evil to be slavery. A little more than a year later, on November 9, 1860, the society debated whether “slavery in the US ought to be abolished immediately” but this time decided against immediate abolition. While some students may have graduated or left the college, it is unlikely that student opinion changed so drastically in such a short time. It is more likely that instead the nature of the altered phrasing led to a complex discussion of the national political climate, and that the key word “immediately” drove the second debate. While the majority of students believed that slavery should be abolished, they may not have believed that doing so “immediately” would be the best course of action. Relatively far removed from the conflict, theirs would have been a rich debate in which their sympathy for the slaves was weighed against the potential consequences of such sudden social change.

In another apparent contradiction, the society determined on May 11, 1861, that it would be “policy to compel the seceding states to remain apart from the union.” Two weeks later, in a second debate, the phrasing was changed and the society came to the opposite conclusion, agreeing that it would be “policy to compel the seceding states to remain in the union.” That nearly identical debate topics would be addressed only two weeks apart suggests that the original debate had not been sufficiently
concluded and that it was felt that further debate was needed. Secession was an important enough issue that the students brought the question back so that they could continue and overturn their previous finding.

Cadman’s own opinions on secession, though, are made clear in a September 28, 1861, journal entry. Opposed to Southern secession, he wrote, “when laymen will ... allow a secession flag to be placed at his window, he must either mend his ways, leave the country, or be hung.”

Some of Cadman’s views on Macbeth may best be explained in terms of the complex sociopolitical context from which students of Kalamazoo College witnessed the secession. Cadman condemns Macbeth for the murder of Duncan – his “best earthly friend, to whom he [Macbeth] owes all that he has ever had, that he now possesses, and all that he may reasonably expect to obtain” – but also sympathizes with him. He shifts much of the blame from Macbeth to Lady Macbeth, and also recalls Macbeth’s honorable military service. Cadman notes that the “first impression of Macbeth’s character is his favor.” He was once a man “of true nobleness of character.” Because “our sympathies are so strongly enlisted for him” at the beginning of the play that at the end of the play “past regard cannot be entirely forgotten.” Such regard, though, is not enough to pardon Macbeth, and Cadman ends his essay: “we may regret to behold powers once noble become so debased, but still cannot refrain from exultation when we see the tyrant brought low.”
Cadman’s sympathies with but final condemnation of Macbeth could easily serve as allegory for the Western view of Southern secession. The West had historically, as recently as twenty years before, been sympathetic to the South, though, they generally sided with the cause of the North by the 1860s. The themes of Macbeth could easily parallel the larger conflict between the North and South, in which the riotous South is represented in Macbeth and Lady Macbeth, and the noble North in Duncan. When Macbeth murders Duncan, it parallels Southern secession; both are overly ambitious attempts, from the perspective of the West, to overcome rightful government. Cadman never explicitly draws this comparison in his writing, but his willingness to hang secessionists, together with the results of Sherwood Rhetorical Society debates, illuminate the context from which he read and understood Shakespeare’s Macbeth. Cadman can condemn Southern secession at the same time he maintains some sympathy with it. He did not condemn the man who hung the Confederate flag without first offering him pardon should he mend his ways. Cadman can sympathize with Macbeth to a limited degree because he can sympathize with the Confederacy to a limited degree. Had Cadman been part of a Northern college literary society with stronger Union ties, he may not have held even these sympathies for the rebel Macbeth. Had Cadman grown up in a Southern state, and been a member of a Southern college literary society, his context for reading and
understanding *Macbeth* would have been altogether different, and his essay likewise would have revealed an entirely different worldview.

In addition to having studied *Macbeth* and his brief reference to *Othello*, Cadman was also familiar with at least two other Shakespearean plays, which he mentions briefly in the closing paragraph of the essay: *Hamlet* and *The Merchant of Venice*. He is satisfied with the ending of *The Merchant of Venice* – “having little or no sympathy for Shylock” he rejoices “to see his property confiscated,” which could point to potential anti-Semitic undertones in the piece – but dissatisfied with the conclusion of *Hamlet*. In the case of *Hamlet*, he is “at loss to find a suitable cause for the introduction of the ghost of Hamlet’s father.” The ghost of Hamlet’s father may have been revenged, but at too great a cost: “The apparition was avenged, but what a sacrifice! He that was required to obtain this satisfaction loses his life in taking it.”

Cadman mentions *Hamlet* only briefly in these three lines of the concluding paragraph, but his mention of Hamlet’s father’s ghost provides an interesting comparison to a lengthy earlier analysis he made of Banquo’s ghost. While he can’t “find a suitable cause” for Shakespeare’s creation of the ghost of Hamlet’s father, Cadman argues earlier in the essay of Banquo’s ghost as “another proof ... which shows how wonderfully correct was Shakespeare’s knowledge of human nature.” Cadman argues Banquo’s ghost to be “one of the finest or rather the most *natural*, characters of the play.” According to Cadman, the ghost
of Banquo is an internal manifestation of Macbeth’s guilty conscience; Macbeth alone sees the ghost because it has been created from his own guilt; his mind has made it real. Cadman believes that it is entirely natural for the minds of men to make their fears real, in “the remarkable power which the mind has over our senses and indeed over our whole being.”

He retells two cases to illustrate his point: one in which a man bit by what he believes to be a rabid dog shows all the signs himself of being infected until he is shown that the dog was actually healthy, after which his symptoms instantly vanish; and another case in which a man guilty of murder is blindfolded and made to believe that he is being executed by being bled to death, when in fact the knife never actually pierces his skin, but the man dies thirty minutes later anyway. Cadman’s logic here illustrates some significant points about his own worldview. Cadman’s two examples suggest his own perceived heightened moral position. Just as Cadman argues that Shakespeare is able to stand above the world and look down into the masses to find his characters, it is as though Cadman sees himself – perhaps because of his class, his gender, his ethnicity and religion, perhaps because of his access to literature and education, perhaps because of his access to Shakespeare even – to stand from a similar height above the rest of humanity and look down himself and analyze the people he sees. Nowhere in Cadman’s work is Shakespeare used as a reflection of self, but instead as a looking glass to judge others. It is important, though, not to judge Cadman too harshly. He was
scholarly and critical as a student, and remained so throughout his life; after his death, an acquaintance who knew him as an old man wrote of him: “He was a scholarly old fellow; sturdy, strong and stubborn. I always appreciated him.” His essay as a young man was written over a century and a half ago and while his writing reveals much about life in the developing Western United States in the early 1860s, his views cannot be fairly evaluated without consideration of the context in which he lived and wrote.

Cadman’s 1860 sophomore essay on *Macbeth* offers a glimpse into how the study of Shakespeare functioned in nineteenth-century American colleges. It reveals much about his education and opinions of Shakespeare: he had read, or at least become familiar with, at least four Shakespearean plays: *Macbeth, Hamlet, Othello*, and *The Merchant of Venice*; he had been exposed to secondary sources: both the official Spaulding text, and also at least one supplementary source available to him, the Schlegel text; he had adopted, like these sources, a writing and speaking style that adulated Shakespeare’s genius; that the study of Shakespeare at Kalamazoo College was not solely oratorical, but that plays were read and studied as full literary pieces; and Cadman held misogynistic and anti-Semitic prejudices tempered with complex pro-Union opinions on slavery, secession, and race. Cadman’s essay was written at a pivotal moment in the history of Kalamazoo College. Its literary societies had just taken shape in the past decade, and English
Literature even more recently had officially become a subject of study worthy of its own class. This was also a period of deep conflict in the nation as dark clouds of the American Civil War loomed. Through literature and Shakespeare, Cadman and the students of Kalamazoo College were able to find both an escape from the oncoming turmoil, but also an outlet through which they could better understand and also interpret their own world. Because of Cadman’s essay, there is a clearer picture of that world and how those students thought, studied, and experienced life and Shakespeare.

Chapter One Conclusions

From a consideration of two nineteenth-century literary societies and their interactions with Shakespeare, it would seem that literary society students used Shakespeare to reinforce and perpetuate contemporary gender perceptions. In the examples from Harvard and Kalamazoo College, there were disturbing undertones in the treatment of Gertrude, Ophelia, and Lady Macbeth. A broader sample of student writing is needed, though, to bolster such a claim. Gertrude, Ophelia, and Lady Macbeth are not the best Shakespearean exemplars of womankind. Those are found in Shakespeare’s comedies. Instead, these three are symbols of female tyranny and madness and to label them as such, as the Pudding men and Cadman do, may not be an example of misogyny so much as exaggeration. If there were student essays addressing the comedies more fully though, and their female characters, it would add
depth to a discussion of the ways in which nineteenth-century literary societies used Shakespeare to bolster, or perhaps undermine, gender perceptions.

A larger sample of student writing might also help to deepen a critical discussion of other ways in which Shakespeare became an agent in bolstering and undermining racial values. In addition to the misogynistic undertones in both the 1893 Pudding production and in Cadman, there are hints at anti-Semitic values in both as well. With this said, though, Cadman also offers a sympathetic treatment of Othello only a few lines after his derogatory comments about Shylock. That Cadman would sympathize with a black character in the same paragraph that he disparages a Jewish one says a great deal about the complexity of racial issues in nineteenth-century United States society. Race was an extremely complex issue, and a deeper understanding of the ways in which racial issues intertwined with the introduction of Shakespeare’s plays into the American literary canon would provide for a rich, scholarly discussion.

A larger sample of student writing would also provide a clearer understanding of the ways in which nineteenth-century literary societies shaped classroom practices involved in teaching Shakespeare. The Pudding took an early interest in theatricals and in treating Shakespeare as material for performance. They both honored the traditional scholarship that emphasized language while also challenging those notions. Cadman and the Sherwood Rhetorical Society, on the other
hand, took a more scholarly approach to the study of Shakespeare that did not include performance. Cadman accepts the scholarship of Schlegel, but builds upon it, willing to add his own voice to the critical discussion of *Macbeth* and the nature of Lady Macbeth’s character.

The next chapter will move from the university to secondary level and analyze the school texts, commonly called readers, which were popular throughout the nineteenth century. Their Shakespeare content changed over the course of the century, though. Early in the century, when theater was part of lowbrow culture and maintained a dubious reputation, reader editors avoided theatrical connections and included Shakespeare, often without attributing the passage to him, only as exemplars of public speaking in the teaching of elocution. As the century progressed, though, and both theater and Shakespeare were adopted into highbrow culture, reader editors included longer selections and even scene sequences meant to be read as dramatic poetry. Editors also tended to include more apparatus at the end of the century to provide context for passages and aid in study: introductory material, notes, and definitions.
CHAPTER TWO

"SPEAK THE SPEECH AS I PRONOUNC'D IT TO YOU":
THE RISE AND FALL OF ORATORICAL SHAKESPEARE STUDY
IN HISTORICAL AMERICAN READERS

The story of Shakespeare’s reception in late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century American schools is closely linked to the story of American school readers, anthologies of brief oral reading lessons, usually didactic in theme, gathered from a variety of English and American sources. Popular in and out of school, readers were widespread, and provided access to Shakespeare for millions of Americans.

Though often neglected in studies of nineteenth-century Shakespearean text because of their peculiar place in the history of print, they played a

9 Readers claim a peculiar place in the history of print and are surprisingly difficult to classify and analyze. Carr et al. explain that they “disrupt definitions of the popular book” (11). In one sense, readers are anthologies, compilations of works by a wide variety of authors representing several centuries of literature and philosophy. On the other hand, their organization sometimes seems too haphazard and colloquial for such classification when compared to modern school anthologies. For example, many editors mixed their own writing alongside canonical selections, giving many early readers a unique local flavor. Compilers later in the century sometimes even included lessons
fundamental role in shaping American perceptions of Shakespeare and also recording changes in those perceptions. Today, they reveal much about nineteenth-century American popular and classroom experience with Shakespeare,\textsuperscript{10} illuminating the priorities and anxieties of a burgeoning educational system and its responses to an influx of non-English-speaking immigrants, the emergence of new pedagogical practices and fields, and also Shakespeare’s evolving place within America’s historical cultural and educational schema.

The influence of school readers in the lives of everyday nineteenth-century Americans is captured in American author Herbert Quick’s autobiography, \textit{One Man’s Life}. In it, he includes a chapter emphasizing the impact his own readers, the \textit{McGuffey’s},\textsuperscript{11} had on his

\textsuperscript{10} Several scholars have acknowledged the relationship between reader content and school experience. Nila Banton Smith, an early twentieth-century scholar in the history of reading instruction, calls “the story of American reading instruction” a “story of old readers which have moved in long procession” (5). Esther Cloudman Dunn, author of \textit{Shakespeare in America}, concurs, writing in 1939, “the history of the school reader is also the history of Shakespeare in American school education” (225). John Nietz, twentieth-century textbook collector and professor, wrote that “the old textbooks ... constituted the school’s course of study ... so an analysis of old American school textbooks reflects the evolution of the American school curriculum and the teaching and learning methods” (1). Provenzo et al., in the preface to \textit{The Textbook as Discourse}, write that “underlying” their “work is the assumption that textbooks, interpreted within the flow of history, can provide the researcher with important insights about the nature and meaning of American culture, and the social and political discourses in which it is engaged” (vii).

\textsuperscript{11} Amongst the many series of readers in the nineteenth century, the most popular were those originally compiled by brothers William and Alexander McGuffey, later simply called the \textit{McGuffey’s}. It is hard to overstate the \textit{McGuffey’s} importance to nineteenth-century American education. No other school reading book – not the \textit{New England Primer}, not Webster’s \textit{Blue Back Speller}, no other reader that came before or after in the nineteenth century – was as significant as the \textit{McGuffey’s} (Sullivan 7-9; Nietz 70; Westerhoff 18). The books were immediately successful; an 1836 edition (held in Harvard University Library’s collection and available digitally through Google Books)
life, “inoculat[ing] [him] with the virus of good literature” (163). They took him from rural farm boy to educated man of letters. He describes his childhood as one marked by a “coldness toward books,” a mother “passionately fond of reading ... but [who] ... had no books,” and teachers “just above the plane of literacy” (153-54). His father “never read anything,” but nonetheless named his prize cow Shakespeare (153).

Quick recalls his “mystification” as a young boy when he “began reading great passages of blank verse written by [his] old cow ... in the big old McGuffey’s Fifth reader”12 (34-35). For frontier boys like Quick who grew up in a world primarily without books, school readers “constitute[d] the most influential volumes ever published in America ... [and its] most claimed that forty thousand copies had been sold in the first three months of publication. Their total sales in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were astounding. According to the publisher, Louis Dillman, 122 million total copies were sold between 1836 and 1920: 7 million between 1836 and 1850, 40 million between 1850 and 1870, 60 million between 1870 and 1890, and 15 million between 1890 and 1920 (Carpenter 85; Carr 124, 228-29; Minnich 92; Mosier 168; Nietz 73; Westerhoff 14). No other American school text sold as many copies in the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. The series’ evolution paralleled and simultaneously compelled changes in the growing nineteenth-century textbook industry – the McGuffey’s represented the majority, near monopoly, of this industry – and also the evolving American education system in the nineteenth century. Westerhoff calls the series “a mirror of changes occurring in the history of American public education” (20).

12 School readers evolved over the course of the nineteenth century from single editions to graded series. The first American readers, for example, compiled by Noah Webster and Caleb Bingham, had been individual, stand-alone volumes that appeared late in the eighteenth century. Early in the nineteenth century, though, compilers began adding introductory and sequel volumes to their main texts, creating a graded series of three books. Lindley Murray’s three readers – the Introduction to the English Reader, The English Reader, and the Sequel to the English Reader – was one of the most popular of these early in the century. By the middle of the century, series of five or six volumes became popular. Their titles often included a number to distinguish their order: first, second, third, etc. McGuffey’s titles, for example, were McGuffey’s First Reader, McGuffey’s Second Reader, etc. Sometimes there would be a volume with “primer” in the title that would precede the First Reader. Fifth and sixth volumes often included the word “speaker” or “rhetorical” in their titles (Nietz 63).
popular reading books for generations” (156). Upon coming to read the English classics later in life, Quick remarks:

I could say as I opened my Shakespeare ... “Why, don’t you remember our meeting away back on the farm in that old book with the front cover torn off? Here’s the passage in which the little prince appeals to Hubert de Burgh not to burn out his eyes with hose hot irons! I haven’t read it yet, but I’ll just repeat it from memory.” (163)

Figure 4: William Holmes McGuffey

Quick’s account is representative of the experience of millions of nineteenth-century Americans, an experience with Shakespeare shaped by the selections in their readers. Mark Sullivan, in his six-volume
historical analysis of United States history, *Our Times*, in 1929, wrote that the McGuffey’s achievement “calls for inspiration and understanding little short of authorship itself” (15). He adds that “one can readily believe that millions of Americans must have been moved subconsciously by the feeling ... that they were one with the race of Shakespeare ... every little prairie schoolhouse in America was an outpost of English literature” (48). School readers were the most important and influential books of Shakespeare in America in the nineteenth century, and more than any other text of their time, they influenced and reflected

---

13 Such outpouring was not uncommon in twentieth-century historical and autobiographical accounts of the McGuffey’s influence; they were remembered and celebrated in twentieth-century scholarship more than any other reader series of the nineteenth century. Hamlin Garland “acknowledge[d]” in *Son of the Middle Border* in 1917 his “deep obligation to Professor McGuffey” for his “first taste of Shakespeare” (Mosier 168). Hugh Fullerton’s *Saturday Evening Post* article recalled that “for seventy-five years his [McGuffey’s] system and his books guided the minds of four-fifths of the school children of the nation in their taste for literature, in their morality, in their social development and next to the Bible in their religion” (Mosier 168, Westerhoff 15-17). Ralph Rusk noted in his 1925 *The Literature of the Middle Western Frontier*, “the influence of McGuffey may well have been greater than that of any other writer or statesman in the West” (Westerhoff 15-17). Robert Wood Lynn wrote in his “Civil Catechetics in Mid-Victorian America” that they were “more than a textbook ... they were a portable school for the new priests of the republic” (Westerhoff 15-17). In 1936, one hundred years after the first McGuffey was published, Harvey Minnich celebrated the anniversary with a two-book set: *William Holmes McGuffey and His Readers and Old Favorites From the McGuffey Readers*. The first was a biographical history of the McGuffey’s, the second a collection of favorite lessons from the readers. In the preface to the second, he wrote, “McGuffey’s religious, moral, and ethical influence over millions of Americans ... is beyond computing, and it still remains [in 1936] the American standard” (vi). Richard Mosier published *Making the American Mind* in 1947, elaborating the political and patriotic influence the McGuffey readers played in nineteenth-century America. Alice McGuffey Ruggles, descendant of Alexander McGuffey, wrote *The Story of the McGuffeys* in 1950; part biography, part historical fiction, it details the McGuffey family background and the circumstances surrounding the first editions of her grandfather and great uncle’s readers. Henry Steele Commager, in his 1962 *The Commonwealth of Learning*, wrote, “They ... helped shape that elusive thing we call the American character” (Westerhoff 15-17); John Westerhoff III, in 1978, wrote *McGuffey and His Readers*, in which he commented, “for many common folk, McGuffey represents the most important figure in the history of American public education” (13). Elliott J. Gorn, in his introduction to a 1998 anthology of selected lessons from the 1879 McGuffeys, wrote that “as much as any other historical source, these textbooks take us to the ideological heart of America” (3).
Shakespeare’s popular and academic reputation for more than a hundred years.

“A Whole School of Tongues”: The Rise of Oratorical Shakespeare Study

The earliest reader compilers included passages from Shakespeare in their readers as exemplars of good speaking, though they often refrained from attributing these to the Bard. Oratory was important in the first half of the nineteenth century; in a burgeoning immigrant republic without widespread higher education, refined public speaking skills could lead to social and economic upward mobility. Shakespeare became popular with compilers late in the eighteenth century interested in molding students’ rhetorical and speaking skills, a study known commonly at the time as elocution (Applebee 5; Dunn 226). According to Dunn, “speeches from Shakespeare” were “among the best passages for practicing in declamation”; his soliloquies and brief dialogues provided some of the finest examples in English of great speaking (226). Sturgess writes that “Shakespeare provided convenient texts that clearly demonstrated the art of rhetoric and public speaking” and that “declamation of the monologues from Shakespeare became an important part of every nineteenth-century American schoolchild’s experience” (31). The result was that Americans could often “call up lines from Shakespeare” from memory – sometimes knowing it originated with Shakespeare, sometimes not – and shared a common cultural knowledge of Shakespeare’s words (Carr 104). Lines of selected Shakespearean
passages provided formative adolescent experiences in thinking and speaking, shaping and refining the vocabulary and style with which America would speak, and engendering an early relationship between Shakespeare reader lessons and American public speaking.

The first school readers in America were printed on English presses and shipped to America, and their Shakespeare content influenced Shakespeare’s treatment in the first American readers. Simon writes that “the teaching of reading was an eighteenth century development in England, and the first texts used in America were naturally imported from the mother country” (11). Carr et al. concur, “much of the educational apparatus is taken – whether silently or with credit – from eighteenth-century British rhetoricians like Walker, Mason, Austin, Blair, Enfield, or Sheridan” (119). Of these, William Enfield’s *The Speaker* was particularly influential. It went through numerous London editions from 1774 until at least 1851, and also through at least seven American printings.\(^{14}\) Though the exact number varied with the edition, it included between 35 and 50 Shakespearean lessons. Simon found that Enfield’s

---

\(^{14}\) Though he acknowledged its influence on later American school readers, Henry Simon was unaware that *The Speaker* had maintained a wide circulation in American schools. He believed that its size and expense had kept it from such use (11). He was aware of only a single American printing: the 1799 Philadelphia edition (11). Louis Marder appears to base some of his conclusions on Simon, because he also mentions only the 1799 Philadelphia edition of *The Speaker* (281). The holdings catalogued at Harvard University and other historic textbook collections, though, reveal several other American editions. A Boston edition in 1795 claims to be the first American edition. Another Boston edition was printed in 1808 (interestingly, somebody else interested in its Shakespearean lessons penciled dashes in the contents page of a Harvard Library volume next to each Shakespearean lesson which were then digitized in Google Books). There were also at least two New York editions, in 1798 and 1814; a Baltimore edition in 1803, and another Philadelphia edition in 1817. Despite this, though, there were many more English editions than American and *The Speaker* was a decidedly English – not American – reader.
selections provided the lot from which later American compilers would
draw their Shakespeare, “the Shakespearian [sic] passages include almost
all of those that were later found suitable for American schools” (12).
Though not part of the formal university curriculum, Enfield was
included in university literary society library holdings, and it is not
uncommon to find references to readings from Enfield in society minutes.
Including Shakespearean passages as exemplars for the study of
elocution, though, Enfield never intended them as dramatic literature.
They were material for practice in speaking and pronunciation. Enfield
establishes the book’s purpose early in its preface: “The great difficulty
is, not to prove that it is a desirable thing to be able to read and speak
with propriety, but to point out a practicable and easy method by which
this accomplishment may be acquired” (vi, 1782).

John Walker, another eighteenth-century English rhetorician
influential in America, published a handful of books on elocution. His
emphasis on elocution through Shakespeare, like Enfield, also
foreshadowed the content and method of the nineteenth-century readers
in America for many decades to come. In addition to The Teacher’s
Assistant in English Composition and The Rhyming Dictionary of the
English Language, his elocution manual Elements of Elocution ...
Exemplified by a Copious Selection of the Most Striking Passages of
Shakespeare, appeared in at least ten editions in England between 1781
and 1830, and at least twice in the United States: in Boston in 1810, and
in Philadelphia in 1811. Marder calls it “the first [elocution] text devoted specifically to Shakespeare” (281, qtd in Sturgess 146). His *Critical Pronouncing Dictionary* was reprinted and abridged numerous times in the nineteenth century, most notably by reader compiler Lyman Cobb, who apologized in the 1828 preface to his abridgment because “not less than ten or twelve [had been] published in the United States” (iii). Later influential American textbook compilers would also pay Walker homage. William McGuffey, for example, wrote in the preface to an 1844 reader that “Free use has been made ... of the works of ... Mr. Walker, whose ‘Elocution,’ and ‘Rhetorical Grammar,’ constitute the foundation on which all subsequent writers have built.”

Walker also compiled a reader: the *Academic Speaker*, which included 39 passages from Shakespeare. In it, Walker emphasized appropriate gesture to accompany spoken language:

> [It] is extremely absurd, and unnatural ... that boys should stand motionless ... while they are pronouncing the most

---

15 Henry Simon mentioned Walker briefly, but made several mistakes in his research and analysis. First of all, he had access only to the 1810 Boston edition and was unaware that the book had been originally printed in the eighteenth century in England (19). As a result, both Marder and Sturgess, working from his findings, refer only to the 1810 Boston edition and believed that Walker was an American (Marder 281; Sturgess 146). Simon also mistakenly calls *Elements of Elocution* a reader when it was, in fact, an elocution manual. Most significantly, he was unaware of Walker’s influence upon later American reader compilers, writing that “no school book that [he had] ever seen acknowledged Walker as an authority” (Simon 18).

16 There were numerous editions of Walker’s *Academic Speaker*. Both an 1800 and 1830 edition included 39 passages, though whereas the earlier edition included “Chorus to the Fourth Act” from *Henry V*, the 1830 edition had eliminated it and instead included “The Quarrel of Brutus and Cassius” from *Julius Caesar*. Further, the 1830 table of contents incorrectly attributes forty passages, though one of these is not actually from Shakespeare: “Nicholaus’s Speech for Nicias” on page 107.
impassioned language ... and that they should sprawl into an awkward, ungainly, and desultory action, is still more offensive and disgusting. (v-vi)

Walker also commented on the relationships between elocution, theater, and teaching. He lauded the fact that “the acting of plays ... has of late years been much laid aside” because such practice diminished the study of speaking (xi). He explained:

A dramatic performance requires so much attention to the deportment of the body, so varied an expression of the passions, and so strict an adherence to character, that elocution is in danger of being neglected. (xii)

He differentiated between “speaking” and “acting,” emphasizing that “it is speaking rather than acting which school-boys should be taught.” He believed the aim of the schools was to teach elocution, and the production of plays, even if of admirable literary quality, did not serve that purpose. The study of pronunciation and gesture had a place, but other elements of theatrical presentation were a distraction. Walker was strictly a rhetorician. The intent was always that of the orator, never that of the actor.

Walker did not condemn theater, though, on moral grounds as later American compilers of the nineteenth century would; for Walker, it was simply a matter of priority. In fact, he chided those who overly feared their students becoming too theatrical (xiii). They “should not be
too much restrained from an exertion of voice” (xiii). Nine of ten boys speak too quietly, with a “frigid equality, a stupid languor, and a torpid apathy” and must be pushed to speak more forcefully. Students should be encouraged “to speak” with “a full, open, [and] animated pronunciation” (xiii). Preventing them from speaking forcefully because of a fear of being overly theatrical, according to Walker, was just as problematic as neglecting elocution in pursuit of the theatrical (xiii). The best material for teaching students to speak forcefully and with proper gesture was the reading of orations, odes, and monologues and dialogues from plays.

Noah Webster, best known today for his dictionary, was the first American to compile a reader (Carpenter 58; Littlefield 153; Nietz 64; Reeder 37). While a student at Yale, Webster had been a member of Brothers in Unity, one of the university’s two literary societies, and he may have acquired his early taste for Shakespeare while a member (Kendall 30). The society staged several dramatic performances during Webster’s attendance, and Webster may have participated, though he became increasingly conservative in his views on theater over the course of his life (Kendall 30). It was in the years following his 1778 graduation that Webster compiled his speller, grammar, and reader, which he collectively named The Grammatical Institute. The speller, first printed in Hartford in 1783 and commonly called the Blue Back Speller, came before the reader. It was wildly popular for more than a century\(^{17}\)

\(^{17}\) By 1809, according a Webster’s preface in an edition of the Blue Back Speller that year, three million copies had already been sold (Nietz 15). The book remained popular
(Carpenter 151-53; Carr 99-100; Johnson 167-84; Nietz 14-17). Its popularity partially derived, as Nietz suggests, from its clean, logical layout, and in later decades from the popularity of its author (16-17). Its success also stemmed from its patriotism. Webster stressed American nationalism in its preface: “to diffuse a uniformity and purity of language in America ... to promote the interest of literature and harmony of the United States – is the most ardent wish of the Author” (qtd in Smith 35). Sturgess argues that Webster believed “the inhabitants of New England understood a form of English that had now been lost in the mother country,” forms and pronunciations uttered before the first Englishmen had sailed for America, but then lost in contemporary British English (77-78). Webster once stated “It is ... to be remarked that the common unadulterated pronunciation of the New England gentlemen [sic] is uniformly the pronunciation which prevailed in England anterior to [Thomas] Sheridan’s time” (Kendall 247).

Webster’s third book was his reader, *An American Selection of Lessons in Reading and Speaking*. It was first published in 1785 and was immediately popular; within two years, Webster’s reader was already in its third edition (Littlefield 156). Despite being an “American” selection, though, it relied heavily from its English predecessors, its entire section of selected sentences, for example, borrowed without attribution from

throughout the nineteenth century; the cover of an 1866 edition claimed that one million copies were sold annually and that over one hundred million total copies had been sold (Nietz 16; Carr 228). Johnson wrote in 1904, 121 years after its first publication, that “there are schools where it is studied even at present” and that it “stands unrivalled among American books in circulation and length of life” (184).
Enfield’s *Speaker* (Carr 100, 103). Webster also followed in the footsteps of Enfield and Walker by including twelve Shakespearean passages.\(^1\)

One of these was “Hamlet’s Instructions to the Players.” Editors like Enfield, Walker, Webster, and later Alden, McGuffey, and others, who built their reader series upon the importance of elocution, prized Hamlet’s words in their compilations: “Speak the speech ... as I pronounc’d it to you ... it offends me to the soul, to hear a robusteous periwig-pated fellow tear a passion to tatters ...” (3.2.1-9). It was one of the most popular selections in the school readers. A number of compilers, both English and American, who professed disgust with poor oratory, included the selection, aiming to improve students’ speaking to more closely resemble their own cultural and linguistic norms.

Given Webster’s patriotism, it may initially seem contradictory that Webster would include Shakespeare in *American Selection*, as well as the handful of other English authors he included. His primary emphasis was teaching elocution, followed closely by the teaching of

\(^1\) Of the twelve Shakespearean passages Webster included in *American Selection*, the first seven were provided as “examples for illustrating the passions.” Two of the passages came from *King Lear*, two from *Richard II*, two from *The Merchant of Venice*, and one from *Othello*. Each is subtitled with a particular emotion: “Grief,” “Anger,” “Pity,” “Hatred,” “Perplexity,” “Revenge,” and “Remorse.” These are short passages, though, each between seven and seventeen lines. Shakespeare is not credited and no contextual background information is provided that would suggest the passages come from larger dramatic works. The eighth passage is just a four-line excerpt from *Hamlet* - “What a piece of work is a man ...” -- and included as one of Webster’s “Select Sentences for Forming the Morals.” The ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth passages are longer selections: “Shylock and Tubal” from *The Merchant of Venice*, “Wolsey and Cromweli” from *Henry VIII*, “The Quarrel of Brutus and Cassius” from *Julius Caesar*, and “The World Compared to a Stage” from *As You Like It*. The last three had been previously included in William Enfield’s *The Speaker*. Webster, like Enfield, though, credits Shakespeare in his table of contents -- though Webster places the contents at the end of the book instead of at its beginning -- for the final four passages, though he does not name Shakespeare alongside the passage within the text.
patriotic American values. He complains in his preface that none of the English readers used in American schools in his time were “calculated particularly for American schools” (2). He goes on to add:

A love of our country and an acquaintance with its true state, are indispensable [sic] – they should be acquired early in life... In the choice of pieces, I have been attentive to the political interest of America. I consider it as a capital fault in all our schools, that ... while the writings that marked the revolution, which are not inferior in any respect ... lie neglected and forgotten. (2)

Including Shakespeare alongside a judicious selection of American political orations, though, is not a contradiction. Many American readers to follow would simultaneously incorporate Shakespeare lessons alongside other pieces espousing American patriotic values. American culture, as Sturgess argues, appropriated Shakespeare as its own after the Revolutionary War, and continued to defend its claim to the Bard throughout the nineteenth century (Sturgess 74-94). If Webster indeed believed the English spoken in New England to be a truer form of the language than what was spoken in contemporary England, that more closely resembled the English of Shakespeare’s time, then it logically followed that Shakespeare belongs alongside other American texts. Abandoned as a cultural icon in England, more American than British, Sturgess writes, “Shakespeare became one of the symbols that allowed
the Bostonian, the Californian and the New Mexican to recognise
themselves as American” (Sturgess 94). America’s appropriation of
Shakespeare and his language engenders complex questions about
nationalism and racial identification, to which Sturgess answers, “In a
time of rapid growth and change, with its accompanying insecurities and
dislocations, many Americans found comfort in the strength and status of
a distinguished racial heritage” (107). As much as anywhere, this political
and cultural appropriation took place in the American schoolbooks of the
late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Reginald Horsman writes that
the ideas of English authors by “the second half of the [nineteenth]
century formed part of the accepted truth of American schoolbooks”
(157, qtd in Sturgess 107). It is fitting then, that in a long tradition of
American schoolbooks that would include passages of Shakespeare side-
by-side with American patriotic ideals, that America’s first reader also
included a number of Shakespearean passages itself.

Webster’s reader, though, would not share the same degree of
popularity as his speller, and was quickly mired with competition
(Carpenter 60-61). Abner Alden was one such competitor. He followed in
the footsteps of Enfield, Walker, and Webster, subordinating
Shakespeare’s theatrical portrayal to that of an oratorical treatment. In
1810, in the preface to his Speaker, he acknowledged contemporary
objections to theater, but urged teachers nonetheless to use single
passages from plays as exemplars for teaching elocution:
Although there are some who object to acting Plays ... no one will deny the very great advantage which boys and young men will receive from being taught properly to speak single pieces in publick [sic]; as by such frequent exercises, they will acquire confidence, and will be enabled to express themselves with more propriety, and greater facility, when they shall be called to act their parts in publick life.

Alden, though, also included lessons in *The Reader* alongside Shakespeare that not only mentioned theater, but that also satirized the study of elocution. These contradictory references are slight in number compared with those supporting the study of elocution, but they nevertheless suggest an ambivalent view of elocution, theater, and Shakespeare. The first of these was a passage from a farcical drama called “The Apprentice.” Its protagonist is a young man named Dick who aspires to become an actor, but is discouraged from doing so by his pragmatic father, who tells him, “You read Shakespeare! get Cocker’s *Arithmetic*; you may buy it for a shilling on any stall – best book that ever was wrote ... if you have a mind to thrive in this world, study figures, and make yourself useful” (71). Dick, though, is incorrigible and replies snidely in an aside, “How weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable, seem to me all the uses of this world!” (71). Dick later faces comic inner conflict as he debates whether to take the stage. His farcical soliloquy
that follows – “Loved by the women, envied by the men, applauded by the pit, admired by the boxes ... celestial sounds!” – before overcoming his stage fright and rushing to the theater would have troubled some early nineteenth-century moral sensibilities. Alden, though, includes the passage between two Shakespeare lessons, suggesting that either he believed students were mature enough to comprehend its mixed message, or he did not wholly condemn the theater as other reader compilers did.

Alden also included an excerpt from Laurence Sterne’s 1759 novel *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy* which he titles “The Cant of Criticism,” again placed adjacent to a Shakespeare lesson: Shylock’s “Revenge.” It satirizes an overly pedantic study of elocution and acknowledges the potential literary merit inherent in theatrical performances:

> And how did Garrick speak the soliloquy last night? – Oh, against all rule, my Lord; most ungrammatically! Betwixt the substantive and adjective (which should agree together in number, case and gender) he made a breach thus – stopping as if the point wanted settling. And after the nominative case (which your lordship knows should govern the verb) he suspended his voice in the epilogue, a dozen times, three seconds and three fifths, by a stop

---

19 Alden places the “Soliloquy of Dick the Apprentice” between “Hotspur’s Soliloquy on the Contents of a Letter” and Shylock’s “Revenge.” Alden originally attributed the passage to Shakespeare in an 1802 edition, but corrected the error and credited Arthur Murphy for the lesson by an 1814 fourth edition.
watch, my lord, each time ... – But in suspending voice,
was the sense suspended likewise? Did no expression of
attitude or countenance fill up the chasm? Was the eye
silent? Did you narrowly look? – I looked only at the stop
watch, [sic] my lord. (92, 1814)

Alden, while following in the traditions of other early reader
compilers, was also subtly challenging notions that students study
elocution exclusively while entirely shielded from theatrical influences.
Amidst a plethora of moralistic passages, “The Cant of Criticism” not
only condones theater, but also satirically urges students to think
critically of its artistic merits.

“Men Shall Swear I’ve Discontinued School”: Absent Shakespeare

Alden’s theatrical references were a rarity in the early nineteenth
century. Most compilers were careful that Shakespeare’s treatment in
their texts not resemble the Shakespeare known at the time on American
stages. As the nineteenth century progressed, with Shakespeare
increasingly the popular subject of lowbrow theater, reader compilers
became progressively wary of including Shakespeare and often avoided
him entirely. Noah Webster, who had included Shakespeare decades
earlier in his first American reader, later in life, rescinded his approval of
the Bard as exemplar for teaching public speaking:

Shakespeare was a man of little learning; and altho [sic],
when he wrote the popular language of his day, his use of
words was tolerably correct, yet whenever he attempted a style beyond that, he often fell into the grossest improprieties…Whatever admiration the world may bestow on the Genius of Shakespeare, his language is full of errors, and ought not to be offered as a model for imitation” (Kendall 255).

Kendall observes that in Webster’s copy of Samuel Johnson’s dictionary, held today in the New York Public Library, which Webster used in preparation of his own 1828 dictionary, Webster “put little black marks next to most Shakespeare quotations” and also that, unlike Johnson, he “rarely cite[d] the immortal Bard’s actual words” in his own dictionary (255). It was not just Webster, though, who had changed: Shakespeare’s presence in American popular culture was also shifting.

Because of the stage, Shakespeare began disappearing from the readers. As a result, nineteenth-century school readers expose an opposition between what happened in American theaters and what happened in American schools, a continuation of a centuries-old antithesis between the ideals of book Shakespeare and stage Shakespeare. These competing treatments evolved through the century, but book and stage continued to resist one another. Even after both theater and Shakespeare were appropriated into highbrow culture in the second half of the century, the alternative Shakespeare of the school reader developed
into a subject of literary study, again dancing away from the theatrical in careful step.

An analysis of Shakespeare’s function in American school readers in the 1810s, 20s, 30s, and 40s first requires a contextual understanding of his larger role in American culture. Throughout the first half of the century Shakespeare was not the elite – and sometimes inaccessible – playwright that he became by the twentieth century. His reputation more closely resembled that of today’s movie celebrities and star athletes. As in the case of Quick’s family cow, Shakespeare belonged to America’s lower and middle socioeconomic classes as much as its upper classes. He was the property equally of the literate and the illiterate, the educated and the uneducated, the wealthy and the impoverished. Lawrence Levine, in *Highbrow / Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*, explains that it can be challenging today to conceptualize such popularity: “so completely have … Americans learned to accept as natural and timeless Shakespeare’s status as an elite, classic dramatist … that we have found it difficult to comprehend nineteenth-century conceptions of Shakespeare” (34). Levine describes two types of Shakespeare that had coexisted relatively peacefully through the first decades of the nineteenth century: the first, a “humble, everyday poet who sprang from the people and found his strength and inspiration among them,” and the second, a “towering genius” standing above the common people (69). By the close of the nineteenth century, though, it was the more cultured, elite
Shakespeare who dominated American culture and theater, and as a result, the “humble” and “everyday” conception of Shakespeare was forgotten in the mass consciousness of twentieth- and twenty-first-century America (69). This was not the case, however, early in the century.

From the turn of nineteenth century until at least its middle decades, most Americans knew Shakespeare through performance, and only secondly through reading. Though Shakespearean texts were available in the first decades of the nineteenth century, only upper classes generally had the means to purchase them, whereas theaters catered to a wide socioeconomic clientele – to both those who could and could not read – and, despite their questionable reputation, they enjoyed increasing popularity through the first half of the nineteenth century (Levine 17-18; Rankin 191; Sturgess 55-57; Teague 17-18; Westfall 43-49). Shakespeare was performed from Eastern cities to Western frontiers, and almost

---

20 As discussed in Chapter One, texts of Shakespeare were not widely available in America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. While it is plausible that some books of Shakespeare’s plays had made their way to the colonies before the Revolutionary War – eight editions had been published in England by the middle of the eighteenth century – there is general consensus amongst scholars that the reading of Shakespeare’s plays in the colonies was limited. Dunn writes that in the seventeenth century “thinking people of all parties were not stocking their libraries with stage plays” because “they were not interested in them” (15). Westfall writes that by the middle of the eighteenth century, “evidence that they were in the hands of any great number of the colonists is lacking” and as a result “knowledge of his works was limited to a few intellectual leaders favored in scholarly and cultural advantages” (38; qtd in Sturgess 57). Shattuck concurs, “books of the plays were not readily accessible [from the middle of the eighteenth century to the end], and only the most highly educated would have developed the play-reading habit” (xi). It would not be until the nineteenth century that books of Shakespeare would be widely available, and even then, for several decades their importance remained secondary to the theaters’.
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everywhere between, a rising popularity that expanded and grew in each of the opening decades of the nineteenth century.\footnote{Ralph Leslie Rusk writes that of 5,692 performances in Cincinnati, St. Louis, Detroit, Louisville, and Lexington from 1831-40, 321, or nearly 18\%, were Shakespearean (qtd in Sturgess 16; also in Westfall 59). David Grimsted, in his study of American theaters from 1800-1850, counted 276 Shakespeare performances in Charleston in those five decades alone, 417 in New Orleans, and 819 in Philadelphia, making up some 20 - 23\% of all theatrical performances in the first half of the nineteenth century (qtd in Sturgess 17). In Philadelphia, in just six years between 1835 and 1841, there were 83 performances of Richard III, 57 of Othello, and 53 of Hamlet; on the other coast, in San Francisco, in the first seven years that theaters had been open, there had been 86 performances of Hamlet, 63 of Richard III, and 57 of Macbeth (qtd in Sturgess 16).}

Levine cautions against misconstruing nineteenth-century American theater based on theaters of the present day: “an understanding of the American theater in our own time is not adequate grounding for a comprehension of American theater in the nineteenth century” (26). Sturgess adds that “the American audience ... regarded the theater as their territory rather than a place where an educated elite could dictate behavior” (86). The plays of Shakespearean tragedy were embedded into larger programs that incorporated juggling, singing, dancing, fencing, acrobatics and other specialty acts between scenes, and were generally capped with a closing farce to complete the night’s entertainment (Levine 21; Sturgess 89; Teague 19, 31). While modern tastes might find such juxtaposition problematic, Levine suggests instead that “Shakespeare [was] presented as part of the culture [playgoers] enjoyed, a Shakespeare rendered familiar and intimate by virtue of his context” (23). Unlike today’s theaters, which draw their audiences primarily from upper middle and upper socioeconomic classes, American theaters of the nineteenth century drew a diverse strata of playgoers, and those playgoers had more
control of what transpired on stage than today’s audiences. Unruly audiences of the nineteenth century sometimes pelted eggs and vegetables at actors when they were unhappy or felt they had been insulted (Levine 28). When they were pleased, it was not uncommon for them to stamp their feet and insist that actors repeat a line or passage, sometimes as many as twenty times, before permitting the action to proceed (Levine 27; Sturgess 86-87). It was not uncommon for audiences to dictate the musical program, as well, demanding favorite patriotic and folk songs (Levine 14; Sturgess 87).

Irreverent to modern sensibilities, there were also many Shakespearean burlesques in the nineteenth century. Shakespearean parody, though, further illustrates Americans’ familiarity with Shakespeare’s plays. Sturgess points out that “for the humour to be successful the majority of an audience needed to have a basic knowledge of the Shakespearean original” (88). A well-known example of such parody in American literature comes from Huckleberry Finn when Mark Twain’s duke and king impersonate Edmund Kean and David Garrick, another well-known English traveling actor. Planning to swindle an Arkansas town, they rehearse scenes from Romeo and Juliet and Richard III, topped with a badly mis-remembered and distorted rendition of

---

22 Both Levine and Sturgess refer to the Huckleberry Finn scene in their analysis. Levine opens his study of “Shakespeare in America,” explaining that “Twain’s humor relies on his audience’s familiarity with Hamlet and its ability to recognize the duke’s improbable coupling of lines from a variety of Shakespeare’s plays” (13). Sturgess concurs, adding that because he was “recognised by a substantial proportion of the American population, Shakespeare could be incorporated into any and every form of popular entertainment” (88).
Hamlet’s “To Be, or Not to Be” soliloquy, while riding down the river on Huck’s raft. When they fail on their first night to draw but a dozen to their makeshift stage, the duo change their strategy and print a new handbill advertising that “Ladies and children will not be permitted” (165). The duke concludes that “these Arkansaw lunkheads couldn’t come up to Shakespeare: what they wanted was low comedy – and maybe something worse than low comedy” (165). Their “Royal Nonesuch” is precisely what the title suggests, vulgar nonsense, and the pair barely escape town on the night of the last performance when the audience comes prepared with “sickly eggs” and “rotten cabbages” (167). Written in the 1880s, but set in the 1830s, Twain captures the lewd early nineteenth-century theatrical spirit in which Shakespeare thrived. It was this Shakespeare as “humble, everyday poet” described by Levine who dominated the American stage through the first half of the nineteenth century (69).

Not all who attended the theater in nineteenth-century America, though, came to see the action on stage. Prostitutes – and their customers – were also regulars in the audiences. Relegated to a third tier in the galleries, a tier that often had its own private entrance and bar, prostitution in the theaters was allowed and even encouraged. Claudia Johnson, in her 1975 article “That Guilty Third Tier: Prostitution in Nineteenth-Century American Theaters,” writes that prostitution influenced “the very design of the theater building, was at the foundation
of theatrical economics, and was largely responsible for the reputation,
and consequently the clientele, of the nineteenth-century theater.” (Johnson 580). The antics of some visiting English actors further
degraded American theaters’ reputation. Some lived nearly as dramatic
lives off the stage as they did on. Charles Shattuck, in his 1976
Shakespeare on the American Stage: From the Hallams to Edwin Booth,
describes the lives of George Frederick Cooke, Edmund Kean, and Edwin
Junius Booth, who were all guilty of “drinking to the bottom of the
bottle” and “plung[ing] into temptations of the flesh and riotous living”
(Shattuck 31). Often reported in local newspapers, their exploits became

23 Without the third tier, it was difficult for theaters to earn enough profit to stay open,
and aggressive managers would even send out free gallery tickets to houses of
prostitution (Johnson 581). Theater historians rarely address American theaters’ third
tiers, but nineteenth-century Americans were well aware of their function. Johnson
explains, “of all the accusations hurled at the theater by its enemies, the charge relating
to the third tier was their strongest, least refuted argument” (575). Sturgess (85-86) and
Teague (56) both cite Johnson in their work.

24 Cooke, famous throughout England and America and initially well received in New
York in 1810, soon disgusted American audiences with his insobriety; his pre-
performance drinking led him to miss rehearsals, stumble through lines on stage,
substitute parts from other plays, and even cancel engagements altogether. Such
drinking and “numberless” other “crazy doings offstage ... gradually became public”
(Shattuck 35). Edmund Kean, more famous and talented than Cooke, but no less
notorious, toured American theaters beginning in 1820. He was considered one of the
most brilliant actors of the nineteenth century; Coleridge had “declared that to see Kean
act was like reading Shakespeare by flashes of lightening” (Shattuck 39). Kean, though,
was also an alcoholic and his drinking affected both his reputation and his acting.
Further, he was unfaithful in marriage and “lapsed into a ... long-drawn-out adultery
with ... the wife of an alderman” which “wrecked his domestic life and his reputation”
(Shattuck 38). Junius Brutus Booth came to America in 1821 with his secret mistress,
leaving behind his wife and two-year old son. His wife, Adelaide, did not know that she
had been abandoned, and “for nearly two decades” waited in vain for “him to return to
her” (Shattuck 45). Booth, like Cooke and Kean, struggled with alcoholism, and also
suffered from mental illness; Shattuck writes, “at intervals he was quite mad” (45).
Numerous stories of his demented antics peppered American newspapers, from refusing
to surrender an on-stage sword fight and driving “his amazed opponent off the stage, out
the stage door, and into the street” to summoning a clergyman to his hotel room to
“arrange burial place and perform the funeral service for his deceased friends – the
‘friends’ being a bushel of dead pigeons” (Shattuck 35-46).
common knowledge to the American public, coloring theaters as drunken brothels, where prostitutes manned the third tier, and deranged lunatics took charge of the stage. Levine describes the American theater in the nineteenth century as “a kaleidoscope, democratic institution presenting a widely varying bill of fare to all classes and socioeconomic groups” (21).

Against the backdrop of Shakespeare’s bawdy and rowdy popularity, it becomes clear why school reader compilers often resisted endorsing theatrical aspects of his writing. Despite welcoming a sampling of society – from poorest to richest – many Americans found theaters an aversion to their moral sensibilities, and this distaste problematized the reading of Shakespeare in schools. Rev. Herman Humphrey, president of Amherst College, wrote of Shakespeare in 1840:

I am sorry that most of his plays were ever written ... It is scarcely possible they should pass through the youthful mind and imagination, without leaving a stain behind. If they must be read by our sons and daughters ... let us have a carefully expurgated edition. (94, qtd in Avery 26)

The most popular American readers of the first decades of the nineteenth century, those edited and compiled by Lindley Murray, contained no Shakespeare lessons at all (Marder 281; Simon 13). Murray was adamant in his distaste for drama. Simon writes that he “was revered for his puritanical sentiments and self-denying life, and ... by his horror of the drama, did more than anyone else to keep Shakespeare out of the schools.
for a long time” (13). Citing a pamphlet edited by Murray, Simon explains:

He did not see fit to include Shakespeare in his schoolbooks ... he did not believe ... “that the literary merit, and accurate knowledge of the human heart, which are displayed in many parts of dramatic works, will atone for the fatal wounds which innocence, delicacy, and religion, too frequently suffer from these performances.” (15).

Simon explains, “the lack of dramatic offerings indicated that Murray’s prejudice against the theater, shared by a large majority of Americans at the time, kept Shakespeare out of the schools excepting as exercises in elocution” (37).

Some compilers experimented with including Shakespeare early in the nineteenth century, but with mixed results. The readers of Albert Picket and his eldest son, John Picket, for example, allude to the problematic nature of including Shakespearean passages in reader compilations. The father-and-son-team compiled a series of readers beginning in 1808. \(^{25}\) The series later expanded and underwent several

\(^{25}\) These were *The Juvenile, or Universal Primer; The Juvenile Spelling Book, or American School Class-Book, No. 1; The Juvenile Instructor, or American School Class-Book, No. 2; The Juvenile Mentor, or American School Class-Book, No. 3; and The Juvenile Expositor, or American School Class-Book, No. 4*. H.G. Good relates that the Pickets’ “texts in spelling, reading, grammar, and other English branches which they gave the general title of the American School Class-Books, were used in many towns from Boston to Cincinnati and made a place for themselves in competition with the works of Webster, Worcester, and McGuffey” (319-20). In the years preceding his own series of school readers, William McGuffey even praised the Picket series. An 1836
series of revisions, remaining popular through four decades. In addition to work as teachers and school administrators, the Pickets also published one of the nation’s first professional journals for teachers, The Academician. When the Pickets’ fourth reader, the Juvenile Expositor was originally released in 1808, it included no Shakespeare. Its content changed somewhat by an 1816 edition, but there was still no Shakespeare. An 1819 edition, though, added a closing section of poetry, its last selection being “The Progress of Life” from As You Like It. An 1830 revision, the New Juvenile Expositor, retained the closing section of poetry along with the “Progress” passage, which now served as the closing piece for the volume. Neither the 1819 or 1830 edition credited Shakespeare as the author, though, avoiding any potential theatrical connections.

The Pickets’ third reader, the Juvenile Mentor, though, presents a more unusual and intriguing history, originally including a single Shakespearean lesson through the 1810s, and then briefly including a significant number of Shakespearean passages in the 1820s, before abruptly removing them by the 1830s. Its earliest editions – there were at least three: 1809, 1813, and 1818 – included only “Brutus’s Speech on
the Death of Caesar” from *Julius Caesar*. In an 1820 edition, though, the Pickets added twenty-six Shakespeare passages. These were concentrated together near the end of the volume under the heading “The Passions.” In total, thirteen different Shakespearean plays were represented, indicating the Pickets’ familiarity with Shakespeare’s canon.27 That they would include so many Shakespeare passages is significant; they were short passages, but no other popular American school reader had before included so many. As with the *Expositor*, the Pickets did not credit any of the selections’ authors, including Shakespeare. They also offered no biographical information about Shakespeare’s life or any contextual information about the plays from which the passages were drawn.

Most fascinating of all, though, was that later in the decade, the Pickets rescinded the entire section from the *Juvenile Mentor*. By the time an 1829 edition of the *Juvenile Mentor* was printed, Brutus’s speech on the death of Caesar remained, but the section titled “The Passions” had been omitted.28 The Pickets’ entire series was released in 1830 as *New* and the *Juvenile Mentor* was renamed *The Reader*, and later in 1838,

---


28 The exact year of publication is difficult to determine. Harvard’s HOLLIS catalog dates the volume as 1829, but includes a question mark. No date is given in the actual text. However, the text and style of the title page do not match the 1818 and 1820 title pages; it does, however, match the text and style of an 1825 edition. Further, the title page refers to Albert Picket as the president of the Incorporated Society of Teachers (as does the title page of an 1820 and 1825 edition, but not on an 1818 edition). His presidency began in 1818 and, except for one year, lasted until 1845 (Good 233). These facts together suggest that this edition was printed after 1818, and that the 1829 identification is likely correct.
the Reader and Definer. It continued to be published under this last title until at least 1847. Its only Shakespeare lesson, “Brutus’s Speech on the Death of Caesar,” was eventually replaced with a “Scene of Filial Affection” from King Lear, but the section “The Passions” was never again included. The Juvenile Mentor’s brief experiment with Shakespeare in the 1820s had been a failed one for the Pickets.

The Pickets’ readers’ prefaces offer no explanation for Shakespeare’s sudden inclusion where there had been relatively none before nor any explanation for his sudden disappearance. At the time that the Pickets began including Shakespeare in the Juvenile Mentor, though, they were also busy with their periodical, The Academician, and spoke on the dangers of the theater in an 1818 issue:

... Theatrical performances seize upon their [students’] minds, and from seeing vice so beautifully arrayed ... they naturally ... fall in love with it, and henceforward pursue ways equally detrimental to morals ... even the committing of plays to memory ... has a very dangerous tendency; as it

---

29 Henry Simon included the Pickets in his study of Shakespeare in school readers, finding that “of the fifty-five passages in verse ... twenty-three were from Shakespeare” (28). He miscounted the number of Shakespearean passages, though, as there are actually twenty-six Shakespearean passages. Simon also overlooked that Picket had included “Brutus’s Speech on the Death of Caesar” from Julius Caesar earlier in the volume. Simon had relatively limited access to school readers when he was writing in the early 1930s, and as a result, he also mistakenly believed that his 1820 Juvenile Mentor had been the first edition. According to his bibliography, he based his conclusions on only two editions of Juvenile Mentor: one from 1820 and another from 1827. Because of this, he was unaware that in earlier and later years the Pickets had not included their section of Shakespearean passages.
may turn their attention, to the despicable means of obtaining a livelihood by play acting. (107)

The Pickets go on to admonish admirers of theater who would acclaim Shakespeare’s works above the lofty titles of Addison, Johnson, and others the Pickets approved:

Should we ... accidentally fall in with one of those admirers of the theatre, and ... put into his hands, one of the volumes, which contains the profound, chaste, and philosophical reasonings of an Addison, a Johnson, a Locke, a Bacon, a Reid, or a Stewart ... the contents of the volume would be laughed at ... while the writings of Shakespeare ... would be extolled to the skies. (108)

Given the Pickets’ position on theater and Shakespeare, it is surprising that they experimented at all including Shakespearean passages in their Juvenile Mentor. Perhaps they believed that by masking his passages as poetry, without identifying the author or providing any context for the passages, they would avoid unpleasant associations with Shakespeare. Perhaps others were involved with the production of the readers by 1820, a printer or publisher, who implemented the inclusion of Shakespeare. Even without an explanation for Shakespeare’s sudden appearance and equally sudden disappearance from Juvenile Mentor, the printing history of this reader illustrates the tumultuous position of
Shakespeare and school readers in the early decades of the nineteenth century.

When Shakespearean passages were included in American readers in the first half of the nineteenth century, they served almost exclusively as exemplars for teaching elocution, though there were also occasionally lessons presaging the reading-based and literary approaches that would come later. The McGuffey’s, for example, included Shakespearean lessons from their origins in the late 1830s, though exposure to Shakespeare was negligible in the 1830s and 40s compared with later editions. Originally, only the 1837 McGuffey’s Fourth Reader included Shakespeare, but many students left school before working through the three lower readers that preceded it (Gorn 27; Minnich 36-37; Westerhoff 57). As a result, the study of Shakespeare in the early McGuffey’s was reserved for only advanced students, and those exemplary students who did reach the Fourth Reader were exposed to only two Shakespearean passages: “Prince Arthur” from King John and Antony’s “Friends, 

30 The McGuffey’s earliest editions, from 1836-38 were the only versions prepared by William McGuffey himself. He compiled the Eclectic First Reader and Eclectic Second Reader in 1836 alone, without the help of his brother. The following year, he added the Eclectic Third Reader and Eclectic Fourth Reader. All four underwent minor revisions in the 1830s and 40s under various editors (Carr 227; Minnich 39-40; Nietz 74; Sullivan 20).

31 As King John has become one of Shakespeare’s more obscure plays, many may not be familiar with it in the twenty-first century. It was never one of the Bard’s more popular plays, but it was more well known in nineteenth century schools than it is today. In the play, King John has ordered Hubert to burn out young Prince Arthur’s eyes, but the youthful and cherubic Arthur, in the passage that McGuffey includes, is able to convince Hubert to spare him. Arthur is an exemplar of boyhood innocence and youthful goodness, and his touching success in persuading Hubert to spare his life parallels other stories of morality common to the McGuffey’s.
Romans, Countrymen” from *Julius Caesar*. Neither included an introduction, though both were followed by a series of five to six questions, a short list of common pronunciation errors, and a set of words to spell and define. Their questions, though – such as “Who was Casca?” and “Relate the story of Caesar’s death” – assessed students’ ability to recall information, but never demanded higher-level thinking from students. Exposure to Shakespeare increased in 1844 when Alexander McGuffey compiled the *Rhetorical Guide, or Fifth Reader*.\(^\text{32}\) It added twelve more Shakespearean passages,\(^\text{33}\) for a total of fourteen, but it lacked even the simple apparatus that accompanied lessons from the *Fourth Reader*. Without any notes, questions, or introductions, its selections were exclusively oratorical.

Charles Sanders, a popular contemporary with McGuffey in the 1840s, also crafted an oratorical Shakespeare in his series of *School*...
Readers. The entire series included only two regular Shakespeare reading lessons, but used examples from Shakespeare extensively in the lengthy elocution introductions that opened its advanced volumes. His 1842 Fourth Reader elocution introduction utilized twenty-five examples from seven Shakespeare plays, while his 1848 Fifth Reader elocution introduction included twenty-one total examples, twenty from six different plays in addition to a single line from Venus and Adonis.

Between the two, Sanders incorporated almost fifty Shakespearean examples in the teaching of elocution. Many examples were brief, such as the lines “I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him” from Julius Caesar, and “Stay, speak; – Speak I charge thee, speak” from Hamlet. Others, though, were as long or longer than the typical reading passages that followed the introduction, such as the exchange between Glo_uster,
Woodville, and Winchester from *1 Henry IV*, which took a full page. These examples demonstrated a variety of different elocution topics, including “Articulation,” “Emphasis,” “Inflections of the Voice,” “Modulation,” “Expression,” “Personation,” “Rhetorical Pause,” and “Poetical Elocution.”^37^ Sanders weaved sixteen examples from

---

^37^ In the *Fifth Reader*, Sanders called this section “Poetical Elocution.” In the *Fourth*, he had named it “The Reading of Poetry.”
Shakespeare into his lessons on inflection. To teach emphasis, he used

Figure 5: Charles Sanders’ Lesson on Personation from his Fifth Reader
nine, for modulation, seven. Sanders systematically included Shakespeare to teach nearly every element of elocution, except one: Sanders entirely neglected Shakespeare in his sections on poetical elocution. In these, he used examples from Alexander Pope, Lord Byron, William Blake, William Cullen Bryant, and others, but none from Shakespeare. Shakespeare’s plays were not poetry. For Sanders, at least in the 1840s, they were useful only for teaching elocution. Such treatment, though, shifted with Shakespeare’s popularity in the middle of the nineteenth century.

American playgoing changed. Theaters, which earlier in the century had served a broad demographic, increasingly began catering to affluent audiences. Walt Whitman observed in 1847 that New York theaters “were becoming ‘low’ places where vulgarity (not only on the stage, but in front of it) is in the ascendant, and bad-taste carries the day” (qtd in Levine 57). Whitman’s observation would not have been a revelation in his own time – American theaters for decades had been low places and their reputation was common knowledge – but what was novel was that a new playgoing market, made up of men and women of Whitman’s mind, was emerging and complaining about the conditions. Theaters took notice, and by the late 1840s, some increased ticket prices and implemented strict dress codes. The old class of theater still remained, seeking to maintain the democratic, popular, and rowdy nature American theaters had known some hundred years, but a new class now
aimed toward a sophisticated, refined theater experience. The clash between them would determine theatrical presentation and ambiance through to the present day.

A number of scholars describing the nature of Shakespeare’s popularity in nineteenth-century America point to the Astor Place Riot in 1849 as a pivotal moment in the battle between highbrow and lowbrow theater, and Shakespeare’s permanent place in American culture (Holland 202; Levine 63-69; Shattuck 62-87; Sturgess 41-43; Teague 52-63). The conflict started as a spat in England between two competing actors: London’s leading Shakespearean, William Macready; and the American, Edwin Forrest, who Shattuck calls “unquestionably America’s first important native-born tragedian” (63). On his second stint touring the English stage, Forrest had received bad reviews and, blaming Macready, attended one of Macready’s performances and hissed from the audience. While such a response was not necessarily inappropriate by nineteenth-century standards if the performance warranted it, Teague suspects that “Forrest was the only one doing it since he was easily identified” (53).

The conflict spilled over to American soil shortly thereafter where the rivals were performing in New York. On the night of May 7, 1847, both were playing Macbeth: Forrest at the Broadway Theater and Macready at the Astor Place Opera House.\(^{38}\) Forrest’s performance was a

---

\(^{38}\) Macbeth was a role Macready was familiar with – he had played it more than any other – and a role that continued to evolve for Macready throughout his career; according to Arthur Colby Sprague, author of *Shakespearian Players and Performances*,
success. Macready, on the other hand, at the Astor Place, was heckled from the balconies. The Astor Place – built just two years before in 1847 – charged higher ticket prices than any other New York theater, insisted on a strict dress code, and was a favorite of New York’s upper class theatergoers. Its prestigious patrons generally bought seats on the main floor while less prosperous playgoers tended to purchase tickets in the balconies above. Macready was inundated with what Levine describes as “an avalanche of eggs, apples, potatoes, lemons, and, ultimately, chairs hurled from the gallery” (63). Those seated on the main floor protested, but to little avail, and the performance ended in the third act.

On May 10, Macready performed again at the petition of several prominent New Yorkers. Macready had meant to end the tour early after the fiasco three days before, but a letter signed by some fifty of New York’s most prestigious citizens – lawyers, merchants, editors, authors, physicians, a banker, a broker, a shipowner, and a hotel proprietor – convinced him “that the good sense and respect for order prevailing in this community will sustain you” (qtd in Levine 64). Local newspapers followed the story, taking sides in the feud. Teague reports Macready’s supporters as the “socially prominent citizens anxious to establish that New York ... valued culture and artists” and Forrest’s supporters tended to be made up of “citizens who were lower-class and publicly more nationalistic” (57).

Macready kept “ideas for single scenes or even phrases” from Macbeth in his diaries, “chronicling ... successes or failures” (93).
The two sides collided when Macready played Macbeth a second time. While he performed, ten thousand gathered and rioted outside, fired up by chants of “Burn the damn den of the aristocracy” and “You can’t go in there without ... kid gloves and a white vest, damn ‘em!” (qtd in Levine 64). Bricks crashed through the theater windows and the mob was prevented from storming the theater only by an armed militia. Macready continued to perform, though, while outside at least twenty-two were killed – some accounts report an even higher death count – and eighty-six arrested. Those arrested were a sampling of the working class of the city – coopers, printers, butchers, carpenters, servants, sailmakers, machinists, clerks, masons, bakers, and plumbers – a stark contrast to those listed on the petition urging Macready to perform. Peter Holland, in a 2002 chapter, “Touring Shakespeare,” calls the riot a “clash of culture, class, and nationalism ... that defined ... the place of the theatre in the structure of American society” (202). The Astor Place Riot became the physical manifestation of a cultural battle for Shakespeare, a battle that only rarely took such violent forms, but a battle that would ultimately be won in later decades by those who would place Shakespeare atop the literary canon.

“Cut Out Your Tongue”: The Fall of Oratorical Shakespeare Study

By the end of the nineteenth century, the nature of American theater – and Shakespeare’s reputation with it – had changed. Gone were the days when Shakespeare was performed alongside jugglers and minstrels, gone was the closing farce that capped an evening of
Shakespearean tragedy, and gone were the homogeneous, rambunctious audiences that had constituted playgoing audiences in the first half of the century. In their place were reserved audiences, audiences who did not throw things even at the worst acting, who did not hiss or boo, and who did not riot outside the theaters. They did not demand to select the music themselves, or force actors to repeat favorite passages. Prostitutes were no longer welcome, nor their clientele. As theaters continued to segregate themselves and their audiences, it “shattered for good” what Levine calls “the phenomenon of theater as a social microcosm,” the notion that had allowed Shakespeare his place in popular culture, but that also had prevented him from taking a preeminent place in American academia (61). As Shakespeare’s significance in popular culture diminished, it just as quickly ascended in academic culture, an ascent recorded in school readers. The two types of Shakespeare Levine describes as peaceably coexisting early in the nineteenth century – the “humble, everyday poet” and the “towering genius” – could do so no longer (69).

School readers responded to changing cultural conceptions of Shakespeare with a new attention to issues of authorship; the appearance of literary apparatus and layout, such as introductions, notes, and the emergence of scene sequences; and an interest in burgeoning critical analysis. By the 1850s and 60s, elocution was in the beginning stages of decline. It would remain important to American school readers through the nineteenth century, but not to the degree it had been in the first half of
the century. Literary study became the primary focus in its place. The later readers of Charles Sanders compared with his earlier readers exemplify this transition. His 1840s *School Readers* had used Shakespeare liberally to teach elocution, but his later readers in the 1850s and 60s shifted toward a literary appreciation and critical analysis of Shakespearean pieces. In the 1840s, Sanders had included numerous Shakespearean examples to illustrate his lengthy elocution introductions, but in 1856, when he added a *High School Reader* and a *Young Ladies’ Reader*, he crafted a new elocution introduction, one with only a fraction of the Shakespeare examples that had appeared in the previous versions.

He henceforth included this new elocation introduction in all subsequent publications of his advanced *School Readers*: the *Fourth, Fifth, High School*, and *Young Ladies*, and also in his *Union Readers* that were published at the outset of the Civil War in 1861. This new elocution introduction, at 34 pages, was shorter than the two previous elocution introductions, indicating elocution’s waning influence, and included only four Shakespearean examples instead of the more than twenty that had illustrated each of his earlier elocution introductions.39 In the *Union Readers* series, Shakespeare instead played a more prominent role in Sanders’s reading lessons.

39 These four examples include the lines “Set honor in one eye, and death in the other / And I will look on both indifferently” from *Julius Caesar*; the lines “Fight, gentlemen of England! fight, bold yeoman! / Draw archers, draw your arrows to the head” from *Richard III*; seventeen lines from Henry V’s speech at Harfleur beginning “Once more unto the breach”; and the three lines beginning “Oh, coward conscience” from *Richard III*. 
Sanders’s *Sixth Union Reader* included six Shakespearean reading lessons: one scene each from *Macbeth*, *Richard III*, and *Julius Caesar*; Shakespeare’s 54th sonnet; and two sequential scenes from *Hamlet*. His treatment of Shakespeare in the *Sixth Reader* was drastically different than it had been in the 1840s. That he included these back-to-back scenes from *Hamlet* is an indicator of a literary shift in his treatment of Shakespeare. The inclusion of two sequential scenes suggests a fuller reading of Shakespeare as a longer literary piece. Brief introductory notes also preceded three of the lessons: Hamlet, Macbeth, and Richard III.

In addition, Sanders gave American readers a flavoring of literary criticism. One of his lessons consisted of a four-page selection from Samuel Johnson’s preface to his edition of Shakespeare. Johnson had been a leading eighteenth-century poet, editor, and critic, and his preface was considered by some to be one of his finest works. Further, Sanders included as lessons two excerpts from William Hazlitt’s renowned *Characters of Shakespeare’s Plays*. Hazlitt’s criticism earlier in the century in England had drawn attention to the delight of Shakespeare’s poetry, and had been a favorite on the shelves of university literary societies for decades, but not previously as material for school readers. Sanders placed the first Hazlitt excerpt, on the “Character of Hamlet,”

---

40 In addition to its previous two Shakespeare lessons, the 1856 *High School Reader* added another to Sanders’s *School Series*—“Cardinal Wolsey and Cromwell” from *Henry VIII*—along with brief introductory material contextualizing the passage, and describing the lives of each of the lesson’s main characters. Likewise, Sanders 1856 *Young Ladies’ Reader* contributed another as well—“Othello’s Defense”—along with a brief introductory note.
just before the two sequential *Hamlet* scenes. He illuminates Hamlet’s speeches to be “as real as our own thoughts [and] their reality ... in the reader’s mind [because] it is we who are Hamlet” (188). Such critique pushed students to inhabit Hamlet’s psyche in ways never demanded earlier in the century. Sanders placed the second Hazlitt excerpt, comparing “Richard III and Macbeth” – “both are tyrants, usurpers, murderers ... but Richard is cruel from nature and constitution [while] Macbeth becomes so from accidental circumstances” – just before the two corresponding scenes from *Richard III* and *Macbeth*, pushing students toward a comparative analysis of the two villains. Sanders’ critical selections are some of the first examples of reader apparatus that extend beyond biographical information on Shakespeare’s life and times.

Shakespeare had entered the literary realm and his works had become meritorious of study in their own right, not simply as exemplars in elocution. Other compilers followed these same patterns, experimenting with and adapting Shakespeare lessons from elocution toward literary study, changes that foreshadowed modern ideas of how Shakespeare school texts would later function. When the *McGuffey’s* were updated in 1857 and 1858\(^\text{41}\) – in addition to changes to the existing

\(^\text{41}\) The *McGuffey’s* – and their treatment of Shakespeare – were not the same at the end of the nineteenth century that they had been earlier in the century. They evolved over time, expanding in length and adapting to changing tastes and market conditions. Westerhoff divides its publication history into three distinct editions: the original edition published between 1836 and 1844, the expanded edition of 1857 and 1858, and the radically revised edition of 1879 (20). Though these three manifestations superficially share the McGuffey name, Westerhoff makes clear that “each [was] compiled by a new editor, for a new publisher, and to meet new needs” (20).
five readers, three new volumes were added: the *New Sixth Eclectic Reader*, the *New High School Reader*, and the *New Eclectic Speaker* – the conception of authorship and the roles of editors and compilers were in flux. Shakespeare had not just been moved around or a few select passages omitted and added. Editors were wrestling with their place in the creative ownership of the texts they prepared. In prior decades, William and Alexander McGuffey had credited each author, including them by name at the end of each of his lessons in the 1836-1844 editions, and later editors had followed the same practice. In the 1857 edition, though, Obed J. Wilson, responsible for editing the text of the new *McGuffey’s*, changed the wording, adding “from” before the author’s name. In the case of Shakespeare, this became “from Shakespeare.”

Paragraphs in the prefaces to the *Fifth* and *Sixth Readers* justify the change, explaining:

> Considerable liberty has been taken with the articles selected, in order to adapt them to the especial purpose for which they are here designed. Much change and remodeling have been necessary. The lessons are therefore credited as taken “from” the author named. (5, 8)

---

[42] The *High School Reader* was not nearly as popular as the others in the series, and according to Carpenter, “not many were printed” (82). The limited number of extant volumes today substantiates Carpenter’s claim.

[43] Two years later, in 1860, another speaker was added: *McGuffey’s New Juvenile Speaker*. Meant for younger pupils, though, it included no Shakespeare. The two *Speakers* appear not to have been as popular as the regular series; according to Carpenter, they “did not meet with sufficient approval to warrant even one reprinting” (82). Scanning available university library catalogs corroborates Carpenter’s claim; neither of the *Speakers* were republished.
In the case of the *McGuffey’s Juvenile Speaker*, added to the series in 1860, authors’ names were omitted entirely. Instead, Wilson listed the authors in the first pages of the book without tying them to respective passages, explaining:

The following are some of the authors whose works have been consulted in the preparation of this volume. The matter has been so materially modified, in order to fit it for its specific object, that no credits are given, and the compiler alone is responsible for it in its present form. (iv)

Reader compilers like Wilson considered themselves authorial collaborators, even creators of text, through the intellectual involvement inherent in the process of selecting, formatting, and editing selections for their readers, and while still crediting the original author, emphasized their own contributions. This sense of pride reflects back to a period earlier in the century when, in the theaters, Shakespearean drama had been intermingled with other acts throughout the nineteenth century, and playgoers had demanded their own active role in what took place on stage. Wilson likewise insisted upon marking his contributions, which manifested in the word “from” preceding each author’s names.

Such experimentation, though, did not serve to heighten Shakespeare’s literary reputation. Treating Shakespeare’s poetry as collaborative rather than individual work diluted the Bard’s creative genius and consequently diminished accompanying editorial and critical
work. Both author and critic benefitted instead from treating Shakespeare conceptually as the sole authorial figure responsible for the plays. Such practice concentrates his poetic authority and respectively heightens the literary authority of the growing body of critical analysis surrounding his works.

George Stillman Hillard, respected reader compiler in the 1850s, 60s, and 70s, and contemporary with Obed Wilson (McGuffey’s) and Charles Sanders, acknowledged the value inherent in attributing a literary work to a single author, even when doing so negated more accurate attributions to collective authorship. Using Homer as an example in an essay titled The Relation of the Poet to His Age, he wrote:

I have spoken of the Iliad as the work of a single mind,

and that opinion is likely always to form a part of the popular literary creed, whatever may be the views of the initiated. The common mind will never consent to exchange that “blind old man of Scio’s rocky isle,” for a

---

44 By trade, Hillard was a lawyer and involved in law for some forty years until disease forced his retirement. However, he was involved in relatively few cases, and was more well-known for his oratorical and scholarly contributions. According to Francis W. Palfrey’s memoir of his life, he was “more distinguished as a public speaker than as a lawyer” and “it was as a man of letters and a conversationist that he was really eminent” (342). Charles Dexter Cleveland wrote of him: “It is in the higher and purer walks of literature that this polished scholar shows himself to be at home” (594). In addition to his successful school readers, his long list of publications included books, papers, articles, and orations on a wide variety of subjects. As a boy and young man, he attended the Boston Latin School from 1822-1824, and then Harvard from 1824-1828. He later studied at Northampton — where he also taught for a short time — and Cambridge, earning a Master of Arts degree in 1830 and a law degree the following year. While at Harvard, he had been a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and years after graduation, he twice returned to speak before the society, first in 1843 when he delivered an oration titled The Relation of the Poet to His Age, and again in 1866 to deliver Political Duties of the Educated Classes. Both were later published. (Carpenter 88-89; Nietz 92-93; Reeder 50; Simon 39-44; Smith 52)
bodiless abstraction, nor blot out that single and blazing star of poetry from the dark morning sky, and put in its place a nebulous galaxy composed of innumerable lesser lights, without a name. (27)

Though Hillard uses Homer as an example, his notion applies equally to Shakespeare. Hillard assumes that the “common mind” will gravitate toward the notion of solitary as opposed to collaborative authorship, an assumption in the case of Shakespeare that advances Shakespeare as the “towering genius” described by Levine (69).

Consequently, reader compilers grew to revere literary criticism in their compilations. By vacating any potential authorial ownership of Shakespearean passages, they entitled to themselves a higher place as editor of and commentator on the text. Hillard revered the literary critic, believing that criticism enhances literature. According to Hillard, it was not enough to simply enjoy literature; one must learn to appreciate literature. He uses a metaphor of a clock to explain: “it is not enough to see the movement of the hands upon the dialplate, we must also watch the

---

45 Hillard writes of authors, both historically and in his own age, as enlightened men forced simultaneously to embrace and endure the adversity of their own unique circumstances. In The Relation of the Poet to His Age, he stated that “the poet ... is emphatically a child of his age ... his mind will unconsciously be moulded and colored by the influences that surround him” (7). Hillard decreed that the poets of his own era must toil amidst their own circumstances, must “work and sing too ... pressed into the service of toiling, suffering, sorrowing humanity” (45-46). Hillard challenged men of literary genius to fulfill their calling: “nowhere is the poet called upon more imperatively to speak out ... we need the charm and grace which he alone can throw over the rough places of life” (49). He idealized the nature of poet as a liberating force, simultaneously distinct from the humanity around himself or herself, yet still integrally and inseparably connected. Their intellect and service placed them above common people.
play of the inner machinery, by which that movement is created and transmitted” (44). His metaphor subordinates the text itself to the critical appreciation of the text. Criticism is “genial,” “penetrating,” and “creative,” and “is vivifying the dead bones of antiquity and extracting a new and deep meaning from the stories which charmed the childhood of the world” (44).

When the McGuffey’s went through their last major revision in 1879, its editors, Thomas W. Harvey and Edwin C. Hewett, abandoned Wilson’s experimental conception of authorship, discarding the “from” before each author’s name. Like Hillard, they did not see themselves as collaborators with Shakespeare or other authors, but instead in a purely

---

46 In 1879, the entire McGuffey’s series was radically revised. The two Speakers were not revised or republished and no longer appeared in advertisements for the series. The High School Reader was also not revised with the series, though it was reissued ten years later in 1889 in a significantly different format. Further, though the 1879 editions retained the McGuffey name and its associated recognition, in content they barely resembled preceding editions of the McGuffey’s. Westerhoff writes that “while these two major editions ... share some content in common, they are significantly more different than alike” (18). Neither William nor Alexander McGuffey had anything to do with these revisions. Westerhoff even believes that William McGuffey “likely would not have approved of the changes made in the later edition” (19). Despite this, though, the new version of the McGuffey series matched and exceeded the popularity of its predecessors, and for the most part, remained unchanged when its publishers renewed the series’ copyright in 1901 and 1920. (See Appendix I.)
editorial role. Conceptualizations of authorship became more rigid, and
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LXXXV.—WOLSEY AND CROMWELL.

 Emanuel van der Meer was born at Bremen, in 1524, and died in 1544. A man of great learning, he was noted for his spiritual and moral teaching. He was a member of the University of Heidelberg, and a chaplain in one of the London hospitals. He was a man of great ability, and became the leading light in the intellectual world of his time. He was the author of many works, including a history of the Church, which was published in 1540. He was a man of great learning, and became the leading light in the intellectual world of his time. He was the author of many works, including a history of the Church, which was published in 1540.
editors seized their own distinct, yet equally distinguished, place in the reproduction and study of literary texts. The 1879 preface to the *McGuffey’s Sixth Reader* explains:

> Close scrutiny has revealed the fact that many popular selections, common to several series of Readers, had been largely *adapted*, but in MCGUFFEY’S REVISED READERS, wherever it was possible to do so, the selections have been compared, and made to conform strictly with the originals as they appear in the latest editions authorized by the several writers.

The role of editor, even school book editor, had shifted from co-creator of text to an agent responsible for identifying and purifying an original, true text, and enhancing that text through commentary and critique, while full credit for original production belonged solely to the author. The prefaces to both the *McGuffey’s Fifth* and *Sixth* readers even give “Especial acknowledgment ... to Messrs. Houghton, Osgood & Co., for their permission to make liberal selections from their copyright editions of many of the foremost American authors whose works they publish” (iv). As a result, Shakespeare’s creative genius was sheltered by the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and consequently his reputation heightened. His passages were above theatrical production and elocutionary exemplar – Shakespeare’s genius was too lofty for such treatment – and instead better placed as meritorious dramatic poetry
worthy of scholarly study, a medium upon which the academic elite could posit their own cultural values and norms.

In brief introductions to their lessons, an apparatus entirely absent in earlier readers, reader compilers – like Sanders and Hillard in the 1850s and 60s, and Harvey and Hewett (McGuffey’s) in the 1870s and 80s – praised Shakespeare. These introductions subordinated information about the passage itself, though, instead typically emphasizing Shakespeare’s biography and critical reception. For example, when Hillard compiled his *A First Class Reader* in 1855,\(^\text{47}\) he introduced its first Shakespeare lesson, a dialogue between Wolsey and Cromwell from *Henry VIII*, with three full paragraphs of biographical and scholarly information, mostly praising Shakespeare’s genius and citing critical Shakespearean studies (432 words), and only one short paragraph

\(^{47}\)From the 1850s through the 1870s, Hillard compiled and twice revised (and renamed) his popular series of readers. Cleveland “consider[s] these among the best reading-books for schools, evincing good taste and judgment in the selections, and just views in the critical notices” (595). Hillard published the most advanced of the series first – *A First Class Reader* – in 1855 in Boston. It was not an uncommon practice for compilers to release the most advanced reader of a series first. He added a second volume in 1856, titled *A Second Class Reader*, and in 1857, *A Third Class Reader* and *A Fourth Class Reader*. The titles are confusing, though, because the smaller numbers correspond to the more advanced of the series; i.e. the *Fourth Class Reader* was to be studied before the *Third*, the *Third* before the *Second*, etc., as students worked their way to the *First Class Reader*, which was the most advanced of the four. In 1858, Hillard completed the series, releasing three primary readers for younger students: the *First Primary Reader*, the *Second Primary Reader*, and the *Third Primary Reader*. These, though, unlike the first four volumes, were numbered in ascending order. The *First Primary* was meant for beginning students, and the *Second* and *Third Primary* to follow. Hillard’s numeration is confusing, but he seemed to have realized this, because when he revised the series in 1863 he renumbered all of the titles. The seven-volume series became the Primer, or *First Reader*; the *Second Reader*; the *Third Reader*; the *Fourth Reader*; the Intermediate Reader; the *Fifth Reader*; and the *Sixth Reader*. Hillard, in collaboration with Loomis J. Campbell and Homer Baxter Sprague, revised and renamed the series once again in the 1870s, adding *Franklin* to each of the titles.
describing the passage’s context (59 words). Hillard’s weighty praise defied the notion of Shakespeare as the “humble, everyday poet”:

It would, of course, be impossible, in the compass of a notice like this, to do any thing like justice to the universality of his powers, his boundless fertility of invention, his dramatic judgment, his wit, humor, and pathos, his sharp observation, and his profound knowledge of the human heart. (313)

In a second introduction, to Ulysses’s speech from Troilus and Cressida, Hillard provided two paragraphs providing contextual information (156 words), but praised Shakespeare further in a final paragraph (52 words):

Shakespeare stands alone in the variety and comprehensiveness of his powers. He is like four or five men of the highest class blended into one. He had the

---

48 When Hillard revised the series in 1863, renaming A First Class Book to the Sixth Reader, Hillard retained only one of the three previous Shakespeare passages – the dialogue between Wolsey and Cromwell – but added three new passages: a dialogue between Hubert and Arthur from King John; a dialogue between King Henry IV, Hotspur, Worcester, and Northumberland from Henry IV Part I; and Antony’s funeral oration (Friends, Romans, Countrymen ...) from Julius Caesar. The three lengthy introductory paragraphs previously attached to the Wolsey and Cromwell passage, though, appeared instead in the introduction to Herbert and Arthur passage. This makes sense because this is the first Shakespearean introduction in the revised text, just as the “Wolsey and Cromwell” introduction had been the first in the previous version, and Hillard uses this introduction not to introduce the play but to introduce Shakespeare. When Hillard made his final revisions in the 1870s, renaming his most advanced reader the Franklin Sixth Reader, he kept two of the Shakespearean passages from the 1863 edition – the dialogue between Hubert and Arthur and the dialogue between Wolsey and Cromwell – and added a third passage: the king’s St. Crispian’s Day speech from Henry V. Hillard affixed the aforementioned three bulky paragraphs praising Shakespeare as an introduction to the Henry V passage – it being the first Shakespearean passage in the new version – but says nothing of the passage itself.
imagination of Milton and the philosophical glance of
Bacon; he was as great an orator as Demosthenes, and as
wise as Franklin. (389)

Such analysis alienates competing notions of collaborative creation
between actors, audiences, and script.

The McGuffey’s, beginning mid-century, also experimented with
celebratory introductions before Shakespearean lessons. The regular
graded editions in 1857 and before, such as the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, etc.,
did not include celebratory introductions, but the 1857 High School
Reader called Shakespeare “the great English dramatist,” whose
“posthumous fame will be co-extensive with the existence of English
literature.” By the last quarter of the century, the McGuffey’s fully
embraced a celebratory stance toward Shakespeare in their lesson
introductions. The 1879 Fifth Reader praised him as “the greatest poet
the world has ever produced” (328). The first of the nine lessons in the
1879 Sixth Reader included an expanded version of the celebratory
introduction included in the Fifth. Preceding “Henry V to His Troops,” it
exclaimed, “his writings show an astonishing knowledge of human
nature, expressed in language wonderful for its point and beauty” (158).

Between 1887 and 1889, Harvey and Hewett published an
alternate set of the McGuffey’s. These were not to replace the 1879
editions, which were still in print, but to be used concurrently with them.

This alternate set of texts – named McGuffey’s Alternate First Reader,
McGuffey’s Alternate Second Reader, etc. – matched the style and format of the regular series, but offered additional content for classroom use (Carpenter 82-83). These also praised Shakespeare in celebratory introductions. The Fifth Alternate preceded its Shakespeare lesson with basic background information on Shakespeare, and also praised Shakespeare as “the greatest observer of human nature” and “the most august of human intellects” (193). It cited Samuel Johnson’s words: “Shakespeare has united the powers of exciting laughter and sorrow not only in one mind, but in one composition” (163). The Sixth Alternate included a similar introduction prior to its initial Shakespearean passage:

The name of Shakespeare ... the greatest in our literature, – it is the greatest in all literature. No man ever came near to him in the creative powers of mind; no man had ever such strength at once, and such variety of imagination. (215)

These expressions of praise instill in students a type of reverence for Shakespeare not present earlier in the century. By adding introductions focused primarily on authorial biography and critical bibliography, late

---

49 McGuffey’s Alternate First, Second, Third, and Fourth Readers were first published in 1887. McGuffey’s Alternate Fifth Reader was added in 1888, and McGuffey’s Alternate Sixth Reader in 1889. Harvey and Hewett explain in the preface that “pupils should have more reading matter in each grade than is contained in the text-book used.” With the release of the McGuffey Alternate Series, Harvey and Hewett added another twelve Shakespearean passages to the series. The Fifth added “Music” from Merchant of Venice, part of the dialogue between Jessica and Lorenzo from the fifth act, which had not been included in any prior McGuffey series. The Sixth added eleven new Shakespearean passages, including its first Shakespearean sonnet; a collection of seven sonnets by various poets included Shakespeare’s “To the Marriage of True Minds.” A collection of eight short Shakespearean passages from various plays were also collected together into a lesson titled “Short Pieces,” five of which were new to the series. These include passages from I Henry IV, The Winter’s Tale, Merchant of Venice, Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet, Henry VIII, and Julius Caesar. (See Appendix I.)
nineteenth-century school readers like Hillard’s and the *McGuffey’s* instill in students an ideological conceptualization of a single author for the passages, a bard to be adulated and praised above all other writers, a notion that lays the groundwork for Shakespeare as “towering genius” to overcome Shakespeare as “humble poet.”

Scene sequences, such as the two connected Hamlet scenes Sanders included in his *Sixth Union Reader*, represent the beginning of a shift both in how Shakespeare would be presented in school readers in following decades, and also the gradually evolving classroom experience students had with Shakespearean texts. Scene sequences offer classroom opportunities for literary study denied by the declamatory passages included in earlier decades. Classroom experience takes on deeper levels of understanding – of Shakespeare as an author and his works as dramatic poetry – not previously possible when study was limited to the reading of passages. Careful analysis of Shakespeare’s textual history and the study of characterization, setting, and theme, the elements of the study of literature, emerge at the forefront of classroom study and become part of a more holistic and contextualized experience with Shakespeare.

Like Sanders’s *Sixth Union Reader*, the *McGuffey’s* also experimented with placing multiple sequential scenes together, providing a greater sense of context and emphasizing the plays holistically. The 1844 *McGuffey’s Eclectic Fifth Reader* had included a series of three complete, sequential Shakespearean scenes from *All’s Well That Ends*
Well – 3.6, 4.1, and 4.3 – together as one lesson, but Wilson expanded the practice in the 1857-58 McGuffey’s editions, including four more series of complete Shakespearean scene sequences, for a total of five. Three 1 Henry IV passages – “Hotspur’s Description of a Fop,” “Hotspur and King Henry IV,” and “Hotspur’s Soliloquy” – were included in The Speaker. These passages had been popular in earlier American readers, but unlike earlier series the McGuffey’s included introductory material that linked the passages. Before the first – “Hotspur’s Description of a Fop” – Wilson explains that the passage is “the apology of Hotspur for not delivering his prisoners to King Henry,” and that it is “followed [in Shakespeare’s original] ... by the dialogue which forms the succeeding exercise.” An introduction to the third, “Hotspur’s Soliloquy,” explains, “Hotspur ... as hinted in the preceding dialogue [the second of the three lessons], corresponds with others on the subject.”

Other mid-century McGuffey’s scene sequence introductions, while still praising Shakespeare, also helped contextualize lessons as dramatic poetry. In the case of a pair of Much Ado About Nothing scenes, Wilson listed the characters: “Dogberry and Verges, ignorant justices; and two watch-men.” The 33-word introduction to a King Lear five-scene sequence went further, instructing students and teachers to read the

---

50 The All’s Well scenes moved to the Sixth Reader, and the High School Reader incorporated two connected scenes from Hamlet as one lesson: 1.2 and 2.2. The Speaker included three scene sequences: five full scenes from King Lear divided into two lessons: 1.1, 1.4, 2.4, 3.1, and 4.7, and also two connected scenes from Much Ado About Nothing as another single lesson: 3.3 and 4.2. The Speaker, as discussed later in the paragraph, also connected three 1 Henry IV passages in three separate lessons: “Hotspur’s Description of a Fop,” “Hotspur and King Henry IV,” and “Hotspur’s Soliloquy.” (See Appendix I).
scenes as one: “to give the story ... its full interest, they [the five scenes] should all be spoken in connection.”

The emphasis of the advanced McGuffey’s at mid-century was in the beginning stages of change and still treated elocution, and its study through fragmented Shakespearean passages, as a worthy subject. Scene sequences themselves would not survive in the McGuffey’s, though the idea of linking scenes and even printing entire plays would eventually become standard in other genres of school texts by the closing decades of the nineteenth century. Harvey and Hewett, in 1879 and beyond, were no longer interested in Shakespearean scene sequences. Neither their 1879 Fifth nor their 1879 Sixth Reader included them as the McGuffey’s from 1857-58 had, and no later McGuffey’s editors would include them either. The longer scene sequences had been an anomaly in the readers, which typically included only short reading passages. They were better suited for newer, emerging genres of school texts, such as the school editions of entire plays that were being marketed and sold, and will be discussed in Chapter Three. These complete editions of the plays rendered scene sequences in the readers obsolete. Further, literature anthologies were also increasingly prominent by the end of the century, and these also proved a more appropriate vessel for longer literary passages.

Though the McGuffey’s experiments with scene sequences did not continue through the century, their movement toward increased literary apparatus did. Changes in lessons in the 1889 Sixth Alternate from earlier
McGuffey’s reveal that though the study of elocution remained part of students’ classroom experience with Shakespeare, it had been fully subordinated to an experience based on the tenets of philology and literary study. “Othello’s Wooing” had been included in both the 1844 Fifth, the 1857 High School Reader, and also in the 1889 Sixth Alternate (see Appendix I). Originally titled “Othello’s Apology in 1844 and 1857,” it had functioned as a monologue divided into six roughly equal parts, each to be read in sequence by different students as they practiced elocution. It was preceded with the parenthetical oratorical instruction: “This should be read in a middle tone.” The Sixth Alternate, though, laid out the passage as a dialogue by breaking Othello’s long speech in half with a line from the duke. It named the characters and also included three notes at the end of the lesson defining difficult vocabulary. Further, it added a final line from Shakespeare’s original that had been absent in the 1844 and 1857 versions: “Here comes the lady; let her witness it,” pointing to Desdemona’s entrance and Shakespeare’s larger plot. These changes suggest a different classroom experience with Shakespeare in 1889 compared with 1844 and 1857, one in which students were aware of and studied underlying historical, philological, and textual contexts of Shakespearean lessons they were reading. Harvey and Hewett made this aim explicit in their introduction to the Sixth Alternate, where they called their “method of study” one “which shall afford exercise not only in reading and elocution, but also in such literary analysis as is calculated to
form a fitting introduction to the more advanced study of the English language and its literature” (xiii).

When Harvey and Hewett released the *McGuffey’s High School Reader* in 1889, they experimented for the first time with the modern literary anthology. It was an entirely different text than its 1857 predecessor had been. Even more than the editions of 1879 and the alternate editions of 1887-1889, its selections suggested a philological classroom experience with Shakespeare founded upon familiarity with Shakespeare’s biography and place in the English literary canon. The 1889 *High School Reader* provided a broad survey of literature from the time of Shakespeare, including each selected author only once, in chronological order. As a result, whereas the 1857 edition had included six Shakespeare lessons, the 1889 edition included only one, new to the series: “The Estimate of a King by a King” from *Henry V*. It included more biographical and contextual information, though, than had previously ever been included in any *McGuffey’s* reader. It was, in fact, the most extravagant apparatus to accompany any *McGuffey’s* Shakespeare lesson. A four-page introduction to the Elizabethan Age, complete with sixteen footnotes, followed by a more than a full-page introduction specific to Shakespeare, preceded the single Shakespeare lesson. It provided background information, a chronology of his other English history plays, and praised Shakespeare’s literary genius: “In his knowledge of human nature, in quickness of mind, in richness of
imagination, in versatility of style, in perfect knowledge of dramatic art, Shakespeare stands foremost among English writers” (29). Compared with the *McGuffey’s* before 1879, which had mentioned little about Shakespeare’s life or the contexts of his works, the 1889 *High School Reader* embraced a literary and biographical study in American schools.

**Chapter Two Conclusions**

Nineteenth-century readers responded to changing conditions as part of a larger schema of ongoing educational reform taking place at the end of the century as classroom experience with Shakespeare shifted from oratorical to literary. The theater’s treatment of Shakespeare had shifted, and with it, classroom Shakespeare took on a fuller flavor, with the study of entire plays and the appreciation of Shakespeare for his poetic genius. Passages at the end of the century existed within the context of entire plays, but more significantly, Shakespeare existed as a historical figure within the context of the emerging academic field of English and also within its literary canon. His treatment in schools, though, continued to distance itself from his treatment on the stage. The study of his plays became literary, but not theatrical. The Shakespeare of school readers, though it evolved through the century, was the Shakespeare of the book – of the Shakespeare instituted by Heminge and Condell – and not the Shakespeare of the theater. It was private, individual, and constant. It was not public, collaborative, or ephemeral. As a result, the school readers’ portrayal of Shakespeare was a
counterpoint to stage Shakespeare. These changes, measured in the
lessons of the late nineteenth-century readers, mark the beginning of
modern conceptions of school Shakespeare and created the foundation for
how his works would come to be studied in the closing decades of the
nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth century.

The next chapter will analyze the role of individual school
editions of Shakespeare that had become popular in the final decades of
the nineteenth century. The most popular and influential of these
published in America were those of Henry Norman Hudson and William
James Rolfe. Theirs emerged in the 1870s and would remain popular well
into the first decades of the twentieth century. These texts reveal a
different classroom experience with Shakespeare from that of early
school readers, an experience no longer focused upon the study of
elocution, but still antithetical to theater. It was Shakespeare as literary
genius, not Shakespeare as playwright that these men promoted. As
Shakespeare’s academic reputation developed in the early twentieth
century, it remained in opposition to his reputation as a dramatist, again
in an ongoing dance of book Shakespeare and stage Shakespeare.
Shakespeare’s eminent rise to the top of the literary canon had been
suggested in changes in school readers in the nineteenth century, but it
was fully realized in these individual school editions of Shakespeare.
CHAPTER THREE

“THESE TESTY RIVALS”: THE SHAKESPEARE SCHOOL EDITIONS OF HENRY NORMAN HUDSON AND WILLIAM ROLFE, 1870-1905

The evolving classroom experience with Shakespeare in the last three decades of the nineteenth century, as school and university emphasis shifted from oratorical to literary, can be measured in the school editions of Shakespeare published by competing editors Henry Norman Hudson and William James Rolfe. There were other school editions of Shakespeare in this period, but the two most popular series in America were those of Hudson and Rolfe. Disagreeing vehemently on how a school edition of Shakespeare should function, what it should look like and do, and what teachers and students should be doing with it in their study, Hudson’s and Rolfe’s conflicting ideas reveal the altered boundaries of classroom Shakespeare experience by the late nineteenth century. Though Hudson and Rolfe superficially agreed on little, both built their respective editions upon a different set of pedagogical principles than those that had dominated the oratorical study of Shakespeare in the first half of the century.

51 The most notable of these were of English origin: the Clarendon Press Series beginning 1868, edited primarily by Cambridge professor William Aldis Wright (he worked collaboratively on the first four texts with his colleague and predecessor William G. Clark until Clark became incapacitated in 1871) and published by the Oxford University Press; and the Pitt Press Shakespeare Series, beginning in 1875, edited by A.W. Verity and published by the Cambridge University Press. Like Hudson’s and Rolfe’s, both series remained popular until well into the twentieth century (Murphy 183-87; Palmer 49-50; Applebee 34, 43).
Theirs was a road forged through a reading- and lecture-based experience with Shakespeare, involving biographical context, lengthy critical annotation and introduction, an intimacy with language and the nuances of textual history, and both an explicit and implied reverence for Shakespeare’s cultural and historical significance. Hudson’s and Rolfe’s texts were not born of the readers. They were instead rooted in the scholarly Shakespeare texts of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: the editorial tradition of Rowe, Pope, and Johnson in the eighteenth century, and Dyce, Halliwell-Phillips, Verplank, White, and Furness in the nineteenth. One of the few areas, in fact, in which Hudson and Rolfe did agree was in their shared aversion to the readers.

Though coinciding chronologically with the last generations of readers both had also reacted against them. Hudson says that he “would have nothing to do with ... any of the school reading-books now in use [the readers], which are made up of mere chips from a multitude of authors” (“English in Schools” 31). He adds, “a need has come … of a selection of Shakespeare’s plays, prepared and set forth … not of mere chips and fragments of the Poet, but of whole plays” (“Shakespeare as a Text-book” iv). Rolfe agrees; he calls the readers “wretched textbooks” of which “only one or two out of twenty or more … are not wretched” (Elementary Study 9). Both Hudson and Rolfe agreed that the time had come for school volumes of entire plays of Shakespeare. Rolfe was optimistic of the changes taking place. Whereas earlier in the century,
“‘school editions’ of Shakespeare,” such as Hudson’s and his own, had been “utterly unknown,” by the 1870s and 80s “such editions” could “scarcey be got ready fast enough to meet the growing demand for them” (Literary World 1879, 365).

The last three decades of the nineteenth century were a time of transition and intellectual conflict in American education more broadly. Gerald Graff explains that the nineteenth-century organization of literature into a field for study was a complex, rich, and chaotic development, and methods for its teaching were in their infancy. It had not always been a given that English would even be a field worthy of school study; in fact, Graff explains that “the idea that literature could or should be taught – rather than simply enjoyed or absorbed as part of the normal upbringing of gentlefolk – was [once] a novel one” (1).52 He concludes that “the story of academic literary studies in America is a tale not of triumphant humanism, nationalism, or any single professional model, but a series of conflicts” and that “these controversies ... possess greater richness and vitality than any of the conclusions they led to about the nature of literary studies” (Graff 14). It is therefore not the resulting educational model that most fascinates Graff, but instead the contextual

52 Esther Cloudman Dunn had expressed Graff’s sentiment decades earlier. In 1939, in Shakespeare in America, she writes, “it was assumed” that an American or English boy “grew up knowing the classics of his own tongue” (239). This was the contemporary view prior to the late nineteenth century, that literature was not a serious topic of study, but instead something cultured boys would do on their own time. Before her, Broome points out that the Yale University library catalog had listed the works of Shakespeare as books of diversion, and explains that both in England and America educated men evidently proceeded on the theory that a requisite facility in the use of the vernacular would come, somehow or other, from experience, general reading, or best of all, from the translation of a sufficient quantity of Latin and Greek” (57).
history involved in achieving that result. Likewise, it is the contextual history of Hudson’s and Rolfe’s school editions of Shakespeare, their disagreements and conflicts, that best illustrate the evolving nature of classroom Shakespeare amidst broader changing cultural and socioeconomic perceptions that existed in the closing decades of the nineteenth century.

“Honorable Men”: Hudson and Rolfe Battle Over Words

After working his way through Middlebury College, Henry Norman Hudson (see Figure 8) first taught and lectured in the South. \(^5^3\) It was after he returned to the Northeast, though, lecturing in Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington – and praised by a number of

---

\(^5^3\) After graduation, Hudson taught a year in Kentucky (1840-41) and then two years in Alabama (1841-43). He also lectured during these years in Huntsville, Mobile, and Cincinnati (Shakespeariana 81-82).
notable intellectuals, including Emerson – that he attained lasting popularity for his aesthetic criticism\(^{54}\) (Applebee 55; George xv-xvi; Simon 109-13). His lectures were published in 1848, and would become the basis for his later two-volume book, *Shakespeare: His Life, Art, and Characters*, and also for a number of the introductions he would later include in his school edition introductions. In 1851, he released an edition of Shakespeare in eleven volumes. Even Hudson, though, conceded that Richard Grant’s 1865 edition far exceeded his own, but in 1881, he released his *Harvard Shakespeare*, which would become his crowning literary achievement (George xviii).

It was Hudson’s school editions, though, that would most influence the evolving American educational system. In 1870, Hudson released a three-volume series of Shakespeare’s plays meant for school and home use. Volume one included a sketch of Shakespeare’s life, followed by a brief general introduction, and seven plays, each with its own introduction and footnotes: *As You Like It*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Twelfth Night*, *Henry IV Part 1*, *Henry IV Part 2*, *Julius Caesar*, and *Hamlet*. Volume two included *The Tempest*, *The Winter’s Tale*, *Henry V*, *Richard III*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*. Volume three added *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Henry VIII*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Cymbeline*, *Coriolanus*, and *Othello*. The plays were also released individually. By 1877, fifteen of the plays had

\(^{54}\) For a discussion of Hudson and his place in the history of aesthetic criticism, see Westfall 185-91.
been released in single volumes, and by 1881, Shakespeare’s entire
canon. For these individual volumes, Hudson added a set of critical notes
following the main text of each play. None of these, though, the
anthologies nor the individual volumes, included illustrations, but in
1881, Hudson’s texts were re-released in a twelve-volume set, The
Students’ Handy Edition, each volume this time with a single
illustration adorning its first pages. Hudson’s editions were popular in
schools and subsequent editions of the individual volumes continued to
be released through the 1880s, 90s, and the first decades of the twentieth
century.

Hudson detailed his views on teaching in four essays which he
included as prefaces introducing a number of his school editions:
“Shakespeare as a Textbook,” included in several individual school
editions beginning in 1870; “How to Use Shakespeare in Schools,” which
began appearing in 1872; “English in Schools,” included in a number of
school editions beginning 1879; and also his preface to Hamlet, which
addressed a number of topics related to the teaching of Shakespeare, first
included in his Hamlet edition in 1879. These four essays were so
popular that they were collected and republished in 1881, and again in

55 The volumes of Hudson’s Handy Edition digitized by the Internet Archive (and
available through Hathitrust at http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc2.ark:/13960/t77s7mz3x),
and physically held in the collections of the University of California, include a
fascinating handwritten inscription in the opening pages of the ninth volume (which
includes Julius Caesar): “As 1900 dawned I sit reading Caesar I was reading Antony’s
speech as the guns could be heard in the city ….” [sic]. It is signed, “Bay Roberts
Centreville” and dated, “January 1, 1900, midnight.” A number of lines of the Caesar
text are also marked with a checkmark or brackets. The volume would have been
nineteen years old – and probably already handled and read by a number of people – as
Centreville read Julius Caesar to welcome in the twentieth century.
1884, as *English in Schools: A Series of Essays*. In 1906, they were published once more as *Essays on English Studies*. In an advertisement beginning the 1884 book, Hudson’s publisher explains:

> The essays have been so heartily approved, and the demand for them, even in their scattered form, has been so great, that we thought it best to collect them into one volume, as more convenient for the use of teachers and students of Literature.” (i)

A.G. George writes in the preface to the 1906 version, “These essays … reveal what is so much needed at the present time, – a deep feeling for literature, its natural magic and moral profundity, rather than a critical knowledge of it” (viii). Hudson’s essays provide one perspective of Shakespeare instruction in the final three decades of the nineteenth century, as the “chips and fragments” of the readers, as Hudson called them, along with elocution, were falling from style to gradually be replaced by the study of whole plays in schools.

William James Rolfe (see figure 9), unlike Hudson, earned his reputation for his textual, not aesthetic, work with Shakespeare. Whereas Hudson’s aesthetic criticism emphasizes the celebration of the beauty of Shakespeare’s work, a “deep feeling for literature” as George had referred to it, the more somber pursuit of textual criticism focuses on the analysis and history of text, the “critical knowledge” of Shakespeare’s words that George had opposed (viii). Early in his career, Rolfe balanced
his scholarship with work as a principal and headmaster at a handful of Massachusetts schools. He did so for fifteen years, firmly grounding his scholarship in practical classroom application. As headmaster at Cambridge High School, he played a key role in the influential school’s evolution from the study of the classics to the study of English. Applebee writes:

… When Rolfe arrived at Cambridge High School in 1862, literature was already a well-established if somewhat peripheral part of the curriculum … [but] Rolfe regularized the study and legitimized it with his philological scholarship; he also placed it firmly within the classical tradition of instruction.” (29)

In 1868, Rolfe stepped down from his headmaster position to focus entirely on scholarly and editorial interests, and in 1870 he released his first Shakespeare school edition: *The Merchant of Venice*. It was divided into three sections: a 29-
page introduction, 85 pages of text, and 41 pages of critical notes. Unlike Hudson, Rolfe also included 23 black-and-white illustrations, interspersed throughout the three sections. The first was a portrait of Shakespeare preceding the title page. Nine adorned the introduction, depicting the Shakespeare arms and various places in Stratford: John Shakespeare’s house, the grammar school, the church, etc. Of the remaining fourteen, most were relevant to play, such as a drawing of the argosies before the first act, an image of the caskets before act two, and the Rialto bridge before act three, but some were ornamental and generic, such as the cherubs before act five and on the last page of notes. Rolfe also included a two-page preface that drew attention to his aim: “to edit this English classic for school and home reading in essentially the same way as Greek and Latin classics are edited for educational purposes” (v). Rolfe saw Shakespeare, and other English authors to a lesser degree, as the imminent replacements of their Classical counterparts. Just as he had helped facilitate the transition from the Classics to English earlier in his career as headmaster at Cambridge High School, Rolfe played a significant role in a similar, larger transformation in school texts.56

His first school Shakespeare text was an immediate success, and between 1870 and 1883, Rolfe released single-volume school editions of

---

56 Rolfe also published a number of non-Shakespearean school texts, leading Applebee to remark that the “breadth and diversity” of his interests paralleled that of “the early college teachers of English” (28). He co-edited A Handbook of Latin Poetry, a school text of Ovid, Virgil, and Horace; edited editions of other English authors including Robert Browning, Oliver Goldsmith, Thomas Gray, Milton, Macaulay, Scott, and Tennyson; and even edited a six-volume Cambridge Course of Physics, later followed by school texts in natural philosophy, chemistry, and astronomy.
Shakespeare’s entire canon (see Appendix J). These all followed the same format that *Merchant of Venice* had: introduction, text, and critical notes. All were illustrated. Unlike Hudson, though, Rolfe included no footnotes, only endnotes. Many of his editions, though not all, also included a preface describing his beliefs on education and scholarship. Unlike Hudson who often attached the same preface to different plays, each of Rolfe’s prefaces were unique.

Beginning in 1879, in addition to work as an editor, Rolfe also wrote the “Shakespeariana” section of the long-running biweekly periodical, *The Literary World*. He would serve in this capacity for ten years, providing critical commentary on the editorial and literary work of his contemporaries and also relaying news and scholarship related to the life and works of Shakespeare. Rolfe’s involvement with the *Literary World* in the late nineteenth century contrasts the work of the father-and-son team Albert and John Picket (reader compilers discussed in Chapter Two) earlier in the century in their educational periodical *The Academician*, which had explicitly shunned the study of Shakespeare. Textbook editors by the end of the century, instead of questioning Shakespeare’s merit, were now actively engaged in Shakespearean scholarship. The line between schoolbook editor and Shakespearean scholar, which in the Pickets’ time had been clear, had blurred by Rolfe’s time, and the two roles had become indistinguishable.
Early in his career, Rolfe had praised Hudson. His 1870 *Julius Caesar* had included an excerpt from Hudson’s criticism. He later said of him, “of the few American works in that line [of aesthetic criticism], Hudson’s *Shakespeare’s Life, Art, and Characters* is *facile princeps*” (*Henry IV*, vi). In January 1881, as Hudson was releasing the first volumes of his *Harvard Shakespeare*, Rolfe even celebrated its publication, “the edition is every way an honor to its editor, and no one who pretends to a thorough study of Shakespeare can afford to do without it,” and notes that in the nine of the twenty volumes already released, there were only three errors (“Shakespeariana” 23). Ten months later, though, in November 1881, after Hudson’s final volumes were released, Rolfe’s tone changed. He comments sardonically that while Hudson’s volumes are “as ornamental as valuable to any Shakesperian [sic] library,” they are “not so free from errors of the type as we believed them to be when writing the former notice” (“Shakespeariana” 400). He does commend Hudson for including *Two Noble Kinsmen* in place of *Titus Andronicus*, but then spends the second half of the review pointing out minor textual errors: “enshield” for “enshielded” in *Measure for Measure*, “scarce scene” for “scarce seen” in *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, and “Edward IV” for “Edward VI,” in *Merry Wives of Windsor*, along with a dozen other errors and misprints (400).

The disagreements between Hudson and Rolfe – both residents of Cambridge – were deeper, though, than a single ambivalent review and
were known publicly by the mid-1880s through the various editorial jabs they took at one another. Their outward battles were primarily over words, sometimes a single word, and the tenor of their debates reveal their ill will. Hudson, for example, opens *Twelfth Night* with Duke Orsino’s melancholy lines:

> If music be the food of love play on:
> Give me excess of it; that, surfeiting,
> The appetite may sicken, and so die. –
> That strain again; – it had a dying fall:
> O! it came o’er my ear like the sweet *south*, (my emphasis)
> That breathes upon a bank of violets,
> Stealing, and giving odour. (1.1.1-7)

In the fifth line, Hudson chooses “south” instead of “sound.” At the time, Shakespeare editors had been debating between “south” and “sound” for decades. To Hudson’s ear, “south” was the conservative choice; it had been in popular use in contemporary editions for more than a century. The First Folio, though, had used “sound,” as had the Second, Third, and Fourth (there are no quarto editions of *Twelfth Night*), but without explanation Nicholas Rowe, in 1709, changed “sound” to “wind.” Alexander Pope, in 1725, changed it to “south,” apparently in reference to a sweet-smelling south wind, but again without explanation. Succeeding editors continued to use “south” for nearly a hundred and
fifty years until Charles Knight, in his 1838 *Pictorial Shakespeare*, working from the First Folio, challenged Pope’s alteration and reverted to “sound.” While Hudson acknowledged that “sound” had been the original, he argues that Pope’s change, “whether right or not, is certainly one of rare felicity” (1851 *Twelfth Night* 30).

Many editors, including Rolfe, accepted the Folio reading as authoritative and adopted Knight’s revision, but Hudson stubbornly insisted upon “south” and continued to do so his entire life. Hudson defends his choice:

“... Upon the whole, however, to say, “the sweet sound breathes upon a bank of violets, stealing and giving odour,” seems hardly allowable; unless it be proper to speak of “smelling music,” which would evidently be too comic for such a strain of poetry as this...” (1851 *Twelfth Night*, 30)

---

57 Theobald, Hamner, Warburton, Johnson, and Steevens had all used “south” (Furness 12). Thomas Keightley made an intriguing compromise; he theorized that “sound” was an erroneous publisher’s contraction for what Shakespeare intended to be either “south wind” or even “sou’ind,” which mistakenly became “sound” in the *First* and subsequent folios (174).

58 Another instance in which Hudson believed it proper to vary from the First Folio comes in *Julius Caesar*. When Lucius reports to Brutus in the early morning that “March is wasted fifteen days” Hudson takes it upon himself to correct fifteen to fourteen, “As this is the morning of the fifteenth, our mode of reckoning would count only fourteen days as wasted” (2.1, p. 451, in editions after 1879, p. 195). Others, including Rolfe, disagreed and preferred to honor the reading of the First Folio as authoritative.

59 In 1908, though, more than twenty years after Hudson’s death, the *New Hudson Shakespeare* series was released, which retained Hudson’s introduction and notes, but was edited and revised by Ebenezer Charlton. Charlton changed “south” to “sound.”
What should have remained a simple editorial disagreement between the two, though, became a battleground, a window into their dispute and also the conflicts under which the first school editions of Shakespeare were created. Rolfe defended his choice of “sound” in a lengthy two-page note in his 1879 *Twelfth Night* school edition:

... When the folio reading can be so eloquently defended we do not feel justified in departing from it ... It is not likely that, in substituting *south*, he [Pope] intended to make the comparison between the effect of music on the ear and that of fragrance on the sense of smell. Why then did he think it necessary to make any change in the expression of the simile? Because as a poet he felt that it was more poetical to refer to the wind, the personified source of the sound, as breathing on the bank of violets, than to speak of the “sound” itself. The difference seems to us almost that between poetry and prose. (119)

Hudson, clearly perturbed, counters in his own 1881 *Harvard* edition:

Some one [Rolfe] has noted that to suppose a comparison was here intended between the effect of music on the ear and that of fragrance on the sense of smell is almost to ignore “the difference between poetry and prose.” O no! it is merely to recognize the difference between sense and nonsense. For how should odour affect us but through the
sense of smell? But perhaps the writer [Rolfe], being in so jo cose humour, caught the style of “sweet bully Bottom,” and so played the Duke into the funny idea of hearing an odour that he smelt, or of smelling a sound that he heard.

(241)

Rolfe likewise found Hudson’s note disparaging. He wrote a pair of letters in 1883 to Hudson’s publishers, Ginn and Crosby, asking that the note be corrected, but Hudson refused, explaining that his note had been “well considered and carefully written, and that to the best of [his] knowledge and belief, there was no injustice or misrepresentation in what [he] had done” (“Hudson versus Rolfe” 5). He could not correct what he did not deem to be incorrect. In December 1883, in response, Rolfe sent to both Hudson and his publishers a proof-copy of a retaliatory note he intended to include in his own forthcoming edition of Twelfth Night. The proposed endnote read:

The misrepresentation of what we have said on p. 119 in support of Pope’s reading is so preposterous that nobody would suspect our note to be referred to here if its language were not quoted; and it is as malicious, since the author [Hudson] declines to correct it after having his attention courteously called to it. Possibly he would correct it if he could make up his mind to sacrifice the neat
little joke about ‘sweet bully Bottom!’ (Hudson, “Rolfe versus Hudson” 4-5)

Rolfe’s threatened note, though, was not included in any published edition that he edited. A month later, however, in January 1884, an article by George H. Holden, a colleague of Rolfe, appeared in the Salem Gazette declaring, “as an annotator … of single plays … for school use” Hudson’s “work is marred by gross faults” (Hudson, “Rolfe vs. Hudson” 1). Holden goes on to call Hudson “inordinately vain, intolerant, and quarrelsome” and suggests that “towards Rolfe, his townsmen and neighbor, he [Hudson] seems to entertain hostile sentiments of so rancorous a type” that even his neighbors are ashamed (Hudson, “Rolfe vs. Hudson” 1).

In response to these, Hudson released an eight-page pamphlet a month later in February titled “Rolfe Versus Hudson,” in which he outlines their conflict and defends himself against Holden’s claims. He calls Holden’s tirade a “strain of low, coarse personal abuse and scurrility … full of malice, and … outrageously false” (2). Toward Rolfe, he writes that “he has often been going out of his way to make digs at me in his public work; it seems, indeed, as if he could not bear to let me alone” (3). Hudson believes it not in “good taste” to make such “public digs” toward “those engaged in the same field” but nonetheless takes his own “digs”:

And so it is said that pigs sometimes see the wind. Now, if a ‘learned pig’ [Rolfe] should undertake to tell me how the
wind looked, I should probably find his pigship too deep for me, or should not be able to catch the exact meaning of his language; and this, because of my lacking the sulline keenness of vision” (“Hudson vs. Rolfe” 8).

Hudson concludes by drawing attention to two editorial errors Rolfe had made. Hudson had previously composed an article for the Literary World in 1880, which the magazine refused to print. He had taunted in the submission:

Your learned assistant, Mr. Rolfe, has obliged me by kindly pointing out, in your columns, several errors of mine … of course both you and he will take it kindly, if I do a trifle of like service for him. My time is so occupied with other things, that I have not been able to make a critical study of any of his volumes; but, on glancing over two of his volumes of King Henry the Fourth, my eye lighted accidentally on the following. (8)

Hudson then details a pair of Rolfe’s own errors: a misprint of “Pope” when Rolfe intended “Raan”; and also a miscount of the number of syllables in “usurpation,” six when Rolfe had meant five (u-sur-pa-ti-on).

Rolfe responded himself to the pamphlet in a March 22, 1884, “Shakespeariana” section of Literary World. Rolfe dismissed the offensive letters published two months before in the Salem Gazette, explaining that he had “always avoided such personalities [as Holden’s]”
He wrote that he had treated Hudson no differently than he had treated other leading editors and commentators, which had initially been true – Rolfe had consistently expressed opinions of the work of his peers with blunt, but generally constructive, frankness – but his severity regarding Hudson had escalated by the mid-1880s. Rolfe refers to but refrains from addressing Hudson’s “learned pig” reference, insisting that “we have no comments to make upon the ‘good taste’ of these extracts; but we will say that if anything at all like them can be found in any of our published criticisms of Mr. Hudson, we will acknowledge ourself, and sank [sic] the gentleman in the critic” (95). He closes the article by addressing Hudson’s unpublished submission to the *Literary World* explaining that the submission had not originally been included in the *Literary World* because of the insignificant nature of the errors Hudson uncovered: “they are not worth showing up in a critical journal, and least of all in one which, like the *World*, can allow only a very limited space to ‘Shakespeariana’” (95). In the subsequent edition of *Literary World*, on April 5, 1884, Rolfe rescinded his previous 1881 praise for Hudson’s *Harvard Shakespeare*:

> We must say in all frankness that more careful examination of some of the volumes … led us to modify the favorable opinions we had expressed. The text, instead of being ‘conservative’ as the editor asserts (and no doubt honestly thinks) it to be, seems to us both freely and badly
‘emended’; and so far as we can learn, the changes for which he is personally responsible meet with little or no favor in critical circles. The ‘introductions’ are not fully up with the times … (120)

Hudson and Rolfe’s fiery debate between “south” and “sound” reflects upon the type of activity they expected teachers and students to undertake in their own classrooms. Earlier in the nineteenth century, this type of textual analysis had been inappropriate and irrelevant – neither students nor teachers, for example, would have known of the editorial work of Rowe, Pope, or any other editor – and by the twentieth century many such textual debates would have already been settled. In the closing decades of the nineteenth century, though, Hudson and Rolfe viewed the classroom as a place where students, like mock editors, weighed varying arguments concerning aesthetics and text and made critical judgments involving single words and their implications upon broader meaning. The spoken word was subjugated to the written. Proper pronunciation and annunciation, which had been the emphasis of study earlier in the century, were relegated beneath an appreciation of Shakespeare’s genius and the analysis of the editorial development of Shakespeare’s text. The underlying principle of the work involved in schoolbook editing had shifted. Reader editors had neither consulted editions of Shakespeare in their compilations nor debated the intricacies of his text amongst themselves. By the time of Hudson and Rolfe, though, the classroom
study of text had become a meta-analysis of the ongoing historical process of editing Shakespeare’s text.

“Volumes That I Prize”: Un-Expurgating School Shakespeare and Establishing a National Canon

The underlying disagreement between Hudson and Rolfe extended beyond their battle over words\(^6\) to include a number of issues related to teaching, though these outward conflicts reveal more commonalities between the two than differences. For example, superficially they disagreed on how best to edit Shakespeare’s risqué passages and scenes to make them appropriate for students, yet both rejected the underlying conservative moral tenets that had determined the school readers. They argued that school Shakespeare be presented as closely as possible to that in scholarly texts, but nonetheless found fault in the other’s interpretation of what was objectionable. Hudson’s non-school editions were entirely uncut – he writes that his Harvard Edition, “which was designed for general use, has no expurgation whatever, not a word” – and he believed likewise that there should be only minimal cuts.

\(^6\) Hudson and Rolfe’s vocal battle of words involved at least one play other than *Twelfth Night: All’s Well That Ends Well*. In an 1881 preface to his edition, Rolfe explains the difficulty of editing *All’s Well* because of its corruption in the First Folio. Hudson, quoted in Rolfe’s preface, explains his solution is to offer “conjectural emendation” based on his own assumptions about the text (v). Rolfe takes the stance that the play should be given “in its corrupted form” instead of as “mere guesses at what Shakespeare might have written” (v). In the case of *Twelfth Night* and the choice between “south” and “sound,” where the First Folio dictated the correct wording, Rolfe was resolute, but when the matter was unclear, Rolfe, unlike Hudson, preferred to include a full myriad of editorial choices for students to ponder. He quotes Richard Grant White, who said on the matter, “the reader of Shakespeare can better pass by a line as incomprehensible, than accept a comprehensible line which is not Shakespeare’s” (v-vi). Rolfe accuses Hudson of making textual decisions better left for readers to determine themselves.
in the school editions. In the cases of *Julius Caesar* and *Richard II*, he points out that he cut nothing at all (“Shakespeare as a Textbook” iv-v). He writes, “the development of character and the course of action [should be] preserved unmutilated and entire, and with only such erasures as are really demanded” (“Shakespeare as a Textbook” iv). Rolfe’s views were similar:

… Here and there in the text I have omitted a few lines that might be deemed indelicate. In some instances I have preferred to strike out a little more than was necessary, rather than to mar the metre or to change a single word that Shakespeare wrote. (*Merchant* vi)

While Rolfe’s ideals were essentially the same as Hudson’s, he nevertheless criticized Hudson’s choices, even when they were the same as his own. For example, Hudson amends the *Twelfth Night* line “there is no true *cuckold* but calamity” to “there is no true *dishonour* but calamity,” (1.5.44, my emphases). Rolfe leaves the original wording and reproaches Hudson: Shakespeare himself “would have smiled at expurgation of this over-squeamish sort” (vi). He counters, “the omissions that are really required … are so few and slight that only those who are minutely familiar with the text are likely to detect them” (vi).

Elsewhere, though, Hudson is accused of not being conservative enough in his choices. Holden, in his aforementioned 1884 *Salem Gazette* article written on behalf of Rolfe, accuses Hudson of “mental and moral
obtuseness” and chastises him for including *Cymbeline* as a school text, a play Holden believed morally unfit for school regardless of any expurgation or edits (Hudson, “Rolfe vs. Hudson” 1-2). Holden calls this “the impossible task of expurgating *Cymbeline,*” explaining that Hudson “does not seem to comprehend that the subject of the play makes it unsuitable for ordinary school reading” (Hudson, “Rolfe vs. Hudson” 1-2). In the play, two male characters, Posthumous and Iachimo, wager whether the latter can sully the heroine Imogen’s purity. In the ensuing bedroom scene, Iachimo sneaks into Imogen’s chamber, notes the décor of the room and her intimate physical characteristics as she sleeps, and later reports these details to Posthumous as evidence that he has won the bet. Holden writes:

… No expurgation which leaves the story as Shakespeare tells it can disguise the nature of the wager … or the manner in which the latter [Iachimo] tries to win it. Hudson leaves all these points perfectly obvious … [demonstrating] Hudson’s incapacity, by reason of a certain coarseness of mental or moral fibre, to prepare school editions of the plays of Shakespeare. (Hudson, “Rolfe vs. Hudson” 1-2)

Ironically, though, three years before, Rolfe had edited his own school edition of *Cymbeline*, which Holden had easily overlooked.61 Hudson

---

61 Rolfe struggled with his text of *Cymbeline*, though, explaining in its preface, “of the twenty-five plays I have now edited [as of 1881], there is none that I have sent forth
was guilty too, though, of taking his own jabs at Rolfe’s expurgations; he once wrote, “in my opinion Mr. Rolfe’s [Friendly] Edition of Shakespeare is expurgated just enough to spoil it for general use, and not nearly enough to fit it for any particular use [in schools]” (“Rolfe vs. Hudson” 3).

Though both Hudson and Rolfe criticized one another, sometimes for being too conservative in their choices and sometimes too maverick, they followed almost identical principles in preparing their respective editions. Unlike school reader compilers of the nineteenth century, with their carefully selected passages, both Hudson and Rolfe believed classroom experience, as much as good taste allowed, should involve students reading from relatively unexpurgated versions of Shakespeare’s plays. These full versions of the play, more than the passages earlier in the century, gave teachers and students a set of narratives around which American cultural norms could indirectly be defined and reinforced.

Hudson and Rolfe were serving a larger cultural process by helping to

with more diffidence than the present” (iii). By the 1880s, Rolfe was making his Friendly edition complete, though, including even plays he believed inappropriate for school use. In his 1882 preface to Troilus and Cressida he writes, “As this play, like Timon of Athens, is not suitable for school use or for social reading, the text is given without expurgation” (5). In the preface to Pericles, he writes, “The wretched brothel scenes in act iv” – which Rolfe did not believe were written by Shakespeare anyway – “have been freely abridged, not because I suppose that the play will be read in schools, but because the scenes are not worth printing at all” (5). In the case of Two Noble Kinsmen, Rolfe writes that he does not think it likely “that Shakespeare and Fletcher worked together according to some ‘partnership’ plan” as theorized by Hudson and others, but instead that “Fletcher filled out after his own fashion a play left incomplete by Shakespeare” (vi). Of Titus Andronicus, he writes, “It was my purpose to omit Titus Andronicus from this edition of Shakespeare … Most … agree with me that Shakespeare probably had little to do with writing the play … [but] I prefer … to leave the student or reader to decide for himself, if he can, how much of it is Shakespeare’s” (7).
establish a national language and literature, one officially sanctioned by American schools and universities. Brief passages that emphasized proper speaking, which had been important earlier in the century in establishing English as the American language, were no longer as efficient as full plays in determining American culture.

The transition from chips of Shakespeare to whole Shakespeare, and from oratorical to literary Shakespeare, was predicated on the selection of a core canon of English authors that students should be exposed to, a canon within which Shakespeare took a preeminent position through the influence of thinkers and teachers like Hudson and Rolfe. Hudson complains that too many often turn to “foolish and bad books” for stimulation; “not less than seven-eighths of the books now read [in 1880] are simply a discipline of debasement” (“English in Schools” 10-11). The role of the school, though, is to introduce society to the few good books that exist. Hudson believed that if teachers exposed students to canonical authors – Spenser, Shakespeare, Addison, Scott, Wordsworth, and Lamb – they would themselves later make better reading choices later in life. If teachers “let the efficacy of a very few good books be seasonably steeped into the mind, and then in the matter of their reading, people will be apt to go right of their own accord” (“English in Schools” 13). Rolfe even agrees with Hudson’s assertion

---

62 Hudson believed that if a teacher “can plant in young minds a genuine relish for the authors [he has] named, then [he feels] tolerably confident that the devils now swarming about us in the shape of bad books will stand little chance with them” (“English in Schools” 31). Popular literature will not suffice, but only “a well-chosen and well-used
“that only a few of the very best and fittest authors should be used,”” a few months later in “Shakespariana,” saying, “there is a great deal of truth in it,” though he adds that the estimation of seven out of eight is a “gross exaggeration” (*Literary World* 1879, 365). Both men adhered to the new direction that the study of English had taken, toward the careful and full study of a limited number of selected texts.

**“Do it in Notes”: Annotating School Shakespeare**

Hudson and Rolfe also disagreed about the quantity and placement of notes in a school edition. Whereas Hudson included footnotes on each page along with a section of critical notes at the end of the play, Rolfe placed all of his notes together after the play as endnotes. Hudson justifies his system, explaining:

> I still adhere to my old plan of foot-notes, instead of massing the annotation all together at the end of the play … whatever of explanation young students need of Shakespeare’s text – and they certainly need a good deal – is much better every way when placed directly under the eye, so that they can hardly miss it” (*Hamlet* iii)

course of study in the best English classics” (“English in Schools” 13). He argues, “no literary workmanship, short of the best there is to be had, ought to be drawn upon for use in school” (“English in Schools” 33). He is steadfast in this, adding, “unquestionably the right way in this matter is, to start the young with such authors as have been tested and approved by a large collective judgment … [I]t is not what pleases at first, but what pleases permanently, that the human mind cares to keep alive” (“English in Schools” 34). Further, there should be an emphasis upon these particular authors and not just merely an introduction; “only a few of the very best and fittest authors should be used” and “these should be used long enough and in large enough portions, for the pupils to get really at home with them” (“English in Schools” 28).
He adds in the preface to his *Harvard* edition that he prefers:

Two sets of notes; one mainly devoted to explaining the text, and printed at the foot of the page; the other mostly occupied with matters of textual comment and criticism, and printed at end of each play … whatever of explanation general readers may need, they naturally prefer to have it directly before them; and in at least nine cases out of ten they will pass over an obscure word or phrase or allusion without understanding it, rather than stay to look up the explanation … (v)

The two also disagreed on the quantity of notes appropriate to a school text. Hudson believed that textual notes should be limited so not to overwhelm students while Rolfe argued that such limitation forced readers to adopt the editor’s perspective without thinking for themselves. Hudson’s method, in his opinion, struck a balance between too few notes and too many, though he admits, “it is not easy to hit just the right medium between too much and too little” (“Shakespeare as a Textbook” v). For the most part, at least in contrast to Rolfe, he argued for brevity, that school edition annotation should exclude “all matter but what appeared fairly needful or useful” (*Hamlet* iii). He encourages “a wholesome restraint against overdoing the work of annotation” and in reference to Rolfe, complains, “there have been divers circumstances, of late, where we find the gloss, I cannot say out-weighing, but certainly far
out-bulking, the text” (*Hamlet* iv). Hudson warns against exposing students to such “superfluous help,” instead arguing that only the “last results of such [critical and textual] study are or may be useful to all” (*Hamlet* iv-vi). Hudson remained careful not to confuse a school edition with a scholarly edition:

> It may flatter common readers to be told that they are just as competent to judge for themselves in these matters as those are who have made a lifelong study of them; but the plain truth is, that such readers must perforce either take the results of deep scholarship on trust, or else not have them at all; and none but a dupe or a quack, or perhaps a compound of the two [Rolfe], would ever think of representing the matter otherwise. (*Harvard* xvi, qtd in Rolfe, *Cymbeline* iv-v).

For Hudson, an aesthetic critic and editor, a student’s classroom experiences with Shakespeare should not dwell on a pedantic study of notes and textual history. What Hudson deemed “needful” and “useful,” though, was still extensive. Hudson’s *Hamlet*, for example, included 47 notes for the first scene alone. In the first scene of his *Merchant of Venice*, he included 45, in *As You Like It*, 25, and in *Richard III*, 24. Almost every play included at least a dozen to twenty notes in its opening scene alone.
Rolfe, though, included even more notation. He explicitly disagrees with Hudson, preferring in his notes “to err, if at all, on the side of fullness”; he writes that “so long as they give him [the student] new work to do, instead of doing his work for him, there had better be too many than too few” (Merchant iii). Partly, his justification stemmed from the lack of critical resources otherwise available to most students:

It is simply impossible for all the members of a large class to make systematic use of the limited number of books of reference in the library. Each pupil really needs all of them all the time he is preparing his lesson … I have endeavored to render the student comparatively independent of books of reference… (Henry V, v)

Unlike Hudson, Rolfe believed, in a time when most school libraries provided no or only limited access to Shakespearean scholarship, that a

---

63 Rolfe reiterates his philosophy on notes in a number of the prefaces to his school Shakespeare editions. In the preface to Macbeth, he writes, “So much has been written on Macbeth … but, as in former volumes of the series, I have preferred to give too much rather than too little” (v). In the preface to Winter’s Tale, he writes, in “giving this ‘variorum’ information, I have aimed not only to make the poet’s meaning clear, but to illustrate the language and the life of his time. I have also added such aesthetic comments as, from their brevity or their close connection with single passages, were more appropriately put there than in the Introduction” (5). In the preface to King John, he writes, “The book, like its predecessors, is meant to be complete in itself” (5). In several prefaces, Rolfe writes of his indebtedness to Furness’s “New Variorum” edition. In the preface to King Lear, he writes, “as in the case of Macbeth, Hamlet, and Romeo and Juliet, I have been under constant obligations to Furness’s ‘New Variorum’ edition … I have depended on it almost entirely for the collation of the early and modern texts, and in the Notes I have been indebted to it for much valuable matter which I could hardly have found for myself. For the benefit of the teacher, who cannot afford to do without this encyclopaedic [sic] edition, I have referred to it in many cases where my limits forbade my borrowing from it further” (3). He sums up in the preface to Coriolanus, “The notes, as I have said more than once before, are meant to err, if at all, on the side of fullness. It is better that the student or reader should find a dozen notes he does not need, than that he should fail to find the one he does need” (iv).
proper school text of Shakespeare should include any information that could potentially be important to a student or teacher in the study of a play. As a result, Rolfe included far more notes than Hudson. Applebee points to Rolfe’s *Julius Caesar*, which included 82 pages of endnotes to accompany just 102 pages of text (34). Rolfe’s *Macbeth* offers an even more extreme example; it includes 126 pages of notes to accompany just 80 pages of text (along with a 37-page introduction). 64

Rolfe calls Hudson “most volubly severe upon those who think [it] proper to give more notes than he does,” but he could be severe himself (Twelfth Night iv). 65 In late 1879, Rolfe gave a pair of harsh reviews of Hudson’s school editions of *Richard II*, *Merchant of Venice*, and *Julius Caesar*, recently released as individual volumes, in which he calls Hudson’s textual notes, “meagre and unsatisfactory” (Literary World 346). He also criticized Hudson’s stance in a number of his school editions.

---

64 Both *King Lear* and *Coriolanus* included 105 pages of notes to 111 and 121 pages of text respectively. Other plays included proportionately fewer notes, but still significantly more than the sparse notes included in the readers. Rolfe’s *Merchant of Venice* included 39 pages of notes to 83 pages of text (and a 29-page introduction). His *Henry VIII* included 53 pages of notes to 108 pages of text (and a 35-page introduction). *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* included 75 pages of notes to 71 pages of text (and a 31-page introduction). *Henry V* included 56 pages of notes to 107 pages of text (and an 11-page introduction). *Much Ado About Nothing* included 57 pages of notes to 86 pages of text (and an 18-page introduction). *Othello* included 58 pages of notes to 113 pages of text (and a 26-page introduction). *Twelfth Night* included 54 pages of notes to 83 pages of text (and a 20-page introduction). When the series was re-released beginning in 1903, the notes were updated and many on textual history were removed, because, as Rolfe comments, “teachers in secondary schools or in college who may wish to give more attention to this subject will of course make use of Dr. Furness’s encyclopedic edition of the play” which had become more widely available since Rolfe initially released his school Shakespeare editions (1904 Twelfth Night 5).

65 Rolfe published a pamphlet, *On the Study of Shakespeare, Hints to Teachers and Students*, which also included this passage. The text of the pamphlet, an advertisement for the *Friendly* series, is a conglomeration of the text from Rolfe’s prefaces to *Twelfth Night*, *Henry VIII*, and *Coriolanus*. The pamphlet is not available digitally, but a print version is available at the Folger Shakespeare Library.
edition prefaces. Claiming “a better opinion of the teachers in our schools and colleges than to think them incapable of understanding and discussing ‘variorum’ criticism,” he countered that to limit students to a carefully selected set of notes compelled students toward the editor’s perspective instead of giving them the opportunity to draw their own conclusions (*Twelfth Night* v).

Rolfe justifies his inclusion of extensive notes based on his experiences in schools. He explains that though “the editor of the ‘Harvard’ edition [Hudson] differs” in opinion, he prefers to believe students … capable of “compar[ing] and weigh[ing] such results [of aesthetic and textual criticism], while he [Hudson] insists on choosing for the reader” (*Cymbeline* iii-iv). Editors, according to Rolfe, face a choice in their annotation, either to “select the answer that seems … the best and give that alone” or to “give several answers and let the reader choose for himself” (*Cymbeline* iii).

Rolfe preferred the latter. Arguing that students’ “young eyes discern the simple truth through all the dust that successive generations of learned editors have raised,” he believes “textual questions are of interest to every student of Shakespeare, and [his] experience as a teacher has satisfied [him] that they may be profitably discussed even by boys and girls in schools” (*Twelfth Night* v). Rolfe refuted Hudson’s claim, asserting that “in nine cases out of ten there are no ‘last results,’” and argued that it is therefore “more interesting and more profitable” to
“furnish them [students] the means of settling it for themselves” (*Twelfth Night* v). Rolfe concludes, “those who want to have their thinking done for them, instead of doing it themselves, will choose their edition of Shakespeare accordingly” (*Cymbeline* iv). For his part, Rolfe refuses to underestimate students’ capacity and interest in textual history. This does not mean, though, that Rolfe intended students necessarily read all of the notes; in being comprehensive he ultimately aimed to make his text flexible to a variety of uses:

I hope that no teacher needs to be told that the notes are not intended to be assigned as lessons to be learned and recited … The text of the author is the lesson, and the pupil is expected to show that he understands the text. He is to use the notes in preparing for the recitation, so far as he needs their help, just as he uses his grammar and lexicon, and other books of reference. The teacher may of course, at his discretion, require the pupil to study certain specified topics or points in the notes, and to be ready to answer questions upon them (*Coriolanus* iv).

---

66 This passage was also included in Rolfe’s *On the Study of Shakespeare, Hints to Teachers and Students*, mentioned in the previous note. Rolfe comments further on the issue, “I do not assume that all the Notes will be equally interesting or helpful to every reader; but I hope that no one will turn to them for help without finding it … [T]hey will enable … pupils to do whatever he may require in the study of the play, whether his taste inclines to linguistic or to aesthetic criticism, or is broad enough – as I trust it may be – to include both” (*Winter’s Tale* 5). He later wrote, “I do not expect that any teacher will use all the notes in all the possible ways I have mentioned … [T]he extent to which they are used must depend upon the method of study” (*Elementary Study* 47).
Both editors had their supporters, and their recommendations
were often included in the final pages of the respective texts. One of
Rolfe’s admirers, Francis James Child – prestigious professor at Harvard,
and the first there to have taught a course in Shakespeare, as well as the
first to hold the title of Professor of English\textsuperscript{67} – praises Rolfe’s approach
to notes:\textsuperscript{68}

I read your “Merchant of Venice” [the first of Rolfe’s
\textit{Friendly Shakespeare} school texts] with my class and
found it in every respect an excellent edition. I do not
agree … that Shakespeare requires but a few notes – that
is if he is to be thoroughly understood … Your notes give
all the help a young student requires, and yet the reader for

\textsuperscript{67} Applebee writes of Child’s influence on Shakespeare instruction in American
education (26-27). He also explains that Rolfe’s work in the Wrentham, Dorchester, and
Lawrence schools in Massachusetts in the 1850s “came to Child’s attention and led to an
honorary A.M. from Harvard in 1859 (before his school texts)” (28). In a later footnote,
Applebee calls Rolfe Child’s protégé (41). After Child, Rolfe’s texts remained popular
at Harvard during George Lyman Kittredge’s tenure as well; Harvard University
Archives today houses six volumes of Rolfe’s Shakespeare – \textit{All’s Well}, \textit{1 Henry IV}, \textit{2
Henry VI}, \textit{Julius Caesar}, \textit{King Lear}, and \textit{Macbeth} – that Kittredge used in teaching his
English 2 class in the 1908-09 academic year (Harvard University Archives, HUC
8909.324.2)

\textsuperscript{68} It was not uncommon for nineteenth-century school texts to include such
recommendations. Similar endorsements had also been included in readers earlier in the
century. Rolfe’s texts included recommendations from a number of individuals: L.R.
Williston, who replaced him as headmaster at Cambridge High School; Rev. A.P.
Peabody, Professor of History at Harvard; Prof. J. Dorman Steele, of the Free Academy
of Elmira, New York; W.C. Collar, Master of the Roxbury Latin School in Boston; and
S.M. Capron, Master of the Hartford High School. As years passed, new
recommendations were added while others disappeared, but Child’s was constant for
many years and appeared in many of Rolfe’s Shakespeare’s editions through the 1870s
and 80s.
pleasure will easily get at just what he wants. You have
indeed been conscientiously concise.\textsuperscript{69} (4)

Rolfé may have included more notes than Hudson, but by placing
them only after the text of each play, he also makes them less intrusive
than Hudson’s, whose footnotes by design forced readers to heed them to
some degree. Whereas Hudson believed footnotes should be placed
where they could not be missed, Rolfe aimed to make his version of the
text adjustable to teachers’ needs; readers could as easily ignore the notes
altogether as consult them. The impetus for their consultation, and the
extensiveness of that consultation, lay entirely with the teacher and
student. Despite these differences in their philosophies regarding
annotation, though, both Hudson and Rolfe included exponentially more
biographical, textual, and critical information than any reader passage
ever had. Even readers late in the century included only a handful of
notes compared with Hudson and Rolfe, who expected students to
acquire a far greater knowledge of Shakespeare’s biography and the
historical contexts in which his plays were set. Both also expected
students to grasp nuances of plot and character, elements adventitiously kept
from students by reader editors early in the century. Most of all, though,
Hudson and Rolfe expected students to engage in an intimate study of

\textsuperscript{69} Editions after 1879 updated Child’s recommendation to include: “Mr. Rolfe’s editions
of the plays are very valuable and convenient books, whether for a college class or for
private study. I have used them with my students, and I welcome every addition that is
made to the series. They show care, research, and good judgment, and are fully up to the
time in scholarship. I fully agree with the opinion that experienced teachers have
expressed of the excellence of these books” (\textit{Dream} 1883, 5; and others).
Shakespeare’s language, not only to read a play in its entirety, but also to
familiarize themselves with the scholarly critical and textual debates of
their time, a study explicitly discouraged in the heyday of the readers.

“Of Teaching and of Learning”: Finding an Appropriate Classroom Tone

Hudson and Rolfe also disagreed on the appropriate classroom
tone for the study of Shakespeare, with Hudson arguing that it be
primarily a pleasurable undertaking grounded in the tenets of aesthetic
criticism and Rolfe contending that it take a more rigorous and textual
emphasis; however, both had fully adopted the shift away from elocution
toward a philological and literary classroom experience with
Shakespeare. Hudson emphasizes that he will not have students suffer a
wearisome classroom experience and come to dislike Shakespeare as a
result; he writes, “I must and will have them take pleasure in the process;
and people are not apt to fall or to grow in love with things that bore
them” (“How to Use” xii). As an aesthetic critic, he believed teachers
should aim toward an appreciation of Shakespeare’s genius. He explains
that “I have never had and never will have any thing but simple exercises;
the pupils reading the author under the teacher's direction, correction, and
explanation,” and that “it is a joint communing of teacher and pupils with
the author for the time being; just that, and nothing more” (Hamlet xvii).

In the classroom, Hudson’s ideas can be seen in the advice he
gives in his footnotes. For Antony’s “Friends, Romans, Countrymen”
passage, for example, Hudson warns that though the “repetitions of
honourable man are intensely ironical … for that very reason the irony should be studiously kept out of the voice in pronouncing them”; he goes on to explain that he has “heard the effect of it utterly spoilt by being emphasized” because “the proper force and charm of the irony depend on its being completely disused and seeming perfectly unconscious” (Julius Caesar 478-79; 1879 and later editions, page 120-21).

Hudson goes on to say that achieving a love of Shakespeare supersedes even student understanding; “I would much rather they should not fully understand his thought … than that they should feel any thing of weariness or disgust in the study,” that “the defect of present comprehension can easily be repaired, but not so the disgust” (“How to Use” xii). According to Hudson, the study of Shakespeare should be an “entertainment” and there should be “enjoyment” in the “proper … studying [of] Shakespeare's poetry” (“How to Use” xix). The purpose of education, according to Hudson, is not to train children into academics, but instead to instill in them an everyday appreciation for literature and language. Students should not aspire to become Shakespeareans; their “main business” is to “gain an honest living” (“English in Schools” 3). Hudson may very well have been referring to Rolfe when he sternly criticized those he saw as elitist, referring to them as “human slugs” and “do-nothings,” who “however book-learned they may be, are not good citizens” (“English in Schools” 8).
Rolfe, in his defense, would claim what he considered a higher, if more austere, aspiration for students. In contrast to Hudson, he argued for a proper balance between aesthetic and textual approaches. Believing that students should aspire to study Shakespeare as critics do, with access to an extensive body of critical notes, he refutes Hudson’s ideal that classroom experience be primarily “pleasurable.” The study of Shakespeare should not be a “pastime,” or “a recreation,” but a delight transcending such simplistic modes of appreciation; Rolfe writes, “I believe that the road to a genuine appreciation and enjoyment of him is through [textual] study” (Coriolanus vi). He adds, “if really a study, it will prove a delight with which no mere pastime or recreation can ever compare” (Coriolanus vi). For Rolfe, “the chief aim in the study of literature … is the cultivation of taste,” and he argues that students “should be educated to this critical habit from their earliest introduction to the study of literature” because “it is a mistake to suppose,” as Hudson does, “that this training belongs only to an advanced course” (“Elementary Study” 9-10).

---

Rolfe illustrates his view on classroom experience in an extended metaphor comparing study to hiking a mountain path in Switzerland: “It is better to travel it on foot [Rolfe’s way] than to be carried over it in a ‘coach’ [Hudson’s way]. In walking over a mountain path in Switzerland, where the ‘pansied turf is air to winged feet,’ all exertion forgotten in its own exhilaration, and only giving a keener zest to the enjoyment of every thing in earth and air, you may sometimes see a tourist ‘doing’ the region, borne along in a chaise a porteurs, listless and half asleep while a professional guide or commissioneer drones out to him the well-worn description of the route. Would you change places with him? Would you give your enjoyment won and heightened by labor for his lazy, somnolent, stupidly absorptive satisfaction?” (Coriolanus vi).
Compared with the study of Shakespeare that took place through the readers, though, their ideals – Hudson’s on pleasurable aesthetic experience and Rolfe’s on scholarly textual study – are more complementary than contradictory. Despite outward differences, both reveal an entirely altered classroom experience than had existed earlier in the century. Each urges an appreciation for Shakespeare and a deep relationship with the language of Shakespeare, his words and an analysis of the underlying implications and effects of the choices Shakespeare – and subsequent editors – made in choosing those words. The ideals of both aesthetic and textual study preclude the study of elocution and its emphasis on proper speaking. Shakespeare may still have occasionally been read aloud in class, but such oral reading was no longer the purpose of study as it had once been. Shakespeare study by the end of the century involved students reading Shakespeare from their desks and working from the text, consulting introductions, notes, and even outside secondary sources when available. Even Hudson, who urged appreciation, still provided lengthy introductions and a plethora of critical notes in his editions.

“O Noble English”: Moving Away From Elocution and the Classics

On these issues – expurgation, notes, and classroom tone – both Hudson and Rolfe were responding to changing classroom conditions as the field of English emerged in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, rejecting traditions that had centered classroom experience on elocution
and classical language for centuries. Elocution was losing its significance in schools and Hudson ranted against what he considered an archaic practice.\textsuperscript{71} He calls it a “fashion” that “has been growing upon us of educating the mouth much more than the mind” (“English in Schools” 21). He laments that “too much time and strength are spent in mere word-mongering and lingual dissection,” that “we are now chiefly intent on educating people into talkers,” and observes that “teachers are ... sticking for ever in the husk of language, instead of getting through into the kernel of matter and thought,” before concluding that “a constant dissecting of his [Shakespeare’s] words ... just chokes off all passage of his blood into the pupil's mind” (Hamlet xiv). According to Hudson, it is “a sin to use him so; for such use can hardly fail to breed a distaste for him and an aversion to him” (Hamlet xiv-xv).\textsuperscript{72}

Further, Hudson would have little to do with the study of Classical authors in schools. Greek and Latin had been the mainstay of classroom experience for centuries, and though he tolerated their study, particularly in their ability to improve a student’s knowledge of the workings of his own English, Hudson argued that the emphasis of a student’s study should be in reading English classics:

\textsuperscript{71} Likewise, elocutionists also ranted against Hudson. The Broadway Journal decried that he had “an elocution that would disgrace a pig, and an odd species of gesticulation of which a baboon would have excellent reason to be ashamed” (qtd in Stafford 652).

\textsuperscript{72} Hudson blames this emphasis on elocution upon teachers’ training; “they know not how to come at [English classics], or to shape their course in teaching them” and “their minds are so engrossed with the verbal part of learning, that, unless they have a husk of words to stick in, as in studying a foreign language, they can hardly find where to stick at all”; as a result, “pupils ... stick in the crust of the words, and never get through to the marrow of thought” (“English in Schools” 19, 22).
There is in Shakespeare a richer fund of ‘sweetness and light,’ more and better food for the intellectual soul, a larger provision of such thoughts as should dwell together with the spirit of a man, and be twisted about his heart forever, than in the collective poetry of the whole ancient heathen world (“English in Schools” 17).

Shakespeare, according to Hudson, is an author that students easily come to love, unlike a writer like Homer: “few, very few, after all, can be trained to love Homer; while there are, I must think, comparatively few who cannot be trained to love Shakespeare” (“English in Schools” 18). Hudson’s reservations with Homer, though, reveal larger cultural insecurities concerning language in late nineteenth-century America. Homer’s epic poetry includes all of the intrigue of great Shakespearean tragedy – themes of heroic journey, infidelity, war, and murder all line Homer’s poetry as much as Shakespeare’s – but by the closing decades of the nineteenth century, with increasing numbers of immigrants making their way to the United States, the nation was searching to define itself through a linguistic heritage. In the past, elocution had taught newcomers proper English, but by the end of the nineteenth century, schools needed to instill a sense of national pride achieved through a national literature, a collective educational experience that reinforced a perceived set of shared national values and norms that bound America together.
Rolfe had similar reservations to the Classical authors as Hudson. Though some years before editing Shakespeare he had co-edited the *Handbook to Latin Poetry*, he also argued toward the end of the century that the time had come for the study of English authors to take a more prominent place in the schools. While still headmaster at Dorchester, Rolfe had urged the study of English literature in place of Classical. His students initially balked at the idea; though they admittedly preferred English classics, they also feared that such study “would impair their chance of showing a familiarity with that of Xenophon” and thus jeopardize their prospects for university admission (Wright 396). In a letter to Cornelius Felton, renowned Professor of Greek Literature at Harvard and editor of the popular *Greek Reader*, Rolfe asked “whether some knowledge of English might not redeem the possibly resultant deficiencies in Greek”; Felton replied, “Go ahead with the English, and let the Greek take care of itself” (Wright 396). Like Hudson, Rolfe was part of a larger ongoing educational movement that was placing Shakespeare atop the literary canon, determining and reinforcing an American cultural literacy, while simultaneously brushing aside the giants of Classical literature.

“I Must Examine Thee”: Shakespeare and the University Admission Examinations

This transition at the secondary level, away from elocution and Classical literature to English, at least partly derived from universities’ inclusion of English in their entrance examinations beginning in the
1870s. The school editions of Hudson and Rolfe, though influential themselves in shaping the emerging literary canon and the classroom methods that would dictate its instruction, were also, like the teachers and students who used them, subject to the evolving school textbook market engendered by these tests. Announced at least a year ahead of time in annual catalogs, entrance exams were offered once, sometimes twice, per year, usually just a few months before the first day of classes. Universities had long required incoming freshmen to demonstrate ability and knowledge in a number of areas – primarily Latin and Greek – before admission, but in the same years that Hudson and Rolfe were first editing school Shakespeare their emphasis began to shift as they gradually tested potential students for the first time on their abilities in composition and familiarity with English literature. In their earliest forms, university entrance exams required students to respond in short essays to literary prompts. The selected works varied from university to university, and often changed from year to year, but almost universally included plays from Shakespeare. He was, more than any other, the most frequently included author.

Harvard was the first American university to assess incoming students’ knowledge of Shakespeare; it first included a question on *Julius*

---

73 A similar phenomenon had already taken place more than a decade before in England, where Oxford and Cambridge had established entrance examinations by 1858, which from the very beginning included Shakespeare; Marder writes that “at least one play of Shakespeare’s has appeared on every examination ever given at these schools” and that “thereafter no school that was attempting to prepare students for a subsequent college career could dispense with Shakespeare in its curriculum” (278).
Caesar on its entrance exam in 1870 (Broome 49; Hays 17; Westfall 2).

Within a year, Hudson included the play in the first volume of his school editions, and the year after that, in 1872, Rolfe released his school edition of Caesar. Neither the composition requirement nor Shakespeare appeared on Harvard’s entrance exams in 1871 or 1872, but beginning in 1873, Harvard reinstated both, this time indefinitely (See Appendix K). For these four years, from 1873 until 1876, three of Harvard’s selections were Shakespearean: Julius Caesar remained, now alongside Merchant of Venice and The Tempest.74 By 1873, both Hudson and Rolfe had already issued all three in their school editions. Julius Caesar, which Harvard used twenty times between 1873 and 1905, and Merchant of Venice, seventeen, both remained mainstays on the exam over the years, but The Tempest was dropped from the test in 1877 and never again included.

Between 1877 and 1882, Harvard experimented with a number of Shakespearean plays. Nine of these were used just once and never again: Henry V (1877), Coriolanus (1878), Richard II (1879), King Lear (1880), Much Ado About Nothing (1880), Hamlet (1881), Romeo and Juliet (1881), Othello (1882), and King John (1882). A Midsummer Night’s Dream first appeared in 1879, and then twice more, in 1891 and 1896. Twelfth Night first appeared later, in 1888, and then twice more in 1893 and 1895 (the 1895 selection coincided with a Hasty Pudding Club

---

74 Applebee calls Harvard’s inclusion of literature in 1873 the “real milestone” in the development of the university’s admission requirements (30).
Christmas program later that year discussed in Chapter One. *As You Like It* had slightly more lasting appeal, appearing five times (1878, 1883, 1889, 1892, and 1897).

*Macbeth*, after *Julius Caesar* and *Merchant of Venice*, though, was the third most popular play selected. It first appeared in 1878 and 1879, and again in 1886, and would become particularly popular after Harvard divided its reading list in 1896 into works to be read generally and another title to be read closely. *Macbeth* was included seven times on the list for close reading: in 1898 and then every year from 1900 until 1905. It was, in fact, the only Shakespearean play used for the close reading selection other than *Merchant of Venice*. By 1898, Harvard had become less adventurous in its Shakespearean reading requirements, though, and along with *Macbeth* for its new close reading requirement, returned to using only *Julius Caesar* and *Merchant of Venice* for its general reading requirement as it had until the late-1870s. These three plays were used significantly more than any others in the period, three times as often as Shakespeare’s other titles combined.

Some actual entrance exam questions for Harvard are available, which reveal the nature of questions asked more generally on university entrance exams. The *Harvard Examination Papers* – an ancestor to modern test preparation programs and books, published by Hudson’s publishers, Heath and Ginn, and advertised in a number of Hudson’s editions – first appeared in 1873 and provided Harvard’s previous years’
entrance examination questions. Its first edition included questions from
the tests from 1860 through 1873, though it omitted the 1870 Julius
Caesar question. The text was updated annually until 1874 and included
the test questions in English from 1873 until 1874. It continued to be
published until at least 1888, but without updates. Harvard itself also
published its questions to the previous year’s entrance exams in its 1882-
83 and 1883-84 catalogs.

The test questions these sources provide, though, reveal
significantly less complexity in the work secondary students were
expected to do than Rolfe had suggested. As Applebee points out,
“literature was to be studied not for itself or even for philology, but as a
subject for composition” (30). Students were expected to recall major
plot elements and describe important characters or speeches from the
plays, but not answer questions requiring higher order thinking skills. For
the June 1874 exam, for example, students were asked to either compose
in writing “The story of the Caskets, in the Merchant of Venice” or “The
story of Shakespeare’s Tempest” (Leighton 215). The complexity of the
questions did not vary much through the 1870s or the early 1880s, though
students were offered a wider selection of questions to choose from. For
the June 1882 exam, for example, students had seven choices: “The Story
of Hamlet,” “Hamlet and the Ghost,” “The Character of Polonius,” “The
Fate of Ophelia,” “Hamlet’s Speech to the Players,” “The Fight between
Laertes and Hamlet,” “The Characters of Hamlet’s Mother,” or “Hamlet
as Gentlemen.” The prompts for these questions stressed quality over quantity and urged students to be brief in their response. The June and October 1874 exams explained that “thirty lines will be sufficient” (Leighton 215, 235). In 1875, students were told that their “composition must be at least fifty lines long” and to “make several paragraphs” (Leighton 278). By 1877, students were instructed to make both a rough and second draft of their work (Leighton 359-60). All of the prompts instructed students to demonstrate proper punctuation, spelling, grammar, and expression.

Other American universities and colleges followed Harvard’s lead, requiring their own entrance exams, which also almost always included Shakespeare. There was little uniformity, though, between the reading lists required by different universities from year to year, and as a result teachers felt inundated with a plethora of titles their students were expected to know. In 1878, the University of Michigan added Shakespeare to its entrance exam (see Appendix L), requiring students to compose an essay on either *Julius Caesar* or *The Tempest* – in contrast, 1878 was one of the few years Harvard did not include *Julius Caesar* (and by then had discontinued using *The Tempest* as well). With the exception of three years from 1898-1900, when Shakespeare was

---

75 Applebee writes, “The Harvard model was quickly followed by other colleges and universities; it offered an easy way to recognize literary studies without raising difficult questions about standards and methods: the subject tested would be composition, not literature. There was, however, no agreed canon of texts on which to base the examinations, and the lists changed yearly. Each college set its own examinations, quickly confronting high schools with a flood of titles in which they were to prepare students” (30-31).
omitted, the University of Michigan would continue to select between one and three Shakespearean plays each year until 1905 when it adopted the Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English. Like at Harvard, the most popular plays were *Merchant of Venice*, *Macbeth*, and *Caesar*, appearing eight, seven, and five times respectively between 1878 and 1905. *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night* each appeared three times, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *Henry VIII* each twice. No other play appeared more than once.

The University of Illinois also began including Shakespeare in its entrance exams in the 1890s (Stout 134-136). Based on his study of course catalogues, Stout finds that the University of Illinois required incoming students beginning in 1893 to compose an essay drawn from four or five literary works, one of which was Shakespearean. Like at Harvard and the University of Michigan, the list was subject to change from year to year, but emphasized a similar set of titles: *Julius Caesar*, *Merchant of Venice*, *Midsummer Night’s Dream*, and *As You Like It*. He adds that DePauw University and the University of Indiana had similar entrance requirements. As universities increasingly included Shakespeare in these entrance exams, no preparatory school claiming to prepare students for college could omit Shakespeare from its curriculum, and no student hoping to attend university could neglect such study. Applebee argues that “college entrance requirements were the moving force” in the study of literature, and consequently the study of Shakespeare (30). He
adds that “annotated classics,” such as Hudson’s and Rolfe’s, “were in widespread use” and that “the college entrance exams, with their lists of specifically prescribed texts, gave great impetus to the development of these texts” (34). Secondary school success – if measured by admittance to prestigious universities – was defined at least in part by one’s familiarity with Shakespeare.

In 1906 a number of universities, including Harvard and the University of Michigan, adopted in their entrance testing the two-reading-list-system recommended by the Joint Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English. Various committees had worked to make the many individual universities’ reading requirements more uniform as early as 1879. These new uniform requirements standardized the reading requirements for incoming students regardless of to which university they were applying. The new reading requirements, in 1906, though, were similar to those that had been most frequently used at Harvard in

---

76 Applebee also complicates the question as to “whether the high school or the college was leading the way in shaping” the literary canon and the lists of texts required on college entrance exams, and concludes that “there is no simple answer” (35). Stout also alludes to difficulties determining whether university entrance exams informed secondary school curricula or the opposite: “to what extent the entrance requirements in English were influenced by what was actually being taught in the high schools is not easily determined ... it is not improbable, therefore, that the agreement on the part of the higher institutions in the general plan was determined somewhat by what the high schools were already doing” (135-36).

77 For a fuller discussion of the work of these various committees, see Applebee (30-36) and Hook (8-15). Hook explains that as early as the 1870s, “some secondary teachers began to plead for a uniform list” while “others wished that all the lists would go away” (9). In 1879, A Conference of New England Colleges was established, which in 1888 “prepared a list of books for reading as the preparation for the examination in English” (qtd in Hook 9). Other similar conferences were held in following years before the influential Committee of Ten was established in 1892 (Applebee 32-34; Hook 10-11). Its recommendations helped standardize reading requirements, but did not entirely satisfy the problem. Other committees and recommendations would follow in the 1890s and early twentieth century.
preceding years. The two lists, like at Harvard, included one for general study and one for close reading. For general reading, students chose two plays from *Julius Caesar, The Merchant of Venice, As You Like It, Henry V*, and *Twelfth Night*. For close reading, they were to know *Macbeth*. As Applebee explains, “the use of two lists offered a compromise between the two conflicting points of view”; the list for general study satisfied “the proponents of appreciation,” thinkers like Hudson, while the close reading requirement satisfied “the advocates of disciplined study,” like Rolfe.

“‘Tis My Limited Service”: The Impact of *Julius Caesar, Merchant of Venice, and Macbeth* on the Curriculum

Not only the focus on Shakespeare, but also the emphasis upon just three of Shakespeare’s plays – *Julius Caesar, Merchant of Venice*, and *Macbeth* – along with critical interpretations made available in the introductions to Hudson’s and Rolfe’s editions, problematize the underlying themes of early Shakespeare instruction. At least partly because of the university entrance exams – Harvard and the University of Michigan included them more than any others – secondary schools focused more on these three plays than any of Shakespeare’s others.

Citing a 1907 *School Review* study of Midwestern schools, Applebee lists the ten most commonly taught literary works: first was *Julius Caesar*, taught in more than 90% of the schools surveyed; second was *Macbeth*; and fifth was *The Merchant of Venice* (49-50). These three plays, by the
dawn of the twentieth century, had been established as the foundation of the early English canon.

For close reading, *Macbeth* proved ideal. The shortest of Shakespeare’s tragedies, it is an excellent length in secondary settings for students’ first careful study of a Shakespearean play. Its well-known and thoroughly critiqued soliloquies serve well for careful literary dissection. Rolfe was in his element gathering critical material on the play: “So much has been written on *Macbeth* that the main difficulty has been in selecting and condensing from it; but, as in former volumes of the series, I have preferred to give too much rather than too little” (v). In it, he included more pages of notes, relative to the length of the text, than any of his other editions. Its thematic punishment of the overly ambitious pairs it well with *Julius Caesar*.

And for general reading, *Julius Caesar* makes sense. It provided a natural bridge between the fading study of Classical literature and the emerging study of English. Alongside other canonical Latin works, the historical Caesar had been the subject of secondary and university study long before Shakespeare became popular in schools. His *Commentaries* had also been studied alongside Cicero and Ovid. Applebee points out that in the 1880s and 90s “*Julius Caesar* was [generally] taught during the same year as Caesar’s *Commentaries*” and that “the classical tradition had both a prestige and a methodology which the early teacher of English hoped to emulate” (35). Still, the argument would suggest that
Shakespeare’s other Roman tragedies – *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Titus Andronicus*, and *Coriolanus* – would also have become popular in the period, when in fact they were almost entirely neglected in schools (and still often are today). Rolfe did not even issue a school edition of any of the three until 1881, nine years after his *Julius Caesar*. Hudson likewise did not include them in his first volume, withholding them for the second and third volumes (and in the case of *Titus* not until it was issued more than a decade later in 1881 in an individual volume), and issuing their individual single-play volumes only after many of the other plays had already been released.

*Titus* is easily dismissed. Its extreme brand of violence makes it unsuitable for the classroom; perhaps even more significantly though in the nineteenth century, its authorship is questionable. Rolfe did not believe it to be Shakespeare’s – “Shakespeare probably had little to do with writing the play,” – and found the text itself unworthy of merit (*Titus* 7). He even commended Hudson for including *Two Noble Kinsmen* in its place in his *Harvard Shakespeare* (*Literary World* 1881, 400). The reason against the other two, though, was not because of any inferiority in the merit of either play. Hudson, in fact, believed both *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus* superior to *Caesar*. He claimed *Antony* to be “equalled by few, and hardly surpassed by any, of the Poet’s dramas” (*Antony* 573). It was also his opinion that *Caesar* was “several degrees inferior to
Coriolanus" (Shakespeare His Life 242; also Julius Caesar 430, in editions after 1878, p. 37). He explained that though Caesar "abounds in particular scenes and passages fraught with the highest virtue of his genius," as a whole it did not "stand among the Poet’s masterpieces."

---

78 Julius Caesar became the preferred exemplar of Shakespeare’s Roman tragedy to Coriolanus, at least in part, because of Coriolanus’s perceived problematic textual history in the late nineteenth century. There were no quarto versions of Coriolanus and Hudson relates that it “is among the worst specimens of printing” in the First Folio (Coriolanus 3). R.G. White, contemporary to Hudson and Rolfe, concurred, calling it “the worst printed play in the Folio” (169). Some recent editors have since continued to complain of its challenging syntactical textual problems, though others have suggested it relatively no less problematic than other texts. A handful of twenty-first century Coriolanus editions, for example, have cited White in their introductions, including Arden, the New Temple, and others. The problem is summed up in The Applause First Folio of Shakespeare: “Some passages are highly suspect, though the argument is rarely presented as by R.G. White … lineation problems are common to the autograph work Shakespeare sent in from Stratford … Scholars suggest the errors consist mainly in setting complex passages according to meaning (via syntax) rather than poetic nicety” (955-56). Stephen Greenblatt, on the other hand, suggests, “Coriolanus is not one of the more textually vexing of Shakespeare’s plays” (2792). Regardless of modern opinion, though, the text was perceived in its time as problematic. In contrast, Caesar had no such issues. According to Hudson, “none of the plays in that inestimable volume [the First Folio] have reached us with the text in a sounder and clearer state” than Caesar (Julius Caesar, editions after 1878, p.3). Because Caesar was perceived as such an excellent textual specimen, and Coriolanus such a poor one, Caesar could be cast as a paragon of Shakespearean drama, the bona fide work of the Bard, in a time when modern notions of authorship, along with Shakespeare’s reputation and place in the canon were still being formed. This line of reasoning, though, does not apply to Antony. Rolfe writes that it “is well printed in the folio, and the textual difficulties are comparatively few and slight” (Antony and Cleopatra 11).

79 Hudson was particularly fond of the interactions between Brutus and Lucius. Regarding Brutus’s lines to Lucius in the fourth act, “Look, Lucius here’s the book I sought for so; / I put it in the pocket of my gown,” Hudson writes in his footnote, “I am not sure but these two simple lines are the best thing in the play. Just consider how much is implied in them, and what a picture they give of the earnest, thoughtful, book-loving Brutus. And indeed all his noblest traits of character come out, ‘in simple and pure soul,’ in this exquisite scene with Lucius, which is hardly surpassed by any thing in Shakespeare” (495, in editions after 1878, 150). In Shakespeare: His Life, Art, and Characters he comments on the encounter: “there we have the earnest, thoughtful Brutus hungering intensely for the repasts of treasured thought … The idea of a bookworm riding the whirlwind of war! The thing is most like Brutus; but how out of his element, how unsphered from his right place, it shows him … The scene … is one of the finest in Shakespeare” (235-36). He adds later, a line also included in school edition introductions, “there is nothing in the play that seems to me more divinely touched than the brief scene, already noticed, of Brutus and his boy Lucius” (Shakespeare His Life 243; also Julius Caesar 430, in editions after 1878, p. 38). In later editions of Caesar, he adds, “And what a dear little fellow Lucius is! so gentle, so dutiful, so loving, so thoughtful and careful for his master; and yet himself no more conscious of his virtue than a flower of its fragrance.
It was the subject matter itself, though, Shakespeare’s protagonist, that catapulted *Julius Caesar* above not only Shakespeare’s other Roman plays, but every other of his plays as well. *Julius Caesar*, more than any of Shakespeare’s other Roman tragedies, connected to the Latin period that had long been the attention of school curriculum. Much like Shakespeare himself, the historical Caesar’s iconic status – not Antony’s, not Coriolanus’s – in late nineteenth-century America made him an ideal subject for study. Hudson’s disappointment with Shakespeare’s *Caesar*, in fact, stems from his adulation of the historical Caesar, whom Hudson calls “the deepest, the most multitudinous head that ever figured in the political affairs of mankind” (*Shakespeare His* 225). The tenor of his praise, in fact, matches that which he often used in describing Shakespeare. Hudson complains, “this seeming contradiction between Caesar as known and Caesar as rendered by him [Shakespeare] is what, more than anything else in the drama, perplexes me” (*Shakespeare His* 227). Other critics had formed similar opinions earlier in the nineteenth century, which found their way to the classroom reprinted in Rolfe’s text.

For example, Rolfe included an excerpt from William Hazlitt: “We do His falling asleep in the midst of his song, and his exclaiming on being aroused, ‘The strings, my lord, are false,’ are so good that I cannot speak of them” (in editions after 1878, p. 38). Hudson was not alone in his admiration of the relationship between Brutus and Lucius. Rolfe, in his *Caesar* edition includes commentary from William Hazlitt: “The councils of generals, the doubtful turns of battles, are represented to the life. The death of Brutus is worth of him [Shakespeare] … But what is perhaps better than either is the little incident of his boy Lucius falling asleep over his instrument, as he is playing to his master in his tent …” (13).
not much admire the representation here given of Julius Caesar, nor do we think it answers the portrait given of him in his *Commentaries*”; the words of James Boswell also ring out from Rolfe’s edition: “There cannot be a stronger proof of Shakespeare’s deficiency in classical knowledge than the boastful language he has put in the mouth of the most accomplished man of all antiquity” (15). Rolfe reprints Georg Gottfried Gervinus, German literary historian, who concurs, “The character of Caesar in our play … is declared to be unlike the idea conceived of him from his *Commentaries*” (22). Shakespeare’s representation did not match the nineteenth-century perception of the historical Caesar.

Careful not to fault Shakespeare, though, Hudson theorizes that Shakespeare likely intended “to represent Caesar, not as he was indeed, but as he must have appeared to the conspirators” (*Shakespeare His* 228). He explains:

> For Caesar was literally too great to be seen by them [the conspirators] … And the Poet may well have judged that the best way to set us right towards them was by identifying us more or less with them … and making us share somewhat in their delusion … Why, then may not the Poet’s idea have been, so to order things that the full strength of the man should not appear in the play, as it did not in fact, till after his fall? This view, I am apt to think, will both explain and justify the strange disguise – a sort
of falsetto greatness – under which Caesar exhibits himself. *(Shakespeare His 228-29)*

Other nineteenth-century critics also defended Shakespeare’s choice. Rolfe included Knight’s defense: “Shakespeare’s characterization of Caesar … is true to the narrative upon which Shakespeare founded it … [and] to every natural conception of what Caesar must have been at the exact moment of his fall” (18). He also included Gervinus, who explains that “Caesar’s character altered much for the worse shortly before his death, and Shakespeare has represented him according to this suggestion” (Rolfe 23). This critical discourse, prepared for and presented to students in the editions of Hudson and Rolfe, engendered a classroom ideology that permitted the historical Caesar his place in the old canon, but made room still for Shakespeare in the new.

Even if Shakespeare’s version of Caesar was not altogether satisfactory to Hudson and other critics of his time, the play’s presence in the classroom nonetheless paired two of history’s greatest figures and served to reinforce patriarchal and democratic values that had and would shape American culture in the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries. The play’s themes reinforce burgeoning republican pride as America’s centennial approached and passed. Shakespeare may not have been born an American, but his writings nonetheless were adopted as American in schools to serve a need for national literature and language. Likewise his story of *Julius Caesar*, ingrained in students through
schools, while not the story of American democracy, provided a
discourse and a shared cultural vocabulary on the nature of democracy.
Any American at the turn of the twentieth century, properly trained in
school, could outline and likely recite Antony’s oration as accurately as
of any of Washington’s or Jefferson’s.

*The Merchant of Venice,* the second most popular of Shakespeare’s
plays in the final three decades of the nineteenth century, was also the first
that Hudson had read as a boy, “the very beginning of [his] acquaintance
with Shakespeare” (*Merchant* 54). Though to a different end, it also
provided a national story upon which American cultural ideals and societal
norms could be shaped. The word “justice” appears in the play fifteen
times, but from its most common nineteenth-century critical
interpretations, justice in the play applies only to those characters who
conform to the cultural norms of dominant society. Its thinly veiled anti-
Semitism and xenophobia, readings of the play often refuted in modern
times but common in the late nineteenth century, helped serve to keep in
check a growing immigrant population. Just as Americans needed
schooling in the language of democracy, *Merchant* taught the
requirements of assimilation. As J.N. Hook points out, “not all high school
students … could read and understand Shakespeare” and “usually
discouraged,” many “dropped out” or instead “sat comprehending but a
fraction of what was going on,” but for immigrant students, the result was
magnified: “Some, from foreign families coming in by the tens of
thousands, knew so little English that the current prescription” requiring students to study Shakespeare “was entirely useless” (12). For those who could understand, though, and for those who would find success in America through its educational system, no other Shakespearean play, as it was read in the late nineteenth century, so efficiently marginalizes the ethnic minorities in its scenes who are unable or unwilling to assimilate.

The two sequences from Merchant of Venice most frequently tested in Harvard’s entrance exams, and also the passages most frequently included in the readers – the story of the caskets and the trial scene between Shylock and Antonio – both portray characters of dominant Venetian culture subjecting non-Venetian characters to their rule. In the case of the caskets, the foreign suitors vying for Portia’s hand, unaided, stand little chance of choosing correctly. Both the Prince of Morocco and the Prince of Aragon are outsiders. Bassanio, on the other hand, the quintessence of Venetian society, perhaps even aided by Portia in choosing, easily selects the correct casket and wins her hand, her love, and her wealth. For him, the play ends triumphantly, for Portia’s non-Venetian suitors, in rejection.

In the case of the trial scene, Shylock, unable and unwilling to conform to dominant culture is similarly subjected and offered neither revenge nor justice for his lost ducats, jewels, and daughter. In a footnote, Hudson points out that Shylock remained an outsider. Though a resident of Venice, he “was reckoned among the strangers of the place,” while
“Antonio was one of the citizens” (*Merchant* 153). In the trial scene, Portia explains he is legally an “alien,” and by its conclusion, Shylock is compelled to either renounce his faith or face death (4.1.344). Only Shylock’s daughter, Jessica, because of her desire to marry a Christian and assimilate – she exclaims, “I shall end this strife, / Become a Christian, and they loving wife” – overcomes the yoke of the play’s dominant Venetian culture (2.3.19-20). She later tells Lancelot, “I shall be saved by my husband / He has made me a Christian” (3.5.15-16). In fact, she is explicitly rewarded with half her father’s fortune for her conversion, while her father, unwilling and unable to do the same voluntarily, is ruined both financially and spiritually. There are three rings in the play, symbols of justice and fair play, and all given by their wives to their husbands. The two Christian men, Bassanio and Gratiano, both give their rings away and though they are chided for it by their wives, see their rings returned to them by the play’s conclusion; Shylock’s ring, though, stolen by his daughter, is traded for a monkey and never seen again. From this critical perspective, the play’s underlying lesson – that justice exists only for those willing to adhere to the values and beliefs of the majority – served in schools to teach American students, both new to its shores and also those who had resided there for generations, of the rigid notions of social and cultural hierarchy.

A student expected to master Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice* at the end of the nineteenth century must also innately master these
ethnocentric themes. Hudson implicitly and explicitly condones such a reading. The Christian characters of the play do not to refer to Shylock by name, but instead call him “the Jew.” In his introduction, Hudson also often calls him “the Jew,” leading students to identify with the play’s dominant culture more than with its minority factions. Hudson is also almost entirely insensitive to Shylock’s predicament. Though in his outline of the plot Hudson speaks of the elopement between Lorenzo and Jessica as being “essential to the well being of the piece,” he overlooks its emotional effect on Shylock, key evidence in defense of Shylock’s bitter anger (Shakespeare His 58). Of this, he writes:

Jessica’s elopement, in itself and its circumstances, puts us to the alternative that either she is a bad child or Shylock a bad father. And there is enough to persuade us of the latter; though not in such sort but that some share of reproach falls to her. For if a young woman have so bad a home as to justify her in this deserting and robbing it, the atmosphere of the place can hardly fail to leave some traces in her temper and character. (Shakespeare His 62)

Lorenzo, who steals from Shylock, according to Hudson, “does nothing unhandsome” (Shakespeare His 62). Antonio, accused of spitting on Shylock, spurning him, and calling him a dog, is “a kind-hearted and sweet-mannered man; of a large and liberal spirit; affable, generous, and magnificent in his dispositions” (Shakespeare His 60). Hudson calls
Portia’s “management of the trial” – after calling Shylock to be merciful and then mercilessly sentencing him to poverty and stripping him of his faith – “a piece of consummate art” (Shakespeare His 67). For Shylock, though, Hudson has no sympathy:

Shylock is a true representative of his nation; wherein we have a pride which for ages never ceased to provoke hostility, but which no hostility could ever subdue; a thrift which still invited rapacity, but which no rapacity could ever exhaust; and a weakness which, while it exposed the subjects to wrong only deepened their hate, because it kept them without the means or the hopes of redress. Thus Shylock is a type of national sufferings, national sympathies, national antipathies. (Shakespeare His 72)

Shylock’s tragic flaw then is his unwillingness and inability to assimilate in the way his daughter desired and accomplished: “Nothing can daunt, nothing disconcert him; remonstrance cannot move, ridicule not touch, obloquy cannot exasperate him … In a word, he may be broken; he cannot be bent” (Shakespeare His 73).

The selections from various nineteenth-century critics that Rolfe includes in the introduction of his edition reinforce Hudson’s findings. In the passage he includes from Schlegel, the German critic praises Shakespeare for Shylock’s “strongly marked and original individuality” as a character, but like Hudson, concludes that he is still a “symbol of the
general history of his unfortunate nation”; Schlegel, also like Hudson, though, approves of Antonio and his “self-sacrificing magnanimity” (Rolfe 22). Schlegel has kind words for Jessica as well, “the fugitive daughter of the Jew, in whom Shakespeare has contrived to throw a veil of sweetness over the national features” (24). Rolfe also includes commentary from Mrs. Anna Brownell Jameson, who compares Portia to Shylock: both are “splendid figures worthy of each other … She hangs beside the terrible inexorable Jew, the brilliant lights of her character set off by the shadowy power of his” (24). Rolfe even includes a brief excerpt from Hudson, selecting for students some of Hudson’s most hostile words for Shylock (32-36).

Rolfe, like Hudson, provided little critical apparatus in his texts that would engender a sympathetic classroom reading of Shylock or the play’s other non-Venetian, non-assimilating characters. For Shylock, there is neither revenge nor justice. As a result, the play provides the symmetrical counterpoint to *Julius Caesar*; both center thematically upon justice and revenge, but Caesar, the paragon of dominant Roman culture, successfully enacts his revenge against his conspirators as a returning spirit and enforces empire upon Rome even after his death, while Shylock, the antithesis of Venetian Christian culture, along with the other foreign identities in the play, is entirely denied revenge, or even equitable grounds upon which to win justice. Whether revenge or justice, the success of their enactment depends entirely on one’s proximity to the
center of cultural and societal expectations. An emperor is fully satiated, an outcast not at all.

Chapter Three Conclusions

The nature of one’s familiarity with Shakespeare’s plays in the late nineteenth century – as well as our own modern methods for appreciating and studying Shakespeare in schools, and even student assessment of that study – are rooted in the traditions established in the Shakespeare school editions of Hudson and Rolfe. These editions rejected Shakespeare’s previous role as an exemplar for elocution practice, as well as the practice of limiting his presence in school texts to brief passages and short scenes. Full plays became the standard, annotation a necessary classroom tool for deciphering the nuances and history of Shakespeare’s language, and the university entrance examination a driving force in determining secondary curriculum. Hudson urged a deep, almost emotional, connection between the plays and students, their study a transcendent experience not altogether different from what Shakespeare might have experienced in composition. Rolfe’s strain of study differed only in that it was more carefully measured and less abstract. For him, each word had a history to explore, and the study of Shakespeare was a satisfying intellectual probe into the editorial scholarship that had revealed Shakespeare’s genius. Three plays in particular took their place atop the Shakespearean canon: Julius Caesar, Merchant of Venice, and Macbeth, each contributing to the establishment and reinforcement of a dominant American culture that clung to its
democratic ideologies that honored the will of the majority while simultaneously coercing its minorities to assimilate to perceived cultural norms, which cyclically included knowledge of and familiarity with the emerging literary canon.

Chapter Four will analyze the origins of a performance-based approach to teaching Shakespeare – teaching approaches inspired from studying Shakespeare’s plays as dramas meant for performance – as told through the early *English Journal* articles written in the second decade of the twentieth century. Hudson’s, like Rolfe’s, had not been a method that invited performance-based approaches into the classroom. As a serious meditation upon meritorious literary achievement, Hudson’s classroom approach still remained distant from the Shakespeare presented in American theaters; he wrote, “the Editor does not believe at all in turning the school-room into a play-house or any thing of that sort” (*Shakespeare as a Textbook* viii). Hudson's admonishment pre-dates the modern debate on teaching Shakespeare through performance by more than a hundred years and indicates that there were teachers as early as the 1870s who were “turning the school-room into a playhouse.” Those teachers, though, who had experimented with performance-based classroom approaches, who would turn “the schoolhouse into a playhouse,” before the formation of NCTE and the publication of its flagship journal, *English Journal*, had had no voice for expressing their successes and failures. Beginning in 1911, though, a number of influential teachers did begin expressing their
ideas for studying Shakespearean drama, not as an editor would, or as a critic would, but in ways that an actor or director might. Though their ideas would not gain mainstream acceptance until the 1970s, their ideas in the 1910s foreshadow modern methodologies for teaching the Bard in the twenty-first century and reveal the tenacity and innovation of teachers over a century ago.
CHAPTER FOUR

“BEAUTY’S TUTORS”: EARLY ENGLISH JOURNAL CONTRIBUTORS AND LEARNING TO APPRECIATE SHAKESPEARE, 1912-1930

In scouring the earliest editions of English Journal, the primary journal of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) since 1912, it becomes clear that issues facing Shakespeare teachers a hundred years ago have echoes in our own time. Early contributors, for example, were concerned with the toll standardized assessment exacted on their students and profession. University entrance exams had catapulted a handful of works to the top of the canon by the beginning of the twentieth century – in Shakespeare, these were Julius Caesar, Merchant of Venice, and Macbeth – and the earliest contributors to English Journal were frustrated that more of Shakespeare’s plays were not available to students. Early contributors also complained that the textbooks available to them did not meet the needs of their students and that traditional methods for teaching Shakespeare’s plays left students bored and uninspired. W. Wilbur Hatfield,80 for example, criticized teaching

80 Though Hatfield was not present for the charter meeting of NCTE in 1911, it would be inaccurate not to describe him as a founding member of the Council. He was historically the Council’s most influential member. His ideas about teaching were included in the very first edition of English Journal, and he was in attendance for its second meeting in 1912, and after that he missed “only one or two meetings in forty years” (Pooley 5). Hatfield served as professor at the Chicago Normal School (later the Chicago Teachers College) for 32 years, but his service to NCTE and its Journal lasted longer; he served in various editorial capacities for the Journal from 1917 until 1955, while also serving as the Council’s secretary-treasurer, a volunteer position, for 33 years from 1920 until 1953 (Pooley 4-5). His last submission to English Journal would come nearly 55 years after his first, in 1967; in total, he contributed over a hundred pieces. Because of his dedication, he was nicknamed “Mr. English,” and later in life “Mr. NCTE.” (Hook 84). Pooley writes of him: “The Council – its growth, its members, its affiliates, its journals,
methods that focused too much upon memorization and recitation and not enough on literary appreciation and critical thinking. In a December 1916 English Journal article, he complained that “twelve years of school life have made [our students] adepts at memorization, but many of them are yet novices in thinking, in imagining as they read, in catching an author’s feeling and purpose” (702). The creative methods that early contributors advocated instead – using models, pictures, music, and dramatization to make literature immediately relevant for their students – resemble more modern progressive educational strategies.

The Progressive Era was marked by the rise of professional organizations, the expansion of schooling, and the application of modernizing, scientific methods to educational disciplines. John Dewey’s experimental and pragmatic approach to education emphasized drawing on student’s prior experiences, fostering active and interactive curriculum, learning by doing, the teacher as facilitator and guide, and the school as essential to social progress. Ellen Fitz Gerald, writing for English Journal in 1914, lamented the traditional method of “Shakespeare-reading” that she found “pedantic and lifeless” (347). She complained that too few of Shakespeare’s plays were available, but that “the question here is not of excluding a few plays ... it is one of making them a joy, a real adventure” (347). Believing that children learn better when Shakespeare’s “fine romantic spirit is not choked out by argument and dissertation,” she

its publications – were the center of Wilbur’s professional life. To these he gave himself unreservedly ...” (8).
echoed Henry Norman Hudson’s belief from some half century before that students are more successful when they take pleasure in the study of Shakespeare (353). Her ideas, and those of other early contributors, though, extended Hudson’s range of pleasurable Shakespeare classroom experience beyond the reading of words to include illustration, music, and dramatization. As we have seen, the dominant mode of instruction had shifted in the nineteenth century from an emphasis on elocution to an emphasis on the aesthetic and textual study of Shakespeare.

As the study of English, literature, and Shakespeare continued to develop in the early twentieth century, there was significant experimentation in methods. English teachers explored new approaches, some which would have lasting impact, and others that would eventually be deemed ridiculous. Simon suggests, “the English literature class [had become] a circus ring for educational stunts” in the early decades of the twentieth century, and while he refrains from judging such pedagogical play and experimentation, he emphasizes the broad methodological range that existed (Simon 137). He writes:

… The possibilities for different types of educational activity are so varied, the temptations to an ingenious teacher not primarily interested in literature are so many, that it would almost be an indictment [sic] of the imagination and resourcefulness of our teachers of literature if substantial agreement prevailed ... (Simon 139).
There were others who also noted the range of pedagogical variation in these early decades. William T. Foster, for example, in 1911, wrote, “even the general prescription of English is an agreement in name only; what actually goes on under this name is ... diverse” (quoted in Graff 100). Graff adds, “even English professors [at the turn of the twentieth century] did not seem able to agree on the core values of English, despite their agreement on the core texts” (Graff 100).

It was a period of educational invention and the annals of English Journal reveal a wide range of classroom experiences: from students building theater models to better understand the original spaces in which the lines of Shakespeare had once been spoken to teachers who were saving and sharing with their students post-cards from trips abroad, magazine clippings of images of stages and productions, and picture books of Shakespeare that they had collected. These copiously illustrated picture books, in contrast to the sparsely illustrated readers of the late nineteenth century and even Rolfe’s illustrated school Shakespeare editions, and even the availability of postcards and illustrated magazines, were the product of new technologies that had not been available in previous generations. The phonograph was another increasingly popular new technology. By the 1910s, schools were investing in their own victrolas and English teachers were playing Victor recordings of Shakespearean voice and music for their students, bringing popular actors into the classroom in ways unfathomable – and equally undesirable – a few decades before. Phonograph technology,
and the recording technologies that followed, also forever changed how students heard Shakespeare.

Further, everywhere the annual play – in many cases a Shakespearean production – was becoming standard fare in American high schools, and early *English Journal* contributors debated and offered suggestions for this new extracurricular innovation. The ideas reported in the early volumes of *English Journal* also included the earliest recorded strategies for dramatization and performance-based approaches integrating elements of theater into the classroom. Increasingly, teachers were looking for kinesthetic and hands-on activities that would engage students in challenging literature. On the other hand, there were also a number of contributors questioning whether Shakespeare should still be taught at all, whether his language was accessible or his plays relevant to young people in the early twentieth century. Some even argued that his works be allowed to slide quietly into oblivion as the classics of Greek and Latin had, to be replaced by modern and American selections. The pages of *English Journal* had finally given teachers a collective voice, which had also for the first time included the voices of women, who long outnumbered their male counterparts in the teaching profession, but nonetheless been silenced. These early volumes record an innovative and distinctive breed of teacher, one rebellious against the changing power scheme thrust down from the university, but also one who would either
invigorate the old methods for presenting Shakespeare or banish him from the classroom entirely.

“A Wise Council”: The Founding of NCTE

NCTE was founded in 1911, at least partly, because of the influence that the university entrance examination system and the subsequent Uniform Lists had had in determining secondary curriculum. Fred Newton Scott,\textsuperscript{81} professor of Rhetoric at the University of Michigan and first (and second) president of NCTE, called the examination system “feudal,” with “colleges attempt[ing] to dictate the content of lower school programs about which they knew little” and his “call was to abolish the lists” (Applebee 50). J.N. Hook explains that the university reading lists had entirely reshaped the secondary curriculum with very little or no influence from secondary teachers: “Previously, what we think of as literature had been largely ignored by elementary and secondary school teachers, except for the miscellaneous excerpts found in McGuffey and other readers”; as a result, the universities’ literary selections had replaced “elocution and some of the other early studies” that “began to slide downhill, some of them into oblivion” (9). As high school enrollment continued to increase at the turn of the twentieth century, high schools were forced to choose between serving the minority

\textsuperscript{81} As both the first and second NCTE president, Fred Scott is the only person to have ever served twice as NCTE president. He was also Professor of Rhetoric at the University of Michigan and Hook credits him with establishing a “precedent of long-continuing NCTE service following the presidency” (5). Hook also calls him “a sturdy supporter of high school teachers and students” (4).
of their students with college aspirations or the majority for whom vocational aspirations were more realistic.

Secondary teachers responded. They complained that the universities’ entrance requirements and lists, even after those requirements and lists became unified, prevented secondary schools from succeeding simultaneously with their two conflicting mandates. Through the lists, universities also had taken curricular control from secondary teachers, and while many approved the study of English literature in place of elocution and the Classics, they were dismayed at the shift of power from the secondary to the university level. Several regional English teacher organizations had already formed by the dawn of the twentieth century and though their views on the universities’ exams and lists varied – Applebee writes that “Teachers in the East … sought instead [of abolishing the lists as Scott called for] to increase the freedom of the school within the general framework of the Uniform Lists” – their agendas merged in a general attack on the lists after 1905, culminating in the founding of the NCTE in 1911 (50).

The Council’s pressing work at its inaugural meeting was, first, to “request to the National Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements” that they “include ‘in their several delegations an adequate number of representatives from the public high schools,’” and, second, to urge “the abolition of prescribed literary works as the basis of entrance examination questions, to be replaced by tests of written composition and oral
expression and a reading test on passages of prose or poetry ‘not previously prescribed’” (Hook 19-20). In a move that would prove most significant of all, the Council also approved a plan to publish a monthly education periodical, which would become English Journal. Hatfield and James Fleming Hosic,\textsuperscript{82} founder of NCTE, said of the publication that immediately became NCTE’s central organ, “it made the English teachers of the country at once articulate” (qtd in Hook 21). Hosic added, it “aspires to provide a means of expression and a general clearing house of experience and opinion for the English teachers of the country” (qtd in Hook 23). The Council in its first year also established its own reading list in response to the prescribed Uniform Lists that had come from the universities, A List of Books for Home Reading, which in later years was expanded and would remain popular for many decades\textsuperscript{83} (Hook 24-25). It included a number of Shakespearean selections, far more than had been the typical fare of the university entrance exams: As You Like It, Hamlet, 1 Henry IV, 2 Henry IV, Henry V, Julius Caesar, King Lear, Macbeth, Merchant of Venice, Midsummer Night’s Dream, Othello, The Tempest, Twelfth Night, Winter’s Tale.

\textsuperscript{82} James Fleming Hosic was one of the principle founders of NCTE. He served from 1911-1920 as secretary and became the council’s ninth president in 1920. Most significantly, he was the “founder, owner, and first editor of the English Journal” (6). Hook calls him “tireless” and “the guiding spirit of the early Council” (6). He goes on to quote Muriel Crosby who many years later wrote of him, “While a number of early founders surely carried their weight …, Hosic stands out in knowledge, perception, motivation, and leadership” (6). Hook concludes, “Hosic must be regarded as one of the American educational leaders of the early twentieth century, and certainly the leader in English teaching” (81).

\textsuperscript{83} The text was released again in 1923, 1928, and 1930. The 1923 version added Coriolanus, Richard II, and Richard III.
At its second annual meeting in 1912, though, the issue of university entrance exams and lists was barely mentioned. The reason for this, Hatfield hypothesized, was that:

If the Council concerned itself vigorously with its many possibilities and with the reorganization of secondary, elementary, and collegiate English, the problem of entrance requirements would be reduced to irrelevancy. (qtd in Hook 25)

Hatfield was right. NCTE proved influential in affecting change, and the Uniform Lists gradually disappeared over the remainder of the decade. By 1916, incoming freshman chose between a restricted examination, which was based on a short list of titles for study, and a comprehensive exam for which there were no lists. In following years, “the trend … was toward increased emphasis upon the comprehensive exam” and eventually the restricted lists were abandoned entirely (Applebee 54).

With the decline of the prescribed reading of the Unified Lists, came renewed interest in appreciation. Applebee explains, “even during the period” in the late nineteenth century when “philological studies had been at their strongest, there had been a dissenting tradition which claimed that the proper goal for the teaching of literature should be ‘appreciation’” (55). He points specifically to Henry Norman Hudson as being “typical” of this older dissenting tradition; initially, voices such as Hudson’s had been dismissed, but “eventually the pedantry of the annotated texts, with
their exhaustive notes and editorial apparatus, generated a reaction of its own” (55). In response, a number of experimental methodologies emerged, ranging from the inclusion of pictures and music in the teaching of literature to the increasingly popular use of dramatization in schools. In addition to its lists of recommended books, the Council also added *A List of Plays for High School and College Production*, and at its founding meeting, established a drama committee (Applebee 62). NCTE fully supported the exploration of new and creative approaches to teaching Shakespeare from its earliest years in the pages of its *English Journal*.

“Look Here Upon This Picture”: Using Art in the Teaching of Shakespeare

Several early *English Journal* contributors expressed interest in how teachers could incorporate art and visual imagery into their teaching. Rolfe had included a limited number of pictures in his series of school Shakespeare texts, and some of the later readers had also included a limited number of pictures to accompany their Shakespeare selections. Illustrated editions of Shakespeare were not new. Even as early as 1709, Nicolas Rowe had included illustrations of Shakespeare. In the nineteenth century, a number of illustrated editions were produced, most notably the *Pictorial Edition* edited by Charles Knight beginning in 1838, which included hundreds of black and white wood engravings. In the early twentieth century, though, the number of illustrated volumes of Shakespeare increased significantly. Many of these were soon discovered by English teachers and integrated into classroom instruction.
Cornelia Carhart Ward was one early advocate for the use of pictures in the teaching of English in articles for the *English Journal* between 1914 and 1920. Specifically addressing the use of art in teaching literature, she comments that there were few using pictures in the classroom – she noted that that she had “found no other teacher who uses this help [pictures] as much as I have and few who use it at all” – but Ward was eager to share her successes and suggest strategies that others could implement (“Use of Pictures” 526). She praised the emerging illustrated editions and the “popular artist [who] lends his skill to the interpretation of some classic hitherto left to plain print (“Use of Pictures” 527). In class, she passed illustrated editions around for student perusal, and when these were not available, postcards collected from her travels, or a magazine she had saved. She reports that pictures made literature more engaging, “characters … become living people, and the scenes have been visualized by pupils who have never been outside their own city or county (“Use of Pictures” 528). She illustrates with an example of a number of girls who on “a recent examination,” incorrectly ascribed the setting of “the scene of Macbeth’s first meeting with the witches” to be in a “wood”; she remained “unable to account for the mistake until one of the teachers remembered that a company which produced *Macbeth* … represented a wood on the stage in that scene,” of which Ward had shown her students a picture (529). Though in this case the image steered her students from her
desired outcome, Ward is nonetheless compelled to praise the power that a single image had to instill “a vital and lasting impression” (528-29).

Ward’s ideas were popular enough that she was permitted space two months later for a second installment in what would become a series that advocated for and provided lists of picture resources useful in teaching literature. She writes in the second of these, “So many requests have come for more definite information about pictures available for use … that the editor … has given space to a list of publishers of prints and other lists for individual books” (“Pictures for the Use” 671). Each of her first two articles included a number of possible picture resources teachers could use, and in 1916, and again in 1917, Ward compiled two additional lists, with a number of suggestions related to the teaching of Shakespeare, available to teachers and schools.

Ward’s ideas remained popular in the pages of *English Journal* in the following decade, as well, when in 1922 and 1923, the *English Journal* ran a six-article series by Jane Anderson Hilson and Katherine E. Wheeling titled “Illustrative Material for High-School Literature.” Theirs was a self-conscious update to Ward’s work:

… The materials previously assembled have become of limited value. Some concerns have gone out of business; a few have changed hands or have been taken over by other firms; others, continuing under the same name, have discontinued supplying materials hitherto furnished. (482)
Their premise was the same as Ward’s: “a picture may bring it [literature] within the experience of the pupil or enlarge his apperceptive basis” (482).

Their purpose was to provide a compilation of resources valuable in the classroom study of literature. In their fifth and sixth installments, they listed a number of Shakespeare picture books as resources for teaching Shakespeare, some of which are included in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As You Like It</td>
<td>Hugh Thomson</td>
<td>Doran</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>William George Simmonds</td>
<td>London: Hodder &amp; Stoughton</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>Howard Chandler Christy</td>
<td>Holliday Editions (Dodd Mead)</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
<td>Variorum Edition – Furness</td>
<td>Lippincott</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth</td>
<td>Variorum Edition – Furness</td>
<td>Lippincott</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant of Venice</td>
<td>James Dromgoole Linton</td>
<td>Doran</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>Lucy Perkins</td>
<td>Stokes</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>Arthur Rackham</td>
<td>Doubleday</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>William Heath Robinson</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romeo and Juliet</td>
<td>William Hatherell</td>
<td>Hodder &amp; Stoughton, Doran</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tempest</td>
<td>Edmund Dulac</td>
<td>Hodder &amp; Stoughton</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth Night</td>
<td>William Heath Robinson</td>
<td>Hodder &amp; Stoughton</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whereas nineteenth-century illustrations had included just a handful of images, often just one for each play, and always in black and white, many of these newer editions were created specifically for young readers. Numerous, lavish illustrations adorned their pages, sometimes with text and image intertwined, the image sometimes weighing as heavily as the text. Some were even in color. Arthur Rackham, for example, in his 1908 Doubleday edition of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, re-created Shakespeare’s magical forest with dozens of depictions, some in color, of playful fairies, fumbling mechanicals, and confused nobles.
Rackham’s pictures, much like a staging of the play, imposed his own reading of Shakespeare’s script on readers, but also made the play accessible to readers and students for whom a Shakespearean play might otherwise prove either tedious or difficult. The same could be said for
other illustrators. The more plentiful the illustrations that a text provided, the more scaffolding it created for students, and while some teachers might have preferred students build their own interpretations of Shakespeare or not split their focus between language and image, for others, pictures were a valued resource potentially serving both their college- and vocational-bound students.

“Let Music Sound”: The Phonograph and the Teaching of Shakespeare

Not just pictures, but also recorded reading and music caught the attention of innovative early English Journal contributors. By the 1910s and 20s the phonograph had become popular in the United States, and English teachers were quick to take notice. A 1924 English Journal note reports that at the proceedings of the Utah Educational Association, members had celebrated the tercentenary of Shakespeare’s First Folio with musical selections from Shakespeare given on the victrola. Just as they had with the new illustrated editions of Shakespeare and would with other technologies that would emerge later in the century, English teachers explored ways to incorporate the phonograph into their teaching, as evidenced through a number of English Journal articles and notes. Likewise the Victor Record Company, the premiere record publisher in the early twentieth century, produced many recordings of famous passages from a number of literary works to meet an emerging educational market, including dozens of Shakespearean audio recordings and songs from and inspired by his plays. These were often even
advertised in the pages of *English Journal*, as shown in the three figures that follow.

Both are Sothern and Marlowe

When you hear the Sothern-Marlowe Victor Records you hear the true expression of the art that has enthralled America and England, precisely as they have given it to thousands of their delighted audiences. Incomparable Victor recordings now make that mastery of art the world’s heritage forever. The Edwin Booths and Coquelins are new mere traditions. The work of these great artists of to-day will always,—matchless models of interpretation for Teachers and Students of English Literature, the Drama, and Elocution; Shakespeare and Literary Clubs; Lawyers, Judges and all persons interested in the Cultural Arts.

Sothern and Marlowe Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>List Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romeo and Juliet—Balcony Scene—Part I</td>
<td>74662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romeo and Juliet—Balcony Scene—Part II</td>
<td>74663 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Merchant of Venice—(1) Shylock’s Speech</td>
<td>74673 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Caesar—Antony’s Oration—Part I</td>
<td>74699 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Caesar—Antony’s Oration—Part II</td>
<td>74700 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As You Like It—The Seven Ages of Man</td>
<td>74701 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet—Hamlet’s Soliloquy</td>
<td>74702 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet—Hamlet’s Speech to the Players</td>
<td>74703 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Caesar—Brutus and Portia</td>
<td>74706 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth Night—The Duke and Viola</td>
<td>74707 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant of Venice—The Casket Scene</td>
<td>74708 1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you a copy of "The Victrola in Correlation with English and American Literature"? If not, you should have one, for it is yours for the asking.

For further information, consult any dealer in Victor products, or

Educational Department

Victor Talking Machine Co.
Camden, New Jersey

Figure 8: A February 1922 *English Journal* advertisement for the Victor Talking Machine Co. A similar advertisement appeared in the December 1921 *English Journal*, but with fewer selections listed.
Will you begin your school year with your English lessons vitalized

Through use of the Victrola and incomparable Victor Records in your classroom?

"I know that thousands of teachers of English literature would not be without Victor Records if they but knew the rich storehouse of helpful material available," a teacher of English recently remarked.

We want you to know of it. Here is a meagre but suggestive hint of invaluable Victrola helps for your classroom. Additional lists under the authors indicated and others will be given in the October number of this magazine. Watch for them!

Browning, Robert
Ah, Love, But a Day 35693
Year's at the Spring 64427
Burns, Robert
Bonnie Wee Thing 64321
Red, Red Rose 16961
Sota, Wha'奈"  
Dickens, Charles
Copperfield 35616  
Squeers, the Schoolmaster 45067  
Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth
Bridge, The 16217
The A Psalm of Life 18181
Village Blacksmith, The 18181
Field, Eugene
Little Boy Blue 64605
SugarPlum Tree, The 16590
Wynken, Blynken and Nod 88056
Milton, John
Masque of Comus 35549
Il Pensieroso 35623
Sweet Bird 88056
Jonson, Ben
Drink to Me Only As You 45114
Have you Seen Bot a 17723, 74701
Whyte Lillie Grow 17723, 74701
Shakespeare, William
Merchant 74673, 74705
of Venice 85060, 44194
Kipling, Rudyard
Dunce Deck On the Road to 35476
Mombasa Rolling Down to Rio 64151
Tennyson, Alfred
Brook, The 64324
Idylls of the King 18145
Sweet is True Love 88056

All these, and hundreds of others, interpreted by the world's greatest artists will stimulate your English work if you have a Victrola in your classroom. Don't forget our booklet, "The Victrola in Correlation with English and American Literature" is yours for the asking.

For further information, consult any dealer in Victor products, or write

Educational Department
Victor Talking Machine Co.
Camden, New Jersey

Figure 9: A July 1922 English Journal advertisement for the Victor Talking Machine Co. A similar advertisement appeared in the February 1922 English Journal, but with fewer selections listed.
If Shakespeare were to come to life to-day

he doubtless would marvel at the wonderful interpretative powers of modern artists as immortalized in

Victor Records
from his works!

Shakespeare becomes alive, vital, and real with a Victrola in the English classroom.

Reproduced above is a page from “The Victrola in Correlation with English and American Literature,” which lists over 500 Victor records useful in English classes, including many from Shakespeare. Secure a FREE copy from your nearest dealer in Victor products or write

Educational Department
Victor Talking Machine Company
Camden, New Jersey

Figure 10: A February 1923 English Journal advertisement for the Victor Talking Machine Company.
Their rhetoric suggests the response of the commercial educational market to the innovative ideas presented by early *English Journal* contributors.

The first contribution to *English Journal* to mention the use of music in the teaching of Shakespeare was written in 1913 by Helen O’Lemert. She describes a complete performance given at her school of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* given with Mendelssohn’s musical rendition of the play (388). Two years later Isabel Graves adds that Mendelssohn’s interpretation of Shakespeare can be just as useful in the classroom as in a school performance. In her article, “A Plan for Reading *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*,” she writes, “the pupils should have an opportunity to hear Mendelssohn’s translation into music of some of the feeling and atmosphere of the *Dream*” (371). Felix Mendelssohn composed his overture to his *Midsummer Night’s Dream* symphony in 1826 when he was only seventeen. It would later become one of his signature works, its “Wedding March” still today his most famous piece. If Mendelssohn could be so inspired from Shakespeare’s work, it seems reasonable that the teenage students of the first *English Journal* contributors could likewise be inspired from the cross between classical music and Shakespeare’s poetry.

By 1921, the use of music to accompany the teaching of literature and Shakespeare had become so popular that it inspired Jessie Thompson to compile a list of useful selections, complete with identifying Victor
and Columbia catalog record identification numbers. Like O’Lemert and Graves, she advocated that Shakespeare’s *Dream* should be taught alongside Mendelssohn’s music:

> The correlation of music with English literature in the high school, though a comparatively new idea, is meeting with the warm approval of many teachers. For a number of years teachers who have made use of pictures and sculpture to stimulate the interest of their pupils in literature. Now they are beginning to realize that music is an art which is even more closely related to literature …

(376)

Working from a number of general and special catalogs – *A New Graded List of Victor Records for Children in Home and School; A New Correlation* issued by Victor (depicted in Figure 10); *The Grafonola in the Class Room*, issued by Columbia; and *Literature and Music*, by Dorey and Mohler, and also issued by Columbia – Thompson outlined appropriate musical selections to accompany an entire four-year high school curriculum in literature. She included many selections from Shakespeare in her compilation, which is the basis for the table that follows. (Many of the Victor recordings she cites have recently been digitized by the Library of Congress and made available online through their National Jukebox project, complete with the scratches and idiosyncrasies unique to the phonograph, which reveal the flavor and sound that filled a number of
Shakespearean lessons early in the twentieth century. Links to these Victor recordings have been included for available selections.

Table 5: Early Twentieth-Century Victor and Columbia Shakespeare Recordings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Victor Label Number</th>
<th>Columbia Label Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As You Like It</td>
<td>The Duke’s Speech (Act II, Scene I)</td>
<td>35235</td>
<td>(4-30-1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As You Like It</td>
<td>Blow, Blow, Thou Winter Wind</td>
<td>17717</td>
<td>(12-23-1914)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As You Like It</td>
<td>It Was a Lover and His Lass</td>
<td>17634</td>
<td>(7-13-1914)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As You Like It</td>
<td>Seven Ages of Man</td>
<td>17163</td>
<td>A1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As You Like It</td>
<td>Under the Greenwood Tree</td>
<td>17623</td>
<td>(7-13-1914)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As You Like It</td>
<td>What Shall He Have Who Killed the Deer</td>
<td>17623</td>
<td>(7-13-1914)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>Airs of Ophelia</td>
<td>17717</td>
<td>(4-21-1915)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>Drinking Song</td>
<td></td>
<td>A5547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>Hamlet on Friendship</td>
<td>17115</td>
<td>(5-3-1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>Hamlet’s Soliloquy</td>
<td>16912</td>
<td>(5-2-1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
<td>The Fall of Wolsey</td>
<td>16912</td>
<td>(7-13-1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
<td>Orpheus and His Lute</td>
<td>18528</td>
<td>(3-7-1918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
<td>Antony’s Address Over the Body of Caesar</td>
<td>35216</td>
<td>(7-26-1911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
<td>Antony’s Address Over the Body of Caesar, Part II</td>
<td>35216</td>
<td>(7-13-1911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love’s Labours Lost</td>
<td>When Daisies Pied and Violets Blue</td>
<td>18528</td>
<td>(3-7-1918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth</td>
<td>Strike Upon the</td>
<td>35235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure for Measure</td>
<td>Take, Oh Take Those Lips Away</td>
<td>64252 (4-2-1912)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant of Venice</td>
<td>Mercy Speech</td>
<td>64194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant of Venice</td>
<td>Shylock’s Rebuke</td>
<td>17163 (5-2-1912)</td>
<td>A1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant of Venice</td>
<td>Tell Me Where Is Fancy Bred</td>
<td>55060 (5-10-1915)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant of Venice</td>
<td>Shylock’s Justification of Jew</td>
<td>17163</td>
<td>A1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry Wives of Windsor</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>31380 (11-2-1904)</td>
<td>35270 (6-15-1922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>I Know a Bank</td>
<td>19295 (1-15-1924)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>Intermezzo (accompanies Helen’s Quest)</td>
<td>35527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>Nocturne (After Act III)</td>
<td>35527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>Overture</td>
<td>31356</td>
<td>31819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>Over Hill, Over Dale (Fairies’ Revel)</td>
<td>17209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>Rondo Capricciosi</td>
<td>35265 (11-5-1912)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>Scherzo (Play of Elves)</td>
<td>74560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>Selection of Principal Airs</td>
<td>35238 (4-9-1912)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>Wedding March (End of Act IV)</td>
<td>55048 (6-27-1912)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>You Spotted Snakes</td>
<td>55060 (9-23-1915)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry Wives of Windsor</td>
<td>Green-Sleeves</td>
<td>17724 (1-21-1915)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Ado About Nothing</td>
<td>Sigh, No More Ladies</td>
<td>17702 (7-13-1914)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Ado About Nothing</td>
<td>Benedick’s Idea of a Wife</td>
<td>17115 (5-3-1912)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello</td>
<td>O, Willow</td>
<td>35279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The greatest argument against incorporating image and music into Shakespeare instruction is that by offering young people an interpretation of Shakespeare’s language, whether it be through music or art, is that a students’ first impression of Shakespeare is not wholly their own. It is instead a conglomeration of theirs and the artists’ who helped introduce them to Shakespeare. The Macbeth in their mind will look like the one they saw in a book. The Shylock they hear will sound like the one they heard on the phonograph. From a conservative perspective, this is problematic; the experience distances students from the written language of Shakespeare and the experience of silent reading.
For teachers in the early twentieth century, though, struggling to make Shakespeare relevant, and in a nation in which Shakespeare’s popularity was increasingly interconnected with scholarly study and less with Shakespeare as agent of popular culture, classroom tools that engendered student engagement with Shakespearean study were welcome. Compared with the organic relationship Shakespeare’s plays had had with common American culture in the previous century, the oftentimes pedantic Shakespeare that dominated school study in the twentieth would have proved lifeless to many young people. For the progressive brand of teacher writing for and reading English Journal, the use of image and music to enhance the study of Shakespeare was well received. Imagery can be tantalizing and seductive, and arguably lead to a deeper and more meaningful experience with the text for many students. Their interaction with Shakespeare is not lessened but intensified when the interaction is blended with that of an artist or composer. The student sees and hears Shakespeare not just through their own eyes and ears, but also through the sharper more detailed senses of a Rackham or a Mendelsohn. Such readings, though, founded on image and sound, in the hands of progressive teachers, could also be used to push students to answer critical questions about interpretation. What makes one interpretation more compelling than another? Is one truer to Shakespeare’s language? Comparing two competing perspectives of the
text can enrich students experience with Shakespeare in ways not possible with text alone.

“The Play’s the Thing”: Advocating for Drama in Schools

Alongside pictures and music, early contributors to *English Journal* were also experimenting with performance-based strategies for teaching Shakespeare in their classrooms. Hook notes that in its first ten volumes, there were “six [articles] on drama and dramatization”; only two topics had been addressed with more frequency: composition with twelve articles, and speaking with seven (27). NCTE had come into being at a time when perceptions of theater and drama were changing. As we have seen, through most of the nineteenth century, the sultry reputation of America’s theaters – with its prostitutes and drunken actors – had kept theatrical elements of Shakespeare out of formal schooling almost entirely. Textbook editors were careful to avoid connecting the works of Shakespeare to the theaters.

As the new century ushered in change, *English Journal* served as both recorder and impetus of incorporating dramatization into instruction. Evolving perceptions of theatergoing at the dawn of the twentieth century influenced classroom methods for teaching Shakespeare’s plays, and *English Journal* contributors were among the first teachers to take note. For example, NCTE took interest in the activities of the Drama League of America. Officially organized in Chicago in 1910, just months before the first NCTE Annual Convention, the Drama League of America published
reading lists and club study-outlines. Its members dedicated themselves to educating playgoers and supporting those plays they saw as worthy, while shunning unworthy plays and productions. Mary Grey Peck advocated for the League in the third issue of *English Journal*. She described the group as a “little reading circle of friends,” that had grown until “its activities attracted the attention of Chicago, then of other cities” (132). She remarked that, with the formation of a group like the Drama League, public perception of drama in America was changing; at the end of the nineteenth century “the public” had been “out of sorts with the stage” and had “wanted something beside amusement”; while “it did not know what it wanted ... it wanted something different from what it was getting” (130). She believed that America was searching for a new identity, one that could be found through this new breed of drama attracting a more erudite audience.

Other *English Journal* contributors also observed changing perceptions of American theater. Like Peck, J. Milnor Dorey argued that theater had attained a more respectable place in American culture than it had known previously. The Methodist church, for example, at its 1912 national conference had removed its prohibitions of theatergoing. Dorey sees this as part of a greater movement and but “one of the many signs of the times that the drama is coming into its own” (425). She suggests that alongside this resurgence of drama in popular culture, should be a “formal recognition [of the drama] in education” (425). Arguing that a “cultivation
of personality” is central to a sound education, and that “the duty of the public schools is … to develop live forceful, attractive personalities,” Dorey advocates for classes in dramatics, in which students produce a school play or two and in doing so greatly improve their character and personality (426). She argues:

If we want our pupils to be honest, let them study the part of the liar, the thief, or the hypocrite; if we want them virtuous, let them portray the evil-doer; if free from cant, sweet of manner, tolerant in judgment, and sympathetic, let them exhibit the traits of the prig, the snob, the ‘grouch,’ the pedant, the recluse, the cynic, and the miser-stingy of purse and self … Contrary to popular impression, school dramatics breeds the highest good spirit and altruism. (427)

As the public theater saw an increased demand for better plays and performances, so too did the schools see an increased call for better productions. It was not enough to do drama, but students should be doing good drama. This was the argument of Edward J. Eaton, who in a December 1912 *English Journal* contribution, argued that schools need not perform “slapstick comedy and farce” but instead use plays of high grade, such as those by Shakespeare. He concludes the argument made in earlier issues by Peck and Dorey “that dramatics have a proper and permanent place in our schools seems generally admitted now, and we may hope for decided improvement in the class of plays given by pupils”
Eaton went on to describe a successful performance of scenes from *Twelfth Night* by his students at Central High School in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Helen O'Lemert, the following year in June 1913, justified the dramatization of Shakespearean plays based on the fact that boys in the sixteenth century often acted out plays. She reasoned that “it is not likely that boy nature has changed that much in the last three or four hundred years” and that “if the boys of Shakspere's [sic] day could do the plays of Shakspere [sic] ... why should not our boys – and girls – of today do the same?” (387). Unlike Eaton, though, who had urged schools to do scenes from Shakespeare, O’Lemert suggested full plays. In the preceding ten years at East High School in Columbus, Ohio, her students had given “complete performances of *As You Like It, The Comedy of Errors, Taming of the Shrew, Twelfth Night, Love's Labour's Lost, A Midsummer Night's Dream* and also a number of non-Shakespearean plays” (388).

Thacher H. Guild, in December 1913, much like Eaton and O’Lemert, also suggests both the immense popularity of the high-school play at the beginning of the twentieth century and adds to the recurring *English Journal* theme of making certain productions “give the actors something worth doing” (637). While he concedes that Shakespeare might not be right for all schools, he also adamantly argues that “the old standbys are much more useful than is generally realized” and that

---

84 Thacher Guild, of the University of Illinois, was appointed chairman of the NCTE drama committee upon its formation. He was responsible for a number *English Journal* contributions and NCTE publications related to drama in its first decades (Applebee 62).
“Shakespeare ... cannot be carelessly counted out” (638). He specifically suggests doing full versions of _A Midsummer Night’s Dream, Merchant of Venice, As You Like It, Twelfth Night, Taming of the Shrew, The Tempest,_ and _Julius Caesar_. He adds that adapted scenes from _Henry V_ and _Much Ado About Nothing_ can also be performed successfully.

With the growing tolerance of theater, both publicly and in the schools, _English Journal_ contributors also began to recognize potential in using performance as a mode of instruction. Allan Abbott, NCTE’s fifth president, describes in a 1913 _English Journal_ contribution a course offered at Horace Mann High School founded upon the premise that “plays can never be intelligibly read without training the difficult art of visualizing them as drama – not the thing told, but the thing acted” (93). Abbott acknowledges that the theater is “the most vital thing in the life of many young people today” but that teachers who teach Shakespeare do not teach “stage Shakespeare” (94). In the course he recommends, the “drama” to be “the thing acted” and that “all discussion of plot, all analysis of character, all notice of the beauty of imagery or phrasing must relate, not to how they read, but to how they act” (94). Abbott saw a power in Shakespeare’s plays to do good for children: “The result ought to be to vitalize, for the pupils, the older plays, and to make the great power of the contemporary stage in their lives a power for good” (98). The strongest educational background would be one that included dramatics.
Walter H. Nichols, in December 1914, builds upon the essays of Guild and Abbott, agreeing, but also adamant that it was not enough just to permit the drama a place in the curriculum. Drama should hold a central place in what schools do, inside and outside of the classroom. Nichols suggests that merely “tolerating the drama ... is the best way to degrade it to a mere exhibition” (626). Nichols eloquently argues:

Drama is primitive, elemental, democratic ... and affords a channel for expression more humanly complete than any other art, for the reason that the player creates a dramatic personality ... the process is essentially creation. (627)

He concludes, calling the drama “an educational force of vital consequence” and declaring that the “drama must win for it[自我] ultimately a dignified place in the curriculum of our high schools” (630).

As these men and women argued the theoretical merits of progressive performance-based methods, other *English Journal* contributors were describing their own successful classroom applications of performance-based approaches to teaching Shakespeare. C.C. Certain reflected in a March 1915 contribution upon a *Macbeth* unit in which students held a mock trial of Banquo, indicting him for his role as co-conspirator in Duncan’s murder though eventually acquitting him of wrongdoing. Students were assigned various roles: judge, jurors, jurors,

---

85 C.C. Certain was also an active contributor to *English Journal* and NCTE. Active in the Council almost since its beginnings, he served the group as writer, perennial speaker, and also in various roles on its Board of Directors (Hook 87). In 1924, Certain became owner and editor of the *Elementary English Review*, today known as *Language Arts*, and the primary journal of the elementary branch of NCTE (Hook 87-88).
witnesses, court recorders, newspaper reporters, etc. Certain notes,

“‘Many of the children prepared for their parts in the trial much as actors prepare for parts on the stage’ (154). Afterward, students created a script inspired from their mock trial, scenes from which were later included in their 1914 commencement program.

Another teacher, Isabel Graves, in a 1915 English Journal article, lays out a plan for teaching Shakespeare’s A Midsummer Night’s Dream.

She begins by emphasizing:

First and last the teacher should be mindful [that] the great advantage of dealing with a play [is] that a play is first something to be acted rather than to be thought about or pondered ever so weightily.” (362)

She goes on to add that “boys and girls of high-school age are much concerned about what people do and how and why, and a play is created primarily to show people doing things” (362). She offers concrete strategies for the introductory scenes, centering the study upon pleasurable and meaningful oral reading built upon careful, analytical silent reading. The unit culminates with one of three performance projects: attending a professional performance, preparing a public reading of the play, or staging a school performance of the play.

Franklin T. Baker, writing in 1916, summarizes the movement in which he finds himself. He suggests that in the last “decade or two,”

---

86 Franklin Baker, of Columbia University, is as influential for his own work as for that of his graduate students and their doctoral work. In the 1930s, several of these involved
schools have “entered upon a new kind of Shaksperean [sic] study” which he calls “the dramaturgic” (306). He defines “the dramaturgic” as “the study of [Shakespeare’s] plays as drama, written to be acted” and then traces this newfound interest to three sources: (1) “the advanced studies from this point of view made by university professors of English,” (2) “the interest in various forms of dramatic activity in the schools, both for instruction and recreation,” and (3) “the large increase in popular knowledge of the theater” (306). Peck and Dorey had already acknowledged the increased acceptance of public theaters. Baker’s thinking, and the arguments of Hatfield and Gerald, suggests that teachers were searching for methods to make Shakespeare pleasurable and imaginative. Eaton, O’Lemert, Abbott, Guild, Nichols, Certain, and Graves increasingly advocated the classroom use of performance. Baker and his English Journal peers were not the only teachers embracing performance-based methods; in England, Henry Caldwell Cook – a renowned teacher from Cambridge – published The Play Way in 1917 advocating that children learn best through play and performance; an American, John Lester, would later visit England and give Cook’s methods rave reviews in a 1926 English Journal article. It was a progressive time in the field of teaching, and English Journal contributors were not only observers, but active participants in fostering change.

---

education and Shakespeare. These include the work of Edna Hays, Henry Simon, and Nila Banton Smith, all mentioned previously and included in the works cited list.
School textbooks were also in flux, and some were even developed that catered to teachers utilizing dramatization in their classrooms. The editions of both Hudson and Rolfe, in their revised forms, had remained popular and advertisements for these were even included in the *English Journal* through the 1910s and 20s. However, *English Journal* contributors by the 1920s were looking for a new style of Shakespeare text. Hatfield complains, in 1927, after seeing a performance of *Twelfth Night* that there were not textbooks that addressed dramatization available to teachers:

> For the youngsters who read these plays in school they never come alive, at least not with whole robustious [sic] Elizabethan flavor. The reason is the absence in our school and college editions of any indication of the stage business and costuming. … At least, good productions might be described and photographed… (389)

Hatfield had long been an advocate of dramatization strategies. In 1925, he had written, “Those who have given pupils half a chance with dramatization, even of Shakespeare, know how quickly the youthful enthusiasm flames” (575).

Julian W. Abernethy, in a November 1921 contribution, critiques the many annotated school texts that had first become popular in the 1870s, such as those of Hudson and Rolfe. He found the increased apparatus to be too much for his students, writing that the “barrage of
pedagogical entanglements pretty effectually cuts off the student's approach to the literature itself” and that “it is now a fair question whether the annotated edition is not a menace to the teaching of literature rather than an aid” (498). He specifically complains of Rolfe, who in his school edition had outlined a textual disagreement concerning the authorship of *Macbeth*:

An editor of *Macbeth*, in a widely used “series,” gives large space to a discussion of the unanswerable question whether the witch scenes were borrowed by Shakespeare from Middleton or by Middleton from Shakespeare. (501)

Abernathy complains of “the commercial exploitation of the annotated classic,” writing:

In reality the publisher, not the teacher, exercises the dominant influence in the classroom; the editor is acquiescent, and in the choice of editors the thrifty publisher does not overlook the advertising advantage of eminent names. (503)

The antithesis between teacher and the producers of school texts was already established early in the twentieth century with teachers criticizing publishers who they believed were vying for increased profit instead of producing school texts that best fostered student success.

Another *English Journal* contributor, L.B. Hessler, in 1928, similarly calls for a minimalistic approach to the editing of school
Shakespeare. He refutes the notation of nineteenth-century school editors like Hudson and Rolfe, arguing that only notes that are really needed should be included, with little or no biographical or textual information. He advocates instead for a text that supports dramatization activities:

I wish that future editions of Shakespeare pare notes down to a minimum, that scholarly appendices (front or back) be omitted, that biographical and other gratuitous information be eliminated, and the student be sent to the library. In place of these moss-grown conventions I respectfully suggest that the editor indicate the proper method of reading, outline some vital dramatic problems with interesting illustrations, and then get out of Shakespeare's way as rapidly as possible” (736).

Allyn and Bacon answered the call. Beginning in the late 1920s, they released their *Academy Junior Classics* Shakespeare editions, which incorporated elements of illustration, music, and dramatization in the instruction of Shakespeare. Each volume in the series featured a reduced set of notes along with several dozen theatrical photographs that detailed various stagings. Where appropriate, the texts also included musical selections which could be played in class. The series maintained the traditional biographical appendix on the life of Shakespeare, but to this added a number of progressive sections including “Elizabethan Theaters,” “Acting the Play,” and “Stage Setting.”
The texts were popular with teachers and were reviewed favorably in the *English Journal* in 1927 by Dora V. Smith. She calls the texts “especially strong in dramatic materials [otherwise] difficult to obtain” (661). She also commends the “wealth of illustration … the authors knowing well the appeal of the picture to the younger boys and girls” and its “close correlation with music” (661). She concludes, “Junior high school teachers of English cannot afford to be ignorant of the series and of the progressive editorial policy which it represents” (662). Hatfield calls the series “a good beginning in this direction” (389).

*English Journal* had from its earliest origins taken an interest in dramatization, as well as illustration and music, interests that both reflected and influenced classroom instruction and the role that Shakespeare played in the development of the field. There are limitations, though, to a study of school Shakespeare through the lens of these early *English Journal* contributions. Their ideas represent a progressive approach to education that is not necessarily a representative sample of educational thought throughout the United States. The vast majority of English teachers were not familiar with *English Journal*, and many that were did not read it regularly. Its readership grew over these early decades, but it would still be an exaggeration to suggest that its subject matter demonstrates conclusive evidence of classroom practice. Instead, its conclusions represent the progressive and experimental approaches that were being recorded and advocated in these early formative years of
English as a school subject. Their influence, though, was nonetheless far-reaching.

**Chapter Four Conclusions**

By the end of the 1920s School Shakespeare had taken a different shape than it had a century or even fifty years before. The *English Journal* provides a view of what was happening in the vanguard of secondary English classrooms as teachers in the first decades of the twentieth century engaged students with Shakespeare. Turning to innovative and progressive strategies involving illustration, music, and dramatization, *English Journal* contributors sought to address a growing educational system and serve both college-bound and non-college-bound students. The *English Journal* provided a professional outlet for the voices of leading teachers sharing approaches and experiences. The inclusion of participatory and performance-based strategies and justifications for teaching Shakespeare illustrates the learner-centered innovation of the professional pioneers who founded NCTE.
CONCLUSION

Now, in 2013, NCTE and its English Journal have entered their second century of publication. The school Shakespeare editions of Henry Norman Hudson and William Rolfe were first published nearly a hundred and fifty years ago. School readers of the nineteenth century long ago gave way to their ancestors, the modern textbook, just as the activities of nineteenth century literary societies either became imbedded into formal curriculum or vanished altogether. Many of the issues that have faced teachers historically are no longer pertinent while others still echo in the twenty-first century. For the lessons learned from these histories that remain relevant, there is much to be learned in the present from schools and teachers in the past.

There is a progression in the history presented in this dissertation, as varying forces within education – administrations, publishers, teachers, students, and others – vied for control of how and what would be taught in schools and colleges. Shakespeare first became part of the curriculum through the activity of literary societies in the nineteenth century, through the activities of students themselves. It was their interest that initially pushed Shakespeare into the university classroom. Latin and Greek had dominated the academic curriculum since colonial times in the United States and centuries before that in England. In literary societies, though, students dissatisfied with the offerings of the official curriculum met to discuss and debate literature and current issues they found relevant and forged a place on the fringes of university life for Shakespeare. University
administrations were slow to evolve, but as a new generation of professors and college presidents came to power, individuals who had been active themselves in literary societies, Shakespeare made his way from the educational fringe to the mainstream. By the 1870s and 80s, Shakespeare was central to the formal curriculum, and firmly in the realm of academic culture, and his works, which earlier in the century had been the property of popular and lowbrow culture were almost exclusively the intellectual property of the university and highbrow culture.

By the first decade of the twentieth century, the university’s grip on the curriculum was even tighter than it had been even in the nineteenth century. Even though the seed for Shakespeare’s preeminence had been sowed through student activity, university administrations throughout the century determined formal curriculum, not students. By the end of the century, even at the secondary level, which of Shakespeare plays would be studied, and how, were shaped almost entirely by the university. Their entrance exams shaped secondary curriculum until teachers at the secondary level, alongside university and normal school professors interested in secondary education formed NCTE and exerted their own collective influence upon the curriculum.

Likewise, the evolution of textbooks and Shakespeare’s function in those textbooks demonstrates an evolving power dynamic. These evolved as educational needs shifted. The first textbooks, the readers of the early nineteenth century, which influenced instruction more than they were
influenced by it, barely included Shakespeare. When they did, it was exclusively as an exemplar in the study of elocution. These textbooks varied dramatically from today’s texts. Without pictures or color, their text packed tightly in painfully small fonts, the oldest of the readers prove a physically tedious task for modern readers. Their focus was on elocution and the teaching of morality.

The perception of books early in the nineteenth century, though, was also different than it is today. Though improving printing press technologies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had made books significantly more available than they had been in previous centuries, they were still expensive and difficult to obtain by modern standards. As a result, there was a reverence for books only rarely shared today in the twenty-first century. Books were a luxury, and many household libraries consisted only of a family bible, perhaps an edition of Shakespeare, and a school text such as McGuffey’s, which was often handed down from elder child to younger, and even from parent to child. Some school texts, as mentioned in Chapter Two, were passed down and actively used through three generations. The printed word could carry an almost unquestioned authority in the early nineteenth century, and there is little evidence to suggest that textbook publishers revised their works based on feedback directly from students or teachers.

As the teaching profession became increasingly professionalized over the course of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the
twentieth, teachers and former teachers gradually became part of the textbook production process. William McGuffey, in the 1830s, was a teacher before he became a reader compiler and editor. So were both Henry Hudson and William Rolfe before their 1870s Shakespeare editions. Their school editions represent their own distinct reflections on the teaching of Shakespeare based on their experiences as teachers. Both men often referred back to their classroom experience in their various commentaries on Shakespeare and education. By the middle of the century, textbooks had also grown in physical size and featured larger print. Many included pictures. Their focus had also shifted toward the literary and textual, and the purposes and style of these texts would remain popular well into the twentieth century.

By the time of *English Journal*, teachers were able to collectively critique textbooks and school Shakespeare editions. As illustrations became more lavish and the phonograph grew in popularity, early *English Journal* contributors took notice. They used illustration and recording in their classrooms and reflected on them in their writing. And as their collective voice was heard, editors took notice and began crafting school texts that catered to changing classroom needs. Teachers wanted school Shakespeare texts that reflected their increasing interest in dramatization, which became a reality in the 1920s. The *Junior Academy Series* incorporated performance photographs aimed to guide classroom
dramatization activities and move questions about stage Shakespeare into instruction.

In the twenty-first century, the balance of power between student and teacher, secondary and university, school and publisher remain in flux. Today’s educational best practices, for example, center instruction around student need and interest as professional vanguard teachers attempt to foster student-centered classrooms. These teachers allow the background, interest, and ability of their students to shape curriculum and instruction, and even the choices of students to impact what will be learned in class and how. Such teachers, though, often find themselves in conflict with a burgeoning for-profit education sector blending publishers technology companies, private corporate funded think tanks and lobbyist-driven government policy makers.

These for-profit companies in the twenty-first century, much like the university in the nineteenth, are perhaps the strongest outside force in an era of increasingly top-down standards-and-testing-driven educational reform. Through their influence, preparing students to do well on the annual state tests that they develop and market has become the primary goal in many American schools. Collective and individual student success is increasingly measured by students’ performance on these tests. Failing schools are defined by the impossible task of raising performing year after year on norm-referenced tests. Increasingly, teacher ability is also being measured by student test scores. An inherent assumption that standardized
annual high stakes state tests can accurately detail student and teacher ability drives continued dependence on these companies, much as the inherent belief in the nineteenth century that university entrance exams could successfully predict student capacity for college success. Both also were successful because of the perceived inability of teachers and schools to provide an accurate and unbiased measure of student performance.

Textbook publishers similarly vie for political control of the curriculum as they lobby, alongside the testing industry, for the standardization of education. In many states, only scripted curriculum mandated by the state, after successful lobbying by its publishers, can be used in the classroom. Textbooks today are aligned with Common Core standards adopted by the vast majority of states, and textbooks continue to exert their influence. And, significant to this dissertation, the only author specifically required by the Common Core standards is William Shakespeare.

No single dissertation could allow for a comprehensive study of the history of Shakespeare’s role in American schools or colleges. To undertake this project I necessarily decided on particular areas to focus and imposed limitations on my work. Chapter One examined only two literary societies in depth, but could be expanded with a larger sample of literary society records. An early draft of Chapter Two weighed in at over a hundred pages before it was cut back, but a larger project encompassing a wider selection of school readers could provide material for an entire
book. Chapter Three extends the conversation of the textbooks in its discussion of the school Shakespeare editions of Hudson and Rolfe, but leaves questions as to what happened with Shakespeare in the decades that followed and through the twentieth century. Chapter four mentions the *Junior Academy Series*, but leaves questions about competing series. What else was happening in the 1920s and 30s, and for that matter, the past hundred years with Shakespeare in textbooks? Chapter Four also provides an analysis of the doings of *English Journal* in its first two decades, but a study of NCTE’s involvement over the next decades through to the present would provide a fascinating continuation.

At this point, I see the dissertation providing the framework for three longer book-length studies and a number of shorter article-length projects that I intend to pursue over the next years. First, Chapter One will be expanded to more comprehensively explore the records of a number of literary societies. The study of literary society records can be tedious, and, as I have discovered, whole days and weeks can be spent in archives with little or no results. With that said, though, this research also sometimes yields a fascinating glimpse into a little understood aspect of educational history. The larger project in the future will examine a more representative sampling of literary societies from the North, South, and West, and also include a wider range of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Chapter One neglects the literary societies of the South, and also any sampling from the early decades of the nineteenth century, a time that was likely
influential in determining Shakespeare’s place in formal curriculum later in the century.

The second larger project that will derive from the dissertation will extend the study of Shakespeare’s role in school texts from chapters two and three. Shakespeare’s prominence in the American curriculum was already being questioned in early decades of the twentieth century, but he nonetheless remained central to the canon at both the secondary and university levels. I am intrigued by texts like the *Junior Academy Classics* and their role in affecting Shakespeare instruction, and also how they serve as a reflection of what was happening in American classrooms. Twentieth-century texts, more rigorously reviewed than nineteenth, may offer a more conclusive understanding of twentieth-century instruction than their nineteenth-century counterparts.

The third potential project deriving from this dissertation involves extending the study of *English Journal* in chapter four into a chapter- or article-length study that extends over a longer period of the periodical’s history. My current study demonstrates the vitality of early contributors and their innovative approaches to Shakespeare specifically and literature more generally. Toward the end of the 1920s, these types of articles decrease in frequency. A study of *English Journal* that extends through the 1930s and 40s, as Formalism and New Criticism develop and take hold in schools, might reveal continued declining interest in the use of illustration, recording, and dramatization in the teaching of Shakespeare. On the other
hand, they might reveal a link through these decades to interest in
performance-based teaching approaches that emerged in the 1970s and
gradually gained momentum in educational research through the 1980s
and 1990s and have become popular today. A study that formally traced
this progression through to the articles that appeared in special editions
dedicated to the teaching of Shakespeare in 2002 and 2009 would provide
new perspectives on the teaching of Shakespeare in the twentieth century
through the lens of *English Journal*.

A fourth potential project deriving from this study involves a study
of how emerging technologies have re-shaped Shakespeare instruction in
the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Technologies early in the
twentieth century, including advanced printing techniques allowing for
visual implementations and recording technologies that brought voice and
music recordings in the classroom, continued throughout the twentieth
century. Advancements in film and video later in the century brought
professional performance into the classroom. With the advent of
computers and the internet, whole new innovative methods became
possible. For example, I was recently part of a project at Western
Michigan University, together with a number of professors and students,
called *Literary Worlds* that created a series of virtual spaces for exploring
literary works, including a number inspired from Shakespeare. The project
was featured in 2011 in *Teaching Literature in Virtual Worlds: Immersive
Learning in English Studies*. A future project surveying the use of
technology in the teaching of Shakespeare, rooted in the work initiated in Chapter Four, would provide a resource and lens for understanding the rich historical progression of the teaching of Shakespeare as emerging technologies evolved.

A fifth potential project would more deeply examine the role that imagery has played and continues to play in Shakespeare instruction. Chapter Four addresses the introduction of children’s Shakespeare picture books, such as those illustrated by Rackham and Robinson. Art and image can play a fundamental role in instruction. Most currently, I am working on a brief article for *Language Arts Journal of Michigan* (LAJM) analyzing strategies for using graphic novel adaptations of Shakespeare in classrooms. As a secondary teacher, these resources engaged my secondary students in Shakespeare in powerful ways. A project building on the work started in Chapter Four on illustration would prove another, possibly book-length, project that may derive from the dissertation.

There is often much assumed in any era about those who preceded in a particular field, and the same can be said of English. Anecdotally, I can attest to a general belief among many of today’s teachers that the strategies and classroom practices through much of the twentieth century to be generally uninspiring. I believe, though, that such assumptions are a myth that should be dispelled through careful analysis of what teachers of the past were actually doing and thinking.
The process of writing this dissertation has at times left me exhausted and befuddled. The writing of any history is a selective process, often driven by availability of materials, or the lack thereof. Historical scholarship is the attempt to put together a picture puzzle, and attain a meaningful understanding of that picture, often when many, perhaps the majority of the pieces have been lost and voices silenced. It is also a process in which the historian can become lost in those details. I found myself many times spending hours searching for a digital copy of an earlier reader volume in hopes of filling out a footnote that would eventually be discarded from the text anyway – I saved well over a hundred pages of text that had been edited from the dissertation, likely never to be used in any meaningful way – or poring over the handwritten marginalia in a digital school text edition, lost in trying to recreate the thoughts of some reader as they had read from its original print edition over a century ago. What were they thinking? How was Shakespeare’s text meaningful to them in the moment in which they had scratched out a comment in the margins? The search for these pieces, often questions that can never fully be answered, takes on an obsessive quality. As I come to the end of this phase of the project, I find myself not at all at a conclusion, but only at yet another beginning. And while I have uncovered some interesting answers to a handful of the questions I originally posed, I have more questions today about Shakespeare’s place in education than I had when I started.
APPENDICES

A: Shakespeare Readings Given by Harvard’s Speaking Club, 1770 - 1790.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Passage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 21, 1770</td>
<td>Samuel Henshaw</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>“Hamlet on Death”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 10, 1770</td>
<td>Name Not listed</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>“The Quarrel of Cassius and Brutus”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 1771</td>
<td>Sanger John Warren</td>
<td>Othello</td>
<td>“Dialogue between Iago and Othello”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 1771</td>
<td>Brutus</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>“To oppose Caesar’s Power (Shaks.)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 3, 1771</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>“The Speech of Junius Brutus, occasion’d by the Suicide of Lucretia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 3, 1771</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Macbeth</td>
<td>“The Soliloquy of Macbeth”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 9, 1771</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>“Hamlet Soliloquy on the Death of his Uncle”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 1772</td>
<td>Clark Crocker</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“A Dialogue from Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 13, 1772</td>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>“The Speech of Junius Brutus in Brutus in behalf of Lucretia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13, 1773</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>Hamlet’s Soliloquy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Actor</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 30, 1773</td>
<td>Ames Eliot</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>A Dialogue from Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12, 1774</td>
<td>Ebenezer Battle Ripley</td>
<td>Othello</td>
<td>“A dialogue between Iago and Authello” [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 5, 1774</td>
<td>Senall</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>“Hamlet’s Soliloquy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 13, 1774</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>Coriolanus</td>
<td>“Devies Speech against Coriolanus”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 1775</td>
<td>Name not listed</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>“The Quarrel of Cassius and Brutus”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 1777</td>
<td>Delaney John Prince</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>“The Quarrel of Brutus and Cassius”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 1778</td>
<td>Dudley Atkins</td>
<td>Henry V</td>
<td>“Speech of Henry 5th before a battle”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4, 1778</td>
<td>Dudley Atkins</td>
<td>Henry V</td>
<td>“Speech of Henry 5th”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10, 1778</td>
<td>Edward Wendell</td>
<td>Henry V</td>
<td>“Speech of Cardinal Wolsey”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 1778</td>
<td>Edward Wendell</td>
<td>Henry IV</td>
<td>“Speech of Henry 4th”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7, 1780</td>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>Henry IV</td>
<td>“Speech of Henry 4th”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 15, 1780</td>
<td>Tobias Lear Prescott</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Scene from Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 22, 1780</td>
<td>Tobias Lear Prescott</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>“Scene Shakespeare’s Caesar”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 29, 1780</td>
<td>Prescott Alpheus Moore</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Scene from Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1, 1780</td>
<td>Thing Prescott</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Scene from Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Performer</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1, 1780</td>
<td>Packard Snow</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Scene from Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 19, 1781</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Scene from Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alpheus Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22, 1781</td>
<td>Joseph Bond</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“From Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22, 1781</td>
<td>Lear</td>
<td>Henry V</td>
<td>“A Speech of King Henry 5th”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 8, 1781</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Do from Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 8, 1781</td>
<td>Burr Babbie</td>
<td>Othello</td>
<td>“Dialogue between Iago and Othello”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30, 1782</td>
<td>Pynchion</td>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
<td>“The speech of Mark Antony”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 13, 1782</td>
<td>singly</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>“Hamlet Soliloquy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 6, 1782</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2, 1783</td>
<td>Thomas Crafts</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 27, 1783</td>
<td>John Fleet</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Soliloquy on Death”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 1784</td>
<td>Samuel Gardiner</td>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
<td>“Tragedy of Julius Caesar”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 8, 1784</td>
<td>John Andrews</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“King England’s Soliloquy”*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3, 1784</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Richard II</td>
<td>“Bolingbroke’s Defence”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17, 1784</td>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td>Richard II or Henry IV</td>
<td>“Speech of Bolingbroke”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 15, 1784</td>
<td>Draught Harris</td>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
<td>“Dialogue of Julius Caesar”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 30, 1784</td>
<td>Abiel or</td>
<td>Pericles</td>
<td>“Pericles to his”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Performer</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>Passage Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 1785</td>
<td>Thomas Thompson</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>“Hamlet’s soliloquy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9, 1785</td>
<td>Joseph Blake</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1, 1785</td>
<td>Hirke</td>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
<td>“Brutus’ Speech on the Death of Caesar”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 1786</td>
<td>Leonard White</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 1786</td>
<td>Oliver Barron</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 13, 1787</td>
<td>Cushing Otis (?)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 13, 1787</td>
<td>Thomas W. Hooper</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 6, 1787</td>
<td>Otis</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22, 1788</td>
<td>Cutts</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 6, 1788</td>
<td>Roger Vofe</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 3, 1789</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1, 1789</td>
<td>Hawley</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct - Dec, 1789**</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>“Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 7, 1790</td>
<td>John Popkin</td>
<td>Richard II or Henry IV</td>
<td>“Henry 4th to his followers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11, 1790</td>
<td>John Appleton, Jr.</td>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
<td>“Brutus’s speech Shakespeare”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*May or may not refer to a Shakespearean passage*
** The record does not make the date clear, but the entry falls after Oct 15 but before Dec 10, 1789, meaning that passage was read between these dates.

B: Excerpt from HPC Class of 1853 Farewell Address (written by RP Rantoral and spoken by Mr. Dutton)

Tis the sad theme of poet and of sage
“Reform the drama: reassert the stage.”
It groans in essays, and it sighs in verse
But yet the stage is growing worse and worse.
“Away!” they cry, “the tinsels and the glow.
“Of empty pomp – of gold-beleaguered show!
“Restore the simple of Shakespeare’s age
“And drive the painted harlot from the stage!”
No groundlings here shall feel the guilty glow
Of such as revel in their seats below.
As well-turned ankles and voluptuous legs,
Then lifted skirts display our sinewy pegs.
No charmer’s here – by courtesy a maid.
To flaunt in lace and flutter in brocade,
...
But all is simple as in Shakespeare’s day.
Save carpets on our boards instead of hay, –
As plain as Hamlet’s, which was just the thing,
Wherein to catch the conscience of the king.
Macbeth shall here in cotton ermine clad
Strut his full hour, unconscious of his plaid,
His lady constant to his “curtained” bed
True at the heart, though false her curly head,
...
The Hasty Pudding Club shall stand secure!
To us, the scenes must wear a different phase.
How brief and waning are our college days!
How soon we scatter from this peaceful field!
The warmest hand we press may soon be cold
(Prompter’s whistle).
But Lark! Methought I heard the prompter’s call;
To o’er the future, let the curtain fall!
(Slow curtain.)

“Friday October 20th, 1854

Macbeth and “Who Stole the Pocket Book.”87

When night shut out the landscape, with its pall,
Beneath the towers high and granite wall
Of that fair shrine, receptacle of love,
Which Senior, Junior, Fresh and Sophomore;
Professors, Tutors, “Scientifics,” all,
With bloody fancy, name the hall of lore,
I stood upon the grating gravel path.

Then, through the dark and church-like window frame,
I saw a ghostly light, a fitful flame,
That played upon the glass with doubtful ray;
All like the moon by night; the sun by day.
Then came a shadow on a lighted pane;
It was a hand! – I stood in sore dismay;
And thought I heard the sound of goblin laugh.

87The HPC oftentimes did two or more performances in a single evening. They paired the 1854 performance of Macbeth with Who Stole the Pocket Book.
It is perchance, I though in sure affright,
A vicious demon, or the troubled sprite
Of some poor wretch, who erst his life had lost,
By broken neck, in Pudding blanket tossed.
And now he wanders through the dreary night;
‘Midst summer’s heat and winter’s chilling frost,
And cries for vengeance on those cruel men.

Or yet perhaps, it is the spectre wan
Of some poor wight, who was Librarian,
And who, in sheer despair went off the hooks,
Because the wicked students stole the books.
And so, the spirit sighs and melancholy looks,
Revisits thus the classic hall again.

As these swift flying thoughts sped through my mind,
The ghostly hand drew back the inner blind,
Then lifted high window broad and long;
Then stood there on the sill a spirit form –
A leathern coat, with marbled paper lined,
And fortified with pastelboard thick and strong,
Stood off from this thin body, straight and square.
This narrow waistcoat, and his ruffle too,
Did shine with gold, most beautiful to view:
And on his back I saw the gilded name
Of one who soared upon the Wings of Fame;
A favoured lover did the Muses woo,
And left a glory, which may never wane –
‘Twas Shakespear’s (sic) paper ghost; a quarto fair

To me these words the spectre did address;
“Alas! for those bright days of good queen Bess.”
“When all the Court, to please their royal lead,”
“Did hide their raven locks with wigs of red;”
“While nobles praised the royal loveliness,”
And had a wholesome and becoming dread”
Of regal Majesty, and gilded throne.”

“Oh for the glory of those brilliant days!”
“When even monarchs rushed to see my plays”
“When in the aisle an Earl was glad to sit,”
“And Dukes and Barons filled the crowded pit.”
“When England’s greatest minds were wont to praise:
“Proud Hamlet’s moody grief; great Falstaff’s wit;”
“And weep, for sympathy with Juliet’s moan.”
“Where, in this age of histrionic dearth,”
“Throughout the length and breadth of English earth,”
“Are my great dramas cherished, once so famed?”
“Now wretched farces, scarcely to be named”
“As plays at all; but such as rouse the mirth”
“Of country bumpkins, who, with looks uncharmed”
“By stupid wonderment, do sit and stare.”

“Good ghost,” I cried, “you make a great mistake,”
“Come down to me my friend; your shelf forsake,”
“And if, before the morning’s first dim light,”
“I show you not a play that’s played aright;”
“To you a fitting present will I make”
“Of new morocco binding, gilded bright”
“The best that wise John Bartlett\(^{88}\) may prepare.”

Scare had I spoken, when, with sudden bound,
Down came the spirit on the grassy ground;
And, as I get me towards the Pudding room,
I saw him, through the silent, doubtful gloom,
Flying, with open leaves and rustling sound,
Among the trees, on which the gentle moon

\(^{88}\) John Bartlett (1820-1905) was a well-known New England writer and publisher.
Looks with her round and ever smiling face.

Sailing through the open door, the agile elf,
With nimble quickness, jumped upon a shelf;
And there, beside Ben Jonson, gazed serene
Upon the gorgeous hills and curtain green.
And ever and anon he rocked himself,
And threw about his legs; while smile did beam,
And followed, one by one, in merry chase.

Ring-dingle-ding; so went the prompter's bell,
And Shakespeare laughed to hear that oft’ rung knell.
Up went the rag, each Brother held his breath,
Waiting on the entry of the fierce Macbeth.
They watch his tragic stride; they mark him well,
Seeking, with single sword; a monarch’s death;
And striving ‘gainst Macduff with boxing glove.

They see fierce goody Barlow; Hosmer too,
And Ellis, cooking a collegiate stew,
Of Tutor’s ears, and wise Professor’s nose
Of Proctor’s fingers, and of Parson’s toes;
While rings the demon laugh, and wild billow.
Brightly the fire, 'neath the cauldron, glows,
And bats and howlets flap their wings above.

The see the downfall of the savage Thane,
When Birnham wood come to Dunsinane,
Chopped by the axe, divided by the saw,
And “dumped” outside the blood-stained castle door.
The see Macbeth now strive to stop, in vain,
The straight “left-hander,” which assails his jaw,
And drops him lifeless, on his kindred ground.

And, as the curtain fell upon the end,
I turned to see how fared my spirit friend:
Upon the self same shelf on high he sat,
Flapping his covers, waving round his hat.
“Tis well,” he cried, “in peace my way I wend;”
“Ne’er will I call your modern drama flat.”
Then out of window sprung, with agile bound.

T. Lyman. Sec.

D: The Hasty Pudding Club Hamlet Song

A hero’s life I sing,
His story shall my pen mark.
He was not the king
But Hamlet, Prince of Denmark
His mamma was young.
The crown she had her eyes on
Her husband stop’d her tongue,
She stopped his ears with poison.
Fooral, Jooral, Jay, ti rol rumpti, udy
Tweedle deedle eh! ri, fol, nimpli doodle!

When she had killed the king
She ogled much his brother
And having slain one spouse
She quickly got another
And this so soon did she
And was so great a sinner
The funeral baked meats
Served for the wedding dinner.
Fooral looral Jay &c

Now Hamlet sweet her son
No bully or bravado
Of love felt hot the flame
And so went to Bernardo
“O sir” says one, “we’ve seen
A sight with monstrous sad eye
And this was nothing but –
The ghost of Hamlet’s daddy.
Fooral looral Jay &c

Just at that time it rose
And sighing said “List Hammy”
Your mother is the snake
That poisoned me, oh damme!
And not I’m gone below
All over sulphurous flame, boy!
That your dad should be on fire,
You’ll own’s a fuming shame, boy.
Fooral looral Jay &c

Just at that time he spoke
The morn was breaking thro’ dell
Up jumped a cock, and cried
Cock-a-doodle, doodle!
“I’m now cocksure of going,
Preserve you from all evil
You to your mother walk
And I’ll walk to the devil.
Fooral looral Jay &c

Hamlet loved a maid
Calumny had passed her
She never had played hicks
‘Cause – nobody had asked her
Madness seized her wits
Poor Lord Chamberlain’s daughter
She jumped into a pond,
And went to heaven by water.
Fooral looral Jay &c

No matter now for that,
A play they made and shammed it,
The audience Claudius was
And he got up and damned it.
He vowed he’d see no more,
He felt a wond’rous dizz’ness,
And then for candles called
To **make light** of the business.

Fooral looral Jay &c

A fencing matter had they

The queen drinks as they hy loo

Says she, “O king, I’m killed.”

Says Laertes, “So am I too.”

“And so am I,” cries Ham

“What can all these thing here be?”

What are you dead?” says the king.

“Yes sir, and so shall you be.”

Fooral looral Jay &c

So then he stabbed his liege,

Then fell on Ophy’s brother,

And so the Danish court

All tumbled on one th’other.

To celebrate these deeds.

Which are from no false shamlet

Every village small

Henceforth was called a **hamlet**.

Fooral looral Jay &c

Of all the many poets that have existed in this world, Shakespeare is the most general. By this I mean that the characters found in his plays are, and have been, existing, in every race and clime of the civilized world. Aye, and so deeply and clearly did the poet read human nature, that we may find many of his characters in every nation and tongue.

Some of the students of human nature have, indeed, reached far out into the common mass of mind and brought in a few of the numerous characters who are always to be found. But Shakespeare seems to have gathered the whole world in one mighty sweep and placed it before us for every one’s individual use: for in him we find the prattling child as well as the wisest philosopher; the timorous as well as the brave; the peasant as the king; and the virtuous as well as the villainous.

So to obtain something of an idea of the manner in which this poet’s great mind was enabled to comprehend the souls of those about him, we may consider him as raised above the common level and from his eminence viewing the characters of those below him. It may not be impossible for someone to behold what he saw, but no one can ever see more, since within the range of this poet’s eye all men seem to have
appeared. Thus we behold Shakespeare in his true position as regards his fellow men.

Since order and arrangement are the primary elements in the great mind, our poet has consequently, grouped men into various classes. This done, he then has arranged them in his plays for the common inspection of all. But now the question arises: how was he able to do justice to these classes? He has simply made a Comprehensive Dictionary of Human Nature. In other words, he has given us a sort of Mythology. And as Jupiter, Minerva, Apollo, and the Muses were personification of Supreme Power, Wisdom, Music, and Poetry, so each of Shakespeare’s marked characters is but a representation of a class of men similar to itself. Hence we may justly name his works either “A Dictionary”, “A Mythology,” or “The Exponent of Human Nature” or “The Mirror of All Faces.”

Our theme leads us to the contemplation of the characters in the play of Macbeth. We now would naturally look first to the peculiarities of the personages here represented, and then back upon the pages of history and see whose image we have been viewing. But time will permit us to give only a passing glance at the characters in the play. In the person of Macbeth we have a character not infrequently met in history and whose general description [sic] will apply to many: During early life a soldier, who by his skill and bravery brings himself into the notice of the king, is promoted, and continues to acquire high honors, day by day, until he is second only to his majesty. But becoming fired by an unnatural ambition
he is led to contemplate the horrid assassination of his best earthly friend, to whom he owes all that he has ever had, that he now possesses, and all that he may reasonably expect to obtain. But alas! for depraved nature he is urged on by the Diivil [sic], now in woman form, and finally commits his first cruel murder from which, however, he does not escape without many a sting of a troublesome conscience. At length upon the throne, he must remove every obstacle to the quiet possession of his prize. A Banquo, his equal in arms, very naturally, presents himself as one who might justly claim equal honors. He is, accordingly, soon dispatched. Then follows a long train of evil forebodings, remorse of conscience, and every thing which tends to render the guilty wretch still more miserable [sic].

Our first impression of Macbeth’s character is his favor. He is spoken of as a brave warrior – fearless in the fight. And hence, since a majority of the great men of the past have been soldiers, we expect, when we hear of their daring, to find in them men of true nobleness of character. Hence in the case of Macbeth our sympathies are so strongly enlisted for him that when at length we learn that his was but little more than brute courage, our past regard cannot be entirely forgotten.

In the ghost of Banquo which appeared to Macbeth we have another proof, among the many which shows how wonderfully correct was Shakspere’s [sic] knowledge of human nature. Some critics consider the poet censurable [sic] for founding his play upon the predictions of the Weird Sisters. But when we consider the superstitiousness of the people in
the poet’s day, we find no cause for censure. But whatever we might think in relation to the witches, we are far from criticizing the introduction of the ghost. Indeed, I consider it as one of the finest or rather the most natural creations of the play. There is every reason to believe that ghosts of Banquos are not confined to the age of Shakspere [sic], but that as often as there have been Macbeths just so often have there been Banquos and Banquos’ ghosts.

The mind of man is a wonderful mechanism. Our world has not yet existed long enough to unravel its many mysteries. But because we cannot measure the distances between the fixed stars, is no reason why we may not between the planets of our own solar system. In the case before us we are at liberty to behold the main agents which acted upon Macbeth’s mind and see the effects produced by those agents upon his actions and whole being. By way of illustration it may be well to cite a few examples showing forth in some degree the remarkable power which the mind has over our senses and indeed over our whole being. We have only to think in our minds that some one of our senses takes cognizance of a certain sound, smell, or what ever it may be, to have that sensation actually produced. We all know how common it is for us, when waiting for some familiar footstep to be exceedingly confident that we heard the one approach, when upon observation no one has been at the door. Many instances could be brought forth to show the influence of the mind over the body but two must suffice. A man was foaming amid all the agonies of hydraphobia,
occasioned by the bite of a supposed mad dog. At length it was ascertained that the dog was not, and never had been, mad; whereupon the animal was shown to the insane person causing his immediate recovery. The other incident occurred at Paris, and as taken from Medical Works, is reliable. In the early part of this century the physicians of Paris petitioned the government to permit them to experiment upon one of the prisoners who had been condemned to death. The request was granted. Their victim was first tightly blindfolded and his arm laid bare, having been securely bound and other arrangements made, he was informed that it had been determined that he should be bled to death instead of being executed, as was customary, and that it would require but half an hour’s flow of blood for death to ensue. This announcement was received very calmly by the prisoner who had been expecting his doom on that day. His arm was then suddenly cut by the lancet, but not so as to draw blood, and at the same instant a stream of water, blood warm, was poured upon the wound. The stream was not allowed to vary either in warmth or in rapidity. After the feigned bleeding had been going on for five minutes, the prisoner is told that there are but twenty-five minutes left for him to live, and that even now his countenance has assumed a somewhat paler hue. At intervals of five minutes each, he is continually informed as to the space of time left, increasing pallor of his countenance, the strength of his pulse, and the amount of blood discharged up to the present moment. The victim occasionally [sic] speaks of his faintness and growing weakness, verily
believing in the truth of the affair and feeling what he says. Presently, when about half the time has expired, the prisoner’s countenance is actually changing to a deathly hue, a circumstance about which the physicians are not, of course, slow to enlighten him. We cannot ascribe this change to fright, for the prisoner at first talked familiarly as anyone so near death could be expected to; and it is not till he has become too faint to speak that he ceases from occasional [sic] conversation. At last when only five minutes are left for the poor man, his pulse which has been growing feebler and feebler, has now almost entirely ceased to beat, and the color of his countenance has become that of a deathly hue. And now the physician, with his eye on his watch, and finger on the sinking man’s pulse, slowly counts out the few remaining minutes, and with each as they passed, the pulse grows fainter and fainter, and is scarcely perceptible, even to the physician’s touch, until at length, as the last moment comes, the heart of they dying man ceases for ever to beat. Thus this man died without injury or fright. If then these persons, in the possession of their right minds, should have such an influence over their senses, and even the very existence of life, why marvel we then, when we behold the apparition of a murdered man appear before the eyes of one whose mind is driven about by constant fears and is continually stung by a conscience that will never cease its knockings?

We will now briefly consider the character of Banquo. By nature he was much similar to Macbeth. Both were high in rank – next to the
king. Both seemed equally ambitious. Banquo might well have uttered, with Macbeth, the words: “If fortunes wishes to exalt me – why she may make me without my stir!” That Banquo was unacquainted with human nature is evident from his great confidence in the faithfulness of others. Had he been provident he would have known better than to have remained under Macbeth’s dominion, since he must have been aware that his claims to the throne were nearly, if not equally as valid as those presented by Macbeth. It is not until sad experience teaches the good and unsuspecting man, that he believes that all men are not faithful. This lesson came too late for Banquo. It is always the deceiver who is first to suspect the treachery of others. Hence when Macbeth comes upon the throne by foul means, he fears being deposed in a similar manner. The great difference between these two men was owing to external agencies. Had there been a Lady Banquo of a nature similar to Lady Macbeth, we should have had in Banquo another Macbeth. But two Macb eths cannot exist in one kingdom, hence in the wisdom of the poet we see no Lady Banquo. We now come to one of Shaksper’s [sic] boldest conceptions – Lady Macbeth. About her character there has been much discussion. Some have pictured her as a fiend incarnate; others, in defending, have rendering her almost amiable. She and her husband seemed admirably suited to be the instruments of evil spirits, for whatever propensity for evil doing he lacked, that she had, and whatever opportunities [sic] failed her those he possessed. He was too disposed to meditate; she had no trouble from that quater [sic] and was
ever ready to break up his meditations and to urge him on in their deeds of
darkness. He had to set guard upon trouble within; she upon that without.
In this last difference lay the cause of the greater difference in the end of
their lives. Woman, though inferior, if may be, to man in intellect is so
much superior to him in moral qualities that if these be destroyed, she has
lost her all, and is soon transformed into a fiend. While man, if robbed of
his most noble qualities, has yet a few redeeming traits which, strongly
enlist our sympathies. To judge of the frequency of the characters similar
to Lady Macbeth that have existed in the world, would be a difficult task:
for History has not, except in few instances, drawn aside the curtain and
allowed us to view castle halls and see there the real corridors of human
affairs. But we may be sure of one thing: that as often as we have seen a
Macbeth just so often have we seen a Lady Macbeth. By the German
critic, Schlegel, the insanity of Lady Macbeth is attributed to remorses of
conscience. We are duty bound to respect the opinion of so great a writer,
yet after careful consideration of the matter I can find no reason for
attributing that unfortunate circumstance, in her life to such a cause.
Indeed, it seems quite evident that the poet intended to represent her to us
as past the reach of the Monitor. What then was the cause of her insanity?
It was the effect of holding the mind constantly upon one subject. Her one
and continuous thought, was that her husband, would, in some manner or
other, betray their deeds of wickedness. This was her all absorbing theme
from which her mind never was released. She talked about it by day and
dreamed about it by night. From the very first she feared his “milk of human kindness,” and this was enough to give sufficient food for her anxious meditations. She has as yet seen no real cause for fearing her husband’s power to keep their secret, but when by his unnatural manner he breaks up the social gathering, she has now positive evidence of his frailty of mind in guarding against its fear. Reasoning sustaining cord, hitherto stretched to its utmost, now snaps before this tremendous pressure; and we see Lady Macbeth a raving maniac. And let us listen to what she says and mark whether or no it is her conscience that troubles her: “Out, damned spot, out I say – One, two, why ’tis time to do it – Hell is murky. Fie, my lord, fie, a soldier and afeared? What need we fear who knows it, when none can call our power to account?” She goes back in thought, to the time just before the murder of Duncan, where she had good reason to be troubled, in respect to Macbeth’s fears. Now listen again: “No more o’ that, my lord, no more o that: you mar all of this by starting,” still admonishing him to be calm. Now she seems to think, the murder just accomplished, and in anxiety about Macbeth’s demeanor says: “Wash your hands: put on your night gown: look not so pale, I tell you yet again, Banquo’s buried; he cannnot come out of his grave,” Thus we see it very evident that Lady Macbeth’s insanity was owing principally to absorption of the thought upon one subject. In other words she became a monomaniac.
I have thus given a very vague description of the principle characters that appear in Macbeth. This play, like Hamlet, is marked by a great degree of variety. The transitions of the scene from the witches’ dismal cave, wherein we saw that stranger compound, to the castle, with all its cheerfulness, is quite refreshing, especially to one of the nervous temperament: now is morn, after that fearful night in which good Duncan fell, unwelcome. The plays Macbeth and The Merchant of Venice are inferior to Othello and Hamlet in the nice distinctions of character, and superior in the arrangement and concentration of their plot. In Othello, and especially in Hamlet we are disappointed at the unhappy termination of the plays. In the former we lament that such a noble soul as the Moor should have fallen beneath deceitfulness of Iago; in the latter are at loss to find a suitable cause for the introduction of the ghost of Hamlet’s father, consequent upon which came the death of Hamlet himself. The apparition was avenged, but what a sacrifice! He that was required to obtain this satisfaction loses his life in taking it. On the other hand, in the Merchant of Venice we rejoice, having little or no sympathy for Shylock, to see his property confiscated. In Macbeth we may regret to behold powers once noble become so debased, but still cannot refrain from exultation when we see the tyrant brought low.

Jas P
Cadman
Kal. Col.
June 8th 1860

Read first in English Literature Class sub. Prof. L.E. Holden, Soph. Year.

Also read (in part) as chapel essay.
### F: Selected Sherwood Rhetorical Society Debate Topics Related to Education and the Study of Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debate Topic</th>
<th>Date Assigned</th>
<th>Date Debated</th>
<th>Finding Aff/Neg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that Common Schools are more beneficial to mankind than Colleges are.</td>
<td>11/19/1858</td>
<td>11/22/1858</td>
<td>Aff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that the State ought to provide for the free education of all children within its borders.</td>
<td>2/11/1859</td>
<td>No record</td>
<td>No record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that the common games of chess, checkers, and backgammon have a bad effect upon the mind.</td>
<td>5/7/1859</td>
<td>5/14/1859</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that the giving of prizes in schools is injurious.</td>
<td>5/21/1859</td>
<td>5/28/1859</td>
<td>Aff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that the Classical course is preferable to the scientific</td>
<td>9/7/1860</td>
<td>9/14/1860</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it right to spend time in reading the news, if thereby any of our studies be partially neglected?</td>
<td>10/25/1862</td>
<td>11/1/1862</td>
<td>Aff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that the pursuit of the classics is better for the development of mind than natural and scientific investigations.</td>
<td>10/23/1863</td>
<td>10/30/1863</td>
<td>Aff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does literature have more influence over people than government?</td>
<td>5/14/1864</td>
<td>No debate</td>
<td>No debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that the writers of novels are as guilty of a wrong as the manufacturers of intoxicating liquors.</td>
<td>11/4/1864</td>
<td>11/11/1864</td>
<td>Aff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

89 There is no reference to the debate in the 2/18 minutes, and then no records at all until the 3/30 meeting.

90 At other points, in the journal, Cadman records having played several games of chess at different times with different people; it was apparently a popular diversion at this time.

91 The debate was never held; at the next meeting, the last of the year, the society voted to adjourn the debate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debate Topic</th>
<th>Date Assigned</th>
<th>Date Debated</th>
<th>Finding Aff/Neg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that the Indians of North America have more cause of complaint against the white people than the Negroes have.</td>
<td>4/15/1859</td>
<td>4/22/1859</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that intemperance is a greater evil than slavery.</td>
<td>4/30/1859</td>
<td>5/7/1859</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that the dissolution of the Union would be beneficial to the North</td>
<td>9/28/1860</td>
<td>10/12/1860</td>
<td>Aff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that slavery in the US ought to be abolished immediately</td>
<td>10/19/1860</td>
<td>11/9/1860</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it advisable for the general government to discontinue the mails in the seceding states?</td>
<td>2/22/1861</td>
<td>3/1/1861</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is resistance to the constituted authorities of a state ever justifiable?</td>
<td>3/8/1861</td>
<td>3/22/1861</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would it be policy to compel the seceding states to remain apart of the United States?</td>
<td>5/3/1861</td>
<td>5/11/1861</td>
<td>Aff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it policy to compel the seceding states to remain in the Union?</td>
<td>5/17/1861</td>
<td>5/24/1861</td>
<td>Aff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that the abolition of slavery ought be the aim of the administration in quelling the present rebellion.</td>
<td>11/29/1861</td>
<td>12/7/1861</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that the patriotism of the Revolution was greater than that of today.</td>
<td>4/18/1862</td>
<td>4/25/1862</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved that it would be expedient for the Government to declare the abolition of slavery in United States.</td>
<td>9/12/1862</td>
<td>9/26/1862</td>
<td>Neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would a compromise such as would produce peace between the North and South be the cause of the destruction of every hope for the abolition of Slavery?</td>
<td>11/7/1862</td>
<td>12/12/1862</td>
<td>Aff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**H: Shakespeare Lessons in Selected Nineteenth-Century Readers**

The table below lists Shakespeare lessons included in the reader series of Enfield, Walker, Webster, Alden, McGuffey, and Hillard, showing their development in American readers from the late eighteenth century to the late nineteenth. Lessons are ordered alphabetically by the name of the play from which they were selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Enfield 92</th>
<th>Walker 93</th>
<th>Webster</th>
<th>Alden</th>
<th>McGuffey</th>
<th>Hillard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True Love Sonnet #116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Alt Sixth (1889)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Knave Unmasked All’s Well 3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fifth (1844)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke and Lord a.k.a. An Approving Mind As You Like It 2.1</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando and Adam As You Like It 2.3</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke and Jacques As You Like It 2.7</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Progress of Life a.k.a. All the world's a stage</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H. School (1857)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92 The Enfield lessons included in this chart are based on an 1808 Boston edition of *The Speaker* held at Harvard University and available digitally through Google Books ([http://books.google.com/books?id=ouRLAAAMAAJ&num](http://books.google.com/books?id=ouRLAAAMAAJ&num)). Other editions varied in content.

93 The Walker lessons included in this table are based on an 1830 edition of Walker’s *Academic Speaker*. Other editions are very similar in content.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a.k.a</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Seven Ages of Man”</td>
<td>As You Like It 2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Class (1856)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando and Jacques</td>
<td>As You Like It 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clown, Duke, and Jacques</td>
<td>As You Like It 4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fable of the Belly and Members</td>
<td>Coriolanus 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellarius, Guiderius, and Arviragus</td>
<td>Cymbeline 3.3</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet and Horatio*</td>
<td>Hamlet 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet's Soliloquy on his</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. School (1857) Fifth (1879)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Marriage</td>
<td>Hamlet 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Thine Own Self Be True</td>
<td>Hamlet 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alt Sixth (1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet and Ghost</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elements of Elocution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet 1.4 &amp; 1.5</td>
<td>Hamlet 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>American Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What a Piece of Work a Man Is</td>
<td>Hamlet 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet's Soliloquy on his</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own Conduct</td>
<td>Hamlet 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene Description</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>The Reader</td>
<td>Ec. Speaker</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet, Guildenstern, Rosencrantz, Hamlet 2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H. School</td>
<td>(1857)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Be or Not to Be Hamlet 3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Reader</td>
<td>Fifth (1844), Sixth (1857), Sixth (1879)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet's Instructions to the Players, Hamlet 3.2</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ec. Speaker</td>
<td>(1858)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliloquy of the King in Hamlet a.k.a. Soliloquy of Hamlet’s Uncle, Hamlet 3.3</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ec. Speaker</td>
<td>(1858)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet and Captain, Hamlet 4.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial of Ophelia, Hamlet 5.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ec. Speaker</td>
<td>(1858)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotspur's Description of a Pop, 1 Henry IV 1.3</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ec. Speaker</td>
<td>(1858)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Henry IV, Northumberland, and Hotspur a.k.a. Hotspur and King Henry, 1 Henry IV 1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ec. Speaker</td>
<td>(1858)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotspur reading a letter a.k.a. Hotspur’s Soliloquy, 1 Henry IV 2.4</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Reader</td>
<td>Ec. Speaker</td>
<td>(1858)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Henry and Falstaff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>(1844)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>The Reader</td>
<td>Alt Sixth (1889)</td>
<td>Sixth (1857)</td>
<td>Sixth (1879)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Henry IV 2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotspur and Glendower 1 Henry IV 3.1</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry IV's Soliloquy on Sleep 1 Henry IV 3.1</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Reader</td>
<td>Alt Sixth (1889)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Henry, and the Prince of Wales 1 Henry IV 3.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sixth (1863)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry IV and Prince Henry 2 Henry IV 4.5</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry and Lord Chief Justice 2 Henry IV 5.2</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of Ely Henry V 1.1</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry V to His Soldiers at Harfleur Henry V 3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fifth (1844)</td>
<td>Sixth (1857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Miseries of Royalty a.k.a. The Estimate of a King by a King Henry V 4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H. School (1889)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry V to His Soldiers a.k.a. St. Crispin's Day Speech) Henry V 4.3</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Franklin Sixth (1870s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester's</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech to the Nobles 2 Henry VI 1.1</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry VI, Warwick, and Cardinal Beaufort 2 Henry VI 3.3</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Clifford's Speech to Henry VI 3 Henry VI 2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham going to Execution Henry VIII 2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolsey and Cromwell a.k.a. Fall of Wolsey Henry VIII 3.2</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fifth (1844)</td>
<td>Sixth (1857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death and Character of Cardinal Wolsey Henry VIII 4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fifth (1844)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcellus's Speech to the Mob Julius Caesar 1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fifth (1863)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brutus and Cassius Julius Caesar 1.2</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brutus's Soliloquy upon killing Caesar Julius Caesar 2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowards Die Many Times Julius Caesar 2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Alt Sixth (1889)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth (1837)</td>
<td>Fifth (1844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antony's Soliloquy over Caesar's Body <em>Julius Caesar</em> 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Speech of Brutus on the Death of Caesar <em>Julius Caesar</em> 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antony's Funeral Oration over Caesar's Body a.k.a. Friends, Romans, Countrymen ...) <em>Julius Caesar</em> 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fourth (1837)</td>
<td>Fourth (1844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarrel of Brutus and Cassius <em>Julius Caesar</em> 4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elements of Elocution</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fifth (1844)</td>
<td>Sixth (1857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dream of Clarence <em>King John</em> 1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fifth (1844)</td>
<td>Sixth (1857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King John Directing Hubert to the Murder of Prince Arthur <em>King John</em> 3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fifth (1844)</td>
<td>Sixth (1857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Arthur <em>King John</em> 4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fourth (1837)</td>
<td>Fourth (1844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remorse of King John <em>King John</em> 4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fifth (1844)</td>
<td>Sixth (1857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passions - Anger</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Lear*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ec. Speaker (1858)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Lear 1.1, 1.4, 2.4, 3.1, 4.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lear (Blow winds and crack your cheeks)</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Lear 3.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passions – Grief</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Lear 3.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is This a Dagger</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth 2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macduff, Malcolm, and Rosse</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Elements of Elocution</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ec. Speaker (1858)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth 4.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sister’s Plea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H. School (1857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas for Meas 2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Meas for Meas 3.1</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passions - Hatred</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant 1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jew’s Revenge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>The Reader</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant 3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonlight Merchant 5.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Alt Sixth (1889)</td>
<td>First Class (1858)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene Between Shylock and Tubal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant 3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shylock, or The Pound of Flesh</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fourth (1844)</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

94 Included in Webster with other selections under the heading of “Passions.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant 5.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Watchmen*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Ado 3.3, 4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello's Apology a.k.a. Othello's Wooing</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello 1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>Fifth (1844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folly of Intoxication a.k.a. Passions - Remorse</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ec. Speaker (1858)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello 2.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>Fifth (1844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello and Iago</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ec. Speaker (1858)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello 3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Steals My Purse a.k.a. A Good Name</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello 3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>Sixth (1879)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passions - Perplexity</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard II 2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>American Selection</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroop and Richard</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard II 3.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bishop of Carlisle’s Defense of Richard</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard II 4.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Entry of Bolingbroke and</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Academic Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| American Selection 96                                                | -       | -      | -       | -      | 96 In the McGuffey’s High School Reader and McGuffey’s Alternate Sixth Reader, the passage is shortened from previous versions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Academic Speaker</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard into London</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Richard II</em> 5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence's Dream</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Richard III</em> 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond encouraging his Soldiers against Richard the Third</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><em>Academic Speaker</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Richard III</em> 5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guilty Conscience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Richard III</em> 5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Mab</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td><em>Academic Speaker</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Romeo and Juliet</em> 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Apothecary</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Romeo and Juliet</em> 5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O my love, my wife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Romeo and Juliet</em> 5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech of Ulysses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Troilus Cressida</em> 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His Years Are Young</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Two Gentlemen</em> 2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Proserpina</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Winter's Tale</em> 4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96 Webster’s *American Selection* includes only the first thirteen lines of York’s passage beginning “As in a theater.” It ends with “And barbarism itself have pity’d him.” It is in the section “The Passions” and is titled “Pity.”
I: Shakespeare Lesson Movement in the *McGuffey’s*

The table below shows the evolution of Shakespearean lessons in the *McGuffey’s* through four different sets of editors, as lessons migrated to more advanced readers and expanded in number with the introduction of additional volumes. Lessons are in order of their first appearance in a *McGuffey’s* reader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>1836-37</th>
<th>1844</th>
<th>1857-1858</th>
<th>1879-1889</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince Arthur</td>
<td>Fourth Reader</td>
<td>Fourth Reader</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>King John</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends, Romans, Countrymen</td>
<td>Fourth Reader</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pound of Flesh</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fourth Reader</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knave Unmasked</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>All’s Well That Ends Well</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folly of Intoxication</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Othello</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Henry and Falstaff</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>1 Henry IV</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Be or Not to Be</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry V to His Soldiers at Harfleur</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Henry V</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall of Wolsey</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader &amp; Alternate Sixth Reader (1889)(^{97})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Henry VIII</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello’s Apology</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{97}\) The *McGuffey’s Alternate Sixth Reader* does not include the entire passage, but instead only the six lines beginning, “Love thyself last.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Othello’s Wooing</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Othello</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death and Character of Wolsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Henry VIII</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream of Clarence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>King John</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King John Directing Hubert to the Murder of Prince Arthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>King John</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remorse of King John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>King John</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrel of Brutus and Cassius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet, Scene I</em> (Hamlet and Horatio)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet 1.2</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet, Scene II</em> (Hamlet, Rosencrantz, and Guildenstern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet 2.2</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quality of Mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Quality of Mercy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister’s Plea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Measure for Measure</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Ages of Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>As You Like It</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotspur’s Description of a Fop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>1 Henry IV</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotspur and King Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>1 Henry IV</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Reader</th>
<th>School Reader</th>
<th>Sixth Reader (1889)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Othello’s Wooing</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Death and Character of Wolsey</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dream of Clarence</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>King John</em> Directing Hubert to the Murder of Prince Arthur*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Remorse of King John</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quarrel of Brutus and Cassius</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fifth Reader</td>
<td>Sixth Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet, Scene I</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>High School Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet, Scene II</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>High School Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Quality of Mercy</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Alternate Sixth Reader (1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sister’s Plea</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>High School Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Seven Ages of Man</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>High School Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hotspur’s Description of a Fop</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hotspur and King Henry</em></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98. The “Quality of Mercy” passage is also part of the larger “Shylock” passage that is listed separately in the chart. For the purposes of this chart, it is treated as a distinct lesson.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene/Title</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Alternate Reader</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotspur’s Soliloquy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I Henry IV</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet to the Players</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guilty Conscience</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Richard III</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliloquy of Hamlet’s Uncle</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macduff and Rosse</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macbeth</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Watchman</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Much Ado About Nothing</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello and Iago</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Othello</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Lear, scenes 1 - 5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial of Ophelia</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Love</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sonnet 116)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry IV’s Soliloquy on Sleep</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>2 Henry IV</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O My Love, My Wife</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Romeo and Juliet</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Thine Own Self Be True</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamlet</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moonlight</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternate Sixth Reader (1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowards Die Many Times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alternate Sixth Reader (1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Estimate of a King by a King</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High School Reader (1889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Henry V</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes that the passage is comprised of sequence of whole scenes*
J: William J. Rolfe’s Friendly Shakespeare Editions

Between 1870 and 1883, Rolfe released his Friendly Edition Shakespeare school editions. The table below shows the years in which these were first released. Many were re-released in the 1880s, 1890s, and between 1903 and 1906, the entire series was reissued with updated notes. Rolfe’s earliest choices generally coincided with those plays most frequently included on college entrance exams, though he eventually released the entire canon, even those plays not deemed suitable for school use. Each was divided into three sections: an introduction, which usually included background information on Shakespeare and the play as well as critical commentary from a number of contemporary scholars; Rolfe’s edition of the text, sometimes expurgated; and a large section of critical notes. Many also included a brief preface, in which Rolfe elucidated some of his views on editing and Shakespeare’s place in the English classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merchant of Venice</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tempest</td>
<td>1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
<td>1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Caesar</td>
<td>1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard II</td>
<td>1876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As You Like It</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macbeth</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry V</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Ado About Nothing</td>
<td>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romeo and Juliet</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othello</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth Night</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter’s Tale</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King John</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry IV Part 1</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry IV Part 2</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard III</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Lear</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taming of the Shrew</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All’s Well That Ends Well</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coriolanus</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedy of Errors</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cymbeline</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antony and Cleopatra</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure for Measure</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry Wives of Windsor</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love’s Labours Lost</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Gentlemen of Verona</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timon of Athens</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troilus and Cressida</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry VI Part 1</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry VI Part 2</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry VI Part 3</td>
<td>1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pericles</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Noble Kinsmen</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Venus and Adonis, Lucrece, and Other Poems</em></td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonnets</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Titus Andronicus</em></td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Harvard University first included Shakespeare on its entrance exams for incoming freshman in 1873. They continued to do so, with the exception of one year, 1899-1900, until well into the twentieth century. The selected plays sometimes stayed the same from year to year and sometimes changed, and are indicated in the chart below. Titles were announced at least one year in advance – and often as many as four – in annual university catalogs. Previous test questions were sometimes made available as samples allowing future students could use them as samples from which to study. Known questions are also included in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Plays Students are to Study</th>
<th>Shakespeare Test Question Options (Students are to select one and write 30-50 lines in response)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Examination topics not included in catalog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Examination topics not included in catalog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td><em>The Tempest, Julius Caesar,</em> and <em>Merchant of Venice</em>&lt;sup&gt;99&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td><em>The Tempest, Julius Caesar,</em> and <em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
<td>June – The story of the Caskets, in the <em>Merchant of Venice</em>; or The story of Shakespeare’s <em>Tempest</em>&lt;sup&gt;100&lt;/sup&gt; October – The Trial Scene, in the <em>Merchant of Venice</em>; or The story of Brutus, in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>99</sup> Referenced in Applebee 30; Broome 58; and Hays 18.

<sup>100</sup> Referenced in Leighton 215.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Plays</th>
<th>Shakespeare’s <em>Julius Caesar</em>&lt;sup&gt;101&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td><em>The Tempest, Julius Caesar,</em></td>
<td>July – An Account of the Tent-scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and <em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
<td>between Brutus and Cassius&lt;sup&gt;102&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>October – An account of the Trial in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice</em>&lt;sup&gt;103&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td><em>The Tempest, Julius Caesar,</em></td>
<td>June – The story of the Tempest,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and <em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
<td>or The story and character of Portia&lt;sup&gt;104&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September – The Story of Ariel&lt;sup&gt;105&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td><em>Henry V, Julius Caesar,</em></td>
<td>June – Mark Antony’s Speech in Julius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and <em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
<td>Caesar&lt;sup&gt;106&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>September – The Battle of Philippi&lt;sup&gt;107&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td><em>Macbeth, Coriolanus,</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and <em>As You Like It</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td><em>Macbeth, Richard II,</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and <em>A Midsummer Night’s Dream</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td><em>King Lear and Much Ado About Nothing</em>&lt;sup&gt;108&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>June – The Story of <em>Hamlet</em>, Hamlet and the Ghost, The Character of Polonius, The Fate of Ophelia, Hamlet’s Speech to the Players, The Fight between Laertes and Hamlet, The Characters of Hamlet’s Mother, or Hamlet as a Gentlemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td><em>Hamlet and Romeo and Juliet</em></td>
<td>Sept – The Story of Romeo and Juliet, Mercutio’s Queen Mab, The Balcony Scene in <em>Romeo and Juliet</em>&lt;sup&gt;109&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>101</sup> Referenced in Leighton 235.
<sup>102</sup> Referenced in Leighton 252.
<sup>103</sup> Referenced in Leighton 278.
<sup>104</sup> Referenced in Leighton 302.
<sup>105</sup> Referenced in Leighton 329.
<sup>106</sup> Referenced in Leighton 359-60.
<sup>107</sup> Referenced in Leighton 389-90.
<sup>108</sup> Referenced in Hays 19.
<sup>109</sup> Referenced in 1882-83 Harvard catalog along with the complete list of questions for the 1881 exams.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Additional Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1882 | *Othello* and *King John* | June – Othello’s Defence before the Senate, Comparison of Desdemona with Emilia, Character of Iago, Iago’s Plot, Character of Cassio, Parallel between Othello and Falconbridge, The Death of Othello Sept – Parallel between Othello and Falconbridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Additional Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> and <em>As You Like It</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> and <em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice</em> and <em>Twelfth Night</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> and <em>Macbeth</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> and <em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> and <em>Twelfth Night</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> and <em>As You Like It</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> and <em>A Midsummer Night’s Dream</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> and <em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> and <em>As You Like It</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> and <em>Twelfth Night</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> and <em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice</em> and <em>Twelfth Night</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td><em>A Midsummer Night’s Dream</em> and <em>Merchant of Venice</em> (for careful study)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

110 Referenced in 1883-84 Harvard catalog along with the complete list of questions for the 1882 exams.

111 Referenced in Broome 58.

112 Beginning in 1896, there were two parts to the examination: works students were to read and know generally, and also those for careful study. These were indicated separately from one another from this year on in the annual catalogs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Plays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1897 | *As You Like It*  
and *Merchant of Venice* (for careful study) |
| 1898 | *Macbeth* (for careful study) |
| 1899 | n/a |
| 1900 | *Macbeth* (for careful study) |
| 1901 | *Merchant of Venice*  
and *Macbeth* (for careful study) |
| 1902 | *Merchant of Venice*  
and *Macbeth* (for careful study) |
| 1903 | *Merchant of Venice, Julius Caesar,*  
and *Macbeth* (for careful study) |
| 1904 | *Merchant of Venice, Julius Caesar,*  
and *Macbeth* (for careful study) |
| 1905 | *Merchant of Venice, Julius Caesar,*  
and *Macbeth* (for careful study) |
L: Shakespeare Plays Included in Univ. of Michigan Entrance Exams, 1878-1905

The University of Michigan first included Shakespeare on their entrance exams for incoming freshman in 1878. They continued to do so, with the exception of the three years from 1898-1900, until well into the twentieth century. These selected plays varied from year, and are indicated in the chart below. Titles were announced at least two years in advance – sometimes more – in the annual university calendars. Beginning in 1906, like Harvard, the University of Michigan adopted the Joint Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Plays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em> or <em>The Tempest</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td><em>Richard II</em> or <em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td><em>As You Like It</em> or <em>Macbeth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td><em>Twelfth Night</em> or <em>Othello</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td><em>Hamlet</em> or <em>Henry VIII</em>¹¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td><em>King Lear</em> or <em>Winter’s Tale</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td><em>Coriolanus</em> or <em>Romeo and Juliet</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice</em>¹¹⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹³ Later calendars would indicate the specific play and topic on which students had been tested in prior years, so that future students could better prepare: in 1878, the subject tested had been the story of Brutus, from *Julius Caesar*; in 1879, the story of the caskets, from *Merchant of Venice*; in 1880, the story of Rosalind from *As You Like It*; in 1881, the story of Desdemona from *Othello*; and in 1882, the character of Queen Katherine from *Henry VIII*. Calendars after 1883-84 discontinued the practice, leaving it unclear which play had actually been tested.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Play</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td><em>A Midsummer Night’s Dream</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td><em>Twelfth Night</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td><em>As You Like It</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td><em>Macbeth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td><em>Henry VIII</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td><em>Macbeth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td><em>Julius Caesar</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td><em>Timon of Athens or Twelfth Night</em>¹¹⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td><em>A Midsummer Night’s Dream or Merchant of Venice</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td><em>As You Like It or Macbeth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice or Macbeth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice or Macbeth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice, Julius Caesar, or Macbeth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice or Julius Caesar</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td><em>Merchant of Venice or Julius Caesar</em>¹¹⁶</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹⁴ It appears that in 1887, it had originally been planned to test *Twelfth Night*, as was stated in the 1885-86 calendar, but later changed, as *Merchant of Venice* was indicated in the 1886-87 calendar.

¹¹⁵ In the 1893-94 calendar, only *Timon of Athens* was listed, but in the 1894-95 calendar, both it and *Twelfth Night* were listed.

¹¹⁶ *Macbeth* had been included as a third option for both 1904 and 1905 in earlier calendars, but it was omitted in the 1904-05 calendar. Earlier calendars had also listed three plays all to be tested in 1906, 1907, and 1908: *Julius Caesar, Merchant of Venice*, and *Macbeth*. The 1904-05 calendar, though, also omitted *Julius Caesar* for these three years. By 1906, though, it had become a moot point, as later calendars indicate that by then the University of Michigan had adopted the Shakespearean selections determined by the Joint Conference on Uniform Entrance Requirements, 1906-1911, which incidentally included all three plays as options, as well as three others.
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