Remembrance and Response: George MacDonald and the Blank Page1

Ashley Chu
Joe Ricke

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.snc.edu/northwind

Recommended Citation

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English at Digital Commons @ St. Norbert College. It has been accepted for inclusion in North Wind: A Journal of George MacDonald Studies by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ St. Norbert College. For more information, please contact sarah.titus@snc.edu.
Remembrance and Response: George MacDonald and the Blank Page

George MacDonald, Shakespeare Scholar

George MacDonald (1824-1905)—prolific author, poet, and controversial heterodox minister—is perhaps best remembered for his fairytales and fantasy literature. Until more recently, however, little attention has been paid to his contributions to Shakespeare scholarship during the second half of the nineteenth century. Still, because MacDonald’s contributions were made primarily through lectures rather than publication (not uncommon in the Victorian era), his scholarship has been relatively ephemeral by modern standards. But this is changing. Our research has documented hundreds of accounts dating back to as early as 1854 and as late as 1891 attesting to MacDonald’s skill and popularity as a lecturer on a variety of literary topics—Wordsworth, Burns, Shelley, Tennyson, but above all, Shakespeare.

Throughout MacDonald’s long life and career, he spent significant time and energy studying, performing, and lecturing on Shakespeare, testifying repeatedly that the Bard’s works were “second only to the Bible” in his esteem. In an 1866 letter to his maternal uncle (who had expressed admiration for his work on Shakespeare), MacDonald writes that “it is one result of much study of the poet. Indeed, I have studied him more than any book except the Gospels.” In fact, later in his career, MacDonald sometimes gave a popular series of “Sermons from Shakespeare.” One contemporary who “never missed” MacDonald’s lectures on Shakespeare claimed, perhaps sarcastically, that “his lectures were in fact sermons, better than the sermons he published.” Not surprisingly, Shakespeare, especially the “moral drift” of Shakespeare, as MacDonald phrased it, played a significant role in MacDonald’s many other writings.

As a testimony to his reputation, MacDonald was recruited as a Vice-President of the fledgling New Shakspere [sic] Society in 1873. The Society’s indefatigable and controversial founder, F. J. Furnivall, attended and documented MacDonald’s 1874 six-part Shakespeare lecture series, often appealed to MacDonald’s opinion to reinforce his own scholarly opinions, and invited MacDonald to present a paper at a Society meeting and publish it in the Society Transactions (both of which MacDonald politely declined). As Furnivall and the Society were especially interested in issues related to establishing authoritative editions of Shakespeare’s texts (and in arguing about such questions), it is not surprising that in 1876 MacDonald...
began planning to produce a critical edition of his favorite play and favorite lecture topic, *Hamlet*. Finally, in 1885, after years of study and lecturing, MacDonald published *The Tragedie of Hamlet: A Study with the Text of the Folio of 1623* (hereafter, *Tragedie*).

The Center for the Study of C.S. Lewis & Friends at Taylor University (hereafter, Lewis Center) curates an extensive MacDonald collection, including many first editions, inscribed copies, letters, books from MacDonald’s personal library, and Victorian periodicals containing first states of MacDonald’s writings. The collection not only contains several rare copies of MacDonald’s *Tragedie*, but also includes an interleaved manuscript that appears, at first glance, to be an early draft of the published edition. This manuscript received little scholarly attention until a group of Taylor University undergraduate students, under the guidance of Joe Ricke, Director of the Lewis Center, competed in *Finding Alexandria*, a research contest sponsored by the university’s Zondervan Library. Their efforts resulted in not only winning first prize in the competition, but, more importantly, in an attempt at transcribing and describing the manuscript. Subsequently, Ricke and Ashley Chu, University Archivist and Special Collections Librarian, received two consecutive summer research grants to direct a wide-ranging contextual study of the manuscript with a team of undergraduate researchers. That contextual study eventually branched out in unforeseen ways, leading to this exploration of the significant ways George MacDonald and his contemporaries utilized interleaved manuscripts to respond to Shakespeare and to one other.

**The Hamlet Manuscript at Taylor University**

The Lewis Center’s *Hamlet* manuscript annotated by George MacDonald (hereafter, Taylor *Hamlet*) contains the text of an 1851 copy of Charles Knight’s *Hamlet* that has been disbound, interleaved with blued paper, annotated throughout in pencil and multiple colors of ink, and rebound in green morocco leather. Both the provenance of the manuscript and comparison with other examples of MacDonald’s writing verify that the annotations are in George MacDonald’s hand. The flyleaves at the back of the volume are crowded with writing, heavily revised and edited with multiple strikethroughs and insertions. Interestingly, once the emendations are accounted for, this seeming chaos appears to be an almost final corrected draft of MacDonald’s poem, “A Vision of St. Eligius” (1873). That the manuscript contains the draft of a poem published in America in 1873, while MacDonald was in the middle of his American lecture tour, suggests that MacDonald had the manuscript with him on that trip (and thus had the manuscript in some form by late September 1872 when he sailed for Boston). Unfortunately, he was rarely asked to lecture on *Hamlet* while in America,
although the final lecture of the tour, “Humanity in Hamlet” (New York City, May 22, 1873) was a rousing success.²⁴

Figure 1. The title page of the Taylor Hamlet manuscript (see note 25).

The title page of the Knight text of the Taylor *Hamlet* bears the date December 10, 1881 (MacDonald’s fifty-seventh birthday) and the dedication, “Lilia Scott MacDonald, from her father.”²⁵ [Figure 1.] MacDonald’s traditional bookplate is pasted onto the front flyleaf.²⁶ The verso of the flyleaf contains the date May 15, 1876, the publication date of an article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* about printers’ blunderings which MacDonald quotes in the manuscript.²⁷ This does not date the manuscript as such, but it does suggest, as does the evidence of the poem draft, a much earlier composition date than 1881. On subsequent introductory pages, MacDonald appears to lay out his plan for explaining the editorial problems the play poses:

Give a short account of the two quartos + folio, as containing all ground of criticism. The blunders in the first quarto are just such as would be made from a careless sketch (?). Title page of 2nd Q[uarto]. In the matter of readings the question lies entirely between the second quarto and the first folio. [Give] reason why. Occasional reference to first quarto. Short account of quartos, and my theory concerning the changes in the folio.²⁸

MacDonald then provides a rather lengthy “Sketch of the Story of the Play,” something that he parcels out throughout his published edition of *Tragedie*.²⁹
Figure 2. A page of the Taylor Hamlet manuscript containing multiple ink colors, various handwriting orientation, and cross-referencing symbols.

Nearly every page of the Taylor Hamlet manuscript is marked by the author, both directly on Knight’s Hamlet text and on the inserted blank pages. There appear to be five colors of ink used, which, when used for underlining, seem to correspond to specific characters in the play. Throughout, black ink is used for emphasis and for textual notes. The presence of multiple colors of ink on the same page with odd combinations of text and underlining suggests MacDonald’s recursive study of the play over time. When MacDonald runs out of traditional writing space, his annotations climb up the page or turn upside down, and even sometimes upside down between lines of previously written text. MacDonald also used a variety of symbols to identify and cross-reference his notes to the play’s text. [See Figure 2.] In several significant ways, the manuscript mirrors the published Tragedie. Both begin with MacDonald’s explanation regarding his preference for the First Folio text of Hamlet. Both discuss the challenges related to “printers’ blunderings.” Both have a similar layout with the play text printed on one page and annotations (or space for annotations) on the facing page.

Without further context, therefore, it would be logical to assume that the Taylor Hamlet manuscript was simply a draft for MacDonald’s Tragedie, envisioned, as we have seen, as early as May 1876. The inscription date of 1881 might also appear to support this assumption. However, our research, including the compilation of the “Timeline of Lectures and Performances” as well as an annotated bibliography to undergird a study of MacDonald’s relationship to Shakespeare, challenged this assumption. Close attention to and a deeper exploration of the details of MacDonald’s six-part lecture
series on *Hamlet* in 1876 revealed another purpose for the manuscript.\(^{31}\) In fact, the article from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, referenced on the Taylor *Hamlet* flyleaf and dated May 15, 1876, was published just one day prior to the commencement of MacDonald’s aforementioned *Hamlet* lecture series. The Taylor *Hamlet* also contains two indices, one of which provides the page numbers for key passages within the play.\(^{32}\) This index would likely have been helpful to MacDonald in quickly identifying the relevant page numbers to give the powerful illustrative readings at lectures for which he was known.\(^{33}\) This and other evidence suggests that the interleaved manuscript served at least four purposes for MacDonald: to engage in deep study of the play (a lifelong interest), to prepare for his lectures, to refer to during his lectures, and, ultimately, to work out his ideas for what would almost a decade later become his published edition of *Hamlet* based on the Folio text. It is often noted that MacDonald claimed that he always lectured “extempore,” but, clearly he had a text in his hand when he lectured, and, at least some of the time, that text happened to be interleaved with his notes.\(^{34}\)

**Additional Interleaved Manuscripts by MacDonald**

Upon determining that MacDonald almost certainly utilized the Taylor *Hamlet* interleaved manuscript for his 1876 *Hamlet* lectures (and probably had been using it already for many years) and given MacDonald’s lifelong interest in Shakespeare, the question arose of whether other such manuscripts might exist. Although MacDonald only published the edition of *Hamlet*, he frequently lectured on other Shakespeare plays, especially *King Lear* and *Macbeth*.\(^{35}\) We were elated to discover that, in fact, at least two other interleaved Shakespeare manuscripts annotated by George MacDonald do exist. All three interleaved manuscripts are identically bound, similarly interleaved, and feature the distinctive MacDonald bookplate pasted in. An interleaved *Timon of Athens*, bearing MacDonald’s signature on the title page, is located at the National Library of Scotland.\(^{36}\) Like the Taylor *Hamlet*, it uses the text from the same Charles Knight volume, features various colors of ink, has extensive annotations (some oriented sideways and upside down), and utilizes various symbols for notes and cross-references. Further, it appears that MacDonald has annotated recursively over time, reviewing the manuscript multiple times, initially with red ink and later with pencil. Finally, a much more sparsely annotated interleaved *King Lear* manuscript in MacDonald’s hand resides in the Charles E. Young Research Library at UCLA.\(^{37}\) Whether MacDonald hoped someday to produce editions of these two plays (and perhaps others) is a mystery for which we are still seeking a solution.\(^{38}\)
Interleaved Manuscripts Related to MacDonald

Another question is whether there are other interleaved manuscripts owned and annotated by MacDonald out there waiting to be discovered. One possibility we considered is that MacDonald disbound, interleaved, and annotated all of the tragedies in Knight’s Volume One, which contained Romeo and Juliet, Othello, and Macbeth (as well as Hamlet, King Lear, and Timon of Athens). It seems especially likely that MacDonald would have utilized an interleaved Macbeth manuscript given that play’s importance to MacDonald not only as a lecture topic but also as a performance piece.39 Our quest to discover other interleaved manuscripts annotated by MacDonald led us to the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington D.C. to examine a nineteenth-century edition of Hamlet (hereafter, Folger Hamlet) identified by the Folger as “interleaved throughout with extensive annotations and commentary by George MacDonald.”40 We had been encouraged by the work of Ann Thompson, distinguished Shakespeare scholar and co-editor of the Arden Hamlet. Assuming that this Folger interleaved manuscript was an early draft of MacDonald’s Tragedie, Thompson used it as the basis of an important Shakespeare Quarterly essay (2000) championing MacDonald’s previously ignored ideas about both the play itself and, more important to her scholarship, about editing Shakespeare.41

Eureka! Another one! Or so we thought, as we excitedly pointed out MacDonaldisms to one another. Eventually, though, after several hours with the manuscript, we realized that things just didn’t add up. Although the text of the play is, once again, Knight’s 1851 edition with identical pagination as the Taylor Hamlet, although the manuscript is interleaved, although the manuscript has extensive annotations, although the manuscript includes the name of George MacDonald, and although the manuscript contains (uncharacteristically) brief versions of MacDonald’s typically lengthy comments on Hamlet, it is not bound in green morocco, it does not bear the MacDonald bookplate, and it is not annotated in MacDonald’s hand. The manuscript is not “MacDonald’s.”

Another curious feature of the Folger Hamlet is that the majority of the annotations were originally written in pencil and later recopied in ink, unlike the annotations in the three authenticated MacDonald Shakespeare interleaved manuscripts. Although MacDonald’s work was recursive, it was cumulative, not repetitive. He typically made new comments or qualified old ones, but he rarely, if ever, simply copied over them. Further obstacles to attributing the manuscripts to MacDonald are several third-person references to “George MacDonald” or “Geo MacDonald” within the annotations, and, especially, the name of a prominent Victorian educator written on the title page of the Knight text. We concluded that, despite its attribution to MacDonald by the Folger Shakespeare Library, the Folger Hamlet was
owned by and annotated by J. P. Faunthorpe, a long-time principal of Whitelands Training College in Chelsea. Ann Thompson was correct, however, that the Folger Hamlet manuscript reflected MacDonald’s ideas about Hamlet, because, as we pieced this puzzle together, we now know it contains a detailed summary of MacDonald’s 1876 six-part Hamlet lecture series. Upon further comparison, the dates listed in the misattributed Folger Hamlet manuscript align perfectly with the lecture series. We concluded that the manuscript’s annotations were undoubtedly MacDonaldesque, but they were not inscribed by MacDonald himself.

Our discovery of Faunthorpe’s ownership and use of the Folger Hamlet not only clarified the mystery of MacDonald’s relationship to the manuscript, it also demonstrated yet another purpose of interleaving in relation to MacDonald and Shakespeare. This particular interleaved manuscript was not necessarily used to prepare a lecture or a publication; it was simply a really good way to take notes, as many Victorian students knew quite well. The nature of the interleaved manuscript allowed its owner ample space to respond, not only to the original text (in this case, Shakespeare), but also to record and respond to insights from others (lecturers for example; in this case, George MacDonald). That Faunthorpe was a teacher and lecturer himself, using the same Knight edition as MacDonald, and taking notes in an interleaved manuscript at the same time MacDonald was almost certainly using his own interleaved manuscript for giving his lecture—well, that’s a Tom Stoppard play for another day.

Exploring the actual card catalog at the Folger Shakespeare Library in hopes of learning more about the mysterious Mr. Faunthorpe, we discovered an interleaved manuscript utilizing Knight’s 1851 edition of King Lear. This very full manuscript is, unlike the Folger Hamlet, actually attributed to Faunthorpe. Among many other elements, it includes transcribed notes from a MacDonald lecture on King Lear. The annotations within this manuscript appear to be from different periods of time, indicating recursive study spanning several decades. Some of them seem to be in a different hand from Faunthorpe’s although the differences may be attributed to the writer’s age. Among a hodge-podge of parts, most of them in one way or another related to King Lear, some of the annotations record a specific George MacDonald lecture, including MacDonald’s name and many of his characteristic remarks about King Lear (in a condensed form, as if one were taking notes not simply copying from another written source). The “MacDonald notes” were written originally in pencil and most of them are copied over later in ink, as in the Folger Hamlet. This manuscript, belonging to Faunthorpe and apparently used for a lifetime of study of the play, demonstrates how an interleaved manuscript could be reviewed and revised throughout decades of an individual’s life. It also provides scholars...
an important witness to the content of one of MacDonald’s lectures on King Lear.

**Interleaved Manuscript as Literary Promptbook**

MacDonald’s and Faunthorpe’s interleaved Shakespeare manuscripts bear a striking resemblance to another type of manuscript that was especially popular during the nineteenth century: the interleaved manuscript promptbook. According to Charles Harlen Shattuck, “The makers of the earliest promptbooks using printed text marked them upon the text, between the lines, and along the margins. About the 1780’s the practice arose of inserting blank sheets between the text sheets to provide more room for the prompter’s markings. Interleaving was extremely common throughout the nineteenth century.”

46 Just as standard theatrical promptbooks were compiled in order to “piece together a theatrical production,” MacDonald’s interleaved manuscripts allowed him to assemble a compilation that included the text of the play, notes on particularly significant or difficult words or phrases, interpretive commentary on the text, his lecture notes, references to particular passages he wished to read aloud or give special emphasis (“performance” notes of a kind), and other comments he thought worth recording or remembering. Since MacDonald was both deeply interested in performance and, with his family troupe, actually mounted many theatrical productions in his lifetime, (including *Macbeth* and *Twelfth Night*), it is no surprise that he sometimes even included stage directions and “advice to the actors” in the Taylor *Hamlet* and in his later published *Tragedie*. For three examples among many such, MacDonald adds the following theatrical suggestions in the Taylor *Hamlet*: “[Horatio,] with the light laugh of incredulity” (119), “Horatio is greatly disturbed by the vision” (122), “[Hamlet] looking or motioning from the one to the other of the three” (131).

49

*Figure 3. A Midsummer-Night’s Dream promptbook from the Folger Digital Image Collection (see note 50).*
We also discovered an interleaved Shakespearean promptbook of *A Midsummer-Night’s Dream*, in appearance not unlike the MacDonald and Faunthorpe interleaved manuscripts, at the Folger Shakespeare Library.\(^{50}\) Produced in the early nineteenth century, this promptbook predates MacDonald, yet the process and organization are much the same. [Figure 3.] As MacDonald utilized the Taylor *Hamlet* manuscript both for his lectures (a type of performance) as well as a published critical edition (a response or annotation), his interleaving created a sort of personal promptbook—organizing and directing MacDonald’s memory and knowledge of these specific plays. Faunthorpe’s interleaved manuscripts, containing his record of and response to MacDonald’s lectures, more nearly resembles what Shattuck identifies as a “‘memorial book’ . . . a book written up during or after a production by an interested participant or observer who wants to preserve his own account of the scenery, the stage business, the histrionics, etc.”\(^{51}\) Indeed, Faunthorpe attempted to capture the affective as well as the conceptual content of a MacDonald lecture, including adding spaces between letters and multiple exclamation marks to emphasize MacDonald’s emotional performance of Shakespeare’s most famous soliloquy (“To s l e e p !! Perchance to D r e a m !!!”).\(^{52}\) [Figure 4] To complete the comparisons, MacDonald’s published 1885 edition, still closely resembling the work of his interleaved manuscript, parallels what Shattuck calls a “final or souvenir promptbook, which is a perfected copy of the promptbook of a famous production . . . made up as a record or keepsake or as the model for future reproduction.”\(^{53}\)

*Figure 4. An example of Faunthorpe’s attempt to capture MacDonald’s presence (see note 52).*

**MacDonald’s Intentionality in Interleaving**

Significantly, George MacDonald employed interleaving not only for his scholarship, but he also utilized (and promoted) a “revised
version” of this technique in two of his published works. In other words, MacDonald published non-interleaved books that intentionally featured the most significant characteristic of interleaved manuscripts—plenty of empty space on the facing page for the reader/responder. Shattuck describes how the interleaved Victorian theatrical promptbooks went through a similar reification process in the second half of the nineteenth century: “As a substitute for interleaving, from Charles Kean’s time (the 1850’s) on, copies of the actor’s own edition were sometimes printed on recto only, so that the left-hand pages were left blank for actors’ and prompters’ notations.” MacDonald’s aforementioned 1885 Tragedie of Hamlet is formatted similar to his interleaved manuscript. The text of Shakespeare’s Folio is printed on the verso pages only, and, although it does have MacDonald’s interpretive notes on the facing page, there is usually adequate space for further responses by the reader to Shakespeare or MacDonald or even to a performance. [Figure 5.] Further, it is structurally clear that all “responses,” as opposed to the play text with textual variants, are on the facing page.

Figure 5. MacDonald’s Tragedie demonstrates his intentionality in incorporating an interleaving aesthetic in the published work.

Perhaps even more remarkable, MacDonald self-published his 1880 book of poems, A Book of Strife in the Form of the Diary of an Old Soul (hereafter, Diary), with a deliberate and provocative interleaved aesthetic intended to encourage the reader to respond in prayer, reflection, and meditation on the facing page.⁵⁴ According to MacDonald bibliographer
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Raphael Shaberman, “this book is unique among the first editions of MacDonald in its proportions (cover: cm: 16.8 x 8) and in being printed on one side of the leaf only, though pagination is continuous.” The “Old Soul” narrator explains his method in the dedication:

Sweet friends, receive my offering. You will find
Against each worded page a white page set: —
This is the mirror of each friendly mind
Reflecting that. In this book we are met. Make it, dear hearts, of worth to you indeed: —
Let your white page be ground, my print be seed,
Growing to golden ears, that faith and hope shall feed.

Though the book was self-published and had intentionally limited circulation, it was used, admired, and championed by none other than John Ruskin, who, according to Greville MacDonald, described it as “quaint, full of devotion, high in tone, the best example of the survival of faith in this skeptical age.”

MacDonald’s commitment to the significance of the blank page is underscored by the fact that he had Diary printed “at his own expense, [and] probably made no money at all.” While many later reprints have unfortunately eliminated the “fit-in-your-hand” dimensions, the intentionally blank pages, and even the directive dedication, all are absolutely essential components of the editions MacDonald published in the 1880s. In the spirit of interleaving and in direct response to MacDonald’s invitational dedication, contemporary poet Betty K. Aberlin published The White Page Poems (2008), featuring her poems facing and responding to MacDonald’s. Based
on our perusal of several Victorian copies of *Diary of an Old Soul*, she was not the first “sweet friend” to do so. As many beloved books do, but perhaps in an even more personal way than usual, copies of this book became a sort of combination keepsake book, memory book, friendship book, and prayer book for many readers. [Figure 6.]

### Conclusion

In the midst of research originally focused on George MacDonald and Shakespeare, this secondary theme of the various uses and affects of interleaving forced its way into our field of vision. We felt invited, even compelled, to respond. While other reasons exist for interleaving (e.g., the insertion of images or ephemera, combining two texts into a single volume, etc.), and while this practice was certainly not unique to MacDonald, these examples demonstrate some of the many ways interleaving Shakespearean texts could be valuable and, perhaps, how doing so suggested to a sensitive soul like MacDonald the deeper possibilities and profound benefits of an interleaving aesthetic. MacDonald interleaved in order to provide space for recording, remembering, and responding to the monumental achievement of Shakespeare (“second only to the Bible”). His high regard for this process is evidenced in the three (known) interleaved manuscripts that MacDonald created and had carefully bound for his study, for his lectures, and, at least in one case, for his published scholarship. It also directly influenced his unique and inspired method of publishing *The Tragedie of Hamlet*, much praised by recent Shakespeare scholarship. J. P. Faunthorpe, in his own way, responded to the influence of both Shakespeare and MacDonald by creating at least two interleaved manuscripts, which memorialized Shakespeare’s plays as well as MacDonald’s ideas and, sometimes, even MacDonald’s presence. Perhaps most theoretically interesting, MacDonald’s development of an interleaving aesthetic, anticipating so-called reader/response theory by almost a century, led him to invite his readers into a participatory role. At least in theory, readers become authors of *The Diary of an Old Soul*, especially when they make their mark on the previously blank page (already paginated by MacDonald).

One final use of MacDonald’s interleaved manuscripts worth our response, especially within the context of Victorian memory work, is how friends and contemporaries utilized interleaved manuscripts for the purposes of remembering, recording, and reflecting on death. Georgiana Cowper-Temple, intimate friend and patron of George MacDonald, “used her copy of the privately published *Diary of an Old Soul*, to mark the deaths of friends and relations.” J.P. Faunthorpe, whose interleaved manuscripts both recorded MacDonald’s lectures and imitated his practices, inserted a seemingly unrelated elegiac reflection on the sudden death of a good friend.
and colleague in his interleaved *King Lear* manuscript (although any elegiac reflection in a text responding to *King Lear* seems somehow relevant). The use of an interleaved manuscript (or a printed book using the same facing page aesthetic) as a highly personal memory book underscores the significance of MacDonald’s presumed purpose for interleaving both his multi-layered Shakespeare criticism and his poems of soul friendship: interleaving leaves space . . . Space to praise and to criticize and to honor and to revise and to remember. Space to record, and, especially, space to respond . . .

. . . to the text on the facing page, 
to the unseen face who calls to us across the text, 
and to the remarkable lives bound up with ours who, 
although they pass away, 
will not be unremembered 
as long as their marks remain with us.
1. The authors wish to acknowledge Taylor University’s Faculty Mentored Undergraduate Scholarship (FMUS) program, from which they received research grants in 2016, 2017, and 2018. The undergraduate students participating in FMUS and contributing to the larger “MacDonald and Shakespeare” project are Abby Palmisano (’17), Blair Hedges (’17), Kaylen Dwyer (’18), Kendra Smalley (’19), and Caleb Hoelscher (’19). We also would like to express our gratitude to the Bedi Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (Taylor University), Zondervan Library (Taylor University), Folger Shakespeare Library, The Marion E. Wade Center (Wheaton College), King’s College London Archives, National Library of Scotland, UCLA Library Special Collections, The Shakespeare Birthplace Trust Library, Whitelands College Archive (University of Roehampton), Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library (Yale University), and Indiana State Library Preservation Services. An earlier version of this article was presented at the Interdisciplinary Nineteenth Century Studies conference in Dallas, TX, March 2019.

2. MacDonald’s best-known fantasy publications included Phantastes: a Faerie Romance for Men and Women (1858), At the Back of the North Wind (1871), The Princess and the Goblin (1872), Lilith (1895), and the remarkable fairy tale collection, Dealings with Fairies (1864).


4. MacDonald did, however, publish at least four works during his long career that might be called Shakespeare scholarship. “The Art of Shakspere, as Revealed by Himself” (originally published 1863); “Saint George’s Day, 1564” (originally published 1864); and “The Elder Hamlet” (originally published 1876)—were all later republished in the collection Orts (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1882). In 1885 he published his edition of Hamlet (see note 17).

newspaper accounts which are often transcriptions of and commentaries on MacDonald’s lecture. Others include letters, diaries, memoirs, and lecture notes from attendees. See also Riche, Chu, and others, “George MacDonald and Shakespeare: An Annotated Bibliography,” unpublished.


8. See, for example, “Timeline,” 161 (entries 508, 510-512), 166 (entries 570, 573-575) and 167 (entries 576 and 579).


10. When MacDonald wrote to the organizers of his American lecture tour, he listed his four favorite lecture topics as “The moral drift of Shakespeare’s plays of Hamlet, King Lear, Macbeth, and Julius Caesar.” See George MacDonald to Sirs [Redpath and Fall], 12 March 1872, Call # Y.c. 3819, Folger Shakespeare Library. Throughout his career, he advertised his lectures on Shakespeare with the same introductory phrase. See “Timeline,” 141 (entries 264-269), 148 (entries 341 and 345), 149 (entries 350 and 352), 150 (entry 359), 167 (entry 579).

11. MacDonald references Shakespeare in the following publications (not an exhaustive list): Unspoken Sermons (1865, 1885, 1889), Adela Cathcart (1864), Alec Forbes of Howglen (1865), Annals of a Quiet Neighbourhood (1867), Cross Purposes (1862), David Elginbrod (1863), Donal Grant (1883), Elect Lady (1888), Far Above Rubies (1899), Flight of the Shadow (1891), Heather and Snow (1893), Home Again (1887), Lilith (1895), Malcolm (1875), Marquis of Lossie (1877), Mary Marston (1881), Paul Faber, Surgeon (1879), The Portent (1864), Ranald Bannerman’s Boyhood (1871), Robert Falconer (1868), A Rough Shaking (1891), Salted with Fire (1897), Seaboard Parish (1868), Sir Gibbie (1879), St. George and St. Michael (1876), Stephen Archer and Other Tales (1883), There and Back (1891), Thomas Wingfold (1876), Wilfred Cumbermede (1872), Weighed and Wanting (1882), What’s Mine’s Mine (1886).

12. “Shakspere” was the idiosyncratic spelling favored by Furnivall and the members of the Society. MacDonald is first mentioned as a Vice-President in the publication, “You are invited to join the New Shakspere Society,” Founder’s Prospectus of Nov. 1873, revised. Bungay: Clay and Taylor, The Chaucer Press, 1. For an enlightening and exhilarating story of the phenomenon that was the New Shakspere Society see, Jeffrey


14. *New Shakspere Society Transactions* (1874), 253; *Transactions* (1874), 253, note 1; *Transactions* (1874), 273, note 1; *Transactions* (1874), 498.


A brief description of the manuscript was presented by Pamela Jordan at the 2001 C. S. Lewis & Friends Colloquium at Taylor University. Her suggestion that the manuscript was probably related both to MacDonald’s lectures and his later edition of the play was an important early insight. Pamela Jordan, “George MacDonald on *Hamlet*,” *Inklings Forever* 3 (2001): 102.

20. See note 1.

21. George MacDonald. *Taylor Hamlet Manuscript* (interleaved). December 10, 1881. Brown Collection, Center for the Study of C.S. Lewis & Friends, Taylor University, Upland, IN. The physical description of the manuscript in this essay owes much to the work of Kaylen Dwyer, 2017 and 2018 student member of the Taylor research team, and a co-author of the aforementioned “Timeline.”


23. George MacDonald, “A Vision of St. Eligius” *Scribner’s Monthly* 5.4
(February 1873), 500. The poem was later published in *A Threefold Cord* (1883) and *Poetical Works*, Vol. 2 (1891).


25. MacDonald, Taylor *Hamlet* Manuscript (1885), 4r.

26. MacDonald’s bookplate featured an illustration by William Blake and the MacDonald family motto, an anagram of MacDonald’s name: “Corage! God mend al!”

27. MacDonald quotes directly from the article “Fireside Studies,” *Pall Mall Gazette*, May 15, 1876: 11-12.

28. 3r-v. Slight expansions and emendations by authors.

29. 5r-v, 7r-v. The “sketch” takes up four pages and over a thousand words. For Tragedie, see for example, “Summary of Act I,” 62-63.

30. See note 5.

31. The lectures were given at 8 Palace Gardens, Kensington on May 16, 19, 23, 26, 30, and June 2. See “Timeline,” 143 (entries 282-87).

32. 9r, 11r-13r.


34. MacDonald famously insisted to F. J. Furnivall that “I always speak extempore.” On the other hand, L. B. Walford witnessed a heated discussion between MacDonald and Ruskin after one of MacDonald’s Shakespeare lectures on Harley Street (June 1864) in which, she says, MacDonald “was talking and arguing a point . . . , and tapped his notes several times with his forefinger (it is unclear if these were simply ‘notes’ or an interleaved manuscript).” See MacDonald, Letter to Furnivale [sic], April 17, 1876, in *An Expression of Character: The Letters of George MacDonald*, ed. Glenn Sadler (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 246. See also L. B. Walford, *Memories of Victorian London* (London: Edward Arnold, 1912), 33-36. For the dating of the Harley Street Shakespeare lectures, see “Timeline,” 122 (entry 68).
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