Whereas the previous chapter focused on women operating within primarily male networks, this chapter discusses the networks of female editors and academics that developed in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century America. As Andrew Murphy discusses in *Shakespeare in Print*, American Shakespeare publishing was slower out of the starting gate than its British counterpart. Large-scale printing and publication depended on the development of a practical infrastructure for such activities. To begin with, printing presses had to be built or shipped across the Atlantic. The first edition of the *Complete Works* printed outside Britain and Ireland was published in Philadelphia in 1795. By the time of de Tocqueville’s travels in 1831, when he commented on the omnipresence of Shakespeare in homes across America, multiple American editions existed, although many of them were reprints of British editions. An increasing number of texts edited by Americans appeared during the first half of the nineteenth century. The gradual acquisition of early exemplars of the folios and quartos by wealthy Americans facilitated more original editorial work, such as that done by Richard Grant White around 1860. As a consequence of its slow growth, by the time home-grown Shakespeare publishing caught up with its British counterpart, American publishing houses already had a rich pool of educated editorial talent, male and female, on which to draw.

This was possible because while its Shakespearean publishing industry might have lagged behind, higher education for women began earlier in the United States than in England. Mount Holyoke Seminary, which would grow into one of the famed Seven Sisters schools, opened in 1837. Its closest British equivalents, Queen’s College and Bedford College in London, opened in 1847 and 1849, respectively. The early seminaries were not exact equivalents to all-male institutions, but they provided a testing ground for curricula and for the general precepts of women’s higher education. Women’s literacy in America has been estimated to have been...
as high as 90 per cent by 1850, compared with 55 per cent in Britain. By 1872, women were writing almost three-quarters of the novels published in the United States. Experiments with coeducation began at Oberlin College in Ohio in 1833. Founded on radical evangelical principles, Oberlin admitted students of both genders, white and black; the first three women graduated with bachelor’s degrees in 1840. By 1870, when Girton College was getting off the ground, 169 of the 582 institutions of higher education in the United States were coeducational (29 per cent), and 70 schools (12 per cent) were women’s colleges.

It is rarely possible to trace a direct line of descent from woman editor to woman editor, but the close connections among American academic women during the period, particularly in the Seven Sisters schools, allow us to do just that. None of this is to say that the women’s colleges in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland did not create networks of female scholars. In terms of female editors, however, the materials needed to demonstrate links have not been as well preserved. In general, the papers of American women editors are more likely to have been preserved in large collections than their transatlantic counterparts. The first generations of American college women acknowledged and understood the historic nature of their undertakings, so colleges such as Wellesley and Smith maintain extremely rich archives relating to their faculty and alumnae. Institutional affiliation significantly increases the odds that a woman scholar’s papers have been preserved. Obviously, any woman who achieved fame in her own lifetime would be even more likely to preserve her papers and to donate them to her own college. Several women editors fit this description, but none more so than poet Katharine Lee Bates, who attended Wellesley and became a professor of English there, serving as head of department for many years. Best known for her poem ‘America the Beautiful’, which became an iconic patriotic song and a top contender for the national anthem, Bates edited numerous student editions, including *Merchant of Venice*, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, and *As You Like It*, all for Boston-based Leach, Shewell, & Sanborn. Bates’s papers demonstrate the depth of her scholarship, the significance of her influence, and her place at the centre of a network of educated women editors.

**Katharine Lee Bates**

The Bates archive at Wellesley totals twenty-two catalogued boxes, as well as an unknown amount of still unsorted material. It includes diaries, letters, manuscripts, books, and lectures that span her life from childhood...
Bates kept a five-year diary from 1893 until 1897, covering the years in which she produced her Shakespeare editions. They are a remarkable resource, and provide enormous insight into Bates’s life and work. The format of the journal allowed the diarist to record a few lines each day for five years, as shown in Figure 3.1.

Although the space was limited, Bates possessed a poet’s ability to convey a great deal in very few words. Many entries consist of prosaic accountings of the weather or dinner guests, but in others her humour and intelligence shine through, as when on 24 April 1896 she writes, ‘Almost made a friend today, but the stars are adverse.’ There are comments on the trials and tribulations of scholarship that will ring true for academics of any period: ‘I don’t know why anybody should write or read’; or, two days later, ‘Life isn’t worth living when it’s making an index.’ More significantly, the diary makes it possible to chart exactly how much time she spent on *The Merchant of Venice*, her first edition, and gives a more general idea of the timeline of the other two projects. In addition, her archive contains letters that she wrote to her mother Cornelia and her sister Jane which expand on her progress and her opinions of her work.

Bates recorded in the diary that she ‘[broke] ground’ on *Merchant* on 3 May 1894. Several frustrated entries followed that week, and then an entire month passed without mention of the play. During this month, Bates and her partner Katherine Coman travelled across the Atlantic to the United Kingdom, settling in Oxford for the summer. Coman was an economics professor at Wellesley. She and Bates spent their whole adult lives together, an arrangement common among educated middle-class women, particularly at women’s colleges. These partnerships were
sometimes called Boston (or Wellesley) marriages. When Coman died of cancer, Bates wrote a book of poetry entitled *Yellow Clover* in her memory.¹¹

Beginning around 5 July, Bates worked in the Bodleian to collate the quarto and folio texts of *Merchant*.¹² A flurry of busy entries followed as she made her way through the text. On 8 July, she wrote to her mother that she had been ‘enjoying my job so much that there’s no telling when I shall finish it’.¹³ To her sister, she explained that she had ‘most unexpectedly become interested’ in *Merchant*, but ‘shall get it off presently’.¹⁴ That same day, 12 July, she noted in her diary that she had finished the textual work. By 23 July, however, like every editor throughout history, she had discovered that the edition ‘is more work than I had realized it would be’ and averred that she must ignore her terrible toothache and stop writing letters or it ‘will never be done’.¹⁵ She gloomily predicted that even if she finished, the manuscript would probably be lost at sea before it reached the publishers in Boston. Luckily, it survived its sea voyage after being posted on 18 August. By the end of September, having returned to Wellesley, Bates noted that she was working on the proofs, which took her a month to complete back in the bustle of classes and coursework. On 26 October, she wrote that she was ‘still busy’ with the proofs, but ‘almost done’, and indeed, the preface of the published edition was dated November 1894. Overall, the process took her about seven months. At the end of the summer, just before sending off the manuscript, she told her mother that ‘I have made a much more thorough piece of work than I expected, and I think it is, perhaps, a fairly good edition, but it has eaten up all the time.’¹⁶

Bates failed to give her work adequate credit. In fact, she produced a remarkable edition that demonstrates how insightful and useful a student edition could be when its execution was placed in the proper hands. Her editions appear to have been the first Shakespeare plays published in this series, the Student’s Series of English Classics, so her approach to the format and contents may have been less constrained by precedent than that of the many editors who produced volumes for pre-existing series.¹⁷ Bates’s preface to *Merchant* explained the principles that guided her edition:

> Explanation is sometimes necessary, suggestion is often helpful; but the happiest and, in the end, the wisest student is he who makes the most discoveries. Taste and appreciation, critical judgment and discrimination, are developed through free exercise of the reader’s own faculties, not by submission to authority.¹⁸
As detailed in her diary, Bates took the textual element of her edition extremely seriously, collating folio and quarto texts during her time at the Bodleian. The resulting text, she explained, followed the first folio ‘somewhat closely’, with quarto variations given in the notes. Although quarto readings or, very rarely, emendations were used in cases of ‘manifestly’ incorrect or ‘inferior’ folio options,

in general the folio readings, even where the editor would personally reject them, are retained, with the design that each member of the class may have opportunity, by aid of the textual notes, of constructing a text for himself. It is suggested that the student, in hope of so sharpening his Shakespearian sense, con these notes carefully, and write into the play the readings which seem to him most worthy of the poet. Whatever perils wait upon the result, it is believed that the process will be beneficial.¹⁹

Each textual note included both the options available and a question prompting further thought and analysis, as seen in Figure 3.2. Bates thus created a democratic, open text in which her own opinions were subordinated to the goal of enhancing the student’s experience. She invited engagement with the text’s material history by deflecting the assumption of a single, authoritative reading, which had predominated in eighteenth-century editions, and by capitalising on students’ pre-existing propensity to mark up their schoolbooks, encouraging them to take on an editorial role by writing in their preferred readings and emendations.

This approach is diametrically opposed to that of eighteenth-century editors, who adopted bombastic and argumentative tones in their notes, but it is in keeping with a shift towards more measured commentary that developed during the nineteenth century and had a particularly distinguished female proponent. Mary Cowden Clarke, the best-known woman editor of Shakespeare, eschewed the use of footnotes in her 1860 edition of the Complete Works, condemning notes as ‘mere vehicles for abuse, spite, and arrogance . . . written for the sole purpose . . . of proving that other editors are wrong’.²⁰ Although Bates does not go so far as to exclude footnotes, her editorial approach, like Cowden Clarke’s, feels both humble and entirely self-assured. Her references to other texts and critics are erudite, eclectic, and generally impartial, an attitude in keeping with her goal of encouraging reader engagement without demanding ‘submission to authority’.

The year 1895 brought work on A Midsummer Night’s Dream for the same series. Although the start date is less clear, Bates once again completed the bulk of the work over the summer vacation. A few of her notes from this period are particularly evocative: ‘Have gotten to a state of calm
despair over that Introduction (7 August). ‘Sunday’, wrote hard in my wrapper all day on Introduction to Midsummer Night’s Dream (18 August). The introduction that so vexed her ultimately began, ‘When was A Midsummer Night’s Dream written? Three hundred years ago nobody

Figure 3.2 First page of the Textual Notes section of Bates’s edition of The Merchant of Venice (p. 147). Photograph by the author.
cared, so to-day nobody knows." 

Like many editors before the advent of twentieth-century bibliography and its increased focus on an idealised editorial objectivity, Bates employed passionate, idiosyncratic, and occasionally overwrought prose to explore the play’s history and contents. The play’s structure garnered her particular attention, earning a description in her rather distinctive authorial voice: ‘It ought to be all a jumble, and it is an artistic harmony. But how? What, in this that looks so helter-skelter, is the unifying truth? Here the scholars are at variance. The play is a twist of gold cord and rainbow silks, homespun yarn and shimmering moonbeams.” Bates’s analysis of the play cannot be called objective, but it is certainly engaging, as is appropriate for a volume intended to spark interest in students. The diagram of the plot included in the Midsummer introduction demonstrates Bates attempting to incorporate creative pedagogy into her editions. In Midsummer, she abandoned the separate section of questions that she had employed for Merchant. Instead, she incorporated questions into the literary notes, while decreasing their number significantly.

Bates’s diary documented a similar four-month span of work on the 1896 edition of As You Like It. Again, the introduction showed her experimenting with the most useful content and format for the school edition. Bates returned to her original format in which the questions are separate from the notes, but she altered the design and page layout of the questions. In 1897, she wrote a letter to another publisher, who was interested in having her prepare student editions, explaining her philosophy on setting out questions, which had evolved in tandem with larger trends in school publishing: ‘Groups of questions, following the chapters, break the narrative effect and are not, in themselves, invariably welcome to teachers. . . . Most of the present day school-histories of literature . . . leave the questioning to the teacher.” The introduction as a whole reflected Bates’s long-standing interest in non-Shakespearian literature from the medieval and Renaissance periods. After referring the student to the earlier editions of Merchant and Midsummer for basic information on Shakespeare and Elizabethan theatre, suggesting the assumption that they would have access to those editions, Bates focused on a comparison between As You Like It and Lodge’s Rosalynde. This included a twenty-four-page abridged version of Rosalynde in ‘old-fashioned speech and spelling’, edited by Bates specifically for this edition. Since As You Like It is only extant in the Folio text, the preparation of the edition required less textual labour than Merchant or Midsummer; however, the abridged Rosalynde provided an opportunity for Bates to display additional editorial acumen.
Katharine Lee Bates’s position at Wellesley and the longevity and success of her career allowed her to forge connections with many other editors of Shakespeare, including women. Bates’s papers illuminate the extensive networks between women academics in the period, particularly those associated with women’s colleges. Her diary reveals that during her time in Oxford in 1894, she wrote an article for *Poet Lore*, the magazine founded and edited by Shakespeare editors Charlotte Endymion Porter and Helen Archibald Clarke. She also mentions meeting with them in person on a trip into Boston in 1895. In 1896, she references a trip to Vassar during which she saw Laura Wylie, who went on to edit *A Winter’s Tale* for the Tudor Shakespeare. She maintained a long correspondence with the editor Edith Rickert, who was, along with Bates, hired to revise an edition of D. C. Heath’s Arden Shakespeare series for reissue. Bates’s letters also include professional correspondence with British Shakespeareans such as F. G. Fleay and Sidney Lee, as well as a suggestion that she visit editor A. H. Bullen during an upcoming visit to Stratford. In her preface to *Merchant*, Bates thanks William J. Rolfe, who, along with Henry Hudson, was one of the two biggest names in the field of American student editions of Shakespeare throughout the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth. She also mentions Rolfe numerous times in her diaries. Horace Howard Furness wrote her a letter in 1895 after reading her edition of *Merchant*, expressing genuine admiration and delight, admiration for the thorough conscientious scholarship and wide reading of the Introduction, and delight of the sane and sympathetic dealing with the whole subject of notes, wherein it is most difficult to strike the happy mean between too little and too much. Happy as your selection of notes is, the best part of your book is the Introduction – a genuine contribution to the literature of the play.

Bates’s influence, like that of many editors of school editions, is difficult to quantify because her work was directed to students rather than the larger world of Shakespeare scholarship. Her editions were certainly used and read throughout the country. Charlotte Whipple Underwood, a Chicago teacher, acknowledged her debt to Bates’s *Merchant* in her own 1899 edition of the play for Macmillan. A used copy of Bates’s *Merchant* includes marks identifying its owner as a resident of Salinas, California. Twenty years after their initial publication, *As You Like It* and *Midsummer* were reissued. Additional evidence of Bates’s popular influence lies in the letters she received, most in response to ‘America the Beautiful’, but others regarding Shakespeare, such as the undated note from a teacher in Colorado named Ellen Louise Hill:
I’m in trouble here in my efforts to teach Shakespeare. I have a very large class, all bright and enthusiastic, and my wits are at a loss to know how to teach climaxes, incentive moments, catastrophe, and tragic moments! Can you help me? Will you? Will you place the above mentioned points in the following plays: Richard III, Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Midsummer Night’s Dream, and then tell me what to say to my class when they insist that it should be somewhere else?!

I know I am taking a great liberty in writing you in this strain, but in my despair I turn to you as an authority on everything Shakespearian. Please do pardon the liberty and give me a little light in my darkness.

These two responses demonstrate the complex interplay between elevated and everyday scholarship present in the best examples of early student editions. Bates produced editions that spoke to students and distinguished Shakespeareans alike.

Perhaps most unusually, her relationship with another faculty member at Wellesley provides a direct link between two editions of the same play, both edited by women. Bates completed her edition of As You Like It in 1896. Martha Hale Shackford’s edition of the same play was published by Macmillan as part of the Tudor Shakespeare series in 1911. Shackford attended Wellesley and subsequently became a member of the English department under Katharine Lee Bates. Bates was at once her teacher, her colleague, and her boss. They worked together for many years, and Bates was still head of the department when Shackford was preparing her edition. It is likely that Bates taught at least some of Shackford’s classes on medieval and Renaissance literature during her time as a student. Shackford later wrote of Bates that we who were undergraduates during the years when she established the major in English literature were constantly impressed by the range of her reading, the remarkable tenacity of her memory, the scope and aptness of her allusions, and, most of all, by her sensitiveness to aspects of imaginative beauty. Yet her awareness of ideal values did not prevent her from being a teacher who gently but firmly demanded from students sound knowledge, scrupulous accuracy of detail, and fastidiousness of form. Though often seeming shy in the classroom she was, when roused by argument, unmatched in repartee. Always there was a certain piquancy, in her conduct of a class, due to unexpected, stimulating modes of approaching a subject, and she was capable of gay and teasing innuendoes regarding the stolidity of some of our appreciation of great literature.

This description of Bates is entirely consistent with the editorial voice present in her student editions and demonstrates how effectively Bates
translated her own pedagogical personality into written guidance for students far outside the borders of the Wellesley campus.

**The Tudor Shakespeare**

Macmillan’s Tudor Shakespeare series stands apart from its contemporaries in the number of women employed to edit individual volumes: five of the thirty-nine editors were women. The five women were Laura J. Wylie (*The Winter’s Tale*, 1912), Virginia Gildersleeve (*King Lear*, 1912), Martha Hale Shackford (*As You Like It*, 1911), Elizabeth Deering Hanscom (*2 Henry IV*, 1912), and Louise Pound (*1 Henry VI*, 1911). Why did this series draw on the talents of so many women? The answer probably lies with one of the series editors, William Allan Neilson. Both Neilson and the other series editor, Ashley Horace Thorndike, clearly farmed out volumes to academics with whom they had pre-existing connections. At least eight of the editors came from universities at which Thorndike or Neilson had either studied or worked. Neilson in particular had a strong connection to women’s higher education. His first teaching job after moving to America from Scotland was at Bryn Mawr. He went on to Harvard, where one of his Radcliffe students was Helen Keller. He is remembered as the only professor who learned her version of sign language. He later became the president of Smith College. It seems likely that his sympathy for women in academia extended to his practices as a series editor.

Neilson’s career affiliations highlight an early argument amongst proponents of women’s education in both America and England: whether single-sex colleges should hire only female faculty members. A major irony involved in discussing the female networks of American college women is that one must acknowledge how many men are involved in those networks. Of the Seven Sisters colleges, only Wellesley committed itself to hiring women academics. At its most fundamental level, all-female Radcliffe was a Harvard annex, as all classes at Radcliffe were taught by Harvard professors. At Vassar, a quarter of the faculty and most department heads were male, and as president of Smith, Neilson recruited and promoted more men than women. According to their advocates, these policies gave the colleges an advantage over women’s colleges like Wellesley, where the primarily female faculty members would have had less formal education and fewer official degrees. Even a professor as distinguished as Katharine Lee Bates worried about whether she could be considered qualified to teach at the university level when hired by Wellesley in 1893. At the time, she held only her Wellesley bachelor’s
degree; she was later awarded a master’s degree based on the strength of her academic publications since graduation.

By 1911, however, when the first volumes of the Tudor Shakespeare were published, opportunities for graduate studies had grown, and women were taking full advantage of them. All five of the women who edited for the Tudor Shakespeare held PhDs, while five of the male editors held only bachelor’s or master’s degrees. In fact, women were first admitted to some older universities through graduate courses, even while the undergraduate programs at the same universities refused to become co-educational. Laura J. Wylie and Elizabeth Deering Hanscom were two of the first seven women to graduate with PhDs from Yale in 1894, although Yale’s undergraduate programs did not become co-educational until 1969. After earning their PhDs, Wylie taught at Vassar, where she had received her undergraduate degree, and Hanscom at Smith.

The Tudor series represents a relatively rigid, standardised version of the student edition, very unlike Bates’s experimental forms. It also demonstrates, however, an awareness of the sophistication of the consumer. All of the individual volumes used the 1906 Neilson text, published by Houghton Mifflin, so the volume editors did not make textual decisions, although they could comment on them in their notes. The use of Neilson’s text led to a particularly interesting exchange between Neilson and a Macmillan staff member. Seeking publicity information about the text, Doris H. Taylor wrote to Neilson:

It is our understanding that you went back to original sources and that so far as possible, existing editions were compared with old manuscripts line for line. Any information which you can give us which will help us to impress Shakespearean scholars with the merits and authenticity of the text will be greatly appreciated.

Neilson replied rather firmly:

Be sure not to say anything about manuscripts as there are no Shakespearian manuscripts. The earliest quartos and folios were collated word for word. I would be very glad if you could let me see your statement before it goes out since inaccuracies of a technical sort are apt to harm the publicity with teachers and others who may happen to have special knowledge.

Neilson’s concern about the details of the publicity suggests how competitive the school edition market had become by the 1920s, and how textually aware the potential consumer could be imagined to be.

Nationalism was also part of the Tudor Shakespeare’s marketing, with the advertisements noting that all of the volume editors were American
scholars. Emphasising the ‘Made in America’ aspect of editions prepared by American scholars became a common selling point for school editions during the nineteenth century, as seen in Figure 3.3. William J. Rolfe, editor of one of the most important school series in America, encouraged American teachers and readers to use American editions (particularly his own, obviously), claiming that they were better suited to their educational needs than British editions could ever be.42

Royalty records kept by Neilson show each volume’s sales in the two decades after its launch. Letters between Neilson and Macmillan reflect disappointment in sales numbers after the first few years of publication. They therefore initiated a marketing campaign and relaunch in 1922, which seem to have been successful.43 Unfortunately, Neilson’s papers include sales numbers only from 1917–21 and 1929–33, but Figure 3.4 gives a sense of the sales numbers for the five volumes edited by women, as well as four other popular titles in the series, during these periods and shows that the jump in sales after the relaunch decreased within five years.44

*King Lear* was by some margin the most popular of the five volumes edited by women, selling over 5,000 copies during the years documented in Neilson’s accounts. In many ways, *Lear* editor Virginia Gildersleeve exemplified the deepening connections between women in academia. In 1919, she founded the International Federation of University Women with Caroline Spurgeon and Rose Sidgwick, with the goal of creating links between educated women to help prevent another war.45 As the dean of all-women Barnard College, she built up the school’s influence and increased opportunities for its students. Her legacy is not entirely unmixed, however; like Neilson, she primarily hired men for senior faculty positions, relegating women to more junior roles in an attempt to attract better-known male scholars. She later wrote that ‘perhaps this was discrimination against women, but it was, I am sure, for the good of the college’.46 In 1945,
President Franklin Delano Roosevelt chose Gildersleeve as the only female member of the United States delegation sent to help draft the United Nations’ Charter. Neilson, her series editor and colleague, said that it was unfortunate that she was the only woman included, ‘but that will not matter if only the men will listen’. Her influence helped convince the delegates to include language on human rights in the Charter, and to require the appointment of the Commission on Human Rights.

The career of the editor of *t Henry VI*, Louise Pound, also demonstrates the growing influence of women in public and professional academic circles. After receiving her BA and MA from the University of Nebraska, where she was an athletic star and co-editor of the literary magazine with her lifelong friend Willa Cather, she attended the

Figure 3.4  Sales figures of volumes in the Tudor Shakespeare series before (a) and after (b) the relaunch. Data compiled from documents in the William Allan Neilson Personal Papers, Box 47, Folder 1081, Smith College.
University of Heidelberg for her PhD before returning to Nebraska to teach at her alma mater. Throughout her life, she fought for increased opportunities for women in graduate studies and research posts. She served as the vice president of the American Association of University Women, and in 1955, she became the first woman president of the Modern Language Association. Although it took several more decades for the MLA to begin seriously to address the needs of its women members – one critic pointed out in 1972 that although the MLA had had two female presidents in its history, it had yet to have a feminist president – Pound’s election signalled the slow movement of women from the outskirts of academia into the mainstream. Pound, Gildersleeve, and the other women leaders of their generation may not have accomplished as much as their descendants would have liked, but they made major strides in deepening the networks linking female academics in America and around the world.

Women as Revision Editors

Another avenue through which women became involved in the editorial process was the phenomenon of revising and re-releasing older editions. Many scholars consider Richard Grant White’s first edition of the Complete Works, published in the 1860s, to be the first original, innovative edition of Shakespeare published in America. White went on to edit the first edition of the Riverside Shakespeare, which remains an institution in America. Following the success of the Riverside’s initial release in 1883, publisher Houghton Mifflin decided to release the plays as individual school editions, supplemented and revised for students’ use. Of the eleven individual editions that seem to have been completed for the first series, released from around 1892 till 1912, three – Hamlet, Macbeth, and Twelfth Night – were edited by Helen Gray Cone, while Laura Emma Lockwood of Wellesley edited A Midsummer Night’s Dream. The hiring of Cone and Lockwood to revise and expand White’s Riverside texts becomes particularly interesting in light of White’s own statements denigrating women readers of Shakespeare. In the preface to the Riverside Shakespeare, White wrote that ‘in determining what passages were sufficiently obscure to justify explanation, the editor . . . took the advice of his washerwoman’, said woman being, presumably, on the lowest possible rung on the ladder of literacy, and therefore an appropriate marker to determine what was and was not comprehensible in Shakespeare. Gender is an issue at several points in White’s essay ‘On Reading Shakespeare’:
It is hard for these men [true lovers of Shakespeare] to apprehend that there are others not without intelligence and education, and who read, who have not read Shakespeare, or who having read a little of him do not read more. But there are such men; and there are still many more such women. On the whole I am inclined to think that Shakespeare is not a woman’s poet. He deals too largely with life; he handles the very elements of human nature; he has a great fancy, but is not fanciful; his imagination moulds the essential and the central rather than the external; he is rarely sentimental, never except in his youngest work. Women, with the exception of a few who are not always the most lovable or the happiest of the sex, like something upon a lower plane, something that appeals more directly to them, because it was written to appeal directly to someone else (for in literature that which is directed to one point always keeps its aim); they like the personal, the external; that which seems to be showing them either themselves or some other real person. Shakespeare’s humor . . . is appreciated by still fewer women than the number who find pleasure in his poetry. They receive it in rather a dazed fashion, and don’t know exactly what it means, all this, just as they would rather look at a woman of the first fashion in a dress of their time than at the grand simplicity of ideal woman in the Venus (so-called) of Melos.¹³

In his view, the shallowness of female thought prevents appreciation of Shakespeare, and even those who seek to improve have no recourse in White’s eyes.

Like Katharine Lee Bates, White’s fame as a Shakespeare scholar led people to write to him for advice on how best to approach Shakespeare. White had no patience for such inquiries:

Most of those who have asked [how to read Shakespeare] are, I am inclined to think, very young, as indeed some of them say they are; and a large proportion are plainly girls just beginning to feel their way in literature, and they ask, in the words of one of them, ‘How shall I begin? and which plays shall I read first, so as to be sure to like them and their author?’ Such uncertainty, I must confess, does not promise any genuine, strong taste for Shakespeare. Boys are of slower mental growth than girls, especially upon the poetical and sentimental side; but no boy who is a born Shakespeare-lover needs to ask such a question as that at sixteen. He has then already stepped in too far to pick his way or to turn back.⁵⁴

Although based in similar precepts, his tone and attitude are a far cry from Katharine Lee Bates’s urging that students develop their critical faculties through ‘free exercise’ of their own faculties rather than ‘submission to authority’.⁵⁵ White speaks with authority even while scorning those who turn to authority for guidance, demanding submission as he criticises those who submit. His own advice to new readers was to eschew criticism and
annotated editions altogether for one’s first reading, relying only on one’s own engagement with the words to establish the most full and true appreciation of Shakespeare. As such, the essential purpose of a student edition was antithetical to White’s opinions. Unsurprisingly, the conversion of his edition into student texts did not take place until after White’s death, when his widow held the copyright. Given his doubts about women’s natural abilities in regard to Shakespeare, the fact that his work was co-opted and supplemented by female Shakespeareans feels particularly ironic.56

Helen Gray Cone (1859–1934) spent her entire career at her alma mater, the Normal College of the City of New York, now known as Hunter College. She achieved particular fame as a poet, but she was well-known within the college for her courses on Shakespeare and Romantic authors.57 Like many early women academics, she demonstrated a remarkable loyalty to her school. In 1945, Vida Dutton Scudder wrote a letter to the new president of Hunter admitting that the Wellesley English faculty had unsuccessfully tried to poach Cone for their own program many years before.58 Women like Laura Wylie, Martha Hale Shackford, and Louise Pound returned to their undergraduate colleges to take up teaching posts even after leaving to earn postgraduate degrees elsewhere.59 In this way, the colleges began cultivating their own home-grown talent and using that talent to increase the prestige of their faculties. Cone became the first woman to hold a professorship at all-female Hunter College, that position having been previously held only by male faculty.

These changing standards and expectations sometimes created tension within departments. Laura Emma Lockwood (1863–1956) emerged from the same University of Nebraska programme that produced Louise Pound (t Henry VI, Tudor Shakespeare) and Willa Cather. After earning her PhD at Yale, she took a teaching position in the English department at Wellesley in 1899 under the leadership of Katharine Lee Bates. There, she developed a rivalry with fellow professor Sophie Hart, who enjoyed seniority over Lockwood despite her lack of a doctoral degree. Coming from outside the Wellesley breeding ground, Lockwood may have felt less respectful of the generational mentor–protégé relationships common within the faculty. Patricia Palmieri cites another similar feud in which an outsider who came from a large co-educational university felt superior to her Wellesley-educated colleagues.60 The period of overlap between the first generation of women professors and their more officially accredited successors was often characterised by strain among faculty members,
particularly as the older ‘war horses’ refused to hand over responsibilities to the newer generation. In Cone’s editions, in order to distinguish White’s work from that of the new editor, all additional annotations appear within square brackets. Those square-bracketed notes far outnumber White’s original, minimal glossing. The editions retain White’s short introductions to each play but supplement them after the play text with a long section of questions and analysis, including extensive characterological commentary, by Cone. White did not engage in character analysis in the Riverside, so the limited critical material restricts the conclusions that can be drawn from the edition itself. Luckily, however, White wrote long critical pieces on both Hamlet and Macbeth for a different book, allowing for a fuller consideration of how Cone’s influence shaped the student editions in opposition to White’s stated views. The character of Lady Macbeth in particular offers a visible point of comparison and demonstrates the power that an editor wields when presenting texts to students.

Originally published in the Massachusetts Ploughman and New England Journal of Agriculture’s ‘Ladies’ Department’ section in 1870, White’s essay entitled ‘The Lady Gruach’s Husband’ also appears in a posthumous collection of his writing called Studies in Shakespeare, published in 1885, a decade before Cone’s revised edition of Macbeth. In this aggressively misogynistic piece, White conspicuously uses the adjective ‘imaginative’ when describing Lady Macbeth, contrasting the ‘less imaginative’ woman to her husband. Here, ‘imaginative’ seems more related to idealism and abstract thought than creativity. White applies the descriptor to women in general, explaining that unlike men, who ‘love power for its own sake . . . women, less imaginative, and, outside of love, more practical and material than men’, desire power in part for the ‘visible elevation’ it provides them, but ‘more for that which it enables them to give to those they love’. In Lady Macbeth’s case, unimaginative, without tenderness, with a cruel, remorseless nature and a bright, clear intellect that saw at once the end that she desired and the means of its attainment, she was a type of those female politicians who in the past ages of the world’s moral rudeness have sought, and, by intrigue, by suggestion, and by the stimulus of sexual temptation and feminine craft which made the strength of men their instrument, have attained, that great end of woman’s ambition, social préeminence.

‘A tigress’, White claims, ‘has not less compunction when she bears a white gasping infant off into the jungle.’ Of course, many critics and readers have embraced the interpretation of Lady Macbeth as the primary
instigator of the couple’s crimes. White’s larger misogyny lies in how he applies Lady Macbeth’s actions and motives to the majority of woman-kind. Women, according to White, will sacrifice everything for the benefit of their men, ‘and sometimes their sisters; and have been known to rejoice even in the triumphs of their dearest female friends’, but a clever woman who lacks ‘tenderness’ is, perforce, ‘the most unscrupulous and remorseless creature under the canopy of heaven’.  

Cone’s analysis reuses some aspects of White’s reading while also reformulating it, restricting it to Lady Macbeth as an individual rather than as an exemplar of her gender. In the process she reconfigures the adjective ‘imaginative’, which White deployed frequently. Regarding Act 2, Scene 1, Cone writes that

Throughout this superb scene there is a contrast between the emotional and imaginative Macbeth, and his wife, who is not only far less emotional and imaginative, but who has all her powers under the control of an inflexible will. It must be strongly emphasized that this is a contrast of organization, and not of moral condition. At the end of the scene we cannot justly pronounce that Macbeth is remorseful, his wife incapable of remorse; judgment must be reserved until the end of the play.

Here, ‘imaginative’ becomes a more neutral descriptor. Lady Macbeth possesses a ‘singleness of purpose. Her nature . . . is simple and balanced; all her powers work together. She is rapid, clear, and direct of thought, and her will is as strong as steel.’ While similar to White’s interpretation in points such as her ambition on her husband’s behalf, a reader can find more to admire in Cone’s Lady Macbeth than in White’s. A student first encountering Macbeth through White’s critical materials would have a different experience than one primed with Cone’s introduction. Cone appears to have constructed her arguments so as to build on and respond to White’s original position, subverting his points while giving them a place in the editions that still bear his name and authority.

Other publishers did not grant their revising editors so much power. In the early part of the twentieth century, D. C. Heath’s Arden Shakespeare series seemingly relaunched itself partly in an effort to appeal to the American market. As Andrew Murphy notes, the series has a convoluted print history, and was completely unrelated to the Arden Shakespeare published by Methuen. Never completed, the earliest volumes appeared around 1895, and new editions continued to be released until around 1932. This included an edition of 2 Henry IV edited by Welsh academic Lilian Winstanley. At some point around 1910–15, Heath began reissuing earlier volumes revised by new editors. Unlike the originals, these were
‘American editions’, prepared by American editors. The publisher had always been the Boston-based D. C. Heath, but the initial volumes were mostly edited by British scholars. Like the Tudor Shakespeare, the publishers hoped to appeal to the American market with an emphasis on ‘home-grown’ scholarship, as illustrated in Figure 3.5.

Before the interruption in publication, an advertisement shows that Professor Martha Foote Crow had been hired to edit *King Lear*, but the *Lear* ultimately released in 1902 was edited by D. N. Smith. Most of the revision editors were men, but Heath hired Katharine Lee Bates to revise Frederick Boas’s edition of *The Tempest* (1916) and Edith Rickert to revise E. K. Chambers’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (1919).

The changes made in the revised editions seem minimal, mostly intended to bring the original introductions up to date with changes in scholarship. Some of the possible restrictions placed on the revision editors are visible in Edith Rickert’s edition. In 1923, she published two articles in *Modern Philology*, explaining her reasons for believing that *Midsummer* was written in honour of the entertainment given for Queen Elizabeth by the Earl of Hertford at Elvetham, rather than for the weddings to which it is more commonly connected. Although she begins the paper by explaining that she developed the theory while preparing the edition, no indication of her endorsement appears in the published edition, which sticks to Chambers’s original explanation regarding the possible wedding connections, mentioning Elvetham only briefly in an appendix.
Ohio-born Edith Rickert attended Vassar as an undergraduate, completing her bachelor’s degree in 1891. She then moved to London, where she wrote freelance and ‘devilled’ in the British Museum for others. Martha Foote Crow, the University of Chicago professor originally hired by Heath to edit King Lear, was one of several academics who hired Rickert to carry out research in the Museum. Rickert stayed in London until around 1897, during which time she registered as a doctoral candidate at the University of Chicago. In 1897, Rickert returned to Vassar, where she worked as an instructor while completing her thesis. She was supervised at Vassar by the Tudor Shakespeare editor Laura Wylie, who served as head of the English department for over two decades. After an initial positive impression, Rickert found Wylie to be extremely difficult. On 9 January 1898, Rickert wrote in her diary that an interview with Miss W. just used me up. I don’t know what to think of her or myself any more. She appears to think me on the whole second-rate, but yet in her summing up, she is so inconsistent that I cannot feel that her judgment is right. It’s all a perfect jumble. If I am losing my grasp of things, it’s time to take hold of the matter & stop it. Is it true? Sally says not, but then she is prejudiced by our friendship. Perfectly helpless, hopeless, yet I’ve got to prove to her that she’s wrong – got to – or I shall regret it all my life. It’s hard because she admits that she is prejudiced agst [sic] me, but it’s got to be done – somehow.

Several weeks’ worth of depressed entries follow before another meeting with Wylie on January 24:

Another talk with my respected chief. Not much satisfaction. She grants that I may have a little brain – a little power to attack ‘intellectual problems’ but makes an entirely new charge – lack of ‘literary sense’. Drop the subject. I am curious to know how it will come out; but I shall & cannot stay here more than one year longer. For Ethel’s sake I’ll do that, if possible. More dead than alive tonight.

True to her word, Rickert left Vassar as soon as possible, returning to London to once again write freelance and research for herself and others.

While the Rickert–Wylie relationship demonstrates again that dealings amongst women academics were not always filled with sororal good will and fellowship, Rickert also maintained a long correspondence with a significantly more supportive mentor, her fellow Arden reviser Katharine Lee Bates. Bates admired Rickert for leaving teaching to write full-time, a consummation Bates devoutly wished for but never achieved. Bates remarked in one letter that ‘we are all colleagues, are we not, in the patient
years of teaching and the secret “urge” . . . toward the free pen? In around 1909, Rickert moved from London to Boston, where she joined the editorial department at D. C. Heath and the *Ladies’ Home Journal*, a situation that Bates judged ‘better, but still not just right’ for her friend. 

Rickert therefore worked for Heath during the re-release of the Arden volumes, which explains her own involvement as volume editor, and potentially Bates’s as well.

After a few years, Rickert moved to Washington, DC, to assist with the war effort. Both Edith and her sister Margaret worked as codebreakers during the world wars, Edith during the first, and Margaret during the second. In this they followed the urging of fellow editor Virginia Gildersleeve, who encouraged educated girls to join the war effort, insisting that their talents would be valued. She pointed out that ‘even the training in research given to candidates for the Ph.D. degree, long held up to ridicule as the very epitome of uselessness, is in many cases proving its worth’. In a speech after the First World War, Gildersleeve encouraged her listeners to ‘never stop any research of your own that you are engaged in because you think it is of no use’, justifying it with a Shakespeare-related anecdote:

> I have tried, at times, to teach Shakespeare, and like many who would be good Shakespeare scholars, I have had great contempt for the Baconians. There was a distinguished, rather prominent, enthusiastic Baconian in this country who had collected, in connection with his researches, the most complete set of books in codes and ciphers that I believe existed in the country. They found extraordinary codes and ciphers of use in explaining how Bacon began to write the books of Shakespeare, and books of codes are all interesting. This Baconian had collected a really remarkable library on codes and ciphers and when the United States entered the War, the decoding of ciphers was quite an important task that fell to the Intelligence department of the Army, and the Baconian’s library proved very useful. So even such an eccentric field as this was practical.

After the war, Rickert moved to Chicago to collaborate with John Matthews Manly, and in the 1920s, she joined the faculty at the University of Chicago. She went on to co-edit one of the most important Chaucer projects of the twentieth century, the Chicago Chaucer Research Project. Unsurprisingly, the Chaucer project employed a number of women, including two of the three primary researchers who finished the project after Manly’s and Rickert’s deaths. In this, Rickert carried on the legacy of supporting and offering opportunities to younger female colleagues.
Charlotte Endymion Porter and Helen Archibald Clarke

Of all the women editing Shakespeare in America, the most well-known held no university posts. Their careers do not fit neatly into the preceding moulds and statistics. Rather, Charlotte Endymion Porter and Helen Archibald Clarke blazed their own trail into the increasingly rarefied world of Shakespeare studies. Nancy Glazener writes that the pair ‘[epitomised] some of the best tendencies of nineteenth-century public literary culture’ because they ‘combined scholarly seriousness, a taste for innovation, and fandom’. Their uniqueness has also ensured that when scholars began investigating the history of women editing Shakespeare, they were among the first to be rediscovered and lauded. In the conclusion to her article on their literary accomplishments, Jeanne Addison Roberts suggests that ‘their work should be belatedly recognized as a landmark in the history of editing, and that they should be recognized as a welcome addition to the long-standing brotherhood of “the Shakespearian editorial club”’. Although modern recognition is well-deserved, there is no need to retroactively add Porter and Clarke to a club in which they were, in their own time, card-carrying members. Porter and Clarke represent the most visible point of osmosis between the supposed ‘brotherhood’ and ‘sisterhood’ of Shakespeare editors in America.

Clarke and Porter met when Clarke submitted an article to Shakespeariana, a literary publication edited by Porter. Neither came from the better-known women’s colleges or coeducational schools – Porter attended Wells College in upstate New York, and Clarke received a certificate from the University of Pennsylvania (not yet co-educational at the time) and studied at the Sorbonne. After Porter resigned from Shakespeariana, the pair founded the literary magazine Poet Lore, now the oldest continuously running poetry journal in the United States, in 1889. As editors of both publications, Porter and Clarke occupied a significant place in the American literary world around the turn of the century. They served as gatekeepers and tastemakers. Although they founded Poet Lore to promote the study of Shakespeare and Robert Browning, Porter and Clarke also championed Ibsen, Strindberg, Chekhov, and the emerging Irish literary drama in its pages. They also supported other women. Not including its editors, in its first decade, Poet Lore included work by ninety-five female contributors, many of whom wrote multiple pieces for the journal during that period. When Porter and Clarke’s substantial contributions are taken into account, more than half the material published in that decade came from women, including
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women editors Katharine Lee Bates, Pauline Wiggin, and Charlotte Carmichael Stopes. In the following years, they also published work by editors Helen Gray Cone and Maud Elma Kingsley.

Over a decade after founding *Poet Lore*, the first volumes of Porter and Clarke’s First Folio and Pembroke editions appeared, printed by Thomas Y. Crowell of New York. The Pembroke was a simplified, ‘general reader’ version of the forty-volume First Folio edition. The first four volumes of the First Folio edition were prepared by both women, after which Clarke moved on to other interests, leaving Porter to complete the other thirty-six on her own. In terms of sheer volume of work, this was an incredible achievement. As John Dover Wilson wrote in a 1937 letter to bibliographer Henrietta Bartlett, ‘I had no idea . . . that Charlotte Porter could possibly have been responsible for two complete editions of the Works of Shakespeare, both beginning in 1903, but such is the incredible fact.’ Emma Smith identifies Porter and Clarke’s edition as the first ‘First Folio’ edition prepared for modern readers following a century of calls for it and an increasing reliance on the First Folio’s authority by editors.

When the first volumes appeared, Oxford professor Walter Raleigh, who had been attempting to convince Oxford University Press to do a First Folio edition, wrote to Charles Cannan at the Press that ‘[t]his is a hard business. It’s exactly the book. I could do without the introductions, and the side-notes are often unnecessary and sometimes wrong. But the rest is all right, and I think, is exactly what is needed . . . I don’t see a way past . . . these two advanced ladies.’ Some references to the editions among Press employees and editors were decidedly gendered. One letter to editor David Nichol Smith referred to their edition of *King Lear* as ‘the Ladies’ Lear’. In another letter, Clarendon Press secretary R. W. Chapman noted that ‘I daresay you know the “Folio” Shakespeare which is being dribbled out of two American ladies . . . . It is said to be good.’ Perhaps ‘dribbling’ is exactly the verbiage one should expect from a man who would later crib and fail to credit his wife Katherine Metcalfe Chapman’s editorial work on *Jane Austen*.

In the introduction to the London printing of the First Folio edition, John Churton Collins writes that Porter and Clarke’s goal has been to empower everyday readers, to free them from dependence on ‘what the poet’s editors have chosen to give’ them, those editors mostly being ‘cranks and fribbles’. That inherited text, Collins asserts, is ‘a concoction the quality and characteristics of which have been determined partly by the idiosyncrasies of particular editors, and partly by the literary tastes and fashions of particular epochs’. This is a fairly accurate summary of...
Porter’s feelings on the matter. Discussing a crux in Keats in a letter to Richard Gilder, poet and editor of *The Century Magazine*, Porter colourfully expresses her opinion of many Shakespeare editors:

I am sure it is one of those punctilious external corrections of prosaic editors, such as they have administered to that ‘careless’ consummate artist, Will Shakespeare, till they have made that curious amalgam of three centuries they call the ‘standard text’ more multifariously and anachronistically corrupt with their ‘corrections’ than that of any other English poet.

I came across an interesting instance recently wherein the real word has since the First Folio never seen the light. And it is most up to date. It puts Willy in the category of those who see that disadvantage to the younger brother where the laud is taken from him, and he is legally made poor.

Although Raleigh and the Oxford University Press delegates criticised Porter and Clarke’s paratextual materials, other critics have found useful details in their introductions; J. Dover Wilson, for example, was impressed by Porter’s foresight in demonstrating that Richard Grant White’s then-popular theory regarding the date of *Richard II*’s composition arose from a bibliographical error. In addition to the critical material in their editions, the two women also produced an extremely well-regarded set of study guides for the plays, originally published in *Poet Lore*, then collected and released separately. The guides were aimed at study circles or clubs. Self-education and social learning were immensely popular in nineteenth-century America, particularly among women, and *Poet Lore* published the reports of Browning, Shakespeare, and general literary clubs across the country. Their editions of Shakespeare cannot be regarded as ‘school texts’ on their own, but taken in conjunction with their study guides, Porter and Clarke’s body of work contain a strong emphasis on education and teaching. Via *Shakespeariana*, *Poet Lore*, and their editions, they reached many readers of varying education levels, bridging, like Katharine Lee Bates, the divide between ‘high’ and ‘low’ scholarship. While doing so, they also helped to create space for women in the national literary dialogue. And in fact, their Shakespeare text immediately became a multigenerational part of women’s editorial history – only a year after its 1903 publication, the publishers licensed the Pembroke text to Doubleday, Page, who reprinted it as a new illustrated series, complete with new introductions by Esther Wood.

Porter and Clarke were exceptional in their degree of scholarly independence; however, for those less fortunate, the spaces and networks established around the framework of the American women’s colleges provided crucial support for scholarly activities. As a result, many of the American
women who edited Shakespeare were directly connected via the extensive network of women’s and coeducational colleges. They attended the same schools, taught in the same departments, and wrote for the same publications. These relationships involved but did not revolve around male scholars. As is still the case, carrying out editorial work required a high level of financial, institutional, and social privilege. Women editors relied not only on the financial support of their universities but often on the domestic support of family and partners. Although most remained unmarried, or stopped working after marriage, many early women professors, including Katherine Lee Bates, lived with widowed mothers and unmarried sisters, who often handled domestic duties and assisted with their research, even serving as their amanuenses. They formed lifelong domestic partnerships, or ‘Boston marriages’, with fellow professors. These stories further underscore the point that no editor is an island – all editorial work involves the support and input of myriad people and institutions.
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First Folio Edition. (London: George G. Harrap, 1906), I, pp. ii, xiii. Although advertised as the First Folio edition, the Harrap printing is comprised of thirteen volumes without extensive explanatory material, so it would more properly be considered a reprint of the Pembroke edition. For this London reprint Harrap replaced all of Porter and Clarke’s introductory material with a forty-three-page introduction by Collins, an English critic and professor at Birmingham. This may have been a response to some of the America-centric language Porter and Clarke used in their original preface:

In a word, the English editors of Shakespeare have continuously groped backward from the most modern toward the most ancient text. And it was reserved for the American editor Dr. Horace Howard Furness to be the first to adopt the rational and scientific method which alone makes it possible to catch all preceding slips and to forestall new causes of error by printing the First Folio as it stands, and noting variations from that in chronological order. (Shakespeare, Clarke, and Porter, Shakespeare: First Folio Edition, IV, pp. xi–xii)

[Our thanks] to Dr. Furness, whose new and thoroughly American lead [the editors] have followed in adopting for this edition the First Folio text. (Shakespeare, Clarke, and Porter, Shakespeare: First Folio Edition, IV, p. xv)
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