WILLIAMSON
& Co
5 KING ST WEST,
TORONTO.

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

A LITERARY BIOGRAPHY

BY

KARL ELZE, PH.D., LL.D.

TRANSLATED BY

L. DORA SCHMITZ.
Translator of "The Correspondence between Schiller and Goethe," Ulrici's "Shakspeare's Dramatic Art," Elze's "Essays on Shakespeare," etc.

113462
31/5/11

LONDON: GEORGE BELL AND SONS, YORK STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.
1888.

[*Authorized Translation.*]

PR
2897
E613

CHISWICK PRESS :—C. WHITTINGHAM AND CO., TOOKS COURT,
CHANCERY LANE.

PREFACE.

DR. ELZE'S work on "Shakespeare," of which a translation is herewith offered to the English public, was published in Germany as early as 1876, and has there passed through several editions. The edition from which the present translation has been made has been specially revised and improved by the author for the English version. Dr. Elze's work has won the reputation in Germany of giving the fullest information on everything that is known in connection with Shakespeare's life, his works, and his surroundings, together with a careful criticism of all the disputed points. It has been one of the author's endeavours to make his book a readable one in every way, and to retain his reader's attention from beginning to end by giving his information as far as possible in a consecutive narrative, without allowing this form in any way to affect the critical character to which his work may justly lay claim. English students of Shakespeare and his times cannot but be interested in seeing the results of Shakespearean study in Germany, and it is hoped that this volume from one of the leading German interpreters of English literature, will be a welcome addition to our English works on the subject.

L. D. S.

London, 1888.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	Home and Childhood	1
II.	Youth and Marriage	71
III.	London	116
IV.	The Theatre	197
V.	Shakespeare's Works	269
VI.	Shakespeare's Intellectual Culture	365
VII.	Shakespeare's Character and Conception of Human Nature	423
VIII.	Retirement to Stratford, and Death	480

Appendix I. The Orthography of Shakespeare's Name . 539

Appendix II. The Portraits of Shakespeare . . . 548

Index 571

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

Chapter I.

HOME AND CHILDHOOD.

TOWARDS the end of last century Steevens[1] gave the substance of a biography of Shakespeare in the following words: "All that is known with any degree of certainty concerning Shakespeare is—that he was born at Stratford-upon-Avon—married and had children there—went to London, where he commenced actor, and wrote poems and plays—returned to Stratford, made his will, died, and was buried." In fact, a hundred years ago the biographer of Shakespeare was much in the same predicament as the young theologian who found that Frederick the Great, when about to select a preacher, had caused a blank sheet of paper to be placed in the pulpit as the text from which he was to preach his sermon. Shakespeare's life is, indeed, anything but a blank leaf, but the writing has for the most part become illegible, and all the philosophical and critical tests that have been applied, have not, as yet, succeeded in accomplishing much more than in bringing to view a number of—for the most part—unimportant, nay, trifling facts and scattered fragments, and these can be formed into one structure only by means of various combinations and conjectures.[2] In the same

[1] In a note to *Sonnet* 93.

[2] Even Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps (*Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, 6th edition, i. p. xix), who professes merely "to furnish the reader with an authentic collection of all the known facts," has nevertheless to admit that he has given his "own interpretation of various testimonies," nor can he get on without hypotheses, and it is these very hypotheses more especially that want a proper foundation, as, for instance, his supposition that Shakespeare's wife was afflicted in mind (i. 240).

way, as Lord Bacon once remarked, that large obstacles may be seen through narrow crevices, we here obtain through small openings a view over large sections and important influences in the poet's life; and Charles Knight is perfectly justified in prefixing to his biography of Shakespeare the words that "every life of him must to a certain extent be conjectural." And indeed this incontrovertible fact is made to hide a number of very questionable statements, in Knight more especially. Goethe's remark, that everything that has been said of Shakespeare is inadequate, does not apply only to the æsthetical domain, but to the hermeneutical and biographical domains as well.

When we look around and inquire into the causes which have led to the obscurity that envelops Shakespeare's life, we find, in the first place, that it is wrong to say that his contempories did not value him sufficiently, or—as Hermann Kurz[1] does—to consider it an irretrievable disgrace on their part not to have handed down any detailed account of his life. For, apart from the fact that Shakespeare may have been active and energetic as a youth, his life in maturer years—like that of almost every poetical nature—was very probably richer in inward than in outward experiences; in this respect, therefore, he would have but little excited the curiosity or the interest of his contemporaries. Besides, biographical literature, the literature of narrating the story of specially remarkable lives, had not yet become the fashion; the age of Boswell, with its minute details of the domestic life of great writers, had not yet come. Nor were there as yet any journals that entertained their readers with communications concerning the private life and habits of eminent persons. The efforts of all men, in those days, were directed mainly in furthering their own peculiar interests in political, military, naval, or literary affairs, not in describing or narrating the lives of other men, and least of all of writers who had not yet attained a position of their own, or the eminent position they occupy in our day. What do we know of the lives of Spenser, of Marlowe, of Chapman, of Ben Jonson, of Beaumont, or of Fletcher? Next to nothing. And of Milton, likewise, we should not know anything, had he not taken part in the political life of his day.[2] Still, we might have possessed

[1] *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, vi. 342.

[2] With regard to Dryden, Dr. Johnson—in his *Lives of the Poets*—

more biographical material relating to Shakespeare, were it not that political and other events combined to destroy what existed. The Civil Wars, Puritanism, and a strange succession of conflagrations, are to blame for having destroyed the few detailed records of Shakespeare's life that had survived his day. Upon the accession of Charles I., only a few years after Shakespeare's death, and but two years after the publication of his works, the political affairs of the country assumed so serious and threatening an aspect, that all other considerations were thrust into the background—more especially everything connected with the drama, which, as is well known, was one of the first things attacked by the fanaticism of the Puritans. The appreciation of, and interest in literature—especially in dramatic poetry—which had shortly before risen to an unparalleled height, and which had affected all the different strata of the nation, died out, or rather was stifled by main force, and this change was accomplished with extraordinary rapidity and with a force that hurled down everything that came in its way. There are indications and single incidents enough that enable us distinctly to recognize this fact, even in their connection with Shakespeare. Let the reader but compare the enthusiastic and significant statements of Shakespeare's contemporaries given in Ingleby's "Centurie of Prayse," with the scanty notices of the poet from the last quarter of the seventeenth century given by Aubrey, Fulman-Davies, Dowdall, and John Ward, which are meagre beyond all conception, and wholly devoid of trustworthy information and of judgment. John Ward even makes use of his opportunity by, as it were, mentally tying a knot in his handkerchief, for one of his remarks is: "Remember to peruse Shakespeare's plays, and be versed in them, that I may not be ignorant of them." What a come down! This neglect into which Shakespeare was allowed to fall, this total want of appreciation of and interest in him, can be accounted for only by the fact that the political revolution was also a complete up-turning of the whole social fabric, an up-turning of the moral, literary, and æsthetic ideas, which affected the very character of the nation. The fact that Shakespeare had himself been an actor was the

complains that "his contemporaries, however they reverenced his genius, left his life unwritten; and nothing therefore can be known beyond what casual mention and uncertain tradition have supplied." This applies word for word to Shakespeare.

very reverse of a recommendation to the party who had gained the upper hand in the country. Although the theatre was completely suppressed only for a few years during the Commonwealth, still, owing to the absolutely altered character of the drama on its return from exile with the Stuart dynasty, or which it assumed upon its return, there can be no doubt that the change that had taken place deeply affected the vital substance of dramatic poetry.

In addition to these political events, there were, as already said, other causes as well that helped in the destruction, and chief among these was a series of fires, which, by a most strange coincidence, destroyed all the buildings where any papers of Shakespeare's, or records of his life, might have been obtained. First of all, in 1613, during a performance of Shakespeare's "Henry VIII.," the Globe theatre was burned down, and in all probability manuscripts of the poet, or other written records relating to the history, the management, and the circumstances of this theatre, were destroyed on that occasion. In the following year, a second conflagration devastated a large portion of Stratford, the town so often visited by the poet, and although, fortunately, Shakespeare's own house (New Place) was spared, still it may surely be assumed —considering that some fifty-four houses fell victims to the flames, and the general confusion that would prevail—that many a record and many an important paper referring to his family was then lost. A few years later (1623 ?) a fire broke out in Ben Jonson's house, destroying more especially books and papers; there can be no doubt that among his papers were letters of Shakespeare's, and editions of single works, even though Ben Jonson does not mention this fact in the poem where he laments his losses.[1] Doubtless, too, the great fire in London in 1666 still further lessened the scanty memorials of Shakespeare's life and work; a large portion of the third folio edition, which had appeared shortly before, is supposed to have fallen a prey to the flames on this occasion, and this edition can thus boast of being almost more scarce even than the first.

There are a few other circumstances of a more personal character that must not be left out of consideration. In the

[1] *An Execration upon Vulcan.* See *The Works of B. Jonson*, ed. Wm. Gifford (Moxon, 1846), 707 ff. Compare also p. 41; Ben Jonson's *Conversations with Wm. Drummond*, ed. D. Laing, p. 6, Note.

first place, Shakespeare did nothing whatever himself towards leaving any record of his life to posterity; except in the case of his two narrative poems, he did not trouble himself about the printing or the preservation of his works, which may, indeed, be said to have been handed down to us almost against his will; his dramas were, in fact, not written with a view to being printed, but for representation, and his sonnets only for patrons and intimate friends. Never was a poet more indifferent about his own celebrity. And his family also did nothing in honour of his memory, with the exception of erecting the rather stately memorial tablet to him in the church at Stratford. This apparent neglect is perhaps not so much the result of any want of esteem and affection for the deceased, but much more owing to the fact of Shakespeare's not having left any male heir. After his death there was no one who could be regarded as the representative of the family, and for whom it would have been both a matter of pride and duty to have cherished the memory of its founder. His daughters had married and left Stratford, and naturally found the main interest of their lives away from their parents' home. According to tradition, a granddaughter of Shakespeare's, Lady Barnard, is said, upon her second marriage, to have taken a number of documents with her to her future home; however, even assuming this tradition to be true, we cannot be surprised that these papers should gradually have become scattered and lost. In all probability, also, the poet's relatives—perhaps even during his lifetime—were influenced by religious considerations, which made them regard the works and literary remains of the husband and father with but little sympathy or pleasure. In a subsequent chapter we shall speak of this point more in detail.

However, in spite of all this, we know incomparably more to-day about Shakespeare's life than did his first editor and biographer, Nicholas Rowe, whose edition of the poet's works (1709-10), may to a certain extent be said to have opened the gates for a flood of editions, of which there seems to be no end. Rowe's biographical sketch is based mainly upon statements made by Betterton, Davenant, and Aubrey. Betterton, the admirable actor, went to Warwickshire for the express purpose of gathering information concerning Shakespeare;[1]

[1] According to R. Gr. White, *Shakespeare's Works*, i. xxxvii, in the year

but, unfortunately, we have only a very imperfect account of the material thus collected. The oral reports given by Davenant—who is said to have prided himself upon being an illegitimate son of Shakespeare's—are of no critical value, and are but little to be depended upon. John Aubrey (1626-1697), an industrious, but very unmethodical antiquary, is best known by his "Minutes of Lives," the manuscript of which he sent in 1680 to Anthony Wood (1632-1695), in order that Wood might make use of it for his work "Athenæ Oxoniensis"; these "Minutes" contain an often-quoted passage referring to Shakespeare.[1] Rowe must, however, have consulted better authorities or sources, for in all essential points his biographical statements have been confirmed. Since his day, that is, during a period of some hundred and fifty years, there has been no cessation in the researches made concerning Shakespeare's life, and many a problem has been solved; but—as was to be expected—while these researches gained in breadth and depth, new difficulties and new problems presented themselves. The additional knowledge was obtained from various sources, above all by the discovery of records relating to the subject, with regard to which Malone and Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, in particular, have rendered indisputable service by their unwearied investigations. It is true that forgeries have found a fruitful field here for their pernicious and ignominious machinations—and among these we may mention more especially those of Ireland,[2] Collier, and Peter Cunning-

1675; according to the *Outlines*, i. p. xii. (compare ii. 251), about 1690; according to Knight, *William Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 278, not till or after 1700. All these statements are based purely upon conjecture—the exact year is not known.

[1] Aubrey's manuscript is preserved in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford.

[2] William Henry Ireland, who died in 1834, carried his forgeries very far, and among other things wrote two plays, *Vortigern* and *Henry II.*, which he published in 1799 as newly discovered works of Shakespeare. Compare *Authentic Account of the Shakespeare Manuscripts*, by W. H. Ireland, 1796; *Miscellaneous Papers and Legal Instruments under the Hand and Seal of Wm. Shakespeare*, published by Samuel Ireland (William Henry's father), 1796; Malone's *Inquiry into the Authenticity of Certain Miscellaneous Papers*, &c., 1796; G. Chalmers's *Apology for the Believers of the Shakespeare Papers*, 1797; *The Confessions of W. H. Ireland*, 1805. J. P. Collier, in his *New Facts Regarding the Life of Shakespeare* (1835), and in his *New Particulars*, &c. (1836), and elsewhere, has published a number of records which, after careful palæographic examination, were declared to be spurious (or at least exceedingly suspicious), much like the emendations in

ham, and owing to this the utmost caution is necessary at every step. A second and no less productive source has been obtained by a careful examination of the literature of the period, whereby great light has been thrown upon Shakespeare's position as regards his contemporaries, as well as upon the date of his plays and the estimation in which they were held. A third source may be added to these, viz., critical combination, which, it is true, has called forth a terrible swarm of absolutely unfounded hypotheses; still, they have given rise to not a few inferences that have acquired such a high degree of probability that they may almost be regarded as certainties. But how deceptive even the so-called internal probability—and the proof obtained from internal reasons—may be, is shown by a well-known anecdote of the poet Thomson. It had been inferred from evidence in his "Seasons" that Thomson must have been an early riser, whereas in truth he was a late sleeper, and rarely rose until noon—it being his habit to go

his copy of the second folio. Even before they had been examined palæographically, these documents had been considered doubtful, and had been critically condemned in 1843 by Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, pp. 496-500, and in 1845 by Hunter, *Illustrations*, i. 67 ff. It is difficult to understand why the palæographical inquiry was deferred so long, and were it not that the notorious folio aroused suspicion anew the records might still be regarded as trustworthy. The extent of these falsifications seem not yet to have been fully revealed, and to demand still further research. Ireland's forgeries, however, have been satisfactorily settled and utterly rejected. Under these circumstances it becomes a paramount duty to be most cautious, and hence we cannot do otherwise than distrust all of the records published by Collier, unless they have been placed beyond doubt by researches from another quarter. Although Collier has given an affidavit, yet Dr. Ingleby (*A Complete View of the Shakspere Controversy*, 1861,) has proved by the most acute and convincing circumstantial evidence that Collier was himself the forger; there can be no conclusive circumstantial evidence anywhere, if Dr. Ingleby's may not be regarded as such. Compare Ingleby, *The Shakespeare Fabrications; or, The MS. Notes of the Perkins Folio shown to be of Recent Origin*, &c., London, 1859;—Hamilton, N.E.S.A., *Inquiry into the Genuineness of the MS. Corrections*, &c., London, 1860; J. P. Collier, *Reply to Mr. Hamilton's "Inquiry" into the imputed Shakespeare Forgeries*, London, 1860; George F. Warner, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts and Muniments of Alleyn's College of God's Gift at Dulwich*, published for the Governors by Longmans (1881), pp. xxxvi-xlvii. A series of eleven of such spurious documents Dyce has collected and given as an appendix to his Biography of the poet (i. 138-148); one of these (No. VII.) is, however, laid to Cunningham's account—the entries relating to Shakespeare in the latter's *Extracts from the Revels at Court*, &c. Compare *The Athenæum*, 1868, i. 863.

very late to bed.[1] There are laws, however, which have ruled human life for centuries, because from inner necessity they are part and parcel of human nature. Shakespeare's life, also, was necessarily affected by these laws, and according to them his marriage *cannot* have been a happy one.

By a methodical application of these sources of information we can form a pretty graphic picture of Shakespeare's outward life; one which may in all essential points be regarded as sufficiently approaching the historical truth; and even where we may not accomplish this, the attempt will not altogether be in vain, for it will make us more familiar with the poet's personality, the time in which he lived, and of his surroundings, as well as of his actual work. Hallam[2] does indeed speak rather disparagingly of the researches made concerning Shakespeare's life, and his opinion has only too frequently been re-echoed. He says: "If there was a Shakespeare of earth, as I suspect, there was also one of heaven; and it is of him that we desire to know something." This seems to us to be based upon a strange mistake. For of the heavenly Shakespeare we have the fullest report in his works, and moreover the only possible record; what more do we need, nay, what more could we wish to know of him in that sense? Then, too, it is more the duty of the æsthetic writer and art-critic to make the acquaintance of the heavenly Shakespeare, than for the philologist and biographer to do so. The Shakespeare of whom we would wish to learn something here is assuredly the earthly Shakespeare, and the earthly circumstances and conditions under which he created his heavenly works. The philological investigation and delineation of the earthly Shakespeare forms the indispensable foundation for the philosophical, æsthetic criticism by which the heavenly Shakespeare is revealed to us.

Even the poet's name—to begin with—has given rise to numerous speculations and inquiries; on the very threshold, therefore, the biographer meets with a difficulty, and up to the present day no agreement has been arrived at with regard to the way his name should be spelt. The reader will find a subsequent chapter devoted to the reasons of this disagreement and the results of the investigations that have

[1] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 234; Thomson's *Seasons*, ed. Bolton Corney (3rd ed.), London, 1863, Longmans, p. xxxvii.

[2] *Introd. Lit. Eur.*, 4th edit., ii. 176.

been made on this subject, as well as regarding Shakespeare's own autograph, and our justification of the spelling which we have adopted. As early as the fourteenth century there were Shakespeares in Warwickshire, and not long afterwards we find the family extending over the whole county and the neighbouring districts: in Warwick itself, in Stratford, Snitterfield, Wroxhall, Temple Balsall, Rowington, Packwood, Little Packington, Kenilworth, Charlecote, Coventry, Hampton, Lapworth, Nuneaton, Kington, and in many other places we have documentary evidence of their existence.[1] This wide distribution of the name leads to the unpleasant result that we meet with several John and William Shakespeares who lived about the same time, and whom it is difficult in all cases to distinguish. The occurrence of such numerous families of the same name in one and the same county, reminds us of the Scottish clans, and leads us to assume a common origin—if not for the family—at all events for the name. "Breakespear, Shakespear, and the like," say Verstegen,[2] "have been surnames imposed upon the first bearers of them for valour or feats of arms." Camden[3] comes nearer the mark in observing that persons have frequently been named after such things as they carried; for instance, pilgrims from the palms which they brought with them on their return from Jerusalem; also Longsword, Broadspear, Fortescue, *i.e.* Strong-shield, and in a similar way Breakspeare, Shakespeare, Shotbolt, Wagstaff. Hunter[4] thinks that the name Shakeshaft ought to be added to these, and, curiously enough, in the counties of Warwickshire and Worcestershire this name is particularly often meet with. Hunter quotes a passage from Zachary Bogan—likewise a writer of the seventeenth century—who maintains the name Shakespeare to be synonymous with Soldier. He says: "The custom first πάλλειν, to vibrate the spear before they used it, was so constantly kept, that ἐγχέσπαλος, and shake-speare, came at length to be an ordinary word, both in Homer and other poets, to signify a soldier."[5]

[1] Halliwell, *Illustrations of the Life of Shakespeare* (London, 1874), p. 62; *Outlines*, ii. 251 seq.

[2] *Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* (Antwerp, 1605), p. 294.

[3] *Remains concerning Britain* (1605), p. 111.

[4] *Illustrations*, i. 3.

[5] *Archæologiæ Atticæ*, Libri III., by Francis Rous, with Additions by Zachary Bogan, Scholar of C.C.C. in Oxon, 5th ed. 1658, p. 324; Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. 275.—According to Charles Mackay in

Hunter, it is true, fails to prove that *Shakespeare* was ever used in England "as a familiar word for a soldier;" nevertheless, it is probable that the name was either a popular, a jocose, or a poetical appellation for the spearmen and lancers of the Duke of Warwick, and it may be of the bishops of Worcester, who served both as bodyguards and as constables.

Charles W. Bardsley[1] says that the name Shakespeare belongs "to a distinct *class* of sobriquets that have become hereditary. The nicknames given to lower-class officials some centuries ago were invariably hits at the officious and meddlesome character of their duties." Such nicknames generally referred to the implement or badge of office, with the additional *wag* or *shake*. Thus we find *shake-buckler* (in Halliwell), *shake-lock* (as the designation of a turnkey), *Waggestaff* (in the Hundred Rolls), *Wag-tail*, *Wagspere*, and the still-existing *Waghorn*, *Simon Shake-lok*, *Henry Shake-launce*, and *Hugh Shakeshaft* occur in ancient records.[2] In the year 1487 a student at Oxford of the name of Shakespeare changed it into Sawndare (Saunders), because he considered his name too common (*Hugh Sawndare, alias dictus Shakspere, sed mutatum est istud nomen ejus, quod vile reputatem*).[3] Bardsley therefore comes to the conclusion that William Shakespeare was undoubtedly the descendant of some "officer of the law, or one who held service under some feudal lord." And this, as we know from documentary evidence, agrees with the fact that all the families of the name of Shakespeare belonged to the lower strata of the nation, to the yeomanry or agricultural class; only two instances have been pointed out where the families belonged to the upper ranks. In a register of the Guild of Saint Anne of Knowle,[4] which extends from the

The Athenæum, 1875, ii. 437, the name is said to be of Celtic origin, composed of *shac* or *scac* = *dry*, and *spier* = *shanks*, and ought properly to be written *Schacspeir* or *Chaksper*, as, in fact, the poet's father spelt his name. Mackay compares *Sheepshank* and *Cruikshank*.

[1] *Notes and Queries*, July 4, 1874, p. 2.

[2] Compare Bardsley, *English Surnames: their Sources and Significations*, 2nd ed. London, 1875, p. 461.

[3] George C. Broderick, *Memorials of Merton College* (Oxford, 1885), p. 242.

[4] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, 3 ff.—At Baddesley-Clinton, not far from Knowle, is a house standing by itself, with a moat and drawbridges, called Shakespeare Hall, which is said to have belonged to an uncle of the poet's, and to have remained in the possession of the family Shakespeare up to the middle of last century.—*The Athenæum*, 1872, i. 337.

year 1407 to the dissolution of the guild in 1535, there is mentioned, among other Shakespeares, a Prioress Isabella Shakespeare of Wroxhall, for the peace of whose soul prayers were said in 1505;[1] also a Domina Jane Shakespeare is mentioned in 1527. Under these circumstances it will readily be understood that no certain track can be discovered of the poet's ancestors (what was stated about them in the document granting a coat-of-arms to John Shakespeare is very justly regarded as doubtful), and it is only by conjecture that anything is known even of his grandfather. Of his two grandmothers we know nothing whatever. And, to speak frankly, this is a matter of no importance, for these ancestors have no claim to our consideration or interest, either personally or by any influence they exercised upon the poet's life or education.

Shakespeare's paternal grandfather was probably Richard Shakespeare of Snitterfield, who rented a small farm that belonged to Robert Arden of Wilmecote, in the parish of Aston Cantlow. The document bearing the date of 1596 conferring a grant of arms upon the son, says that his "parent and late antecessors were, for their *valiant* and faithful services advanced and rewarded of the most prudent prince King Henry VII., of famous memory." The grant of a coat-of-arms in 1599 is conferred in language almost exactly the same.[2] What little value can be attached to this statement will be shown later, when we come to discuss the grant of the arms. Richard Shakespeare had at least two sons, Henry, also of Snitterfield, and John, the father of the poet, who removed his family to Stratford. John was probably born about 1530, and in 1557 married Mary Arden, the youngest daughter of the above-mentioned Robert Arden of Wilmecote.

The family of Arden was one of the oldest and most respected, although by no means one of the wealthiest in the county; they belonged to the gentry, while the Shakespeares, as already stated, belonged to the yeomanry. Many efforts have been made to clear up and to fix the pedigree and the

[1] A second Isabella Shakespeare is mentioned in this same register, the wife of one Radulphus Shakespeare in 1465. R. Gr. White, *The Works of Shakespeare*, asks whether Shakespeare can have known this, and whether the circumstance may not have led him to introduce the name of Isabella into his *Measure for Measure*.

[2] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, 17, 75 ff.

history of the Arden family, but owing to the want of trustworthy documentary evidence, these investigations have not led to any satisfactory results.[1] Dugdale, on the one hand, derives the family from Edward the Confessor, while J. T. Burgess has recently put forward the supposed proof that a son of William the Conqueror, who first adopted the family name of Arden, was the earliest known ancestor of our poet, and, not satisfied with this, he traces the family up to Alfred the Great. Such fancies are most uncritical, and no value whatever can be attached to them. There can be no doubt that, as in the case of the Shakespeares, there was more than one family of the name of Arden—that, indeed, there were numerous families of that name; they, too, may be said to have been a clan, and the name was originally the general designation for those who inhabited the wooded districts in the north-western half of the county, which went by the same name. "In this place," says Dugdale, in describing the parish of Curdworth, "I have made choice to speak historically of that most ancient and worthy family whose surname was first assumed from their residence in this part of the country, then and yet called Arden, by reason of its woodiness, the old Britons and Gauls using the word in that sense."[2] In contrast to this the more level and open eastern part of the county, the boundary of which almost follows the course of the river Avon, went by the name of Feldon. The increase of the population and the cultivation of the county, its industries and their equalizing effects, have long since effaced the differences between these two districts.

The grandfather of this Robert Arden is the earliest

[1] Compare Dugdale, *Warwickshire;* Fuller's *Worthies;* George Russell French, *Shakespeareana Genealogica*, London, 1869; J. T. Burgess, in *The Athenæum*, 1867, i. 821, ii. 52; T. Helsby, *Shakespeare and Arden*, in *Notes and Queries*, 4th series, vii. 118 ff.; John Gough Nichols, *Shakespeare and Arden*, in *Notes and Queries*, 4th series, vii. 169 ff.; Hunter, *New Illustrations*, i. 33-34, and ii. 331-335.

[2] The name Arden or Ardern, *i.e.*, wood or wooded hills, is recognized also in the word Ardennes. May this not have led to the choice of the scene in *As You Like It?* Compare also *Arden of Feversham.*—Guy Beauchamp, the second Earl of Warwick, received from Edward II. the nickname of "Black Dog of Ardenne." Even at this day the local names of Henley-in-Arden and Hampton-in-Arden remind us of the old division. Compare *The Forest of Arden, its Towns, Villages, and Hamlets; a Topographical and Historical Account of the District between and around Henley-in-Arden and Hampton-in-Arden*, by John Hannet, London, 1863.

ancestor of the family we know of with any degree of certainty, that is to say, if we trust Dugdale, and refer the statements in the document granting the arms—not to the family of Shakespeare—but to the Ardens. This grandfather, like his son and grandson, was called Robert, so that three successive generations possessed the same baptismal name. A brother of the eldest Robert, Sir Robert Arden (who died in 1526), is said to have held the office of *Squire of the Body* at the court of Henry VII., whereas his son, hence the second Robert, served the same prince in the capacity of *Groom of the Chamber*. The honour of having held this office at court, and the favour bestowed by Henry VII. on his faithful servants, was very highly valued, not only by the Ardens themselves, but subsequently by the Shakespeares also, and was appealed to in the end by John Shakespeare as one main reason for his claim to a coat-of-arms. The youngest Robert, the poet's grandfather, had seven daughters by his first wife; his second marriage, probably with the widow Agnes Hill, *née* Webbe (buried December 29, 1580), remained without issue. Robert Arden, like many other fathers, may have had his trouble in providing for his daughters, but we know nothing about this, except that the youngest, Mary—as already mentioned—became the wife of John Shakespeare. She seems to have been the favourite daughter of her father; at least in his will he made her—conjointly with her sister Alice—his executrix, and left her a special legacy, in addition to the portion to which she was legally entitled. From this we may draw the inference that Mary Arden, by her natural gifts and character, as well as by her business turn of mind, deserved and justified the confidence placed in her, even although (owing to the very defective education given to women in those days), she had never been taught to write, as was the case also with her stepmother.[1] However, another reason may be imagined for this preference for Mary; it is very likely that, owing to her cheerfulness, she may have brightened many a weary hour for her sick father, and have dispelled many of the gloomy thoughts that affected him—"*sick in body*," he calls himself in his will. By the brightness of her spirit, as well as by the practical uprightness of her character, which

[1] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, 57, 14; ibid, 15 ff. The will of Robert Arden, which has been preserved at Worcester, is published even by Malone.

enabled her to transact business matters without discord and friction—does she not seem to resemble Goethe's mother? May not her son have inherited his joyous nature and his delight in poetic creations from her, as Goethe inherited his from his mother? If, as experience teaches us in so many cases, illustrious men inherit a large portion of their mental and moral qualities from their mothers, we may at all events draw the favourable inference with regard to Shakespeare's mother. Her father's will—which we must return to once more, and which was executed on the 24th of November, 1556—affords a pleasant insight, not only into family affairs, but also into the life and circumstances of a class of society that was not an unimportant one in those days. The introductory words to the will, where the testator commends his soul "to Almighty God and to the blessed Lady Saint Mary, and to all the holy company of heaven," does not permit of our drawing any certain conclusion as to the religious sentiments of the testator, for the will was drawn up in the reign of the Bloody Mary, when such a document must certainly have had a Catholic tone about it, even in the case of non-Catholics. Charles Knight justly observes[1] that the introductory words to the will of Henry VIII. (who certainly did not die a Catholic) are almost precisely the same. Shakespeare's will does, it is true, open in a very different form, and has a distinctly Protestant tone. But even admitting that Robert Arden had professed the Roman Catholic faith, it would not by any means justify our supposing this with regard to his daughter and his son-in-law, and still less with regard to his grandson, the poet. This question will be fully discussed in a subsequent chapter. Robert Arden in his will disposes of his property in such a manner that his youngest daughter Mary—it is a significant fact that he mentions her first—is to receive all his landed property in Wilmecote, called Asbies or Ashbies, together with the crops it produces. The estate of Asbies consisted of fifty acres of arable land and six acres of pasture ground, together with the right of pasture on the common. Malone estimated the value of this inheritance at £100, while Thomas Campbell estimated it at from £300 to £400. De Quincey[2] takes a middle

[1] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 10.
[2] *Shakspeare*, Edinburgh, 1864, 29 ff.

course, and reckons the value at £224, which, according to our present standard, would amount to five times that amount.[1] He fixes the annual produce of the land at £28, equal to about £140 of our present money. In addition to this, Mary was to receive in ready money, before the division of the property, £6 13*s.* 4*d.*, *i.e.*, 20 nobles. "To my daughter Ales," continues the testator, "I bequethe the thyrde parte of all mye goodes moveable and unmoveable n ffylde and towne, after my dettes and leggeses be performyde, besydes that goode she hathe of her owne att this time. Also I give and bequethe to Agnes my wyfe vj. *li.* xiij. *s.* iiij. *d.* apon this condysione, that [she] shall sofer my dawghter Ales quyetlye to ynyoye halfe mye copye houlde in Wyllmcote dwryng the tyme of her wyddowewhodde: and if she will nott soffer my dawghter Ales quyetlye to ocuppye halfe with her then I will that my wyfe shall have butt iij. *li.* vj. *s.* viij. *d.* and her gintur in Snyterfylde.

"Item, I will that the resedowe of all my goodes moveable and unmoveable, my ffuneralles and my dettes dischargyde, I gyve and bequethe to my other cheldren to be equaleye devidide amongeste them by the descreshyon of Adam Palmer, Hugh Porter of Snytterfyld, and John Skerlett, whome I do orden and make my overseeres of this my last will and testament, and they to have for ther peynes takyng in this behalfe xx. *s.* apese. Allso I orden and constytute and make my ffull excequtors Ales and Marye my dawghters of this my last will and testament, and they to have no more for ther peynes takyng now as afore geven them. Allso I gyve and bequethe to every house that hath no teme in the paryche of Aston to every house iiij. *d.*"

Robert Arden died between the 24th of November and the 9th of December, 1556, as is clear from the date of the inventory of his property, attached to the will. The total value of his movable goods—about his landed property unfortunately nothing is said—amounts to £77 11*s.* 10*d.* Among the articles mentioned is a feather bed with two mattresses, a coverlet, 3 bolsters, 1 pillow, &c., 5 board-cloths, 3 towels (among these a coloured one), 6*s.* 8*d.* in cash, &c. Hence there was not even a separate towel for every member of the family, and no mention is made of a washhand basin.

[1] Compare, however, *Outlines*, i. xxi. (Premonitory Notes).

In the kitchen are 4 pans, 4 pots, 3 candlesticks, a chafing-dish, a frying-pan, a gridiron; further, an axe, 2 hatchets, 4 casks, 4 pails, a baking-trough, a hand-saw, &c. The inventory of live stock consisted of 8 oxen, 2 bulls, 7 cows and 4 calves, amounting to £24 in value altogether; of 4 horses and 3 foals, estimated at £8; of, probably, some 52 sheep, valued at £7; 9 pigs valued at 26*s.* 8*d.*; of bees and fowls, valued at 5*s.*, &c. How simple, nay, how meagre were the possessions of the household! With the exception of the marriage-bed no others are mentioned, so that the daughters probably slept on sacks of straw or coarse mats.[1] And how few the articles of household furniture! The only things beyond the absolute necessaries of life are two painted cloths in the hall, five similar ones in the chamber, and four others of the same sort are mentioned, without it being specified where they were used. There is not a word about body-linen or dresses, or of vessels for eating and drinking, nor any mention of any articles of silver or even tin. The family probably used wooden spoons and bowls—forks were not then used in England. Nevertheless, this family, although by no means rich, occupied a position higher both as regards rank and wealth than did the Shakespeares, and Mary Arden was decidedly what is called a good match for John Shakespeare.

Mary's marriage, as already said, must have taken place in the year 1557, as her first child was baptized on the 15th of September, 1558. That she was still unmarried at the time of her father's death is proved by his will, where she is mentioned only by her first name. As regards the inequality of station between Mary Arden and the Shakespeare family, it is generally supposed that—owing to her having been left an orphan—Mary could not have been very particular about the social position of her suitor, especially as her stepmother does not appear to have acted very kindly towards the children; at all events, in her will, drawn up in 1579, she leaves no remembrance to any one of them.[2] Whatever the lover may have lacked in rank was compensated for by the state of his worldly circumstances; as early as 1556 he possessed two properties in Stratford, one in Henley Street, the other in

[1] Compare Harrison's *Description of England*, ed. Furnivall, p. xxi. seq., and p. 240 seq.

[2] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, 12 ff.

Greenhill Street,[1] even though both houses may have been small and unimportant. Then, too, John Shakespeare was, at all events, a man of good parts, of a steady and energetic character, probably also stately and prepossessing, if we may be allowed to draw an inference from the son's good looks—for both Aubrey and Davies[2] expressly state that the poet was "well-shaped and handsome." The confidence and position of distinction which John Shakespeare enjoyed among his fellow-citizens are an undoubted proof of the steadiness and trustworthiness of his character, as well as of his capacity in business matters; hence it would seem that the poet inherited the latter quality from both parents. It can hardly be doubted that John Shakespeare's education and schooling were defective, but Mary Arden was not likely to find anything very wrong in that. The one test we have of judging of the schooling given in those days—and as the poet has himself pointed out—may be obtained from the question (to put it in Jack Cade's words): "Dost thou use to write thy name? or hast thou a mark to thyself, like an honest plain-dealing man?"—whereupon the Clerk of Chatham replies: "Sir, I thank God, I have been so well brought up that I can write my name."[3] But even this criterion often leaves us in doubt, for, according to Lord Campbell,[4] it frequently happened that persons quite able to write their names were content to make their marks. John Shakespeare, too, often availed himself of a mark resembling the letter A, which, as Malone thinks, he probably chose out of courtesy to his wife (Arden); but this supposed sign of affection is as little probable as Halliwell's conjecture[5] that the mark represented an instrument used in the glove trade. Robert Bigsby[6] has corrected Malone's romantic explanation in so far, by declaring that the mark was no other than the so-called caret (∧), which was frequently made use of by persons unable to write, and which in John Shakespeare's case had an additional cross line. However, there exists a document in Stratford, a facsimile of which is given by Knight

[1] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 18; *Outlines*, i. p. 25.

[2] Compare De Quincey, *Shakspeare*, 49 ff., where their testimony is supported by other reasons.

[3] *Henry VI., Part II.*, iv. 2.

[4] *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements*, London, 1859, p. 15.

[5] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 65.

[6] *Signature of John Shakespeare* in *Shakespeare Society's Papers*, i. 111 ff.

and Halliwell,[1] at the bottom of which are nineteen names of members of the town council of Stratford; and of these nineteen aldermen, only seven were able to write their names, while the others—the high bailiff too—made their marks. John Shakespeare's name also occurs in this list, and Charles Knight endeavours to prove on palæographical grounds, ingeniously worked out, that John Shakespeare must have written the name himself, and that the mark beside it does not belong to his name, but to the one next on the list. This supposition has also been adopted by Lord Campbell, who believes that John Shakespeare sometimes used his own signature and sometimes his mark. Halliwell, on the other hand, confirms Malone's observation that John Shakespeare usually put his mark a little below his name, and that this is the case also in the document referred to. He even points out that John Shakespeare changed his mark, and that later he made use of the customary cross. If, therefore, John Shakespeare did, in this one case, sign his name, which is scarcely likely, at all events it is certain that as a rule he preferred making his mark, probably because he found it too troublesome to write his name. Halliwell's supposition that he could not write his name seems most probable.

John Shakespeare had removed to Stratford in the year 1551, or even earlier, and was settled in Henley Street as early as 1552. Our first documentary acquaintance with him there is connected with such an exceedingly unpoetical proceeding, that we doubt whether anything of the kind could be said of the father of any other poet. On the 29th of April, 1552, John Shakespeare—together with his neighbours (?) Humfred Reynolds and Adrian Quiney—were each fined twelve pence for having, contrary to the orders of the magistrate, allowed a dunghill to stand in front of their houses in Henley Street.[2] However unpleasant the large fine may have been to those concerned, this dunghill is of advantage to us, in so far as it proves that John Shakespeare was engaged in farm work. As is well known, there has for many years been a dispute as to what his occupation was; this is now

[1] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 16; *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 18.

[2] A later regulation (1563) about dunghills (sterquinaria) is quoted by Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 27, note. As will be shown subsequently, the town council had every reason to make strict regulations with regard to the state of the streets.

believed to be a settled point, for on the evidence of a document he is now declared to have been a glover. Rowe's statement that he was a "dealer in wool," would not be incompatible with this, for Halliwell[1] has pointed out another instance in which the traffic in gloves and wool were carried on together. The document referred to was first published by Malone,[2] and is given in facsimile by Knight[3] and by Halliwell; it is preserved in Stratford, and is dated the 17th of June, 1555, or 1556, as Halliwell more correctly has it; in the midst of the Latin text is the one English word "glover," referring to John Shakespeare, but is so indefinite that Knight even cannot suppress his doubts, and indeed straightway denies the matter.[4] Halliwell, on the other hand, finds the cause of the indefiniteness to have arisen simply from the imperfect facsimile which Knight made use of, and is himself quite convinced that John Shakespeare was a manufacturer of gloves. The supposition, however, will remain doubtful until the genuineness of the document has been further attested, and Knight justly points out that in the numerous other cases in which John Shakespeare is mentioned nothing is said of his having been engaged in that trade; whereas he is, in some instances, spoken of in connection with occupations that can hardly have been combined with the manufacture of gloves—*e.g.*, on the 19th of November, 1556, he brings an action against one Henry Field, on account of his having unlawfully detained eighteen quarters of grain. It is true, that in this case also—as Knight himself admits—the contents of the document are somewhat doubtful, but this does not affect the force of the objection, and Halliwell has not refuted it, has not even taken any notice of it. The manufacture of gloves may have been a lucrative trade, as gloves were not only articles of luxury worn by knights and on festive occasions, but had, in fact, become articles necessary for everyday wear.[5] That John Shake-

[1] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 22. [2] Vol. ii. 78.

[3] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 104; Halliwell, p. 21.

[4] It is an action raised against John Shakespeare for a debt of £8, which was tried "coram Johanni Burbage ballivo." The words are: "Thomas Siche de Arscotte in com. Wigorn. queritur versus Johannem Shakyspere de Stretford in com. Warwici glover in placito quod redd. ei octo libras, &c."

[5] Compare De Quincey, *Shakspeare*, 26 ff.; Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. 79 ff. According to Malone there were at least seven, if not ten, manufacturers of gloves at Stratford in 1618, and their trade,

speare was engaged in some trade seems certain from his having moved to Stratford; or did he take this step with a view of disposing more advantageously of the produce of his father's farm? or may not both occupations have been carried on together? At any rate, the various trades were at that time but little developed in Stratford; they were not at all sharply defined, nor was there any thought of any such strict division of labour in the small provincial town as we have

according to him, was by no means a lucrative one. In *The Winter's Tale*, iv. 3, Autolycus trades in ribbons and gloves; the latter were frequently bought as presents, and were often perfumed for that purpose ("as sweet as damask roses"), especially when presented as tokens of affection or bridal gifts. This we learn, among others, from *Love's Labour's Lost*, v. 2; from Ben Jonson's *Every Man in His Humour*, ii. 2; and still more fully from Beaumont and Fletcher's *Knight of the Burning Pestle*, i. 1:—

> I can pull
> Out of my pocket thus a pair of gloves.
> Look, Lucy, look; the dog's tooth, nor the dove's,
> Are not so white as these; and sweet they be,
> And whipt about with silk, as you may see.
> If you desire the price, shoot from your eye
> A beam to this place, and you shall espy
> F S, which is to say, my sweetest honey,
> They cost me three and twopence, or no money.

Anyone but a lover would certainly have thought that money enough, especially considering the value of money at the time. That gloves, which had been received as presents, were worn on hats as a mark of favour is evident—among other cases—from *Henry V.*, iv., 7, 8, and from *King Lear*, iii. 4. When Queen Elizabeth in 1556 came to Oxford, six pairs of very beautiful gloves were presented to her in the name of the University (Nichol's *Progresses*, i. 211), and, according to Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 54, at the harvest festival even reapers received presents of gloves. In Brooke's *Romeus and Juliet* (ed. Daniel, p. 76, l. 2511), "marriage gloues" and "funeral gloues" are mentioned. It is probable the expensive gloves used in falconry were in great request.—S. Harting, *The Ornithology of Shakespeare* (London, 1871), p. 78. In *The Merry Wives*, i. 4, Mrs. Quickly compares a large round beard to "a glover's paring knife," which certainly might seem to suggest Shakespeare's intimate acquaintance with glove-making. Shakespeare repeatedly alludes to cheveril gloves and to their elasticity, which latter quality he recommends as a model to wit and conscience, in *As You Like It*, iii. 1, *Romeo and Juliet*, ii. 4, and *Henry VIII.*, ii. 3. According to these passages Shakespeare was well acquainted with gloves—but with what was he not well acquainted? How quickly the fashion of wearing gloves became general is shown in Thomas Heywood's *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* (1606), Part II. i. 1 (ed. Collier, for the Shakespeare Society, p. 77): "Then, your mask, silk lace, washed gloves . . . as common as coals from Newcastle; . . . you shall not have a kitchen-maid scrape trenchers without her washed gloves."

nowadays. Everyone worked as best he could, and managed all his household affairs as far as possible himself, without caring whether the matter pertained to his own craft or to that of another, or whether it was refined or menial work; no occupation was considered mean that furnished the necessaries of life, or was connected with the maintenance, management, and produce of the home. Harrison[1] gives the following account of the yeomanry, and John Shakespeare is expressly described as a yeoman in 1579[2]: "This sort of people have a certain pre-eminence, and more estimation than labourers and the common sort of artificers, and these commonly live wealthily, keep good houses, and travel to get riches. They are also for the most part farmers to gentlemen, or at the leastwise artificers; and with grazing, frequenting of markets, and keeping of servants (not idle servants, as the gentlemen do, but such as get both their own and part of their masters' living), do come to great wealth, insomuch that many of them are able and do buy the lands of unthrifty gentlemen, and often, setting their sons to the schools, to the universities, and to the inns of the court, or otherwise leaving them sufficient lands whereupon they may live without labour, do make them by those means to become gentlemen: these were they that in times past made all France afraid." Harrison completes this description by the following complaint against the landed proprietors[3]: "Most sorrowful of all to understand, that men of great post and countenance are so far from suffering their farmers to have any gain at all that they themselves become graziers, butchers, tanners, sheepmasters, woodmen, and *denique quid non*, thereby to enrich themselves, and bring all the wealth of the country into their own hands, leaving the commonalty weak, or as an idol with broken or feeble arms, which may in time of peace have a plausible show, but, when necessity shall enforce, have an heavy and bitter sequel."

Knight has already explained how this description seems to solve the mystery which has so long enveloped in darkness John Shakespeare's position in life.[4] That John Shakespeare

[1] *Description of England*, ed. Furnivall, p. 133, compare pp. 105 and 137.
[2] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, 21 ff.
[3] Harrison, *Description of England*, p. 243.
[4] Compare R. Gr. White, *Shakespeare's Works*, i. xv; Niel, *Shakespere; a Critical Biography*, London, 1863, p. 16.

began life as a farmer cannot be doubted, any more than that, in consequence of his marriage, he had to devote himself to this occupation with increased interest. Moreover, it was an occupation that would best have suited the character and habits of the Arden family, as well as his own, and was probably regarded by his wife as more respectable than any actual trade, for, as already stated, his wife brought him a considerable amount of landed property. John Shakespeare being of a speculative and enterprising turn of mind, would endeavour, therefore, to carry on both his town and his country occupations. As he possessed sheep, it was of consequence to him to make use of the wool for the requirements of his household as far as possible; if any were left over, it would be sold, and this probably would lead him to purchase and sell other wools beyond his own, and in the same way he would doubtless sell the increase of his flock. This explains how it is that Rowe—following Betterton—calls him a "considerable dealer in wool." It is very possible that the youthful poet may occasionally have assisted his father in such transactions, as has been inferred from four passages, in "Henry IV.," Part II. iii. 2, in "The Winter's Tale," iv. 2 (3), in "As You Like It," iii. 2, and in "Hamlet," v. 2. In the first-named passage, the words are: "a score of good ewes may be worth ten pounds;" in the second: "every leven wether tods; every tod yields pound and odd shilling; fifteen hundred shorn, what comes the wool to?" in the third passage the shepherd Corin speaks of the fatty fleeces of his sheep, adding that his hands "are often tarred over with the surgery of our sheep;" the fourth passage: "there's a divinity that shapes our ends, Roughhew them how we will," has been commented upon more especially by Dr. Farmer and Steevens. The calculation regarding the weight of the wool, certainly betrays a knowledge which seems based more upon actual experience than upon accidental observation.

It is probably precisely the same as regards the tradition recorded by Aubrey that John Shakespeare was a butcher.[1] In his own family—as in many others—we may be sure that pigs, calves, and heifers, were from time to time slaughtered for domestic purposes, and that whatever animals could be spared were sold. Undoubtedly, too, the poet must, as a

[1] Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, London, 1874, p. 293.

youth, occasionally have assisted at the slaughter, for such slaughter is, even at the present day, looked upon as a kind of family festival, at which little children even are only too delighted to render some small service. It is, however, anything but likely that John Shakespeare carried on the business of a butcher, or that his son was brought up to it. The whole of Aubrey's account clearly shows that he had no distinct idea of such family affairs, and, indeed, great changes occurred in household arrangements during the first half of the seventeenth century, for the distinction between the various trades was becoming more accurately defined. Aubrey, however, is utterly absurd and ridiculous when, in addition to stating that the boy William slaughtered calves, he says, "and he used to doe it in a high style, and make a speech!" Aubrey further endeavours to prove rather too much in stating that, in those days, there was a second butcher's son in Stratford—a friend of William Shakespeare, and of the same age—who was not inferior to him in natural gifts, but who died young.[1] Aubrey declares that he heard this story—of William Shakespeare having been apprenticed to a butcher, having run off from his master, and gone to London—from a clerk of the parish church named William Castle,[2] a man of eighty years, who had shown Dowdall the church of Stratford in 1693; but this assertion does not by any means add to the trustworthiness of the tradition, as it is opposed to acknowledged facts. For if there is anything we know for certain about William Shakespeare's life, it is, that he left Stratford not as an apprentice, but as a married man and a father. Further, the passage which the advocates of the butcher-tradition quote from Shakespeare in support of their theory, has no weight whatever, for the illustration is taken from a proceeding which the poet might have witnessed anywhere, without ever having touched a calf, much less slaughtering one. The lines referred to occur in "Henry VI.," Part II., iii. 1:—

> And as the butcher takes away the calf
> And binds the wretch and beats it when it strays,

[1] Halliwell, *Was Nicholas ap Roberts that Butcher's Son recorded by Aubrey as an Acquaintance of Shakespeare, and was Shakespeare an Apprentice to Griffin ap Roberts*, London, 1864 (10 copies). It seems scarcely likely that the slaughtering of calves, which is certainly not one of the easiest operations of a butcher, should be left to a boy of fourteen.

[2] Halliwell, *Outlines*, i. xi.

Bearing it to the bloody slaughter-house,
Even so remorseless have they borne him hence;
And as the dam runs lowing up and down,
Looking the way her harmless young one went,
And can do naught but wail her darling's loss,
Even so myself bewails good Gloucester's case
With sad unhelpful tears, and with dimm'd eyes
Look after him and cannot do him good,
So mighty are his vowed enemies.

Now just as John Shakespeare may have been an occasional —not a regular—dealer in wool, as well as a butcher, he may in like manner have been an occasional glove-maker. Harrison, as we have seen, expressly mentions tanning among the pursuits carried on by landed proprietors. It is, at any rate, possible that John Shakespeare, in his youth and of his own accord, learned the business of a tanner, and also of glove-making, but it is also possible that at times he engaged a competent tanner to attend to the accumulated stock of hides. Whatever may have been the case, this much seems certain, that the poet's father was a man in prosperous circumstances, and respected by his fellow-citizens, and that, even though a manufacturer of gloves, he may nevertheless have been occupied with farm work.

In agreement with this supposition, we find John Shakespeare rising, step by step, in the estimation of his fellow-citizens and in the administration of municipal affairs. The corporation of Stratford consisted, at that time, of fourteen aldermen and as many burgesses. Every year a bailiff was elected from among the aldermen, and he presided over a court of law twice in every month. At this court the bailiff settled all matters pertaining to the jurisdiction of the town, where the fine imposed did not amount to more than thirty pounds. The so-called *court-leet* nominated the *ale-tasters* (whose duty it was to "look to the assize and goodness of bread and ale or beer"), also the *affeerors*, who, at their own discretion, had to fix the fines for small offences for which the law had not provided any definite punishment. The important post of constable was regularly filled by members of the corporation. John Shakespeare's admission into the civil body as a burgess (at the beginning of 1557), was the first of a series of honourable offices which he subsequently held. On the 30th of April of the same year he became a member of the *court-leet*, although he did not take

the oath of office at the time.[1] During the same year, too, he was appointed ale-taster, which was assuredly no sinecure, there being in the little town of Stratford about thirty beer-houses.[2] Notwithstanding the respect in which he was held, owing to filling these important offices, John Shakespeare, and several other citizens, had, in 1558, to pay a fine of fourpence apiece for not having kept their gutters clean; his untidy friend, Adrian Quiney, is again one of the number. This matter, however, did not interfere with his promotion, for, on the 30th of September of the same year, John Shakespeare was elected one of the four constables, and was reappointed to this office for the following year, on the 6th of October, 1559. On the same day he became one of the four *affeerors*, an office which he again held in 1561. In September of this same year he was made chamberlain, in which capacity he had charge of the funds belonging to the town. He seems to have understood this branch of the administration particularly well, for he not only held this office for two years, but, in 1564, undertook the work of one of the other chamberlains.[3] This important feature in his character we shall have to return to when we come to discuss the son's capacity and talent for business matters. On the 4th of July, 1565, John Shakespeare was elected an alderman, and from Michaelmas, 1568, to Michaelmas, 1569, he was high bailiff of Stratford, the highest honour which his fellow-citizens could confer upon him, and by which he acquired the title of "Worshipful." From the 5th of September, 1571, to the 3rd of September, 1572, he was again chief alderman, while Adrian Quiney (who, according to C. Knight, was a grocer) held the office of high bailiff.

Even though we had no other proofs, we might infer that, as John Shakespeare held these honourable appointments, his pecuniary circumstances probably corresponded with them, and that they steadily advanced in prosperity likewise. We have seen that even before his marriage he possessed two houses. During the time he held the office of chamberlain, and afterwards, he advanced several sums of money to the

[1] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 25.
[2] Wise, *Shakespeare: his Birthplace and its Neighbourhood* (London, 1861), p. 18, note.
[3] According to Halliwell, p. 18.

town funds, and also sold to the town a quantity of timber ("*a pec Tymbur*"), which probably came from Asbies. In several lists of contributions towards relief of the poor, dated 1564, John Shakespeare is mentioned as having, during the time of the plague, paid twelve pence, six pence, and eight pence twice, altogether, therefore, two shillings and eight pence; this would not, indeed, place him among the wealthiest of his fellow-citizens, but by no means among the poorest either.[1] And even though, according to the earlier supposition, his strength was beginning to fail in 1570,[2] still it seems a well-established fact that five years later he rented Ingon Meadow, a piece of land of fourteen acres, in Old Stratford, from William Clopton, and purchased two additional houses, one of the latter having for long been regarded as the house in which the poet was born; tradition even names the room in which he was born. According to this, John Shakespeare must have occupied the house as a tenant during eleven or twelve years before he purchased it, which is not very probable. Unless unconditional faith is placed in traditions, we must agree with C. Knight's assumption that William Shakespeare may just as likely have been born in one of his father's other houses, seeing that we do not know which house John Shakespeare inhabited in 1564.[3] Nevertheless, the house in which William Shakespeare is supposed to have been born has become a sacred shrine to which pilgrims wander, not only from every part of Britain, but from every civilized part of the world;[4] and, owing to the skilful manner in which it has been restored, and the museum of articles of Shakespearean interest that has been established in it, the house has acquired additional attractions. Numerous pictures of it exist, both in its earlier state and in its renovated condition, and are to be found in almost every biography of Shakespeare. During the Shakespeare Jubilee, arranged by Garrick in

[1] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, 47 ff.

[2] *Outlines*, ii. 252 ff.

[3] *An Historical Account of the Birthplace of Shakespeare. By the late R. B. Wheler, Esq.* Reprinted from the Edition of 1824, with a few Prefatory Remarks by J. O. Halliwell, Esq., Stratford-on-Avon. Sold at the Poet's Birthplace, for the Benefit of the Birthplace Fund, 1863.—Oldys, in his *Notes on Langbaine*, mentions a tradition, according to which John Shakespeare's house stood close to the churchyard.

[4] Even the names of Scott and Byron are found inscribed there (Knight, p. 30).

1769, the house where the poet was supposed to have been born was naturally the principal object of curiosity, interest, and veneration. On the evening of the grand illuminations it was adorned with a gigantic transparency, representing the sun breaking through the clouds, beneath which were the words:

Thus dying clouds contend with glowing light.[1]

Up to the year 1806 the house had been in the uninterrupted possession of the Hart family, descendants of the poet's sister Joan. Unfortunately the family became more and more impoverished, and were obliged not only to sell portions of the house, but, in the end, had to give up the revered inheritance altogether.[2] At that time (1806) a butcher was occupying the western half of the tenement, while the other half was used as an inn under the name of The Swan and Maidenhead. The landlord of this inn, Thomas Court, thereupon acquired the whole property, until, finally, societies were formed in Stratford and London, and succeeded in purchasing the house in 1847, in restoring it, and presenting it to the nation as public property.[3]

Now, whether William Shakespeare was born in this house or not, it is likely, at all events, that he spent a part of his youth in it (perhaps from his eleventh to his eighteenth year). On this account let us examine it a little more narrowly. The house was both spacious and of goodly appearance for the time, although only a wooden structure, with small, low rooms, such as were customary three hundred years ago, but which strike one with amazement in our day.

[1] This and the following remarks are from Wheler, ed. Halliwell, pp. 14 and 19.—Robert Bell Wheler (1785-1857) was a solicitor at Stratford, and a great admirer of Shakespeare. Besides the above-mentioned *Historical Account*, &c., he wrote the *History and Antiquities of Stratford-on-Avon* (1806), and *A Guide to Stratford-on-Avon* (1814).

[2] Compare, however, Drake, *Shakspeare and his Times* (London, 1817), i. 21. In the year 1821 the house was inhabited by a butcher, who had entered the following absurd inscription upon a board in his shop (according to Wheler-Halliwell, p. 16): "William Shakespeare was born in this house. N.B.—A horse and taxed cart to let."

[3] According to an announcement in the *London Gazette* of November 19th, 1852 (reprinted in Fennel's *Repository*, p. 4), Government had resolved to buy the house in which Shakespeare was born, and to preserve it as national property.

The house was doubtless one of the more important ones in Stratford at the time. It is rather picturesque, with its three gables, its projections, and its attic, and forms a pleasant contrast to the barrack-like uniformity of our modern dwelling-houses. It is evident that it must have been an abode of comfort and respectability, and that the boy Shakespeare must there have come in contact with that industrious and well-to-do class of citizens of which his father (from all reports) was a worthy representative. A feeling of self-esteem and a consciousness that he belonged to a sphere in life at once respected and held with honour—these must have been the feelings which such a residence must have awakened in the susceptible mind of the boy. And there is good reason for believing that the boy William Shakespeare moved into this house, with his parents, in 1575. As already stated, the other houses belonging to John Shakespeare were, in all probability, small and unimportant.[1] Hence, owing to the increase of his family, John Shakespeare may have felt the necessity of moving to a more spacious dwelling; that he was blessed with a number of children we know; and this may also have been the reason of his having purchased the house that now enjoys the reputation of being the birthplace of the poet. Rowe states that John Shakespeare had ten children, and the sixth "Sonnet" has been interpreted as a confirmation of the statement. We there find the words:—

> That's for thyself to breed another thee,
> Or ten times happier, be it ten for one;
> Ten times thyself were happier than thou art,
> If ten of thine ten times refigured thee.

In the register at Stratford only eight children are entered, and C. Knight[2] accounts for the supposition of ten children from there being a confusion in the names of one John Shakespeare, a shoemaker; and, indeed, biographers are sorely puzzled by the fact that in Stratford there was certainly one, and probably more persons, of the same name as the poet's father, and it is doubtful whether biographers have, in all cases, managed to keep these several personages distinct

[1] See Halliwell's preface to Wheler's *Historical Account*, &c., p. 6.
[2] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 26.

from one another.[1] As regards the Stratford Church register, it dates from the accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558 (the first entry being one on the 25th of March in that year), but previous to the 14th of September, 1600, the register does not contain any original entries; they are obviously only transcripts, made when the church register was established.[2] The first children of John Shakespeare of whom we have any report were two girls, Joan, baptised on the 15th of September, 1558, and Margaret, baptised on the 2nd of December, 1562; both died in infancy. This is inferred, as regards Joan, from the otherwise inexplicable circumstance that to the next daughter was given the same name; Margaret, on the other hand, is entered in the church register as having been buried on the 30th of April, 1563. Then follow two sons, William, baptised on the 26th of April, 1564, and Gilbert, baptised on the 13th of October, 1566. The baptism of William is entered thus: "1564, April 26, Gulielmus

[1] The shoemaker John Shakespeare is first mentioned in a document of 1584, according to which he married Margaret Roberts, whom he lost by death as early as 1587. He must, however, have married again, for between the years 1589 and 1591 three children (Ursula, Humphrey, and Philip) are entered as having been born to him. In the church register the shoemaker John Shakespeare can be distinguished from the poet's father by the latter's title of *Magister*, which is regularly added to the name of the poet's father after 1569. But what means of distinction have we with regard to the town and other documents where no title is ever given? The tenant or owner of Ingon, who was buried on the 25th of September, 1589, was a third John Shakespeare (*Outlines*, ii. 253). A fourth is met with about the same time at Rowington, according to Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 4, and Collier's *Life of Shakespeare* (appended to his edition of *Shakespeare's Works*), p. 40. Rowington was one of the chief seats of the Shakespeares, and mention is there made on the 23rd of September, 1605, of a second William Shakespeare as "a trained soldier," and as serving as a member of the jury in 1614. Thoms, in his *Three Notelets on Shakespeare* (1865), 135 ff., considers this "trained soldier" to be no other than the poet himself; and even Dyce (*Works of Shakespeare*, 3rd ed., i. 92,) considers this not at all improbable. A third William Shakespeare, of Warwick, is said to have been drowned in the Avon in 1579. That it was nothing unusual for a number of persons to possess the same name is proved, among other things, by the will of John Combe (Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, 234 ff.), according to which there existed three John Combes at Stratford at the same time—two brothers, and the son of a third brother. Compare *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series of the Reign of James I.*, 1603-1610, ed. by Mrs. Green (London, 1857); *Athenæum*, Aug. 15, 1857; Kenny, *Life and Genius of Shakespeare*, p. 69; Collier's *Shakespeare* (ed. 1858), i. 181.

[2] Knight, p. 116. The Stratford register is written on vellum, and has

filius Johannes [*sic*] Shakspere,"[1] and the ceremony was probably performed by John Breechgirdle.[2] Of Gilbert's life and death nothing is known for certain; he seems to have lived for some length of time in London, and probably was that younger brother who, according to Oldys' account, frequently visited the theatre, and is said to have seen his illustrious brother play Adam in "As You Like It."[3] A signature of his, which has been preserved, belongs to the year 1609.[4] The fifth child of John Shakespeare and Mary Arden was a girl, again named Joan, baptised on the 15th of April, 1569. She married William Hart, a hatter in Stratford, who died there in 1616. She continued to live in Stratford up to 1646, and, according to the church register, had four children, the eldest having been born in 1600, and the youngest in 1608. She, as well as her children, are mentioned in the will of her brother the poet, while all the other sisters are passed over in silence; owing to this it has been inferred that the others had all died before the poet made his will. Joan Hart has descendants living at the present day,[5] but they have fallen into obscurity owing to their impoverished circumstances. After Joan Shakespeare there again came a daughter, Anne, baptised on the 28th of September, 1571, who also died early, and was buried on the 4th of April, 1579. At her funeral the "bell and pall" cost her father eight pence, the highest sum mentioned in the death-list of that year, all other deceased persons having been buried with "bell" only, not with "pall." From this fact, likewise, we may draw an inference regarding the state of John Shakespeare's worldly

been carefully kept. Up to the year 1600 every page is signed by Richard Bifield, vicar of Stratford from 1596 to 1610, and by the churchwardens; subsequently by the latter only. After 1600 the entries are not made on the day of the occurrence, but at monthly, or even longer intervals. It is evident, therefore, that rough notes were made. The first introduction of church registers into England took place in the reign of Henry VIII., in 1538, by order of Thomas Cromwell. See Holinshed (ed. 1586), p. 945; Knight, 24 ff.

[1] A facsimile is given by Knight on p. 25.

[2] According to R. Gr. White, i. v.—The year of Shakespeare's birth was also that of Galileo, and the year of Michael Angelo's death.

[3] *Outlines*, i. 170 ff.

[4] In the Shakespeare Museum in Stratford; see *Catalogue*, p. 52, No. 224. A facsimile is given by Halliwell in his *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 29 and 282, and in the *Outlines*, i. 299.

[5] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 30.

circumstances and of his social position. The seventh and eighth children were again sons, Richard, baptised on the 11th of March, 1573-74, buried on the 4th of February, 1612-13, and Edmund, baptised on the 3rd of May, 1580. This youngest and last scion of the family became an actor at the Globe Theatre, and died as such in London; he was buried on the 31st of December, 1607, in the church of St. Saviour.[1]

These statements show that in the Stratford Church register, as in all English church registers, it is not the date of birth that is entered, but the day of baptism, and hence we cannot with certainty determine the poet's birthday. The Protestants had not yet given up the Catholic custom of baptising children as soon as possible after birth, in order that they might not die unbaptised, and thus lose their right of being admitted into heaven. Even in our own day, in England, unbaptised children are not buried in consecrated ground, nor with full ecclesiastical rites.[2] The fact that mortality among children was far greater then than now, was another reason for not postponing baptism, and this in turn again contributed to increase the mortality among infants. It has been proved by several instances that, in Shakespeare's time, children were baptised on the third day after birth, therefore, the 23rd of April (St. George's Day) has generally been assumed to be the poet's birthday, and from this circumstance the day has become one of increased national interest. The supposition was first mooted by Joseph Greene, who, from 1735 to 1771, was teacher in the school at Stratford, and died in 1790 as rector of Welford in Gloucestershire, some four miles from Stratford.[3] Malone then took up the supposition, and founded upon it his assertion that Shakespeare died on the anniversary of his birthday. This, however, is contradicted, as Bolton Corney justly remarks, by the clear statement on his tombstone, according to which Shakespeare died *in the* fifty-third year of his life ("æt. 53"), and such a rare coincidence would

[1] Collier's *Memoirs of the Principal Actors in Shakespeare's Plays*, Introduction, p. 14; Skottowe, *Life of Shakespeare*, i. 8.

[2] De Quincey, *Shakspeare*, p. 2.

[3] Greene, as Malone states, made an extract from the Stratford Church register for his patron West, President of the Royal Society, who handed it to Steevens to make use of.

hardly have remained unnoticed on the memorial tablet.[1] Bolton Corney infers from this that Shakespeare must have been born before the 23rd of April, and points out that baptism on the third day after birth was by no means a general custom, but occurred accidentally here and there; he adds that it was rather the custom or rule to baptise children on the Sunday or holiday following the day of birth.[2] In accordance with this, the 26th of April, 1564, would have been a Sunday or holiday, and it is surprising that so critical a writer as Bolton Corney should have omitted to investigate this point; on the contrary, however, he merely reprints, without further remark, a note of Malone's, according to which the 23rd of April, 1564, fell upon a Sunday.[3] According to the well-known works of Saint Allais[4] and Grotefend,[5] the 26th of April fell upon a Wednesday, and consequently the 23rd upon a Sunday, so that Bolton Corney's supposition does not appear to be well founded. It is very probable that even the poet himself and his family did not know the exact day of his birth, as the date had not been written down anywhere black on white. The custom of entering the date of the children's births in the family Bible did not then exist;[6] at all events, no instance of the custom is known from Shakespeare's time. This is easily accounted for by the fact that the art of writing was but little practised in those days. And, in William Shakespeare's case, who was there to attend to the entry, if both parents were unable to write? For even though we admit, with C. Knight, that John Shakespeare could write his name, still an entry of this kind must have far surpassed the modest measure of his skill in writing. It

[1] *An Argument on the Assumed Birthday of Shakspere: Reduced to Shape* A.D. 1864. By Bolton Corney, p. 16. Private Impression.—Compare *Athenæum*, 1864, i. 303 (and the preceding Nos.). Among the few distinguished men who died on the anniversary of their birth are Raphael and Sobieski, but it does not seem to be a perfectly established fact as regards Raphael.

[2] In *The Boke of Common Praier*, anno 1559, we find the words: "The pastours and curates shal oft admonish the people that they deferre not the baptisme of enfantes any longer than the Sonday, or other holy day, next after the childe be borne, unlesse upon a great and reasonable cause declared to the curate, and by him approued."

[3] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. 63.

[4] *L'Art de Verifier les Dates* (Paris, 1818), ii. 158.

[5] *Handbuch der Historischen Chronologie* (Hanover, 1872), p. 142.

[6] R. Gr. White's *Shakespeare*, i. x.

is only natural, therefore, that the birthdays (especially in so numerous a family) came to be forgotten in the course of years, the more so as the celebration of these anniversaries had not yet become customary. The Catholic Church, as is well known, celebrates the day of the patron saint, or name-day. To judge from the inscription on the poet's tomb, the most probable inference is that William Shakespeare was born a few days before the 23rd of April. De Quincey is inclined to adopt the 22nd, because the poet's only granddaughter, Lady Barnard, celebrated her wedding on the 22nd of April, 1626, and had probably chosen the day in honour of her grandfather's birthday. But De Quincey himself eventually decides for the 23rd of April, and says: "We cannot do wrong in drinking to the memory of Shakespeare both on the 22nd and 23rd." However, Shakespeare's admirers of to-day—in wishing to celebrate his birthday—should bear in mind that the Gregorian calendar was not introduced into England till 1752, and hence that, according to our chronology, the 23rd of April, 1564, would correspond to the 3rd of May.[1]

William Shakespeare was thus the first son and only surviving child, and this circumstance alone must have led the parents to bestow upon him more than an ordinary amount of love and affection; there was, however, another reason, which tended further to increase their affection for him. A few weeks after William's birth, the plague broke out in Stratford; it was raging on the Continent at the time, and a year before, had made its ravages in London. Between the 30th of June and the 31st of December, it carried off, in Stratford (according to Malone's calculation) 238 persons, nearly one-sixth of the inhabitants of the town: thirty-five persons were buried in August, eighty-three in September, fifty-eight in October, twenty-six in November, and eighteen in December.[2] The houses that were visited by the scourge had a red cross marked on the door, and round it were inscribed the words, "Lord, have mercy upon us."[3] John Shakespeare fortunately

[1] De Quincey, *Shakespeare*, p. 3. [2] Hunter's *Illustrations*, i. pp. 81-83.
[3] Compare *Love's Labour's Lost*, v. 2:—

> Write, "Lord, have mercy on us," on those three;
> They are infected; in their hearts it lies;
> They have the plague, and caught it of your eyes.

Compare also *Romeo and Juliet*, v. 2, and Pepys' *Diary*, June 7, 1665.

> These lords are visited; you are not free,
> For the Lord's token on you do I see.

never had the terrible red cross affixed to the door of his house, the destroying angel did not enter there. This may be regarded as a proof that (according to the notions of the time), the house was kept in an orderly, cleanly, and rational state—notwithstanding the dung-hill left in the street, and the uncleansed gutter! Still the parents may have passed anxious days and weeks; they had already lost two children, and after the cessation of the plague, they, no doubt, looked upon the one remaining child as given and born to them anew.

William was a healthy, well-formed child, and the supposition (gathered from Sonnets 37 and 38), that he was lame,[1] is absolutely of no value, when the poems are correctly understood; besides, the supposition is opposed by Sonnets 50 and 51, which speak of Shakespeare as a rider, and by other testimonies relating to the poet's physical constitution. It is, indeed, true that lameness need not interfere with horsemanship, as is proved in the cases of Scott and Byron, but it would be an exceedingly strange coincidence if Shakespeare had to be classed with them as a third lame poet. Scott, as is well known, has introduced Shakespeare into his "Kenilworth" (ch. xvii.), merely in order to greet him as a lame comrade: "he is a stout man at quarter-staff and single falchion, though, as I am told, a halting fellow." But would Davies[2] have praised Shakespeare's and Burbage's :—

> Wit, courage, good shape, good parts, and all good,

and would Aubrey have said of Shakespeare that "he was a handsome, well-shaped man," if he had been lame? If he had been lame, some mention of the defect would assuredly have been made in the traditions referring to Shakespeare, for nothing is more apt to be remembered of a person than any physical defect. The further supposition that Shakespeare, owing to

[1] Capell was the first to notice this in the Sonnets referred to. Malone (in his *Shakespeare*, ed. by Boswell, 1821, xx. 264) expresses himself against the supposition. Harness (who was himself lame), in his *Life of Shakespeare*, prefixed to his edition of the poet's works, treats Capell's supposition as an established fact, and Thoms (*Notes and Queries*, 2nd series, vii. 333), even ventures to state the cause of Shakespeare's lameness, viz., an accident met with during his military service in the Netherlands! The whole story is wisely and wittily refuted in *Notes and Queries*, 5th series, January 31st, 1874, p. 80 ff.

[2] In his *Microcosmus*, 1603.

his lameness, was employed on the stage only to represent old men (for instance, old Knowell, in "Every Man in His Humour," and Adam, in "As You Like It"), and that he played such parts only, does not at all tally with the actual fact; for we know positively that Shakespeare played the part of kings, the ghost in "Hamlet," &c.[1]

It is only in accordance with human nature that parents, in circumstances like the present, should bestow double care upon the education of this one surviving son, and that they should endeavour to give him a better schooling than they themselves had been able to obtain. We have manifest proofs of a species of ambition in the family, a striving after some higher position; and this ambition was doubtless fostered in John Shakespeare by his connection with the Arden family, and also by the distinguised position he held among his fellow-citizens. We may be perfectly certain that, according to the best of his ability, John Shakespeare looked well after the education of this son, and the more so, perhaps, if he perceived in the boy the germs of unusual mental gifts. Hence, although we have no documentary evidence of the fact, still, since Rowe's day, it has very justly been assumed that William was sent to the Grammar School when seven years old.[2] This school-house—an old gloomy-looking building with low rooms—still exists, and was the outcome of a legacy which Thomas Jolyffe, in 1482, bequeathed to the guild of the Holy Cross, at Stratford-on-Avon, on condition that "the said guild should find a priest fit and able in knowledge to teach grammar freely, to all scholars coming to the school in the said town." At the time of the Reformation the Guild of the Holy Cross was broken up, and its property confiscated by the Crown. When, however, Stratford was granted a royal charter for the incorporation of its inhabitants, one condition was, "that the free Grammar School, for the instruction and education of the boys and youths there, should be thereafter kept up and main-

[1] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 34; Ch. A. Brown, *Shakespeare's Autobiographical Poems*, p. 81 ff.

[2] Rowe, it is true, only says, "he (viz., the father), had bred him for some time at a free school," and the hypothesis is based merely upon a combination—certainly difficult to refute—that this free school was the Stratford Grammar School. Dyce, in his *Life of Shakespeare*, erroneously makes Rowe say that Shakespeare attended the *Stratford* free school.

tained as theretofore it used to be." The institution thus became the property of the town, and this it has remained up to the present day. It is quite possible that, as Lord Campbell[1] thinks, the sons of the neighbouring gentry attended the school, provided they were able to comply with the conditions of admission. These conditions demanded that the pupils should reside in the town, should be seven years of age, and be able to read. Hence we may, with certainty, infer that William had learned to read before his seventh year, whether at his mother's knee (admitting that she could read), or from a private teacher, may be left to the reader's fancy. It may also be inferred that he was sent to school in 1571, the same year in which Roger Ascham published his celebrated and influential book "The Schoolmaster." Private instruction in the first elements of reading must, at all events, have been given, for it is not likely that parents were generally inclined or able to undertake the task themselves. In "Love's Labour's Lost" (iv. 2), we read that Holofernes (who was probably modelled from a Stratford teacher), instructed the children from a *horn-book*. Learning to read was, however, a more difficult task then, than in our day, for a boy in addition to learning the Roman letters, had to study the black-letter alphabet. The school hours, in summer, lasted from six in the morning till six in the evening, and in winter from daybreak till dusk; of course, with the requisite intervals for dinner, as well as for rest and play. Whether William Shakespeare liked going to school, or whether he was the "whining school-boy" whom he has depicted in his celebrated description of the seven periods of life in "As You Like It" (ii. 7):—

> Then the whining school-boy, with his satchel
> And shining morning face, creeping like a snail
> Unwillingly to school,

must be left undecided. Fortunately the distance between the school and his home, was not great, and the boy may have been able to run home at various times during the day, much to his mother's delight, and have got some good thing popped into his pocket by her. However, while at school, the boy must have necessarily been a good deal away from home, and that home would no longer be the exclusive centre of existence

[1] *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements*, p. 16.

to him. His teacher from 1572 to 1577 was one Thomas Hunt, a clergyman from the neighbouring village of Luddington (buried on the 12th of April, 1612, at Stratford), and afterwards Thomas Jenkins, his successor, who, as his name testifies, was a Welshman.[1] It may here be mentioned that families of Welsh origin formed no inconsiderable portion of the inhabitants of Stratford, as is proved by the names occurring in the church register, such as: Ap Roberts, Ap Rice, Ap Williams, Ap Edwards, Hugh ap Shon, Howell ap Howell, Evans Rice, Evans Meredith, &c.[2] William Shakespeare had, therefore, from his infancy, ample opportunities of becoming acquainted with the peculiar character and dialect of the Welsh people; and, indeed, the two Welshmen portrayed in his works (Captain Fluellen in "Henry V," and Sir Hugh Evans in "The Merry Wives"), prove his intimate acquaintance with the national peculiarities.[3] And there is, probably, little doubt that the poet has immortalized Thomas Hunt, as Holofernes, in "Love's Labour's Lost," and Thomas Jenkins, as Sir Hugh Evans, in "The Merry Wives;" for, with the exception of Pinch in "The Comedy of Errors," and of Sir Nathaniel in "Love's Labour's Lost," these are the only schoolmasters met with in Shakespeare's works. Still, Pinch figures less as a teacher than as a wizard, and Sir Nathaniel is described as a curate. According to Warburton and Farmer, more especially, Holofernes was modelled from John Florio.[4] However, although several objections might be raised against this supposition, certain traits in Florio and in Hunt may have been woven together

[1] If Jenkins (according to Bellew, *Shakespeare's Home at New Place*, p. 38) really entered upon his office as late as 1580, Shakespeare could hardly have been one of his pupils. However, according to Malone's *Shakspeare*, ed. by Boswell, ii. 100, Jenkins received the appointment before 1577 (if not earlier). The annual salary of a teacher amounted to £20, and that of his assistant to £10; Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 92, note.

[2] Hunter, *Illustrations*, i. p. 60 note.

[3] Even the Keltic words and expressions, met with here and there in Shakespeare, may perhaps be accounted for by this fact. Compare Charles Mackay, *Celtic or Gaelic Words in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, in *The Athenæum*, 1875, ii. p. 437 ff.; Samuel Lover, *The Lyrics of Ireland* (1858), p. 162 ff., p. 355 ff. (in connection with "Qualtitie calmie custure me!" in *Henry V.* iv. 4).

[4] Compare Drake, *Shakspeare and His Times*, i. p. 444 ff.; Knight, *Studies of Shakspere* (1868), p. 123 ff. Knight is opposed to the supposition, and thinks the original of Holofernes must have existed in Stratford or its neighbourhood.

to form the portrait, and the invitation from a pupil's parents might apply to the one as well as to the other. The delightful scene in "The Merry Wives," (iv. 1), where Sir Hugh examines the boy Page—he is not named William without reason—in the presence of his mother, must assuredly have had its prototype in the poet's own experience as a schoolboy. The examination probably took place when Jenkins—or Hunt—had been invited to dinner by Shakespeare's parents, just as related by Holofernes in "Love's Labour's Lost," (iv. 2): "I do dine to-day at the father's of a certain pupil of mine." And Jenkins must certainly have often received invitations of this kind from other families; how, otherwise, could he have existed upon his scanty income? We may, therefore, consider that Thomas Jenkins stood for Sir Hugh, Mrs. Shakespeare for Mrs. Page, and some old woman in the neighbourhood for Mrs. Quickly, and we thus obtain a complete picture from the poet's own childhood. To have made the examination take place before the mother, and not before the father, is a very natural and characteristic feature; for the father's head was no doubt so full of the different branches of his extensive business—as well as of municipal affairs—that he probably paid but little heed to his son's Latin studies, of which, moreover, he understood nothing whatever himself. The picture gains in striking truthfulness and piquant charm, when we bear in mind that Page was a name actually met with in Stratford.[1] In the play, Evans concludes the examination by saying "he is a good, sprag memory," and the words sound as if they had come straight from the lips of Thomas Jenkins, for the boy Shakespeare must assuredly have had "a good, sprag memory." However, the boy learned more Latin at the Grammar School than the "*hig, hag, hog*," about which Sir Evans questions him; he must have also learned something about the elements of Greek, as is proved from Ben Jonson's well-known words, that he knew "small Latin and less Greek." The indefatigable industry of antiquarians has even pointed out what school-books the boy Shakespeare learned out of; the Latin Grammar he used

[1] John Page is mentioned, as a third, in connection with John Shakespeare and Thomas Quiney, as having left a dunghill in Rother Street (1570); in 1585 he received 2*s.* for repairing the great bell. Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 116. The same (?) John Page is also mentioned in Agnes Arden's will in 1578 or 1579; Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 13.

was that of William Lilly.[1] How far Shakespeare advanced in his Latin and Greek studies, how far, in fact, his knowledge extended, is a subject that will have to be discussed in a subsequent chapter, and is one of the numerous points of controversy in the study of Shakespeare; however, of late years the views entertained by scholars have become tolerably clear and unanimous. For the present it will be sufficient to mention that at school—beyond learning Latin and Greek—the boy Shakespeare was probably only taught something about his own language, writing, and arithmetic. A knowledge of modern languages he certainly did not acquire at the Grammar School in Stratford, and lessons in history and geography were, perhaps, even less thought of. The extent and method of instruction was no doubt meagre enough, according to our ideas; still, as compared with the education his father had received, the young poet's schooling was undoubtedly of a superior kind, and, considering the state of education in those days, would have enabled him to aim at acquiring a position in the very foremost ranks. A very graphic picture of the proceedings in the school-room, as well as of the method of instruction in those days, is given us by R. Willis, a contemporary of Shakespeare's; he was born in the same year as the poet, and therefore attended school during the same years. The account given in Willis's book, "Mount Tabor,"[2] does, indeed, refer to the school in Gloucester, which may have been somewhat inferior to the school at Stratford: "Before Master Downhale came to be our master in Christ-school, an ancient citizen of no great learning was our school-

[1] This is clear from the fact that in *The Taming of the Shrew*, i. 1, the poet quotes a line from the *Eunuchus* of Terence (i. 1, 29): *Redime te captum quam queas minimo*—hence not according to the original, but as given by Lilly. The passage: *dilucolo surgere* (saluberrimum est) in *Twelfth Night*, ii. 3, is likewise taken from Lilly's Grammar. Compare Dyce on *St. Drake*, i. 25 ff.; Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 43; Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. p. 105. The other Latin school-books used at the time were the *Accidence*, and the *Sententiæ Pueriles;* the examination of the boy William Page, is taken almost word for word from the *Accidence*.—See *Outlines*, i. 52. Shakespeare must also certainly have used at school the *Mantuanus*, which was very popular in those days. See *Love's Labour's Lost*, iv. 2. Compare T. S. Baynes, *What Shakspere Learnt at School*, in *Fraser's Magazine*, November, 1879, January and May, 1880.

[2] *Mount Tabor, or Private Exercises of a Penitent Sinner*, by R. W. [*i.e.*, R. Willis], Esqre, 1639, p. 10.

master, whose manner was to give us severall lessons in the evening, by construing it to every forme, and in the next morning to examine us thereupon; by making all the boyes in the first forme to come from their seates and stand on the outsides of their desks, towardes the middle of the schoole, and so the second forme, and the rest in order, whiles himself walked up and down by them, and hearing them construe their lesson one after another; and then giving one of the words to one, and another to another (as he thought fit), for parsing of it. Now, when the two highest formes were dispatched, some of them, whom we call prompters, would come and sit in our seates of the lower formes, and so being at our elbowes, would put into our mouths answers to the master's questions, as he walked up and downe by us; and so by our prompters help we made shift to escape correction, but understood little to profit by it; having this circular motion, like the mil-horse that travels all day, yet in the end finds himselfe not a yard further than when he began.

"I, being thus supported by my prompter, it fell out one day that one of the eldest schollers and one of the highest forme fell out with mee upon occasion of some boyes-play abroad; and in his anger, to doe me the greatest hurt hee could (which then he thought to be to fall under the rod), he dealt with all the prompters, that none of them should helpe me, and so (as he thought) I must necessarily be beaten. When I found myselfe at this strait, I gathered all my wits together (as we say) and listned the more carefully to my fellowes that construed before me, and having also some easie word to my lot for parsing, I made hard shift to escape for that time. And when I observed my adversaries displeasure to continue against me, so as I could have no helpe from my prompters, I doubled my diligence and attention to our masters construing our next lesson to us; and observing carefully how in construction one word followed and depended upon another, which with heedfull observing two or three lessons more, opened the way to shew me how one word was governed of another in the parsing; so as I needed no prompter, but became able to bee a prompter myselfe; and so evill intended to mee by my fellow-scholler, turned to my great good."

Who does not recognize in this system of instruction the beginnings of the Lancastrian method? Who would not like

to have an answer to the question in what relation Shakespeare stood to his "prompter," or whether he exerted all his mental powers in order himself to be promoted to the influential position of prompter? Who can wonder that, with such a method of instruction, he learned "but small Latin and less Greek"? I am, however, inclined to believe that the Stratford Grammar School was of a better kind; and, in fact, an improvement seems to have been introduced into the Gloucester School when Master Downhale was appointed to succeed the "ancient citizen."[1] I further believe that Shakespeare, by private study, quickly and abundantly made good the defects of his school learning.

It is a well-known experience that the most eminently gifted men have not, as a rule, distinguished themselves at school, but owed the better part of their knowledge and success in life to their own independent development, to self-instruction and self-education. A youthful genius has a dislike to trodden paths, and endeavours to go his own way. We need only adduce as proofs, Scott, Byron, Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe. It was probably the same with Shakespeare. At all events, he must have been a boy fond of reading, and must have begun early to look for mental food in other books besides those which the school offered him; and it was probably more especially chronicles and books on knightly exploits that would attract his lively imagination. Without fear of being far wrong, we may picture the boy in some corner of the house or garden, absorbed for hours in the black letter of some folio or quarto volume. The works printed by Caxton—the venerable father of English printing—by Wynkyn de Worde, and other printers of the day, were not then the priceless bibliographical treasures they have become in our day, and some of them, no doubt, found their way to Stratford. That these stories were read in the domestic circle is proved, among others, by a scene in "The Winter's Tale" (ii. 1), where Knight imagines Mary Shakespeare to have stood for Hermione, and her son William for Mamillius, and thus reproduces a scene from the poet's own boyhood. We may certainly assume that some of the books on chivalrous exploits—which Shakespeare afterwards used so extensively for his dramas—formed part of the boy's

[1] Compare, as regards Shakespeare's school education, Farmer, *On The Learning of Shakspeare;* Drake, i. p. 29 ff., and i. p. 55 ff.

reading. Holinshed's "Chronicle" (1577), upon which Shakespeare subsequently founded his historical plays, must certainly have fallen into his hands at an early period; also R. Robinson's translation of the "Gesta Romanorum" (1577), and Painter's "Palace of Pleasure" (1566-67, containing "Romeo and Julietta," and "Giletta of Narbonne"); on the other hand the poet cannot, of course, have become acquainted with Spenser's "Shepherd's Calendar" (1579), till he had reached the age of early manhood.[1] Shakespeare must also, undoubtedly, have been a diligent reader of the Bible even in his boyhood; and the Old Testament, in particular, must have early excited his imagination, as it has that of every other poet.

Yet, whatever we may think of Shakespeare's love for reading, and although we may assume that he speedily exhausted the scanty stock of books in Stratford, he cannot be regarded as a stay-at-home or a book-worm. Owing to his lively temperament, the confined air indoors could not possibly have been to his liking, and as he grew up, he must assuredly have made use of his leisure, after school-hours, in roaming about the fields and woods. To love roaming about the country, to be fond of nature as well as of reading, and to show a disinclination for school-work, are characteristic features of most poetical boys and youths; and, as already said, this was the case, among others, with Burns, Scott, and Byron. In Shakespeare's case, moreover, this open-air life went hand in hand with an element of self-culture, which was more active in him than in any other poet, *viz.*, his close observance of nature and human life. In the English method of bringing up children—which allows them much greater freedom than children have in Germany—Shakespeare may have found excellent opportunities for such studies; and there is no reason to suppose that his parents put an exceptional restraint upon him, or that they kept him at home against his will. There can be no doubt that even as a boy, he was intimately acquainted with his native town and its immediate surroundings, and that, as he grew up, he not only repeatedly visited his relations at Snitterfield, Wilmecote, and elsewhere, but other places of interest which were to be found close at hand in all directions. A glance at the town of Stratford and its neighbourhood will show what varied impressions

[1] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 39 ff.; also pp. 112, 222, 246 ff.—Drake.

these places must have made upon Shakespeare's youthful mind, and what great advantages his mental development would be likely to derive from them.

Stratford, which Camden describes as an "*emporiolum non inelegans*,"[1] is a place of Saxon origin, founded over a thousand years ago, and is said to have originated with a monastery, apparently founded shortly after the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons.[2] According to Camden, the place was made over by Ethelard, a Governor of Worcestershire, to the bishopric of Worcester three hundred years before the Norman Conquest; at all events, the bishops of Worcester were, for a long time, lords of the manor of Stratford, and in Shakespeare's time the Earls of Warwick seem to have succeeded them in this capacity. A very ancient road (from London to Ireland) passed through Stratford, and crossed the Avon there, as we learn from the name *straete-ford*. The town of Stoneyford, close to the Stour, likewise has its name from the ford there. And these towns not only owe their names, but their very origin to these fords. For it was at such points that travellers would make a halt and rest; it was at such places that they would be obliged to wait, when the rivers ran high, till the waters had subsided; it was at such points, in many cases, that assistance and a hospitable reception would be both welcome and necessary. Hence it is as likely that a monastery may have been founded there —offering the hospitality of an inn—as that the monastery may gradually have developed into a small township. The town was granted a charter for fairs, as early as the reign of King John, but was not granted a municipal constitution till the 28th of June, 1553, in the reign of Edward VI. One of its first duties, after receiving the charter, would naturally be to construct a bridge across the Avon,

[1] Although Camden published a new edition of his work in 1607, he does not mention Shakespeare among the noteworthy persons of Stratford; on the contrary he says: "Nec aliud memorandum Avona ad suas ripas videt!"

[2] *History and Antiquities of Stratford-upon-Avon: comprising a Description of the Collegiate Church, the Life of Shakspeare, and Copies of several Documents relating to him and his Family, never before printed; with a Biographical Sketch of other Eminent Characters, Natives of, or who have resided in Stratford. To which is added a Particular Account of the Jubilee celebrated at Stratford in Honour of our Immortal Bard.* By R. B. Wheler. Embellished with Eight Engravings. Stratford-upon-Avon, Printed and Sold by J. Ward (Longmans).—See pp. 26 and 27.—Sidney L. Lee, *Stratford-on-Avon from the Earliest Times to the Death of Shakespeare, Illustrated.* London, 1884.

and the good old stone bridge, which still adorns the place, can scarcely have been the first that was made. This stone bridge owes its origin to the liberality of a private citizen, who went to London, where he made his fortune; this wealth he devoted in a praiseworthy and patriotic spirit, to his native town of Stratford. An inscription on the third pillar of the bridge informs posterity, in simple but dignified words, that: "Sir Hugh Clopton, Knight, Lord Mayor of London, built this bridge, at his own proper expense, in the reign of King Henry the Seventh."[1] The original ford still exists by the side of the bridge. While thus attending to its commercial interests, the town did not omit to consider the intellectual or rather the spiritual wants of its citizens. A splendid church was erected and dedicated to the Holy Trinity; in its first beginnings the church must certainly have reached to a remoter period even than Clopton's Bridge, and gave occupation to a numerous body of ecclesiastics. The clergy resided in the stately college building, which was surrounded by an extensive garden. After the Reformation the inmates were dispersed, and this may, in many respects, have been a loss to the town.[2] The property was secularized, afterwards added to the Crown lands, and ultimately sold by Queen Elizabeth in 1575 to John Combe, the well-known friend of Shakespeare, who resided there up to the time of his death on the 10th of July, 1614. From his possession it passed to his nephew and heir, William Combe, who also used it as a residence. Subsequently, after having frequently changed hands, it fell into the possession of the Clopton family, who again sold it; finally in 1799-1800 it was completely demolished. The whole of the movable contents of this memorable house were sold by auction, as early as 1797.[3]

Stratford possessed another sacred edifice in the so-called Chapel of the Guild, the property of the same Guild of the Holy Cross, which owned the Grammar School. This Chapel —built in the architectural style of the time of Henry VII.— stood, and still stands immediately by the side of the School,

[1] Pictures of this bridge may be found in almost every work on Shakespeare and Stratford.

[2] See Hunter's *Illustrations*, i. pp. 81-83.

[3] Pictures of the College are given bv Wheler, Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, by Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, and others.

so that the boy Shakespeare must, at all events, have known it earlier, and been even better acquainted with it than with the more distant Trinity Church, the College and the Bridge. The beautiful bells of this chapel were, doubtless, among the child's earliest recollections, and probably exercised a lasting impression upon him. The mural paintings which originally adorned the chapel, and which were accidentally discovered in 1804 when the chapel was undergoing repair, were, no doubt, partly whitewashed and partly destroyed by the proceedings of the iconoclasts in 1559 and 1560; still, we can hardly venture, with Mr. C. Knight,[1] to believe that Shakespeare may have seen some remains of these old paintings. And it is scarcely likely that Shakespeare can have seen any other paintings in the little town of Stratford; according to Malone's calculation, the town, at the time of Shakespeare's birth, contained a population of not more than 1,470 souls; only 55 baptisms are entered during the year 1564, and 42 burials.[2] There can, of course, be no question in so insignificant a town of any special attention having been bestowed upon the arts and sciences, or of any active interest taken in the political and literary culture of the nation. Stratford was a small town of scattered houses, like a village; the houses were small and made of wood, and in many cases had thatched roofs, and all their surroundings pointed to rural occupations and rustic amusements. We ought not so much to be surprised at the scarcity of the traces and signs of culture and intellectual life in the Stratford of those days, but rather at the number of the traces of such culture that are met with.

As is shown in Dugdale's map of Warwickshire, in Shakespeare's time, four roads proceeded from Stratford;[3] in the first place the road to Henley-in-Arden, which passed the house in which Shakespeare was born, and turned northwards

[1] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, 46 ff.; Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 95. A minute description of these frescoes is given by Wheler, *History and Antiquities of Stratford-upon-Avon*, 12 ff. Drawings of them have been published by Thomas Fisher, both in his *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, and in his *Ancient Allegorical, Historical, and Legendary Paintings in Fresco, discovered on the Walls of the Chapel of the Trinity at Stratford-upon-Avon*, &c., with upwards of 60 plates. Lond., 1836, fol.

[2] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 14.

[3] As far as we know, there exists no plan of Stratford and its environs to satisfy the requirements of modern investigations, and yet such a plan would be most welcome to every student of Shakespeare.

beyond the villages of Wilmecote and Aston Cantlow; secondly, we have the picturesque road to Warwick, close to which lay the already-mentioned estate of Ingon, and further on the village of Snitterfield; the third road ran along the Avon to Bidford; and the fourth across Clopton's Bridge to Charlecote, Hampton-Lucy, and beyond. These four roads must, each in its own way, have enticed the boy Shakespeare into the open country, whether we picture him, walking by his father's side, in the company of some merry schoolfellow, or by himself.[1] Directly beyond the town, only a few hundred steps from the supposed house of the poet's birth in Henley Street, stood the famous old boundary elm, which may not only have been a favourite spot with the boys for their games, but may also have been a point where the processions, held during Rogation-week, made a halt; these solemn perambulations were continued after the Reformation, and the schoolboys were expected to take part in it under the supervision of the clergy and the schoolmasters. We may, therefore, imagine the boy Shakespeare forming one of the procession as a singer or standard-bearer, not only passing this very elm-tree, but perambulating round the entire boundary of the parish; for the object of these annual processions—like the Roman terminalia—was to prevent the boundary from becoming indefinite, and, at the same time, to impress the line of boundary upon the mind of the younger generation.[2] Whoever has read the detailed descriptions given by Knight of life in and around Stratford in Shakespeare's day, can scarcely doubt that the growing boy often wandered up and down the winding and picturesque banks of the Avon, with its pretty villages and stately mansions (Welcombe, Hampton-Lucy, Bidford, Charlecote, Fulbrooke, &c.); and several passages in Shakespeare's dramas show what a deep impression that lovely river must have made upon the boy's mind.[3] These places, therefore,

[1] See Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, pp. 52, 63 ff.

[2] Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, ed. Ellis, i. 116 ff.

[3] Knight, p. 231 ff., p 254 ff. *Two Gentlemen*, ii. 7: "The current, that with gentle murmur glides," &c.; *As You Like It*, ii. 1: "As he lay along, under an oak," &c.; *Hamlet*, iv. 7: "There is a willow grows ascaunt the brook," &c. Hence doubly significant and beautiful is Ben Jonson's well-known eulogy of the poet, where he addresses him as: Sweet Swan of Avon. It may, however, seem doubtful whether this epithet was actually one of Ben Jonson's own making, if we compare the epigram "Cignus per plumas

were the scenes of the boy's first excursions and gambols. The pleasant country districts, the undulating hills, the rich green meadow-land, the woods and splendid trees, among which the villages lay snugly hidden—may frequently be recognized in Shakespeare's descriptions of country landscapes. In fact the scenery in the "Midsummer Night's Dream," in "The Winter's Tale," in "As You Like It," and various other of his plays corresponds exactly with the scenery of Warwickshire.[1] The poet often refers to the rich orchards, that were so numerous on the outskirts of Stratford, and to the special kind of apples cultivated there.[2] The charming picture of Warwickshire which is revealed to us in the poet's works, becomes still more interesting when we bear in mind that upon this part of the country fell the last rays of the roseate light and the fragrance associated with the popular poetry of merry old England—when Puritanism, with its leaden feet, stepped in and crushed the joyous and poetical character of the nation. Of all the commentators on Shakespeare none have given us fuller accounts of these merry-makings, the customs and the ballads of the rural population, than Drake and Knight, and the remembrance of them is found running, like a red thread, through all Shakespeare's poetry. He, in every case, regards these festivals and games (*e.g.*, the sheep-shearing in "The Winter's Tale"), as an essential and pleasant part of the life of the people, and in every case, too, he protects them from the attacks of the Puritans, as in "As You Like It," ii. 3, where it is asked: "Dost thou think, because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale?" Knight is certainly right in assuming that the poet, as a boy and youth, must "in gleeful companionship" have taken part, not only in the above-mentioned perambulations, but also in the celebration of St. George's Day, the pageants, butt-shooting,

Anser," from *Laquei Ridiculosi*, 1613; see Part III. Garrick has written a lovely poem on the Avon: "Thou soft-flowing Avon." Compare S. Ireland's *Views of the Avon*.

[1] Wise, *Shakespeare, his Birthplace*, &c., pp. 6-12.

[2] For instance: "warden-pies" (*Winter's Tale*, iv. 2); "leather-coats" (*Henry IV., Second Part*, v. 3); "apple-John" (*Henry IV., First Part*, iii. 3); "pippen" and "caraway" (*Henry IV., Second Part*, v. 3); "bitter-sweeting" (*Romeo and Juliet*, ii. 4); "pomewater" (*Love's Labour's Lost*, iv. 2); "crab-apples" (*Love's Labour's Lost*, closing lines). See Wise, *Shakespeare, his Birthplace*, &c., p. 96 ff.; C. Roach Smith, *The Rural Life of Shakespeare* (London, 1870), p. 20.

quintain, barley-breaks, and other sports. Hence the boy's imagination at an early age found abundant food in these popular festivals and pageants.

But the youthful heart and youthful imagination are usually more deeply impressed by localities famous for their historical remains and monuments, by legends and stories, than by mere beauty of landscape and popular merry-makings. And such localities abounded in Warwickshire, which Michael Drayton—in his "Polyolbion"—has called the heart of England.[1] Even the Romans have left important traces of their dominion in Warwickshire. All the roads from the south of England, leading northwards and towards Ireland, pass through the county, and thus we have here three great Roman roads traversing Warwickshire; to the west the Ikenield Way, to the east the Fosse Way, running from south-west to north-east, and lastly Watling Road, on the borders between Warwickshire and Leicestershire. In Shakespeare's time these Roman roads were considered to have been made by the Britons, at all events they are expressly declared to be so, by Robert of Gloucester, and in Fabyan's Chronicle.[2] At the confluence of the Arrow with the Alne, where the Ikenield Way crosses the Alne, we have the small town of Alcester, about six miles west of Stratford. As is evident from the name (Alni castrum, Alncester, Alcester), as well as by the discovery of walls, urns, and coins, a Roman camp existed here, to protect the ford across the river. Another though less important Roman camp—traces of which may still be seen—existed on the Fosse Way seven or eight miles to the north-east of Stratford. Nay, Stratford, itself—owing to its ford—appears to have been a Roman station, for numerous Roman coins have been dug up there, and are preserved in the Shakespeare Museum. And near Welcombe, quite close to Stratford, traces of Roman fortifications are still found.

There is nothing in Warwickshire, or in any other part of England, that recalls the Danish occupation; the remembrance of the Danes is connected only with their devastations. Richer and more significant are the recollections connected

[1] Michael Drayton (1563?-1631) was himself a native of Warwickshire, and in his *Polyolbion* he gives us a very minute description of the county, calling it:—

"That Shire which we the Heart of England well may call."

[2] Knight, p. 149 ff. The roads are marked in the map Britannia Saxonica, in Lappenberg's *History of England*, vol. i.

with the two oldest, and, at one time, the most important towns in the county—Warwick and Coventry. The magnificent and exceedingly romantic castle of Warwick, was the seat of the powerful Earls of Warwick, a brave and warlike race, which has played a prominent part in the history of England. The founder of the family is said to have been the legendary Guy of Warwick, the subduer of the Danish giant Colbrand, who after his warlike exploits retired to what is now called Guy's Cliff,

> Where with my hands I hewed a house
> Out of a craggy rocke of stone;
> And lived like a palmer poore
> Within that cave myself alone:
>
> And daylye came to begg my bread
> Of Phelis att my castle gate,
> Not knowne unto my loved wiffe
> Who dayle mourned for her mate, &c.

The legends and ballads relating to Sir Guy must undoubtedly have been told or sung to the boy Shakespeare; and no doubt he had also seen the statue of the old hero at Guy's Cliff.[1] Among the famous Norman Earls of Warwick are the Beauchamps, especially Thomas Beauchamp, the fourth Earl, whom parliament appointed guardian of Richard II.;[2] and Richard Beauchamp the fifth Earl, surnamed the Good (1381-1439),[3] who distinguished himself in the struggle with Owen Glendower, and at the battle of Shrewsbury against the Percies; it was he who negotiated the marriage of Henry V. with Catherine of France, and was appointed "tutor" to Henry VI. up to his fifteenth year. This Richard Beauchamp was likewise one of the heroes of the Wars of the Roses. He died as Regent of France at Rouen, and his body was brought to Warwick and buried in St. Mary's Church in the Beauchamp Chapel, which had been erected there by him; his tomb, which is said to have cost the extravagant sum of nearly £2,500, is still an object of admiration to persons visiting Warwick. His son Henry was not only made Earl of Warwick, by Henry VI., but sub-

[1] With regard to the legends and ballads referring to Sir Guy of Warwick, see Warton, H. E. P., *Percy's Reliques* (*The Legend of Sir Guy*), &c.

[2] This Thomas Beauchamp is said to have been the one who became known by the name of Bold Beauchamp. See Nares under *Bold Beauchamp.*

[3] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, pp. 58, 155 ff.

sequently even King of the Isle of Wight, of Jersey and Guernsey. With him the male line of the Beauchamps became extinct in 1445, and the lands and possessions passed, through the female line, into the hands of the Nevilles, the first and mightiest of these being the famous Richard Neville, the "king-maker." He was the mainstay of the Yorkists (the White Rose) for whom he gained the victories of St. Albans and Northampton. He was less successful at the battle of Wakefield and at the second battle of St. Albans. In conjunction with the Duke of York, however, he drove the Lancastrian party back northwards, and in March, 1461, proclaimed his cousin king in London, as Edward IV. By his victory at Towton he secured the throne for the newly-made king, who in return, showered honours and rewards upon him and his family.[1] Nevertheless, discords gradually arose between the dependent king and his all-powerful vassal, which ended in the latter having to flee to the Continent in 1470; while there he gave his daughter Anne in marriage to Edward Prince of Wales, the son of Queen Margaret. Thereupon at the head of a considerable force he landed at Plymouth, and proclaimed Henry VI. king. Edward IV., meanwhile, fled to Holland, where he likewise raised an army, which he brought over and landed at Ravenspurg, in Yorkshire, in March, 1471. At the battle of Barnet, the Lancastrians were at last thoroughly beaten, but the King-Maker and his brother Lord Montague lost their lives on the field of battle. Richard Neville left two daughters, Isabella, married to the Duke of Clarence, the brother of Edward IV., and Anne (mentioned above), who after the murder of her first husband in 1741, married the Duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard III.

These were the great historical characters whom young Shakespeare could not fail to have thought of, when entering Warwick Castle by the passage cut through the solid rock, and gazing at its massive towers built to withstand the wear and tear of hundreds of years,—or when visiting the Beauchamp Chapel and looking inquisitively at its monuments and tomb-

[1] Richard Neville lived in pompous style, and wherever he resided kept open house. Tradition says that he had daily to provide for 30,000 persons on his different estates. When he came to London, says Stowe, six oxen were consumed at breakfast by his household, and every tavern was full of meat provided by him. See *The Diary of the Rev. John Ward*, ed. Severn, p. 139 ff.

stones there.[1] That Shakespeare, even as a boy, wandered to Warwick, which was only some eight miles from Stratford, and became acquainted with all the objects of interest there, will not admit of any reasonable doubt. At Warwick he would at once be transported to the time of the Wars of the Roses, to the scene of his Histories, and would learn the present as well as the past circumstances of the famous race of earls who figure in all of these dramas. Would it be too much to maintain that the youthful impressions which Warwick made upon Shakespeare, were the first inspiration of his Histories?

But Shakespeare, as a youth, not only wandered to Warwick, he must undoubtedly have extended his excursions as far as Coventry, some eighteen miles from Stratford. And if Warwick was exclusively the earl's town, in Coventry he would find by the side of the aristocratic class, the citizens themselves occupying a prominent position. In connection with the aristocratic element there, young Shakespeare would have found in the well-known mythical Earl Leofric of Mercia —the husband of Lady Godiva—a somewhat parallel figure to the mythical Guy of Warwick. Both of these figures, however, failed to rouse an echo in Shakespeare; they were pre-eminently epic subjects, and probably did not recommend themselves to him for dramatic purposes. Coventry, after the Norman Conquest, fell into the possession of the Earls of Chester, who were succeeded by the comparatively unimportant and unknown earls of Montalt and Arundel. Subsequently it became crown property. Gosport Green, which is immediately beyond the town of Coventry, was the scene of the hostile meeting between Henry Bolingbroke (afterwards Henry IV.) and Thomas Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, which Shakespeare has immortalized in his "Richard II." Some years later (1404), Henry IV. held his *Parliamentum indoctorum* there, so called because no lawyers were allowed to take part in the proceedings. Coventry was favoured by Henry VI., who visited it several times, and in 1459 also held a parliament there, the so-called *Parliamentum diabolicum*, which received this epithet owing to the sentences of outlawry passed against the Duke of York and others. After the battle of Bosworth (1485), Henry VII. was received by the town with

[1] The Earl of Leicester, Queen Elizabeth's favourite, was also buried in this church in 1588.

great demonstrations of joy. In the year 1565 Queen Elizabeth paid the town a visit,[1] and in 1566, and again in 1569 Mary Stuart was imprisoned there for some length of time. Lastly, James I. also, in 1616 (the year of Shakespeare's death), paid Coventry a visit, when great festivities were held in his honour. Shakespeare might, of course, have learned the historical incidents connected with Coventry without having been there himself, and he might—especially in Hall's "Chronicle"—have found every information relating to the Wars of the Roses; and yet the accurate and intimate knowledge of the localities displayed by Shakespeare in certain passages of his works, can probably only have been acquired by personal observation.[2]

As already remarked, however, Coventry owes its celebrity not merely to Royalty and its Earls, but to its own citizens, who, even before Shakespeare's day, had given proof of their culture and attainments. Directly connected with this, is the interest and encouragement which was bestowed there upon dramatic art, when its connection with the Church was broken off and it passed into the hands of the guilds. Our information respecting the so-called *ludi Coventriæ* extends over a period of about one hundred years up to 1591, hence far into Shakespeare's life-time. In a subsequent chapter we shall have to return to the character and development of these plays, and shall also have to speak of the persons who took part in the performances. It will be sufficient, meanwhile, to remark that when these magnificent Corpus Christi festivals were held—and they formed the nucleus of these theatrical representations—the country people had, for many years past, been in the habit of coming in great numbers from places many miles distant to take part in these merriest of gatherings, it may be, for business purposes also, as is done in our own day at Ober-Ammergau at the time when the Passion Plays are given. Even in "Piers Ploughman's Creed" the miracle plays are spoken of as the most popular fêtes, and are mentioned together with Annual Fairs and taverns:—

[1] According to another statement, Elizabeth is supposed to have visited Coventry in 1571, and a play is said to have been given in her honour, at which Shakespeare might have been present with his parents.

[2] Compare *Richard II.*, 1, 3; *Henry IV.*, Part I.; *King Henry VI.*, Part III., v. Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 164.

We haunted no tavernes,
Ne hobelen abouten ;
At marketes and miracles
We medeleth us never

says a minorite in proof of the virtuous life he leads.[1] Chaucer's "Wife of Bath," on the other hand, does not allow such merry-makings to escape her; she attends both processions and miracle-plays:—

Therfore I made my visitacioun
To vigiles, and to processioun,
To prechings eek, and to this pilgrimages
To pleyes of miracles, and mariages.[2]

It cannot have been very different in Shakespeare's time, for in such matters all times are very much alike. Are we to believe that young Shakespeare, then in the fulness of youthful spirit and energy, was not among the festive crowd at the Corpus Christi pageants? Would we, in his place, have remained at home? We do not, by this, mean to say that he regularly attended the Coventry plays, but merely that he had been there at times. Knight[3] thinks there is little doubt that Shakespeare must have witnessed the pageants of the Shearmen and Tailors, the subjects of which were the Birth of Christ, the Offering of the Magi, the Murder of the Innocents and the Flight into Egypt; he draws this conclusion from an allusion to the massacre at Bethlehem, and the cries of the mothers in "Henry V." (iii. 3):—

Whiles the mad mothers with their howls confus'd
Do break the clouds, as did the wives of Jewry
At Herod's bloody-hunting slaughtermen.

In the Coventry mysteries a soldier does appear before Herod with a child on the end of his spear. Halliwell[4] also quotes the allusion to Herod—whom Shakespeare frequently mentions—and also the passage, "*it was a black soul burning in hell*" from "Henry V" (ii. 3), in favour of the supposition that the poet had witnessed the Coventry plays, for Herod's wrath plays a prominent part in them, and the Damned

[1] *The Vision and Creed of Piers Ploughman*, ed. by Thomas Wright, London, 1856, ii. p. 457 (*Creed*, v. 211-214). Compare Warton, *Hist. Eng. Poetry*, ii. p. 20.

[2] *Canterbury Tales*, ed. Thom. Wright, v. 6137 ff.; also editor's note.

[3] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, pp. 95-97.

[4] *Illustrations*, p. 49.

Souls appear with blackened faces. However, Shakespeare might have become acquainted with the Coventry plays in Stratford, for they were in all probability performed there by itinerant players, as may be gathered from the prologue.[1] The pageant of the "Nine Worthies" also, Knight thinks Shakespeare must have seen in Coventry, as the speeches of the nine heroes in "Love's Labour's Lost," are remarkably similar to those in the Coventry play.

Knight believes that Shakespeare, as a boy and youth, wandered abroad even farther than Coventry; according to him Shakespeare visited the cathedral town of Worcester, saw the tomb of King John there, and the battle-fields of Tewkesbury, Shrewsbury, and even Bosworth. But, tempting as it is to bring Shakespeare into direct connection with these historical places—which owe the veneration in which they are held as much to his genius as to the historical events themselves—still we must not allow ourselves to be carried away by the allurements of mere fancy, unless, indeed, we mean to lose all hold of the ground beneath our feet. Bosworth Field lies some 15 or 16 miles to the north-east of Coventry, in Leicestershire, and it is scarcely likely that Shakespeare would have undertaken so long an expedition merely to look at a battle-field which, moreover, had no special interest for him till some years afterwards, in fact, till after he had left Stratford.

It is a different matter as regards Kenilworth, which is situated half-way between Warwick and Coventry, and thirteen miles from Stratford.[2] Kenilworth Castle—now a magnificent ivy-covered ruin—has played almost as important a part in English history as Warwick Castle. About 1360 it came into the possession of John of Gaunt ("time-honoured Lancaster"), who received it as a gift at his marriage with Blanche of Lancaster. Subsequently it became Crown property, and Queen Elizabeth gave it to her favourite, the Earl of Leicester, who enlarged and embellished it at lavish expense (tradition says at the cost of £60,000); the portion of the Castle built by him, still bears the name of Leicester's

[1] See *Outlines*, i.p. 46.

[2] See *Amye Robsart and the Earl of Leicester; a Critical Essay into the Authenticity of the various Statements in Relation to her Death, and the Libels on the Earl of Leicester*, &c.; also *A History of Kenilworth Castle*, &c. By George Adlard, London, 1870.

Buildings. Elizabeth honoured the Earl with visits on three different occasions, in 1566, in 1568, and in 1575; it was upon the last occasion that Leicester arranged those extravagant fêtes (the Princely Pleasures of Kenilworth) in her honour, by means of which he hoped to win her hand by storm.[1] However, as is well known, secret causes led to a very opposite result, and the Queen suddenly quitted the Castle in a most ungracious mood, after a stay of seventeen days. Percy[2] was the first to moot the supposition that Shakespeare —then a boy of eleven—probably went over to the Castle during those days in order to see the unparalleled fêtes, and if possible to obtain a sight of the adored Queen also, and this conjecture has since steadily gained ground. But this was not the first occasion upon which Shakespeare may have seen the Queen and her regal pomp; he might have enjoyed the sight three years previously (in 1572), when she paid Sir Thomas Lucy a visit at Charlecote. It seems all the more likely that Shakespeare had visited Kenilworth, owing to the fact that a relative of his mother's was at the time in the service of the Earl of Leicester;[3] it seems justifiable also to assume that Shakespeare did not confine himself to this one visit to Kenilworth. At all events the large and magnificent Castle with its splendid surroundings, must have possessed a great charm for the boy's sensitive mind, even when the Queen was not there, and no princely pageants were being held.

Shakespeare has nowhere in his works dropped a word about his personal acquaintance with any one of these localities; he mentions them only in so far as it is necessary for the historical occurrences in his dramas, and his position towards them is as objective as towards the personages he brings

[1] See Nichols, *The Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, 1788, 2 vols. The Accounts of the festivities given by Gascoigne and Laneham.—Drake, i. p. 37 ff.—W. Scott, *Kenilworth*.

[2] Percy's *Reliques*, in his treatise *On the Origin of the English Stage*. In the first edition (1765) the passage referred to is wanting; in fact, this treatise was enlarged by subsequent additions.

[3] Edward Arden seems to have known the reasons which led to the Queen's sudden departure, even though he may not have taken an active part in the proceedings. At Leicester's instigation he was executed in 1583. The much-disputed passage in *The Midsummer Night's Dream*, ii. 1: *That very time I saw, but thou couldst not*, &c., many commentators explain as an allusion to Shakespeare's having been present at the Princely Pleasures. See Halpin, *Oberon's Vision in the Midsummer Night's Dream*, &c. (Published for the Shakespeare Society, 1843).

upon the stage. Only in two of his plays has he gratified himself by alluding to places and persons belonging to his native county, and to incidents that happened in his young days, without having been obliged to do so by the subject of the play. These two plays are "The Merry Wives of Windsor"—which we shall have to refer to again when speaking of the deer-stealing incident—and "The Taming of the Shrew." In the latter Christopher Sly alludes to Burton-on-the-Heath (some 12 miles south of Stratford) as his birthplace, refers to Marian Hacket as the fat ale-wife at Wilmecote, and speaks of old John Naps of Greece as his friend. This obviously corrupt word "Greece" in all probability likewise conceals some given place in Warwickshire, possibly the village of Cleeve on the Avon, or (according to Halliwell) Greete, between Stratford and Gloucester. A namesake of the drunken tinker, Stephen Sly, Halliwell has pointed out as being a workman of Mr. Combe's at Welcombe (1615).[1] Shakespeare has frequently made use of names of persons from his native district, for instance (in addition to the already-mentioned William Page), such names as Bardolph, Fluellen, Ford, Brome,[2] Herne (originally Horne), Evans and Peto (Peyto). The name Fluellen is certainly no other than the Welsh Lluellyn, which occurs in "Sir John Oldcastle" (i. 2). The names of William Ffluellen and George Bardolfe are found in the list of recusants together with that of Mr. John Shakespeare.[3] There can be no doubt that we have here to deal with recollections from the poet's young days.

But in addition to these intentional references to his early life, we also meet with in Shakespeare unintentional recollections of a very different kind, which have only recently received the attention they deserve. We refer to certain provincialisms, the correct understanding of which has enabled commentators to give a right interpretation to passages hitherto regarded as unintelligible or corrupt.[4] It is clear that Shakespeare in his

[1] *Outlines*, i. p. 216, and ii. p. 296.—See also my *Notes on Elizabethan Dramatists*, lxviii.

[2] Broome is Ford's assumed name in the first folio edition.

[3] The name Bardolph is also met with in Edw. Hake's *News out of Powles Churchyarde*, &c. (1579). These are satirical conversations carried on by Bardolph and Paul in their walks in St. Paul's.—See Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 72, 100, 126 ff.

[4] A list of provincialisms of this kind is given by Wise, *Shakespeare, his Birthplace*, &c., p. 106 ff.—*Outlines*, i. p. 130.

youth did not speak London-English, or rather High English, but that he used the dialect of his county, which, it is true, does not differ as much from the language of literature as, for instance, the Lancashire dialect, and, indeed, can scarcely in a philological sense be regarded as a dialect. Its chief characteristics consist of a number of peculiar expressions which have either never been admitted into literary language, or, at all events, have assumed a different significance. One dialectic peculiarity of the pronunciation is seen in the poet's surname, the first syllable of which was pronounced short in Stratford, whereas it was pronounced long in London. The dialect peculiar to the neighbouring town of Cotswold in Gloucestershire is also recognizable at times in Shakespeare.[1]

In endeavouring to determine the influences that affected Shakespeare's mind, as a youth, we must above all things not omit to consider one circumstance which—even in his boyish days—greatly contributed to arouse his interest in the stage and dramatic poetry. Stratford—to give it in a few words—cherished a great liking for theatrical performances, as is proved by the many troops of actors who gave representations there; and even the best companies from London did not fail to visit the town. Between 1569 and 1587—the years with which we are specially concerned—no less than twenty-four visits of itinerant companies have been counted. And in addition to these there were, of course, other entertainments, such as the bear-wards, morris-dancers, &c. The people of Stratford must, in fact, have led a gay sort of life. The aldermen of the town knew how to make their life a pleasant one; sect, claret, muscat and Rhenish wines (used on festive occasions or presented as gifts) form no small item in the accounts of the Chamberlains; we even find them ordering two kegs of sturgeon in 1602, for which they had to pay the goodly sum of 44 shillings and 4 pence.[2] When we bear in mind that these men belonged to the same generation of citizens who were fined for leaving dung-heaps in the street, and for uncleansed gutters, we are struck by the strange mixture of the refinements of town life and a kind of primitive and rural

[1] *A Glossary of the Cotswold Gloucestershire Dialect, illustrated by Examples from Ancient Authors.* By the late Rev. Richard Webster Huntley. London, 1869.—*The Athenæum*, 1869, i. p. 574 ff.

[2] Skottowe, *Life of Shakespeare*, i. p 11. Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 95 ff.

state of affairs. A pleasant and life-like picture of the performance by a troop of actors in a provincial town, is furnished by the city archives of Leicester from the year 1586.[1] From Thompson's "History of Leicester" we gather that in this town—quite in contra-distinction to Stratford—the popular merry-makings had come into disrepute as early as the first years of Elizabeth's reign, and were at that time no longer permitted. In 1566 the Corporation withheld the fees which had until then been granted to the bear-warders, who kept bears for the entertainment of the people, and also the fees granted to the itinerant players who performed in the Guildhall. In 1582 theatrical entertainments were even forbidden except when the players had obtained a licence from the Queen or the Lords of the Privy Council, and even then, the Mayor and the Corporation were first to witness the performance. And when, in 1586, the Earl of Worcester's players came to Leicester to give a performance,[2] the Mayor provided them with a dinner in order to induce them to quit the town without giving a theatrical entertainment; the excuse made on this occasion by the Mayor was that the day being a Friday (the 6th of March) the time was not a convenient one. To this, however, the players would not agree, and insisted upon their right to give a performance, as they held a licence from the Earl of Worcester. They declared to the Mayor—whom they met in the street—that they meant to give the play at the inn where they were staying whether he allowed it or not; and they even let fall "dyvers other evyll and contemptyous words." Further, by way of showing their contempt of the Mayor, they perambulated the streets with drums and trumpets, and when the Mayor had them arrested by his officers, the two chief culprits were punished, those who had spoken "the aforesaid words." One of them, indeed, did not belong to the Earl of Worcester's troop, but is called "Lord Harbard's man." These two men apologized

[1] See Halliwell, *Dispute between the Earl of Worcester's Players and the Corporation of Leicester in* 1586, *from the Records of that City.* In *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iv. p. 145 ff.

[2] Among the names of the actors that of Edward Allen is mentioned third; the others are unknown personages, and only one other, Thomas Cooke, is noteworthy in so far as he may possibly be related to the Alexander Cooke who belonged to Shakespeare's company, and was a friend of Edward Alleyn and his wife. See Collier, *Lives of the Principal Actors.* Allen, at the time, was in his twentieth year.

to the Mayor and prayed him not to inform their master of what had occurred; the Mayor, thereupon, gave them permission to give a play that same evening at their tavern, on condition that before they began they should read out to the audience the licence granted them by the Mayor, and renew their apology.

Curiously enough, this same troop of actors belonging to the Earl of Worcester, is among the first mentioned as having performed in Stratford (1569); they received only 12 Pence from the funds of the Corporation, whereas the Queen's players, who performed that same year were rewarded with 9 Shillings. Shakespeare's father at that time probably still held the office of Bailiff, or had just quitted the post. The players before receiving permission to give performances, had generally to give the Bailiff and a circle of his friends a proof of their skill, for which they received a separate fee.[1] We may, therefore, picture to ourselves the satisfaction which the Bailiff (John Shakespeare) may have felt, in allowing the most famous players from London to appear before him and his friends. We may picture him, facing the curtain, seated in the Magisterial Chair (the *sella curulis*), with his young son of five years on his knee or standing by his side. Four years afterwards, in 1573, Earl Leicester's players visited Stratford, and received from the Chamberlain 6*s.* 8*d.* for their performance. In the following year Earl Warwick's men gave a play for the fee of 17*s.*, and the Earl of Worcester's men for 5*s.* 7*d.* In the year 1579 the players of Lord Strange, and those of the Countess of Essex gave performances in the Guildhall, under the patronage of the Bailiff, while in the following year the Earl of Derby's company delighted the town with representations "of human passion, set out with sweetness of words, fitness of epithets, with metaphors, allegories, hyperboles, amphibologies, similitudes, with phrases so picked, so pure, so proper with action, so smooth, so lively, so wanton."[2] Lastly, in 1587 the Queen's players came again, *i.e.*, the younger company formed in 1582, which was under Burbage's management; they were welcomed with greater honour and received higher pay than any of the earlier companies. It has frequently been assumed that it was upon this

[1] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 96.

[2] Gosson, *Plays Confuted*, 2*nd Action*, in Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 128. Compare Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 99 ff.

occasion that Burbage won Shakespeare for the stage, and persuaded him to return to London with him; however—for reasons to be given later—it is much more likely that Shakespeare had, by that time, already left his native town.

It would be showing an utter ignorance of human nature, and a disregard of the experience of every age and country to maintain that young Shakespeare did not attend these theatrical representations as often as he possibly could, or that they did not occupy his mind in a very high degree. The imagination of young persons, as is well known, is never more easily excited than by theatrical performances—the stage representing as it were the world; and the life and doings of actors, even behind the scenes, has an indescribable charm for the young. Who does not know from his own youthful experience what fascination seems to surround theatrical heroes and heroines? The boy Shakespeare certainly would not have been content till he had seen the stage heroes (of stage heroines, fortunately for him, there were as yet none) at the taverns where they put up: at the Crown, the Bear, or the Swan;[1] or, if a chance offered, he would have struck up an acquaintance with one or other of the company. Lord Campbell[2] is inclined to believe that Shakespeare, at a later date—when an attorney's apprentice—took part in some of the performances himself, perhaps only as a prompter, or to replace some other actor. R. Willis,[3] a contemporary of Shakespeare's, to whom we owe the description of the schoolroom at Gloucester, tells us further that his father took him to the theatre, and we need only change his name into William Shakespeare, to obtain a second account from the poet's youth, an account that leaves nothing to be desired:—"In the city of Gloucester the manner is (as I think it is in other like corporations) that, when players of interludes come to town, they first attend the mayor, to inform him what nobleman's servants they are, and so to get licence for their public playing; and if the mayor like the actors, or would show respect to their lord and master, he appoints them to play

[1] These were the inns in Stratford at the time, and were all in Bridge Street; they are, it is true, nowhere mentioned till the days of James I. (1611). Later there was a fourth tavern called the Falcon, in Chapel Street, opposite to Shakespeare's house, New Place.

[2] *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements*, p. 25.

[3] In a small volume called *Mount Tabor*.

their first play before himself and the aldermen and common council of the city; and that is called the mayor's play, where every one that will comes in without money, the mayor giving the players a reward as he thinks fit, to show respect unto them. At such a play my father took me with him, and made me stand between his legs, as he sat upon one of the benches, where we saw and heard very well. The play was called 'The Cradle of Security,' wherein was personated a king or some great prince, and his courtiers of several kinds, amongst which three ladies were in special grace with him, and they, keeping him in delights and pleasures, drew him from his graver counsellors, hearing of sermons, and listening to good counsel and admonitions, that in the end they got him to lie down in a cradle upon the stage, where these three ladies, joining in a sweet song, rocked him asleep, that he snorted again; and in the mean time closely conveyed under the clothes wherewithal he was covered a vizard, like a swine's snout, upon his face, with three wire chains fastened thereunto, the other end whereof being holden severally by those three ladies, who fall to singing again, and then discovered his face, that the spectators might see how they had transformed him, going on with their singing. Whilst all this was acting, there came forth of another door at the farthest end of the stage two old men, the one in blue, with a sergeant-at-arms his mace on his shoulder, the other in red, with a drawn sword in his hand, and leaning with the other hand upon the other's shoulder, and so they two went along in a soft pace, round about by the skirt of the stage, till at last they came to the cradle, when all the court was in greatest jollity, and then the foremost old man with his mace stroke a fearful blow upon the cradle, whereat all the courtiers, with the three ladies and the vizard, all vanished; and the desolate prince, starting up barefaced, and finding himself thus sent for to judgment, made a lamentable complaint of his bitter case, and so was carried away by wicked spirits. The prince did personate in the moral, the wicked of the world: the three ladies, pride, covetousness, and luxury; the two old men, the end of the world and the last judgment. This sight took such impression in me, that when I came towards man's estate it was as fresh in my memory as if I had seen it newly acted."[1]

[1] *The Cradle of Security* seems to have been a very favourite piece; it is

This exceedingly moral, and exceedingly unpoetical metamorphosis of a prince into a pig was, accordingly, a so-called dumb-show, such as the boy Shakespeare must certainly have seen in Stratford. This leads to the question as to the repertory of the players who acted in Stratford, the question as to what were the plays which first introduced Shakespeare to the realm of dramatic poetry.[1] If, under Drake's guidance, we survey the productions of the dramatic Muse that have come down to us from the years between 1560 and 1580, we find a perfect medley: the last of the Moralities, Interludes, the first attempts at historical dramas, the first regular tragedies and comedies, and, finally, pieces that can scarcely be classed in any distinct genus; we have dramatic poetry, so to say, in a state of fermentation. We may safely assume that dramas of all these various species were given in Stratford, and that Shakespeare, as a youth, experienced in his own case this process of fermentation. To pass on to details, even Malone, and after him Knight,[2] give it as their opinion that young Shakespeare had, in all probability, seen "Common Conditions,'" where Othello's famous Farewell[3] has its unmistakable prototype; the grandly flowing lines seem to have retained their hold on Shakespeare's memory no less firmly than those of "The Cradle of Security" had done in R. Willis' case. "Common Conditions" was a genuine transition piece. Collier terms it an Interlude, Knight pronounces it to be "in its *outward form* as much a comedy as 'The Winter's Tale.'" Both are equally right, for as Knight goes on to say, the piece is neither a Mystery nor a Moral Play.[4] The "pretie new Enterlude, both pithie and pleasaunt, of the story of King Darius," taken from the third book of Esdras, may also be

also mentioned in Chettle's *Patient Grissel* (1603), and in the works of the water-poet, Taylor, in a poem entitled *The Thief*, ed. of 1630, p. 122. Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry* (1st ed.), ii. p. 273 ff.

[1] Compare Malone's *Shakespeare* by Boswell (1821), iii. 28.

[2] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 128 ff.

[3] *Othello*, iii. 3:

Farewell the tranquil mind! farwell content!
Farewell the plumed troop, and the big wars,
That make ambition virtue! etc.

[4] There exists but one copy of *Common Conditions* (in the Duke of Devonshire's Library), and unfortunately the title-page is wanting. See Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, ii. p. 376 ff. Knight (*Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 180, note) gives a detailed analysis of the piece.

mentioned here.[1] Another interlude, "Mary Magdalene, her Life and Repentance," by Lewis Wager (1567), would be likely to recommend itself to itinerant players, as it required only four actors. The two comedies, "Damon and Pithias" (first performed in 1562) and "Palamon and Arcite" (first in 1566), by Richard Edwards, enjoyed greater popularity, and probably were of greater artistic value; the author is eulogized on his tombstone as:

> The flower of all our realm
> And Phœnix of our age.

Other well-known comedies of that day are John Still's "Gammer Gurton's Needle" (1566); the "Comedy of the most virtuous and godly Susanna," by Thomas Garter (1568); George Wapul's "Tide tarrieth for no Man, a most pleasaunte and merry Comedie" (1576, now lost); Tho. Lupton's "A Moral and Pityful Comedie, entitled All for Money" (published 1578), "evidently the offspring of the old Moralities," says Drake;[2] Nath. Wood's "An excellent new Comedie, entitled the Conflict of Conscience" (1581, again an offshoot of the moralities); perhaps also Richard Tarleton's "The Seven Deadlie Sins" (1589). Most of these plays are a mixture of low comedy and commonplace morality. As regards the first attempts at tragedy, Shakespeare, as a youth, may have seen a performance of the well-known "Ferrex and Porrex," by Tho. Norton and Tho. Sackville (first performed in 1561-62, published in 1565, 1571, and 1590); this, of course, does not exclude the supposition that he may also have read the play as Knight[3] makes out; then there was "Tancred and Gismonde" (1568, printed in 1592), by Robert Wilmot, in conjunction with four friends, each one undertaking to write an act, which strongly reminds one of Scribe's style of work; further, we have Thomas Preston's "Lamentable Tragedy mixed full of pleasant Mirth, conteyning The Life of Cambyses, King of Persia" (about 1570), which Shakespeare subsequently ridiculed in his "Henry IV."[4] Some years later the Stratford stage may also have witnessed performances of "The Blacksmith's Daughter," and "Catiline's Conspiracy" (which even found favour in Gosson's eyes), "The Play of Plays," "The History of Cæsar and Pompey," and "The Play of the Fabii,"

[1] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 124.
[2] Drake, ii. 237.
[3] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, 133 ff.
[4] Drake, ii. 236.

for they were all favourite pieces at The Theatre, in London, towards the end of the seventh, and the beginning of the eighth decade.[1] Whetstone's "Promos and Cassandra" (published 1578) was as little likely to be performed in Stratford as the classic plays that were written and acted at the Universities in imitation of Plautus and Terence, such as the old play of "Timon," which Shakespeare subsequently made use of as the foundation of his own drama, or Gascoigne's "Jocasta" (1566), and the same author's "The Supposes," which were modelled upon Ariosto and were used by Shakespeare, at a later day, for his "Taming of the Shrew." Of Rightwise's "Dido"[2] (1564), which was written in Latin, and the plays of Bishop Bale, there can, of course, be no question whatever. Such learned productions could not possibly have found appreciation or favour with the citizens of Stratford. All the greater would be their interest in the first historical plays, based upon national or popular subjects, such as are met with in "The Mirror of Magistrates" (of which four editions appeared between 1564 and 1590) or in "The Famous Victories of Henry V." (first printed in 1594), which may have first aroused Shakespeare's enthusiasm for that prince, or in the older play of "King John." What importance was attached to these Histories from the very first, is evident from a well-known passage in Nash; indeed these plays may be said to have formed the main substance in the further development of the national drama. Nash,[3] after having described the character of the Histories in general, and in doing which he no doubt had Shakespeare as well as the earlier writers in mind, goes on to say: "What a glorious thing it is to have King Henry V. represented on the stage leading the French King prisoner, and forcing both him and the Dauphin to swear fealty."[4] In fact, if anything could have delighted and increased the feeling of English patriotism and national pride, it was these very Histories; and those critics who deny that Shakespeare's plays are essentially

[1] Halliwell, *Illustrations*, p. 27; Gosson, *The Schoole of Abuse*, ed. Arber, p. 40.

[2] Drake, ii. p. 236.

[3] *Pierce Penniless*, ed. Collier, p. 60.

[4] Knight refers this remark to a scene in *The Famous Victories*, Collier, *l.c.*, p. vii., to an earlier and lost play, so that he assumes three dramas on Henry V., including the one by Shakespeare.

national in character, should not fail to consider this point, the more so as the Histories clearly not only aroused the patriotism of the lower orders of the people as well as the highest aristocracy, but had also a beneficial and ennobling influence upon the middle classes.[1]

The above plays, which we refer to only by way of example, of course by no means exhaust the dramatic supply produced during the twenty years between 1560 and 1580; in other words, from about the time of Shakespeare's birth to the publication of George Peele's first work. The dramatic poetry of that period, as is well known, was written for representation and not for print, and accordingly a great deal has been irrecoverably lost. Our object here is to obtain some idea of the nature and character of those plays to which Shakespeare, as a boy and youth, owed his first impressions. As a rule, these plays still exhibited prosaic meagreness, awkwardness, nay, even crudity, and not a few of these plays were full of horrors in the style of "Titus Andronicus" or Marlowe's "Jew of Malta." If we may judge by the public taste of our own day—nay, of every age—which insists upon having plays like those given at annual fairs, depicting murderous deeds in bloody colours, and recited with frightful tones and gestures—it was probably plays of this very sort which, in those days, were likely to create most effect in the provincial towns, and hence also in Stratford. Even after Shakespeare had succeeded in raising himself and the drama out of this state of crudity, the taste for bloody tragedies did not at once die out; this is proved, among others, by Chapman's plays, "Alphonsus," "Bussy d'Ambois," &c.;[2] the more that people's hair was made to stand on end the better. And even young Shakespeare cannot have been wholly unaffected by this tendency of the age. If we may draw an analogy from the natural law of development in all poetic minds, it must be assumed that Shakespeare's attempts in poetry, nay, that even his first dramatic effort was made about

[1] As regards the favour with which the Histories were received, even by the lower classes, we need only quote the closing words from the Induction to the *Taming of the Shrew*: "*Sly*. Is not a comonty a Christmas gambold or a tumbling trick? *Page*. No, my good lord; it is more pleasing stuff. *Sly*. What, household stuff? *Page*. It is a kind of history. *Sly*. Well, we'll see it."

[2] *Outlines*, i. p. 98.

this time. The period of physical development is always accompanied by an increased degree of mental activity and a specially active state of the imagination, together with an irrepressible desire for poetic production, and this feeling will be the stronger the greater the mental ability. We may unhesitatingly apply Shakespeare's own words from his "Antony and Cleopatra" (iv. 4) to himself:—

> This morning, like the spirit of a youth
> That means to be of note, begins betimes.

Precocity is the characteristic sign of genius, and, as is well known, almost every poet has made his first poetic flight while his physical nature was still in a state of development. This must have been the case with Shakespeare's contemporaries, Marlowe and Ben Jonson, for they both published works of importance before they came of age. Walter Scott at the age of between fourteen and fifteen made his first venture in epic poems of considerable length,[1] and Byron in his thirteenth year even attempted to write a drama.[2] Chatterton, Keats, and Shelley are famous instances of early poetical precocity; and in the domain of painting and music are almost surpassed by Raphael, Handel, Mozart, and Mendelssohn. Is Shakespeare alone to be made an exception to the rule? The fact of his early marriage is almost sufficient to convince us of the contrary. Besides, all his outward circumstances and the influences of his home, as well as the poetical, sensuously gay, popular life amidst which he was brought up, must have encouraged the early development of his mind. What an important influence theatrical representations must have exercised upon him we may see in the case of young persons in our own day. Even children who possess a mere minimum of poetical fancy take delight in a puppet show for which they have themselves arranged a play. Looked at from this point of view, it would be unreasonable forthwith to reject as absurd the supposition that "Titus Andronicus" was written before Shakespeare had left Stratford.[3] Some commentators—with much less probability—assign the first beginnings of the

[1] His *Guiscard and Matilda* and the *Conquest of Granada.*

[2] *Ulrich and Ilvina.*

[3] Hermann Kurz, *Zu Titus Andronicus* in the *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft*, v. p. 82 ff.; *Outlines*, i. p. 97 ff.

Sonnets to the period before the poet quitted his home in Stratford.

We have, however, been hurrying on in advance of chronological order, and must now return to Shakespeare's school-days, and resume the thread of our narrative. It is generally supposed that Shakespeare left school in 1578; Rowe, at least, reports that John Shakespeare was forced, about this time, to withdraw his son from school owing to his straightened circumstances. But as we have already seen, the instruction in the Stratford school was given free, so that the father could not have removed his son merely with a view of saving the school fees. The reason must simply have been that the father found it absolutely necessary to have his son's help in his business or his agricultural pursuits, and yet it is difficult to believe this. Knight,[1] on the other hand, very justly points out that boys, as a rule, left school much earlier in those days than they do now—that, in fact, boys of eleven and twelve years old were sent to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The school curriculum was much less extensive than nowadays, and probably thirteen or fourteen was the average age at which boys ceased to attend school. It seems also that they began to learn Latin at the age of seven or eight. However, there is no concealing the fact that we do not possess the smallest clue for determining when Shakespeare left school, and that we have absolutely nothing to rely upon but conjectures. And as regards John Shakespeare, it seems pretty well established that his circumstances were not in any favourable state at this time; still we are utterly in the dark as to the reason of this turn in his affairs, and there are doubts in connection with it that cannot be overlooked. Besides—as if to fill the cup of our perplexities to the brim—the Stratford registry from the twelfth to the twenty-sixth year of Elizabeth's reign is missing, that is to say, we have no reports from the years 1570 to 1584 inclusive, and every inquiry made respecting them has been in vain.[2] According to the public records published by Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, the following facts must be considered as established. In the year 1578 John Shakespeare, in conjunction with his wife, sold or mortgaged their estate of Asbies, for the sum of £40, to

[1] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 109.

[2] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 40. According to Neil, p. 15, the missing reports belong to the years 1569 to 1585.

Edmund Lambert, who seems to have been a distant relative of Mary Shakespeare;[1] the mortgage deed specified that the estate should be returned to them on payment of the same sum before Michaelmas Day, 1580—this, at all events, is the date mentioned by John Lambert in a law-suit to be spoken of immediately, although John and Mary Shakespeare seem to have fixed no definite term for the repurchase—in fact, mentioned no dates. On the 29th of January of the same year (1578) the Corporation decided to exempt Mr. Shakespeare, the alderman, from contributing 3*s.* 4*d.* "towardes the furniture of three pikemen, two billmen, and one archer." In like manner, on the 19th of November of the same year, they resolved that Mr. John Shakespeare and Mr. Robert Bratt need not pay the customary tax of 4*d.* levied weekly from the aldermen for the relief of the poor. Finally, during this same year, we find the above-mentioned Edmund Lambert acting as security for John Shakespeare for a sum of £5 which he owed to Rodger Sadler, a baker in Stratford. On the 11th of March of the following year a tax is again levied for the purchase of armour and defensive weapons, and the name of John Shakespeare appears among the defaulters as owing 3*s.* 4*d.* On the 15th of October, 1579, we find "John Shakespeare of Stratford upon Avon in the county of Warwick, yeoman, and Mary his wife" even obliged to part with a portion of their property in Snitterfield to Robert Webb for £4.[2] And yet this was in the self-same year in which—as we have seen—John Shakespeare went to the expense of paying the highest fee "for bell and pall" at the burial of his little daughter Anne. May he not have done this, however, in spite of his reduced circumstances, for the sake of appearance? There is, in the present case, no possibility of the poet's father having been confounded with the shoemaker of the same name, for the identity of the poet's father is sufficiently established, in the records referred to, by his being called the alderman, or by the mention of his wife and the property in Snitterfield. It would be strange, indeed, had the wife of the shoemaker, John Shakespeare, been also called

[1] Edmund Lambert married a Joan Arden, who had inherited property in Snitterfield in conjunction with two sisters.—Halliwell, pp. 52, 60 ff.; Neil, p. 16, note; *Outlines*, i. p. 59, &c.

[2] The record is preserved in the Shakespeare Museum at Stratford. See *Catalogue*, p. 146, No. 1005.

Mary, with property in Snitterfield. Simultaneously with the adverse change in his fortunes, John Shakespeare began to be irregular in his attendance at the meetings of the Corporation. It appears, however, that he was deeply concerned about the repurchase of the estate of Asbies, and, it seems, procured the necessary money by incurring other debts. For when—upon the death of his mother-in-law—he came into the possession of another sixth part of the property in Snitterfield, it was likewise sold, at Easter, 1580, to Robert Webb for £40, whereupon he demanded that Asbies should be given up to him again.[1] Edmund Lambert—who had died meanwhile—had bequeathed the property to his son, John Lambert, and he declined to fulfil the conditions of the mortgage deed. The money, he said, had not been paid to him on the Michaelmas Day specified, and besides, that John Shakespeare owed him other moneys, and that the estate of Asbies should not be returned to him till all these debts were settled. Nineteen years afterwards, this dispute became a suit in Chancery, which John Shakespeare probably instituted against John Lambert at the instigation of the poet, who, probably, also furnished the money necessary for the case; the want of means for carrying on the expensive legal proceedings would account for the matter having been delayed so long, otherwise, at least, we should be unable to explain why John Shakespeare did not claim his rights then and there. In his charge against John Lambert, he declares him to be "of great wealth and ability," whereas he describes himself as "of small wealth and very few friends and alliance in the said county." It is unfortunately not known how this Chancery suit ended.

John Shakespeare's reduced circumstances had, however, by no means reached their worst stage. But before we follow him further in his downward career, we must first turn to the son, and inquire what his pursuits were after leaving school, or to what occupation he devoted himself. Our preceding account will sufficiently prove how unlikely it is that young Shakespeare—after having studied classic antiquity (although he may only have reached the gates of the temple)—should

[1] As related above, Agnes Arden died in December, 1580. Now if the Easter of 1580, according to our present calculation, was Easter, 1581, it would certainly seem as if there had been reason for John Lambert's complaint about the non-compliance of the conditions of the contract.

have demeaned himself by becoming a butcher's apprentice, as we are asked to believe by the tradition already referred to—a tradition, however, that has but little external evidence in its favour. Such occupation would have been an impossible departure both from the father's ambition as well as from the son's more genial aspirations. The father certainly entertained brighter hopes of his son's future, and the son must have already felt the desire and the power within him for accomplishing something higher. There are, it is true, other hypotheses that have a better claim for consideration in the solution of the difficulty, but from every one of the hypotheses we gather one fact of vital importance; and young Shakespeare has perhaps by it provided posterity with a surprise even greater than it was to his contemporaries and fellow-citizens, they who witnessed its further course, which to us is veiled in obscurity. We refer to his marriage, which, in fact, followed as directly upon his schooldays as the wedding feast follows the funeral festivities in "Hamlet." Curiously enough, Shakespeare himself, in his already quoted description of the seven periods of life, brings in the lover immediately after the schoolboy, with words that might apply to himself :—

> And then the lover,
> Sighing like a furnace, with a woeful ballad
> Made to his mistress' eyebrow.

Chapter II.

YOUTH AND MARRIAGE.

IN December, 1582, William Shakespeare, then a youth of eighteen, married Anne Hathaway of Stratford, or rather of Shottery, a village close to Stratford; she, as we know from her tombstone, was born in 1556, and hence was young Shakespeare's senior by eight years. This fact, which, in itself, is one full of significance and strange, becomes more significant and stranger still from the attendant circumstances. In what place or upon what day the wedding took place is not known, as all investigations on this point have been fruitless, and probably will remain so. An approximate date, however, has been rendered possible by an extremely important document discovered by Sir Thomas Phillipps in 1836 among the church archives in Worcester.[1] In this document it is stated that: Fulk Sandells and John Richardson, both described as "*agricolæ*" of Stratford bound themselves on 28th Nov. 1582, before Richard Cousin and the notary Robert Warmstry of Worcester, for £40 that: "William Shagspere one thone partie, and Anne Hathwey of Stratford in the dioces of Worcester, maiden, may lawfully solemnize matrimony together," and that "if there be not at this present time any action, sute, quarrell or demand, moved or depending before any judge, ecclesiasticall or temporall, for and concerning any such lawfull lett or impediment: and moreover, if the said William Shagspere do not proceed to solemnization of mariadg with the said Anne Hathwey without the consent of his frindes: and also if the said William do, upon his owne proper costes and expenses, defend and save harmles the right

[1] See Collier, *Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iii. 127. Printed in Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 111, ff.

reverend Father in God, Lord John Bushop of Worcester, and his offycers for licencing them the said William and Anne to be maried together with once asking of the banns between them. . . . ." The two bondsmen—in the introductory words—declare that they will place their seals below the deed; curiously enough there is but one seal, with the letters R. H., hence not belonging to either of the two bondsmen, but, as is supposed, to Richard Hathaway, the bride's father. Knight,[1] without any authority, makes the bridegroom join Sandells and Richardson in their ride to the cathedral town thirty miles off, and in this narrative loses himself completely, for, however attractive his descriptions may be at times, they are pure romance. It seems to us that the sum asked of the bondsmen as security is unusually high (according to our present money value somewhere about £200, or according to Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps at least £480); and it may well be doubted whether the two "*agricolæ*" had such a sum at their disposal, even though, as Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps has pointed out, both were well-to-do husbandmen in Shottery. They would have had to pledge half their property! And yet this is supposed to have been the usual and ordinary mode of procedure.[2] Obviously the security demanded was in proportion to the usual expenses in Worcester, which, accordingly, must have been unusually high. If the bride's father—or in the present case his representatives—had to meet the expenses, we might calmly subscribe to Rowe's statement that Richard Hathaway was a "substantial yeoman;" but, on the other hand, if the bridegroom's father had to contribute his share, then we have again to face the doubt whether John Shakespeare's circumstances were in as impoverished a state as we find them represented a few years later.[3] It makes a curious impression that the somewhat elderly bride should have required the sanction of her relatives, in fact, that any importance should have been attached to the matter, whereas there is no mention of the consent of the bridegroom's family, although he was still a minor. More enigmatical still is an entry in the Stratford registry of marriages, which seems to raise a fresh difficulty in our path.

[1] *Wm. Shakspere: a Biography*, p. 270. [2] *Outlines*, i. p. 61 ff.

[3] It is to be regretted that the question concerning the costs of the wedding and of "the dispenses" has not yet been fully inquired into. And biographers have also, as yet, not paid due attention to the fact of the banns of marriage having been called but once.

Under the date of 17th Jan. 1579-80, we find: "William Wilsonne et Anne Hathaway of Shotterye."[1] Are we to suppose that Shakespeare's bride was a young widow? In the marriage bond, however, she is termed "maiden," and we find no mention of William Wilson's death, which must have occurred meanwhile. Or are we so far pursued by double names that not only have we several John and William Shakespeares but two Anne Hathaways to deal with, and both Annes from the village of Shottery? The name Hathaway (Hathway) was certainly of frequent occurrence in Warwickshire, and the persons bearing the name cannot possibly all have belonged to the same family.[2] No less inexplicable is a marriage licence met with in the church register at Worcester. Under the date of 27th Nov. 1582, we find: "*item eodem die, similis emanavit licencia inter Willielmum Shaxpere et Annam Whateley de Temple Grafton.*"[3] Can it be that this entry refers to Anne Hathaway's first marriage?[4] In spite of investigations on all sides, we are here still surrounded by enigmas, and shall probably ever remain so. These strange coincidences, which Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps curiously enough leaves unheeded, and regards as perfectly natural, are, however, not our only difficulty. We have further the fact that the first child of William and Anne Shakespeare—Susanna—is entered as having been baptised as early as the 26th of May, 1583, hence five months and three weeks after the marriage; for the marriage could not possibly have taken place before the return of the two bondsmen from Worcester, *i.e.* not before the 1st of December, 1582.

These are established documentary facts. And we have now to ask what was the probable course of the story of their love and marriage. Let us first inquire further into the circumstances relating to the bride and her family. Anne's father "Richard Hathaway alias Gardiner, de Shottery," had died at least three months before his daughter's marriage. Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps discovered Richard Hathaway's will in the Prerogative Court in London, and has given a reprint of

[1] See Malone (*Reed's Shakespeare*, i. p. 134); Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 115. According to the latter Wm. Wilson was an alderman in Stratford.

[2] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 111 ff.; *Outlines*, i. p. 61 ff.

[3] *Outlines*, ii. p. 384.

[4] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 111 ff.; *Outlines*, i. p. 61 ff.

it in his "Life of Shakespeare;"[1] it was drawn up on the 1st Sept. 1581, and legally confirmed on the 9th July, 1582, so that the testator must have died in the latter half of July. The most remarkable circumstance about this will is that Anne is not referred to in it by a single word. Could she have been disinherited by her father, and if so, why? Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps does, indeed, maintain that "there is nothing unusual in the circumstance of all the members of the family not being mentioned," and points out that another daughter of the testator—Joan, born in 1566—is also not spoken of in the will. But may she not have died previously, although we have no record of the fact? Seven children are mentioned: Bartholomew, Thomas, John, William, Agnes, Catharine, and Margaret. Bartholomew as the eldest, and with the mother's express consent, is referred to with special favour, and inherits the principal part of the property; he, in conjunction with his mother, is to attend to the produce of the land. The two bondsmen, Fulk Sandells and John Richardson, are both mentioned in this will, the first as a neighbour and "supervisor of this my last will and testament," the other as a witness. One John Hemynge also figures as a witness. The testator's property must certainly have been pretty considerable, although the daughters received each only a legacy of 20 nobles, *i.e.* £6 13*s.* 4*d.*; this was to be paid to Agnes and Catharine at their marriage, whereas Margaret was to receive her portion on attaining her seventeenth year. In spite of Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps' assertion to the contrary, and other biographers making no allusion to the matter, the omission of Anne's name in the will only adds one more enigma to the numerous other unexplained points in Shakespeare's life. Are we to doubt the genuineness, or rather the identity of the will? Besides this, it is also strange that Richard Hathaway's death is not entered in the church register. Bartholomew Hathaway—according to another document preserved in the Shakespeare Museum at Stratford (No. 225)—came into possession of the estate at Shottery in 1610, and died in 1624; the poet's son-in-law Dr. Hall was one of his executors.

Whatever may have been the case, this much is certain, that Anne's father was, as stated, "a substantial yeoman" in Shottery, a picturesque village in the neighbourhood of Strat-

[1] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 292 ff.

ford.[1] Shottery belonged to the diocese of Stratford, and this accounts for the fact of Anne Hathaway, as well as the two bondsmen Sandells and Richardson, being described as "of Stratford." The Hathaway's thatched cottage (now divided into three tenements) was prettily situated at the end of the village, and, up to within a few years, was still in the possession of the Hathaway family; it then passed into the hands of the Taylor family, lineal descendants on the female side. The cottage is still one of the places visited by the poet's admirers.[2] The lane leading to the picturesque hamlet, which winds its way between green hedges; the high trees overshadowing the cottage with its little garden in front; the adjoining park, and the surrounding scenery of undulating meadowland, give the place that peculiar charm which is a characteristic feature of an English landscape. The family —as has been proved—had existed in Shottery before the middle of the sixteenth century, and seem to have been intimate with the Shakespeare family; at all events, the heads of the two families had business transactions with each other. John Shakespeare, it seems, became security for Richard Hathaway in 1566, and in the following year both are assessed "*in bonis*" at £4 apiece.[3] The identity of the persons is, indeed, a mere conjecture, and to our misfortune it would seem as if here again some other person of the same name were hovering about. In the extracts from the church register at Stratford[4] referred to, the name Richard Hathaway is repeated in a very suspicious way, even though the younger Richard Hathaway (baptised 1561-62), whom we meet with again later in London as an actor and dramatic poet,[5] may not have been one of the family. Besides, it is doubtful whether William Hathaway (baptised the 30th of November, 1578) was a son of this Richard Hathaway. In his will—as we have seen—one William Hathaway is mentioned as the fourth son, and accordingly he would have been twenty-two years younger than his sister Anne.[6] We shall have to speak of him later

[1] Rowe was the first to mention the family name of Shakespeare's wife; he must therefore, as Halliwell points out, have had good sources to draw from. He does not mention Shottery.

[2] Pictures of the cottage are to be found in Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 115, in Knight, p. 265, and elsewhere.

[3] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 328. [4] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 114.

[5] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 120; Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, iii. p. 99.

[6] Another William Hathaway lost a son in 1558, and had a daughter

under circumstances which, at all events, make it seem highly probable that he was related to Anne.

Anne was, no doubt, a pretty, lively girl, and, in her lover's eyes certainly,

> —the prettiest low-born lass that ever
> Ran on the green sward.

William Shakespeare, too, was a well-made, good-looking youth, and owing to the freedom enjoyed by young people of both sexes in England, these two would have every opportunity of becoming acquainted, even though their families had not stood on any intimate footing. That they should have had a liking for each other is also intelligible, for it frequently happens that precocious youths of poetic temperament—whose mental development has outrun their physical powers or has increased their activity—feel themselves drawn to girls older than themselves, or to young married women whom they meet with in all the charms of early womanhood. It will be sufficient to remind the reader of Byron's love for Mary Chaworth and Lady Caroline Lamb, of Schiller's passion for the widow of Captain Vischer (Laura), and of Goethe's relation to Frau von Stein. Accordingly, it is very likely that a love-affair sprung up between the two, and the blame—if blame there is—must fall more especially on the woman. Lord Campbell[1] says that Anne was "no better than she should be," and that Shakespeare could scarcely have been the seducer, and De Quincey[2] feels sure that Shakespeare must have been drawn on by Anne and her family, or, at least, that his attentions were all too readily accepted. A corroboration of this supposition may perhaps be found in Shakespeare's 41st Sonnet:—

> Gentle thou art, and therefore to be won;
> Beauteous thou art, therefore to be assailed;
> And when a woman woos, what woman's son
> Will sourly leave her till she have prevailed.

The question cannot even be suppressed, whether it is mere accident that Shakespeare, in his earliest poems ("Venus and Adonis" and "A Lover's Complaint"), places the raging passion of love in the female breast. Can his love-affair with

born to him in March, 1576-77. William Hathaway of Bishopton had a son baptised on the 13th of June, 1562.—Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 114 ff.

[1] *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements*, p. 106 ff.

[2] *Life of Shakspeare*, p. 50.

Anne have had any resemblance to that between Venus and Adonis? May she not have been the prototype of the amorous goddess? The poet's description is one of such appalling truthfulness, that it is easy to believe that he spoke from personal experience. Then again, may there not have occurred between him and Anne scenes such as are described so vividly in "A Lover's Complaint"? In a word, may not these two poems, perhaps, be personal confessions similar to those which, at a later day, were given to us by Goethe in his "Sorrows of Werther"? Or was it all, without exception, the poet's own imaginings? Still it cannot but arouse surprise and doubt to think that Anne, if pretty and her father well-off, should have reached the age of twenty-six without having found a lover. A pre-contract or troth-plight was, however, made between them, and, according to the custom of the day, the contract was considered morally—even though not legally—equivalent to the actual marriage ceremony, and the betrothed parties might live together as husband and wife, without incurring the censure of public opinion. In so far, therefore, the young couple cannot be found fault with.[1] This point has been sufficiently established by examples and proofs, and Shakespeare himself alludes to a pre-contract of this kind on various occasions. In "Measure for Measure" (i. 2) the relation between Claudio and Julietta is described as a lawful one owing to their marriage contract:—

> Upon a true contract
> I got possession of Julietta's bed:
> You know the lady: she is fast my wife,
> Save that we do the denunciation lack
> Of outward order: this we came not to.

In the same comedy (iv. 1), the Duke, disguised as a friar, induces Mariana to represent Isabella on the occasion of the latter's proposed nocturnal visit to Angelo, by referring to the pre-contract between them:—

> He is your husband on a pre-contract:
> To bring you thus together, 'tis no sin,
> Sith that the justice of your title to him
> Doth flourish the deceit.

[1] Even the English marriage ceremony lays special stress upon the "troth-plight"; it concludes with the words, "And thereto I plight thee my troth." In the English Church, accordingly, the popular custom and

In "Twelfth Night" (iv. 3 and v. 1) the solemnity of the betrothal is enhanced by the presence of a priest:—

> A contract of eternal bond of love,
> Confirm'd by mutual joinder of your hands,
> Attested by the holy close of lips,
> Strengthen'd by interchangement of your rings;
> And all the ceremony of this compact
> Seal'd in my function, by my testimony.

On the other hand, in "The Winter's Tale" (i. 2), Leontes says of his wife that she deserves a name—

> As rank as any flax-wench that puts to
> Before her troth-plight.

In Shakespeare's case there seem to have been special reasons to make it desirable that the marriage contract should speedily receive legal or ecclesiastical sanction. Otherwise why should they have asked the favour of the banns being called but once, or have obtained security for the fulfilment of the pre-contract? That this was the usual custom—as Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps maintains—we cannot believe, because it is hardly likely that all young couples in the same predicament would be able to afford the expense of such a licence. We can scarcely avoid suspecting that Shakespeare's parents were opposed to his early marriage, and that, on the other hand, the bride's family were anxious to hurry on the event, in order to settle a matter from which there was retracting. According to Drake and Knight, the Shakespeare family as honestly wished the marriage as the Hathaways did; however, neither Drake's nor Knight's statements have much power of proof, and I am more inclined to adopt Capell's view. Granting that early marriages were much less uncommon than nowadays (Ben Jonson, in spite of his impoverished state, married at a very early age), still the difference in the ages of William and Anne must, in any case, have been an unwelcome fact to the poet's parents. And notwithstanding the comparatively wealthy circumstances of the Hathaways, the Shakespeares may not have considered this sufficient compensation for their being inferior to them in social position. John Shakespeare was, no doubt, a man

the ecclesiastical rite have become blended. See R. Gr. White, *Shakespeare's Works*, i. p. xxxiv. ff. The troth-plight plays a very important part as regards its legal consequences in Sam Rowley's *The Noble Soldier*. Compare Thom. Alfred Spalding, *Elizabethan Demonology* (Lond. 1880), p. 5 ff.—*The Academy*, Oct. 14, 1876, p. 385, and Oct. 21, 1876, p. 409.

wise in all worldly matters—he himself had married above his station—and the more he perceived his son's unusual gifts, which he had doubtless observed even in his early youth, the more he must have wished to see him attain a still higher position. Now any such ambition would have been irresistibly checked by too early and imprudent a marriage.[1] Unfortunately we have as little external evidence for this conjecture as for the reverse of the case, and yet, upon careful consideration, it would seem to follow with inner necessity from the documentary statements. The very fact that no entry of the marriage is to be found anywhere seems to indicate that secrecy was observed. Tradition or hypothesis does, indeed, maintain that the marriage took place in Luddington, a village where Shakespeare's former schoolmaster, Hunt, the parson, lived; however, even this would not have been a usual proceeding, as both Anne and William belonged to the parish of Stratford, and ought, therefore, to have been married in the church there. They evidently, at their marriage, purposely avoided their birthplace and home.[2] The church at Luddington no longer exists, and the church register was unfortunately destroyed by fire early this century.[3] Malone[4] conjectures that the marriage took place at Hampton-Lucy or Billesley, but little value can be placed in this supposition, for although Halliwell-Phillipps addressed a written request to all the clergy of Warwickshire to search their church registers for an entry of the marriage, no entry of the kind has been discovered. However, we must bear in mind that in many villages the old church registers have been lost.[5]

[1] *All's Well that Ends Well* (ii. 3, conclusion):—

A young man married, is a man that's marr'd.

[2] A Mr. H. W. Holder lately discovered a painting which is said to represent Shakespeare's wedding. The picture, which is in the possession of a Mr. Malam in Scarborough, is, however, of no value whatever, and is probably a bad copy of a Dutch painting from the middle of the seventeenth century, and had originally no reference whatever to Shakespeare. In the left upper corner are the words:—

Rare Lymninge with us dothe make appere
The marriage of Anne Hathaway with William Shakspere. 15—.

Compare *Notes and Queries*, Aug. 24, 1872; *The Athenæum*, No. 2343, Sept. 21, 1872, p. 376; No. 2345, Oct. 5, 1872, p. 438.

[3] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 328. [4] Reed's *Shakespeare*, i. p. 139.

[5] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 112.

The doubt whether there was a marriage ceremony at all seems scarcely justified, for in that case the Stratford register would, on the occasion of Susanna's baptismal entry, assuredly have added the note "bastard" or "notha," in accordance with the established custom of the time. Besides, in Shakespeare's will, on his wife's tombstone, and in other records, Anne is unequivocally called Shakespeare's wife.

Shakespeare's marriage does not, by any means, speak in favour of the worldly wisdom which distinguished his further career, and which never again seemed to forsake him. Yet who could expect worldly wisdom from a youth of eighteen, especially if he were in love? If we are not deceived on all hands, he had to pay dearly and long for the rash step. It is a much-disputed point whether Shakespeare's marriage was a happy or an unhappy one. Several of the poet's biographers maintain it to have been a happy one; this is the opinion of Halliwell,[1] Knight, Charles Armitage Brown,[2] Samuel Neil, Wise, and others. In their endeavour not to tolerate the smallest flaw in Shakespeare's character, some of these biographers go so far as to maintain it to be their conviction that the poet alludes to his wife by the "sweet Anne" in his Sonnets,[3] and that he subsequently took her to London, where they are said to have lived as happy as two turtle-doves. Ch. A. Brown even contrives to unite this latter fancy with the autobiographical interpretation of the Sonnets addressed to the dark beauty. Knight also maintains that Shakespeare took his family to London, and lived an untroubled life there with them. The marriage he considers to have been a perfectly regular one in accordance with the customs of the day. Nor does Knight put any faith in the deer-stealing incident (to speak somewhat in advance); in fact, any contrary opinion with regard to this latter episode, or as regards the poet's marriage, is, to him, almost as much as defaming the name of Shakespeare. Dyce, De Quincey, R. Grant White, Gervinus, Ulrici, and others, on the other hand, consider that the marriage became an unhappy one, and believe that Shakespeare lived apart from his family in London, and that he merely paid annual visits to Stratford.

[1] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 120.
[2] *Autobiographical Poems*, pp. 200-224.
[3] *Sonnets* 27-29, 36, 39, 44-49, 50, 61, 97, and 109-121.

Lord Campbell[1] fears that Shakespeare's lines in "A Midsummer Night's Dream" (i. 1),—

The course of true love never did run smooth,

may have only too well applied to his own married life, and Moore thinks that if we know anything for certain about Shakespeare's life, it is that he was unhappily married.[2] This opinion is supported by the well-known clause in Shakespeare's will, where he bequeaths his second-best bed to his wife; this point will, however, be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

It is a well-founded experience in human nature that the marriage of a young man with a woman older than himself cannot, as a rule, be a happy one. An older woman—nay, even one of the husband's own age—will always be one stage in advance of the man in her physical development, and even more so intellectually and in her ideas about life; the man never overtakes her in this, and any true or enduring sympathy between them becomes an impossibility. She does not look up to him as she ought; on the contrary, is inclined to look down upon him; she comes to find herself unable to live in his interests, and expects him to adapt himself to hers, which is contrary to nature. She possesses, or believes she possesses, more knowledge of life than her husband, and thus instinctively considers it her right—nay, her duty—to direct and guide him, which, in a lively or energetic woman, is bound to lead to a love of domineering. From this point of view it is certainly not without autobiographical significance that Shakespeare, in his earlier dramas, has chiefly portrayed women of hard, overbearing, and quarrelsome natures, as Gervinus very justly has pointed out. In most cases also, when a woman is married to a man younger than herself, and the period of first and ideal love is passed, it is the older woman who is more concerned about worldly matters, about providing for the future; or it pleases her feminine vanity that, in spite of her age, she can attract another lover. Sensuality may bridge over the gap for a time, but not permanently; the gap between them will only become the more conspicuous as time goes on, when passion has flown and love should prove lasting. These are phenomena

[1] *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements*, p. 106 ff.
[2] *Life and Letters of Lord Byron*, 1860, in one vol., p. 271, note.

based upon the unalterable laws of nature. In Shakespeare's case we have the additional circumstance that his wife obviously did not possess either culture or the capacity for culture, whereas his intellect not only grasped the spirit of the age, but took an active part in directing it, and seemed to scale the heights of humanity, as it were, at a bound. How this alone must have widened the gulf that already existed between them! What intellectual power, what delicacy of feeling Anne need have possessed! How she must have striven to improve her own culture, had she wished to understand her husband's poetic flights and his work, or to obtain even a faint idea of his endeavours!

Shakespeare must soon enough have been unable to conceal the melancholy truth from himself; he has, in fact, in several passages expressed his feelings in unequivocal and impressive words. In "The Two Gentlemen of Verona" (i. 1), we are told how a foolish love can be the ruin of a young life:—

> As the froward bud
> Is eaten by the canker ere it blow,
> Even so by love the young and tender wit
> Is turn'd to folly, blasting in the bud,
> Losing his verdure even in the prime,
> And all the fair effects of future hopes.

In "The Winter's Tale" (iv. 4) Polyxenes says:—

> Reason, my son,
> Should choose himself a wife, but as good reason,
> The father, all whose joy is nothing else
> But fair posterity, should hold some counsel
> In such business.

These words are perhaps a sad confession that Shakespeare did not seek counsel of his father at the time of his marriage. The most convincing and unequivocal passage, however, is met with in "Twelfth Night" (ii. 4):—

> Let still the woman take
> An elder than herself; so wears she to him,
> So sways she level in her husband's heart.
> For, boy, however we do praise ourselves,
> Our fancies are more giddy and unfirm,
> More longing, wavering, sooner lost and worn,
> Than women's are. . . . . .
> Then let thy love be younger than thyself,
> Or thy affection cannot hold the bent;

For women are as roses, whose fair flower
Being once display'd doth fall that very hour.[1]

Is it possible not to recognize this to be the poet's grief at his own unfortunate marriage? It is obviously wisdom that has sprung from sorrow.

And, at a later day, Shakespeare seems even to have had painful thoughts concerning the way he himself entered upon his marriage; for, whatever excuses may be raised, his marriage was certainly not one perfectly in accordance with the customs of the day. At all events, in the repeated and express warnings which Prospero urges upon Ferdinand in "The Tempest" (iv. 1), we obtain a deeply sorrowful view of this period of his early life, and the melancholy consequences that followed:—

If thou dost break her virgin-knot before
All sanctimonious ceremonies may
With full and holy rite be minister'd,
No sweet aspersion shall the heavens let fall
To make this contract grow; but barren hate,
Sour-eyed disdain and discord shall bestrew
The union of your bed with weeds so loathly
That you shall hate it both: therefore take heed,
As Hymen's lamps shall light you.
. . . . . Do not give dalliance
Too much the rein: the strongest oaths are straw
To the fire i' the blood: be more abstemious,
Or else, good night your vow!

Our next question concerns what were the young married couple's means of existence. How important worldly welfare and good prospects are to conjugal happiness Shakespeare knew very well himself, and gives expression to his thoughts on the subject in "The Winter's Tale" (iv. 4):—

Prosperity's the very bond of love,
Whose fresh complexion and whose heart together
Affliction alters.

He must, undoubtedly, have made bitter experiences of this himself. The obscurity that envelops Shakespeare's occupa-

[1] The words in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, i. 1:—"*Lysander*. Or else misgraffed in respect of years. *Hermia*. O spite! too old to be engaged to young,"—may also be referred to discrepancy in the husband's age. Shakespeare, however, is in this case, again, "gentle" enough to lay the principal blame upon his own sex.

tions and social position in Stratford, as a youth, is scarcely likely ever to be cleared up, unless, by some unexpected piece of good-fortune, new records are discovered; this we can hardly believe possible, and thus we are again thrust back upon hypotheses.[1] The legend which speaks of Shakespeare's having been a butcher's apprentice may be considered as altogether unworthy of belief. As little likely is the story brought forward by Aubrey that the poet, in his earlier years, was a teacher. Aubrey even attributes Shakespeare's dexterity in Latin to this circumstance, and states that the poet knew Latin very well, "*for* he had been in his younger years a schoolmaster in the country." This statement is as uncritical as can be. What need was there for a village schoolmaster to know Latin, at a time when even the majority of the principal citizens could scarcely write their names? Would Aubrey have us believe that Shakespeare, as a village schoolmaster, taught in Latin? Or that as a schoolmaster he had any special opportunity and leisure for studying Latin on his own account? If this statement has any truth in it at all, it can be accepted only, as Collier suggests, by assuming that Shakespeare was, for a time, assistant teacher in the Stratford Grammar School. Yet even this supposition has only a small degree of probability. Instances of the kind are met with, it is true, and Dr. Simon Forman, the well-known physician and astrologer (1552-1611), relates that it was in this manner that he acquired the necessary means for attending the University of Oxford.[2] Before he had reached the age of eighteen he had, for six months, taught in the school at Sarum, where

[1] One of the strangest has been brought forward by the author of *The Footsteps of Shakespeare, or a Ramble with the Early Dramatists* (London, 1862), p. 14 ff. (Can the author be in earnest?) According to him Shakespeare upon leaving school became "an apothecary's apprentice"—perhaps the author is himself an apothecary. This supposition he gathers from *Romeo and Juliet*, and other of Shakespeare's plays, which he thinks saturated with a knowledge of medicine!! Cerimon in *Pericles* (compare especially iii. 2: *I held it ever*, &c.) and Friar Lorenzo in *Romeo and Juliet* are supposed to be portraits of Shakespeare's masters in the craft; while the half-starved apothecary in Mantua and his shop, are said to be an ironical description of his detested competitors in Stratford!!—Dr. Bucknill (in the Preface to his *Medical Knowledge of Shakespeare*, London, 1860) points out that the poet, in the interval between leaving school and entering the dramatic profession, appears to have devoted some time to the study of medicine.

[2] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 109.

he had himself been a pupil, and not only earned his own livelihood by so doing, but was able to save forty shillings, which had to prove sufficient for his first days at Oxford. If, however, Shakespeare had left school at the age of about fourteen, in accordance with the custom of the day, he is scarcely likely to have returned there at eighteen, for he is more likely, meanwhile, to have forgotten what he knew, than to have made progress in any branch of school knowledge. Besides, at the age of fourteen, he could not possibly have made the sudden bound from a schoolboy to a schoolmaster. He could, at most, have become some such "prompter," as R. Willis has described; an actual teacher he could not have been, for we have the names of every one of the teachers in the Stratford School from the time of Edward VI. up to the days of James I., and there is no Shakespeare among them.[1] Besides, education was still almost exclusively in the hands of the clergy; laymen who, like Dr. Forman, became teachers for a time, did so only when compelled by necessity, and the occupation was to them only a short period of transition. The remuneration was extremely small, and for laymen there was absolutely no prospect of advance, or of obtaining any permanent appointment.

An incomparably better claim to credence and support is to be found in the hypothesis brought forward by Malone and Lord Campbell, among others, that Shakespeare after leaving school became an apprentice or clerk to an attorney, for there were no less than six such persons in the little town of Stratford at the time. We may, in the first place, feel convinced that if Shakespeare had been preparing himself for so lucrative and honourable a career, it would have been in perfect accordance with the wishes of his parents. Besides, the supposition that Shakespeare was a clerk to an attorney is not contradicted by any one fact known of the poet's life; on the contrary, it harmonizes most completely with everything that we know of him. A very significant fact is to be found in the well-known satirical allusion in the "Epistle to the Gentlemen Students of the two Universities," by Thomas Nash, which stands as a preface to Robert Greene's "Menaphon" (1589), and was first pointed out by Malone, who, however, did not attach much importance to it himself.[2] The passage in Nash

[1] Lord Campbell, *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements*, p. 19 ff.

[2] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. p. 107 ff. Ch. A. Brown,

runs as follows: "It is a common practice nowadays, among a sort of shifting companions, that run through every art, and thrive by none,[1] to leave the trade of Noverint, whereto they were born, and busy themselves with the endeavours of art, that could scarcely latinize their neck-verse, if they should have need; yet English Seneca, read by candle-light, yields many good sentences, as Blood is a beggar, and so forth; and if you entreat him far, in a frosty morning, he will afford you whole hamlets, I should say, handfuls of tragical speeches." Much as this passage has been the subject of dispute and doubt,[2] we think it must be interpreted as including Shakespeare, and hence as describing him, in his early years, to have been a "*Noverint*," *i.e.* an attorney's clerk.[3] This opinion seems the less open to dispute, if we consider the internal evidence that can be brought forward in support of this point more especially. Shakespeare, in his works, exhibits from first to last, not only an absolutely correct acquaintance with legal matters, but shows an undeniable liking—or shall we say, habit—for using legal phrases. It is not an exaggeration to maintain that no other poet of his day, or any other day, equals him in this, although (as R. Gr. White remarks) the other poets of the Elizabethan period make much more frequent use of legal phrases than is done nowadays.[4] The most eminent English lawyers have been unable to point out a single error in legal matters, and they have expressed their admiration of and surprise at this fact. Halliwell-Phillipps, indeed, thinks that Shakespeare might readily have learned such phrases from the many legal transactions in which his parents were implicated. This explanation, however, does not appear to us at all sufficient. The documents connected with any such transactions would only, on the

Shakespeare's Autobiographical Poems (London, 1838), pp. 9-17, and Drake, i. p. 42 ff., are also convinced of the correctness of this hypothesis.

[1] These words seem only to point to the fact that Shakespeare tried his hand at various occupations before he devoted himself to the stage; Aubrey with his schoolmaster-hypothesis and Blades with his printer-hypothesis might quote the passage in support of their statements.

[2] See Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 108.

[3] *Noverint universi* were the words ordinarily used in Shakespeare's day for beginning of a Latin document.

[4] R. Gr. White, *Shakespeare*, i. p. xliv. ff. Even Beaumont, whose father was a Judge of the Common Pleas, and who had studied at the Inns of Court, does not make use of such an abundance of legal phrases, or use them as correctly as Shakespeare does.

rarest occasions, if ever, have been given into the father's hands; nor would he be likely to have handed them to his son to study. As little can it be supposed that the son was present at any oral transactions which the father may have had with his legal advisers. How, therefore, could the son have been able to acquire anything but a superficial knowledge even as regards the substance of these transactions, not to speak of any legal or technical knowledge of them? And if it be said that Shakespeare might have had opportunity enough of becoming acquainted with legal phraseology from his own experiences in life—this might perhaps account for his knowledge of the subject, but not for his undoubted liking for legal phrases, or for the fact that such phrases are met with in his youthful poems as well (for instance, in his "Venus and Adonis," "The Lover's Complaint," &c.), and moreover with no less frequency or correctness than in the works of his later years. It is impossible, in any one of his works, to recognize any increase of legal knowledge, in so far as it is not determined by the subject, nor is it possible to observe any progress in his acquaintance with such phraseology; accordingly, it must have been learned before Shakespeare appeared as a poet. However great may be the facility we grant to genius of acquiring knowledge of a positive kind accidentally, as opposed to systematic study, still English law, in particular, unquestionably demands a greater degree of professional training than any other branch of knowledge; mere observation or intuition is absolutely useless here—although it might have enabled the poet to describe natural occurrences, or the apothecary's shop in "Romeo and Juliet." The most exhaustive inquiry into this matter we owe to no less a person than John Campbell, the Lord Chief Justice of England in his day, and he, if anyone, may be considered fully entitled to pronounce judgment in this case.[1] Lord Campbell is, indeed, too cautious to utter a decided Yea or Nay with regard to the question, but the whole of his dis-

[1] Lord Campbell, *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements*, London, 1859.—See also W. L. Rushton, *Shakespeare a Lawyer*, London, 1858. Rushton arrived at his conclusion before Lord Campbell did, but otherwise his work cannot be compared with that of Lord Campbell's. Nevertheless Rushton's explanations of some of the more striking passages are worth consideration.—Franklin Fiske Heard, *The Legal Acquirements of Shakespeare*, Boston, 1865.—Cushman K. Davis, *The Law in Shakespeare*, 2nd ed., St. Paul, 1884.

course is the most eloquent confirmation of his supposition. It is also a significant fact that Lord Campbell makes use of Shakespeare's own words, "*Thou art clerkly, thou art clerkly,*"[1] as the motto prefixed to his book. The two points of the case, which we have already referred to, Lord Campbell establishes irrefutably: in the first place, that Shakespeare exhibits in his works a striking and almost unparalleled liking for, not to say delight in weaving legal expressions, similes, and imagery into his poems; and secondly, that, in not one instance—although all have been examined severally by Lord Campbell—is there an error; on the contrary, every case shows the positive knowledge of a man intimately acquainted with the subject, whose language frequently even excels that of professional lawyers. Not a few passages in the poet's works are so full of legal expressions and imagery, that it would be impossible to understand them properly without a knowledge of English law.[2] Considering the weight of such facts as these, the objections raised by Knight can no longer be regarded as tenable. Knight,[3] among other things, says that if Shakespeare had been an attorney's clerk, his name would be found in some of the documents as a subscribing witness, which it is not. Without entering further into the question, we need only ask, in reply, could Shakespeare, inasmuch as he was a minor, have acted as a witness? Another point, has, however, recently been brought forward, which must not be passed over in connection with our other proofs, although no great value can be attached to it. According to Richard Simpson, Shakespeare's autographs distinctly show that his handwriting is that of a "scrivener"[4] and lawyer.

If, in accordance with the above account, Shakespeare, at the time of his marriage, be regarded as having been an attorney's clerk, we have him, at once, occupying an independent position in which—even without his father's consent

[1] *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, iv. 5.

[2] Thus for example Sonnet 46, of which Lord Campbell (p. 102) says: "This sonnet is so intensely legal in its language and imagery, that without a considerable knowledge of English forensic procedure it cannot be fully understood."—Well known, too, are Hamlet's observations on a lawyer's skull (v. 1).

[3] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 260 ff.

[4] *Notes and Queries*, 4th series, vol. viii. 1-3 (1 July, 1871), in the essay: *Are there any extant Manuscripts in Shakespeare's Handwriting?*

—he might have ventured to marry; for if he received assistance from his wife's relatives he would have been able to support a family, and would, in any case, have had better prospects of a steady improvement in his affairs. In fact, this hypothesis would reduce all the unaccountable and perplexing points in our inquiry to a minimum, if it did not settle the matter entirely. And those critics who cannot subscribe to this hypothesis have no choice left but to adopt the unpalatable supposition that young Shakespeare, after leaving school, assisted and engaged in his father's pursuits; that, in fact, all the knowledge he had acquired at school was forthwith shelved, and that the youth, in a tragic way devoted himself to agriculture, to the sale of wool and to the slaughtering of calves—occupations which, in our opinion, seem utterly incompatible with the poetic spirit and ideal thoughts within him, and would necessarily have led to his becoming rough and uncouth. The dependent position in which Shakespeare—under these circumstances—must have stood to his father, would also make his marriage appear a most thoughtless and unaccountable proceeding, for to suppose that his father could have been pleased with, or have wished, or even encouraged it, is altogether inconceivable. Another and insurmountable difficulty would oppose this supposition; that is, the father's continued and increasing state of poverty, which even Knight is not altogether able to explain away. John Shakespeare would have required assistance and help only if his business had been in a flourishing condition and capable of being extended, in which case he might not have been able to superintend it himself; but such assistance he would not have required if his circumstances, as seems probable, were in such a state that it was difficult for him to maintain an honourable position for his family. His circumstances, on the contrary, must have made him wish to see his son in an independent position. It can scarcely have been the father's wish to train this son to become his successor, for he was himself still in the prime of life, and had two or three younger sons, and, above all, no longer possessed as much land as formerly. What the causes were that led to the continued decline of John Shakespeare's prosperity, we do not know; probably it was connected with the general state of depression that seems to have affected the whole town of Stratford at this time. That some such state of depression did exist,

we know from irrefutable evidence, by the petition which the bailiffs and burgesses of Stratford addressed to the Lord Treasurer Burghley in 1590.[1] The town, it is stated, had fallen "into much decay for want of such trade as heretofore they had by clothing and making of yarn, employing and maintaining a number of poor people by the same, which now live in great penury and misery, by reason they are not set to work as before they have been." Special mention is also made of the decline of the wool trade, otherwise so flourishing; hence, when tradition maintains—as is not unlikely—that John Shakespeare was a dealer in wool, we find here a very obvious connection between the decline of John Shakespeare's personal circumstances, and the state of the municipal affairs in general.

The worst reports concerning John Shakespeare's affairs are from the years 1586-1587, when his son was already in London, and we shall here again have to disregard strict chronological order, and refer to matters in advance of the period under discussion. On the 19th of January, 1586, a *distringas*, or warrant of distress, was issued against John Shakespeare, which the officers of the law could not execute, as "John Shakespeare has nothing to distrain upon." This warrant was followed by a *capias*, issued three times in the same and the two following months. John Shakespeare was thereupon declared to have forfeited his office as alderman, inasmuch as he had for some time past omitted to attend the meetings of the Corporation. In the following year he seems even to have been arrested for debt; at all events, a "*writ of habeas corpus*" is issued against him. The primary cause of this appears to have been that he became security for his brother Henry, and on the 1st of February, 1587, an action is brought against him in connection with it by Nicholas Lane; documentary evidence proves that he had become security for this brother more than once. This circumstance, however, cannot but rouse doubt and hesitation in our minds. Could John Shakespeare have become security for anyone, if he had become so impoverished as to have no goods to distrain? In fact, the account sounds altogether absurd: how could a well-to-do proprietor of land and tenements—when in money difficulties—not have any possessions to confiscate? The doubt is in-

[1] Skottowe, *Life of Shakespeare*, i. p. 6.

creased by the circumstance that John Shakespeare throughout this anxious time remained in undisputed possession of his houses in Stratford, for there is no record of any kind to show that they were either seized or sold.[1] Has the identity of the person been properly established, and are we sure that there may not here be some confusion with the shoemaker John Shakespeare? Knight offers an entirely different explanation that requires careful consideration; he maintains it to be probable that the poet's father no longer resided in the borough of Stratford at the time, and hence that the penalties and charges against him were to a certain extent issued *in contumacium*—that during this time he devoted himself exclusively to agriculture, and paid his taxes to the diocese, in place of to the borough. From 1579 to 1583, and probably longer, we find a John Shakespeare residing in Clifford, a prettily-situated village some two miles from Stratford. Knight thinks that this was John Shakespeare, the poet's father.[2] This hypothesis has much in its favour, and we think it can even be strengthened by pointing out a causal connection which may have induced John Shakespeare to have changed his abode for a time. As has already been stated, John Shakespeare in 1580 (perhaps even somewhat earlier) made a vain effort to recover the possession of his estate of Asbies, which had been mortgaged. Lambert's objections to giving it up make the impression of quarrelsomeness and quibbling. What legal connection was there between the payment of other debts and the repurchase of Asbies? Would it not have been sufficient to pay back the money that had been received for it? This John Shakespeare declared himself ready to do, and the Lamberts themselves do not deny it. According to the document in question, it would appear that the Lamberts somewhat illegally retained possession of Asbies, and refused to fulfil the conditions of the mortgage; but—in the charge brought against him by John and Mary Shakespeare it is stated that "the saide John (Lambert)

[1] According to a document dated the 14th of August, 1591, George Badger sells to one John Couch "a tenement in Henley Street, between the house of Robert Johnson on the one side, and the house of John Shakespeare on the other."—Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 73 ff.

[2] Halliwell (*Illustrations*, p. 62, and *Outlines*, ii. p. 253) endeavours to refute this supposition by pointing out that the John Shakespeare of Clifford married in 1560.

denyed in all things, and did withstande them (viz., John and Mary Shakespeare), for entringe into the premisses, and as yet doeth so contynewe still; and by reason that certaine deedes and other evydences concerninge the premisses and that of righte belong to your saide oratours, are coume to the hands and possession of the sayde John, he wrongfullie still keepeth and detayneth the possession of the said premisses from your saide oratours, and will in noe wise permytt and suffer them to have and enjoye the sayde premisses accordinge to their righte in and to the same." It can only be supposed that John Shakespeare must have appealed to the Stratford authorities [1] to recover his rightful possession, and that when he found this appeal prove fruitless he would then address himself to the High Court of Chancery, as the highest court of appeal. Perhaps it was Sir Thomas Lucy who, in his capacity of Justice of the Peace, played John Shakespeare false in this matter; this would account for the undoubtedly hostile feeling which the Shakespeare family entertained towards him, and would throw new light upon the affair of the deer-stealing. How it was that John Shakespeare could obtain no legal redress in Stratford can be explained only by those acquainted with English law. Still we have no doubt that John Shakespeare felt himself aggrieved and mortified, and this would lead him to assume a hostile position towards those of the Stratford aldermen and burgesses who had opposed his claim. The words in the document quoted above, "your saide oratours are of small wealthe and verey fewe frends and alyance in the said countie," prove this clearly. And this, too, was probably the reason why John Shakespeare ceased to attend the meetings of the Corporation, and in a spirit of hostility and retaliation refused to pay the taxes. The supposition that the poet's father retired to the country for some years, thus comes to seem all the more likely; and as he would no doubt take all his movable possessions with him, it is, further, quite intelligible that nothing of his would be left in Stratford to distrain. His son William, on the other hand, would remain in Stratford with the attorney, and, being away from his parents, would enjoy a freer

[1] The power of the Stratford Court of Record could not decide any personal action beyond the value of £30. How far this applies to the present case, and whether John Shakespeare was satisfied with it or not, can be decided only by an intimate knowledge of English legal proceedings.

and more independent position, and his marriage, without the consent of his parents, becomes all the more intelligible. Still, all this by no means sets aside the supposition that John Shakespeare had difficulties to contend with as regards money matters. Knight,[1] it is true, brings forward the supposition that it was during these years that John Shakespeare purchased the estates of Bishopton and Welcombe, which property is mentioned in the son's will as having been inherited; however, there is no record anywhere of the purchase. This conjecture of Knight's is a bold one, especially as we possess, from the year 1592, a corroboration of John Shakespeare having been in a state of insolvency. This is the well-known report of Sir Thomas Lucy and other commissioners, under date of 25th September, 1592, relating to those recusants in the Hundred of Barlichway, in the diocese of Stratford, who did not attend church once in the month as prescribed by Her Majesty's laws. Among these recusants we find "Mr. John Shakespeare" (the title Mr. proves that this cannot have been the shoemaker) and eight others, whose non-attendance at church is accounted for by the remark: "It is sayd that these last nine coom not to churche for feare of processe for debtte." Now, as the list—as is expressly stated—enumerates all those recusants "as have been heretofore presented for not coming monthly to the church," Halliwell[2] is justified in concluding that Mr. John Shakespeare had been mentioned as a recusant in a previous report, probably in 1586-87, when his pecuniary difficulties were at their worst. In 1592, on the contrary, John Shakespeare appears again to have been in better circumstances, at least this may be inferred from the fact that, according to Halliwell,[3] he was one of those "engaged in making inventories of the goods of persons deceased," and on the 24th of July of that year, he undertook to make an inventory of the possessions of "Ralph Shawe, woll-dryver" (!), and on the 21st of August, of those of "Henry Fielde, tanner." Now, as this office was considered both honourable and one demanding confidence, it could hardly have been entrusted to a man who was so deep in debt that he dare not show himself in public. That the document cannot refer to John Shakespeare the shoemaker seems obvious from the trades to which the de-

[1] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 106 ff.
[2] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 72.
[3] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 67 ff.

ceased persons had belonged, apart from the fact that the title of *Mr.*, is again used. It is certain that only those with a knowledge of the different trades in question would have been appointed to make the inventories, and the shoemaker, John Shakespeare, can scarcely have understood anything about wool drying, even though he might have known something about tanning. On the other hand, that the poet's father should have undertaken the business, is perfectly in harmony with what is inferred regarding his occupations from other sources and facts, and again serves to confirm the view we take of the matter. Lastly, again in 1592 (in the list of the moneys received by the chamberlains of Stratford) an entry is found stating that 20*s.* had been received from John Shakespeare (not Mr. !) for Richard Fletcher. Halliwell[1] refers this entry to the shoemaker, and yet it seems that the sum must have been somewhat too large a one for him. However, even apart from this last point, there appears to be some confusion between the recusant John Shakespeare (who did not venture to attend church on account of his debts) and the valuator of the property left by Fielde and Shawe, which we are unable to explain. Or are we to ascribe the non-attendance at church, partially, at least, to the feeling of annoyance that had been aroused in the poet's father by the refusal to grant him his rightful claim to repurchase Asbies? In fact, we are here surrounded by riddles to which we have no clue whatever. In the detached bits of information which the unwearied efforts of investigators have brought to light from dusty archives, we possess, as it were, only the bits of stone for forming a mosaic, whereas the drawing, by means of which the bits of stone were to be made into a picture, has been irrecoverably lost, and the most that can be done is to form a mosaic as best we can.

To return to William's marriage; it seems we may confidently assume—from what has been said above—that he could count upon but little assistance from his father as regards the maintenance of his rapidly increasing family. If it was the hope of William's parents, during his schoolboy days, that their unusually gifted son would one day not only be an honour to them, but able to render them substantial help, they could not possibly (even though they had possessed the means) have

[1] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 71.

been very ready to help him at the time of his hasty marriage. Hence, as William's own income could scarcely have been sufficient for his wants, De Quincey's supposition that the wife's family lent a helping hand—to put it briefly—must not be left unconsidered, especially as it was obviously the wife's family who had brought about the marriage.[1] Now, this state of dependence in which young Shakespeare found himself, could not fail to affect the relation between him and his wife. Mutual dissatisfaction about such a state of affairs, and mutual reproaches also, very likely were not wanting, and De Quincey is probably not wrong in his conviction that these reproaches more frequently came from Anne than from William. Some such development of the relation between them entirely corresponds with what experience teaches, and is the direct and natural result of the workings of human nature; and in this William Shakespeare's marriage can hardly be considered to have been an exception to thousands of others.

These unpleasant circumstances the young poet must have felt all the more depressing, as not only was he, at this time, entering the period of mature manhood physically, but his mental activity, the power of his poetic genius, was irresistibly pressing on towards its full development. Where, under such circumstances, could he obtain food for the inward workings of his mind—where, guidance in and sympathy for his poetic flights? Where was the loving hand to watch over and to cherish the tender buds?—where, the heart to follow him in the course of his inspirations? Some critics, as already said, do, indeed, believe that it was about this time that (in his Sonnets) Shakespeare sung of his "sweet Anne;" but this supposition is opposed by various objections. The sonnet was a form of verse that his wife was least of all likely to appreciate; if she had any appreciation for poetry at all, it would probably be limited to "the russet and kersey" of popular poetry,[2] or to an exciting theatrical piece. But even Shakespeare himself, during this "storm and stress" period, probably felt but little drawn to that abstract and polished

[1] De Quincey (*Shakspeare; a Biography*, Edinburgh, 1864, p. 52 ff.) did not know of Richard Hathaway's will, for it was only subsequently discovered; De Quincey therefore assumed that Anne's father supported the young married couple. The same conjecture is expressed by Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps in his *Outlines* (4th edition), p. 73.

[2] In *Love's Labour's Lost*, v. 2, 413.

form of Italian verse. Malone and Drake[1] have already pointed out that Daniel's Sonnets (published in 1592) were Shakespeare's prototypes both as regards form and substance, and that, accordingly, none of Shakespeare's Sonnets can be assigned to any previous date. Even Sydney's Sonnets did not appear till 1591. It is possible, of course, that Surrey's Sonnets (1557) and those of Watson (1581) may, by some happy chance, have fallen into the young poet's hands at this time; still we cannot induce ourselves to believe that the conceits and the fully developed thoughts—we might almost say, the excess of reflection—displayed in Shakespeare's Sonnets can have been the work of so young a man. The supposition must rather be that Shakespeare's first poetic efforts were made in the dramatic field, and this seems to be inferred also from the already quoted passage from Nash, according to which Shakespeare was engaged during the day as an attorney's apprentice, and of an evening, by candlelight, studying his English Seneca,[2] and in making many a good bit from it his own. This passage gives us a most lifelike and attractive picture. Whether "Titus Andronicus" or "Pericles" were the results of these studies, or whether Shakespeare's first dramatic efforts were left unfinished and lost, are questions that must be left undecided. Very probably the poet destroyed his first efforts himself. But his creative genius would not rest satisfied with this: Shakespeare was more likely to make a venture at the aristocratic and artificial style of poetry, which was then regarded as the only legitimate form, and alone appertaining to literature. It seems scarcely to be doubted that "Venus and Adonis" was written at this time, at least in its first shape; for if any poetic work possesses internal evidence it is this one, where every line exhibits the immoderate sensual fervour of youth; and when Shakespeare went to London after several years of married life, the first sensuous excitement of youth had probably already subsided. Shakespeare, as is well known, himself dedicated this poem to the Earl of Southampton as the first heir of his invention; this has given rise to several interpretations, although there appears no

[1] Drake, *Shakspeare and his Times* (1817), ii. 50.

[2] Seneca's *Tragedies*, translated by Studley, Nevile, Nuce, Jasper Heywood, and Thomas Newton, were published in 1581, and hence possessed the additional attraction of novelty. Separate plays had indeed appeared previously.—Warton, *Hist. Eng. Poetry*, iii. p. 309.

reason to doubt the simple truth of the statement. The fact of its not having been published till many years after it was written, is not in any way surprising to those acquainted with the literary circumstances of the time, and we shall on a subsequent occasion enter more fully into the reasons of this.

Shakespeare's "storm and stress" period, however, did not reveal itself only in poetic productions, but showed itself in a very different and thoroughly realistic form. We have already said that we are wholly disinclined to imagine the boy Shakespeare to have been a stay-at-home, and much less are we inclined to believe this of Shakespeare as a young man; he was undoubtedly an admirer of nature, and whenever able must have roamed abroad and made the expeditions we have already spoken of. If ever mortal man possessed in his breast the two souls Faust speaks of, it is Shakespeare. Traditions which in themselves possess but little or no credibility, point to the fact that he took part in the popular fêtes, in sports of all kinds, and dancings and merry-makings, and, it is said, excelled other youths by his wit and humour, his joyousness of spirit and readiness in retort. For, in spite of his genius he was neither arrogant and conceited, nor petulant and exclusive, and must therefore have been no less a favourite as a youth, than he was afterwards as a man. Shakespeare was no such weakling as Tieck in his *Dichterleben* makes him out, but, like his own Prince Hal, he must have been attracted by the broad humour of the people, and the life associated with inns and taverns which was a peculiar feature in the Merry Old England of those days. Shakespeare was not one to spoil a game or sport, and probably in this way sowed his wild oats, to use a proverbial expression. It must have been somewhat thus that he acquired his intimate acquaintance with the language, the customs and the habits of the people, with the taverns, the innkeepers and their guests; and we have already seen with what secret pleasure (in "The Taming of the Shrew") he relates incidents from his youthful life in Stratford. One legend, belonging to this period of Shakespeare's life, is connected with an old apple-tree which stood not far from the village of Bidford on the road to Stratford, and was known far and wide as "Shakespeare's Crabtree." The legend, it is true, cannot be traced back to any older or more trustworthy

source than the mere oral communications which were made by residents in Stratford[1] to Malone, and to Samuel Ireland, the notorious fabricator; still it may be as well to give it here. Bidford, so the story goes, was celebrated for its excellent beer as well as for the thirstiness of its inhabitants, and could boast of a society known by the name of *The Bidford Topers*, who frequently challenged the good fellows of the neighbouring villages to see who could drink the hardest. Stratford one day received a challenge and accepted it, one of the party being Shakespeare. When the Stratford men went to Bidford, the *topers* were not there, having gone to the fair at Evesham. The Bidford *sippers*, however, declared themselves ready to take up the wager, which offer was accepted. After a while the Stratforders considered it time to set off homewards, lest this might prove an impossibility later. When half-way on the road home, they could not manage to go further, and lay down under an apple-tree and slept off their debauch. When they woke next morning, their first thought was to return to Bidford to take up the challenge again, which Shakespeare, however, refused to do, saying that he had had enough, and pointing to the surrounding villages, added that he had drunk with :—

> Piping Pebworth, Dancing Marston,
> Haunted Hillborough, and Hungry Grafton,
> With Dadging Exhall, Papist Wixford,
> Beggarly Broom, and Drunken Bidford.[2]

It would be waste of words to endeavour to show the untrustworthiness of this anecdote; it proves at most what was the popular belief regarding Shakespeare as a young man, and of what it believed him capable. In short, it is most probable that Shakespeare gave himself up to a free and gay kind of life with companions of his own age, even after his marriage; this is the more probable if, as seems most likely, his home was not a pleasant one to him, and if neither affection,

[1] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. 500 ff.; Ireland, *Picturesque Views on the Avon*, pp. 229-233. Compare Fullom, *History of William Shakespeare*, 109 f.

[2] See *The Legend of Shakespeare's Crabtree*, by C. F. Green. With Portrait and 9 Plates, London, 1862, 4to.—C. F. Green, *Shakespeare's Crabtree, with its Legend*, London, 1869, 8vo.—Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps is inclined to believe even this foolish tradition, as well as in all the rest. *Outlines*, i. 217.

sympathy, nor satisfaction were to be had there. Looked at in this connection it would seem as if the much-debated point about the deer-stealing had been the boldest—to a certain extent, the crowning escapade of the young scapegrace. The incident, accordingly, deserves a fuller examination.[1]

At about one hour's distance to the north-east of Stratford, near the village of Hampton Lucy, and on the banks of the Avon, is the mansion and park of the still flourishing Lucy family. The owner in Shakespeare's day, Sir Thomas Lucy, had rebuilt the house (as it now stands), in the form of the letter E—a very unique way of showing his devotion to Queen Elizabeth, who, as is well-known, was very open to such forms of flattery, and delighted her architectural admirer in 1572 by paying him a visit and creating him a knight. Now Shakespeare is said to have repeatedly gone on poaching expeditions with his comrades into Sir Thomas Lucy's park, and to have been mercilessly persecuted by Sir Thomas in consequence; Davies reports that Shakespeare had even been "oft whipt and sometimes imprisoned." Malone tried to destroy the foundation of the legend by endeavouring to prove[2] that Sir Thomas did not possess a deer-park at all. Other commentators (Drake, for instance), therefore remove the scene of the tradition to Fulbroke Park, an estate that also belong to the Lucies. Holte Bracebridge, on the other hand, tries to break the point of the matter altogether, by wishing us to believe that poaching was not forbidden in Fulbroke Park. He supports his case upon a remark of Mr. Lucy's to Walter

[1] With regard to the poaching episode, See—among others—Capell, *Notes and Various Readings*, &c., ii. 75; Hunter, *Illustrations*, i. 53 ff.; Skottowe, *Life of Shakespeare*, i. 109 f.; C. Holte Bracebridge, *Shakespeare no Deer-stealer; or, a Short Account of Fulbroke Park, near Stratford-upon-Avon*, London, 1862; J. E. Jackson, *Shakespeare; Thomas Lucy; The Earl of Leicester's Players*. In *Notes and Queries*, 1867, No. 279, p. 349; No. 284, p. 461; No. 288, p. 4; No. 291, p. 61. See also the "heavy, dull, insipid joke" of W. S. Landor, *Citation and Examination of William Shakespeare, Euseby Treen, Jos. Carnaby, and Silas Gough, before Sir Thom. Lucy, touching Deerstealing on the* 19 *Day of Sept.* 1582. *Now first published from the Original Papers*, London, 1834; Hermann Kurz, *Die Wilderersage* in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, iv. 247-267; J. S. Brewer, *English Studies*, ed. by Henry Wace, London, 1881, p. 217 ff.

[2] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. 145 f. In a map of the environs of Stratford from the year 1603, where the parks are indicated by marks that represent the encircling palings, there is, indeed, no park marked at Charlecote; but neither is Fulbroke Park indicated. See Halliwell, *Illustrations of the Life of Shakespeare* (London, 1874), p. 63.

Scott, when the latter visited Charlecote; "the park," he said, "from which Shakespeare stole the buck was not that which surrounds Charlecote."[1] This evidence, however, has no power of proof. Knight[2] refuses to believe anything about the story, because, in his opinion, it would be a blemish on Shakespeare's character, and Knight's whole endeavour is to represent the poet immaculate in every respect; the undeniable ill-feeling against the Lucy family he accounts for in an entirely different manner. Fairholt[3] speaks out his mind bluntly by saying "the dignity of a great man's biography should not be broken up by such tales." But nevertheless it cannot be denied that if any tradition connected with Shakespeare can be traced to an actual foundation, it would seem that this one can.[4]

Malone's assertion that Sir Thomas Lucy could not boast of owning a deer-park, in the first place can only mean, that he did not possess a deer-park in the legal sense. Blackstone[5] says: "It is not every field or common, which a gentleman pleases to surround with a wall or paling, and to stock with a herd of deer, that is thereby constituted a legal park." Probably Sir Thomas was the originator of the present deer-park, as he was the originator of the still existing mansion, and started his deer-park in a small way at first. The laying out of deer-parks and making enclosures was a fashion prevailing at the time. Holinshed[6] dwells upon the injurious custom of making enclosures and expressly says: "Nobles and gentlemen furnished the same with beasts and sheepe and also deere." It is very likely that Sir Thomas at first only had a warren, into which he gradually introduced deer as

[1] Lockhart, *Memoirs of Sir W. Scott* (1845), in one vol., p. 682.

[2] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 487.

[3] In Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 133.

[4] It is strange that those who are opposed to the legend about the deer-stealing, do not appeal to the fact that it is not mentioned by Greene. Why —they might ask—why has Greene, who has not spared the poet in any way, not accused him of this misdemeanour, if it were true? Such a question would, however, be a very weak argument. Greene's attacks were not directed at Shakespeare's private life, but at his literary work. And besides Greene knew too well what public opinion on such matters was, to make any special reference to the poaching affair. Greene has not even said a word about Shakespeare's marriage, any more than any other of Shakespeare's contemporaries.

[5] *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 7th ed. Oxford, 1775, vol. ii. p. 38.

[6] *Chronicle*, 1586, iii. 862.

well. Coneys and deer are usually mentioned together, and Davies expressly says that Shakespeare stole "venison and rabbits." The enclosure, no doubt, became greatly extended, and the rabbits themselves came to be of less value as the deer increased in number. At all events, two years after Sir Thomas's death (1602) we find his son, in accordance with the custom of the day, presenting a buck to the Queen, who was at the time being entertained at Harefield, Lord Ellesmere's seat;[1] the other nobility in the neighbourhood were, it is true, generally more liberal with their gifts. If this interpretation is correct, it explains Sir Thomas Lucy's extraordinary jealousy with regard to his game. It was, in fact, his ambition to make it a deer-park of some pretension, and, possessing but few animals at first, he could ill afford to lose them. This would, at once, make it intelligable why Sir Thomas never presented the worthy Stratford magistrates with a haunch of venison, whereas the corporation did not fail to show him some attention, and made him liberal gifts of sack and sugar, as is evident from the chamberlain's accounts. Now, as the Stratford Corporation stood upon a friendly footing with the nobility and gentry of the district, and followed the axiom that small gifts engender friendship—they must have felt somewhat annoyed at Sir Thomas's want of generosity, and an unfriendly feeling would naturally arise between them. Who can say whether John Shakespeare, in his capacity of bailiff and alderman, may not have felt personally aggrieved? And the young Stratforders would naturally rejoice at an opportunity for playing the knight some mischievous trick. Halliwell[2] speaks of having seen a record containing the names of those "that made the ryot uppon Master Thomas Lucy, esquier;" there are no less than thirty-five names mentioned, but there is not a Shakespeare among them. Unfortunately there is no indication to what period this document belongs, but to judge from the title of "Master," it must belong to a date prior to Lucy's elevation to the knighthood (1572). As Malone even points out, Sir Thomas showed himself a zealous supporter of the game laws in parliament also; in 1585 he took a prominent part in introducing a bill for the protection of game, which he would certainly not have done had he not himself

[1] *The Egerton Papers*, ed. by J. P. Collier (for the Camden Society), pp. 350 and 355.
[2] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 128.

possessed game. This parliamentary activity on his part is, in fact, in perfect accordance with the supposition that the new deer-park at Charlecote was Sir Thomas's own creation, and, on the other hand, almost induces us to believe that Shakespeare may only shortly before have stolen deer there, and thus been the cause of Sir Thomas's anxiety about the laws being enacted. Possibly also—in connection with another circumstance to be mentioned later—it gives us a clue as to the date of Shakespeare's flight, or removal to London, which, in our opinion, took place in the spring or summer of 1585. That Sir Thomas may have threatened "to make a Star Chamber matter of it"—as Shallow says in "The Merry Wives"—is by no means unlikely;[1] for being a justice of the peace in the county, a sheriff for the time being, and a royal commissioner on various special occasions (for instance, in the subsequent inquiry concerning the recusants), Sir Thomas stood "in some authority under the Queen," as Shallow says of himself ("Henry IV." 2nd Part, v. 3). Accordingly, when Shakespeare and his companions went deer-stealing in Sir Thomas's park, it was not merely an act of mere youthful frolic, but also a result of the ill-feeling entertained by the Stratford people towards the Lucies; for as the owner of a deer-park he would be looked upon as an upstart, and, like most upstarts, may have overshot his mark and exposed himself to ridicule, contempt, and raillery.

That deer-stealing was not, in any way, considered a dishonourable proceeding in Shakespeare's day, is clearly evident from many circumstances; and indeed, from its first occurrence up to our own day, has never been regarded by the people at large, or by the law, as a mean or disreputable species of theft. Froude[2] says: "No English peasant could be convinced that there was any moral crime in appropriating the wild game. It was an offence against statute law, but no offence against natural law; and it was rather a trial of skill between the noble who sought to monopolize a right which seemed to be common to all, and those who would succeed, if

[1] And, in fact, his son (also called Sir Thomas Lucy) brought a case of poaching, committed by some of the inhabitants of Rock in Sutton Park, before the Star Chamber in 1610.—See, Thomas E. Winnington in *Notes and Queries*, 4th series, v., March 5, 1870, p. 257. See also, *Notes and Queries*, 3rd series, xii. p. 181 and p. 234.

[2] Froude, *History of England*, 2nd ed. (1858), i. 66 ff.

they could, in securing their own share of it. If deer-stealing was a sin, it was more than compensated by the risk of the penalty to which those who failed were submitted." Lawful as well as unlawful hunting has always been associated with a certain poetic glory and renown. Deer-stealing was the origin of the tragic feuds between the Douglasses and the Percies, celebrated in the beautiful ballad of "Chevy Chase;" and Robin Hood's deer-stealing forms the subject of a gay and popular legend. In Queen Elizabeth's day, and even later, deer-stealing was considered a gentlemanly and noble sport, as we find it called in a MS. comedy entitled "The Wizard":[1]—

> Gentlemanlike! he ne'er kept horse
> Nor hounds; you might as soon have got him to
> The gallows, as to th' stealing of a deer:
> Since he has made a journey to London,
> Shall have him in the twelve-penny seat at
> Playhouses, ne'er sit in the stage pit.

In "The Merry Devil of Edmonton" (1608) we have a case of poaching, in which even the parson, Sir John, takes part, and which all those who had a hand in it frankly proclaim a merry, successful joke. In Dodsley[2] it is said of the parson: "the stove priest steals more venison than half the country." Another poaching priest, who hunted rabbits on a large scale, we meet with in "A Hundred Merry Tales;"[3] he is not only accompanied by a few assistants, but is provided with a net, hay, and ferrets, and then places the rabbits that have been caught upon a horse, brought with them for the purpose. In "The Hector of Germanie" (1615) the page says: "I hold it [viz., my office] not by patent, for term of life, nor for years: but as young gentlemen get venison upon sufferance, or by stealth."

Raynolds—who wrote against the theatre in 1599—classes the stealing of deer and the stealing of fruit together, as of equal importance, and the Oxford students seem to have reckoned the stealing of deer as one of their academic sports. At all events, it is related of Sir Thornbury, who afterwards became Bishop of Limerick, and of his cousin Sir Pinkney, that "they never studied nor gave themselves to their bookes, but to goe to scolles of defence, to the daunceing scolles, to

[1] Written about 1640; Brit. Museum, MSS. Addit. 10,306, i. 1, p. 3.
[2] Edited by Hazlitt, x. 246.
[3] In Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, ii. 263.

stealle dear and conyes, and to hunt the hare, and to woinge of wentches."[1] Earl Shrewsbury wrote to his wife concerning their son Charles Cavendish, the younger brother of the first Lord Cavendish: "I would have you provide for Charles, your son; he is easily led to folly; for within two nights after you went from me, his man Morton enticed his master, Blithe, and my armourer to go stealing into Staveley Park in the night; and I would wish you to advise him from these doings, lest some mischief come thereby to his harm and your grief."[2] According to this, and if we believe the tradition, Shakespeare is in no way accused of any mean crime, but merely of a venturesome, reckless, youthful frolic.

And the tradition deserves all the more to be believed, for not only—as already pointed out—is it in perfect accordance with actual facts, but because it has been handed down to us from three different sources, entirely independent of one another, and this naturally adds in no small measure to its trustworthiness.[3] The tradition was, on the one hand, related by Rowe in his Life of Shakespeare, and Rowe probably obtained it from Betterton's investigations in Stratford. In a second form we have it from Davies, who between 1688-1707 added supplementary remarks to Fulman's "Notes on the most eminent English Poets."[4] These Notes, as is proved by various circumstances, Rowe did not know; in fact, they were first brought to light by Malone in his Life of Shakespeare, who obtained them from the library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. A third testimony is furnished by Capell, in connection with a Mr. Jones of Tarbick, whose communications were handed over to Oldys and Capell. "Mr. Jones," says Capell, "who dwelt at Tarbick, a village in Worcestershire, a

[1] This was in 1573. From Dr. Simon Forman's *Autobiography*, in Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 128. According to Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 208, rabbits were not protected by law at all, between the reigns of Henry VIII. and James I., and hence might be killed by anyone; they were *feræ naturæ*.—In contradistinction to all other writers, Harrison (ed. Furnivall, p. xxi. and 224) classes nocturnal poachers together with street-robbers, pickpockets, coiners, &c., and says that they were punished by death.

[2] Hunter's *Illustrations*, i. 55.

[3] See more especially Herman Kurz, *l. c.*

[4] The Rev. William Fulman (died 1688) left his papers to the Rev. Richard Davies, Rector of Sapperton in Gloucestershire and Archdeacon of Lichfield (died 1708), and the latter's papers after his death all came to Oxford.

few miles from Stratford-on-Avon, and died in the year 1703, aged upwards of ninety, remembered to have heard from several old people at Stratford, the story of Shakespeare robbing Sir Thomas Lucy's park." This same Mr. Jones is said to have jotted down the verse in which Shakespeare ridiculed the knight:—

A parliamente member, a justice of peace,
At home a poore scare-crow, at London an asse;
If lowsie is Lucy, as some volke miscalle it;[1]
Then Lucy is lowsie, whatever befalle it:
He thinkes himself greate,
Yet an asse is his state
We allowe by his eares but with asses to mate.
If Lucy is lowsy, as some volke miscalle it,
Sing lowsie Lucy, whatever befalle it.[2]

Capell's grandfather on his mother's side—Thomas Wilkes—is said to have repeated these lines from memory to Capell's father, and the latter it was who jotted them down. This is Capell's story, and he may be considered perfectly trustworthy; his version of the lines, moreover, tallies almost exactly with those given by Oldys. Critics differ in their judgment as to the genuineness of these lines; in my opinion they are anything but Shakespearean in tone, and notwithstanding all the external reasons adduced in their favour, we cannot admit their genuineness. A second verse, given by Hunter,[3] is emphatically not genuine, and very possibly is the production of John Jordan, a local poet in Stratford, whose acquaintance we shall make in a subsequent chapter. A second lampoon, by which Shakespeare is said to have avenged himself against Sir Thomas, cannot possibly have been in any way connected with the above lines, and comes with no good recommendation to begin with:—

Sir Thomas was too covetous
To covet so much deer,
When horns enough upon his head
Most plainly did appear.

[1] The people of the district, it is said, pronounce lowsie like Lucy. See Drake, i. 405. Compare Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, 229 f.

[2] This lampoon has been spun out to seven verses, and is printed in W. Harvey's edition of *Shakespeare's Works* (Lond. 1825), and thence entered in the *Diary of the Rev. John Ward*, ed. Severn, p. 47 f.

[3] *Illustrations*, i. 53 ff.

Had not his Worship one deer left?
What then? He had a wife
Took pains enough to find him horns
Should last him during life.

These verses were obtained from a MS. History of the Stage written between 1727-1737, which contains numerous fabrications. The unknown author states that "the learned Mr. Joshua Barnes, late Greek Professor of the University of Cambridge, baiting about forty years ago at an inn in Stratford, and hearing an old woman singing part of the above-said song, such was his respect for Mr. Shakspeare's genius, that he gave her a new gown for the two following stanzas in it (*i.e.*, the verses quoted above); and, could she have said it all, he would, as he often said in company, when any discourse has casually arose about him, have given her ten guineas."[1] According to this account, it would certainly seem as if the lines, "Sir Thomas was too covetous," &c., were a continuation of "A parliamente member," &c., to which, however, they do not correspond either in rhythm or tone. All this is very suspicious, and however frequently the play upon the words *deer* and *dear* appears to have been in Shakespeare's mind, the verses would seem best left to themselves. And yet it is both remarkable and strange that in the words engraved on the tombstone erected in memory of Lady Lucy in 1596, Sir Thomas seems anxious to defend her from some sort of gossip. The words on her tombstone are: "never detected of any crime or vice . . . . in love to her husband most faithful and true . . . . misliked of none unless the envious." Hunter[2] gives the words in full, whereas Knight[3] omits the introductory words, which, it is true, are of no essential importance to the point in question. Hunter decides in considering the verses as genuine, and Kurz—who has not made use of Hunter's work—seems, at heart, also inclined to believe in their genuineness; he says, "if they are fabrications, they are, at all events, good fabrications." The inscription on Lady Lucy's tombstone, he says, was either "a monstrous absurdity, or a proof that Sir Thomas had reason to defend his wife's memory from gossip." It seems to me very likely

[1] Drake, i. 406. According to another version, the two verses were found in an old drawer in Stratford.

[2] In his *Illustrations.*

[3] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 210.

that the Stratford people were as little disposed to be friendly in their feelings towards Lady Lucy as towards her husband, and that she was not held in any special esteem by them, for, in all probability, she was her husband's worthy partner in inhospitable stinginess, as well as in aristocratic arrogance; that Sir Thomas was not wanting in this latter quality will be proved immediately. The building of his mansion, the visit of the Queen, and the laying-out of the deer-park, must certainly have made great demands upon Sir Thomas's purse, and both husband and wife may have thought that by exercising economy towards their neighbours in Stratford (whom no doubt they considered much beneath them) they might retrieve their expenses. The Stratford people, on their side, would express their dislike and ill-feeling towards the lady as well as towards her husband, and hence it is the most natural thing possible that mischievous and exaggerated reports about them should have arisen. These reports, which were handed down from mouth to mouth, and became exaggerated accordingly, might quite well have reached the ears of the unknown author of the abusive lines, so that the agreement between the latter and the words on the tombstone, cannot in any way seem surprising.

With regard to Shakespeare's having stolen deer, we have, however, another proof of a very different kind; for, considering all things, it is hardly possible to do otherwise than to regard the allusions in the Induction to "The Merry Wives of Windsor" as evidence in favour of the supposition.[1] Even Davies observes that Shakespeare's feeling of revenge (we would ask what about?) was so great that he depicted

[1] The following passages also are brought forward in connection with the deer-stealing, inasmuch as they seem, at all events, to confirm the poet's knowledge of hunting. In the first place the description of the "timorous flying hare" in *Venus and Adonis;* further, the very suspicious words of Prince Demetrius in *Titus Andronicus* (ii. 1):—

What, hast not thou full often struck a doe,
And borne her cleanly by the keeper's nose?

The description of the dying stag in *As You Like It* (ii. 1) strikes one as very like an experience of the poet's own; even the brook, *i.e.* the Avon, is not wanting—it is clearly a scene he witnessed himself on the banks of that river. Remarkable also is the knowledge he exhibits when describing the characteristics of hounds (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, iv. 1, and *The Comedy of Errors*, iv. 2) and the division of the spoil (*The Merry Wives*, v. 5): "Divide me like a brib'd buck," &c.

Sir Thomas in his Justice Clodpate, and, in allusion to Sir Thomas's name, gave him three "louses rampant" for his coat-of-arms and called him "a great man." This latter appellation is not, indeed, found in the play, but the aristocratic pride and the official conceit of Justice Shallow are conspicuous in all his utterances; besides in the lampoon, too, we have the words, "he thinks himself great," so it is surely a justifiable conclusion to maintain that Sir Thomas was as conceited and arrogant as he was inhospitable and mean.[1] At any rate Justice Shallow is the portrait of Sir Thomas; the arms of the Lucy family were, in fact, "three luces hariant en argent."[2] Shallow says, with a feeling of great satisfaction, "it is an old coat," and this is probably intended to be a squib from Sir Thomas at the new coat-of-arms of the Shakespeares. The thanks expressed by the page for the venison that has been received, is an unmistakable hit at Sir Thomas's meanness for ignoring the time-honoured custom of occasionally presenting gifts to the Corporation. The "coney-catching rascals, Bardolph, Nym, and Pistol," stand for the poet's comrades, who, as the word "coney-catching" (with its double meaning) gives us to understand, fetched rabbits from the warrens at Charlecote when there were no bucks to be had.[3] Shallow's threat that "the council shall hear it; it is a riot," remind one of the "ryot" made by the thirty-five Stratford men "upon Master Thomas Lucy, esquier," which

[1] In order to complete the delineation of Sir Thomas's character, Herm. Kurz, *l. c.*, also refers to that Sir William Lucy (perhaps an ancestor), who in *Henry VI.*, 1*st Part*, iv. 7, talks so grandiloquently about the title and distinctions of the fallen Talbot. The love of titles exhibited by "Robert Shallow, Esquire, in the county of Gloucester, justice of peace, and Corum and Custalorum and Rotalorum too," who can subscribe "in any bill, warrant, quittance or obligation Armiger," does certainly seem to correspond very well with the rest, and the poet's satire can distinctly be read between the lines.

[2] Drake says (i. 402): "The Luce or Pike is very abundant in this part of the Avon, and there may still be seen in the kitchen of Charlecot-House, the representation of a pike, weighing forty pounds, native of this stream, and caught in the year 1640."

[3] "We gather from Decker's *English Villanies* that formerly the sharpers termed their gang a warren, and their simple victims rabbit-suckers, or conies." Harting, *The Ornithology of Shakespeare* (London, 1871), p. 149.—"The coney is called the first year a rabbet, and afterwards an old coney." R. Blome, *The Gentleman's Recreation* (1686), in Harting, *l. c.*, p. 12.—Rabbits were caught in nets. See *As You Like It*, iii. 2; *King Henry VI.*, 3*rd Part*, i. 4.

no doubt enraged Lucy, whereas Falstaff's words, "I will answer it straight; I have done all this. That is now answered," is a frank and honest confession of the poet's, who with manly uprightness acknowledges an escapade done in his younger days, and which, he considered, had created too much stir at the time.[1] And in the poet's idea Sir Thomas—who, as most others of his rank would have done, ought to have ignored the matter, in place of raising a storm about it—deserved to be ridiculed for his stupidity and arrogance. If we are not mistaken, those who knew the circumstances must have burst out into a Homeric peal of laughter at this introductory scene in "The Merry Wives of Windsor," and we cannot conceive a greater triumph for the poet and his companions over their old antagonist than the performance of the play in Stratford. However, the passion for theatrical representations had, meanwhile, been retiring out of sight before the advance of Puritanism. That Shakespeare has cunningly woven several allusions from his youthful days into his "Merry Wives of Windsor," has already been stated when we discussed the boy William's school knowledge; the story of Cousin Garmombles is another proof of this.[2] The poet may be said to have himself enjoyed these jokes.

We have seen that both the satirical allusion to Sir Thomas in "The Merry Wives," and the supposed lampoon, are described as an act of revenge on the part of the poet. And it is said on all sides that Sir Thomas "prosecuted" Shakespeare, yet it is not evident anywhere at what court he was prosecuted, or with what result; and, indeed, it is not at all likely that any such thing occurred. Sir Thomas was himself a justice of the peace—perhaps even a sheriff. And if Shakespeare had poached in Sir Thomas's park—once or fre-

[1] "*De toutes les sottises de Falstaff, la seule dont il ne soit pas puni, c'est d'avoir 'tué le daim et battu les gens' de Shallow, exploit d'alleurs beaucoup plus conforme à l'idée que Shakespeare pouvait avoir conservée de sa propre jeunesse, qu'à celle qu'il nous a donné du vieux chevalier, d'ordinaire plutôt battu que battant. Tout l'avantage resta à Falstaff dans cette affaire, et Shallow, si clairement désigne par les armes de la famille de Lucy, n'est nulle part aussi ridicule que dans la scène où il exhale sa colère contre son voleur de gibier. . . . À coup sûr, peu d'anecdotes historiques peuvent produire, en faveur de leur authenticité, des preuves morales aussi concluantes.*"—Guizot, *Shakespeare et son Temps* (Paris, 1852), 32 ff.

[2] The latter incident occurs in *The Merry Wives*, iv. 5, 79, but only in the quarto edition of 1602, *not* in the folio.

quently—there would have been no cause for Shakespeare having to "avenge" himself, even though Sir Thomas had interfered and threatened him with legal proceedings; the question of revenge would have devolved more upon Sir Thomas. Something, however, must have occurred to have led Shakespeare to believe himself aggrieved, and to have called forth so strong and enduring a feeling of revenge. Something most vexatious it must assuredly have been that induced the genial and gentle-minded poet, after the lapse of some years, to pour forth his satire with such annihilating acumen, and we are involuntarily reminded of Davies's words that Shakespeare was "oft whipt and sometimes imprisoned" by Sir Thomas. That the actual facts have been exaggerated and vulgarized by reckless reports seems obvious, and yet it is by conjecture only that we can here separate truth from fiction. It does not seem to us to exceed the bounds of probability to conceive the case to have been somewhat as follows. Shakespeare and his companions may have frequently gone on poaching expeditions into Charlecote Park, perhaps even into Fulbroke Park; for having been successful on the first occasion, this would only have led them to wish to repeat the venture, and then, too, there was less danger in such an affray in those days, when a crossbow took the place of a rifle. Sir Thomas would hear of the matter, but before he could punish the offenders he had to find out who they were and get them into his power. Accordingly, he would arrange for some of his men to watch for the unbidden nocturnal guests, and order his men to give the intruders a pretty good cudgelling, or to seize them and have them locked up *brevi manu* in the keeper's lodge or elsewhere. One of these orders, or both perhaps, may have been carried out. Now the young scapegraces probably regarded such treatment, for what they considered gentlemanly sport, as unheard-of and intolerable, and perhaps determined to give tit for tat. They would return in larger numbers, cudgel Sir Thomas's men, and break into the lodge; it is likely enough they had no time for kissing the keeper's daughter,[1] as they may have been accused of doing, or may have them-

[1] "But not kissed your keeper's daughter?" is given in the form of a question in the first folio. Falstaff thinks it would have been as great a misdemeanour as killing the knight's deer and cudgelling his men, and that this crime might also be laid to their charge. The story reminds us involuntarily

selves wished to do. Sir Thomas would be enraged at this, and threaten, in all seriousness, to bring the matter before the Star Chamber. An ordinary law court, it seems, could not deal with such matters, as no law existed for any such proceedings, or because Sir Thomas's deer-park was not one acknowledged by the law. The misdemeanour was, in fact, not punishable by law, and it was only in consequence of Shakespeare's deer-stealing that Sir Thomas introduced his bill for the protection of game. Shakespeare may have then considered it his wisest plan to avoid, as far as possible, Sir Thomas's anger and persecution.[1] Whether or not he stuck the lampoon, "A parliamente man," on the park-gates, as a friendly remembrance, before leaving Stratford, is of little importance, but it is, at all events, not unlikely. Kurz thinks that if Sir Thomas did not possess an actual deer-park, there would, of course, have been no park-gates or lodge. Yet Kurz himself assumes that Sir Thomas possessed a rabbit-warren and kept deer there; accordingly, he must have had a keeper or overseer of the warren, the more so as it was his ambition to ex-

of a passage in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Knight of the Burning Pestle*, i. 1, which would almost seem to be an allusion to Shakespeare:—

> Hum. *But how far*
> *Is it now distant from the place we are in*
> *Unto that blessed place, your father's warren?*
> Luce. *What makes you think of that, sir?*
> Hum. *Even that face;*
> *For stealing rabbits whilome in that place,*
> *God Cupid, or the keeper, I know not whether,*
> *Unto my cost and charges brought you thither,*
> *And there begun—*
> Luce. *Your game, sir?*
> Hum. *Let no game,*
> *Or anything that tendeth to the same,*
> *Be ever more remember'd, thou fair killer,*
> *For whom I sate me down, and broke my tiller.*

[1] In R. Gr. White, *Shakespeare's Works*, i. xliii., there is a note (without any reference to his authority) to the effect that Sir Thomas refrained from prosecuting Shakespeare at the intercession of the Earl of Leicester. Now, as we have already seen, Leicester had formerly had one Arden in his service, but he had long since fallen into disfavour with the Earl, and indeed, in 1583, Leicester managed to have him executed. Under these circumstances it is not probable that the Shakespeare family would have applied to him, and the Earl, on the other hand, is not likely to have interfered without having been applied to.

tend and to improve it, and the keeper would certainly have had a lodge in the enclosure. Those who may think this inference not sufficiently justified, will find in Shakespeare an express confirmation of the fact that even a warren always had its keeper's lodge: "I found him here as melancholy as a lodge in a warren," says Benedict in "Much Ado About Nothing," ii. 1.

One other remark must be added here, although this may not be the place for us to give the details in full. If it is admitted that the Induction to "The Merry Wives" is a hit at Sir Thomas Lucy, the piece must necessarily have been written during Sir Thomas's lifetime.[1] For, apart from the fact that the satire would have failed in its object after Sir Thomas's death, no one would surely imagine Shakespeare capable, as it were, of kicking a dead adversary, even though anything but a lion. Sir Thomas Lucy died in 1600, whereas "The Merry Wives" was not entered in the books of the Stationers' Company till 1601, and appeared in print in 1602. It is, however, a well-known fact that plays were often, nay regularly, put upon the stage long before there was any intention of having them published. Hence there is nothing to prevent our assuming "The Merry Wives" to have been written somewhat earlier, and this is probable for other reasons as well.[2]

Accordingly, the deer-stealing, with its threatening consequences, the smallness of Shakespeare's income, and the unhappiness of his married life, led to the turning-point in the poet's career. In January, 1585, Anne gave birth to twins, and if the supposition is not too bold a one, Shakespeare may have gone upon his last and memorable poaching expedition to procure a roast for the christening feast.[3] The baptism took place on the 2nd of February, and the twin children received the names of Hamlet (or Hamnet)[4] and Judith, evidently

[1] Ch. A. Brown (*Autobiographical Poems*, pp. 21-23) asserts that Sir Thomas Lucy was dead when *The Merry Wives* was put on the stage, and for this reason also declares himself opposed to the whole story of the deer-stealing.

[2] Kurz, *Shakespeare's Leben und Schaffen*, 101 ff., assumes the year 1595, and Knight, *Studies of Shakspere*, places *The Merry Wives* previous to *Henry IV.* and *Henry V.* The mention of the Cotswold plays in *The Merry Wives* (i. 1) does not oppose this date; see Drake, i. 254.

[3] In *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* the booty obtained from a poaching expedition is used for a wedding breakfast.

[4] In the ancient Stratford documents published by Halliwell the name is spelt Amblett, Hamlet, and Hamnet.

after their god-parents, Hamlet and Judith Sadler. This unexpected addition to his family must have increased the difficulty of his position to the utmost, and have placed the young father in the inevitable necessity of taking some decisive step to secure the proper means of providing for his family; the more so as the birth of a son and heir to his name must have rendered this a special matter of interest. For what father does not feel his heart filled with joy and hope at the birth of a son? And all the more must such golden dreams of the future have arisen in Shakespeare's heart, for, in addition to the usual parental feelings, the impetuosity of his poetic and imaginative faculties were only waiting for an opportunity to press onwards towards their goal. The opportunity and the goal were, however, only to be found in London, of which the popular idea is still that its streets are paved with gold. And Shakespeare's inclination and his genius would naturally drive him to a literary career and to the stage—the stage which represents the world, and which had seemed to him, even as a boy, to embody the whole ideal world. The fact of his giving up his employment as an attorney's clerk seems to require but little explanation. To be engaged indoors doing clerical work was not to his liking, and can hardly have been his own choice—it had, in fact, been his father's choice for him. What poetic youth would ever have wavered between the study for a profession and entering the service of the Muses, unless indeed he were bound by outward circumstances? That a transition of this kind was not a rare occurrence in Shakespeare's day is proved by Beaumont's case, and many others. There is, indeed, reason to believe that Shakespeare had latterly begun to show inattention to his office work, which in the first instance he may have undertaken with zeal, perhaps even with a certain amount of enthusiasm.

In Shakespeare's mind, accordingly, various circumstances —one stronger than the other—concurred to make his decision take actual shape; what the circumstance was that induced him to take the decisive step he may have been unconscious of himself, much less can we venture to point out what it may have been. Like his own Prince Hal, he banished from him the lower interests of life amidst which he had hitherto been living, and by a bold act rose to higher regions, the highest and brightest point in which he was himself destined to occupy.

Prince Hal mounted the throne of England, Shakespeare the throne of dramatic poetry.

It may appear doubtful whether Shakespeare—at the time of his flight, or removal to London—intended to devote himself mainly to literary work, or to the stage. Knight[1] is probably right in coming to the conclusion that it was to follow a literary career, and believes that Shakespeare became an actor because he was a dramatic writer, and not a dramatic writer because he was an actor. According to all internal evidence, the probability is that he went to London with some play or other in his pocket, in order to get this mental child of his published there, much as Schiller did when he left Stuttgart with the MS. of his "Fiesco." Like all young poets he, no doubt, hoped to win a pile of gold with it, and he was infinitely less deceived in his expectations than thousands of others have been. The pile of gold was, however, not to be found in the literary field, but—as we know from undoubted testimony—in theatrical work. Shakespeare must have come to see this soon after his arrival in London, if indeed he had not become convinced of the fact before leaving Stratford. This circumstance would enable him to disregard the low estimation in which actors were held in those days, and which he was himself to feel in after years. Probably it was not so much his innate fondness for the stage as his desire thoroughly and lastingly to improve his own and his comrades' position, that determined his choice. If he had not found himself in needy or pressing circumstances, perhaps he would not have become an actor, in spite of the partiality for the profession which he undoubtedly possessed.

The year 1586 or 1587 is generally accepted as the date when Shakespeare severed himself from his home, although there are no distinct reasons to give in favour of this supposition. I have already expressed it as my conviction that Shakespeare must have left for London in the spring or summer of 1585, and have also stated my reasons for assuming this earlier date.[2] Not only do all the circumstances appear to favour this supposition, but seem actually to force one to accept this date: the birth of the twins and the memorable case of deer stealing, which must be assigned to the first months of the year 1585,

[1] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, 283 ff.

[2] F. G. Fleay in his *Shakespeare Manual*, p. 297, is of the same opinion, and points out that Shakespeare attained his majority in that year.

because shortly afterwards we find Sir Thomas Lucy in parliament very anxious about the passing of measures to protect his game. There is, however, another circumstance that speaks in favour of 1585. We have seen that Shakespeare in 1589 was already sufficiently worthy of note to be attacked by Thomas Nash, and in all probability (in addition to other plays) "Hamlet" had already then been put upon the stage in its first form. In the following year (1590) he probably wrote "A Midsummer Night's Dream," and in 1592 had attained an eminent position both as regards celebrity as well as pecuniary means, so that Robert Greene could quite well (in his posthumous pamphlet, "A Groatsworth of Wit") designate him as "an absolute Johannes Factotum in his own conceit, the only Shake-scene in a country." Shakespeare's career—astonishing as was the quickness with which he reached the highest summit—would appear almost miraculous were it assumed that he attained such eminence in four or five years. In fact, the latest investigations show that the dates accepted by earlier biographers and commentators in connection with Shakespeare's life were almost invariably fixed at too late a period. Shakespeare, like Ben Jonson, began his career very early and rose very speedily; but nevertheless the speedy rise must not be referred exclusively to the first years of his sojourn in London; it has to be distributed equally over the whole course of his career. For these reasons we maintain the year 1585 to have been the Hegira of Shakespeare, as it has frequently been called.[1]

[1] Here again we meet with a perplexing difficulty. In *The Castell of Courtesie, Chariot of Chastitie, and Diana and Venus*, by James Yates, Servingman, London, 1582, John Wolfe, 4to., there are on p. 16: "*Verses written at the Departure of his friend W. S. when hee went to Dwell in London*," where there is much the same play upon the name Will as in Sonnets 135, 136, 143. Can this W. S. have been William Shakespeare? If so, then he must have made an endeavour to move to London before 1582, which would correspond with a supposition of Lord Campbell's to be spoken of immediately. Anne Hathaway may, in that case, have even fetched back the runaway, to make him attend to his duties towards her. We here lose our footing altogether, yet the circumstance seems to deserve a closer examination. According to Drake, i. p. 707, there seems to exist but a single copy of *The Castell of Courtesie;* unfortunately he does not state anything further about it.—Compare *Censura Litteraria*, iii. p. 175, and Fennell's *Shakespeare Repository*, p. 6.

Chapter III.

LONDON.

We have not the smallest evidence as to how or why Shakespeare went to London, and are at liberty, therefore, to imagine it in whatever way we may feel disposed. The main point is, whether we have to deal with the question of actual flight, or simply with a removal to London. Did Shakespeare leave his native town secretly or with the knowledge and consent of his family? Did his wife let him go willingly, or was it as much Shakespeare's object to escape from his wife as from Sir Thomas Lucy? These are questions to which we have no answer, except the conjectures made from the picture we may have formed of the poet's character, his domestic circumstances, and his whole position in life. If there were reasons for his having to take to flight, his experiences may, perhaps, have been something similar to those which befell a young man from his own county a few years later, a young man who may even possibly have been a distant relative of Shakespeare's. This was John Sadler; and, Hunter[1] thinks, he was a nephew of Hamlet Sadler and a brother-in-law of one Quiney, whose daughter gives the following account of the turning-point in his life.[2] The father of this John Sadler was a person of good substance in Stratford, having had, according to the narrative of his granddaughter, Mrs. Walker, £400 a year, which by his generous living he reduced to £80. He had found out a marriage for his son, and as Mrs. Walker tells us, provided him with good

[1] *Illustrations*, i. 69.

[2] *The Holy Life of Mrs. Elizabeth Walker, late Wife of A. Walker, D.D., Rector of Fyfield, in Essex*, London, 1690, 8vo.—In the reprint of this book (ed. by the Rev. J. W. Brooks, Lond., 1823) the passage in question is omitted.

clothes, a good horse, and money in his purse, and sent him to make his addresses to a gentlewoman in the country. But the son having considered the difficulties of a married condition, instead of going a-wooing, "joined himself to the carrier,[1] and came to London, where he had never been before, and sold his horse in Smithfield; and having no acquaintance in London to recommend him or assist him, he went from street to street, and house to house, asking if they wanted an apprentice, and though he met with many discouraging scorns and a thousand denials, he went on till he light on Mr. Brokesbank, a grocer in Bucklersbury, who, though he long denied him for want of sureties for his fidelity, and because the money he had (but ten pounds) was so disproportionate to what he used to receive with apprentices, yet, upon his discreet account he gave of himself, and the motives which put him upon that course, and promise to compensate with diligent and faithful service whatever else was short of his expectation, he ventured to receive him upon trial, in which he so well approved himself that he accepted him into his service, to which he bound him for eight years."

[1] Thornbury (*Shakespeare's England*, i. 342, and ii. 26)—unfortunately without stating his authority—says that towards 1564 large covered waggons were employed between Canterbury, Norwich, Ipswich, and other places, to take travellers and packages to London. Milton has written two epitaphs on the Cambridge "University Carrier," Thomas Hobson. This Hobson, who was born in 1544, had travelled from Cambridge to London and back, regularly once a week, between the years 1564 (the year of Shakespeare's birth) and 1631, the year of his own death, and had made a goodly amount of money in this way, as well as by his agricultural pursuits, beer-brewing, and his inn. Hobson is said to have been the first person to let out horses on hire in England, and proved himself as honest and as reliable a man in this branch of his business as in his other pursuits. Travellers had to take his horses in turn (hence the proverbial expression "Hobson's choice"). In *King Henry IV.*, Part I., ii. 1, the carriers certainly have no waggon, but pack-horses, and the one man has to take, among other things, a gammon of bacon, the other, a turkey, to London. For security's sake, other travellers might have joined such an expedition, for the road between Rochester and London had a specially bad name. See Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, 49 and 219 ff. It is very likely that covered waggons eventually took the place of pack-horses upon this road as well as upon the others. How flourishing and fully developed the business of carriers had become in 1637 is evident from *The Carriers Cosmographie*, published in that year by John Taylor the Water-Poet. It is the Bradshaw of its day. It does not, however, mention any carrier from Stratford, but certainly carriers from Warwick and "divers parts of Warwickshire;" the places, however, are not specified. Also carriers from Oxford, Woodstock, &c.

A very different course has to be conceived if, with Lord Campbell, we assume that Shakespeare had previously been to London when attending to some small legal matters for his employer, and hence that the poet was not an utter stranger to the place. It is even likely that upon some such occasion Shakespeare may have visited one or other of the London theatres. As regards the supposition brought forward by R. Gr. White[1]—that Shakespeare's object in going to London was the hope of being able to follow the legal profession with more success in the metropolis—seems but little probable after what has been stated in our last chapter.

The only thing that can be inferred with any degree of certainty from a series of facts and allusions is, that Shakespeare knew several persons settled in London, and that one or other of them may have lent him a helping hand. First and foremost among these were James and Richard Burbage, in regard to whom even Malone maintained that they were Warwickshire men, and Knight and Collier agree with him in this.[2] We have, indeed, no actual proof of this, yet we know for certain that the name of Burbage, like that of Shakespeare, was widely distributed over Warwickshire and the neighbouring counties, more especially Herefordshire, and that one or more families of the name had settled in Stratford towards the end of the sixteenth century; one John Burbage, in 1555, was a bailiff there, and on the 12th of October, 1565, one Ursula Burbage was married to Robert Greene.[3] It is possible that young Burbage had acted with the Servants of the Earl of Leicester in Stratford, and that Shakespeare may have made his acquaintance on that occasion. John Heminge also, the subsequent publisher of the first folio, appears to have belonged to Stratford or Shottery, where, according to Malone, two families of this name resided. Elizabeth Heminge, daughter of one John Heminge of Shottery, was baptized at Stratford on the 12th of March, 1597, and Richard Heminge, also of

[1] *Shakespeare's Works*, i. xlviii. ff.

[2] See Note in *Spenser's Works*, ed. Collier, i. xi. The letter which Collier publishes from Lord Southampton to Lord Ellesmere, in which it is stated that Shakespeare and Burbage are "both of one countie and indeede almost of one towne," is not genuine.—Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, 496 ff.

[3] See Collier, *Memoirs of the Principal Actors*, pp. 2 and 12; Malone, in Drake, i. 417.—See also *Outlines*, ii. 344.

Shottery, had a son of his baptized on the 7th of March, 1570. The fact of the actor's name (John Heminge) not being found in the Stratford church-register, Malone accounts for by assuming that he was born before 1558, which is not improbable. With regard to the distinguished comedian Thomas Greene, Malone's conjecture goes so far even as to suppose that he was a connection of Shakespeare's.[1] However, the genuineness of the lines quoted by Chetwood from "The Two Maids of Moreclack," upon which Malone bases his supposition, are extremely doubtful; yet it is not impossible that the "Thomas Greene alias Shakspere," who was buried at Stratford on the 6th of March, 1589, was the father of the actor and a relative of Shakespeare's. Richard Field also, a man in no way connected with the stage, who was, in fact, a printer, is also said to have come to London from Shakespeare's county. It was Field who printed Shakespeare's "Venus and Adonis," and his "Lucrece;" at all events Collier maintains that he found the following entry in the books of the Stationers' Company, under the date of 10th of August, 1579: "Richard Feylde, sonne of Henry Feilde, of Stratford-upon-Avon, in the countye of Warwick, tanner, hath put him selfe apprentis to george bishop, citizen and stacioner of London, for vii yeres from Michaelmas next."[2] According to this, Richard would be a son of the Henry Field of whose property the poet's father had to make a valuation in 1592. It is strange, certainly, that Malone, Steevens, and Chalmers, among others, have been unable to find this entry on looking through the books of the Stationers' Company, an entry that looks suspicious even from the fulness of the details; it is even stranger, however, that the conjectures which Collier brings forward in his "Memoirs of the Principal Actors," respecting R. Field, should be confirmed by this very entry, almost word for word. It can only be hoped that Collier has not again, as upon a previous occasion, come for-

[1] See Drake, *l.c.*; Dodsley, ed. Hazlitt, xi. 175 ff.

[2] J. P. Collier, *Richard Field* (the printer of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*), *Nathaniel Field, Anthony Munday, and Henry Chettle* in *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iv. 36-40; *Spenser's Works*, ed. Collier, i. lxxi.—Below the above quotation is added the further remark: "It is agreed that this Apprentis shall serve the first vi yeres of his apprenticeship with the said Vautrollier whose name is inserted in the margin to learne the arte of printinge, and the vii^th yere with the said g. bishop." How extraordinary! Why the last year with a different employer?

ward with a spurious document. With greater certainty we may assume that William Warner, the author of "Albion's England" (1586), and Michael Drayton, the author of "Polyolbion," came from Warwickshire, while the sonnet-writer Daniel, Shakespeare's model, was married to a lady from Warwickshire, or, at least, was in love with some such lady, whom he addresses as Delia, and says she lived by the Avon.[1] Drayton, who, according to Aubrey, was born in 1563, in Atherston-upon-Stour (or in the neighbouring village, Harshul), the son of a butcher, was certainly an early acquaintance of Shakespeare's, as may be inferred from the praise he gives to Shakespeare's "Lucrece," in his poem entitled, "Mathilda the chast, daughter to the Lord Robert Fitzwater" (1594);[2] besides, Drayton is mentioned by name, shortly before Shakespeare's death, as having been an acquaintance or guest of the poet's at Stratford. Even Spenser—although undoubtedly born in London, may possibly have lived in Warwickshire for a time, where his father seems to have settled at Kingsbury in 1569.[3] Collier, in endeavouring to show Spenser's connection with Warwickshire, points to the circumstance that in 1596 he had the first six Books of his "Fairy Queen" printed by Richard Field, whom he had been induced to employ as they both belonged to the same county.

According to a new and very unexpected hypothesis, which, however, does not seem to be meant altogether seriously, William Blades makes out that—owing to the intimate knowledge of the art of printing exhibited in his works—Shakespeare, before becoming an actor, must for about three years have been employed in the printing establishment of Thomas Vautrollier, not, indeed, as a type-setter, but perhaps as a reader or some sort of assistant.[4] Shakespeare is said to have

[1] *Spenser's Works*, ed. Collier, i. x. note; Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, 395 ff.—With regard to Warner, see Wood's *Athen. Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, i. 765.

[2] Drake, i. 615 ff., ii. 39; Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse* (2nd ed.), p. 13.

[3] *Spenser's Works*, ed. Collier, i. ix. ff.; Collier, *Shakespeare's Works* (1858), i. 95.

[4] *Shakspere and Typography; being an Attempt to show Shakspere's Personal Connection with, and Technical Knowledge of, the Art of Printing*, &c., by William Blades, London, Trübner and Co., 1872.—According to *The Athenæum*, 1872, ii. 337 (Sept. 14), *The Scottish Typographical Circular*, Aug. 2, 1862, had already contained a short essay on *Shakespeare a Printer*. Blades does not mention it, and evidently did not know of it.

owed his introduction to this establishment (which was situated in Blackfriars, close to the theatre) to the young poet Richard Field, who, in 1588, married Vautrollier's daughter Jacqueline, and hence must have been on intimate terms with the family some time previously; in fact, after his father-in-law's death, R. Field took charge of the business for a time. The reorganization of the business after Vautrollier's death is said to have offered Shakespeare the opportunity of leaving it and of devoting himself to the stage. Blades supports his hypothesis upon the already-mentioned entry concerning Richard Field in the books of the Stationers' Company, and also upon the entry of R. Field's marriage in the church register of Blackfriars, dated 12th of January, 1588, and considers that Richard Field must accordingly have been from the same county and a friend of Shakespeare's as a boy. But, as both these documents were discovered and published by Collier, it seems necessary that the matter should be inquired into and established anew before any further reliable statements can be founded upon them. Still, these documents do not by any means form the only substratum of Blades' hypothesis; he gives a stately series of quotations in favour of his supposition, much in the same way as Lord Campbell does in favour of the attorney-hypothesis. And, in fact, even after setting aside those passages where the inferences seem too far-fetched, it would seem as if the poet had been intimately acquainted with the art of type-setting and printing, and disposed to make use of this knowledge in his poetic works. But this surely does not necessarily prove that Shakespeare must have stood in any direct connection with a printing or publishing business. Like every other young writer, Shakespeare probably took an inquisitive interest in the magic art which confers paper immortality, and the printing of his two epic poems, which he superintended himself, would offer ample opportunity for his becoming acquainted with the printing establishment of the publisher, who was, moreover, a personal friend. Vautrollier's publishing house, which passed into R. Field's hands, Shakespeare may also have become acquainted with on this occasion. At all events, his connection with the publishing house throws unexpected light upon the poet's intellectual development, as well as upon his social surroundings, for in Vautrollier's establishment were to be found works of all kinds that must eminently have influenced his mental culture, and tended to extend and promote his know-

ledge of various subjects. This chapter in Blades' work is, in fact, the most attractive portion of the book, although it cannot be said to possess any force in favour of the hypothesis he brings forward. Shakespeare might very well have been acquainted with Vautrollier's establishment without ever having been employed there himself. We find in the list of works published by Vautrollier, two treatises on Music; the New Testament (1575); Calvin's "Institutio Christianæ Religionis," both in a Latin and in an English translation by Norton (1576 and 1578); Scipio Lentulo's Italian Grammar, translated by Henry Grantham (1578, and a new edition in 1587); "Campo di Fior, or else the Flourie field of foure Languages, for the Furtherance of the Learners of the Latine, French, English, but chiefly of the Italian tongue" (1583); "A most easie, perfect, and absolute way to learne the French tongue" (1581); "Phrases Linguæ Latinæ" (1579); North's "Plutarch's Lives" (1579); Ovid's "Metamorphoses," his "Epistles," and "Art of Loving"—Shakespeare mentions Ovid more frequently than any other Latin poet; Cicero's "Orator," in various editions;[1] and finally, "A Treatise of Melancholie: containing the Causes thereof and Reasons of the strange Effects it worketh in our Minds and Bodies" (1586). It is much to be regretted that Blades has not inquired more closely into the contents of this last-mentioned work in connection with Shakespeare's works.

Although not disposed to attach any undue importance to any of the above individual statements and combinations, we may, at least, accept the well-founded belief that Warwickshire men formed an important element in the literary and theatrical life of London, and that, accordingly, Shakespeare's move to the metropolis was in no way a reckless expedition into unknown regions; he must have known that he might hope to obtain there advice and active help towards a future career. With the one exception of his marriage, Shakespeare, as already said, proved himself throughout life a man of worldly wisdom, and ready to make use of outward circumstances and worldly advantages. And for this reason alone the often-quoted anecdote of Shakespeare's having commenced his career in London by holding the horses of gentlemen who attended the theatre, does not deserve credence.[2] Cibber, who

[1] Compare *Titus Andronicus*, iv. 1, and *Henry VI.*, Part II., iv. 1.

[2] Halliwell has recently, in his *Illustrations of the Life of Shakespeare*,

was the first to relate this story, in his "Lives of the Poets" (1753), says that it was communicated by Davenant to Betterton, by Betterton to Rowe (who, however, does not mention it), by Rowe to Pope, and finally by Pope to Dr. Newton; he relates that as coaches[1] were but little used at the time, it was the custom to go on horseback to the theatre, and to employ boys to hold or lead about the horses while their owners attended the play; that Shakespeare soon proved himself so ready and reliable in this business that any great person coming to the theatre did not care to entrust his horse to anyone else; hence that Shakespeare had to engage boys to assist him, who offered themselves to customers by calling out, "I am Shakespeare's boy, sir." Even the explanation given by Knight[2] in justification of the story, that it was an age when horse-stealing was one of the commonest occurrences, cannot be accepted. Knight says that it is possible that Shakespeare may have employed trustworthy boys for the business, and been himself a guarantee for the safety of the horses, and hence that the boys may have used the cry in recommendation of their trustworthiness. But how could Shakespeare, who was himself without means, have become guarantee for others. If he had been in a position to stand surety, not only for one, but for several horses, he would, of course, have been in tolerably good circumstances. According to Knight, Shakespeare never held the horses himself. In fact, in our opinion, it is incredible that Shakespeare should ever have so demeaned himself; he —a married man and father of three children, the son of a respected family, who had enjoyed a comparatively good education, and who, besides, bore within his breast the divine

pp. 1-8, endeavoured to uphold the truth of this story. See also *Outlines*, i. 69 ff.

[1] With regard to the introduction of coaches into London (1564, and also the above-mentioned canvas-covered waggons) and the manner of travelling to the theatre, see Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, iii. 406 ff. It seems strange that no sort of stables or stalls were erected at the theatres for the shelter of horses, which would certainly have proved a profitable undertaking if most persons came to the theatres on horseback. See De Quincey, p. 62. The main high road through London in those days was the Thames, and all the theatres were situated close to the river. It may, therefore, be supposed that more persons came to the theatre by barge than on horseback; this would also account for the otherwise unaccountable number of watermen. Compare *King Henry VIII.*, i. 3, and i. 4.

[2] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, 282 ff.

spark of poetic genius, and the ambitious feelings that must assuredly have accompanied it—could not have so thrown himself away, unless in the most abject want, and driven to it by hunger. Now to all appearance Shakespeare was in no way in any such straitened circumstances. He possessed accomplishments enough to have earned a living in some more refined, or, at least, in some more remunerative way, and to have found some employment in the theatre itself. If he did not begin at the outset by taking some subordinate parts on the stage, he might have obtained employment by copying out the actors' parts, or in some other of the many occupations to be had in connection with a theatre. In fact, to state it in a few words, the story about Shakespeare's having held horses at the theatre *cannot* be true. Another legend says that Shakespeare was at first a "call-boy," *i.e.*, the prompter's assistant to call the actors when it was their turn to appear on the stage. Apart from other facts, this would not seem unlikely, if only the external evidence of the story were better accredited; but we do not even know where it originated.[1] In any case Shakespeare must have devoted some time to studying an actor's business, however quickly he may have learned it, and it is not impossible that Heminge or Greene may have been his teachers; for we know that it was the custom for such students to receive instruction from some eminent member of the profession. This supposition would agree with Rowe's report that Shakespeare came to the theatre "in a very mean rank," and also with the communication made by the old Stratford parish-clerk of eighty years to Dowdall in 1693, "that Shakespeare was received into a playhouse as a serviture." Richard Burbage, who began his theatrical career about the same time as Shakespeare, had, according to Drake, not undertaken any higher part than that of a messenger till 1589, so that very likely Shakespeare may have outstripped him.

But before we enter more fully upon Shakespeare's connection with the stage—which can be better done in a separate chapter—we must examine those hypotheses according to which Shakespeare—either immediately after leaving Stratford, or at a later period in his life in London—is said to have visited the Continent, that is, Holland, Germany, and Italy, perhaps even to have made a shorter or longer stay in one or

[1] Drake, i. 420.

other of these countries.[1] John Bruce, in an essay entitled, "Who was Will, my Lord of Leicester's jesting player?"[2] has pointed out that Shakespeare could only have escaped Sir Thomas Lucy's vengeance by joining the Servants of the Earl of Leicester, who went to the Netherlands in 1585 as commander-in-chief of the English troops. Leicester, as we know, took his company of actors with him, and Bruce makes out that Shakespeare was a member of the troupe, although he hesitates to identify the poet with the "jesting player." William Thoms and Dr. William Bell not only agree to the identity, but both carry the hypothesis further, each in his own way.[3] Thoms promotes Shakespeare from an actor into a soldier in Leicester's service, and Bell believes him to have travelled as far as Germany in order to join the so-called English comedians. In Germany Shakespeare is not only said to have laid the foundation of his wealth—the English comedians having done a very good business there—but also to have become personally acquainted with Ayrer, to have acted in his plays, as well as in some of Hans Sachs's. All of these conjectures, however, may be said to float on air, for the arguments raised in their favour are much too weak for so weighty a construction to be based on them. Much more plausible is the hypothesis brought forward, among others, by Ch. A. Brown, that Shakespeare visited Northern Italy, and Venice in particular.[4] In fact there occur in Shakespeare, in his "Merchant of Venice," in "Othello," and more especially in "The Taming of the Shrew," numerous details which prove him to have possessed such an intimate acquaintance with Italian circumstances and peculiarities, that they can scarcely be accounted for except by the supposition that he wrote from personal observation. If any one of the supposed travels of Shakespeare can be made to seem probable, it is a visit to Upper Italy, and it would further have to be assigned to the year 1593, when the London theatres were closed for several months owing to the plague. On the other hand, the journey

[1] See *The Supposed Travels of Shakespeare* in my *Essays on Shakespeare* (Lond., 1874), pp. 254-315. Translated by L. Dora Schmitz.

[2] In *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, i. 88-95.

[3] William J. Thoms, *Three Notelets on Shakespeare*, London, 1865, pp. 115-136, and pp. 3-22; Dr. William Bell, *Shakespeare's Puck*, Lond., 1852-60, ii. 227-334.

[4] Ch. A. Brown, *Shakespeare's Autobiographical Poems*, London, 1838.

which Ch. Knight assumes Shakespeare to have made to Scotland appears to us improbable.[1] It cannot be denied that these conjectures are all mere combinations, and that we have no actual or documentary evidence to rely upon; still the further development of these very inquiries touch upon so many attractive and important points in Shakespearean criticism that, for this reason alone, they are by no means fruitless, and hence cannot be set aside without due consideration.

If, in following the documentary evidence, we are to assume that Shakespeare's whole life was spent in Stratford and London, our duty is now to give a glance at London as it was in his day, in the same way as we have examined Stratford as it was then.[2] Shakespeare's London! What an inexhaustible subject for historical and literary investigation is comprised in these two words! Can Shakespeare's London be less significant and interesting to the admirers of poetry and literature, as well as to those engaged in following the course of human progress, than is the Athens of Sophocles or the Rome of Virgil—poor though it may be in striking features of natural beauty and in conspicuous architectural monuments, as compared with those two brilliant centres of classic antiquity? But although it lacked the gorgeous colours of the south, and although neither an Acropolis nor a Coliseum rose up into the glorious azure of the sky—London was not without pleasant, picturesque surroundings, especially on the north side, nor was the city wanting in conspicuous creations of the human hand; it had, in fact, become an important centre of political, industrial, and social life, and, in this respect, stood at the head of the Teutonic nations.

The London of those days did not present the gigantic uniformity of the modern metropolis, and had not as yet become wholly absorbed in the whirl of business life. It was not as yet a whole province covered with houses, but a city of moderate size, surveyable from end to end, with walls and gates, beyond which lay pleasant suburbs. There were as yet

[1] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 345 ff.; Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, ed. by H. H. Furness, Philadelphia, 1837, pp. 407-410.

[2] Compare Stowe's *Survey;* Camden; Manningham's *Diary*, &c.—Knight, *Pictorial History of England.*—Cunningham, *London Past and Present;* Froude, *History of England.*—W. G. Thornbury, *Shakespeare's England; or, Sketches of our Social History in the Reign of Elizabeth*, Lond., 1856, 2 vols.—Drake, p. 417 ff.—*Shakespeare's London*, in Julius Rodenburg's *Studien-reisen in England* (Leipzig, 1872), pp. 67-112.

no building societies which erected, upon speculation, row upon row of streets and squares, in barrack-like uniformity.[1] Compared with the London of to-day, it possessed colour and the stamp of originality; for, as in the southern climes, business and domestic operations were carried on in the streets—and then the red houses with their woodwork, high gables, oriel windows and terraces, and the inhabitants in picturesque and gay attire. The upper circles of society did not, as yet, live apart in other districts; the nobility still had their mansions among the burgher class and the working people. Queen Elizabeth might be seen driving in an unwieldy gilt coach to some solemn service in St. Paul's Cathedral, or riding through the city to the Tower, to her hunting grounds, to a review of her troops, or might be seen starting for Richmond or Greenwich, accompanied by a brilliant retinue, on one of her magnificent barges that were kept in readiness close to where the theatres stood. Such a scene, with but little stretch of the imagination, might have led Shakespeare to think of the brilliant picture of Cleopatra on the Cydnus.[2] The Thames was crossed by one bridge only, and was still pure and clear as crystal; swans swam about on it, and gardens and meadows lined its banks where we now have dusty wharfs and warehouses. Hundreds of boats would be skimming up and down the stream, and incessant would be the calls between the boatmen of "Westward ho!" or "Eastward ho!"[3] And yet the loungers in the Temple Gardens and at Queenhithe could amuse themselves by catching salmon.[4] In the streets crowds would be passing to and fro; above all, the well-known and dreaded apprentices, whose business it was to attract customers by calling out in front of the shops: "What d'ye lack, gentles? what d'ye lack? My ware is best! Here shall you have your choice!" &c.[5] Foreigners, too, of every

[1] Harrison, *Description of England*, ed. Furnivall, p. lxxxvi.

[2] *Antony and Cleopatra*, ii. 2.—Harrison, *Description*, ed. Furnivall, p. lxxix.

[3] Compare Peele, *Edward I.* (ed. Dyce, 1861), p. 409.—Dekker and Webster's *Westward Ho!*

[4] Dekker's *Knight Conjuring*, 1607, p. 17.—Harrison, ed. Furnivall, pp. xxxv. and xxxvii.

[5] Compare *Eastward Ho!* i. 1: "What do ye lack, sir? What is't you'll buy, sir? . . . Wilt thou cry, what is't ye lack? stand with a bare pate and a dropping nose, under a wooden penthouse, and art a gentleman." Kempe's *Nine Days' Wonder*, ed. Dyce, p. 14, &c.

nationality, resident in London, would be met with. Amid all this life every now and again would be seen the perambulation of one or other of the guilds, wedding processions, groups of country folk, gay companies of train-bands and archers; also vendors of different kinds of articles, each with their own peculiar cry. As yet there was no incessant rattle of cabs or omnibuses and heavily-laden waggons, nor the deafening shriek of railway engines, to bewilder one at every turn and corner, nor had every bright bit of colour been changed into a melancholy grey by the reeking smoke of factories. The city was rich in springs and gardens, and the inhabitants still had leisure to enjoy their existence; time had not yet come to be synonymous with money, and men enjoyed their gossip at the barbers' and tobacconists' shops; at the latter, instruction was even given in the art of smoking, and in 1614 it is said that there were no less than 7,000 such shops in London.[1] St. Paul's was a rendezvous for promenaders and idle folk; and on certain days, Smithfield and its Fair would be the centre of attraction; also Bartholomew Fair, with its puppet-shows and exhibitions of curiosities, where Bankes and his dancing-horse Morocco created a great sensation for a long time;[2] Southwark, too, with its Paris Garden, attracted visitors to see the bear-baiting; it was here that the famous bear Sackerson put the women in a pleasant state of flutter; Master Slender had seen the bear loose twenty times, and taken it by the chain.[3] No less attractive were the bowling-alleys,[4] the

[1] Smoking, the latest fashion among the *élite* in the Elizabethan period, is indeed mentioned by B. Jonson (*Every Man in his Humour*, iii. 2; *Every Man out of his Humour*, v. 1; *The Alchemist*, v. 1, &c.), but nowhere by Shakespeare. Can it be that he had an objection to it somewhat like James I., who wrote against it in his well-known book, *A Counter-blast to Tobacco?* It is a well-known fact that the *jeunesse dorée* even smoked on the stage. Smoking was practised with every luxury; for instance, silver tobacco-boxes, silver coke-bowls and coke-tongs are spoken of, so that it must have been a very expensive luxury, even though the statements in Thornbury, *Shakespeare's England*, i. 170-179, seem to be exaggerated. Compare Greene's *Quip for an Upstart Courtier* (1592); Rowland, *'Tis Merry when Gossips Meet* (1602; Shakespeare Society's Publications); Rich, *Honestie of this Age* (1614); Decker, *Gull's Horn Book*, &c.; W. Thornbury, *Shakespeare's Silence about Smoking*, in *N. and Q.*, 1866, No. 210, p. 1. Compare also No. 218, p. 171; No. 220, p. 228, &c.

[2] See *Love's Labour's Lost*, i. 2: "the dancing horse will tell you," and commentators on this passage.—B. Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair*.—Nares, *Bank's Horse and Morocco*.

[3] *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, i. 1.

[4] According to *K. Richard II.*, iii. 4, women also played at bowls.

fights at the Cock-pit and the tent-pegging in the tiltyard; and yet all these amusements were even surpassed by the newly-risen star of the theatre.

There are several plans of old London; the earliest, or, at least one of the earliest, is that known by the name of "Civitas Londinum," by Ralph Agas or Aggas, first published in 1560, and which subsequently seems to have appeared in other editions, as the city increased in size;[1] it measures 6½ feet in length and 2 feet 4½ inches in height. A reduced imitation of this plan, in bird's-eye view (or a copy from one common original), is published in a German work by Georgius Braun, dated 1574.[2] A third plan was made in 1593 by John Norden, and was engraved that same year by Pieter van den Keere; copies of this plan, together with explanations, are given by Halliwell[3] and in Harrison.[4] In this plan the Play Howse, *i.e.*, the Rose Theatre, is marked on the Bankside, whereas the Theatre and the Curtain, which stood in the fields outside Bishop's Gate, are not marked, and neither are they marked in the plan by Agas or in that by Braun.[5]

The population of London during the reign of the Bloody Mary is estimated by the Venetian ambassador, Giovanni Micheli, at 150,000, or, according to other MS. reports of his, at 180,000 souls. The population must have increased at an almost inconceivable rate, if we are to trust the reports of a second Venetian ambassador, Marc Antonio Correr, who, in 1610, reckoned the number of inhabitants at 300,000 souls;[6]

[1] Of Agas's plan only two genuine copies now exist—one in Magdalen College, Cambridge (in the Pepysian Library), and the other in the Guildhall, London. Of the latter an excellent facsimile was published in 1874 by William Henry Overall, under the title of *Civitas Londinum. A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster, the Borough of Southwark and Parts Adjacent in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Published in Facsimile from the Original in the Guildhall Library, with a Biographical Account of Ralph Agas and a Critical and Historical Examination of the Work and of the several so-called Reproductions of it by Vertue and Others.*

[2] *Beschreibung und Contrafactur der vornembsten Stät der Welt* von Georgius Braun, Simon Novellanus, und Franciscus Hohenberg (1574). The imperial privilege prefixed to it, and the general introduction, are dated 1572, hence eight years after Shakespeare's birth.

[3] *Illustrations of the Life of Shakespeare*, London, 1874, p. 4 ff.

[4] *Description of England*, ed. Furnivall, p. xli f.

[5] See also Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. lxxxix ff. A fourth view (not a plan) of London, from the year 1603, is given by Halliwell in his *Illustrations*, p. 44. See also *Outlines*, i. 76 and 166.

[6] Prescott, *Philipp II.*, vol. i. chap. 3, init., vol. ii. chap. i.—Rye, *England*

however, according to Raumer,[1] another Venetian, Molino, estimated the population at 300,000 in 1607. The number of foreigners in London was extremely large, and in 1621 the colony of foreigners of all nations found settled there amounted to no less than 10,000 persons.[2] Commerce, trade, and the industries were in a very flourishing state. The Thames alone, according to John Norden in his MS. description of Essex (1594), gave occupation to 40,000 men as boatmen, sailors, fishermen, and others.[3] Great political and historical events had put new life into the English nation, and given it an important impetus, which manifested itself in London more especially, and exercised a stimulating influence upon literature and poetry. Indeed, it may be said that Shakespeare had the good fortune of having his life cast in one of the greatest historical periods, the gravitating point of which lay principally in London.[4] The horrors of the Wars of the Roses, which had entrapped three generations, had come to an end, and there now arose the beneficent fruits of that bloody season. Feudalism, with its limitations and restrictions, was set aside, and the nation was now able to advance freely. The Reformation, which in Germany—in keeping with the national character—had acted more inwardly in freeing the conscience, in England took more of a political form, and reached its climax in the hostile position assumed by Protestant England towards Spain, the representative of Catholicism; hence, in the political antagonism between Protestantism and Romanism, the religious or ecclesiastical opposition at once became mixed with political

as seen by Foreigners, p. 225 f., 372. The population of Paris at this time was computed at 300,000, Antwerp at 100,000, Brussels at 75,000, and Ghent at 70,000.

[1] *Beiträge*, i. 606 and 624.

[2] Wm. Durrant Cooper, *Lists of Foreign Protestants and Aliens* (Camden Society's Publications). With what success Shakespeare made use of his observations of these foreigners we have proof, among others, in his Dr. Caius, in *The Merry Wives*, Monsieur Parolles in *All's Well that Ends Well*, and Don Armado in *Love's Labour's Lost*. The Jews alone were forbidden to settle in London (or anywhere else in England), although some may have succeeded in creeping in; they had been expelled from the country in 1287 (or 1290) by Edward I., and it was not till 1652, under Cromwell, that they were again allowed to settle in the country. It is therefore doubtful, where Shakespeare can have made his study of Shylock.—My *Essays on Shakespeare*, 107 and 281 ff.

[3] Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, p. 185.

[4] Gervinus, *Shakespeare Commentaries*, translated by F. E. Bunnètt, London, 1875, pp. 877-887.

and commercial interests, and these latter formed the determining and decisive motives; the main thing to be done was, therefore, to wrest the sword out of the hands of the Spaniards. To assist the Netherlands against their Spanish oppressors was, therefore, an urgent wish of the English people, and for many years the young men of England, athirst for deeds of glory, found there a welcome field for their love of action; and this we find mirrored in the poetry of the Elizabethan period. Ben Jonson served in the Netherlands, and, shortly after Shakespeare left Stratford, gallant Sir Philip Sidney received his mortal wound at Zütphen. The day of his funeral, in St. Paul's Cathedral, on the 16th of February, 1587, was one of national mourning, and Shakespeare in all probability was present on the occasion. The danger to which England seemed to have been exposed by the Spanish Armada, roused the nation to an unparalleled state of enthusiasm, of unanimity, and of readiness to risk everything in her cause. The Catholics went hand-in-hand with their Protestant fellow-citizens; they felt, for the moment, that they were pre-eminently Englishmen, not Catholics, and perceived that it was not so much a religious war as a conflict between two nations. Armed bands of men streamed from all parts of the country towards the places in need of defence, and gifts of money poured in to equip both army and navy. In place of the fifteen ships demanded from the city of London, thirty were offered as ready for the service of the country, together with 30,000 troops, and also a grant of money close upon £52,000.[1] England has, perhaps, never celebrated a triumph where the unanimous joy of victory rose to such a height as on the occasion of the destruction of the Invincible Armada; and yet, with religious humility, the victory was ascribed to God alone—*Soli Deo gloria* are the words inscribed on a medal struck in honour of this victory; another, struck in the Netherlands, has the words, *Flavit Jehovah et dissipati sunt.*[2]

After this victory the star of Spain disappeared below the horizon, and that of England was in the ascendant. On the 19th of November, 1588, Elizabeth proceeded, in solemn procession, to St. Paul's Cathedral, to be present at the national

[1] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 337 f.

[2] Compare *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland, &c.*, by Edward Hawkins, ed. by Franks and Grueber (Lond. 1885), i. 145.—*The Spectator*, No. 293.

thanksgiving, and it can scarcely be doubted that Shakespeare was present on that occasion. It may well seem surprising that Shakespeare, who was surely not behind any of his countrymen in patriotism, should nowhere have given expression to his joy at this victory. But the lyric glorification of the events of his own day was certainly not his aim; and, indeed, political poetry, which in our day has come to occupy so prominent a position, is an outcome of modern times. Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, however, speaks of having discovered that Shakespeare wrote one or more ballads on the Armada.[1] The expedition against Cadiz also, in 1596, probably called forth some such expressions of interest, especially as the expedition was under the command of the Earl of Essex, one of Shakespeare's patrons.

A second direction in which the energy of the nation manifested its patriotic enthusiasm and spirit of enterprise were the voyages of discovery undertaken across the Atlantic, and the colonies founded in America. In America, too, the English could attack Spain and check the power of the Spaniards; and, indeed, it was in America that most of the disputes between the two nations originated. The position which had hitherto been held by the Mediterranean as pre-eminently the historical sea—so to say, the centre of civilization—now came to be occupied by the Atlantic; and it was the English who were foremost in this gigantic stride made by history. And it was not only in the West that these great enterprises were undertaken, voyages to the far East also were made, as is proved by the East India Company having been established in 1600. The men by whose energy the new order of things was mainly brought about, were the two immortal naval heroes, Sir Francis Drake, the first English circumnavigator of the globe, and Sir Walter Raleigh, the founder of the colony of

[1] *A Discovery that Shakespeare wrote one or more Ballads or Poems on the Spanish Armada*, by J. O. Halliwell, Lond. 1866. Privately printed.—As this paper, according to the intolerable English custom, was printed in ten copies only, for friends, we have unfortunately not been able to obtain access to it. An allusion to the Armada is found in *King John*, iii. 4 ("a whole armada of convicted sail"). The great pirate Valdes, in *Pericles*, iv. 2, probably owes his name to the Spanish Admiral Don Pedro Valdes, who commanded the Andalusian galleons of the Armada, and was taken prisoner by Sir Francis Drake on July 22nd, 1588. The Spaniards avenged the capture of their "great pirate" by Lope's *Dragontea*. See Dyce, *Glossary*, under *Valdes*.

Virginia, men with whom Shakespeare must certainly have been personally acquainted. The memorable ship, the "Golden Hind"—in which Drake made his voyage round the world, and upon which Queen Elizabeth paid him a visit and dubbed him a knight—was, at her command, anchored off Deptford in the Thames as a lasting memorial of the voyage, and it was for many years one of the favourite sights in London both for Englishmen and foreigners; hence there can scarcely be any doubt that Shakespeare was one of the numerous persons who went to see it.[1] Shakespeare's patron, Lord Southampton, was throughout life a zealous promoter of voyages of discovery and of colonization. In 1605 he sent out a ship, equipped at his own expense, on a voyage of discovery, and subsequently joined the Council of Virginia. These undertakings opened up to the English a new and grand prospect, not only for extending their trade and maritime commerce, but also for the spread of culture, and we find an unmistakable echo of these efforts in Shakespeare's "Tempest."

If we turn our attention to the internal affairs of the nation, we notice, in the first place, the efforts made in organizing and strengthening the political system. Elizabeth's government was occupied in a very considerable degree by proceedings against Scotland—whose queen fell a victim to the unity and internal strengthening of the kingdom—and also against Ireland, where the attempts at rebellion had to be suppressed by armed force.[2] When England and Scotland became united under James I., the old feuds and struggles came to an end, and internal peace was established, while the power of the State became twice as great as it had been. These events also cannot possibly have failed to affect Shakespeare; he must have been interested in the increased greatness of his country which was manifested in every direction, and have also felt the glory which was attached to Elizabeth's throne as the greatest sove-

[1] Londoners frequently went in holiday parties to the ship, where the cabin served as a tavern, but according to Peter Eisenberg it was already almost wholly destroyed in 1614.—Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, pp. 49, 135, 140, 173, 219.—In *Eastward Ho!* iii. 2 (*The Works of George Chapman: Plays*, ed. by Richard Herne Shepherd, p. 469) are the words: "We'll have our provided supper brought aboard Sir Francis Drake's ship, that hath compassed the world; where, with full cups and banquets, we will do sacrifice for a prosperous voyage"—hence, a farewell banquet before starting on a voyage.

[2] See the allusion to this in the Prologue to *King Henry V.*, v.

reign of her day. What was of the utmost importance to the dramatic poet, however, was the free scope that was offered to him on all sides for the freest and fullest development of every individual feeling. In a period exhibiting such a spirit of enterprise, nay, of adventure, nowhere would an obstacle be placed in the path of any justifiable, often also of any unjustifiable species of energy; everyone could assert himself in his own way, and show his full individuality. Public life resembled the stage to a much greater extent than it does now, where a good deal of our individuality is checked by the strict conventionalities and formalities of official and domestic life, and which, accordingly, has but few opportunities for giving evidence of its existence. Besides, the various professions were not so overstocked, and the difficulties to contend with were less great. Healthy, energetic impulse, successful undertakings, consciousness of the power of self, and a sturdy love of adventure, are the characteristic features of the time. Elizabeth undoubtedly exercised both political and religious pressure, and in spite of parliament there was a kind of absolutism about her reign, which, however, was as nothing compared with the absolutism that reigned supreme in Spain; and the English people being conscious of their power—a feeling that was enhanced by their continued prosperity—would not allow themselves to be in any way checked or suppressed. In addition to this, the classical culture which had been called forth, and had quickly been spread abroad by Humanism, was a powerful instrument in freeing and elevating the individual character in every class of society, as well as of the nation at large. Taken all in all, to use Hutten's words, it was a joy to live, and Shakespeare had his full share of this joy of life; no mind could have been more sensitive to all the expressions of individual, as well as of national life, than his—no one could have evinced a keener appreciation of it.

London, however, was not merely the political centre, it was the centre of all the intellectual life of the kingdom. "London is the fountaine whose rivers flowe round about England," is said in "Pierce Pennilesse."[1] All eminent persons, or persons desirous of occupying an eminent position in literature or poetry, science or art, flocked to London, which in those days was a city of good proportions for such a confluence of intellect. There was no possibility of any literary

[1] Ed. Collier, p. 41.

activity or of obtaining literary success, in the provinces; for there were as yet no daily newspapers or any other means of literary intercourse, such as nowadays at once communicate every achievement to the whole country and makes it the common property of the nation. Literary work, accordingly, was able to overcome or lessen the disadvantages of local limitation, only by connecting itself with the central city of the kingdom. This applied pre-eminently to dramatic poetry and art, inasmuch as dramatic works were not printed forthwith, but belonged exclusively to the theatrical company which had acquired them by purchase; the printing crept in *per nefas*. At all events, anyone desirous of advancing in his profession was obliged to go to London, and hence towards the end of the sixteenth and at the beginning of the seventeenth century we find there a brilliant assemblage of poets, actors, pamphleteers, and writers of all kinds, such as has scarcely ever been equalled. National literature—in contradistinction to the classical literature of the court—was in the ascendant; no wonder that it attracted the freshest, most energetic and vigorous intellects from every quarter, although naturally there were some reckless spirits among the number. They turned their backs upon the pedantry of the universities and the philistinism of the provinces, and plunged head over ears into the whirl of London life.

In the same way as we find two main tendencies in literature, there are at least two great social circles distinguishable, the classic or court circle, and in contradistinction the democratic or national circle, of which latter the drama formed the centre. The classical or court poetry was the result of the revival of the study of ancient classics, which was chiefly patronized by the fashionable circles. Virgil, and more especially Ovid, were the favourite poets of the aristocratic classes. Queen Elizabeth herself, as is well known, set an example in this, and was throughout life an admirer and patron of classic antiquity, and delighted in the aristocratic and pastoral poetry of the Renaissance. The study of the classics was combined with the influences of Italian poetry, which a few years later came to the fore in Germany through the second Silesian school of poetry. A beginning was made by the study of Petrarch and Boccaccio among others, and then onwards to Marini the Neapolitan, who was five years younger than Shakespeare and survived him by nine years. Marini's

"Adone," one of the most voluminous poems ever written, was published in the same year as the first folio edition of Shakespeare's works; however, it had undoubtedly been finished and become known at a much earlier date—partially at least—for Marini was already a celebrated man at the time of its publication. Whether Shakespeare knew Marini's work when writing his "Venus and Adonis" is a question that cannot well be answered. At any rate, both poems have shared the same fate of having in various quarters been declared immoral, at least indecent; both are, in so far, at all events, children of the same mind or of the same poetical tendency. Italian poetry was introduced and fostered in England more especially by persons whose social position and eventful lives perhaps conferred upon them greater celebrity than accrued to them through their works. Among the foremost of these was Sir Thomas Wyat, who is said to have had a love intrigue with Anne Boleyn; the Earl of Surrey, who was as brave as he was unfortunate; gallant Sir Philip Sidney, who was held in the highest esteem by his contemporaries of every shade and party; Earl Pembroke, Shakespeare's patron; Spenser, and Samuel Daniel, whose sonnets were the direct prototype of the Shakespearean Sonnet. In the hands of these poets the sonnet, more especially, was brought to a perfection such as it has never again attained in English literature. Shakespeare himself, if he had wished to see his works acknowledged, and the tendency he represented favoured by this leading circle of poets, would necessarily have to meet it upon its own ground, and this he did by his two poems, "Venus and Adonis" and "The Rape of Lucrece," as well as by his Sonnets, which were originally not intended for publication.

In so far, therefore, Shakespeare himself was one of the classic or court poets; but however great and general may have been the recognition and admiration expressed of his achievements in this species of poetry, it is clear, without any further remark, that the gravitating point of his poetry lies in its democratic or national character. Under his leadership it forced the classico-court species into the background, placed the drama at the head of English literature, and, with the full consciousness of victory, acquired for English literature a comprehensive and truly national character, the different elements of culture being dissolved into one harmonious whole. Now as Shakespeare, in his works, belonged to both literary circles,

it must have been pretty much the same as regards his actual life. He no doubt associated both with the representatives of the classico-court circle—in so far as it was accessible to him—and also with the poets who were his immediate predecessors in the field of the national drama, his fellow-workers (it may be opponents), and also with those who were his immediate successors. Nor must we forget the actors of his day, for like other contemporary dramatists his very profession would bring him into contact with the actors themselves. There can be no doubt that the circle which consisted more especially of dramatists and actors was the one in which Shakespeare felt himself more especially at home. If we turn to the men who, between 1590 and 1610, enjoyed the esteem and favour of this circle, we can scarcely be wrong in assuming—although of express proofs we have none—that Shakespeare was acquainted with them, and was upon a more or less intimate footing with them. Among his immediate predecessors, most of whom were only a few years his seniors, we find in the first place Robert Greene (who died in September, 1592), Thomas Kyd (who died in extreme want about 1595), George Peele (who died about 1597), John Lilly the Euphuist (who died about 1600), and Christopher (Kit) Marlowe, whose magnificent imagination and grandly dramatic power more resembled that of Shakespeare than did that of any of the others.[1] Ben Jonson, in his well-known eulogy on Shakespeare, speaks of Marlowe's "mighty line;" one thing he entirely lacked was wit and humour, and neither was he able to delineate female characters. His premature and miserable death took place as early as 1593. Then, too, we have Thomas Lodge (died 1625), distinguished both as a dramatist and as the author of various satirical treatises; he had studied medicine at Oxford and at Avignon, and eventually practised as a physician of note in London. Of Ben Jonson (1574-1637) and his relation to

[1] In *King Henry IV., Second Part*, ii. 4, Shakespeare puts into Pistol's mouth two lines from Marlowe's *Tamerlane*, but little altered (Pt. II., iv. 3):—

Holla, you pampered jades of Asia,
What, can you draw but twenty miles a day!

and in *The Merry Wives*, iii. 1, he makes the parson, Evans, quote the first line of Marlowe's *The Passionate Shepherd to his Love*. In *As You Like It*, iii. 5, he quotes a line, taken from *Hero and Leander*, 1st Sestiad:—

Whoever loved that loved not at first sight?

Shakespeare, we shall have to speak more fully immediately. Shakespeare is said to have written "The Two Noble Kinsmen," in conjunction with John Fletcher (1576-1625); whatever may be the opinion of modern criticism with regard to this tradition, it can but little affect the question as to the personal acquaintance of the two poets, for Fletcher in his works proves himself a great admirer of Shakespeare, whose style and spirit he has imitated in many instances. Fletcher's literary partner, too, Francis Beaumont (1586-1615), although twenty years younger than Shakespeare, and also Philip Massinger, who was about the same age, must be reckoned among the circle of Shakespeare's acquaintances, notwithstanding their youth. Beaumont among other things mentions the club at the Mermaid of which he was a member. George Chapman (1559-1634), although older than Shakespeare, did not appear as a dramatist as early as the latter; much may be said in favour of Shakespeare's having known Chapman's translation of Homer, at all events the beginning, and that he made use of it in his "Troilus and Cressida." Anthony Wood's account of this exceedingly estimable poet and man is well known; he says of Chapman that he was "a person of most reverend aspect, religious and temperate, and highly esteemed by the clergy and academicians." Of the other dramatists it will be sufficient for our purpose here to give their names: Henry Chettle, Thomas Dekker, John Ford, John Marston, Anthony Munday, William Rowley, John Webster, &c.; in all probability they all belonged more or less to the circle of Shakespeare's friends and acquaintances; still we have no evidence whatever of their personal connection with Shakespeare.

In quitting the circle of the dramatic writers, we are at once met by the eminently poetical character of Edmund Spenser, who, it is true, lived in London only for a time, and, indeed, died there of starvation in 1599. But even though it may not be accepted as proved that Spenser lived in Warwickshire for several years (and the supposition does stand upon very uncertain ground), still no one can well believe that two such great poets as Shakespeare and Spenser could have resided in the same city without having become personally acquainted with each other, the more so as the Earl of Essex seems to have been a patron of both poets. We possess, however, other indications from both sides which enable us to infer that the two men held each other in high

estimation, and that they were personally acquainted. These are the often discussed passages in "Colin Clouts come home againe" (1595), l. 444-7 :—

> And there, though last not least, is Aetion,
> A gentler shepheard may nowhere be found;
> Whose Muse, full of high thoughts invention,
> Doth like himselfe Heroically sound—

and in the "Midsummer Night's Dream" (v. i.) :—

> The thrice three Muses mourning for the death
> Of Learning just deceased in beggary.

In spite of the doubt raised in opposition to the conjecture, these passages can scarcely have any other reference than to Shakespeare in the first case, and to Spenser's death in the other; of course the last-quoted passage would have to be regarded as a subsequent interpolation, and indeed its general tenour may very well have a perfectly independent meaning, without our being obliged to suppose it to have any personal reference.[1] Two other much disputed passages may be quoted here, the first of which occurs in Spenser's "Teares of the Muses" (1591), l. 205 ff. The lines are :—

> And he, the man whom Nature selfe had made
> To mock her selfe, and Truth to imitate,
> With kindly counter under Mimick shade,
> Our pleasant Willy, ah! is dead of late:
> With whom all joy and jolly meriment
> Is also deaded, and in dolour drent.

Pleasant as it may be to refer these words to Shakespeare, there are, however, grave doubts against any such supposition.[2] The second passage occurs in the eighth sonnet of "The Passionate Pilgrim," where Spenser is mentioned :—

> Dowland to thee is dear, whose heavenly touch
> Upon the lute doth ravish human sense;
> Spenser to me, whose deep conceit is such
> As, passing all conceit, needs no defence.

We are here met by a doubt of another kind, viz., whether

[1] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 361, refers the second passage to Robert Greene.—Compare *Is Aetion Shakespeare?* in *The Athenæum*, 1875, i. 499 ff. (by F. G. Fleay); ibid., i. 762 (by J. M. Hales); ibid., i. 798 (by F. G. Fleay); Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, i.

[2] Compare among others *The Athenæum*, 1875, ii. 507 ff., where the lines, with much probability, are referred to Lilly. The name *Willy* is repeatedly met with as the pastoral designation for a poet, even where there is not the smallest possibility of any reference to Shakespeare. In the *Outlines*, i. 82 and ii. 382, the passage is referred to the comedian Richard Tarlton, who died in September, 1588.

the sonnet was written by Shakespeare;[1] but even though, to all appearance, this should not have been the case, still it would in no way be a proof against the supposition that Shakespeare and Spenser were personally acquainted. It would not even weaken the belief that John Dowland may be reckoned among the circle of Shakespeare's personal acquaintances, although Dowland, like Spenser, spent most of his life out of London. Shakespeare betrays, on all hands, too much appreciation of and love for music not to have felt himself drawn to the man whom Fuller eulogizes as "the rarest musician that this age did behold," and whose songs resound in our own day as genuine musical harmonies from the Elizabethan period.[2]

The poet who stood second in eminence after Spenser, Michael Drayton, we have already spoken of as a man from Shakespeare's county; likewise of William Warner. Samuel Daniel (1562 to 1619) was, as already stated, not only Shakespeare's model for his Sonnets, but wrote among other things a "History of the Civil Wars between York and Lancaster" in verse, and one or two dramas; they are written in a very different spirit to Shakespeare's, for they belong to the classico-court species of poetry. His "Tragedy of Cleopatra" (1594, remodelled 1623), although having the same subject as Shakespeare's, differs from it diametrically in style and treatment, being written in rhyme, and having choruses in the antique fashion. Still, this would in no way have affected his esteem or kindly feeling for Shakespeare; indeed, their intercourse may have been the more intimate as Daniel does not appear to have been on friendly terms with Ben Jonson, who con-

[1] According to *Venus and Adonis*, ed. by Charles Edmonds (The Islam Reprints, 1870), Knight, *Pictorial Shakespeare*, vi. 507, and Edward Arber, *R. Barnfield's Poems* (1882), p. xix-xxii., the sonnet was written by Barnfield. Compare *Athenæum*, 1869, i. 798. On the other hand, Collier (*Athenæum*, May 17, 1856; *Notes and Queries*, July 5, 1856; *Bibliographical Account of Early English Literature*, 1856, *s.* Barnfield), and Ulrici (*Shakes. Dram. Art.*, 3rd ed., i. 278 n.), ascribe it to Shakespeare.

[2] Dowland (born at Westminster, 1562,) had travelled through France, Germany, and Italy, and then resided for some time at the Danish court as lute-player to the king. The second book of his *Songs or Ayres* is dated from "Helsingör in Denmark, the 1st July, 1600," a circumstance that must have been peculiarly interesting to Shakespeare. With what inward emotion may he not have listened to the songs that called up in his mind thoughts of Hamlet's terrace! With regard to Dowland's sojourn in Germany, compare Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany*, xxxv. ff.

sidered him a rival, and, at times, ridiculed him as he did most of his other contemporaries. Daniel was, in fact, "master of the queen's revels, and inspector of the plays to be represented by the juvenile performers." After Spenser's death, he seems to have wished to obtain the post of poet-laureate, and with this view he wrote several masques, which could not fail to excite Ben Jonson's jealousy. Daniel eventually led a retired life in a farmhouse in Somersetshire, and died there "beloved, honoured, and lamented."

John Marston, who has been mentioned among the dramatists, also occupied a notable position as a satirist. His chief work (obviously suggested by Shakespeare's "Venus and Adonis"), "The Metamorphosis of Pygmalion's Image," appeared in 1598. In the Prologue (to his Mistress), Marston describes it as "the first bloomes of my poesie," precisely as Shakespeare said of his "Venus and Adonis," that it was "the first heir of my invention." Shakespeare seems to allude to it in his "Measure for Measure" (iii. 2), by the words, "What, is there none of Pygmalion's images, newly-made woman, to be had now—?" We have no other evidence of Marston's having been personally acquainted with Shakespeare; nor have we any proof of this as regards the other eminent satirist and pamphleteer Thomas Nash, and yet it can scarcely be doubted that Shakespeare must, at least, have known both men by sight. Nash (1558-1601), whom Lodge in a detailed criticism designates as a veritable English Aretino, was famous no less for his acuteness, his knowledge, and his ready pen, than for his envious, spiteful, and abusive nature; personal polemics, the coarser the better, were the subjects he specially delighted in.[1] He and Robert Greene were, as far as we know, the only opponents of Shakespeare who ever directed personal attacks against him. The passages in question do not, indeed, mention Shakespeare by name, but describe him so unmistakably that there can be no doubt as to whom they refer. In addition to the passage quoted on p. 85, from Nash's "Epistle to the Gentlemen Students," in

[1] Nash's numerous pamphlets are extremely rare, and only some of them have been republished. And yet they are so important for a knowledge of the Elizabethan era, and for the study of Shakespeare in particular, that it would be a praiseworthy undertaking to have a complete edition of them made accessible to Shakespearean scholars. Compare *Satires and Declamations of Thomas Nash*, in *The Retrospective Review*, vol. i.

all probability the following passage from Nash's "Anatomie of Absurditie" (1590) can refer to none other than Shakespeare. Nash there speaks not only of "new found songs and sonnets, which every red nose fiddler hath at his fingers' end," but of "men who make poetry an occupation; lying is their living; and fables are their moveables," and goes on to say, "They think knowledge a burden, tapping it before they have half tunde it, venting it before they have filled it, in whom the saying of the orator is verified—Ante ad dicendum quam ad cognoscendum veniunt. They come to speak before they come to know. They contemn arts as unprofitable, contenting themselves with a little country grammar knowledge." At whom can this squib from the pen of a learned man and directed at a self-taught man from the country, be aimed at, if not at Shakespeare? In Marlowe's and Nash's "Dido, Queen of Carthage," iii. 4, there is a hit at Shakespeare which can only have been penned by Nash. Æneas says:—

> Who would not undergo all kinds of toil,
> To be well-stored with such a Winter's tale?

In looking through the pamphlets in which Nash has, so to say, cudgelled his rival Harvey almost to death, the attacks on Shakespeare seem extremely gentle; they are, in fact, less cutting than many of the squibs Ben Jonson fired at Shakespeare. Greene's jealous attack upon Shakespeare in his "Groatsworth of Wit," partly quoted on p. 115, only proves the important position Shakespeare occupied at the time; the passage in full runs thus: "There is an upstart crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his Tygers heart wrapt in a Players hide, supposes he is as well able to bumbast out a blanke verse as the best of you: and being an absolute Johannes factotum, is in his owne conceit the onely Shake-scene in the countrie." No inference whatever can be drawn from this as regards Shakespeare's character—although all critics are agreed that the passage refers to Shakespeare—and indeed Nash[1] has declared this posthumous publication of Greene's as "a scald, trivial, lying pamphlet," and Chettle, who published it, in his Preface to "A Kind-Harts Dreame," withdraws the statement and cries *Pater peccavi* by saying: "The other (viz., Shakespeare), whom at that time I did not so much spare as

[1] In a *Letter to Abell Jeffes* (preceding the second edition of *Pierce Penniless*).

since I wish I had; for that, as I have moderated the heat of living writers, and might have used my own discretion (especially in such a case, the author being dead), that I did not, I am as sorry as if the original fault had been my fault; because myself have seen his demeanour, no less civil than he excellent in the quality he professes; besides divers of worship have reported his uprightness of dealing, which argues his honesty, and his facetious grace in writing, that approves his art."

Two other persons must be mentioned as having in all probability been personally acquainted with Shakespeare; these are the famous architect Inigo Jones, and the teacher of languages John Florio. The former, after a long sojourn in Italy (more especially in Venice) and in Denmark, where he had been in the service of Christian IV., returned to his own country in 1604, and for some years afterwards he worked with Ben Jonson in devising and planning the scenery for Jonson's Masques, but they eventually quarrelled. Considering the close relation in which Shakespeare stood to Ben Jonson, it cannot be supposed that he remained unacquainted with Jonson's partner. This is the less likely, as Inigo Jones had other connections with the theatre, as is proved by his sketches of costumes for a series of important characters; these have been preserved, and among them we find even Shakespeare's Romeo as a pilgrim (?), and also his Jack Cade. This latter drawing, like all the rest, is a mere sketch, but, as Planché[1] maintains, is extremely characteristic; the rebel is dressed in the tattered breeches of a workman, but has decorated himself with a plumed helmet from the spoil of the murdered Stafford ("King Henry VI.," 2nd Part, iv. 3); his right hand is drawing his sword as if he were about to utter the words, "Come then, let's go fight with them;" his left is holding the commander's staff. In order that there might be no doubt regarding the persons he meant to delineate, the artist has even placed the names below all the sketches.[2] It is no un-

[1] See p. 57 f.

[2] See *Inigo Jones, A Life of the Architect*, by Peter Cunningham; *Remarks on some of his sketches for Masques and Dramas*, by J. R. Planché, &c. (London, 1848. Printed for the Shakespeare Society). The original drawings of the facsimiles given in this work are preserved in the Library of the Duke of Devonshire. Can they be the same of which Dr. Ingleby (*A Complete View of the Shakespeare Controversy*, p. 311), says: "*Neither these designs—nor any of them—nor the 'annexed' description can be found*

warrantable stretch of the imagination to fancy that the artist and the poet may have discussed these very sketches, and also exchanged thoughts on other subjects as well. Men like Dowland and Inigo Jones, who had not only seen the world and moved in many different spheres of society, but were at the head of their own professions, and, indeed, had brought their professions to a high degree of perfection, must undoubtedly have greatly attracted and interested Shakespeare; what they had to relate of their experiences would meet his eager desire for information and culture, by increasing his knowledge of life; and his opinions and views about the nature of art would become enlarged and enlightened by his intercourse with them. The fact of Inigo Jones having been a Catholic would in no way affect the matter. Florio, too, although not to be compared with Dowland or Jones as regards intellect, nevertheless possessed elements of culture which could not fail to be welcome and of advantage to Shakespeare. Florio was born in 1545 of Italian parents who had to flee to London owing to the persecution of the Waldenses, to which sect they belonged; it is probable that Michaelangelo Florio, who is mentioned about 1550 as having been a preacher in the Italian Protestant Church in London, was John Florio's father. When Mary the Catholic ascended the throne, his parents had again to flee and leave England, and John was educated on the continent. Upon the accession of Elizabeth, the family were enabled to return to England. John went to Oxford, where he finished his studies at Magdalen College, but, at the same time, gave lessons to his co-religionists in the modern languages, more especially in Italian. Subsequently he was patronized by the aristocratic circles in London, was for some years in the service of Lord Southampton, and then appointed teacher of languages to Prince Henry and Queen Anne, and eventually became the Queen's private secretary. Anne, like Elizabeth, spoke Italian fluently. Florio's Italian Dictionary ("A World of Wordes," &c., first published in 1598), for a long time enjoyed an almost classic reputation as being the best work of its kind. But he won even greater celebrity by his well-known translation of Montaigne's "Essays" (1603), which he dedicated to Lady Rich, and which Shake-

at Devonshire House?" Dr. Ingleby, however, makes no mention of Cunningham's *Life of Inigo Jones;* the designs which he refers to are some of Collier's discoveries.

speare—as has been established beyond doubt—read diligently and made use of on occasion.[1] According to Warburton and other editors, Shakespeare is said to have given us a portrait of Florio in Holofernes (see p. 37); however, there are many things that oppose the supposition. Florio, according to his own statement, was a *protégé* of Southampton's, and moreover was married to the daughter of Samuel Daniel the sonnet-writer; these two circumstances alone would have prevented Shakespeare putting Florio on the stage. And besides we know nothing of Florio's life and character that could have induced Shakespeare to ridicule him in such a manner; "resolute John Florio," as he signs himself at the end of the Preface to his Dictionary, seems, on the contrary, to have been a most estimable man, both in his life and in his work. This is confirmed by what Anthony Wood says of him: "he was a very useful man in his profession, zealous in the religion he professed, and much devoted to the English nation." Shakespeare might moreover have found Florio very useful in helping him to acquire a knowledge of the modern languages and literatures, and our poet would have been the very reverse of "gentle," if, by way of gratitude, he had caricatured him, and exposed him to the ridicule of the London public. Florio died at Fulham, of the plague, in 1625.

Of the actors who must have belonged to the circle of Shakespeare's acquaintances, after Burbage, the first place must naturally be assigned to Heminge and Condell, the subsequent editors of his works. These three of his fellow-actors (and they alone) Shakespeare mentions in his will, bequeathing to each 26*s.* 3*d.* to purchase rings in remembrance of him. In a subsequent chapter we shall have to speak more in detail of these men, as well as of the other members of the Lord Chamberlain's company. Whether, or in how far Shakespeare associated with the members of other theatrical companies, more especially with Alleyn and Henslowe, there is no evidence whatever to show.

Most of the literary men, as well as the actors, introduced to the reader above, were married men, and led an orderly life among their families, in accordance with the customs of the

[1] The well-known passage in *The Tempest*, ii. 1, 147 ff., is borrowed almost word for word from Florio's translation. Florio also published a work entitled *First Fruits, or Dialogues in Italian and English* (1578), and *Second Fruits* in 1591.

day. Their homes, however, were not the centres of social intercourse. Social gatherings within the family circle were not then known; women did not, as yet, play any part in social entertainments, much less did they form the centre of attraction as in the French *salons* of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. London was a gay and lively city, and, in this respect also, was the veritable and genuine capital of Merry old England. Thornbury[1] justly proclaims "sociability" to have been one of the prominent features of the Elizabethan period. People found their "ease in their inn," where, of course, there was drinking in plenty. Nash, in his "Pierce Penniless," denounces this life at taverns, and maintains that the excessive drinking of the age was introduced from the Netherlands. "From gluttonie in meates," he says on page 52, "let me discend to superflutie in drink, a sinne that, ever since we have mixt our selves with the Low Countries, is counted honourable, but before we knew their lingring warres, was held in the highest degree of hatred that might be." Who, in reading this, can fail to remember Shakespeare's fierce denunciation of "giddying drink" in "Hamlet"? Certain it is that Dutchmen, Danes, and Germans were masters in drinking, and that Englishmen too gave excellent proof of the same talent, and became a credit to their teachers. The subject is repeatedly referred to by Shakespeare, as well as by other contemporary writers, especially in "Othello," ii. 3: "I learned it in England, where, indeed, they are most potent in potting: your Dane, your German, and your swag-bellied Hollander—Drink, ho!—are nothing to your English.—Is your Englishman so expert in his drinking?—Why, he drinks you, with facility, your Dane dead drunk; he sweats not to overthrow your Almain; he gives your Hollander a vomit, ere the next pottle can be filled."[2] Shakespeare's own position with regard to the subject is easily recognized from this; he denounced hard drinking no less than the satirist Nash, and was himself a moderate drinker, although, no doubt, he was not one to despise the good things of the table, and probably found pleasure in all temperate enjoyments. In this, as in many other respects, Shakespeare doubtless resembled Walter Scott, who

[1] *Shakespeare's England*, i. 103.

[2] Compare Beaumont and Fletcher, *The Captain*, iii. 2; *The Merchant of Venice*, i. 2 (the Duke of Saxony's nephew).

although not at all disinclined to join in genuine Teutonic "conviviality," repeatedly wrote to his eldest son, warning him that nothing was so injurious to body and mind as the love of drink, even in a moderate way. Aubrey reports that Shakespeare was "very good company;" but we cannot for a moment doubt that he was a temperate man. He, probably, often and gladly mixed with cheerful and intellectual society and visited public places of entertainment—The Mermaid, The Boar's Head, Steelyard—were it only to study character there. The ordinaries, where the entrance fee varied from 3*d.* to 10 crowns, had a peculiarly bad reputation among Shakespeare's contemporaries; all sorts of disreputable and dishonest folk frequented these places, and their behaviour must often have been outrageous, if we are to believe the accounts given by Dekker,[1] Thornbury,[2] and others. After dining, the guests generally smoked and played *primero*. The gay circles in London were very well acquainted with the fully-developed Teutonic rules of the noble art of drinking, as is proved by the expression *Upsy Dutch* (which has caused commentators so much trouble), the *supernaculum*, and other such words. The young men of Shakespeare's London drank to good-fellowship in precisely the same manner as the German students do nowadays, with their arms linked one into the other.[3] Dutch drinking songs, or at least songs with a Dutch ring in them, were introduced from Holland.[4] A vintner's business was a brisk one all over England, and above all in London. Steelyard was a centre for international drinking bouts, and was frequently patronized by Englishmen also, who could there become acquainted with German delicacies and German customs. Crabbed old Nash [5] says: "Men, when they are idle, and not know what to do, saith one: Lett us goe to the stilliard and drinke Rhenish wine. Nay, if a man knew where a good whorehouse were, saith another, it were somewhat like. Nay, saith the third, let us goe to a dicing-house, or a bowling-alley, and there we shall have some sport for our

[1] See Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 263.
[2] *Shakespeare's England*, i. 124-129.
[3] See my *Notes on Elizabethan Dramatists*, vol. i. p. 31 ff.
[4] Compare *Othello*, ii. 3 ("let me the canakin clink"), and the lines in *The Shoemaker's Holiday* ("There was a boer van Gelderland"); see also my *Englische Sprache und Literatur in Deutschland*, p. 17 ff.
[5] *Pierce Penniless*, ed. Collier, p. 56.

money." In Dekker and Webster's "Westward Ho!" we are introduced to an exceedingly lifelike scene in the Steelyard; Londoners, both men and women, are drinking German wines and cider, eating German buns and swearing in German, while the German waiter, Hans, uses her Majesty's English in broken accents. There can be no doubt whatever that, just as Shakespeare must have visited Drake's famous ship, he must also, at times, have visited the Steelyard in merry company, and have there drunk Rhenish wine and partaken of caviare, ox-tongue and Westphalian ham. To as keen an inquirer into human nature as Shakespeare, it must undoubtedly have been of the utmost interest to come across foreigners and to observe their ways in a place of this sort. He may there even have seen the *upspring*[1] danced, which in his "Hamlet" he causes to be danced before the drunken King, and may there have become acquainted with the custom of using wreaths as a decoration; for a wreath, under the German name of *Crants*, he gives Ophelia on her last journey. However, there were other things—better and nobler—that Shakespeare would come across at the Steelyard, viz., Holbein's far-famed picture, "The Triumph of Riches and The Triumph of Poverty," which had been painted at the request of the Hanseatic merchants as a decoration for their great hall.[2] No doubt other paintings adorned the walls, perhaps portraits more especially, whether the work of Holbein or other artists. The two Triumphs, with its reflective, allegorical character, does not appear to have made any deep impression upon Shakespeare, otherwise he would probably

[1] See my edition of *Shakespeare's Tragedy of Hamlet* (Halle, 1882), p. 133 ff.

[2] Woltmann, *Holbein und seine Zeit*, ii. 218-228; Lappenberg, *Stahlhof*, pp. 82-87.—After Elizabeth had taken possession of the Steelyard in 1598, and had caused the Germans to be driven from their houses, the building and its contents were left wholly uncared for and neglected, so that when James I. returned the place to its original owners in 1606, it was in a pitiable state, and almost all the furniture had been stolen. Shortly after this, when social gatherings had ceased to be held at the Steelyard, and the rooms were let out on hire, the Hanseatic towns determined to present Holbein's painting to Prince Henry, who was a zealous patron of art, as was subsequently his brother Charles I. Woltmann, *l.c.*—We may add that Shakespeare must certainly also have seen the painting of Holbein, still preserved in Barber Surgeons' Hall, which represents Henry VIII. conferring a charter to the Corporation of the Barber Surgeons; in this picture Holbein gives a portrait of Dr. Butts, the King's physician, whom Shakespeare has immortalized in his *Henry VIII.*, v. 2.

have alluded to it somewhere. Perhaps, according to his idea, paintings should not demand careful study, but rather attract by their direct truth to life, like Giulio Romano's sensuous fulness of nature. Of this, however, we shall have to speak more fully in another chapter.

In a circle of such highly cultivated men as Shakespeare must have associated with, it could not, of course, have been the mere love of drinking, but the poetry of drinking, that induced them to meet at their so-called clubs which contemporary writers invariably refer to with praise. These evening —it may have been nocturnal—meetings, tradition tells us, were held at The Mitre, The Falcon,[1] The Apollo, and, above all, at The Mermaid, where the famous club founded by Sir Walter Raleigh, praised by Beaumont (in a letter to B. Jonson), and described by Fuller, held its meetings.[2] Owing to the occasional mention of many other inns, it may be inferred that club-life was not confined to any specified locality, but that the members, influenced by the goodness of the beverages or other circumstances, retained their freedom of moving from place to place at will. The famous Boar's Head in Eastcheap —which Shakespeare makes the scene of his Falstaff club— appears not to have been visited by the club of literary men.[3] It would further seem that Shakespeare was by no means the chief attraction at the club. This position was occupied by Ben Jonson, and his admirers frequently bring this forward in his praise, whereas Shakespeare has never been eulogized in any such way as Herrick's ode speaks of Ben Jonson.[4] Jonson was obviously the one who attended the meetings most regularly. He was cock of the roost, whereas Shakespeare was perhaps only an occasional visitor and inclined to be reserved. Jonson subsequently started a club of his own, called St.

[1] A picture of The Falcon is given by Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 379.

[2] The lines in Beaumont are :—

What things have we seen
Done at the Mermaid! heard words that have been
So nimble, and so full of subtile flame,
As if that every one from whence they came
Had meant to put his whole wit in a jest,
Aud had resolv'd to live a fool the rest
Of his dull life.

[3] Compare *Athenæum*, 1868, ii. 92; *Outlines*, ii. 257 ff.

[4] *The Works of B. Jonson*, ed. Gifford (in one vol.), p. 88. The first verse runs :—

Dunstan's.[1] It is certain also that Jonson was less temperate than Shakespeare; at least, Drummond says of Jonson that "Drink is one of the elements in which he liveth."[2] In "Every Man in His Humour," v. 4, Jonson allows us to spend an evening at The Mitre, and it is supposed that he has described himself in the drink-loving Carlo Buffone; still this may have been meant to be a comic piece of exaggeration. It is curious that while Jonson seems to have enlivened and delighted the company at the club with his humour, in his writings this humour is invariably stilted and artificial, and in comparison with Shakespeare his works cannot in fact be admitted to possess anything whatever of wit or humour. Shakespeare's comic scenes to-day carry away the reader or listener even against their will, but who can laugh at Ben Jonson's jokes? Fuller[3] reports that, "Many were the wit-combats betwixt him [viz., Shakespeare] and B. Jonson; which two I behold like a Spanish great galleon and an English man-of-war: Master Jonson (like the former) was built far higher in learning; solid, but slow, in his performances. Shakespeare, with the English man-of-war, lesser in bulk, but lighter in sailing, could turn with all tides, tack about, and take advantage of all winds, by the quickness of his wit and invention." This report comes from the year 1662, and Fuller was only eight years old when Shakespeare died; he is, therefore, anything but an authority of the first rank, and the expression, "I behold them"—to which may

---

Ah Ben!
Say how, or when
Shall we thy guests
Meet at those lyric feasts
Made at The Sun,
The Dog, The Triple Tun?
Where we such clusters had
As made us nobly wild, not mad;
And yet each verse of thine
Outdid the meat, outdid the frolic wine!

The Triple Tun refers to the circumstance that the Vintners' Guild had three tuns as their crest.

[1] See *The Works of B. Jonson*, ed. Gifford, p. 56.

[2] Compare Sir John Suckling, *Poems, Plays, and other Remains.* A new ed. [by W. C. Hazlitt], Lond., 1874, i. 8. Suckling was about twenty-nine years old at the time of B. Jonson's death, and is therefore a reliable witness.

[3] *The Worthies of England*, p. 180.

be added, "in my mind's eye"—is characteristic of his account. But nevertheless it cannot be denied that it possesses the most plausible internal truth. For Jonson was precisely like a huge, unwieldy Spanish galleon, even outside of his club, and was puffed up with self-sufficiency and arrogant conceit. In his "Bartholomew Fair" (i. 1) we see him looking down contemptuously upon the other wits of the day: "A pox o' these Pretenders to wit! your Three Cranes, Mitre and Mermaid men! not a corn of true salt, not a grain of right mustard amongst them all! They may stand for places, or so, again the next wit-fall and pay two-pence in a quart more for their canary than other men," &c. And yet it is not in Ben Jonson but in Shakespeare that the wit-combats have been immortalized, and found a re-echo in the most varied forms; in Ben Jonson there is nothing worth speaking of in this respect. The character of these wit-combats has been most fully and best described by Gervinus.[1] But, in any case, the origin of the Falstaff episode must be looked for in The Mermaid club and other such meetings, where the members, no doubt, chaffed and quizzed one another much in the same way. Indeed, when we read a description of the person of Henry Chettle, we find it difficult to reject the thought that he must have been the model for Falstaff, at all events as regards his corpulence, and that a great many of the jokes fired at Falstaff respecting his size had originally been aimed at Chettle. In Dekker's pamphlet, "A Knight Conjuring" (1607, Sign. L), the company of poets are represented in an Elysian laurel-wood. At the head stand Chaucer and Spenser. "In another companie sat learned Atchlow and (tho he had been a player molded out of their pennes, yet because he had been their lover and register to the Muse) inimitable Bentley: these were likewise carowsing out of the holy well, &c. Whilst Marlowe, Greene, and Peele had gott vnder the shades of a large vyne, laughing to see Nashe, that was but newly come to their colledge, still haunted with the sharpe and satyricall spirit that followed him heere upon earth." Chettle is also introduced: "In comes Chettle, sweating and blowing, by reason of his fatness: to welcome whom, because he was of olde acquaintance, all rose up and fell presentlie on their knees, to drink a health to all lovers of

[1] Gervinus, *Shakespeare Commentaries*, p. 171 ff.

Helicon."[1] This falling on their knees must also, it would seem, have had a satirical meaning; the young blustering spirits are sure to have done more than merely had their fun with the fat old gentleman in the Elysian wood, especially as he was an old acquaintance. Not only wit-combats but coarser jokes are sure to have been the order of the day, or rather of the night. Of Shakespeare jests only one is reported, not upon any very good authority certainly, and although it did not originate at one of these evening meetings, this will be our best opportunity for quoting it. In Sir Nicholas Lestrange's MS. "Merry Passages and Jests,"[2] we find the following passage: "Shakespeare was godfather to one of B. Jonson's children, and after the christ'ning, being in a deepe study, Jonson came to cheere him up, and ask't him why he was so melancholy? 'No, faith, Ben' (says he), 'not I, but I have been considering a great while what should be the fittest gift for me to bestow upon my god-child, and I have resolv'd at last.' 'I pr'y the, what?' says he. 'I' faith, Ben, I'le e'en give him a douzen good Lattin Spoones, and thou shalt translate them.'" Knight[3] gives this anecdote only as a note, and there only by way of showing his respect for the editor, Mr. Thoms.

This brings us now to the thorny question as to the relation in which Shakespeare and Ben Jonson stood to each other, a question which has called forth a little literature of its own, and is ever giving rise to new investigations.[4] Jonson's rela-

[1] Whether it is necessary to infer from this passage, as is done by Joh. Meissner (*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, ix. 134), viz., that Chettle was dead at the time this was written, seems to me doubtful. We possess no information whatever of Chettle's death, and the chaff and wit of the above description would only have been the more drastic had it been written during Chettle's lifetime.

[2] In the British Museum *Harleian MSS.* No. 6395, from which Wm. J. Thoms has published an extract.—*Anecdotes and Traditions illustrative of Early English History and Literature derived from MS. Sources*, published for the Camden Society, Part I., 2 and 3.

[3] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 275.

[4] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), i. 402-435.—Octavius Gilchrist, *An Examination of the Charges maintained by Messrs. Malone, Chalmers, and others of B. Jonson's Enmity, &c., towards Shakespeare*, Lond., 1808; *Shakespeare and Jonson. Dramatic versus Wit-combats. Auxiliary Forces: Beaumont and Fletcher, Marston, Dekker, Chapman and Webster*, Lond., 1864 (*Athen.* No. 1895, Feb. 20, 1864, p. 255 ff.).—*B. Jonson's Quarrel with Shakespeare* [by R. Simpson] in *The North British Review*, No. civ., July, 1870 (in *The Academy*, Aug. 13, 1870, p. 283 ff.).—Gifford, *Memoirs of B.*

tion to Shakespeare as a poet has been best described by Dryden in the Prologue to his and Davenant's version of "The Tempest," and in the Prologue to his version of "Julius Cæsar."[1] It is a generally accepted fact that Shakespeare stood in closer relation to Ben Jonson—in a literary respect as well as personally—than to any other contemporary poet, and it is only Octavius Gilchrist and Gifford who seek to deny that various literary quarrels and differences arose between them—differences that were provoked by B. Jonson. However, Gilchrist is very superficial in his proceedings, and Gifford, who is most one-sided, we might almost say deluded, endeavours not merely to whitewash his hero, but eulogizes Jonson both as a man and a poet.[2] And yet there are such numerous and express proofs and indications of the existence of these quarrels, that to any unprejudiced mind there can be no doubt of the fact; but curiously enough these disputes appear to have but little affected the personal friendship or the esteem which both poets entertained for each other. When we read Jonson's famous eulogy on Shakespeare—"To the Memorie of my Beloved," &c.—it is of course hard to believe that the same man could ever have attacked the object of his veneration, or have been guilty of making underhand and spiteful allusions to

Jonson (*The Works of B. Jonson*, Moxon, one vol.).—Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 380 ff.—Kenny, *The Life and Genius of Shakespeare*, pp. 410-414.—Brinsley Nicholson, *The Countercheck Quarrelsome*, by B. Jonson and Co., with Shakespeare's *Retort Courteous*, in *N. and Q.*, 1864, No. 115.

[1] Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 256 ff.

[2] It is strange that Rowe in his later editions suppresses the accusations he originally brought against Jonson. This proceeding is the less intelligible as we cannot help considering the eliminated passage to be perfectly correct. The passage in question is this: "After this they were profess'd Friends: tho' I don't know whether the other [viz. Jonson] ever made him an equal return of Gentilness and Sincerity. Ben was naturally Proud and Insolent, and in the Days of his Reputation did so far take upon him the Supremacy of Wit, that he could not but look with an evil Eye upon any one that seem'd to stand in Competition with him. And if at times he has affected to commend him, it has always been with some Reserve, insinuating his Uncorrectness, a careless manner of Writing and want of Judgment; the Praise of Seldom altering or blotting out what he writ, which was given him by the Players, who were the first Publishers of his Works after his Death, was what Johnson could not bear; he thought it impossible, perhaps, for another Man to strike out the greatest Thoughts in the finest Expression, and to reach those Excellencies of Poetry with the Ease of a first Imagination, which himself with infinite Labour and Study could but hardly attain to." See *Malone's Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), i. 442. Malone would merely like the words "but hardly" changed to "never."

him. In his "Discoveries"[1] Jonson, in speaking of Shakespeare, gives him both praise and censure; in referring to Heminge and Condell's statement that Shakespeare had never blotted out a line—he wishes that Shakespeare might have blotted out a thousand, but at the same time assures us that he "loved the man and do honour his memory, on this side idolatry, as much as any." This love and veneration, the sincerity of which can no longer be disputed, finds its noblest expression in the above-mentioned ode to Shakespeare's memory, one that will be classic for all ages to come. It may sound paradoxical, but it is my conviction that this is Ben Jonson's finest poem—to a certain extent, the finest passage in his poetry—and it is inconceivable that Dryden, in the Dedication of his translation of Juvenal (1693), should call it "an insolent, sparing, and invidious panegyric." Dryden must surely have known that Jonson had no such intention. In his famous Ode, Jonson, for instance, praises Shakespeare's art ("thy art, My gentle Shakespeare, must enjoy a part"), of which he had spoken disparagingly to Drummond and others.[2] In order to explain the contradiction between his extravagant praise and oft-repeated abuse of Shakespeare, we must enter a little more fully into Jonson's life and character.

The most important contribution we have regarding Ben Jonson's character we owe to William Drummond, to whose romantic residence at Hawthornden, near Edinburgh, Jonson travelled on foot in 1619. Drummond made detailed entries in his Diary of Jonson's observations and conversation, and these were subsequently published, but not till long after Drummond's death.[3] The picture he gives of his guest is anything but flattering, but in the main features is certainly correct, let Gifford fight against or try to turn the point as he may. Drummond describes Jonson thus: "He is a great

[1] The *Discoveries* are not contained in the first folio edition of Jonson's works (1616), but first appeared in the second folio of 1641, published four years after his death.

[2] With regard to the lines quoted by him from *Julius Cæsar*, iii. 1 ("Know, Cæsar doth not wrong," &c.), compare Rowe, *Some Account*, &c. (1709), xxxix.—Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 184 ff.—Jonson also ridicules this line in the *Introduction* to *The Staple of News*, so that there can be no doubt about his interpretation of it.

[3] First in *William Drummond's Works*, Edinburgh, 1711; afterwards in *B. Jonson's Conversations with Wm. Drummond*, ed. David Laing, London, 1842 (Publications of the Shakespeare Society).—Drummond died in 1649.

lover and praiser of himself, a contemner and scorner of others; given rather to losse a friend than a jest; jealous of every word and action of those about him (especiallie after drink, which is one of the elements in which he liveth); a dissembler of ill parts which raigne in him, a bragger of some good, that he wanteth: thinketh nothing well bot what either he himself or some of his friends or countrymen hath said or done; he is passionately kynde and angry; careless either to gaine or keep; vindictive, but, if he be well answered, at himself. For any religion, as being versed in both. Interpreteth best sayings and deeds often to the worst. Oppressed with his fantasie, which hath ever mastered his reason, a generall disease in many Poets. His inventions are smooth and easie, but above all he excelleth in a Translation. When his play of a Silent Woman was first acted, there was found verses after on the stage against him, concluding that that play was well named the Silent Woman, there was never one man to say Plaudite to it." To this sharp delineation of Jonson's character, Cibber[1] adds the following comparison: "In short, he was in his personal character the very reverse of Shakespeare; as surly, ill-natured, proud, and disagreeable, as Shakespeare, with ten times his merit, was gentle, good-natured, easy, and amiable." It is true that no great value can be placed in Cibber's "Lives of the Poets," which were in reality not written by Cibber, but by Richard Shiels; but what conceivable reason was there for Drummond, in a private diary, to paint his guests in blacker colours than they had shown themselves to himself? Or can Drummond be supposed to have lacked the power of observation and of judgment for estimating Jonson properly? Drummond was of good family, had enjoyed a careful education, and had travelled far and wide, so that we must believe him to have possessed some knowledge of humanity and a correct insight into character. Jonson's champions, especially Gifford and Gilchrist, have attacked Drummond's character, and tried to throw an unfavourable light upon him merely to save the honour of their *protégé*. They have branded Drummond's Notes as treacherous to friendship and hospitality, as the outcome of a mean and deceitful nature.[2] But it was not Drum-

[1] *Lives of the English Poets*, i. 241.

[2] "A contemporary who knew Drummond a little better than Mr. Chalmers, calls him 'Testy Drummond,' in a defense of poesie, appended to *The most pleasante Historie of Albino and Bellama*, 8vo., 1639."—This is

mond who published the Notes, and in all probability he never intended to have them published, at least there is not the faintest reason for any such supposition, which, in fact, is as good as refuted by established facts. If such principles are to be set up as a guarantee of character, then anyone who keeps notes of his experiences in life must be regarded as a contemptible traitor. Besides, what Drummond jotted down in connection with Ben Jonson corresponds perfectly with what we know and must infer from other sources respecting him. Ben Jonson had an unhappy and hard life as a child, and the want of means and of affection in his early home seem to have embittered his whole life, and to have left an irremovable thorn in his side. His father, who had been a clergyman, died before his birth; and, according to the general supposition, first started by Anthony Wood (?), his mother shortly afterwards married a mason or bricklayer, who brought him up to this craft. Fuller even reports that Jonson was engaged at the building of Lincoln's Inn, and that "when having a trowel in one hand, he had a book in his pocket." He then served as a volunteer in the English army in Flanders, but liked this pursuit as little as that of a bricklayer. At the age of nineteen he returned to London, tried his luck as an actor, but was as little successful in the service of Melpomene as in that of Mars, and indeed was not likely to be successful, for reasons to be stated immediately. A quarrel with one of the other actors led to a duel in which Jonson killed his antagonist, and for this he was charged with murder, imprisoned, and came "almost at the gallows." During his imprisonment he became a Papist, but eventually returned to the Protestant Church.[1] At the age of twenty, and with no other means of existence beyond his pen, Jonson married a person whom, after her death, he described to Drummond as "shrewish, but honest

the only thing that Gilchrist has to bring forward against Drummond's character. Is this nameless and unknown defender of poesie really a witness to be trusted and relied upon? And even though Drummond may have been "testy," this would not in any way detract from his truthfulness.

[1] Jonson himself communicated this story to Drummond. According to Aubrey, the actor whom he killed was no other than Marlowe; but this is incorrect. Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 381. In a letter (is it genuine?) of Henslowe's, given in Collier's *Memoirs of Alleyn*, Jonson's antagonist is called Gabriel, and Jonson is termed a "bricklayer." With regard to Gabriel compare *The First Sketches of the Second and Third Parts of King Henry VI.*, ed. Halliwell, p. xv.

to her husband." He thereupon began to write for the stage, and, according to Rowe's statement, it was Shakespeare to whom he owed the performance of his first (and best) piece—"Every Man in His Humour," in September, 1598.[1] The actors, so it is said, had rejected it, but Shakespeare, perceiving its merits, urged its acceptance. Whether or not this story may be considered beyond all doubt, still it is very likely that Shakespeare gave Ben Jonson a helping hand. The very fact of Shakespeare's having taken part in the performance was exceedingly important to Jonson, and to the success of his plays, and we have B. Jonson's own evidence that Shakespeare played in "Every Man in His Humour" and in "Sejanus." Jonson was by no means blind to this advantage, and, indeed, acknowledged it with pride; it was food to his unquestionable self-sufficiency and his conceit. But unless we are deceived on all sides, Shakespeare lent him a helping hand in writing his "Sejanus." Jonson himself says in the Preface of the remodelled play, that he has effaced all traces of the hand which had helped him, but, at the same time, acknowledges his gratitude for the help he had received. His fellow-worker is not, indeed, mentioned by name, but between the lines it is clear that the reference is to no other than Shakespeare.[2] "I would inform you," he says, "that this book, in all numbers, is not the same with that which was acted on the public stage; wherein a second pen had good share: in place of which I have rather chosen to put weaker, and, no doubt, less pleasing of mine own, than to defraud so happy a genius of his right by my loathed usurpation." To what other "happy genius" would Jonson have been as deferential? On the other hand, the reason which Jonson gives for having remodelled his work is scarcely correct. A passage in Davies' "Scourge of Folly" throws a very different light upon the matter, admitting that it is not a mistake to refer it to Jonson. This is the famous epigram, "To our Terence, Mr. Will Shake-speare," which runs as follows:—

> Some say—good Will—which I in sport do sing,
> Had'st thou not plaid some kingly parts in sport,

---

[1] Gifford, *B. Jonson's Works* (Moxon, 1846), p. 12; *Outlines*, i. 154 ff.

[2] Gifford, naturally, is of a different opinion; according to him it was Fletcher or Middleton; according to F. Cunningham (in his edition of *B. Jonson's Works*), Beaumont; and, finally, according to Nicholson, it was Samuel Sheppard. Compare *The Athenæum*, 1875, i. 581.

Thou had'st bin a companion for a king,
And beene a king among the meaner sort.
Some others raile, but raile as they think fit;
Thou hast no rayling, but a raigning wit:
And honesty thou sow'st, which they do reape,
So to increase their stock, which they doe keepe.

These lines were written in 1611,[1] and it is not till 1616 (when his first folio was published) that Jonson confesses to having had help from another hand, and that these parts were to be erased; and this was doubtless done because of other charges of a similar kind that had been brought against him.[2] The "rayling wit" leads one at once to think of Jonson. Does he not himself state in the Prologue to his "Volpone," and in the closing scene of his "Poetaster," that his adversaries say of him, "all he writes is railing." Further, his request in the Introduction to his "Bartholomew Fair," that no one is to seek or find in his pieces all sorts of allusions to persons, is the very thing to prove the existence of such allusions. In another passage in Davies' "Scourge of Folly," also, we learn the general opinion of contemporaries concerning B. Jonson, and it matters but little that Davies is found trying to shield him:—

Thou art sound in body, but some say, thy soule
Envy doth ulcer; yet corrupted hearts
Such censurers must have.

Or is Davies only ridiculing him, and, at heart, of the same opinion as the public? Jonson was quite unable to control his satirical, quarrelsome, and spiteful nature.[3] At the very outset

[1] According to Drake, i. 680, and Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 43. Neil, p. 51, on the other hand, assumes 1607. Are there two different editions from these years?

[2] The same accusation is contained, for example, in the following epigram from *Laquei Ridiculosi, or Springes for Woodcocks*, by H. P. (Henry Parrott?), 1613, No. 163, printed in *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, i. 21:

Cignus per plumas Anser.
Put off thy buskins, Sophocles the great,
And mortar tread with thy disdained shanks.
Thou thinkst thy skill hath done a wondrous feat,
For which the world should give thee many thanks.
Alas! it seems thy feathers are but loose,
Pluckt from a swan, and set upon a goose.

The allusion to the "mortar tread" shows clearly who is spoken of. Can therefore the "swan" have been anyone but Shakespeare?

[3] In addition to all this Jonson is accused of having been *a denouncer*—with regard to the murder of the Duke of Buckingham (*Steenie*), *Athenæum*, 1859, ii. 740.—"His malignity seems to have been more equal to his wit," says Steevens of Jonson, *Shakespeare*, iv. 2.

he placed himself in opposition to the Shakespearean style of drama; his combativeness led him to quarrel with everyone, and he not only had squabbles with Dekker and Marston, but also with Inigo Jones among others. Jonson's words to Drummond in connection with his literary colleagues are: "Drayton feared him—he beat Marston, and took his pistol from him—Sir William Alexander was not half kind unto him—Markham was but a base fellow—such were Day and Middleton—Sharpham, Day, Dekker were all rogues and that Minshew was one—Abraham Francis was a fool." After such remarks, and all the other circumstances that speak in the same strain, can there be any doubt regarding Jonson's character? The fact that Shakespeare is not classed with the rest as a rogue or fool, is obviously accounted for by Jonson's having felt indebted to him, and, in his less irritable moments, allowed his nobler feelings to assert themselves. For Shakespeare, throughout life, met his rival in a spirit of friendliness and consideration, and in replying to his attacks always kept within the bounds of the literary dispute, whereas the others allowed themselves to be carried away, and made personal retorts of the most offensive kind. This is the key to it all. That there were quarrels and also antagonism between Jonson and Shakespeare cannot unfortunately be doubted, but they remained literary disputes, and never degenerated into personal squabbles, as in Dekker's "Satiro-Mastix," where we have no literary satire, but mere personal abuse. Dekker's "Satiro-Mastix" was, it is true, a reply to Jonson's "Poetaster," and Jonson had, therefore, been the aggressor; however, Dekker not only attacks Jonson's personal character, but sneers at his former occupation as a bricklayer, calling him "a foul-fisted mortar treader," and other such names, nay, even scoffs at his ugliness, saying that his face looked like "a rotten russet-apple when it is bruised," and his "goodly and glorious nose was blunt, blunt, blunt." This must have hurt Jonson's feelings most deeply, especially as his ugliness seems to have been one of the reasons why he was unsuccessful as an actor, and had to give up that remunerative profession. He also, probably, had no refinement of manner, or graceful bearing. Aubrey says frankly, after having praised Shakespeare as an actor, "now, B. Jonson was never a good actor," but adds that he was "an excellent instructor."

An irrefutable testimony regarding the disputes between Jonson and Shakespeare is to be found in "The Return from

Parnassus,"[1] a piece not indeed published till 1606, but which had doubtless been written before Elizabeth's death, and had been performed by the students of St. John's College, Cambridge.[2] The following words are there put into Kempe's mouth: "Few of the University pen plays well; they smell too much of that writer Ovid, and that writer Metamorphosis, and talk too much of Proserpine and Jupiter. Why, here's our fellow Shakespeare puts them all down: Ay, and B. Jonson too. O, that B. Jonson is a pestilent fellow, he brought up Horace giving the poets a pill; but our fellow Shakespeare hath given him a purge that made him bewray his credit." This clearly shows the state of affairs. Jonson was the first to fall out, and Shakespeare had to give him a bit of his mind. The bringing in of Horace refers to the "Poetaster," where Jonson deals out his blows under the name of the Roman satirist; a hit at Shakespeare[3] is said to be contained in the ridicule cast upon the armorial bearings of Crispinus, and upon the poet's claim to "gentility;" on the other hand, Dr. Brinsley Nicholson[4] endeavours to prove that the coat-of-arms satirically ascribed to Crispinus corresponds with that of Marston, and has nothing whatever in common with Shakespeare's. Dekker, in his "Satiro-Mastix" has, in fact, accepted the names Crispinus and Demetrius for Marston and himself; whether Jonson wished to weave some feature of Shakespeare's character into that of Crispinus seems very doubtful. Incomparably more distinct allusions to Shakespeare are to be found in Jonson's other works, in fact almost from first to last; the Prologue to "Every Man in His Humour" opens the series. Gilchrist and Gifford grow hot in their endeavour to prove that it does not contain the smallest allusion to Shakespeare; however, it is difficult to believe that Jonson's public did not take it as referring to Shakespeare, even though the thrust may not have been intentionally aimed at him, but at some earlier dramatists who had already been

[1] In Hawkins, *Origin of the English Drama*, iii.

[2] See the reprint of *The Return from Parnassus* in Mr. Arber's *English Scholar's Library* (1879), with Mr. Arber's *Introduction;* Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse* (2nd ed.), p. 49. *The Return from Parnassus*, i. 2, also contains a drastic description of B. Jonson, who is termed "the wittiest fellow of a bricklayer in England, a bold whoreson, as confident now in making of a book, as he was in times past in laying of a brick."

[3] According to *The North British Review*, No. civ.

[4] In *Notes and Queries*, June 3, 1871, p. 469.

forgotten.[1] The substance and object of the Prologue is simply that Jonson wishes to have it understood that his comedy is based on the ground of common experience, in contrast to the Shakespearean style. It is scarcely likely, therefore, that this Prologue can have been spoken when Shakespeare took part in the piece as old Knowell; in fact, the Prologue is not given in the quarto of 1600, but appears first in the folio of 1616. Even Steevens refers the words spoken by Mitis (in the sixth scene of Act iii.): "That the argument of his comedy might have been of some other nature as of a duke to be in love with a countess," &c., to "Twelfth Night." Malone, however, contradicts this; in his opinion "Twelfth Night" was not written till 1607—Tyrwhitt even assigns it to 1614. At all events, Jonson spoke disparagingly, in an indirect way, of "Twelfth Night" and of "The Comedy of Errors" to Drummond, for he declared that it had been his intention to write a play in imitation of the Amphitruo of Plautus, but that he had given up the idea because he felt he would never be able to find two persons so like each other as to make his audience believe they were one and the same person.[2] In the Dedication of "Volpone" to the two Universities, Jonson discusses the state of dramatic poetry and his position to it, and in his abuse of all the various writers Shakespeare is obviously included. Naturally the course he himself pursues is declared to be the right one, whereas the other, with Shakespeare at its head, is said to have struck out a wrong direction. In the piece itself (iii. 2) we find an allusion to the "theft" from Montaigne that can scarcely refer to anything except the description of the Utopian style of life in "The Tempest" (ii. 1). In fact, "The Tempest" seems to be the piece which Jonson takes special delight in attacking. In the Introduction to his "Bartholomew Fair" he attacks it again, and classes it with "The Winter's Tale;" he says: "If there be never a servant-monster in the fair, who can help it, nor a nest of antiques? He is loth make Nature afraid in his plays, like those that beget tales, tempests, and

[1] See Hunter's *Illustrations* and my *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 4. Gilchrist refers this *Prologue* to *Patient Grissel*, Lilly's *Endimion*, and other still earlier pieces, and points out that the same censure had been expressed by Sir Philip Sidney.

[2] *Conversations*, p. 29. Still, if B. Jonson by this meant to say that *The Comedy of Errors* was an imitation of the *Amphitruo*, he was not wrong.

such like drolleries." The extravagant friendship depicted in the Shakespearean Sonnets also—and more particularly where the Beloved one is seduced by the friend, without this making any difference to their friendship—is obviously held up to ridicule in "Bartholomew Fair" (v. 3), in the puppet-show introduced there under the title of "A True Trial of Friendship." We shall have to enter more fully into this matter on another occasion. According to Henry Brown,[1] Jonson's "Epicœne, or the Silent Woman" (1609), was also a satire on Shakespeare's Sonnets, and he even assumes that Sir John Daw and Sir Amorous La Foole can be recognized as Shakespeare and Pembroke, "drawn to the life, as near as Jonson dared." This, however, is going too far, and the reasons adduced by Brown are anything but convincing. The only thing that could possibly be an allusion to the first seventeen Sonnets are the verses entitled "A Ballad of Procreation," which Sir John Daw addresses to the beloved youth. To judge from various allusions in Jonson's unfinished drama, "The Sad Shepherd," it would seem as if the author had wished to give Shakespeare a lecture as to how a pastoral drama ought to be written.[2] And even though it were proved that "The Sad Shepherd" was written after Shakespeare's death, this would not alter the case. One of the most striking passages is the close of Act ii. 1, where Maudlin describes her "browdered belt;" this is almost word for word the story of the handkerchief in "Othello" (iii. 4).[3] When Jonson's "New Inn" proved a failure in 1629, he gave vent to his vexation in a poetical exhortation ("An Ode to Himself") addressed to the theatrical public, accusing it of still finding pleasure in such "mouldy tales" as "Pericles."[4]

It is impossible to bring forward a list of counter-thrusts by which Shakespeare may have replied to this list of Jonson's hits at him—a list which is, moreover, by no means a complete one, owing to his many concealed thrusts at his rival. In fact,

[1] *The Sonnets of Shakespeare Solved*, &c., 1870, p. 16 f.
[2] My *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 28.
[3] My *Notes on Elizabethan Dramatists*, i. 128 f.
[4] The lines are:—

No doubt, some mouldy tale
Like Pericles, and stale
As the shrieve's crust and nasty as his fish—
Scraps, out of every dish
Thrown forth, and raked into the common tub,
May keep up the Play-club.

not one single allusion to Jonson has been pointed out in Shakespeare's works. Where "Shakespeare can have given him a purge," as Kempe says he did, is as yet an unsolved question.[1] According to Malone,[2] Shakespeare's retorts to Jonson's attacks need not be looked for in his dramas, as they were given in epigrams or ballads that have been lost. This, however, is a conjecture without any foundation whatever.

It was not only in temperament, however, that Jonson was a complete contrast to the genial and gentle-minded Shakespeare, but in various other respects as well. Shakespeare was a well-made, if not a good-looking man, whereas Jonson, as already said, had to bear the misfortune of being ugly. Shakespeare scaled the ladder of prosperity with ease, and succeeded in acquiring a respected position in society, while Jonson, in spite of his praiseworthy efforts, remained poor, and was able to keep his head above water only by means of the pension he received from Court. Neither his works nor his connection with the Court as poet-laureate and a writer of Masques, obtained for him any position of respect and comfort which he could enjoy unmolested. Dekker in his "Satiro-Mastix" says that the barefaced way in which Jonson forced himself into aristocratic circles, his fawning flatteries, and the arrogant way in which he delighted to make a show of his learning, probably did him more harm, in this respect, than good. Further, while Shakespeare's works exhibit a poetic and creative power such as has never been equalled, B. Jonson's—taken as a whole—are the productions of indomitable industry. He knew well that quick production was the fashion of his day, and that it was accounted the inevitable sign of genius, and hence he boasts of having written his "Volpone" in five weeks; however, the malicious report which maintained that he took a year to write a play, cannot have been very far from the mark.[3] Shakespeare soared to the summit of Parnassus in one bold flight, Jonson scrambled and scrambled in the sweat of his brow, and did not reach the summit in spite of all his exertions. The road to fame was as rough for him as it was smooth to Shakespeare, and yet, in his self-conceit, he found no satisfaction in being compared to Shakespeare. Jonson, it is true, had his public, but not at all to the same

[1] Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 49.
[2] *Shakespeare's Works*, ii. 293.
[3] See the *Prologue* to *Volpone*. Also my *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 21 f.

extent as Shakespeare.[1] Even Gilchrist[2] cannot explain away the fact, partly admitted by Jonson himself, that four of his dramas proved utter failures,[3] namely, "Sejanus," "Catilina," "The New Inn," and "The Silent Woman."

Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that Jonson should feel the difference between himself and Shakespeare with bitterness and vexation, although in his better moments he may, perhaps, not have been able to withhold his full admiration of Shakespeare both as a man and as a poet, especially as Shakespeare never made him feel that he was his superior, and continued to play in Jonson's dramas till 1603, in spite of the insinuations against him; and yet this task—owing to Jonson's attacks—cannot always have been one of Shakespeare's pleasantest duties as an actor. Jonson seems invariably to have made Shakespeare the occasion of showing his dissatisfaction with his lot in life—not a very easy one to bear, it is true—and in pardonable self-excuse Jonson considered it the cause of all his want of success. But however much we may feel disposed to pardon such excuses, it is impossible to make out that his character was faultless. The fact that he attacked Shakespeare even after his death—nay, even after writing the famous Eulogy—can be denied only by those who force facts on to the Procrustes-bed of their own obstinacy, by declaring Drummond's Notes to be a disgraceful libel, and by wilfully ignoring the abuse Jonson poured upon "Pericl s" in "His Ode to Himself," or by a string of other sophisms.

In now returning to Shakespeare himself, we are met by the much-debated question as to whether his family followed him to London. In spite of the endeavours of several biographers to describe Shakespeare's marriage as having been a happy one, and that he and his wife continued to live happily afterwards in London, still we cannot do otherwise than join those who meet the question with a decided No. Of external proofs we have none, it is true, for the inference which Collier draws from the lately discovered will of Thomas Whittington of Shottery can never be considered a proof one way or the

[1] This is the incontrovertible testimony of an eyewitness, as given by Leonard Digges in his ode *Upon Master William Shakespeare, the Deceased Author, and his Poems* (reprinted in *Outlines*, ii. 88 f. and in Ingleby's *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 231 f.

[2] *An Examination into the Charges*, &c., p. 18.

[3] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), iii. 169.

other, notwithstanding the interest attached to the document itself.[1] This will, dated March 25th, 1601, was found by Sir Thomas Phillipps, the same who discovered the marriage contract among the Cathedral archives at Worcester, and contains the following entry: "Item, I give and bequeath unto the poor people of Stratford, forty shillings that is in the hand of Anne Shaxspere, wife unto Mr. William Shaxspere, and is due debt unto me, being paid to mine Executor by the said William Shaxspere, or his assigns, according to the true meaning of this my will."[2] This would, indeed, seem to prove that Shakespeare's family lived in Stratford while he himself resided in London; it would be unlikely, otherwise, that Mrs. Shakespeare should have money lent to her by a stranger. She may have been in temporary want of money, not being able to obtain it quickly enough from her husband in London. Shakespeare, as Collier points out, was very busy at the time in removing from Blackfriars, the Winter theatre, to The Globe or Summer theatre, where the performances probably commenced with the opening of the legal year, the 25th of March. Still Shakespeare's wife can scarcely have been in needy circumstances, for in all likelihood she was at the time residing at New Place, which had been purchased as early as 1597, and her father-in-law was still alive; his death did not take place till the beginning of September of that year. Why, therefore, did she not apply to him, if in difficulty? The matter permits of an entirely different explanation. Mrs. Shakespeare's father, Richard Hathaway, in his will of 1st of September, 1581, mentions Thomas Whittington as his shepherd, and as owing him £4. 6*s.* 8*d.*—perhaps wages due to him. May there not have been some dispute between Richard Hathaway and this Thomas Whittington respecting the amount of the debt, Whittington considering that he was receiving too little? In this case the forty shillings may have been

[1] *The new Fact regarding Shakespeare and his Wife contained in the Will of Thomas Whittington.* By J. P. Collier (Shakespeare Society's Papers, iii. 127-130.) Compare Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 291 ff.

[2] It may here be stated that in Whittington's will two Hathaways are mentioned from Old Stratford, for 12*d.* are bequeathed to one "Thomas Hathaway sonne of the late Margret Hathway." The Heminge family are also spoken of; John Hemynge the elder is to receive a legacy of 2*s.* and Margret Hemyng one of 4*d.*—of course as a token of affection—"memorials of the testator's love."—Unfortunately the day of Thomas Whittington's funeral has not been ascertained.

the sum which Whittington felt convinced he had a right to from Mrs. Shakespeare's father. The fact that Whittington bequeathed larger sums to the poor than his circumstances seemed to warrant, would indicate that he endeavoured to obtain the money from Mrs. Shakespeare by appealing to her honour and by devoting it to charitable purposes. This supposition would not, of course, explain why Whittington appealed to Mrs. Shakespeare and not to one of her brothers, especially to the eldest brother Bartholomew, who, as we know, inherited the principal portion of the property. But in whatever way we look at the circumstance, the entry is at all events of very doubtful value in connection with the argument that Shakespeare did not take his family to London; there are other indications of incomparably greater weight. It is almost sufficient, as regards this question, to refer to the fact that no more children were born to Shakespeare after the birth of the twins Hamnet and Judith.

We shall have to enter more fully into the well-known tradition which speaks of Shakespeare's having paid Stratford regular visits once a year. Anthony Wood [1] is our authority for this, so that the report would appear perfectly trustworthy, except as to absolute correctness regarding dates. Moreover, had his wife and children followed the poet to London, there would have been no sense in such habitual visits to his native town. And even though Shakespeare can have had no great longing to see his wife, still the children must unquestionably have attracted him the more powerfully. Rowe's statement that Shakespeare was specially fond of his eldest daughter has been admitted on all hands as correct. And the father's heart can have been no less interested in his one son, who was not only the sole inheritor of his name, but would be the main inheritor of his increasing wealth and property, which—as will be subsequently shown—Shakespeare evidently hoped might be transmitted from generation to generation. Shakespeare's love of children is distinctly evident in his dramas; he himself is the father of whom Polixenes in the "Winter's Tale" (iv. 4) says, that his joy is centred in having a "gracious issue." It is difficult to reject the thought that his own fatherly feelings find expression in the charming and delightful description of the boy Mamillius in the "Winter's Tale," i. 2,[2]

[1] *Athen. Oxon.*

[2] The "If at home, Sir, He's all my exercise, my mirth, my matter," sounds as though it were spoken from Shakespeare's inmost heart.

and ii. 1, of the boy Macduff in "Macbeth," and of Prince Arthur in "King John;" and we can (with Malone) fancy we hear the father's grief at his son Hamnet's death in August, 1596, in the heartrending lamentations of Lady Constance for her beloved child Arthur.[1] The fact that Hamnet died and was buried in Stratford, may certainly be regarded as a proof that Mrs. Shakespeare lived there with the children, and not in London with her husband. Shakespeare must assuredly have seized every opportunity of visiting Stratford to see how his children were developing physically and mentally, to direct their education, and also to make "a July's day as short as December" amid their gambols and chatter ("The Winter's Tale," i. 1).

The journey between London and Stratford, although it must have occupied about three days,[2] was by no means an unpleasant one, especially in summer, and the traffic between the two places was greater and more regular than is apt to be assumed upon a mere superficial consideration. Stratford men were very frequently called to London to attend some higher law-court in connection with legal proceedings. Harrison[3] says: "People must come to London for their law." According to an entry in the Accounts of the Chamberlains of Stratford from the year 1599, twelve shillings were paid to Bailiff Sturly for a six days' journey to London, where he had to appear as witness in an action against Mr. Underhill. In the already mentioned action of John Shakespeare against John Lambert, the personal attendance of the plaintiff is

[1] Neil, *Shakespeare; a Critical Biography*, p. 35, thinks Shakespeare was present at his son's funeral. This would only have been possible if Hamnet had been dangerously ill for some length of time, and Shakespeare had gone to Stratford upon receiving the news of his illness. If, on the other hand, the child had died suddenly, there would probably have been no time to communicate with the father, unless the corpse was left unburied for six days. But even then, is Shakespeare likely to have been able to get away from his duties as actor? Henry Brown (*The Sonnets of Shakespeare Solved*, p. 127) finds an allusion to Hamnet's death in Sonnet 37. But this is scarcely correct.

[2] That the journey on special occasions could be made in two days we learn from Arnim's *Nest of Ninnies:* "One Friday morning there was a gentleman [in London] to ride down into Warwickshire [could it be to Stratford?] about payment of an hundred pound upon a bond's forfeiture: the time was next day by sunset; it was no boote to bid him pull on his boots and be gone." Robert Arnim's *Nest of Ninnies* (1608), ed. by Collier for the Shakespeare Society, 1842, p. 52.—Compare John W. Hales, *Notes and Essays on Shakespeare* (London, 1884), p. 1-24 (*From Stratford to London*).

[3] *Description of England*, ed. Furnivall, p. 206.

requested "before your good Lordship in her Majesty's highness court of chancery." William Shakespeare's cousin Thomas Greene and his friend Richard Quiney and other men from Warwickshire frequently went to London on business; and Shakespeare's granddaughter Elizabeth Hall, at a later date, undertook the journey as a young girl to pay a visit to relatives and friends, or in connection with some medical treatment. At every stage on the road, post-horses were hired from innkeepers. Falstaff, in "King Henry IV." (Part II. iv. 3), boasts of having "speeded hither with the very extremest inch of possibility; I have foundered nine score and odd posts." In "Romeo and Juliet," v. 1, Romeo says: "Get me ink and paper, and hire post-horses; I will hence to-night." When Queen Elizabeth in 1578 visited the town of Warwick, one of the arrangements made for her journey was that every innkeeper should have a post-horse ready for her Majesty's use.[1] We do not know when the carrier spoken of on p. 117 first started his covered waggon between Stratford and London; but travellers must certainly have made the journey on horseback as well. Inns had become a well-organized institution, as we know from Harrison's[2] account; he says "each comer is sure to lie in clean sheets, wherein no man hath been lodged since they came from the laundress, or out of the water wherein they were last washed. If the traveller have a horse, his bed doth cost him nothing, but if he go on foot he is sure to pay a penny for the same. But whether he be horseman or footman, if his chamber be once appointed, he may carry the key with him, as of his own house, so long as he lodgeth there. If he lose aught whilst he abideth in the inn, the host is bound by a general custom to restore the damage, so that there is no greater security anywhere for travellers than in the greatest inns of England." But it was not only security that was to be found at these inns, the life there was a very pleasant one as well; travellers were regaled with songs of a morning and with music at dinner, and the host and hostess vied with each other in entertaining

[1] According to Thornbury, *Shakespeare's England*, ii. 350.—See also *Much Ado About Nothing*, i. 1: "Here is a good horse to hire."—What the charges were for post-horses we learn from *The Diary of the Rev. John Ward*, ed. Severn, p. 297, who says: "He that rideth post pays 3*d.* a mile for his post-horse, and 4*d.* a stage to the post-boy for conducting."

[2] Ed. Furnivall, Part II. 107 f.; Part I. p. lxx.

their guests at meal-time, although they did not join in the repast, but took their meals in their own private rooms. If this was the case, women even need not have minded a journey or putting up at an inn. Shakespeare, no doubt, as a rule made the journey on horseback, and Knight[1] connects his first journey to London with a detailed account of the road he was likely to have taken. There were two roads from Stratford and London, for Shakespeare to choose between: the one went by Edge Hill, Drayton, Banbury, Buckingham, Aylesbury, Amersham, and Uxbridge; the other, and in all probability the one by which Shakespeare travelled, passed by Shipston-on-Stour to Woodstock, where the castle and park, with their historical past, must have in various ways appealed to the young poet's imagination, for it was at Woodstock that Fair Rosamond was kept in concealment by Henry II.; it was there that Edward III. had resided, and where Queen Elizabeth had been a prisoner before her accession to the throne, and it was there also that Chaucer wrote his immortal "Canterbury Tales." From Woodstock the traveller would proceed to Oxford,[2] where he would visit and admire the Colleges and Halls, the proud seats of English learning; and thence on by way of High Wycombe and Uxbridge to London. It is pleasant thus, in spirit, to accompany Shakespeare on his journey on horseback. How delighted his eye would be with the rich fields and fresh meadowlands of his country, with the varied change between lordly mansions in the midst of parks, cheerful-looking townships and busy villages hidden among trees! After the exhausting bustle of the metropolis, how he would revel in the refreshing country air, in the sight of the clear expanse of sky, and in the song of the birds! For every page of Shakespeare's works tells us that he must have been unusually susceptible and

[1] *Wm. Shakspere: a Biography*, pp. 285-289 and 363. See also Halliwell, *Shakespeare's Journeys between Stratford-on-Avon and London.—Notes and Queries*, 1864, No. 132; No. 134 (by Crux); No. 135 (by Halliwell).

[2] Shakespeare speaks in admiration of Oxford in *Henry VIII.* iv. 2, and calls Ipswich and Oxford (Christ Church College) "those twins of learning" founded by Wolsey:—

One of which fell with him,
Unwilling to outlive the good that did it;
The other, though unfinish'd, yet so famous,
So excellent in art, and still so rising,
That Christendom shall ever speak his virtue.

observant of the marvels and beauties of nature, even in their smallest details. How absorbed in poetic thought he may have been thus riding on horseback, with "Silver" and "Tray" running by his side! Perhaps when riding thus on horseback he may have felt somewhat like the Dauphin on his steed, as described in "Henry V." (iii. 7): "When I bestride him, I soar, I am a hawk: he trots the air; the earth sings when he touches it; the basest horn of his hoof is more musical than the pipe of Hermes." Perhaps he experienced the same feelings as Sir Walter Scott, and felt himself a different creature as soon as he had mounted his horse, or as Lord Byron, who is said to have had poetical inspirations when galloping across the downs of Lido on the Adriatic.

Shakespeare's journeys to his native county are connected with a tradition of another kind. Anthony Wood relates that it was Shakespeare's custom to halt at Oxford and to lodge at the Crown Inn, and that he had a love-intrigue there with the pretty and sprightly hostess, Mrs. Davenant. Oldys, who repeats Wood's story, adds the following, supporting his statement upon Betterton and Pope: "Young Will. Davenant (afterwards Sir William) was then a little school-boy in the town, of about seven or eight years old, and so fond also of Shakspeare, that whenever he heard of his arrival, he would fly from school to see him. One day an old townsman, observing the boy running homeward almost out of breath, asked him whither he was posting in that heat and hurry. He answered, to see his god-father Shakspeare. There's a good boy, said the other, but have a care that you don't take God's name in vain."[1] Oldys, who was not born till the end of the seventeenth century, is certainly not an authority of the first rank, and it cannot be denied that the anecdote seems to be a well-manufactured joke. The legend, however, would seem substantiated by the fact that, according to Aubrey's report, Sir William Davenant in his conceit, and at his mother's expense, used to boast of being Shakespeare's son.[2] Later

[1] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), i. 464 ff.; *Biographia Dramatica*, i. 116; Spence's *Anecdotes* (London, 1820), p. 269; my *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 316 ff.; *Outlines*, i. 197 ff.; Ingleby's *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 385.—If, from the above quotation, it is inferred that Shakespeare was William Davenant's god-father, the supposition can be opposed by the fact that the poet, in his will, leaves no memento or legacy to Davenant, as he does to his other god-son, William Walker.

[2] What sort of reputation hostesses enjoyed, especially those at country

writers even speak of there having been a resemblance between the two men, and the fact of their first names being the same might also be brought forward as evidence in favour of the story; but even John Davenant's will, by means of which Halliwell seeks to prove the worthlessness of the anecdote, contains some details that may seem doubtful.[1] The story is rejected by most biographers as not well founded, although it cannot be denied that there is both external and internal likelihood in the report. It is only sanctimonious ignorance which would venture to deny that Shakespeare carried on love-intrigues of a similar kind during his residence in London; such ignorance would like to make a Nazarene out of a man in the overflow of life and spirits. Whether or not such a supposition lowers Shakespeare in our estimation, need not be inquired into. With regard to what his contemporaries may have thought of such matters, the following indications will show. Shakespeare has depicted jealousy both from its tragic as well as from its comic side, in "Othello," in "The Winter's Tale," and in "The Merry Wives;" but nowhere in his works has he portrayed a jealous woman, except Adriana in "The Comedy of Errors," i. 1, and v. 1, who gets the worst of it. Is this accident, or may it not rather intimate that, according to the ideas of the time, jealousy was justified in the man, but not in the woman? The much-disputed love affair which plays such an unintelligible part in the Sonnets, will be discussed in connection with the Sonnets themselves. We will here merely quote an anecdote reported by Manningham. A pretty woman, captivated by Burbage's performance in his chief *rôle* as Richard III., invited him to sup with her after the theatre. Shakespeare, who had accidentally overheard the invitation, paid the pretty woman a visit before the appointed time, and found so much favour in her eyes that when Burbage—as had been arranged—was announced as King Richard III., Shakespeare sent him a message asking him to retire, because William the Conqueror came before Richard III.[2] The story is so good that we

ans, is shown in Dekker and Webster's *Westward Ho!* (Dekker's *Dramatic Works*, London, 1873, ii. 291): "Why, as stale as a country Hostess, an Exchange Sempster, or a Court Laundress."

[1] A copy of the will is given in Halliwell's *Illustrations*, p. 122 ff.

[2] *Diary of John Manningham*, &c., ed. for the Camden Society by John Bruce, 1869, p. 39.

would gladly believe in its genuineness, the more so as it is also related in Saunders' MS.[1]

That Shakespeare's success in life was, as already stated, extraordinarily rapid, both as regards his poetic creations and the esteem and prosperity that accrued to him from his works, is confirmed by the unusual circumstance that he was able to think of an honourable retirement from active life earlier than any other poet, and that in his thirty-fourth year (1597) he purchased an estate in Stratford which he resolved to make his Tusculanum. The remarkable increase of his wealth is accounted for by two circumstances: by his share in the theatrical property, and his friendship with Lord Southampton and the gifts received from him. Collier, in his notorious "New Facts relating to the Life of Shakespeare," publishes a supposed record from the MS. of Earl Ellesmere, according to which Shakespeare, as early as 1589, is mentioned as the twelfth in the list of the sixteen proprietors of Blackfriars Theatre. Collier, by means of this record, calculates to a penny, not only how much Shakespeare's share was, but also what the shares of the other actors were worth; we should thus have known to a nicety how much they all had in their pockets, were it not that this interesting document has been declared to be a forgery.[2] This would seem to settle the supposition that the poet became a shareholder of the theatre a few years after coming to London. But Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps has recently made a discovery that would seem to prove the very reverse: that Shakespeare was never, at any time, one of the actual proprietors or "housekeepers"—as they are termed in the old documents—of the Globe or of Blackfriars Theatre, but that he was a partner "in the profittes of that they call the House." The statement, which at first caused Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps some difficulty, he explains from Alleyn's Memoirs, to the effect that it refers to all the money taken at the theatre, except that received from the galleries.[3] The information we obtain from these records

[1] Compare Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 196 ff. Dr. Ingleby, in his *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 45 ff., adds the following apt quotation from *Microcosmographie* (1628), p. 22: "The waiting women spectators are overeares in love with him [an imaginary player], and Ladies send for him to act in their chambers."

[2] *Shakespeare's Works*, ed. Dyce (3rd. ed.), i. 95 and 146; Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 480 ff.

[3] Halliwell, *Illustrations*, p. 22 ff., 86-91; *Outlines*, i. 286-293.

with regard to the proprietorship of the two theatres will be discussed in our next chapter; meanwhile it need only be stated that the question how Shakespeare acquired his wealth becomes only the more perplexing when these circumstances are inquired into. One point in favour of Halliwell-Phillipps' discovery is the fact that Shakespeare, in his will, makes no mention of any property connected with the theatre. Hence we should have to assume that he had sold all his shares before making his will, probably when he returned to Stratford for good.[1] This would not be unlikely, in so far as Shakespeare has everywhere shown himself to be a careful man of business, who invariably invested his money in landed possessions, and may probably have considered that theatrical property—wardrobes and other such tawdry possessions—did not afford satisfactory security. And yet could the mere "profittes of that they call the House," together with the money he received for his dramas, have been sufficient to form the foundation of Shakespeare's prosperity? An actor's business was certainly, in those days, a most lucrative profession. Most of the actors, when they led a tolerably well-ordered life, became pretty well off, and this was especially the case with Burbage; yet not only were they, as far as we know, much more frequently engaged as actors than Shakespeare—which is an important consideration from the money point of view—but they were shareholders of the theatre, and this was the principal source of their income.[2] Greene, in his "Groatsworth of Wit," makes an actor boast that his share in the "stage-apparel would be cheap at £200." We have proofs that the large sums paid to actors roused the envy of pamphleteers; among others in the epigram "Theatrum licentia" in the "Laquei Ridiculosi" (1613) quoted above:—

> Cotta's become a Player, most men know,
> And will no longer take such toyling paines;
> For here's the spring (saith he) whence pleasures flow,
> And brings them damnable excessive gaines;
> That now are cedars growne from shrubs and sprigs,
> Since Greene's Tu Quoque, and those Garlicke Jigs.[3]

[1] According to Collier Shakespeare sold his share in Blackfriars to Alleyn. This supposition is wholly wanting in proof.—Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 505.

[2] Malone's calculation of the receipts at the theatre and their distribution is based upon unproved suppositions. See Drake, ii. 223 ff.

[3] *Dramaticus, The Profits of Old Actors*, in the Shakespeare Society's Papers, i. 21 ff. Compare Collier, *Memoirs of the Principal Actors*, p. 31.

This is also confirmed in "The Return from Parnassus" (1606), where Kempe addresses the two Cambridge students who had requested him and Burbage to give them instruction, saying: "Be merry, lads; you have happened upon the most excellent vocation in the world for money: they come north and south to bring it to our playhouse." In the pamphlet, "Ratsey's Ghost" (1605),[1] Shakespeare's wealth is most distinctly referred to in the passage where the thief addresses the following piece of advice to an itinerant actor: "When thou feelest thy purse well lined, buy thee some place of lordship in the country, that, growing weary of playing, the money may bring thee to high dignity and reputation . . . . for I have heard indeed of some that have gone to London very meanly, and have come in time to be exceeding wealthy." All this, however, only proves the fact—which has never been disputed—that Shakespeare and the majority of his colleagues succeeded in becoming wealthy men; but it does not explain the means by which they acquired their wealth. Shakespeare could not have earned his money simply by the sale of his works; those poets who were not actors as well—Ben Jonson at the head—all remained in needy circumstances. Jonson told Drummond[2] that "of all his Playes he never gained two hundreth pounds."

We obtain as little real information on this point from the tradition which says that Shakespeare's prosperity was due to a munificent gift which he received from his friend and patron Lord Southampton. According to Rowe, who supports his statement upon a story of Davenant's, Southampton gave the poet £1,000 "to go through with a purchase, which he heard he had a mind to." What this purchase can have been, we have no idea whatever. With such a sum of money, that according to our present valuation would be five times the amount, Shakespeare might have bought up a whole theatre or half the town of Stratford. The largest outlay of money Shakespeare

With regard to "the *Jig of Garlick*," see Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, iii. 380.

[1] *The Life and Death of Gamaliel Ratsey, a famous Thief in England executed at Bedford the* 26 *of March last past*, 1605, ed. by J. P. Collier, London, 1866. The only existing copy of this remarkable pamphlet is preserved in the library of Earl Spencer at Althorp (Northamptonshire). The chapter in question has recently also been printed in Halliwell's *Illustrations*, p. 85 ff., and in the *Outlines*, i. 299 ff., from the original.

[2] *Conversations*, &c., p. 35.

ever made was purchasing the lease of the tithes of Stratford, for which he paid £440. But apart from everything else, it is but little likely that Lord Southampton should have made Shakespeare this more than royal gift; it would have been tantamount to giving away a property. Such a gift would stand unparalleled not only in the literary history of England, but of any other country.[1] Even Rowe cannot conceal his doubt about the matter, for he says he would not have ventured to insert the story had it not been handed down by Sir William Davenant, who was probably well acquainted with Shakespeare's affairs. Nay, it is even very questionable whether Shakespeare would have accepted any such gift, which could only have been a burden to his feeling of self-respect. For Shakespeare was anything but a fawning flatterer to Southampton; the two dedications to him do not exceed the style demanded by the day, and the independent man is to be seen through the lines. Southampton must, no doubt, have made Shakespeare some acknowledgement for the two poems, "Venus and Adonis" and "Lucrece," having been dedicated to him; but as the usual honorarium for a dedication was £5,[2] it would have been a most unusual proceeding to have presented £100 for the two, the tenth part of the sum in question.[3] And yet even with this sum Shakespeare could have accomplished much, for New Place with its garden, &c., only cost him £60. In judging of this tradition, the main point, of course, is how we are to conceive the relation in which Shakespeare and Southampton stood to each other. Was the relation between them so very close, such a Platonic union of souls, as it has been represented by many? Unfortunately, in this case again, we have no actual facts to rely upon. Lord Southampton's supposed letter to Lord

[1] Bacon, it is true, received from the Earl of Essex an estate in Twickenham, and Young, the author of *Night Thoughts*, is said to have received from the Duke of Wharton a gift of £2,000 for his poem *The Universal Passion*; but the value of money had diminished considerably by that time.

[2] According to Nat. Field in the Preface to his *Woman is a Weathercock* (1612) as small a sum as forty shillings was given. Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, iii. 393.

[3] According to Hudson, *Shakespeare, his Life, Art, and Characters* (Boston, 1872), i. 36, Southampton paid the £1,000 for the first Dedication, and this is supposed to be "the warrant of your honourable disposition," which Shakespeare mentions in the second. Further, the poet is said to have purchased a large number of shares in the Globe Theatre. But what if Shakespeare never had any shares in it at all?

Ellesmere,[1] where he calls Shakespeare his "especial friend," is not genuine, and Knight, after critically examining it, had rejected it long before palæological research declared it to be a forgery. Southampton, we know as a fact, was not only a great patron of poetry and an enthusiastic admirer of the drama, but also a man of great culture, and of an unprejudiced and a powerful intellect. Still he belonged to the high aristocracy—a fact its sons never forget—and he stood high in office as well as in the favour of the Queen. It is only pure fancy which could assume that Southampton would regard the nobility of mind in the poet and actor, as equal to the nobility of birth in the peer, or that he associated with the poet on terms of equality, and that an intimate bond of friendship existed between them; such fancy might consider an ideal relation of this kind as extremely poetic, and regard it as a virtue in Lord Southampton as well as in Shakespeare. We certainly have reliable evidence that members of the aristocracy were on friendly terms with Ben Jonson, and accordingly we cannot doubt that this must have been the case with Shakespeare likewise. Lord Clarendon reports of Jonson "that his conversation was very good, and with men of most note," and Lord Falkland speaks of the intimate terms upon which he was with him. Lord Clarendon even admits "that he lived many years on terms of the most friendly intercourse" with him.[2] Nor can it be denied that the friendship between Southampton and Shakespeare may have been more intimate than the ordinary cold relation between patron and *protégé*; in both of Shakespeare's Dedications a tone of honest affection is perceptible through the euphuistical shroud, and from the second one it is clear, that in return for this affection the Earl showed him an "honourable disposition." Whether Southampton was the youth who figures in the Sonnets is very doubtful, and all the inferences which Gerald Massey draws from this conjecture with regard to the relation between the poet and his patron, are founded upon a mere hypothesis. That the Mr. W. H. in the Dedication of the Sonnets does not apply to Southampton may be considered as a settled point. With regard to the way in which

[1] Ireland even fabricated a letter from Lord Southampton to Shakespeare, which begins with, "Dearest Friend." Knight, pp. 497, 500. Compare also Knight, on Southampton, p. 369 ff.

[2] *Ben Jonson's Works* (Moxon, 1853, in one vol.), p. 52 ff. Compare p. 162.

their friendship originated, there are but two conjectures. Southampton's mother, after the death of her first husband, and probably before 1580, married Sir Thomas Heneage, who held the office of Treasurer to the Chamber; in this capacity he had to settle the accounts due to the various companies of actors who performed at Court. It is very likely that the actors got Shakespeare to transact these business arrangements for them, and thus the poet may have often met Southampton in his stepfather's house. This is the way in which Malone[1] has endeavoured to explain the origin of their acquaintance. It is even more difficult to explain how Shakespeare came to enjoy the patronage of the Earls of Essex, Pembroke, and Montgomery. The first folio edition of the poet's works was dedicated by the editors, Heminge and Condell, to Pembroke and Montgomery, because they had shown the author so much favour and consideration during his life. The Dedication gives sufficiently clear proof how little thought there was of any intimacy on equal terms. Heminge and Condell present the immortal works of the greatest of all dramatists to the Earls as "trifles" (in the same humble spirit as country folk might offer the produce of the land to their gods), knowing: "Their Highnesses dignity greater than to descend to the reading of these trifles;" the Earls, therefore, are addressed by the royal epithet of Highness, whereas Shakespeare is termed their "Servant." And this language is used by the editors at a time when Shakespeare's fame had not only spread all over England, but had already become known beyond the confines of his own country. How much greater must have been the distinction between Southampton and Shakespeare, when the peer first extended his patronage to the poet, and the latter was still wholly unknown to fame. The patronage of the Earl of Essex is more a traditional report than an historical fact; we have no trustworthy evidence from his contemporaries or from other sources in regard to it. The compliment which the poet pays the Earl of Essex in the Prologue to Act v. of "Henry V.," gives as little indication of the personal relation in which they stood to each other, as the much discussed resemblance of some passages in "Hamlet" with letters of the Earl of Essex. The only one likely conjecture as to how the Earl became acquainted with and a patron of Shakespeare's has been pointed

[1] *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. 477 ff.

out by Hermann Kurz.[1] Kurz starts with the hypothesis, first brought forward by me, that the "Midsummer Night's Dream" was written for the festivities in connection with the marriage of the Earl of Essex (1590); however, Kurz transfers the festivity from the marriage feast to the celebration of the first of May, which followed shortly afterwards, and this, in all probability, was the case.[2] Essex ordered a festive play from the managers of the Lord Chamberlain's Company of Players, and the latter gave the commission to their "factotum," who was not yet known to the world at large. Kurz adds, "Now the drama which so immensely surpassed what had been ordered and anticipated, must necessarily have drawn the attention of Essex to the author; we thus obtain a better foundation for a supposition which has hitherto seemed based merely upon one of those pleasant but often unfulfilled postulates of a cultivated mind. The Earl, who was between twenty-three and twenty-four years of age, and the poet of twenty-six (they lived and developed quickly in those days), must have become attracted to each other as soon as they met, and have remained attached to each other. It no longer admits of a doubt through whose influence it was that Shakespeare was introduced to Southampton."

There is one point in connection with this second conjecture concerning the origin of the friendship between Shakespeare and Southampton that requires a somewhat closer examination. Why did not Shakespeare dedicate his "Venus and Adonis" to Essex, as this poem was unquestionably written first? Why did he leave it for years in his desk till Southampton consented to have it dedicated to him? The fact of Shakespeare's having been on intimate terms with Essex and Southampton—their senior by a few years—while they were still in the full enthusiasm of youth, certainly speaks in favour of the two Earls having been men of more than ordinary intellectual powers, although they may not have been able to free themselves from the fetters of their class. The relation between them reminds us in many respects of that which subsisted between Carl August, Duke of Weimar, and Goethe.

We must now return to Shakespeare's pecuniary circumstances. After what has already been said in connection with the subject, we cannot, of course, admit either that Shake-

[1] *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, iv. 300.
[2] My *Essays on Shakespeare*, pp. 30-66.

speare's connection with the theatre, or that gifts received from admiring and magnanimous patrons, was the main source of his prosperity; we are thus obliged to turn our attention to his business transactions, the more so as we possess fuller information on this point than on any other details of his life. And this information proves not only that Shakespeare was peculiarly well acquainted with money transactions, but that he had an undeniable liking for such business. This again confirms the supposition that he must, as a youth in Stratford, have acquired a practical knowledge of legal and business matters in some attorney's office. We must, however, bear in mind that in all probability both parents may be considered to have possessed a faculty for business, and to have managed their own domestic affairs, and other business transactions, with undoubted ability. This has been pointed out in a previous chapter, and it would seem that the poet was a true child of theirs in this respect. We confess not only does it seem strange, but, to speak frankly, it is unpleasant to find in one and the same person, the sublimest and world-embracing thoughts combined with the calculating, keen perception of the man of business. Shakespeare's mysterious and enigmatical personality gives us this riddle to solve, if indeed it can be solved. Shakespeare not only knew how to acquire capital, but knew how to invest it in a business-like and advantageous manner. While engaged with money transactions, poetry had no longer any hold on Shakespeare, his imaginative faculties were set aside for the time, whereas Walter Scott collapsed in his endeavour to attend to his worldly affairs, while remaining the poet filled with imaginative thoughts. Who would have conceived it possible that the author of "The Merchant of Venice," the creator of Shylock—and perhaps even while working out the characters of the magician Prospero and the angelic character of Miranda—could have disputed a debt of £1 15*s.* 10*d.* for malt,—who would believe it, were it not that we possess the merciless document from the year 1604? The malt had not been sold all together, but in small quantities, on various occasions between 1603 and 1604, to one Philip Rogers in Stratford, who therefore was probably a man of small means, whereas the plaintiff was the owner of houses and of landed property—"spacious in the possession of dirt," as is said in "Hamlet." The document

is important in another respect also; it proves that Shakespeare was living in London at the time, for he employed a Stratford lawyer, William Tetherton, to attend to the matter. Hence it is evident that Shakespeare managed his Stratford property with the utmost care, and it is supposed that his brother Gilbert assisted him in this; at all events, on the occasion of the purchase of a large piece of land from the Combes in May, 1602, Shakespeare was represented by his brother.

In order to obtain a complete view of all Shakespeare's commercial and money transactions, let us examine them in chronological order. The series opens with the already mentioned purchase of New Place, the largest and finest house in Stratford (Easter, 1597). In a future chapter we shall have to speak of this property, its purchase and its chequered history up to the present day. Shakespeare had a tolerably large garden laid out at the back of this house, and at a later day extended the property by a further purchase of land. In fact, he systematically acquired so much land in his native town, that towards the end of his life he was one of the largest, if not the largest landowner in the place, and became one of its leading inhabitants. It cannot be doubted that this was the main object of his life, in the same way as—at a later day—it was Walter Scott's principal object in life to found a baronetcy in his home on the Borders. Both men started with the idea that the possessions which they acquired should be handed down from generation to generation in the future. We may therefore imagine how deeply Shakespeare must have felt the loss of his only son. But still he did not give up his cherished plan, and centred his hopes in the female line; for the purchase of New Place was not made till after Hamnet's death. But even this hope of a long line of prosperous descendants from one of his daughters was frustrated by unpropitious fate. The dream of Shakespeare's life was as little fulfilled as that of Walter Scott.

In the same year in which Shakespeare purchased New Place, he also, as already said, took active steps to recover property for his father; for it can scarcely be doubted that it was the son who induced his father to make the action against John Lambert a suit in Chancery, the most expensive court in England. The estate of Ashbies had nineteen years previously been mortgaged to Edmund Lambert, and as

John Shakespeare cannot well have been able to meet the expenses of such a legal suit himself, this would further prove that the poet must have had a considerable amount of money at his disposal; for not only was he able to pay down the money required for New Place, but was at the same time able to provide his father with the means for carrying on the suit in Chancery. It is evident also from this, that Shakespeare was by no means ignorant of matters connected with law. Unfortunately we have no knowledge whatever how the suit ended; perhaps it was never actually brought before the court, but settled amicably by the parties coming to some agreement themselves. At all events, the poet sustained no loss, as is evident from a message that was sent to him by Abraham Sturley a few months later through Richard Quiney. Sturley writes to Quiney in London that he has heard that Mr. Shakespeare is willing to lay out money upon "the odd yard" of land near Shottery or Stratford, and that it would be well rather to direct his attention to the matter concerning the tithes, and then adds, "by the instructions you can give him thereof and by the friends he can make therefore, we think it a fair mark for him to shoot at, and not impossible to hit. It obtained, would advance him indeed, and would do us much good." [1] The writer of this letter had evidently discussed this proposal with his friends and fellow-citizens, and the purchase of the tithes by Shakespeare, seemed to them desirable and advantageous for Stratford itself as well as for the purchaser; Stratford, namely, received an annual share of the tithes, and it was therefore a matter of no small importance to the town into whose hands the tithes fell. Hence the Stratfordians expressing a wish that Shakespeare should purchase the tithes is a brilliant proof of the trustworthiness and reliability of his character, as well as of his knowledge of business affairs. At the same time, however, the mention of "the friends" whom Shakespeare was to interest in the matter shows us that he not only possessed money, but credit, and that perhaps it was not only his own money that he employed in commercial transactions. Nevertheless, it was not till seven years afterwards that Shakespeare accepted the proposal regarding the tithes; probably—as very often happens

[1] The letter is quoted in full in *Outlines*, ii. 57 ff.

—his fellow-townsmen over-estimated his means. At all events, the tithes were dearer in 1598 than they were in 1605, as the "lease" had run so many years longer. If Shakespeare, as some suppose, had really received the gift of £1,000 from Lord Southampton to enable him to make some desirable purchase, Shakespeare is not likely to have allowed this advantageous investment of capital to have escaped him. Again, some months later (25th October, 1598), Shakespeare is applied to by Richard Quiney—who occasionally resided in London—for a loan of £30, for which he offers security. The letter in question is the only one, among the many that must have been addressed to Shakespeare, which has escaped the destructive influences of time. It would seem that Shakespeare agreed to his request—no doubt at the usual rate of interest[1]—for on the 4th of November Sturley writes to Quiney that he has heard "our countryman Mr. Wm. Shakspeare would procure us monei, which I will like of." The way in which these business communications are mixed up with puritanical forms of religious speech, are characteristic of the writer. Another indication of Shakespeare's pecuniary resources during that year is to be found in a document published by Hunter,[2] according to which the poet lived in the parish of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, near Crosby Hall,[3] and was "assessed" at £5 13*s.* 6*d.* In the rent-roll of this parish of 1600, Shakespeare's name does not occur, however; so he

[1] Although Edward VI. had caused an act to be passed prohibiting the lending out of money on interest, still at Shakespeare's time it was a general custom. See Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. xxii. and 242. The usual rate of interest was 10 per cent.; goldsmiths and other professional money-lenders demanded more (according to Thornbury, *Shakespeare's England*, i. 56). "Ten in the hundred" is therefore the general term given to a money-lender or "usurer," as he was straightway called in Shakespeare's day, for there were still people who considered it wrong to take interest. Sir Philip Sidney, for instance, in his will (1586) forbade a sum of £4,000 his father-in-law was to invest being lent out at interest. See Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. 499. Shakespeare, on the other hand, in his will states that his daughter Judith is to receive 10 per cent. of the money left to her. Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 177 ff., does not consider it at all an unwarrantable conjecture to assume that Shakespeare lent out money on interest. According to the documents recently discovered by Halliwell (*Illustrations*, p. 90), it is proved that Burbage built his theatres with borrowed money, for which he had to pay a high rate of interest. Bacon's *Essays*, ed. Aldis Wright (1865), p. 168-172.

[2] *Illustrations*, i. 77 ff.

[3] Crosby Hall, as is well known, is mentioned in *Richard III.*

must in the meantime have changed his residence.[1] In the year 1602 he acquired three considerable properties in Stratford, the large piece of pasture-land from the Combes for £320,[2] Getley's house in Walker Street, and the Underhill's estate for £60, which will be spoken of more fully in a subsequent chapter. It was in 1604 that Shakespeare brought the action against Philip Rogers for a debt due to him for malt. On the 24th of July, 1605, the proposal made to him concerning the tithes of Stratford, Old Stratford, Bishopton, and Welcombe was carried into effect, and the poet acquired the moiety of the lease for £440. Thomas Combe was his partner as the purchaser of the other moiety.[3] In Catholic times the tithes had belonged to the College, which was secularized in the first year of the reign of Edward VI. In 1544 the proprietors let them out on a lease of ninety-two years to one William Barker, from whom the lease passed on to John Barker. It was from the latter that Sir Thomas Huband purchased them in 1580, and he, in his last will, bequeathed the one moiety to his executors, the other to his brother Ralph Huband. It was this Ralph Huband who, on the 24th of July, 1605, sold his moiety of the lease to Shakespeare.

[1] "From a paper now before me," says Malone, *Inquiry*, p. 215, "which formerly belonged to Edward Alleyn, the player, our poet appears to have lived in Southwark, near the Bear-garden, in 1596."—"It has been shown beyond doubt, by a brief note taken out of the Poors' Book of the Liberty of the Clink in Southwark, that the house in which Mr. Shakspeare there resided, as late as the year 1609, was assessed at the very highest rate, to a weekly payment for the relief of the poor, at the rate of 6*d.*, being one of five assessed at the highest rate, while even the Ladye Buckley paid only four pence." Knight, p. 280, according to Collier's *Memoirs of Alleyn*, p. 91. See Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 227 ff.—"This paper has not been found; one, said to be it, in which Shakespeare's name appears, has been declared to be 'an evident modern forgery.'" Neil, *Shakespere; a Critical Biography*, p. 34. Compare *Shakespeare's Residence, Aldersgate Street*, in *Notes and Queries*, February 13th, 1869, No. 59, 148.

[2] Halliwell-Phillipps, in the fourth edition of his *Outlines*, says: "It may be that this acquisition is referred to by Crosse in his *Vertues Commonwealth* (1603) when he speaks thus ungenerously of the actors and dramatists of the period,—'as the copper-lace gentlemen growe rich, purchase lands by adulterous playes, and not fewe of them usurers and extortioners, which they exhaust out of purchases of the haunters, so are they puft up in such pride and selfe-love as they envie their equalles and scorne theyr inferioures.' Alleyn had not at this time commenced his purchases of land at Dulwich."

[3] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 210-217, 299; Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 478; Drake, *Shakespeare and his Times*, p. 628; Neil, *Shakespere; a Critical Biography*, p. 53.

Many years previously, however, in 1553, Edward VI., shortly before his death, had secured them to the town by a charter, but naturally the gift was to date from the expiration of the lease. The town, therefore, as the inheritor of the tithes, even at this time took an active interest in their management. As might have been foreseen from the peculiar position of affairs, Shakespeare became involved in a number of difficulties owing to this purchase, even in a suit in Chancery (1609?); in fact, were it not that the poet possessed a practical knowledge of law, one might be inclined to think such an investment of capital a thoughtless proceeding, and that his business turn of mind had for once played him false. The year 1609 (March 15th) mentions another action for debt raised by Shakespeare; it differs from the action raised against Philip Rogers only in so far as it treats of a somewhat larger debt, the amount due to the poet being £6, and 24*s.* for costs. The defendant John Addenbrooke had absconded—*non est inventus* is said in the document—and the plaintiff on June 7th had to take legal proceedings against one Thomas Horneby who had become bail for Addenbrooke. Whether the latter answered the summons or was able to pay the sum required, we are not told.[1] Such was the energetic way in which Shakespeare followed up his legal claims, and resolutely kept his possessions together. And, moreover, as there is no mention in either of the above documents of anyone representing or acting in behalf of the plaintiff, it would seem justifiable to assume that Shakespeare conducted the cases himself, and hence that he was in Stratford at the time. The last commercial transaction of Shakespeare's we know of from documentary evidence, takes us back to London, where, on the 10th of March, 1612-13, he acquired (in conjunction with William Johnson, a citizen and vintner, John Jackson, and John Heminge, gentleman), in the neighbourhood of Blackfriars Theatre, "abutting upon a street leading downe to Puddle Wharffe, on the East part, right against the Kinges Majestie Wardrobe," a house and yard from Henry Walker, "a citizen and minstrell," for £140. Of the money required for this purchase only £80 was paid at the time; it was arranged on the following day that the rest of the purchase-money was to remain on mortgage, and the property was then

[1] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 228 ff.

rented to one John Robinson for a term of ten years.[1] Collier conjectures that it was merely out of friendship for Heminge that Shakespeare agreed to make this purchase, and that when the others who took part in the transaction could not or would not pay the money required, the property fell entirely into Shakespeare's hands. In our opinion, this last transaction of the poet's is of peculiar interest, inasmuch as the only two signatures of Shakespeare that can make any claim to being unquestionably genuine (except the one attached to his will), are to be found in the two legal documents pertaining to this purchase.[2]

No one can have so low an opinion of Shakespeare as to believe that he loved wealth purely for its own sake. No one knew better than he that riches in themselves are nothing, but no one knew better than he that wealth is the condition, the very foundation of a life of culture, a life that can be freely devoted to the Good and Beautiful—the Greek *καλοκάγαθία*—that he who, like Portia, would enjoy what is noble, and accomplish something noble, must have a Belmont of his own. Shakespeare knew as well as Ford and Falstaff ("Merry Wives," ii. 2) that, "if money go before, all ways do lie open," that "money is a good soldier and will on," and that, as Iago preaches to Roderigo, it is necessary to "fill thy purse with money" to accomplish one's purpose. He was aware, too, of the dangers of an over-abundance, and perhaps we have his own opinion in the words which he puts into Nerissa's mouth ("Merchant of Venice," i. 2): "and yet, for aught I see, they are as sick that surfeit with too much, as they that starve with nothing. It is no mean happiness, therefore, to be seated in the mean: superfluity comes sooner by white hairs, but competency lives longer."[3] Even in our own day a good social position and culture are nowhere seen in closer correlation than in England. Still, wealth alone was not able to confer the good social position and esteem which, for various reasons, we must consider to have been the main object of Shakespeare's life; according to the custom and idea of the age, public recognition of his position could be obtained only by the grant of a coat-of-arms. Armorial bearings gave formal permission to a family to be

[1] The house was burnt to ashes at the time of the Great Fire in 1666.

[2] The history of these two documents is given in the Appendix in connection with the orthography of Shakespeare's name.

[3] My *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 83.

classed among the gentry; the coat-of-arms was the outward and legal emblem of the gentleman, who enjoyed the title of Master, whereas the yeoman was addressed by his surname. Harrison[1] describes the position of a gentleman and the significance of the possession of a coat-of-arms in the following words: "Whosoever studieth the laws of the realm, whoso abideth in the university giving his mind to his book, or professeth physic and the liberal sciences, or beside his service in the room of a captain in the wars, or good counsel given at home, whereby his commonwealth is benefited, can live without manual labour, and thereto is able and will bear the port, charge and countenance of a gentleman, he shall for money have a coat and arms bestowed upon him by heralds (who in the charter of the same do of custom pretend antiquity and service, and many gay things), and thereunto being made so good cheap, be called master, which is the title that men give to esquires and gentlemen, and reputed for a gentlemen ever after." The wish to be thus admitted among the gentry must have been all the greater in Shakespeare's mind, for, on the one hand, the theatrical profession to which he belonged was not by any means universally respected,[2] and, on the other, owing to the intimate relation in which he stood to Southampton and his other patrons, he must have felt drawn to the aristocracy, who were the mainstay of culture in the days when the middle classes had not yet developed their full mental, moral, and political faculties. In fact, it cannot be denied that Shakespeare, like all great characters,[3] exhibited an aristocratic trait of mind, and in this respect also shows a resemblance to Walter Scott, who was anything but indifferent about being created a baronet. The social rank which Shakespeare strove to attain to, he has himself described in his will, as well as in some earlier documents, by the words, "Wm. Shakespeare of Stratford-upon-Avon, in the county of Warwick, gentleman." In order to attain this object Shakespeare, with the utmost worldly wisdom, pursued the best plan possible, for he did not seek to obtain the coat-of-arms for himself, but—as cannot be doubted, and as Malone, Collier, and Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps also assume—induced his father to take this step, while he

[1] Ed. Furnivall, p. 128.
[2] Compare the lament in Sonnets xxix. and cxi.
[3] See Hartley Coleridge, *Shakespeare a Tory and a Gentleman*, in his *Marginalia*.

himself must certainly have had to incur the necessary expenses, which were not inconsiderable. The son, owing to his profession as an actor, would have met with difficulties in obtaining the grant, whereas the father could lay stress upon his position as a landed proprietor and his having become connected with the old and respected family of Arden; moreover, the armorial bearings would in this way pass on to the son as an inheritance, and hence he could not altogether be regarded as an upstart or *homo novus*. But even this plan had its difficulties, and John Shakespeare's claims had to be bolstered up by all sorts of devices, and if Sir William Dethick, the King-at-Arms, had not been a very easy man to deal with, a man whose careless grants of arms and other shortcomings were loudly complained of at the time, it is probable that Shakespeare might hardly have attained his wish.[1] And yet the coat-of-arms, which probably was not designed without suggestions from the poet, bears the motto, *Non sanz droict!* The documents relating to the matter, which have been preserved in the Herald's College and are printed in Halliwell, do not by any means give us a full account of the proceedings; in fact, many points are left unexplained and obscure. The first draft of a coat-of-arms to John Shakespeare (two copies of which have been preserved) belongs to the year 1596; but whether the arms were granted at the time seems doubtful, for in a record of 1597 John Shakespeare is still described as "a yeoman." At all events, the matter was not perfectly settled, for there exists a second draft, from the year

[1] Halliwell, *Extract from a MS. at Oxford, containing a Memorandum of the Complaints against Dethick the Herald who made the Grant of Arms to John Shakespeare.* In *The Shakspeare Society's Papers*, iv. 57-62. This is a very interesting document, but contains nothing with reference to Shakespeare. Dethick as the Garter King was one of those who conveyed the Order of the Garter to Duke Frederick of Wirtemberg in 1603. Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, p. lxxvii. ff.—See Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 17, 76 ff. Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 485.—"The pattern of arms," says Kenny, *Life and Genius of Shakespeare*, p. 39, "given, as it is stated, under the hand of Clarencieux Cooke, who was then dead, is not found in his records, and we can place no faith in his allegation. John Shakespeare had been a justice of the peace merely ex-officio and not by commission, as is here insinuated; in all probability he did not possess 'lands and tenements of the value of £500;' and Robert Arden of Wilmecote was not a 'gentleman of worship.'" Hence Dethick's statements regarding Shakespeare's ancestors and the services rendered by them are of no value whatever. Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 327, and *Outlines*, i. 118 and 162; ii. 56 and 60 *seq.*

1599, drawn up by the two Kings-at-Arms, Dethick and Camden (the famous antiquarian), in which—without referring to any former grant—the grant of arms is not only again conferred, but permission is also given "to impale" the newly-acquired Shakespeare arms with those of the Arden family—a permission which the poet, however, does not appear to have made use of. On his tombstone, at least, only the paternal arms are given, and they have since then been used countless times as a symbol or decoration on works connected with the poet's life or his writings. The crest is, of course, the spear which the poet, according to Jonson's beautiful words, "brandished" in every line he wrote:—

> In each of which he seems to shake a lance,
> As brandish'd at the eyes of ignorance.

The other half of the name, the *shaking*, is expressed by the falcon, that "shakes its wings previous to flying;"[1] the coat-of-arms is thus one of the so-called *armes parlantes*, and may, moreover, be used as an argument for the spelling of the name "Shakespeare." Both drafts give the same reasons for the application of a grant of arms, except in a few points; both speak of John Shakespeare's connection with the Arden family; both contain the obvious untruth that John Shakespeare was a justice of the peace by her Majesty's appointment, whereas he was so merely by virtue of holding the office of bailiff. In the draft of 1596 this last statement is added only as a supplementary note, and is not stated in so many words, but is merely to be inferred from the context. However, in this note another remark is met with which Halliwell-Phillipps cannot resist calling a "pleasing fiction," namely, that John Shakespeare, twenty years previously had been granted "a patierne therof" by Cooke the King-at-Arms of the day. If this had really been the case, the Shakespeares, both father and son, would scarcely have been likely to have waited twenty years before getting the matter finally settled, as it was one of deep interest to them both. The two existing drafts would have been referred to in a very different manner from a mere supplementary note in the one copy, and the Stratford documents could not for a period of twenty years have withheld from John Shakespeare and his son the much-wished-for predicate of "gentleman."

[1] Fleay, *Shakespeare Manual*, p. 311 ff.

It is scarcely worth while to show up the minor inaccuracies in the records, conferring the grant of arms, regarding John Shakespeare's ancestors and the lands bestowed upon them. The many interlineations, erasures, and corrections show how little reliance can be placed in the statements themselves, and Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps very justly observes that "we may readily believe the real history perished with Dethick and Shakespeare." According to Halliwell-Phillipps[1] it would further seem that a charge was brought against the Kings-at-Arms, and that they defended themselves for having granted the arms to Shakespeare. But however the matter may finally have ended, two things are certain: firstly, that in the numerous other cases of grants of arms, all did not go perfectly smoothly, and secondly, that (as has been proved in the long course of ages) it was not the coat-armour that conferred distinction upon the poet, but conversely that the poet brought honour and glory upon the coat-armour. Nevertheless, we wish it had been in our power to deny that our poet-hero had shown this human weakness; but it is in the nature of things that even the greatest and noblest characters have to pay their tribute to the conventionalities of society, and that they cannot live altogether independently.

Of course, according to the ideal conception that a poet in all his thoughts and feelings, in all his works and doings, ought to belong wholly to the realm of poetry and art—Shakespeare's anxious care concerning his worldly goods, his well-calculated projects for securing wealth and distinction, will always be the Achilles'-heel of his character. But the heel only, for his head touched the heavens notwithstanding. This is evident from the remarkable fact that at the very time when he had firmly established his position in life, when his pecuniary circumstances, and the esteem and celebrity he enjoyed had reached their zenith, a lasting feeling of dissatisfaction with life came over him, and his works of this period speak with greater solemnity and bitterness of the vanity of all worldly possessions than has ever been done by any other writer before or after him.[2] This, in fact, is the beginning of his tragic period—the period of his completed "Hamlet," of "The Tempest" (although not a tragedy), of "Timon of

[1] From a MS. in the Herald's College, W. Z. 276.

[2] Hallam, *Hist. Lit. Eur.* iii. 85; Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 143.

Athens," &c. The worldly position he had won for himself is a striking contrast to this deeply tragic, bitter, and melancholy view of life, and proves that the poet in no way considered the possessions and esteem of the world as true happiness in themselves, but merely as a means towards happiness. We have here a trait of genuine world-sorrow, and it is exhibited not only in the series of his dramatic works but is manifested also in his Sonnets. How far personal experiences, or outward and inward influences may have contributed to produce this gloomy state of mind, cannot be determined, although the beginning of the new century brought occurrences enough that must have painfully affected Shakespeare. On the 8th of February, 1601, Essex made that unfortunate and unaccountable attempt at rebellion which brought him to the scaffold, and Lord Southampton, his friend and comrade, to the Tower, where he remained a prisoner till after Queen Elizabeth's death. Whatever we may conceive to have been the relation between Shakespeare and Southampton, at all events this misfortune that befell his patron cannot have left Shakespeare indifferent.[1] In September of the same year the poet lost his father—the church register says: "Septemb. 8 Mr. Johannes Shakspeare"—and although we have no evidence of any specially affectionate or tender relation between the poet and his father, still neither have we the smallest proof of anything to the contrary, and have therefore no reason to suppose that the poet was not deeply affected by this loss; the consolation that his father had reached the age of the Psalmist may have lessened his grief, but could not have altogether stifled his filial feelings.[2] A year and a half afterwards Queen Elizabeth died, and it is scarcely likely that Shakespeare could have attended her solemn funeral with an unmoved heart;[3] he had reached that

[1] *Outlines*, i. 174 ff.

[2] It might seem strange that Shakespeare should have given repeated warnings not to grieve to excess for those that are dead—both in *Hamlet*, i. 2, as well as in *All's Well That Ends Well*, i. 2.—in connection with a father's death, were it not that, from all we know and can infer, both passages had been written before the death of his own father. Compare Brutus' grief for Portia (*Julius Cæsar*, iv. 3).

[3] Two other deaths may be enumerated here, although they occurred some years later. On December 31, 1607, Shakespeare's brother Edmund was buried in Southwark, and in September, 1608, his mother died; hence the poet's mother lived to witness more of her son's celebrity and good fortune than the father.

age in life when it becomes hard to part with the old friends we have been accustomed to, or have loved, and when we are doubtful about or hesitate to welcome what is unknown and still new to us. But although no bonds of personal esteem or gratitude may have bound Shakespeare to the Queen, and although he could not possibly have been blind to her faults, still he must assuredly have had an anxious feeling of uncertainty regarding the future of his country. Besides Elizabeth had always proved herself a patron of the poet's works as well as of the drama generally, and Shakespeare had nothing to complain of personally in this respect. According to Rowe, the Queen bestowed numerous tokens of her favour upon the poet, although we are left in doubt as to what these tokens were; the report, however, is confirmed by some lines of Henry Chettle's, which we shall have to quote immediately. How often he had acted in her presence and been inspired by her applause or by her interest silently expressed:

> And make those flights upon the banks of Thames,
> That so did take Eliza, and our James!

as Ben Jonson says. The remembrance of Queen Elizabeth, therefore, must have been connected in his mind with many happy associations. If tradition speaks truly, it was at her request that Shakespeare wrote "The Merry Wives;"[1] and he is even said to have once picked up a glove she had let fall while he was acting; but this seems rather a doubtful story.[2]

[1] Rowe relates (according to Dennis, *Epistle Dedicatory to the Comical Gallant*, 1702) that the Queen "was so well pleased with that admirable character of Falstaff in the two Parts of *Henry IV.*, that she commanded Shakespeare to continue it for one play more, and to show him in love." Dennis adds that the Queen was so inquisitive to see the play, that she commanded the poet to have it ready in a fortnight. *Outlines*, ii. 263 ff. The story is by no means incredible.

[2] This anecdote is first met with in the seventeenth century. The Queen, so it is said, crossed the stage during a performance of *Henry IV.*, and bowed to Shakespeare, who was playing the part of the King, and he took no notice of her. In order to assure herself whether this was intentional or whether he did so merely to preserve his character as the King, the Queen again crossed the stage and dropped her glove—which was a mark of favour with her. Shakespeare immediately picked it up and handed it to her, introducing into his part the following lines:—

> *And though now bent on this high embassy,*
> *Yet stoop we to take up our cousin's glove.*

This is said greatly to have delighted the Queen, who praised him for his

Still, Shakespeare has nowhere expressed himself extravagantly in her praise, and although publicly challenged to do so by Chettle in his "England's Mourning Garment," Shakespeare did not write any poem in her memory.[1]

It would indeed be extremely interesting to know what Shakespeare's feelings towards Elizabeth may have been, and what he thought afterwards about her successor. From a political point of view he could scarcely have done otherwise than acknowledge the Queen the representative of the power and glory of his country. In "Henry VIII.," accordingly, she is eulogized directly and indirectly in the apotheosis of her parents, and this is more conspicuous still in the well-known prophecy at the end of the play: that in her reign God should come to be truly known. But what may the poet's opinion of her have been from a human point of view? Of the Queen's personal tyranny and jealousy Shakespeare had had sufficient proof at the time of the marriages of Essex and of Southampton—still, to an absolute form of government he had always been accustomed, and knew no other. Then, too, her love of being surrounded by favourites; her affectation about her virginity; her absurd and insatiable vanity; her shameful proceedings against unhappy Mary Queen of Scots! Could Shakespeare, in accordance with his whole

presence of mind. R. Gr. White, *Shakespeare's Works*, i. lxxxiii., very justly remarks "that kings cannot go on embassies." Compare *The First Sketches of the Second and Third Parts of K. Henry VI.*, ed. Halliwell, p. xxvii. ff.

[1] The lines in question are:—

Nor doth the silver tongued Melicert
Drop from his honied muse one sable teare
To mourne her death that graced his desert,
And to his lines opened her royall eare,
Sheapheard—remember our Elizabeth,
And sing her rape done by that Tarquin—Death.

A second challenge of the same kind to Shakespeare is met with in the anonymous poem, *A Mournefull Dittie, entituled Elizabeth's Losse, together with a Welcome for King James*, where it is said:—

You poets all, brave Shakspeare,
Johnson, Greene,
Bestow your time to write
For England's Queene.
Lament, lament, &c.

Ingleby, *Shakespere Allusion-Books* (published for the New Shakspere Society), i. 119 ff.; Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, p. 5.

character, have done otherwise than—to use a mild expression—have disapproved and turned from such weaknesses with a feeling of contempt? He the great knower of hearts, he who valued truth to nature so highly and abhorred every species of deception, everything that was unreal and untrue?

As regards King James, this monarch's idea that kings were rulers by the grace of God, must certainly have exceeded Shakespeare's standard, although he places the royal dignity sufficiently high.[1] The circumstance of James I. having been a cowardly man may be explained from physical causes, and pardoned; but Shakespeare certainly cannot have admired a cowardly man, and least of all a cowardly prince. The brutal indifference which James exhibited at the fate that befell his mother, Shakespeare could have tolerated as little as his arbitrary and deceitful nature; for instance, his treatment of Raleigh, although he was not executed till after the King's death. Finally, Shakespeare had an inveterate hatred of unproductive learning, and who could have surpassed King James in this?

If Shakespeare entertained any such opinion about the two sovereigns, he kept his thoughts locked up in his own breast, and very probably did not broach the subject even to his more intimate friends, for in those days politics and criticism generally were subjects not discussed by the middle classes. Shakespeare would, at all events, not have ventured to express any such censure in Ben Jonson's presence; for, in spite of their faults, Jonson has overwhelmed Elizabeth as well as James with adulation, and any words depreciative of their sacred persons would assuredly have led to a passionate outburst of wrath. Hence, outwardly at least, Shakespeare's position to James was no less favourable than it had been as regards Elizabeth, and he enjoyed James's favour in a no less high degree. James had been a patron of dramatic representations even when in Scotland, that is to say, as far as circumstances permitted, and in this respect he followed the footsteps of his predecessors. It was one of the first acts of his reign to take the Lord Chamberlain's Players into his own service under the name of the King's Players. The King entered London on the 7th of May, 1603, and as early as the 17th he issued, at Greenwich, the patent "Pro Laurentio Fletcher et Willielmo Shakespeare et aliis."[2] It seems that the different

[1] See our chapter on Shakespeare's character.

[2] There are (or were) two copies of this licence, the one issued at Green-

companies of players ceased giving performances shortly before Elizabeth's death, partly on account of the plague, which is mentioned in the patent, partly in order that the licences might be confirmed by the new sovereign. Some of the companies made use of these circumstances for making a tour through the provinces. There is no word of the theatres having been closed on account of Elizabeth's death; on the contrary, the performances were given again as soon as the new licences had been issued. James himself, a few months later (Dec. 2), paid a visit to the young Earl of Pembroke at Wilton, and it seems that the King's Players (and Shakespeare among them) gave a performance there during the King's visit, for John Heminge received £30 for the company out of the King's purse, in return for his having come to Wilton on this occasion, with the company, from Mortlake in Surrey. There is nothing at all improbable in this; but as the story is based simply upon a note in Cunningham's unreliable "Revels' Accounts," it must be accepted with great caution; in fact, it ought first to be ascertained whether this is not one of the forged passages.[1] The discovery of Halliwell-Phillipps that Shakespeare in 1604 played before the Spanish ambassador[2] at the command of, or at the desire of the King, would not contradict the supposition that the poet retired from the stage about this date. The supposition is as little contradicted by the circumstance that, according to a MS. in the Lord Chamberlain's office, Shakespeare and the other members of the company received 4½ yards of scarlet cloth (the usual dress allowance to players belonging to the royal household) on the occasion of King James's triumphal entry into London with his Consort on the 15th of March, 1604; this undoubtedly proves that the King's Servants, and Shakespeare among

wich under the King's private seal, the other under the Great State Seal dated Westminster, May 19. The first was published first by Collier from the original in the Chapter House at Westminster; the second, which shows only trifling orthographical differences, was printed in Rymer's *Fœdera*, and was thence introduced into Malone's *Historical Account of the English Stage* (Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii. 50 ff.); Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dramatic Poetry*, i. 347 ff.; Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 476; Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 203 ff.

[1] This is not very definitely stated in the *Athenæum*, 1868, i. 863.

[2] *Athenæum*, 1871, ii. 51. See Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, p. 117 ff.

them, took part in the procession. Shakespeare's retirement from the stage may, of course, have taken place at the end of the year, or at the beginning of 1605. This hypothesis is based upon the fact that Shakespeare, in 1603, was still one of those who acted in "Sejanus;" but he took no part in the performance of "Volpone" in 1605. The passage from "Ratsey's Ghost" (already quoted on p. 174) also seems to corroborate the supposition that Shakespeare, at this time, "grew weary of playing." The question as to why and how it was that Shakespeare gave up his profession as an actor at the earliest possible opportunity, will be discussed in another chapter. The wish had certainly taken such a powerful hold of him, that—according to a somewhat doubtful tradition—a letter in King James's own hand failed to induce the poet to alter his decision. This story comes with no better recommendation than as one mentioned in the preface to Lintot's edition of Shakespeare's Poems (1710); it is there said, "that most learned Prince, and great Patron of learning, King James the First, was pleased with his own hand to write an amicable letter to Mr. Shakespeare; which letter, though now lost, remained long in the hands of Sir William Davenant, as a credible person now living can testify."[1] Oldys, in his MS. notes to "Fuller's Worthies," supplements this statement by saying that the "credible person, now living," was the Duke of Buckingham, who had received the communication from Davenant. But even granting the truth of the story, Davenant's trustworthiness in such matters is by no means above suspicion; it also seems strange that Rowe, who surely also reckoned Davenant as one of his authorities, and is, in fact, well informed on most points, knew nothing of the supposed letter—at least, does not mention it. Royal autograph letters of that description are probably to be met with only in recent times. And it seems more uncertain still as to what year the letter may have belonged; for all we know, it may have been written at a time when Shakespeare had already retired from the stage. Farmer conjectures that King James may, in that letter, have expressed his thanks to

[1] See Collier, H. E. Dr. P., i. 370 ff.; Boswell's *Shakespeare*, ii. 481; Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 473; Hallam, *Hist. Lit. Eur.*, iii. 77; Neil, 51.

the poet for the compliment paid him in "Macbeth,"[1] and Malone is inclined to agree with him. Knight, on the other hand, asks whether it is not likely that the compliment in "Macbeth" is not the poet expressing his thanks for the mark of favour which the King had shown him by sending him a letter in his own handwriting. Collier very justly remarks that if any such letter existed at the beginning of the eighteenth century, we should assuredly possess some reliable testimony concerning it. Whatever may be the truth of the matter, at any rate the supposed letter did not affect Shakespeare's position or his future career; for Shakespeare withdrew from the stage about this time, and returned to Stratford to enjoy there the honourable leisure which it had been his great desire to obtain.[2] In 1604 he had reached the age of forty, and if it be true that he retired from the stage in that or the following year, his career as an actor had lasted about twenty years, assuming, in accordance with what has been said above, that he left Stratford as early as 1585. The question as to whether or how far his career as a poet may have closed then likewise, is an extremely difficult one to answer, and we shall have to return to this subject in a subsequent chapter.

[1] The passage referred to occurs in Act iv. 3:—

Comes the king forth, I pray you?
Doct. *Ay, sir; there are a crew of wretched souls*
That stay his cure: their malady convinces
The great assay of art; but at his touch—
Such sanctity hath heaven given his hand—
They presently amend.

The so-called *touching for the evil* was re-introduced by James soon after his accession.

[2] Compare my *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 24 ff.

Chapter IV.

THE THEATRE.

THAT the theatre was not only the principal entertainment of Londoners, but the principal national amusement in England in Shakespeare's day, has never been doubted by anyone except by Rümelin and his followers, and they—with more confidence in their own opinions than with a knowledge of the subject—deny that the English drama possessed any such national character. If we glance back—more than a glance would exceed our limited space—upon the development of the English drama, we shall find that no other course was possible than that it should go hand-in-hand with the development of the nation, and that, in fact, the stage and dramatic poetry gradually drew all classes and strata of the nation within its circle: the Court and the Universities no less than sailors and coalmen, and the capital no less than the small provincial towns of 1,500 inhabitants. And self-evident as is this intimate connection of the drama and the stage with the other manifestations of social life, as obvious is the fact that the development of both proceeded gradually side by side. Indeed, how could it have been otherwise? Darwinism in the history of creation may still present doubts, but the history of the world and of civilization acknowledges no other than the law of gradual development. A great genius may accelerate the development, may give it a powerful impetus, but cannot break or set aside the law; a genius cannot create anything out of nothing, but merely help in making the already-existing buds blossom and bear fruit; he can merely evolve the higher, out of the already-existing lower form. The great chain of history can therefore be traced back link by link, and the more we succeed in doing this, the better we understand it; the seeming missing links

and gaps are but the evidence of our own defective knowledge. Mr. Froude[1] very justly says: "No great general ever arose out of a nation of cowards; no great statesman or philosopher out of a nation of fools; no great artist out of a nation of materialists; no great dramatist except when the drama was the passion of the people. . . . . We allow ourselves to think of Shakespeare, or of Raphael, or of Phidias as having accomplished their work by the power of their own individual genius; but greatness like theirs is never more than the highest degree of an excellence which prevails widely round it and forms the environment in which it grows. No single mind, in single contact with the facts of nature, could have created out of itself a Pallas, a Madonna, or a Lear; such vast conceptions are the growth of ages, the creations of a nation's spirit, and artist and poet, filled full with the power of that spirit, have but given them form, and nothing more than form. Nor would the form itself have been attainable by any isolated talent. . . . . Shakespeare's plays were the offspring of the long generations who pioneered his road for him."

It is, indeed, true that the history of the English drama still presents a number of uncertainties and doubts in single instances, a misfortune that has been rather increased than lessened by Collier's unfortunate work. However, the main outlines upon which, after all, everything depends are sufficiently well established to prevent our drawing wrong conclusions.[2] The earliest form presented by dramatic poetry, not only in England, but in Western Europe generally, were the Mysteries and Miracle Plays, and they were unquestionably the outcome of the Catholic religious service, whether or not, in their first beginnings, they formed an actual part of the Church Service, or were merely an effective addition to special religious ceremonies. The secular world could not,

[1] *History of England* (2nd edition), i. 67-70.

[2] Among the principal works on this subject are: Malone's *Historical Account of the English Stage* (Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii.); R. Gr. White's *Rise and Progress of the English Drama*, in his first edition of *Shakespeare*, i. cxxxi.-clxxxviii.; Jules Jusseraud, *Le Théâtre en Angleterre depuis la Conquête jusqu'aux Prédécesseurs immédiate de Shakespeare.* Paris, 1878; Collier, *History of English Dramatic Poetry.* London, 1831, 3 vols.; A. W. Ward, *A History of English Dramatic Literature*, &c. London, 1875, 2 vols. Compare A. Ebert, *Entwickelungs-Geschichte der französischen Tragödie.* Gotha, 1856.

and, in fact, was not allowed to read the Bible; hence a species of mimic representation, with dialogue, was found to be the quickest, most suitable and attractive means of making the people acquainted with the leading facts of Bible history and its legends. And the legends were especially made use of by the clergy when festivals were arranged to celebrate the day of the saint to whom their church happened to be dedicated. The celebration of the saint's day was an occasion when people came flocking in from the country around, and by holding pageants and giving instructive and impressive representations of the miracles worked by the saint, and the sufferings he had endured, it was hoped that some special benefit would be obtained both for the saint and for the church.[1] The Mysteries, in their infancy, were thus more epic than dramatic in character, and were, of course, at first written in Latin. It was only the responses made by the congregation that were given in the vernacular, and in this way it gradually came to supersede the Latin altogether. When the historical element in the religious service had once been introduced, the next step naturally was to bring in the dogmatic element into these representations. For, of course, the dogmas of the Church could not be brought more palpably before the people than by the representation of a miracle or some other such supernatural event; and the name Miracle Play, which was employed at an early date and seems to have ousted the name of Mystery, proves what a prominent feature the miracles played in the Mysteries. The "Play of the Blessed Sacrament," which taught the doctrine of transubstantiation, was probably purely dogmatic in character.

The earliest Mysteries and Miracle Plays were undoubtedly performed within the precincts of the churches, and the performers were the priests themselves.[2] By degrees improprieties of various kinds may have crept in, and from an ecclesiastical point of view it may probably have come to be desirable (as seems to have been the case) that the Popes and Ecclesiastical Councils forbade the priests taking part in the Mysteries, and hence parish clerks, ministrants, and lay-brothers took their place; it is possible, also, that the priests were not numerous enough for the increasing number of persons intro-

[1] Morley, *First Sketch of English Literature*, 2nd edition, p. 50.

[2] Compare, Thomas Wright, *Early Mysteries, and other Latin Poems* of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, London, 1838.

duced into the plays, and that for this reason also they had to engage non-ecclesiastics to take part in the proceedings. The more inevitably that, in the natural course of things, the Mysteries came to show a distinctly dramatic character, the more they would of necessity have to admit the secular element, and be forced, both inwardly and outwardly, to quit the place of their birth. The next step, therefore, was that the performances were no longer tolerated within the precincts of the church, and were ordered to be held in the churchyard. But even there they were not allowed to remain for long, and the consecrated ground round the churches at length became forbidden ground, the reason being that the crowds of spectators destroyed the graves that lay around the churches. The dramatic performances were thus step by step thrust back into the streets and on to the market-places, where they became completely secularized, both as regards performers as well as subject. It seems that the Mysteries—which were introduced from France shortly after the Conquest—fell into the hands of the laity earlier in England than elsewhere; at least, the oldest Mysteries and Miracle Plays that have been preserved can scarcely be said to represent the early ecclesiastical form, but exhibit rather the popular style of treatment. Perhaps the principal impulse towards making the laity take part in these performances was the introduction, by Popes Urban IV. (1264) and Clement V. (1311), of the feast of Corpus Christi; for, as the festival was placed in the most favourable season of the year—on the first Thursday after Trinity, hence twelve days after Whit Sunday—it soon became a grand and universally popular national holiday, in which the whole nation took part, and the holiday probably came to include the ancient merry-makings on May Day and of Whitsuntide.[1] On these anniversaries the priests and the laity worked hand-in-hand, and did all in their power to make the festival as brilliant a one as possible, and also joined in the amusements which the occasion offered. Even in Chaucer's day the priests took part in the Miracle Plays performed at Corpus Christi, as well as upon other festivals; it is doubtful how this is to be

[1] Compare *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, iv. 4:—

At Pentecost,
When all our pageants of delight were play'd,
Our youth got me to play the woman's part, &c.

The Chester plays, as is well known, were played at Whitsuntide.

explained, considering the prohibition that had been previously issued. According to Dugdale,[1] priests must even have taken part in the Coventry plays in 1492, in the reign of Henry VII.; still this may have been an exceptional case, inasmuch as the King was at Coventry on that occasion, and the festival was one of unusual magnificence in honour of the royal visit.

It was chiefly the guilds who got possession of the Miracle Plays, and in those towns where the guilds were in a specially flourishing condition, the Miracle Plays, too, attained a higher stage of development than elsewhere. For when the Miracle Plays were performed, not only was there a great concourse of people from all parts, but the day naturally became one on which business of various kinds was transacted, and among the assembled spectators there were sellers as well as buyers. Hence it was to the interest of the guilds to attract as great a number of persons as possible, but we do not wish to deny that performers as well as spectators were as greatly attracted by the pleasure they anticipated from the performances themselves. Every guild possessed its own Miracle Plays, or rather its series or succession of Miracle Plays, and were responsible for the manner in which the performances were given and put on the stage. Thus the tanners of Chester played "The Fall of Lucifer," the drapers "The Creation and Fall and the Death of Abel," and the water-carriers very consistently had "The Story of Noah's Flood."[2] Considerable sums of money were spent in erecting and decorating the scaffold or stage, for apparel and such things; and the performers, who had previously to give a proof of their skill,[3] were paid in accordance with their parts. God the Father got 2*s.*, the Devil and Judas 1*s.* 6*d.*, Herod 3*s.* 4*d.*, on account of the exhausting part, with obligato storms of rage, &c.[4] As is well known, several collections of Miracle Plays have come down to us—the Chester, Wakefield, and Coventry plays.[5]

[1] *Warwickshire*, p. 116.

[2] A detailed list of the various guilds and the plays they performed at York, is given in Miss Lucy Toulmin-Smith's *York Plays*, &c., p. xix. ff.

[3] See *York Plays*, p. xxxvii.

[4] Thomas Sharp, *A Dissertation on the Pageants or Dramatic Mysteries anciently performed at Coventry*, &c., Coventry, 1825.

[5] *The Chester Whitsun-Plays: a Collection of Mysteries*, &c., ed. by Th. Wright (published for the Shakespeare Society, 1843); *The Towneley Mysteries, or Miracle Plays*, ed. by Dr. Payne and J. Gordon (Lond., 1836 and 1841, for the Surtees Society); *Ludus Coventriæ: A Collection of*

The Chester plays contain twenty-four pieces, written by a monk of the St. Werburgh monastery at Chester, probably Ralph Higden, and were first performed in 1327 or 1328. The second collection of plays, given at Wakefield in Yorkshire, is better known by the name of "The Towneley Mysteries," the only existing MS. copy of them having been for long in the possession of the Towneley family. This collection contains thirty-two plays, most of which, probably, were the work of a monk in the Augustine monastery at Woodkirk, four miles north of Wakefield. The third collection consists of forty-two plays; it is the least attractive one, and it may be doubted whether they are really the plays that were performed at Coventry, especially as the only record of the fact is a note (dating only from the seventeenth century) and made in the margin of the MS. by some librarian. The York plays, which contain forty-eight complete pieces, and one fragment, have been fully discussed by Miss Lucy Toulmin-Smith in her learned and admirable Introduction. The subjects of the first eleven are taken from the Old Testament, the rest from the New Testament, the Apocrypha, &c. Five pieces show a close resemblance to some of the Towneley collection, *i.e.*, they are the same pieces, except for some additions, omissions, and unimportant deviations in the text. The MS., moreover, contains five of the musical parts belonging to the collection. "The Digby Mysteries"—four complete pieces and one unfinished Morality presumably more recent than the rest—were printed in 1835 for the Abbotsford Club, however *minus* the one added by Dr. Furnivall, "The Burial and Resurrection of Christ."

It is obvious that the performances of the Miracle Plays were by no means confined to the three above-mentioned towns; we have, in fact, evidence of performances having been given in London, York, Newcastle, Lancaster, Preston, Kendal,

Mysteries, &c., ed. by J. O. Halliwell (published for the Shakespeare Society, 1841); *York Plays: The Plays performed by the Crafts, or Mysteries of York on the Day of Corpus Christi in the 14th, 15th, and 16th Centuries. Now first printed from the Unique Manuscript in the Library of Lord Ashburnham*, ed. by Lucy Toulmin-Smith (Oxford, 1885); *The Digby Mysteries*, ed. from the MSS. by F. J. Furnivall (for the New Shakspere Society, London, 1882); *A Collection of English Miracle Plays or Mysteries*, ed. by W. Marriott (Basle, 1838); Wm. Hone, *Ancient Mysteries Described, especially the English Miracle Plays founded on Apocryphal New Testament Story*, &c. (Lond., 1823).

Leeds, Dublin, and other places.[1] It is only in accordance with the natural course of things, if we assume that the smaller provincial towns did not care to be behind the larger towns in regard to such festivals. The movable scaffold or stage upon which the plays were performed could not only be wheeled about from one street to another, but from one town to another. No doubt itinerant companies were gradually formed either by irregular members of the guilds, or perhaps by the forerunners of the jesters and minstrels who found it to be a lucrative business to gratify the popular love for theatrical exhibitions, apart from the performances given in connection with the Church festivals. Why should the Miracle Plays not have found as good a public at the time of the annual fairs as at the feast of Corpus Christi? In a previous chapter it has been pointed out that the Coventry plays were very probably performed by itinerant companies of actors. From a remark of Heywood's[2] it would seem that a number of towns were granted the privilege of giving dramatic performances at the time of the annual fairs, and that several towns, for instance Manningtree (in Suffolk) and Kendal, retained this privilege till the beginning of the seventeenth century. Even the passage from "Piers Ploughman," quoted on p. 52, brings Miracle Plays and annual fairs into direct connection; on all sides, therefore, we have incontrovertible evidence of the popular character of the Miracle Plays.

And this popular character was retained when the Miracle Plays developed into the Moralities. The central interest of the Morality lay in the allegory. Morley[3] maintains, it is true, that the Morality is not a transition from the Miracle Play to the drama proper, and that it has no connection whatever with the Miracle Play. However, he is not likely to convince many of his readers of the correctness of this statement. On the contrary, the allegory forms the natural transition from the Miracle Play to the regular drama; like the Mystery it was of Biblical origin, and the Biblical allegory has never failed to exercise its influence upon the imagination. It is perfectly clear that even the Miracle Plays were instructive and moralizing in character, and that this feature

[1] See the full, but inappropriately arranged, list in *The York Plays*, p. lxiv.-lxviii.; Prologue to the *Coventry Plays*, conclusion.
[2] *Apology for Actors*, ed. Collier, p. 61.
[3] *A First Sketch of English Literature*, p. 246.

was merely further developed and extended in the Moralities, and hence that there is obviously a connection between them and the Miracle Plays. Even in the Coventry plays (not the Towneley and Chester plays, which probably belong to an earlier date) certain allegorical personages were introduced, and hence the public gradually became accustomed to them; for the Moralities were at first played on the same scaffolds as the Mysteries, and only subsequently found a home in barns and halls, and finally in the inn-yards. Personifications of the virtues and vices, especially of the seven cardinal virtues and the seven deadly sins—of Poverty, Age, the World, the Soul, and Death, &c., came to play the chief parts in the performaces. Among the earliest known Moralities are "The Castle of Perseverance,"[1] "Every Man," (*i.e.*, the representative of the human race, who also plays the chief part in the "Castle of Perseverance,") and "Lusty Juventus." Morley[2] gives an analysis of Skelton's "Magnificence" (1529), and of Sir David Lindsay's "Satire of the Three Estates," as the two masterpieces and models of the species. Allegory was in those days incomparably better understood by the people than it is in our day; besides, with the introduction of the Devil, and of Vice or Iniquity—who, as comic characters, had to amuse the audience—the allegory was in no danger of becoming in any way tedious. The Devil, who was provided with hoofs, a tail, horns, and a bottle-nose (like Barabas in the "Jew of Malta"), had been borrowed from the Miracle Plays, whereas Vice or Iniquity was a new character, and was, of course, indispensable if virtue was to be impressively inculcated. Vice was attired as a fool, and was equipped with a long wooden switch or sword, and with this he incessantly belaboured the Devil, cut his claws, and carried on other such pranks,[3] and at the end of the play had to pay for all this by being dragged down to the lower regions by the Devil. Vice, every now and again, was made to utter moralizing speeches and snatches of song, like those found, in abundance, in Shakespeare at a later day. Thus in the play, "The longer thou livest, the more Foole thou art," the

[1] Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, ii. 263 and 279.

[2] *A First Sketch of Eng. Lit.*, p. 246 ff. and 271.

[3] *Twelfth Night*, iv. 2; *Henry V.* iv. 4: "Bardolph and Nym had ten times more valour than this roaring devil i' the old play, that every one may pare his nails with a wooden dagger"; B. Jonson, *The Devil is an Ass*, i. 1.

stage direction for the appearance of the chief character, Moros, is given thus, "Here entreth Moros, counterfaiting a vaine gesture and a foolish countenance, synging the foote of many songes as fools were wont."[1] Shakespeare alludes to these moralizing remarks from Vice, in "Richard III.," iii. 1:—

> Thus like the formal vice Iniquity
> I moralize two meanings in one word.

In short, the Miracle Plays provided miracle, legend, and dogma, and the Moralities added a moral exhortation for the people. It is evident that when the plays ceased to introduce the dogmatic element which had originally connected them with the actual Church Service, they acquired greater scope for action and a capacity for further development. Hence they were a decided step in advance in their outward relation to the people.

The next stage in the development of the drama was that a beginning was made to introduce characters from real life among the allegorical figures; they were, at first, probably intended as satires upon certain conditions, customs, or follies of the age. But personages from the historical past were also introduced, and thus the allegory gradually came to be thrust into the background; this paved the way for a transition to comedy on the one hand and to history on the other. Accordingly, in "Tom Tylor and His Wife" (which appeared in 1578), we find by the side of Desire, Strife, Patience, Vice, &c., the actual figures of Tom Tylor, his wife, and his friend Tom Tailor. In the Morality, "The Conflict of Conscience" (which was written about 1570 and published in 1581), there appear beside the personifications of Conscience, Hypocrisy, Tyranny, Avarice, &c., four historical characters, namely, the Italian lawyer Francesco Spiera, his two sons, and Cardinal Eusebius.[2] Another piece of this transition species is "The Tragical Comedy of Appius and Virginia."[3] Even at the

[1] *Shakespeare's Works*, ed. by R. Gr. White, i. clx.

[2] The full title of this piece is: *The Conflict of Conscience contayninge the most lamentable Hystorye of the desperation of Frauncis Spera, who forsooke the trueth of Gods Gospell for feare of the losse of life and worldly goodes.* Spiera, in fact, had become a Catholic. The play has been reprinted in *Five Old Plays Illustrating the Early Progress of the English Drama, edited from Copies, either unique, or of great Rarity*, by J. Payne Collier, Esq. Printed for the Roxburghe Club. London, 1851.

[3] From 1576; or about 1563, according to A. W. Ward, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Literature*, i. iii. The play is reprinted in Dodsley's *Old Plays*.

end of the eighth decade we find in Tarleton's "Platt of the Seven Deadlie Sinns," by the side of the historical characters of Henry VI., Sardanapalus, and others, the fictitious characters of Gorboduc, Ferrox, Porrex, &c., and the allegorical figures of Pride, Gluttony, Wrath, Covetousness, Envy, &c.[1] At an even earlier date Bishop Bale, in his "Kynge Johan," had introduced the same mixture of historical and allegorical personages. Allegory, in its last stage, is met with even in Kyd's "Jeronimo," where Revenge appears; nay, we meet with allegory even in "Titus Andronicus," where Tamora likewise figures as Revenge, with Rape and Murder by her side—all three only as masks, it is true. "The Second Part of Henry IV.," also, is opened by an allegorical figure, Rumour, who is represented as "full of tongues."[2] One of the last offshoots of the Moralities is "The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London" (which appeared in 1590 and was written shortly before); it is written partly in blank verse, and is already almost completely a comedy.[3]

By the side of the Moralities is found advancing another species of dramatic poetry, which had proceeded from an independent source and did not take part in the development described above. We refer to the Interludes which originally served to fill up and to enliven the pauses in the revels and fêtes at Court and in the houses of the nobility, and accordingly they were more or less of a comic or satirical character. However, they probably were closely connected with masquerades, mummeries, and dumb shows. They attained their fullest development and an independent literary existence through John Heywood, jester and lute-player at the Court of Henry VIII., who shaped them into burlesques or farces in one act.[4] Although Heywood was known to be a zealous member of the Catholic Church, his Interludes—of which "The Four P's" and "The Pardoner and the Friar" may be mentioned as best known—are full of the broadest

[1] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), iii. 348 ff.

[2] See the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, vii. 277.

[3] This piece is likewise reprinted in *Five Old Plays*, &c., ed. J. Payne Collier.

[4] John Heywood died in 1565 at Malines, to which place he had retired at the time of Elizabeth's accession, from fear of Protestantism. *The Four P's* are, of course, the Palmer, Pardoner, Potycary, and Pedlar.

squibs at the clergy, the veneration of relics, &c. In "The Four P's," for instance, the Pardoner exhibits the "All-Hallowes blessed jaw-bone," the slipper of one of the Seven Sleepers, and "the great toe" of the Trinity, and a buttock-bone of Pentecost, and the other personages make the most irreverent jokes at them; the toe, says the Apothecary, is so large that the Holy Trinity must either have the gout, or it must be "three toes in one, God made it as much as three toes alone."[1] In this respect the Interludes honestly contributed to the secularization of the drama, and hence to its further development, and more especially helped to pave the way for comedy, which, in fact, attained its full development earlier than tragedy. And yet the species produced next to no imitators.

The last stage of its development, the English drama accomplished with astonishing, nay, it may be said, with unparalleled rapidity. This gigantic stride is most intimately connected with the powerful impulse which had been given by the Reformation and so-called Humanism, and which affected the whole intellectual life of the nation. Miracle Plays and Moralities could have proceeded only from the domain of Catholicism, and naturally they died out with it. But dramatic poetry then entered the service of the Reformation, and the stage, for a time, became almost like a second pulpit. By way of proof it will be sufficient to mention the plays by Bishop Bale, and the subsequent controversy known as that of "Martin Marprelate."[2] It is clear that dramatic poetry and dramatic art nevertheless continued to become more independent and to show more fulness of life. What had originally been a performance of the priests, and afterwards the pleasure and pride of the guilds, was now assuming a function of its own, and becoming a distinct profession; as an independent agent it forced its way into the foreground of social and public life, and, leaving the provinces—where the Mysteries and Moralities seem to have received their principal support—proceeded to the metropolis, where the theatre (as a factor in the national culture) had naturally taken up its main abode. It was in London that the first actual theatres were built, and the great number which, in a surprisingly

[1] Dodsley, ed. Hazlitt, i. 361 ff.

[2] Compare A. W. Ward, *Hist. of Eng. Dram. Literature*, i. 250 ff.; *Martin Marprelate, The Epitome* (1589), ed. Edw. Arber.

short space of time, so to say, rose up out of the ground, again furnishes an unquestionable proof of the universal popularity of the drama. Dramatic poetry could not possibly have reached its climax so rapidly, were it not that what its culture lacked in the way of a lengthened course of development may be said to have been counterbalanced by the fact that the drama had found admission into every circle of society, and had excited universal interest.

An influence no less extraordinary than that exercised by the Reformation upon dramatic poetry, was the effect produced by the Humanism of the day which may be said to have gone hand-in-hand with it. The revival of the study of the classics directed the attention—not only of the Universities, the law schools, and other learned bodies, but also that of the Court and aristocratic circles—to the ancient drama, and to the Latin authors in particular; Seneca's plays met everywhere with universal esteem and universal favour. The numerous Latin dramas, which had chiefly been written for and performed at the Universities, are a proof of this, and in many of them (for instance, in Bishop Bale's works) the double tendency—to promote the study of classic antiquity and the doctrines of the Reformation—is unmistakable. However, writers did not confine themselves to the study or to the imitation of the ancient drama, but also applied themselves with scarcely less zeal to the drama of the Renaissance in Italy; for instance, Gascoigne's translation of Ariosto's "Suppositi"—whose influence upon Shakespeare is recognized in his "Twelfth Night"—was performed in 1560. Evidence of the study of the classics is even visible in the earliest regular comedy, "Ralph Roister Doister," by Nicholas Udall, who was a teacher at Eton and Westminster, and it is even more evident still, more direct, and less affected by national peculiarities in the earliest regular tragedy, "Gorboduc or Ferrex and Porrex," the authors of which (Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville) obviously aimed at the utmost possible elegance of style in imitation of the classics.[1] All of the tragic events—more especially the killing and dying—are not, in this case, brought upon the stage, but are merely reported to have occurred;

[1] *Ralph Roister Doyster, a Comedy*, by Nicholas Udall, and *The Tragedie of Gorboduc*, by Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville, ed. by William Durrant Cooper (publ. for the Shakespeare Society, 1847); *Ralph Roister Doister*, ed. Edw. Arber (Lond. 1869).

besides every act opens with a dumb show, and, with the exception of the fifth act, all end with a moralizing chorus. It is only as regards metre that "Gorboduc" differs from the classic models, for it is the first drama we have in blank verse. The piece is didactic throughout, and wholly wanting in dramatic life. Sir Philip Sidney says of it: "It is full of stately speeches, and well sounding Phrases, clyming to the height of Seneca his stile, as full of notable moralitie, which it doth most delightfully teach; and so obtayne the very end of Poesie: yet in troth it is very defectious in the circumstances—for it is faulty both in place and time."[1] Nor can it seem strange that these beginnings of the regular drama appeared about twenty years previous to the complete cessation of the Moralities; indeed, it is but the natural order of things. And in "Ralph Roister Doister," at least, the allegorical element of the Moralities is still apparent in the symbolical names of the personages: Dame Custance, her servant Truepenny, Goodluck, Tristram Trusty, Doughty—in fact the names are the keys to the characters. Nor need we go far afield to find the moral which the play is intended to inculcate, and the allegorical flavour of the piece, as a whole, is unmistakable. The manner in which it was endeavoured to make the popular and the classical elements interpenetrate—although they did not in any way become blended into one harmonious living whole—may be seen in John Lilly's works. He transferred the Allegory to classic ground; but it certainly seems doubtful how far he borrowed the Allegory from the Moralities of native growth or from ancient poetry. The classic and learned influences had, of course, to adapt themselves and to make way for the peculiarly national development exhibited by dramatic poetry; neither of them could maintain the supremacy in the long run, or even succeed in acquiring an independent existence in the literature of a people with whom the individual development in all the domains of practical as well as of intellectual life, had from time immemorial been so vigorous and so distinctly expressed, as in the English people. In fact, the English were in this respect favoured by their insular exclusiveness; and the influences in question could not produce any lasting effect except by purifying, clearing, and giving a new form to the national elements, and

[1] *An Apologie for Poetrie*, ed. by Edw. Arber (1868), p. 63.

accordingly could not but exercise a beneficial influence. R. Gr. White[1] very justly brings forward the important fact that none of the numerous plays written for the Court, the aristocratic circles, or for any of the learned corporations, has exercised any sort of lasting influence on the drama; the fact being rather that the English drama, in contradistinction from the French drama, was rooted in the instincts of the English people, and that its growth went hand-in-hand with that of the nation. What did George Whetstone accomplish by the Dedication of his "Promos and Cassandra" (1578), or even Sidney by his "Apologie for Poetry"—not to speak of others—and thus entering the lists in favour of the classical model, and advocating the three unities and all pertaining to these? Nothing whatever; the English drama has from the outset up to the present day remained true to its national character.

Between the above-mentioned first-fruits of the regular drama and Shakespeare's immediate predecessors, there is a wide difference, it is true, and yet the difference between these predecessors of Shakespeare's and Shakespeare himself is even greater still. But nevertheless, as is, of course, self-evident, the connecting threads are perceptible in every direction. These predecessors of Shakespeare's, whose lives were crippled partly by misfortune, partly by their own fault—Kyd, Lilly, Peele, Greene, and Marlowe—have, very appropriately, been compared with Goethe's predecessors in the storm and stress period.[2] Their relation to Shakespeare and to one another, both from a literary and an historical point of view, has been repeatedly discussed by English as well as by German literary historians, and the inquiries into their circumstances have, as a rule, proved less successful than in the case of Shakespeare. Of the lives of Kyd and Marlowe we know next to nothing; the latter was but little older than Shakespeare, and in so far was more a contemporary than a predecessor; yet he unquestionably exercised a very important influence upon Shakespeare. Still, it can hardly be said that any one or other of the above-named men was the founder or representative of any dramatic school; all of them laboured and worked together, and their endeavours, taken as a whole, differed so little that—as is well known—it was their custom

[1] *Shakespeare's Works*, i. clxxiv.
[2] Hense, *Shakespeare*, Halle, 1884, p. 4.

to write a play in conjunction with two or three others, and even Shakespeare can scarcely be said to have altogether refrained from this style of work. This has already been pointed out in connection with Jonson's "Sejanus," and will be more fully discussed in a subsequent chapter. The only one who, to a certain extent, may be said to stand apart, is Lilly, who, however, nevertheless set his mark upon the language and taste of the age.

In spite of all the investigations that have been made with regard to the first London theatres, we cannot be said to have obtained satisfactory light on all points. The two earliest theatres in London—and accordingly the first anywhere in England—were The Theatre and the Curtain, both "in the liberty of Halliwell," midway between Finsbury Fields and Shoreditch, where the memory of the latter has been preserved down to the present day in the name given to a street, *i.e.*, Curtain Road.[1] The earliest known allusion to The Theatre is from the year 1576, and to The Curtain from the year 1577. The ground upon which The Theatre was erected had been acquired on the 13th of April, 1576, by James Burbage, Richard's father, from a certain Giles Allen (on a lease of twenty-one years) at an annual rent of £14. This first builder of an English theatre had originally been a "joiner," but had subsequently been a member of Leicester's Company of Players, and very soon occupied a distinguished position among them. James Burbage was thus specially well fitted for the undertaking, both on account of his original trade and subsequent occupation; and this venture not only proved a success in itself by providing for the requirements of the day, but was followed by a series of similar undertakings within a very short period of time. The one thing that James Burbage lacked for the success of his enterprise was money, and hence (as we learn subsequently from his sons) he had to raise capital to the amount of several hundred pounds at high interest; according to another state-

[1] Collier, *Original History of "The Theatre" in Shoreditch, and Connexion of the Burbadge Family with it* in: The Shakespeare Society's Papers, iv. 63-70.—Halliwell, *Illustrations*, p. 11 ff., and *Outlines*, i. 319-349. Stow mentions The Theatre and the Curtain twice in the first edition of his *Survey* (1598), but in the second edition (1603) both notices are omitted. Stow, *A Survey of London*, ed. Thoms (1876), pp. 36 and 158. According to Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. liv. ff., theatres had existed in London as early as 1572.

ment the sum of £600 was lent to him by his father-in-law for the express purpose. Unfortunately James Burbage became involved in a legal dispute with Giles Allen, in consequence of which—on the expiration of the lease—he gave up The Theatre at the beginning of 1598, and the building was left standing unused and deserted. We know this from an allusion in Edward Guilpin's "Skialetheia" (1598), where it is said:—

> But see yonder
> One, like the unfrequented Theatre,
> Walks in dark silence and vast solitude.

In fact, in December, 1598, or January, 1599, Burbage even had the building pulled down (it was a wooden structure), and the materials were used for building the Globe Theatre. It may here be remarked that both The Theatre and The Curtain were not used exclusively for theatrical performances, but frequently served as a place for fencing matches and similar entertainments. The famous comedian, Tarlton (who died in 1588), performed at The Curtain, and Ben Jonson is said to have made his first appearance as an actor there. Remains of this theatre existed as late as 1772, according to Maitland's "History of London."

The third playhouse erected, after The Theatre and The Curtain, was Blackfriars Theatre, which, according to Collier,[1] was erected in 1576; according to Knight,[2] as early as 1575;[3] and, moreover, on the spot where the great religious house of the Dominicans or Black Friars had once stood—between the Printing House Square and Apothecaries' Hall of our day. What a change in human affairs even in this locality! It was in the Great Hall of the Dominicans that sentence was passed in the divorce suit between Henry VIII. and Katharine of Arragon,[4] a proceeding which, to a certain extent, inaugurated the Reformation in England. There it was that Shakespeare's Muse reigned triumphant, and there too, in our day, is printed "The Times" newspaper, "the leading paper of the world." The memory of the religious order and of the

[1] In his *Hist. of Eng. Dram. Poetry*, i. 227.

[2] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 296.

[3] According to Halliwell, *Illustrations*, p. 43, Blackfriars Theatre was not built till 1596, yet on p. 42 he himself alludes to a mention of it by Gosson in 1580.

[4] *Henry VIII.*, ii. 2; ii. 4.

theatre has been preserved in the names Blackfriars Bridge and Playhouse Yard. Shortly afterwards—and previous to 1580—Whitefriars Theatre is said to have sprung up in Salisbury Court.[1] Thereupon followed—the exact chronological order cannot be given—the Globe Theatre in Bankside; the Red Bull Theatre at the upper end of St. John's Street, Clerkenwell; the Fortune Theatre in Golden (Golding) Lane, Cripplegate;[2] the Newington Butts Theatre; and lastly, the Cockpit or Phœnix Theatre, which probably belongs to a day when Shakespeare had already retired to Stratford. There arose later other smaller theatres, the Swan, the Rose, and the Hope, all in Bankside. With the exception of Blackfriars, which was "a liberty" within the city, all of these theatres stood, so to say, outside the city, and were thus beyond the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor; and yet, on the other hand, they were within easy reach of their public, who lived mainly within the city. As already remarked, on the plans of London by Agas and Braun, not a single one of the theatres is marked—and yet the bear-wards and places for bull-baiting are indicated. This fact agrees with the remark made by Howes in his "Continuation of Stow's Chronicle" (1631), that he was unable before that date (1570) to learn anything relating to the theatres, stages, or playhouses, such as had existed from time immemorial. Some writers claim the Globe Theatre to have been of a great age by assuming that it was built directly after 1570. This is inferred from an entry in the baptismal register in St. Saviour's, according to which, in 1573, John Taylor the actor had a son baptized there. The Globe Theatre was in the parish of St. Saviour's, and as the actors usually lived close to their theatre, it might be inferred that The Globe existed at that

[1] P. Cunningham, *The Whitefriars Theatre, the Salisbury Court Theatre, and the Duke's Theatre in Dorset Garden.* In *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iv. 89-109. Compare Nares, under *Alsatia.*

[2] The Fortune Theatre was built in 1599 by Edward Alleyn and Philip Henslowe; the contract relating to it and drawn up between them and the joiner Peter Strent is printed in Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), iii. 338 ff., in Skottowe, i. 115 ff., and in Halliwell's *Illustrations*, p. 81 ff., and is both interesting and important, as it gives the exact measurements of the building as compared with the Globe Theatre. It was in this theatre—which was burnt down at night between the 14th and 15th of December, 1621—that the Lord Admiral's Players performed with Alleyn at their head.

time; still, it is an inference that is anything but convincing.[1] It is possible in so far as there is a report that The Globe was built of the materials that had previously been used in the construction of The Theatre which was pulled down in 1598-99; still, the report does not settle the question as to whether this was the original Globe Theatre. In the midst of all these uncertainties, one thing is quite certain, viz., that the theatres steadily and rapidly increased in number and in importance,[2] so that Prynne, in his "Histrio-Mastix" (in 1633, hence sixty years after the first theatre was built), counted no less than nineteen playhouses in London, a greater number, probably, than could well be found in any other town, of the same size, as the London of those days. And that Prynne's statement is not exaggerated may be gathered from Strype, who says that seventeen playhouses arose within the period mentioned, and that five taverns were turned into theatres.

This fact of itself would justify our drawing important inferences regarding the number of persons who frequented the theatres, as well as the position and popularity of the stage and of dramatic poetry. The more recent opponents of Shakespeare, with Rümelin at their head, make the assertion that Shakespeare's public—apart from the *litterati*, who were admitted by free tickets—consisted merely of the so-called *jeunesse dorée* on the one hand, and of the rabble on the other. In other words, that the better class of citizens and respectable women did not attend the theatres; at all events, that if respectable women ventured to visit the theatres on some exceptional occasion, they could have done so only in disguise, both on account of the low company they would meet there and the disreputable character of the plays that were performed. Nothing can be more erroneous. In an essay on "Shakespeare Dilettantism," I have proved that the case was exactly the reverse, and this opinion may here be supplemented by a few further observations.[3] If women could not

[1] Fennell, *Shakespeare Repository*, p. 4 ff.

[2] Prince Ludwig of Anhalt, in the poetical account of his travels in 1596, states that there were four playhouses in London. Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, p. 216, however, conjectures that this remark refers merely to the theatres in Bankside, as the number otherwise would be much too low.

[3] *Abhandlungen zu Shakespeare*, p. 378 ff. Compare H. Kurz in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, vi. 340 ff., and the chapter *On Audiences* in Collier's *Hist. of Eng. Dram. Poetry*, iii. 406 ff. And reference may more especially be made to the well-known passage in Nash's *Pierce Pennilesse*, where the

attend the theatres on account of the pieces given, then boys also would not have been allowed to witness the performances, and of this we hear nothing anywhere; on the contrary, from a passage quoted in our first chapter, we have an express proof of a father having taken his son to a theatre. The play was given in a provincial town, it is true, where the audience may have been a more orderly one than in London; the character of the plays, however, must have been pretty much the same. There can, of course, be no doubt that the sons of the nobility were devoted to the theatre—just as they are in our day—and that they spent large sums in gratifying their pleasure in it. In "Bartholomew Fair," it is said that "the favouring of this licentious quality, is the consumption of many a young gentleman; a pernicious enormity." As little can it be denied that all sorts of worthless people—pickpockets and loose women[1]—hovered round about the theatres in the same way as they do nowadays. But still, the theatrical public of Shakespeare's day did not consist exclusively of such persons any more than it does at present. If different classes of persons had not attended the theatre, there would have been no necessity for making any distinction in the seats and the prices, and we know from the Introduction to "Bartholomew Fair" that when the piece was played in the small and inferior Hope Theatre, the prices ranged from 6*d.* to 2*s.* 6*d.*, the latter sum representing at least half-a-sove-

moral influence of the stage is discussed; also to the story originally narrated by R. Brathwaite (*The English Gentlewoman*, 1631); this "gentlewoman of good ranke," who, on her death-bed, would not listen to the consolations of the priest, her thoughts being wholly wrapped up in the theatre, and she breathed her last exclaiming, *Oh Hieronimo, Hieronimo, methinke I see thee, brave Hieronimo!* or (according to Prynne) *Hieronimo! Hieronimo! O, let me see Hieronimo acted!* As Brathwaite expressly says, she had been "daily bestowing the expense of her best houres upon the stage." See Dodsley, ed. Hazlitt, v. 3. From a passage in Gosson's *School of Abuse*, ed. Arber, p. 37 (*they have purged their Comedyes of wanton speeches*, &c.), it might certainly be inferred that the most glaring unseemlinesses were omitted in the representations.

[1] When pickpockets were caught at the theatre, the actors tied them to a stake stationed on the platform, and there they had to remain during the whole performance. This, at least, is what Kempe says in his *Nine Days' Wonder*, ed. Dyce (for the Camden Society), p. 6 and p. 26. Also Collier, *Hist. of Eng. Dram. Poetry*, iii. 413. Compare Simpson, *School of Shakspere*, i. 352. The "public stews" were close to the Globe Theatre. Compare W. Rendle, *The Stews on Bankside*, in *The Antiquarian Magazine*, August, 1882.

reign according to our present money. In other theatres, however, there were gallery seats for 2*d.*, and a standing-place in the pit cost 1*d.* The prices obviously varied, and were raised on special occasions—again as in our own day. It may be remarked that the entrance-money was put into a box, handed to those about to enter by a clerk stationed at the door.[1] Another argument in favour of the attendance of the better classes at the theatre may be gathered from the popular jokes made at the "groundlings," or "understanding gentlemen o' the ground," which are met with in almost all the dramatists of the day. For it may fairly be asked whether such jokes could have been indulged in unless the ridicule had been sure of support from those seated in the galleries and boxes. It is possible that the circumstance of there having been public as well as private theatres, originated with the endeavour to reserve the private theatres for the better portion of the community, and to keep away the lower and objectionable elements. In any case, no legal or intelligible difference between the public and private theatres has been discovered; this alone seems to be established, that the private theatres were smaller, more comfortably arranged, and consequently more expensive.[2] William Henry Smith maintains that the only difference between them was that admission to the private theatres could not be obtained by payment, but only by invitation; he seems, however, to have confounded private theatres with private performances. Any play given at the request of one of the nobility, or of any society, &c., and to which persons were admitted only by invitation, might have been played at any one of the theatres, and, in fact, were given in everyone of them.[3] The private theatres differed from the public theatres by being wholly covered over, whereas the public ones were only partially roofed in; then, too, the pit of the private theatre—which seems to have been provided with seats—was known in the

[1] Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, iii. 341-353.

[2] Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, iii. 335 ff.; Smith, *Bacon and Shakespeare* (Lond., 1857), p. 65 ff.

[3] For instance, the Duke of Buckingham in 1628 ordered a performance of *Henry VIII.* in the Globe Theatre, and remained only up to the point where Buckingham is executed. Halliwell, *Early Notice of Shakespeare's Play of Henry VIII.*, in *Shakespeare Society's Papers*, ii. 151; *Athenæum*, Oct. 18, 1879, p. 497 ff., and Oct. 25, 1870, p. 529,

public theatre by the name of "the yard." And another difference arose from the fact that the private theatres were roofed over, viz., the performances had to be given by artificial light (candles or torches) even on ordinary afternoons. Blackfriars, for instance, is accounted one of the private theatres, and, owing to being wholly covered in, was used by the Lord Chamberlain's Company as a winter theatre, whereas The Globe, which was a public theatre, was only partially covered and could thus be used only as a summer theatre.

It would seem, therefore, that the private theatres were the result of an endeavour to keep the better portion of the public apart; and a similar endeavour, and one much more far-reaching, we find in the Court circles. The Court, with the Queen at its head, found, to their regret, that they were not able to satisfy their love for the theatre as easily as the mercantile classes of the city, or the daughters of the burghers of Whitefriars. For the newly-erected playhouses did not as yet possess any of the conveniences which alone would have made it possible for the occupant of the throne to attend the performances without compromising her dignity; and, in fact, the public was probably too unruly and loose in its behaviour, and possessed but little of the considerate demeanour of our modern Court theatres. Hence there was no alternative but that the theatre must needs go to the Queen, as the Queen could not go to the theatre. It is well known that the Lord Chamberlain's Company, and Shakespeare among them, frequently played before the Queen, and that for a performance they received 30 nobles = £10; of these, 20 nobles were the recognized fee, and the additional 10 nobles a voluntary gift.[1] As a rule, the performances at Court were given at high festivals, such as Christmas, Twelfth Night, Hallowmas, Shrovetide, &c. However, the arrangement of the actors going to the Court was a mere makeshift; it was an inconvenient and expensive plan, nor were all the necessary appliances for a theatrical performance to be found in the royal palaces, small as may have been an actor's expectations in this respect.[2] Hence these private performances failed to satisfy the Queen's love for dramatic representations, and

[1] Drake, *Shakespeare and His Times*, ii. 204.

[2] In Whitehall—at all events in the reign of James—there was a special apartment for theatrical performances.

some other and more convenient arrangement had to be devised.

A plan was devised in the establishment of the so-called Children's theatres. In the ancient endowed schools, as well as in the Universities, the custom of giving dramatic performances had never quite died out—nay, has been continued up to the present day. The choirs also furnished a means towards the desired object. It seemed a simple matter to employ the Children of the Chapel Royal, not merely for church purposes, but also for secular and, in fact, for dramatic performances—the more so as the theatres were continually in need of boys to take the female parts, for up to the time of the Restoration women had not appeared on the stage. In this way the church choirs might easily have been formed into preparatory schools or seminaries for the stage. The first beginnings of the Children's theatres are lost in obscurity, but were probably, in the first instance, connected with the representations of Moralities, which seem to have been given uninterruptedly at St. Paul's and elsewhere by the choir-boys. In quick succession five boy-companies were formed, but we are ignorant as to their chronological order: the boys of St. Paul's, of Westminster, the Children of the Chapel Royal, of Windsor, and the so-called Children of the Revels.[1] The choir-boys of St. Paul's gave their dramatic performances in their singing school, which was in or close to the church, and this, of course, led to the plays being prohibited (probably in 1591), for they gave a performance of "Martin Marprelate" on their stage in 1589. In fact, political, ecclesiastical, and literary allusions were indulged in, and these may, on the one hand, have sounded less mischievous and more amusing from the lips of children, than if they had been spoken by grown-up persons,—but, on the other hand, may merely have been a makeshift for the equivocal and lewd jests that could not be put into the mouths of children. The prohibition seems, however, either to have been with-

[1] Warton, *Hist. of Eng. Poetry*, i. 529-536; Collier, *Hist. of Eng. Dram. Poetry*, i. 281 ff. and 352 ff. Compare *The Old Cheque Book, or Book of Remembrances of the Chapel Royal*, from 1561 to 1744. Ed., from the original, by Edward F. Rimbault. Lond. 1872 (for the Camden Society). With regard to the Choir Boys of Henry VIII., and of the fifth Earl of Northumberland, compare *The Babees Book*, ed. Furnivall (*Early English Text Society*), p. lxxv.-c.

drawn, or the performances were continued in some other non-ecclesiastical locality, for in 1600 we find that Lilly's "Maid's Metamorphosis" was played by the boys of St. Paul's. Under these circumstances it cannot seem strange that the Children's theatres soon enjoyed great favour, especially with the better portion of the public; in the first place they were a complete novelty, and were, moreover, patronized by the Court, which was an important item in the scales.[1] It is much less easy to understand how they came to occupy a kind of hostile position towards the actual theatres, and referred to the latter in terms of ridicule and contempt. But the most inconceivable part of the matter is that the favour and fashion went so far that the Children of the Revels ventured to ridicule the actual stage and even Blackfriars Theatre, where their performances competed with those of the Lord Chamberlain's Company. The famous reproof which Shakespeare gives them in "Hamlet" on account of this, was therefore not altogether undeserved—in fact, it seems almost to have been written in self-defence. The Children of the Revels nevertheless retained the favour of the Court, and doubtless that of the public also; and this position they held up to the time of King James, who allowed the institution to continue for the entertainment of his consort, more especially, as neither she nor James himself ever attended a public performance. Samuel Daniel, the poet, was for some time Director of the Children's Theatre in his capacity as Master of the Revels.

[1] The select public is specially spoken of in *Jack Drum's Entertainment*, which was played by the boys of St. Paul's in 1601. It is there said (Sig. H, 36):—

Sir Edward. *I sawe the Children of Pawles last night,*
And troth they pleas'd me prettie, prettie well.
The Apes in time will do it handsomely.
Planet. *I' faith I like the Audience that frequenteth there,*
With much applause. A man shall not be choakte
With the stench of Garlicke, nor be pasted
To the barmy Jackett of a Beer-brewer.
Brabant, Jn. *'Tis a good gentle Audience, and I hope the Boyes*
Will come one day into the Courte of Requests.
Brabant, Sig. *Ay, and they had good playes, but they produce*
Such mustie fopperies of antiquitie
As do not sute the humourous ages backs
With cloathes in fashion.

Simpson, *The School of Shakspere* (Lond. 1878), ii. 199; *Hamlet*, ed.

It could not fail to happen that the theatre ultimately had its opponents, and that their zeal increased the more that the love for dramatic poetry and scenic representation took hold of the people. This is the less surprising as the opposition was confined, on the one hand, to the fanatical Puritans, and, on the other, to the philistines among the city authorities; both parties could not do otherwise than regard the theatre with hostile feelings. This was no more than what always and inevitably occurs when a new social or historical element is fighting its way into the foreground. The fanaticism of the Puritans was obliged to show itself antagonistic to the secularization of the drama, as well as to every other form of worldliness, the more so as in England the Reformation did not show much inward sincerity of feeling. In so far, therefore, as Puritanism endeavoured to bring the actual object of the Reformation into the mental and moral life of the nation, as well as of the individual, and to counterbalance the outward, worldly, and political character it had assumed—its endeavour was in the main a right one. But it overshot its mark, it degenerated into bigotry and fanaticism, and it was Puritanism that brought Merry Old England to its grave. Just as the games on May Day, the Morris-dances, and all the other popular amusements were an abomination to the Puritans, the theatre too appeared to them a temple of Baal—an idea which has at all times and in all places been peculiar to the fanatical clergy. Step by step they came to regard the stage and dramatic poetry as the broad path to destruction, nay, as the actual abyss of sin and hell. The arguments by which they came to this conclusion were certainly of rather a wondrous kind; one of their most absurd assertions was: that a poet and a liar were one and the same thing. The Puritans did not or would not distinguish between fiction and falsehood, and the idea was so deeply rooted in their minds that even Davenant, on the occasion of the re-opening of The Theatre, found it necessary to address his audience on the subject.[1] Another complaint, and one as frequently heard, was that the actors appeared in women's attire, and that the actresses wore men's garments, although the second part of the

H. H. Furness, i. 165. Compare R. Gr. White, *Shakespeare's Works*, i. clxxxiv.

[1] Davenant, *The First Day's Entertainment at Rutland House*, &c. (1657); Knight, *William Shakspere; a Biography*, pp. 135 ff., 145.

accusation could, of course, not apply to the English stage at the time. The Puritans in this appealed to the Mosaic law—which they considered binding unto its extreme consequences—and this law forbad men to wear women's apparel, it being an abomination unto the Lord.[1] In the table of contents to Prynne's "Histrio-Mastix" (1633) such disguises are even branded as an encouragement to sodomy; it is there said: "Sodomy occasioned by acting in women's apparell, by wearing long compt haire and love-locks; . . . . Sodomites usually clad their Ganymedes in womens apparell, caused them to nourish, to frizle their haire, to wear Periwigs and Lovelocks, &c." In like manner the Puritan Zeal-of-the-Land Busy (in "Bartholomew Fair," v. 3) rages at Leatherhead's puppet-show, and addresses the puppets thus: "Yes, and my main argument against you is, that you are an abomination; for the male among you putteth on the apparel of the female, and the female of the male." Whereupon the puppet Dionysius replies: "It is your stale argument against the players, but it will not hold against the puppets, for we have neither male nor female amongst us."[2] The Puritans also accused the actors to their face of being the same "roysters, brawlers, ill-dealers, boasters, lovers, loiterers and ruffians in their life abroad as they are on the stage."[3] What Shakespeare may have thought of the Puritans, and what he has said of them, will be shown upon a future occasion.

The opposition of the city authorities—not of the citizens themselves—to the theatres, was chiefly owing, as already said, to their philistine narrowmindedness. It cannot be denied that unruly behaviour was met with at the theatres, and that a loose set of persons of both sexes, and with a very questionable means of existence, were to be found hanging about the buildings, for the rising sun of the drama attracted not only all the talent and energy of the day, but also all the frivolity and all the scum of society. This complaint was frequently raised by the landlords and tenants of the adjacent

[1] *Deuteronomy*, xxii. 5; Malone's *Shakespeare;* by Boswell (1821), iii. 509; Stubbes, *Anatomie of Abuses*, ed. Furnivall (New Shakspere Society, 1877), p. 73.

[2] Nash in his *Pierce Pennilesse* speaks against the Puritans and for the actors. See Collier's edition, p. 59 ff. (*The Defence of Plays*).

[3] Compare Knight, *William Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 320. This accusation was refuted more especially by Thomas Heywood in his *Apology for Actors*.

houses; and, at a later day, their grievance mainly concerned the number of coaches that came driving up to the theatres and obstructed the narrow streets, preventing persons going about, interfering with the business of the shop-keepers, and making it impossible to hold a funeral or any other procession.[1] The theatres may have rendered it difficult for the Lord Mayor to manage his constables, or the aldermen may have been anxious about the peace of mind of their wives, daughters, and maid-servants; in any case, the city authorities would not tolerate a theatre either in the city itself or on its boundaries, where, however, as already stated, the theatres were beyond the Lord Mayor's control.[2] Perhaps, too, one reason of the Mayor's annoyance may have been that he could not directly interfere with or assert his official authority against the actors; he had, in every instance, to appeal to the Privy Council, either in the form of a request or of a complaint, although experience had often enough proved that the wind from that quarter was more apt to blow in the actors' favour than his own. Hence there was a perpetual conflict, the subject of dispute being more especially Blackfriars Theatre. For since the days when the locality had belonged to the great ecclesiastical body, it had enjoyed certain privileges, and although within the city, was not under the Lord Mayor's jurisdiction—in a word, it was "a liberty." The city authorities, however, considered that the privilege had ceased to exist with the dispersion of the religious order, and accordingly made continued efforts to bring Blackfriars under their dominion, and—what was equally important to them—to get the actors driven out. The place was, and remained a perpetual apple of discord.[3]

The formation of an independent dramatic profession went hand-in-hand with the erection of theatres. As the number of the performances increased, and a fuller dramatic substance was added to the pieces to be performed, the actors themselves

[1] Collier, *Hist. of Eng. Dram. Poetry*, ii. 27 ff., 50 ff.

[2] Within the city itself plays were given in the great inn-yards, which owing to their construction could readily be made use of for dramatic representations.

[3] See the documents in Halliwell's *Illustrations*, &c.; Wm. Carew Hazlitt, *The English Drama and Stage under the Tudor and Stuart Princes*, 1543-1664. *Illustrated by a Series of Documents, Treatises, and Poems.* Lond. 1869 (Roxburghe Library).

found that the difficulties to be overcome and the demands made upon them increased at the same rate. Dramatic representation came to be an art and a special profession, a fact which the narrow ideas of the burgher class found it difficult to realize. They regarded the first professional actors more as a set of people who had missed their aim in life, and, in fact, many men had given up their trades or business and entered the theatrical profession. This circumstance also explains how it was that the civic authorities classed actors among "rogues and vagabonds," as persons who had no regular means of subsistence (although the theatrical profession soon proved to be a very lucrative one), and also the cases of imprisonment and other punishments inflicted upon them.[1] In order to escape such condemnation, the different companies of actors entered the service of one or other of the great noblemen, who gave them protection, but, at the same time, exercised a certain amount of control over them. We know of Earl Leicester's men, who obtained the first royal licence as players, the Lord Chamberlain's men, the Lord Admiral's men, and the Servants of the Earls of Pembroke, Derby, Sussex, Warwick, Dorset, Worcester, and others.[2] The number of one company was generally twelve men, even the subsequent band of the King's Players was no larger.[3] The theatres were under the general supervision of the Master of the Revels [4] and the Lord Chamberlain, which latter office was held by Lord Hunsdon, a kinsman of Queen Elizabeth's, between the years 1585 and 1596, the year of his death. This arrangement of being in the service of the nobility gave the actors a safer and more respected position as long as they proved themselves worthy of it. But

[1] See the well-known *Act against Vagabonds* in Knight, p. 296 ff., and elsewhere; Harrison, ed. Furnivall, pp. 213-230; *Tell Trothes New Yeare's Gift*, ed. Furnivall, p. 200.

[2] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), iii. 440 ff.

[3] Compare Stowe (1615), p. 697; *The Play of the Sacraments* (*York Plays*, p. lxviii.) is reckoned for eleven *dramatis personæ*, but it is added, "IX may play it at ease." Compare *York Plays*, p. xxxvii.—In the list of persons to be represented in *Mucedorus*, the quarto of 1598 requires eight, the quarto of 1600 ten actors; in other instances, too, it is considered a merit when the fewest possible are required for a play. The patent granted by James I. on the 4th of January, 1612-13, to the Company of the Count Palatine, mentions fourteen actors by name, and then speaks of "the rest of their associates," what we nowadays call the supernumeraries.

[4] See the royal patent granted in the year 1581, in Halliwell, *Illustrations*, &c., p. 114 ff.

nevertheless the vocation only gradually lost its bad reputation, and Shakespeare complains bitterly of this in his Sonnets; however, it was not long before a distinction was made between the itinerant companies and those permanently established in London, and, naturally, much in favour of the latter.[1] That the stage cast a certain stigma upon those belonging to it has been nowhere more bluntly stated than by John Davies in his "Microcosmos" (1603), in a sonnet which has all the appearance of having been addressed to Shakespeare and Burbage:—

—the stage doth stain pure gentle blood,

he says, but then immediately adds:—

Yet generous ye are in mind and mood.

When Hamlet urges Polonius to have the players—the itinerant company—"well bestowed" and "well used," not merely according to their deserts, but much better, it is clear the request would have been unnecessary had it been a matter of course that the players would be well treated. Again, in the Induction to "The Taming of the Shrew," the lord gives orders that the company of players who have just arrived, may be well looked after, but nevertheless they were shown into the "buttery," hence among the serving-men.[2] In London, actors frequently had relatives among the well-to-do burgher families; besides, many of them established a respectable home of their own there, and the inhabitants of the capital finally came to appreciate and admire the artistic mind and talents of the actors better than the public in the provinces. The comedians Tarlton and Kempe were universal favourites with the Londoners; everyone knew them, and everyone had seen them on the stage and been captivated by their acting. Tarlton himself says that his portrait was to be seen in every house.[3] The theatres formed a pleasant subject of conversa-

[1] See Sonnets 29 and 111; *Hamlet*, ii. 2; Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 127 ff.

[2] "In a gentleman's house where Miller resorted, as he was welcome to all, it chanced so there was a play, the players dressed them in the gentleman's kitchen, and so entered through the entry into the hall. It was after dinner," &c.—Rob. Arnim's *Nest of Ninnies*, ed. Collier, p. 35.

[3] In the lines:—

He is truely a player-foole
And so you may him call.
You may see his goodly counterfeit
Hung up on everie wall.

tion in society,[1] just as in our own day, and actors were invited to assist in entertaining and enlivening social gatherings. A remarkable proof of this is found in "Bartholomew Fair," iii. 1, where it is said of Leatherhead, the already mentioned owner of the puppet show, who is introduced as the representative of the players, that "He scorns victuals, sir; he has bread and butter at home, thanks be to God! and yet he will do more for a good meal, if the toy take him in the belly; marry then they must not set him at lower ends, if they do he'll go away, though he fast: but put him a-top o' the table, where his place is, and he'll do you forty fine things. He has not been sent for, and sought out for nothing, at your great city-suppers, to put down Coriat and Cokely, and been laughed at for his labour; he'll play you all the puppets in the town over, and the players, every company, and his own company too; he spares nobody."[2]

The social position of actors was further improved by the circumstance (already referred to on p. 173) that the profession became very remunerative, and that it was repeatedly and frankly declared to be the quickest means of acquiring a fortune; actors, therefore, ultimately found themselves able to lead a well-ordered and regular kind of life. The majority of them were married men. Their endeavour and ambition was to work their way up to the rank of the "gentleman;" they liked giving themselves and being given this title. It is probable that, following Shakespeare's example, Cuthbert Burbage, Alleyn, and Henslowe applied for and were granted a coat-of-arms as the official recognition of their rank. The manner by which they acquired their fortunes is unfortunately still enveloped in obscurity, although the fact itself is evident enough. Thomas Heywood says: "Many of us I know to be of

---

You can never misse the likenesse,
For everie bodie knowes
His father's lovelie visnomie,
His two eyes and flat nose.

I regret not to have any better authority for these verses than Collier's *New Facts*, p. 19 ff.

[1] Compare the lines in Marston's *Scourge of Villany* (1598), in Halliwell's *Illustrations*, p. 121.

[2] Compare Jonson, *The Devil is an Ass*, ii. 8 (the passage quoted further on respecting Dick Robinson); Dr. Ingleby, *Was Thomas Lodge an Actor? An Exposition touching the Social Status of the Playwright in the Time of Elizabeth*, Lond., 1869. Privately printed.

substance of government, of sober lives, and temperate carriages, housekeepers, and contributory to all duties enjoyned them, equally with them that are rank't with the most bountifull."[1] If actors eventually came to be shareholders of the theatres and of the appurtenances belonging to the theatres, it is intelligible enough that any such investment of capital would have its advantages and contribute a high rate of interest. And it is an established fact that not only Shakespeare, but Alleyn also (who founded Dulwich College with the money he had made), and Henslowe, Burbage, and others, all accumulated great fortunes. Alleyn and Henslowe, it is true, owed their prosperity mainly to their activity as managers and theatrical agents; but that the dramatic profession was a lucrative one in and of itself, apart from any other occupation, will be shown more in detail when we come to speak of Shakespeare's connection with the stage. One other observation may be made at this opportunity, namely, that owing to the infinitely greater simplicity of the Shakespearean stage, as compared with the stage of our day, the expenses in connection with the arrangements, maintenance, and management must have been infinitely less, and accordingly the shareholders and performers must have derived much greater advantage personally from the moneys received.

The simplicity and plainness, not to say poverty of the scenic arrangements is, in fact, one of the most important features of the Elizabethan stage, and cannot be left out of consideration—indeed, it is most important for the correct understanding of Shakespeare's works. He entertained a very high conception of the aim and object of the drama, and has expressed his thoughts on the subject in Hamlet's well-known words, that the endeavour should be, as it were, to hold a mirror up to nature, to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time its form and pressure; and Shakespeare could the more readily raise his public up to his point of view, as their thoughts were not constantly diverted and distracted by the outward decorations and subordinate details which in our day so greatly obliterate the main object of the dramatic work. Shakespeare's public did not attend the theatre merely

[1] *An Apology for Actors*, ed. by J. P. Collier (for the Shakespeare Society), p. 44.

to admire the effects of decorative art, such as a picture of Venice with its canals, gondolas, and swans, or chemical sunrises—there were no such marvels then. Nor did his public expect to be entertained with music, for operas were first introduced at the time of the Restoration; neither did they go to admire actresses or ballet girls, for, as we have seen, the female characters were played by young men and boys, and the jigs were not ballets in the present sense of the word. The one exception to the general simplicity was in regard to the costumes, for large and even extravagant sums were spent on the dresses. Henslowe's Diary and similar works give us abundant and most minute reports on this point. It may, for instance, be mentioned that £4 14*s.* was given for a pair of trunk-hose, £16 for a velvet mantle, and for another as much as £20 10*s.*, whereas the author of a play (before 1600) received on an average from £4 to £8 for his work. It was not till 1613 that the payments rose from £12 to £20, and we must bear in mind that money possessed four or five times the value it does nowadays.[1] The most remarkable fact, however, is that King James and his Court (nothing of the sort is known of Queen Elizabeth) did not disdain to sell their discarded garments to the theatre. After the Restoration, the King and the principal noblemen at Court so far forgot their dignity as to give the actors a loan of their coronation robes.[2]

In spite of the magnificent display of costumes, the dramatic work was itself the chief, nay, the main attraction, and we cannot but suppose that Shakespeare's public must have shown a greater appreciation for poetry than the public of our day can boast of. There were, it is true, devices for scenic illusion, and, if we rightly understand the Prologue to "Every Man in his Humour," Shakespeare was the last to disdain to make use of these contrivances; but they were poor indeed compared with the contrivances on our modern stage. But both as regards the decorations for and the representation of great historical events—such as a battle or rebellion—the stage could only give some symbolical indication of what was taking place; this we learn in unequivocal words

[1] According to Oldys, Shakespeare received £5 for *Hamlet*. Greene received for his *Orlando Furioso*, 20 nobles (= £6 13*s.* 4*d.*).—Halliwell-Phillipps, *Memoranda on Hamlet* (Lond., 1879), p. 51 ff.

[2] My *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 353.

from Shakespeare himself, as well as from various of his contemporaries. Thus his "Henry V." is opened by a Chorus, with the following apology and request:—

> Can this cockpit hold
> The vasty fields of France? or may we cram
> Within this wooden O the very casques
> That did affright the air at Agincourt?
> O pardon! since a crooked figure may
> Attest in little place a million;
> And let us, ciphers to this great accompt,
> On your imaginary forces work.
> Suppose within the girdle of these walls
> Are now confined two mighty monarchies,
> Whose high upreared and abutting fronts
> The perilous narrow ocean parts asunder:
> Pierce out our imperfections with your thoughts;
> Into a thousand parts divide one man,
> And make imaginary puissance;
> Think, when we talk of horses, that you see them
> Printing their proud hoofs i' the receiving earth;
> For 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our kings.

This poetical idea of Shakespeare's is a contrast to Sir Philip Sidney's more critical view of the subject, written about 1583; he says: "Now ye shal have three ladies, walke to gather flowers, and then we must believe the stage to be a garden. By and by, we heare newes of shipwracke in the same place and then wee are to blame, if we accept it not for a rock. Upon the back of that, comes out a hideous monster, with fire and smoke, and then the miserable beholders are bounde to take it for a cave. While in the mean-time, two armies flye in, represented with four swords and bucklers, and then what harde heart will not receive it for a pitched fielde."[1] The scenic arrangements thus ridiculed are, however, so much an integral part of the structure and arrangement of the theatre itself, that a short account of them must be given here, although the subject is one that has repeatedly been discussed; and we shall take the Globe Theatre as the representative of all the other playhouses.[2]

The Globe Theatre stood on the Bankside, *i.e.*, on the south side of the river, and was in the immediate vicinity of the

[1] Sidney, *An Apologie for Poetrie*, ed. Arber, p. 63 ff. Compare the Prologue to B. Jonson's *Every Man in His Humour*.

[2] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), iii.; Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, iii. 296 ff., 335 ff.

Bear Garden; this theatre, in which Shakespeare acted, and in which his dramas were performed, was, like all the others, a wooden structure with a straw or thatched roof over the stage (perhaps also over the boxes), and this roof proved the cause of the destruction of the theatre;[1] for on the 29th of June, 1613, it was burnt down during the performance of Shakespeare's "Henry VIII.," by the wadding fired from a gun setting fire to the roof.[2] The theatre received its name, according to Collier, from its internal form;[3] according to Rowe from the figure, at the principal entrance, of Hercules holding the globe,[4] beneath being the inscription, *Totus mundus agit histrionem.* Its architectural shape was more oval than circular—was, in fact, a decided "wooden O." After the fire, in 1614, an octagonal and much more stately structure was erected,[5] and yet this cannot have been the last time it was rebuilt, for Hollar's "View of London" in 1647 again describes the building as circular. The part of the

[1] That all the London theatres were built of wood we hear, among others, from Paul Hentzer, who visited England in 1598; the account of his travels appeared in 1612.—Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, p. 215.

[2] My *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 151 *seq.* According to Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, ii. 292 ff., the piece performed at the time was not Shakespeare's *Henry VIII.*, but a drama of the same name by another writer. His reason for supposing this is that according to some poem (*Outlines*, i. 284 ff.), a Fool occurs in the play; however, the passage admits of an entirely different interpretation, and the words in Sir Henry Wotton's letter—*King Henry, making a masque at the Cardinal Wolsey's house*—distinctly point to Shakespeare's *Henry VIII.*

[3] Malone was originally of the same opinion, but gave it up in favour of the other.

[4] *Hamlet*, ii. 2: *Hercules, and his load too.*—It may be added that there were only two entrances, as we know from Sir Ralph Winwood's *Memorials*, where he speaks of the fire; the one entrance was to the public part of the theatre, the other to the *tiring-house* and to the stage.

[5] The only authentic picture of the original Globe Theatre is in the view of London (in the map of Great Britain and Ireland) in Speed's *Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine*, 1611; a facsimile is given in Halliwell's *Illustrations*, p. 44, and in his *Outlines*, i. 166. There are pictures of the second octangular building, in Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii. 64; in Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, i., and in Knight, p. 367, all from the Antwerp view of London in Pepys' Library at Cambridge (Magdalen College). The water-poet Taylor extols the new building in the following words:—

As gold is better that's in fire tried,
So is the Bankside Globe that late was burned;
For where before it had a thatched hide,
Now to a stately theatre is turned.

house reserved for the audience was separated from the stage by palings, and by a woollen or silk curtain hung on an iron rod, which was pulled apart on either side, as is still done with the so-called curtain in English theatres. This was the only arrangement possible in those days; for owing to the thatch roof, or in the case of wholly uncovered theatres, of course neither curtain nor decorations could be drawn upwards. A balcony ran round the three sides of the building set apart for the public, in imitation of the arrangement at the inn-yards. This corresponded to the boxes of the present day, and was reserved for the better portion of the public. There were, it is true, boxes close to the stage, the so-called Lords' rooms, which are frequently alluded to by the old dramatists; and in some of the theatres there were private boxes, but it is not exactly known where these were situated. At times the seats in the balcony were engaged before the day of a performance and reserved. A second or higher gallery, above what is now called the stage-box, was set aside for the orchestra, while the floor of the house was occupied by the "groundlings." The stage, like the floor of ordinary dwelling-houses, was usually strewn with rushes, and upon special occasions matting was used.[1] At the back of the stage was the well-known balcony, some eight or nine feet above the floor, which served a variety of purposes. Below this balcony there was no doubt a smaller stage, where, for instance, in "Hamlet," Gonzago was murdered. It would be from this balcony that Christopher Sly, in "The Taming of the Shrew," witnessed the play with the disguised page; it would also have formed the Capitol on which Julius Cæsar was murdered; it was there that, in "Richard III.," the ghosts of the murdered persons would present themselves; it was there that, in "King John," the negotiating citizens of Angiers would enter; and again, it was from this balcony—in the same drama—that

[1] Compare *The Taming of the Shrew*, iv. 1: *Is supper ready, the house is trimmed, rushes strewed*, &c. The rushes perhaps answered certain purposes on the stage, as may be inferred from the following passage in Nash, *Summer's Last Will and Testament* (Dodsley, 1825, ix. 75): *You might have written in the margin of your play-book, "Let there be a few rushes laid in the place where Backwinter shall tumble, for fear of 'wraying his clothes;'" or set down, "Enter Backwinter with his boy bringing a brush after him, to take off the dust, if need require." But you will ne'er have any wardrobe wit while you live.* Hence the rushes also served to protect the expensive garments worn by those who had to fall, kneel, &c.

Prince Arthur leaped down, whereas Romeo made use of it for climbing up to Juliet's chamber. Upon occasions when this inner balcony on the stage was not wanted in the play, it was concealed by a traverse or curtain.[1] There must also have been some such contrivances as trapdoors; also trees, rocks, and other objects to effect a change of scene, and also some means for raising and lowering objects from above,[2] but no movable decorations, and the scenic apparatus was, in fact, so imperfect that the scene of the action had to be written up on a board, an arrangement which is even met with at the time of the Restoration.[3] The only decoration of the walls of the stage was a piece of tapestry or curtain known by the name of the arras, such as was generally used in the houses of the nobility.[4]

As early as the sixth or seventh decade, the performances at the theatre were advertised by playbills which were posted up in the principal thoroughfares; according to Collier,[5] one John Charlewood, a printer, had been specially engaged, since 1587, to print these bills. Unfortunately not one of these bills has been preserved. The playbills of the first performance of "Hamlet," of "Henry VIII.," or of "The Tempest," would not only be an interesting relic, but so instructive that hundreds of persons would be ready to cover it with gold, were one obtainable by any such means. The performances, as is well known, took place in the afternoon by daylight, hence Shakespeare's public had also to dispense with the charming effects produced by artificial light, at all events in the so-called public theatres. "Mucedorus" ends with a reference to the setting sun, and with a "good-night" to the King. A trumpet sounded thrice, gave the signal that

[1] Compare *Merchant of Venice*, ii. 7 (*Go draw aside the curtains*); *Henry VIII.*, v. 2 (*Draw the curtains close*); *Lear*, iii. 6 (*Draw the curtains*); *Othello*, v. 2 (*Let me the curtains draw*); Dekker and Webster, *Westward Ho!* iv. 1.

[2] *Greene's Works*, ed. Dyce (1861), p. 248; *Cymbeline*, v. 4. The words in the Prologue to *Every Man in His Humour* (*Nor creaking throne comes down the boys to please*) may perhaps be a parody on the scene in *Cymbeline*. —*B. Jonson's Works*, ed. Gifford (one vol.), p. 10.

[3] Sidney, *An Apologie for Poetrie*, ed. Arber, p. 52.

[4] See *Hamlet*, iii. 3 and iii. 4, where Polonius hides behind the *arras*, and is there assassinated. When tragedies were played, the stage was draped with black; compare *A Warning for Fair Women*, Act i. l. 74 f.; Marston, *The Insatiate Countess*, a. iv. (*Works*, ed. Halliwell, iii. 176).

[5] Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, iii. 382.

the play was about to begin; and a flag was hoisted on the flagstaff (the topmost decoration of all the theatres), where it remained during the whole time of the performance.[1] At the commencement of the Elizabethan period it was the custom that all the actors about to appear in the piece first crossed the stage in their different dresses—a custom, no doubt, that had come down from the days of the Miracle Plays and Moralities. The person who read the Prologue wore a long mantle and a laurel wreath, *i.e.*, figured as a poet, probably because the poet originally read the Prologue himself, or, at all events, because it was read in the poet's name. In "Mucedorus," *Comedy*, who speaks the Prologue, wears a laurel wreath; subsequently, however, we no longer hear of a laurel wreath, but merely of a black velvet mantle. In 1614 the clowns still made improvisations, at least in Greene's "Tu Quoque," which appeared in that year, we meet with the stage direction, "Here the two talke and rayle what they list"—so little attention had been paid to Shakespeare's exhortation in "Hamlet," iii. 2, "Let those, that play your clowns, speak no more than is set down for them," &c. The improvisations of the clown (as stated in the quarto edition of "Hamlet," p. 37) were not in the smallest degree connected with the play itself, but wandered completely away from the subject. In "Mucedorus," iii. 6, an intermezzo of this kind has been preserved, whether or not it is the outcome of an improvisation of the clown, or was written by the author for the clown.[2] With regard to the music—and Shakespeare made use of it both extensively and appropriately—it consisted of violins, hautboys, flutes, drums, horns, and trumpets. Music was likewise given during the pauses between the acts,[3] but it seems doubtful whether a curtain was meanwhile let down, or rather drawn across the stage; for in all of the dramas played during the Elizabethan period, the murdered persons had to be carried off the stage by the actors on some pretext or another, as they could not be removed from the spectators' gaze by any other means.[4] The audience amused themselves between the acts, and before the play began, by drinking

[1] In Ben Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*, v. 1, a flag is even hoisted on the top of the puppet-show. [2] See Furness on *Hamlet*, iii. 2, 36.
[3] Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, iii. 449.
[4] Compare Staunton on *Hamlet*, iii. 4.

beer, eating fruit, playing cards, smoking, and other such things.[1] Smoking was even indulged in during the performances by the young aristocrats who had seats on the stage, and were waited upon by boys belonging to the theatre, who were also employed to applaud.[2] The performances lasted from two, to two and a half hours, rarely for three hours; the time generally specified is "two short hours."[3] At all events, no time would be wasted in changing the scene, and the intervals between the acts, if indeed there were intervals, were certainly not prolonged. However, even with the shortest of intervals, "Hamlet" in our day takes almost twice as long as the time specified above, in spite of the many passages omitted when it is played. Hence the only possible supposition is that the drama was even more mercilessly curtailed than it is in our day, and, in fact, we have several proofs that the plays were treated in the most arbitrary manner. In "Bartholomew Fair," *Cokes* asks: "But do you play it according to the printed book?" and *Leatherhead* replies: "By no means, sir. *Cokes.* No! how then? *Leatherhead.* A better way, sir; that is too learned and poetical for our audience." In fact, within the two, to two and a half hours, not only was the principal piece played out, but the jig too was got through, and if one of the longer ones it would sometimes last an hour, as seems evident from Tarlton's "News out of Purgatory." The jig was danced by the clown, who accompanied himself on the "tabor and pipe;" Richard Tarlton was specially famous as a player of jigs. The performance concluded with a prayer for the Queen, with all the assembled actors on their knees.[4]

[1] See Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. lxxix. ff.; Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, p. 215 ff.; *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, ed. Harold Littledale (London, 1876), p. 107.

[2] See *The Works of John Marston*, ed. Halliwell, ii. 300.

[3] Compare, for instance, the Prologue to *Romeo and Juliet* (*The two hours' traffic of our stage*); the Prologue to *Henry VIII.* (*May see away their shilling Richly in two short hours*); the Prologue to Davenant's *Unfortunate Lovers;* the Introduction to *Bartholomew Fair* (*Two hours and a half, and somewhat more*); and Dryden, *Essay on Dramatic Poesy* (*If you consider the Historical Plays of Shakspeare, they are rather so many Chronicles of Kings, or the business many times of thirty or forty years crampt into a representation of two hours and a half*).

[4] Compare, for instance, the conclusion of *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* (Dodsley, ed. Hazlitt, vi. 501 ff., of *Damon and Pithias*, and of *Mucedorus*.

This latter proceeding, which to our ideas seems so strange a show of loyalty, was, however, more consistent at the Globe than at the other theatres, inasmuch as the company which played at the Globe stood in a close relation to the Court, and could in fact be said to be Her Majesty's Company of Players. For from the commencement of Queen Elizabeth's reign a company of "Players of Interludes" had been considered a part of the Queen's Household; and not satisfied with this—in March, 1582-83—she ordered the Master of the Revels to form a second company, the members being selected from existing companies of players.[1] The company thus formed was called Her Majesty's Servants, and received wages and liveries from her; their wages are said to have been much the same as those of the grooms of the chamber; and with regard to their livery, we shall probably not be wrong in imagining it to have been the costume shown in Droeshout's portrait of Shakespeare. The two royal companies appear to have existed for some length of time side by side. The younger company, which (as already said on p. 59) played in Stratford in 1587 under Burbage's management, or, at all events, with him among the company—at the beginning of the ninth decade assumed the title of the Lord Chamberlain's Servants. We have no evidence to show the reason of this change, or in what way their position was affected by the change; this alone is certain, that after the 27th of February, 1592-93, there is nowhere any mention of the Queen's Players. Henslowe's Diary[2] reports, under the 3rd of March, 1593, that the Queen's Players had been disbanded, and gone to the provinces—no date being given as to when this occurred; it was probably owing to the plague that prevailed at the time, and which led to the closing of the theatres and the breaking up of the other companies. At all events, when the company returned to London it had changed its name and had probably been re-organized. When the Globe Theatre was built, the company played alternately with the Lord Admiral's Servants in Newington Butts, where—during that time—a piece called "Hamlet" was being played, if we may trust Henslowe.[3] Whether this play was an ante-Shakespearean drama or an

[1] According to Howe's *Continuation of Stow;* Collier, *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, i. 254 ff.

[2] Ed. Collier, p. 5.

[3] His *Diary*, p. 35.

earlier form of Shakespeare's own "Hamlet," can never be known.

This company, therefore, was the one to which Shakespeare belonged, at all events at a later date; whether he had previously ever belonged to any other is very uncertain. It is a well-known fact, and one greatly to be regretted, that we have no certain evidence either as to the date and upon what conditions Shakespeare joined the company, or when and how he withdrew from it. The question as to whether and with which of the older actors Shakespeare may have served his apprenticeship, has been discussed on p. 124; in no case can this apprenticeship have lasted any length of time, for, as already stated, every indication we possess favours the supposition that Shakespeare very speedily rose to eminence both as an actor and a poet. The earliest documentary evidence of Shakespeare's appearance as an actor—setting aside the spurious certificate relating to the actors of Blackfriars of November, 1589—is the statement that he took part in the performance of "Every Man in His Humour," in 1598. However, according to a discovery lately made by Halliwell-Phillipps,[1] Shakespeare had played before the Queen in Greenwich as early as 1594.[2] This is the earliest notice we yet possess of Shakespeare having been engaged as an actor, and it is specially important on account of the distinguished position it assigns to him, and is thus again a proof that his career in London, both as an actor and a poet, began at an earlier date—and hence ended at an earlier date—than has generally been assumed. At the same time, it is probably also a proof of Shakespeare's talent as an actor, of which too low an estimation had been formed since Rowe's reports.[3] One point on which all commentators and critics are now agreed is that Shakespeare must have

[1] *Illustrations*, p. 30 ff.; *Outlines*, i. 107 ff.

[2] The document found among the manuscript accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber gives the following entry: "To William Kempe, William Shakespeare and Richarde Burbage, servauntes to the Lord Chamberleyne, upon the Councelles warrant dated at Whitehall xv to Marcij, 1594, for twoe severall comedies or enterludes shewed by them before Her Majestie in Christmas tyme laste paste, viz., upon St. Stephens daye and Innocentes daye xiij. li. vj. s. viij. d., and by waye of her Majesties rewarde vj. li. xiij. s. iiij. d., in all xx. li."

[3] See Hermann Kurz, *Shakespeare, der Schauspieler*. In the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, vi. 317-342.

thoroughly understood the theory and the art of acting, for of this he has given unmistakable evidence in the famous and often-quoted passage in his "Hamlet." Still, experience teaches that an excellent theorist is by no means invariably equally excellent in practice; and we learn from Aubrey that Ben Jonson was never a good actor although an admirable teacher, and this would seem confirmed in the present case also by Rowe's statements. For Rowe says of Shakespeare that he soon became distinguished by his natural disposition for the stage, "if not as an extraordinary actor, yet as an excellent writer;" Rowe goes on to say that, in accordance with the custom of the day, Shakespeare's name—like those of the other actors—is printed in front of several of the old plays, but without specially stating the parts he played, and that in spite of all the inquiries made, no further information on this point was to be obtained, except that the height of his dramatic skill was reached in his representation of the Ghost in his own play of "Hamlet." Now, in the first place, the low estimation formed of the *rôle* of the Ghost—which may be read between the lines of the above communication—is in no way justified, for the Ghost is neither an easy nor a grateful part to play, and in our day the most eminent artists have not disdained to undertake the part. On the contrary, it seems to us that the very fact of the poet having chosen to represent the Ghost, is a proof of his having been a master of the art, and further, that he possessed the necessary physical appearance; above all things, therefore, a stately and a noble figure, and a voice both good in tone and capable of modulation.[1] The fact of Rowe—who was himself a dramatist—not having drawn this inference, which to us seems so self-evident, might mislead us, were it not that the circumstance is to be accounted for from the English drama of his day having been under the influence of the French taste. It would, in fact, be surprising if Shakespeare, as an actor, had not possessed something of the Protean nature which so eminently distinguished him as a poet. It can scarcely be doubted that he appeared both in comic as well as in tragic parts, perhaps more frequently in the latter, as he was not actually a comedian. In Shakespeare's day no such definite distribution of the *rôles* was made, as has now been

[1] This is even pointed out by Thomas Campbell, in his *Life of Shakespeare.* Compare Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 268.

introduced; how otherwise could the small number of actors have managed to play pieces with such numerous characters as Shakespeare's and other dramas? It is true that in "Hamlet," ii. 2, six different *rôles* are named, viz., "he, that plays the king; the adventurous knight; the lover; the humorous man; the clown, and the lady." However, no actor, perhaps with the exception of the clown, could have played only one of the parts, or have confined himself to the one character. We have seen that the average number of players in a company was from eight to twelve men. But even granting that this number was increased with the increased demands of the dramas, still the number could scarcely have become so great as to admit of every part having a special representative; on the contrary, in fact, even the more distinguished actors must evidently at times have undertaken to play several parts. In Webster's "Duchess of Malfi," which, apart from the supernumeraries, was played only by twelve actors, Pallant had not only to represent two male characters, but one female character as well; the one male part may possibly have been a supernumerary. In "Every Man in His Humour," Ben Jonson mentions only ten "principal comedians" for his seventeen *dramatis personæ;* in his "Sejanus," which has thirty-four *dramatis personæ*, only eight "principal tragedians" are mentioned. In the first folio edition of his works, the list of the "principal actors of these plays" amounts to twenty-six persons, it is true; but it may be considered certain that they were not all engaged on the same occasions. Shakespeare, too, was probably an actor able to undertake a variety of parts, and very much in request; in fact, the opinion of his contemporaries regarding his capacity as an actor differs greatly from Rowe's lukewarm praise. In the well-known apologetic Preface to "Kind Hart's Dream," Chettle, as we have already seen, describes Shakespeare as "excellent in the quality he professes," for there can be no doubt that the words refer to Shakespeare, and it is even more certain still that the word "quality" is the technical term applied to the actor's art. Aubrey—who was not indeed a contemporary of Shakespeare's, but preceded him in point of time—says of Shakespeare that "he did act exceedingly well." Then, too, the already quoted epigram of John Davies of Hereford ("To our English Terence") must also be mentioned in this connection, inasmuch as it is evident from it that Shakespeare played the

part of kings (see p. 157). These reports are also corroborated by the position which we know Shakespeare occupied, from the already mentioned lists of actors. In the notices of the pieces played before the Queen in 1594, Shakespeare's name is mentioned second (before Burbage's); in the list of the actors prefixed to "Every Man in His Humour," Shakespeare's even occurs first; but again, in that prefixed to "Sejanus," his name stands fifth. In the patent granted by King James, Shakespeare's name, as already stated, appears second, and in the list of actors enumerated in the first folio it of course stands first. Accordingly Shakespeare cannot have been an actor of mere ordinary ability, but must have been a distinguished member of the profession. And it is not surprising that this fact should have come to be forgotten by posterity; for, as Schiller says, "Posterity weaves no laurel wreaths for the mimic artist; his art does not survive the hour that gave it birth; but the poet's works endure and even grow in fame and renown." Nothing is more natural than that the actor should be forgotten in the poet, that the actor's fame should be eclipsed in the same degree as the poet's renown increased.

The characters which Shakespeare may have represented can be specified only in a few cases, and even in these only by way of conjecture, except as regards the Ghost in "Hamlet." If, as Kurz thinks, the order in which the actors are mentioned corresponds with the list of the personages prefixed to Ben Jonson's plays, then, certainly, it would seem very likely that the parts of Sejanus and that of old Knowell fell to Shakespeare. The part of old Knowell has, for other reasons, been supposed to be one of Shakespeare's *rôles*, and Boaden, in fact, considers it an established fact.[1] The portrait of Shakespeare by Droeshout prefixed to the first folio, has with tolerable certainty been recognized to represent Shakespeare in one of the parts he played, and, indeed, as representing old Knowell, and Boaden is perfectly right in saying that "perhaps it would be difficult to exhibit anything more descriptive than this portrait of the way in which Shakespeare looked the staid, sensible, feeling and reflecting father," in "Every Man in His Humour." The distribution of parts in "Hamlet" leads to the supposition that the representative of the Ghost (hence

[1] James Boaden, *An Inquiry into the Authenticity of Various Pictures and Prints*, &c. (Lond., 1824.) See also Appendix II.

Shakespeare) also took the part of the First Player, and possibly that of the Priest at Ophelia's interment; although the Priest may also have been played by the same actor who took the part of Polonius. The *rôles* of the Ghost and the First Player are in so far alike, that they both demand a considerable degree of declamatory power. It seems further to be likely that the actor who distinguished himself as the Ghost in "Hamlet" must have played the Ghost in "Julius Cæsar," and, hence, Julius Cæsar himself. That Shakespeare very probably played the Duke's part in "Measure for Measure" has been inferred from Lucio's allusion to the friar's bald-headedness (*i.e.*, the Duke disguised as the friar),[1] which is said to have been a squib at the actor as well. Davenant, in his "The Law against Lovers," a play well known to have been concocted out of "Measure for Measure" and "Much Ado about Nothing," makes this allusion even more apparent by the words, "She has been advised by a bald dramatic poet of the next cloister;" nevertheless this hypothesis is so little to be trusted that no importance can be attached to it. On the other hand, Kurz's conjecture that Shakespeare also played the Duke of York in the Second and Third Parts of "Henry VI." is, at all events, perfectly in harmony with the distribution of the parts in these dramas. The tradition, already mentioned on p. 30, according to which Shakespeare is said to have played Adam in "As You Like It," is certainly very probable, but is not well accredited; for Oldys himself admits that Shakespeare's younger brother, who lived to a good old age—a man stricken in years and weak in memory—only had a vague recollection of having seen his brother Will act a part in one of his own comedies, where he had to appear a decrepit old man, so unable to walk that he was forced to be supported and carried by another person to a table, at which he was seated among a company who were eating, and one of them sang a song. Thomas Jones of Tarbick also mentions this legend, although in a somewhat different form; according to him Shakespeare's younger brother or some relative related this recollection from his early days, not in London but in Stratford. In support of this supposition Adam's words in Act ii. 3, are quoted:—

Though I look old, yet I am strong and lusty.

[1] *Measure for Measure*, v. 1: *Come hither, goodman bald-pate*, &c.

The passage is supposed to show that the character had been played by a young actor; this is indeed possible, but the inference might be misleading.

The supposition—already referred to—that Shakespeare may ultimately have become one of the proprietors of the Globe or of Blackfriars Theatre, and thus acquired his wealth, which seems difficult to account for otherwise—seems to be refuted by the documents recently discovered by Halliwell-Phillipps in the Lord Chamberlain's office, although these records belong to a date subsequent to the poet's death. (See p. 172.) They do not, it is true, altogether refute the hypotheses and combinations, but merely offer a new field for investigation; however, they give an extremely pleasant insight into the theatrical doings of the time, and show that the ever-recurring and ever-varying dispute between Capital and Labour cropped up even at Shakespeare's theatre. The actors, it seems, were the paid servants of the proprietors, and endeavoured to break down the barrier which thus separated them into two distinct parties; while the proprietors opposed this with all their might. The proprietors of the Globe Theatre in 1635—all the seven records belong to that year—were Cuthbert Burbage with three and a half shares; Mrs. Winifred Robinson (the re-married widow of Richard Burbage), for herself and her son William Burbage, likewise with three and a half shares; Mrs. Condell, the widow, with two; Shanks with three; Taylor and Lowin with two shares each. The sixteen shares of the Globe Theatre had, at a previous date, been divided thus: eight to Cuthbert Burbage and his sisters (*sic!*), four to Mrs. Condell, and four to Heminge. The shares of Blackfriars Theatre were divided thus: Shanks possessed two, Cuthbert Burbage one, Mrs. Robinson, Taylor, Lowin, Mrs. Condell, and Underwood all one share. Now, the actors—apart from their salary—received only a moiety of "what they call the house," *i.e.*, half of the daily profits from certain seats in the theatre; hence, of course, it was their ambition to become shareholders as well. However, the happy possessors of the shares would not part with them. It was on this account that Robert Benfield, Heliard (or Eyllardt) Swanston and Thomas Pollard appealed to the Lord Chamberlain of the day, Philip, Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, with a petition that Burbage, his sister-in-law (Mrs. Robinson), and Shanks be requested to sell some portion of their shares to the petitioners. They ask

that the moneys daily received from the galleries and boxes of both houses, and from the "tireing-house door at the Globe," be divided in two equal portions, the one half to be given to the shareholders, the other half to the actors; the number of the shareholders, they maintain, is six, whereas of actors there are nine, so that "betweene the gaynes of the actors and of those few interested as house-keepers, there is an unreasonable inequality." The petitioners further complain that they have to defray "all charges of the house whatsoever, vizt., wages to hired men and boyes, musicke, lightes, etc., amounting to £900 or £1000 per annum or thereabouts . . . . besides the extraordinary charge which the sayd actors are wholly at for apparell and poetes, etc." The shareholders, on the other hand, are said to have shortly before paid only £65 annual rent for the two playhouses, whereas they make about £20 or £30 per annum by letting the taphouses and gardens, &c., out on lease. Earl Pembroke (curiously enough!) does not seem at all disinclined to introduce some alteration in the laws of proprietorship, and in quite a modern fashion supports his decisions upon "the interest of his Majesties Service." The shareholders of course make counter remonstrances, and moreover in two separate documents, the one presented by the Burbages, the other by Shanks. The Burbages argue that their father had built the first London theatre with money raised at interest, and that this inheritance had passed on to them (the sons), and that the undertaking had been carried on by them at a great expense; they go on to say that, "wee joyned those deserveing men, Shakspere, Hemings, Condall, Phillips, and others, partners of that they call the House." Hence, the latter were not exactly on the same footing with them. With regard to Blackfriars, they say that they had purchased the lease from Evans, "and placed men-players [in contrast to the children whom Evans had employed] which were Hemings, Condall, Shakspeare, etc." Shanks points out to the three petitioners that they had not been badly treated, inasmuch as all of the actors had, during the previous year, received £180 (about £900 in our present money), and that Swanston during the past year had further received £34 "for the profitt of a third part of one part in the Blackfriars which he bought for £20," whereas he (Shanks) had had to pay £60 for the same amount. Shanks also states that the rebuilding of the new Globe Theatre, after being burnt down in 1613, had cost £1,400,

that the proprietors had to pay annually £100 rent for the two theatres, as well as the expenses in connection with the endless repairs, &c.; Shanks concludes his address, again in rather a modern style, by saying that it is an irrevocable fact that no one can be made "against his will to depart with what is his owne," and prays that he may be permitted to "injoy that which he hath dearly bought and truly payd for." However, in accordance with Earl Pembroke's decision, Shanks offers to sell two shares to the petitioners, although the two parties seem at first to have been unable to agree about the price. Earl Pembroke held to his decision, however, and at last referred the matter to Sir Henry Herbert, Sir John Finett, and his solicitor Daniel Bedingfield, to be finally settled by them.

If these documents can be trusted, Shakespeare was never a shareholder of either of the theatres, and yet, from more than one point of view, we are strongly inclined to believe that he was. For again and again there arises the unanswerable question how Shakespeare can have acquired his wealth. Does it not seem most likely that he, who so well knew the value of worldly goods and the way by which they were to be acquired —that he should have been no less eager, perhaps even more eager, than Benfield, Swanston, and Pollard, to be admitted among the smaller but more favoured number of the shareholders? According to this record of 1635 discovered by Halliwell-Phillipps, it would seem that Heminge too—one of the actors engaged by the Burbages—became a proprietor by acquiring four shares in the Globe Theatre; he appears also to have been a shareholder in Blackfriars Theatre. And besides, the prominent position which Shakespeare occupies in the above-mentioned lists of actors, seems hardly compatible with the supposition that he stood in any subordinate position to Burbage and the other proprietors. In this respect the financial statement relating to Kempe's, Shakespeare's, and Burbage's performances before the Queen in 1594, appears specially remarkable. For it is surely impossible that these three actors alone could have played two comedies without further assistance. And the fact of these three alone being mentioned seems to point to their being the managers or directors of the theatre, and in so far this document may, to a certain extent, be said to oppose the documents of 1635. The same, it would seem, can be maintained of the patent granted

by James I. on the 17th of May, 1603. How could it contain Shakespeare's name, and, moreover, before Burbage's, if only Burbage, and not Shakespeare as well, had been one of the proprietors, and if the actors had been engaged by Burbage alone? If Shakespeare and Burbage are there considered only in the capacity of actors, Shakespeare, in any case, could not possibly have ranked before Burbage. Again, in the list of actors provided with new costumes on the occasion of King James's triumphal entry into London, Shakespeare is mentioned first, whereas Burbage stands fifth. And what position can Fletcher have occupied in this respect? Or did the proprietors let the actors have the theatre on a lease, and take no further trouble about the matter? But even this does not seem likely, for almost all of them took part in the performances, and accordingly had their share of the moneys taken at the theatre. But enough, the difficulties and uncertainties regarding Shakespeare's personal connection with the theatre are by no means satisfactorily solved.

The same doubts and uncertainties envelop most of the sporadic notices which speak of the performances of Shakespeare's plays during his lifetime. The notices relating to these performances in the "Revels' Accounts," edited by Cunningham, are forgeries (as already stated on p. 7), perhaps with the exception of those which are taken from Lord Stanhope's accounts, and refer to the performances at Whitehall in 1613. Dyce,[1] at least, seems inclined to admit that these latter are genuine—they will be more fully discussed immediately. Another, and no less doubtful combination, relates to Shakespeare's "Richard II." For it is an established fact that before Earl Essex's unfortunate attempt at rebellion, a play called "Richard II." was repeatedly performed, not only to rouse and incite the conspirators, but, if possible, to incite the people generally. Queen Elizabeth herself informed William Lambard that performances of this kind had been given on various occasions, and even in the public streets; she was aware that it was the intention of the conspirators that she should share the fate of Richard II.—"I am Richard II., know ye not that?" she wrote to Lambard. One is naturally inclined to suppose this play to have been Shakespeare's "Richard II."; however, Knight[2] has pointed out

[1] *Shakespeare's Works*, 3rd ed., i. 93 f.
[2] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 410 f.

the unreliability of this supposition from internal as well as external evidence. Shakespeare's "Richard II." could scarcely, he thinks, have suited the purpose of the conspirators, as Shakespeare's drama does not by any means leave us without sympathy for the king, and the scene at the actual deposition (where the king is brought into the so-called parliamentary scene, act iv., line 154, "May it please you, lords," &c., down to line 318, "That rise thus nimbly by a true king's fall") is not contained in the earlier editions of the play, and is first met with in the edition of 1608. These 150 lines might be regarded as a subsequent interpolation were it not that, of internal necessity, they belong to the context, and hence it is more probable that—although originally a part of the drama—the passage could not have been given on the stage during Elizabeth's reign. This is a rule of censorship which is quite intelligible, when we bear in mind that Cardinal Allen in his "Admonition to the Nobility and People of England and Ireland" (1588), and even the Pope himself eight years subsequently, addressed a public appeal to the English people to rise in rebellion against the Queen. Still, whichever of these two explanations we may feel inclined to accept, at all events the point against the Queen would be broken if the deposition scene were omitted. But there is another argument. The actors at first refused to comply with the request of the conspirators, who addressed them through Sir Gilly Merrick; their excuse was that "the playe was olde, and they should have losse in playing it." Hence Sir Gilly Merrick found himself obliged to put an end to their objections by offering to cover the probable deficit by a payment of forty shillings. Now, as this remark about the play being an "olde one" cannot in any way have applied to Shakespeare's drama, we must, with Dyce,[1] assume that the revolutionary play which the conspirators wished to have performed was an earlier drama of the same name, the "exoleta tragœdia de tragica abdicatione Regis Richardi Secundi," as Camden[2] calls it.

Little as we can be certain about this having been a performance of Shakespeare's "Richard II.," as little certain are we regarding the supposed performance of his "Othello," which is said to have taken place in August, 1602, at Harefield,

[1] *The Works of William Shakespeare*, 3rd ed., iv. 102 f. Compare Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), i. 358 f.; ii. 324 f.

[2] *Annales* ed. Hearne, iii. 867.

the seat of Sir Thomas Egerton,[1] the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, in honour of the Queen's visit. This supposition is based solely upon a statement in one of the so-called Egerton Papers, discovered by Collier, and published in his "New Particulars," the genuineness of which is extremely doubtful.[2] Accordingly we are, no doubt, justified in not taking any further notice of them, and in turning instead to those few notices relating to the performances of Shakespeare's plays during the poet's lifetime which have more claim to be considered trustworthy. Manningham—who was at the time a barrister of the Middle Temple—reports in his "Diary" (p. 201), under the date of the 2nd of February, 1601-2, that "Twelfth Night" was played at one of their feasts; he not only briefly gives the contents of the play, but, what is most unusual, finds that it resembles the "Menechmi" of Plautus, and still more so the Italian comedy of the "Inganni" (more correctly "Gli Ingannati").[3] To Mr. Rundall we owe a most curious piece of information, which he obtained from the MS. archives of the East India Company; he informs us of the very surprising fact that, in 1607, both "Hamlet" and "Richard II." were played on board several of the English ships bound for the East Indies. When the ships were lying off Sierra Leone, Captain Keeling, in his daily report of the ship "Dragon," writes, under the date of the 5th of September, 1607: "I sent an interpreter, according to his desier, abord the Hector, whear he brooke fast, and after came abord mee, where we gave the tragedie of Hamlett." Under the date of the 30th of the same month Captain Keeling makes the following entry: "Captain Hawkins (the captain of the Hector) dined with mee, wher my companions acted Kinge Richard the Second." On the following day Captain Hawkins was invited by Captain Keeling to a fish dinner, after which we "had Hamlet acted abord me: which I permitt to keepe my people from idleness and unlawfull games, or sleepe."[4]

[1] Sir Thomas Egerton in 1603 was made Lord Ellesmere, and in 1616 Viscount Brackley; he was Lord Keeper under Queen Elizabeth and Lord Chancellor under King James.

[2] Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 465; Dyce, *Shakespeare's Works*, 3rd ed., i. 77; Ingleby, *A Complete View*, &c., p. 263.

[3] Compare *Diary of John Manningham*, ed. Bruce, p. 18; *Outlines*, ii. 82 (facsimile of the passage); Ainger, *Shakespeare in the Middle Temple* in *The English Illustrated Magazine* for 1884, pp. 336-376.

[4] *Narratives of Voyages towards the North-West in Search of a Passage to*

Another report that may be mentioned here, and which again refers to "Othello," has been preserved in the Diary (written in French) of Hans Jacob Wurmsers, who in 1610 was in London among the suite of Prince (or, according to his title at the time, Duke) Ludwig-Friedrich of Wirtemberg. On the 30th of April of that year the Prince paid a visit to the Globe Theatre, "lieu ordinaire ou l'on joue les Commedies, y fut representé l'histoire du More de Venise."[1] It can scarcely be doubted that this was Shakespeare's "Othello," although his drama does not appear in the Stationers' Register till 1621, and was not published till 1622. We have fuller reports from Dr. Simon Forman of the performances of "The Winter's Tale," "Richard II.," "Macbeth," and "Cymbeline," which he saw played in the Globe Theatre in 1610-11.[2]

From the accounts of Lord Stanhope, who was Treasurer of the Chamber to King James, it becomes clear, at last, that in the spring of 1613, in celebration of the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth to the Prince Palatine, the following Shakespearean dramas were played at Whitehall: "Much Ado About Nothing," "The Tempest," "The Winter's Tale," "The Moor of Venice," and "Cæsar's Tragedye."[3] There is also a "Sir John Falstaff" mentioned among the other plays, but whether this was Shakespeare's "Merry Wives," cannot, of course, be determined.[4]

If, however, we wish to obtain a complete picture of the theatrical life of Shakespeare's day, it is not sufficient merely to know Shakespeare's own position as an actor, we must also turn our attention to his colleagues on the stage. The "gentle" Shakespeare stood in a kindly and friendly relation to all of them, and we hear nothing whatever of the jealousy, envy, and intriguing which, unfortunately, are such conspicuous elements in our modern theatrical world. In Shakespeare's day, probably, there was no lack of such ill-feeling either, but he himself must assuredly have been free from it. From

Cathay, ed. by Th. Rundall (for the Hakluyt Society), 1849; Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, p. cxi. f.; Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 79. The MS. referred to no longer exists, it seems.

[1] Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, pp. cxviii. f., 61; *Outlines*, ii. 85 f.

[2] See *Dr. Simon Forman's Autobiography and Personal Diary*, ed. J. O. Halliwell, London, 1849.

[3] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 272.

[4] See Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 103; *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, 1875-6, p. 419 f.

all we know, a spirit of steady comradeship seems to have prevailed among the actors as a rule; they respected and helped one another, and in almost every one of their wills they bequeath rings, swords, and other small legacies to their "fellows" in token of affection. At first this feeling of comradeship was probably confined to members of the Lord Chamberlain's Players, which stood more or less apart from the circle headed by Henslowe and Alleyn. Neither in Henslowe's Diary, nor in Alleyn's Memoirs (even granting their genuineness generally) do we receive any further information regarding Shakespeare worth mentioning; for the letter from Mrs. Alleyn to her husband which Collier brought to light, is a forgery, at least in so far as it is said to contain a mention of Shakespeare.[1] Henslowe and Alleyn, it is true, appear only to mention those playwrights and actors to whom they had advanced money, and Shakespeare was not one of the number. London was, in fact, large enough to afford scope for more than one company of actors. We shall confine our remarks to Shakespeare's own company, and shall therefore now add a few notices of those of his "fellows" who, according to the list given in the first Folio, took part in the representation of his dramas.[2]

I. Richard Burbage (Burbadge, Burbige). On p. 118 it has already been stated that the Burbage family in all probability came from Warwickshire; but in what year, or in what place Richard Burbage was born is still a question wholly enveloped in obscurity, notwithstanding all the investigations made, for the supposed letter of Lord Southampton to Lord Ellesmere, where the subject is mentioned, has been declared to be a forgery. It may be assumed that Richard Burbage—whose father, as we have seen, gave up his occupation as a joiner to become an actor — took to the stage at a very early age, and also that he became acquainted with young

[1] *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, p. 63.—Compare Knight, p. 469; Dyce, *Shakespeare's Works*, 3rd ed., i. 83.—That Collier's *Memoirs of Alleyn* contain more than one forgery has been pointed out by Dyce, *Shakespeare's Works*, 3rd ed., i. 138, and by Ingleby in *Notes and Queries*, August 6, 1881, p. 103 f.

[2] See Malone's *Names of the Original Actors in the Plays of Shakespeare* and Chalmers' *Farther Account of the Rise and Progress of the English Stage*, both in Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), iii. 182 f. and iii. 464; Collier's *Memoirs of the Principal Actors in Shakespeare's Plays* (for the Shakespeare Society, 1846).

Shakespeare in Stratford before Shakespeare had ever been to London. The Earl of Leicester's Company of Players, to which Richard's father had belonged in 1574, and perhaps at a later date also, was engaged in 1575 on the occasion of the Princelie Pleasures at Kenilworth. It is not known when Richard Burbage joined the Lord Chamberlain's Players. His name is mentioned even previous to 1588 in connection with the "Seven Deadly Sins," in which he took the parts of Gorboduc and Tereus; according to Collier, the date is obtained from the circumstance that Tarlton, "the contriver of the piece," died in September of that year. With regard to the other parts in which Richard Burbage distinguished himself we should possess information of the most unusual fulness and detail if the genuineness of the "Funeral Elegy on the Death of the Famous Actor, Richard Burbage, who died on the Saturday in Lent, the 13th of March, 1618," could be regarded as above all suspicion.[1] There can be no doubt, however, that Burbage played most of the principal and grandest characters in Shakespeare's dramas, hence Richard III., Lear, Macbeth, Hamlet, Othello, and others, for Flecknoe praises his Protean nature.[2] It was, moreover, Burbage who first created these parts, and his conception and representation of them was followed, as it were, traditionally. His name seems to have been more particularly associated with the character of Richard III., for in "The Return from Parnassus," it is this *rôle* which he undertakes to interpret to the students; and again, from Bishop Corbet's "Iter Boreale" (1582-1635), we learn that the man in Leicester—who described the battle of Bosworth to him—in place of

[1] Collier, *New Particulars*, pp. 29-31; *Memoirs of the Principal Actors*, p. 52 ff.; *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, i. 430 ff.; Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, p. 131 f., and *Occasional Papers on Shakespeare* (London, 1881), pp. 169-182; *The Academy*, Jan. 25, 1879, p. 77; Apr. 5, 1879, p. 304; Apr. 19, 1879, p. 345; *Outlines*, ii. 88. Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps emphatically asserts their genuineness, and names no less than five different handwritings.

[2] In his *Short Discourse of the English Stage* (1664), and, according to Collier, also in his eulogy on Burbage in *Euterpe Restored* (1672). Malone, however, wishes it to be remembered that Flecknoe had previously published the first-mentioned account under the general title of *An Excellent Actor*, and that probably he had never seen Burbage act, or, at least, only as a boy, for Flecknoe's death did not take place till 1682 or 1683. A very curious (if reliable) statement of Flecknoe's is, that Burbage invariably so identified himself with the character he was playing, that he would continue to act the part even during the intervals while in the dressing-room.

saying, "King Richard died," exclaimed, in his enthusiasm, "Burbage died" (or, "King Burbage died").[1] The anecdote of the lady who invited him to come to her as Richard III. has already been narrated on p. 171. But Richard Burbage had an important rival in Edward Alleyn for the grand tragic *rôles*, for Alleyn as well as Burbage is eulogized by his contemporaries as a Roscius and Proteus—for instance, by Thomas Heywood in his Prologue to Marlowe's "Jew of Malta" (1633).[2] In fact both of these two great artists had his public, and Ben Jonson has extolled them both in order not to fall out with either; in "Bartholomew Fair," v. 3, he introduces Burbage as the "best actor," and praises Ned Alleyn in his Epigrams (No. lxxxix.). The list of actors prefixed to Ben Jonson's works tells us that Burbage played in "Every Man in His Humour" (probably the part of Kitely), in "Every Man out of His Humour," in "Sejanus" (the chief character), in "Volpone," in "Epicœne," in "The Alchymist," and in "Catiline." In Webster's "Duchess of Malfi" he played Duke Ferdinand of Calabria (as is evident from the *dramatis personæ*), and in Marston's "Malcontent" he played Malevole, as is evident from the Induction. Collier enumerates a number of the other parts which this very active "old Roscius" probably played, but whether he really played them, or played them merely in Collier's own imagination, it would be difficult to determine with such a guide. However, there is no necessity for this, as it is an established fact from other sources, that Burbage's contemporaries were unanimous in their opinion that he was the most gifted and favourite actor of his day, and that he surpassed them all by a head's length. Sir Richard Baker (1568-1644) says of him, that he was an actor "as no age must ever look to see the like." And amid the admiration and respect invariably paid to him, we do not meet with a single dissentient voice. As a man, too, he was universally respected, and Shakespeare must have held him in especial esteem, for he bequeathed to him in his will 26*s.* 8*d.* to purchase a ring as a token of remembrance. As already said, Burbage amassed such a large fortune, that towards the end of his life it is said to have

[1] Farmer's *Essay* in Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), i. 358 f.

[2] Compare Collier, *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, p. 8 f.; Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), iii. 502 f.

represented an annual income of £300.[1] He died in 1618-19 at his residence in Holywell Street—Chalmers says of the plague, whereas Collier says of apoplexy. It does not appear that Burbage was ill for any length of time previously, for he was buried on the 16th of March, having made his will (a nuncupative one) on the 12th of March; hence he probably died on March 13th.[2] According to the Ashmolean MS.[3] and Philpot's supplements to Camden's "Remains," his tombstone bore the famous epitaph "Exit Burbage." Besides several other children, he left a son William, born a few months after Shakespeare's death, and who probably received the name William in memory of the poet. Heminge and Condell both had sons who likewise received the name William, probably for the same reason. Richard Burbage's widow, Winifred, afterwards married the actor Robinson, and retained for herself and her son William—as already stated—her late husband's shares in the Globe and Blackfriars Theatres. How the other children were provided for is again one of those unanswerable questions which are perpetually met with in our investigations in this domain. As a proof that Richard Burbage's talents were not confined to acting, we may mention the tradition which speaks of his having also occupied himself with painting. Some of his biographers have even assumed that the well-known and so-called Chandos portrait of Shakespeare was his work; this, however, would clearly be overestimating Burbage's achievements in that direction, which cannot well have been more than mere dilettanti work. It is more likely that he was the painter of the so-called Droeshout portrait, for it is obviously a portrait in theatrical costume, and most probably was painted in the theatre.[4] More than mere conjectures cannot, however, be made in this case either.

II. John Heminge. (In the Dedication and in the Preface to the first Folio the name is spelt Heminge, but in the list of actors it is Hemmings.) He was, in all probability, also a Warwickshire man. One John Heminge, living in Shottery, had a daughter baptized in Stratford in 1567; and again, one Richard Heminge, also of Shottery, had a son John christened there on the 7th of March, 1570. But this

[1] *Shakespeare's Works*, ed. Collier, i. ccxxii.
[2] According to Camden he died on the 9th of March, 1619.
[3] No. 38 fol. and 190.
[4] See Appendix on the Portraits of Shakespeare.

latter John Heminge can scarcely have been the actor, as we know that he married one Rebecca Knell in London on the 10th of March, 1587-8, and Ben Jonson in his "Masque of Christmas," in 1616, calls him "old Mr. Heminge." Now as Jonson at this time was forty-two years of age, we are obliged, with Collier, to assume that Heminge must have been, at least, sixty years old, hence that he was born about 1556—accordingly, before the opening of the church register in Stratford. Heminge died in October, 1630, at his residence in Aldermanbury, and, it seems, suddenly (Malone thinks of the plague), for he was unable even to sign his will. Now if Collier's supposition is correct, Heminge must have lived to be seventy-four, which would be an exceptional age, compared with that of most of his colleagues and friends. Heminge was not only one of the proprietors of the Globe Theatre, but also of Blackfriars Theatre, and, as has already been stated, had four shares in the Globe. He was, moreover, a grocer by trade; at least in his will he calls himself a "grocer and citizen of London," not a "player." Probably, according to an astute conjecture of Malone's,[1] Heminge had already ceased to act in 1623, although in the entry of his burial in the church register of St. Mary's, Aldermanbury, he is called "the player;" he may possibly have still been connected with the theatre as one of the directors or managers. To all appearances, therefore, Heminge was probably a man of means, and it is difficult to understand why he should have made such detailed and anxious arrangements in his will, for having his debts settled after his death. For although he left a number of children (he had thirteen in all) and grandchildren, he nevertheless ordered that all his "leases, goods, chattles, plate, and household stuffe whatsoever" should forthwith be sold to liquidate his debts, and further adds, that should the proceeds be insufficient, the interest of his shares in the theatres are to be made use of on certain conditions. He names his son William as his executor; this son had studied at Oxford, and subsequently became known as a dramatic poet.[2]

Of Heminge's ability as an actor, and of the pieces or parts he played, no information has come down to us, and

[1] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii. 190.

[2] Besides a lost piece, *The Coursing of the Hare; or, The Madcap*, this William Heminge wrote *The Fatal Contract* (1653 and 1661), and *The Jew's Tragedy* (1662).

it would seem that he was less distinguished as an actor than as a theatrical manager or director. From Cunningham's "Revels' Accounts" (granting that the passage is genuine) it would seem that Heminge attended to the company's financial affairs, and divided the fees and gifts received from the Court, among the various members, &c. This would explain the fact of his name usually appearing first in the lists of actors, and in the licences. And from this circumstance alone it might be inferred that he must have come into close contact with Shakespeare, and this surmise is confirmed by the fact that Shakespeare in his last will bequeathed to him 26*s.* 8*d.* to purchase a ring. After Shakespeare's death Heminge joined Condell in editing the poet's works, and from his name being mentioned first it would seem that he must have been the chief editor.

As already stated, Heminge, like Shakespeare, applied for a grant of coat-armour, which seems somewhat inconsistent with his occupation as a grocer. Malone[1] gives a copy of the document conferring the grant, together with the coat-of-arms; if this document really refers to our John Heminge—and he is described as for many years the servant, *i.e.*, player to Queen Elizabeth as well as to King James—then he was not a Warwickshire man, but came from Droitwich in Worcestershire; hence not very far from Stratford after all.

III. Augustine Philips (Phillips) played Sardanapalus in Tarlton's "Platt of the Seven Deadly Sins."[2] In the patent granted by King James in 1603 his name occurs immediately after Burbage's. Of his performances as an actor we know nothing; it is assumed, without evidence however, that he generally played low or comic characters. In his private life he was a man greatly esteemed, acquired considerable wealth, and became the proprietor of an estate at Mortlake, where he died at the beginning of May, 1605, and was buried in the church there, in accordance with a wish expressed in his will. Small legacies were left to several of his colleagues as tokens of remembrance. Shakespeare is mentioned first with a legacy of "a thirty shillings peece in gould." He appointed his widow his executrix, as long as she remains unmarried; however, she married again two years afterwards, and as there

[1] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii. 197.
[2] Ibid., iii. 348 ff., 356.

were young children and other inheritors, the management of the property left by Philips passed into the hands of Heminge, who thereupon—in accordance with an order in the will—received a silver bowl worth £5.[1] Philips had tried his hand as a playwright, and wrote "The Jig of the Slippers," a kind of ballet, which was entered in the Stationers' Registers in 1595.

IV. William Kempe (Kemp), according to Heywood's "Apology for Actors,"[2] was Tarlton's successor, both as the Court favourite and of the public generally. His chief talent lay in playing the part of clowns, and, like Tarlton, was famous for his improvisations; hence it is not improbable that Shakespeare's severe censure respecting improvisations, in "Hamlet" (iii. 2), may have been mainly directed against Kempe. The parts he played were, more especially, Dogberry in "Much Ado About Nothing," and Peter, and probably also Balthasar, in "Romeo and Juliet," as is proved from the early editions of this drama, where, in some instances, Kempe's name appears by mistake in place of the character to be represented.[3] It is probable also that he played Launcelot in "The Merchant of Venice," Launce in "The Two Gentlemen of Verona," Touchstone in "As You Like It," and the First Gravedigger in "Hamlet." From "The Return from Parnassus," where Kempe is mentioned by name, together with Burbage and Heminge, it is evident, firstly, that he was a master in mimetic art, and secondly, that he had been to Italy and had given performances there as a morris-dancer.[4] It would seem that he acquired the highest celebrity as a dancer, and that he even performed his famous morris-dance from London to Norwich; he gave an account of this adventurous joke in his famous pamphlet, "A Nine Days' Wonder."[5]

[1] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii. 470 f.

[2] Edited by Collier for the Shakespeare Society, p. 43.

[3] In the first Folio (*Much Ado About Nothing*, iv. 2) we have *Kemp* in place of Dogberry and *Cowlie* in place of Verges. In *Romeo and Juliet*, iv. 5, the quarto edition of 1599 gives *Enter Will Kemp*, instead of Enter Peter, and in v. 3, *Enter Romeo and Peter* instead of Enter Romeo and Balthasar. See *Romeo and Juliet. Parallel-Texts of the First Two Quartos.* Ed. by P. A. Daniel (publ. for the New Shakspere Society, 1874). The quarto gives in the first instance *Enter Seruingman.*

[4] He seems also to have danced before the German Emperor. See my *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 267 f.; also my *Notes on Elizabethan Dramatists*, i. 66-76.

[5] The full title of this work is: *Kemps nine daies wonder performed in a daunce from London to Norwich. Containing the pleasure, paines and kind*

Nash dedicated his pamphlet "An Almond for a Parrot," to Kempe, in the words: "To that most comicall and conceited Cavaleiro Monsieur du Kempe, Jestmonger and vice-gerent generall to the Ghost of Dicke Tarleton." Kempe wrote several jigs, as is evident from the Stationers' Registers; for instance, the "New Jigg of the Kitchenstuff Woman," the "New Jigge betwixt a Souldier and a Miser and Sym the Clowne," and "The Men of Gotham," which, however, is not termed a jig, but a "merryment." Marston, in his "Scourge of Villanie" (Satyre xi.) ridicules these jigs. Of Kempe's private life we do not know anything for certain, or, at least, what we do know is merely negative: it seems hardly likely that he belonged to Warwickshire, for the name is not met with there; nor does it seem likely that he was a married man, or that he was a man of means, for no will of his has been found. About the time of the accession of James I. he disappears from the scenes, it is not known why or where to; and it is not known in what year he died. Brathwaite's "Remains," 1618, contain an epitaph on him ("Upon Kempe and his Morice, with his Epitaph"), which is reprinted in Malone.[1]

V. Thomas Pope, of unknown origin, went abroad with the so-called English Comedians, accompanied by his fellow-actor George Bryan, and entered the service of Frederick II. of Denmark, who, however, in 1586, handed over his English Company to Christian, the Elector of Saxony. In the "decree of appointment," printed by Cohn,[2] these five Englishmen are, indeed, described as "fiddlers and instrumentalists," but are also praised for "their art of leaping and other graceful things that they have learned." This difficulty is only an apparent one. Pope was a clown, and hence, like Kempe and others, he could dance jigs, morris-dances, and accompany himself on the tabor and pipe. He must have returned to England before 1589, for he took the part of Arbactus in "The Seven Deadly

entertainment of William Kemp between London and that city, in his late morrice. Wherein is somewhat set downe worth note; to reprooue the slaunders spred of him: many things merry, nothing hurtfull. Written by himselfe, to satisfie his friends. London, 1600. New edition, by the Rev. Al. Dyce, for the Camden Society (London, 1840).

[1] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii. 198, and in Dyce's edition of the *Nine Days' Wonder*, p. viii.

[2] *Shakespeare in Germany*, p. xxv.

Sins."[1] He then appeared in Jonson's "Every Man in His Humour" and "Every Man out of His Humour," and in 1597-8 his and Heminge's names stand first among the Lord Chamberlain's Players. Then, too, he acquired shares in the theatres and other property, and, indeed, became a person of some consequence, as may be gathered from the circumstance that he is almost invariably mentioned as *Mr.* Pope. He does not seem to have been a married man. He resided in the parish of St. Saviour's, in Southwark, and died there in February, 1603-4. In his will, that still exists, he sets aside £20 to defray the costs of his funeral and for a tombstone.[2] Heywood, in his "Apology for Actors,"[3] pays him the following compliment: "Gabriel Singer, Pope, Phillips, Sly, all the right I can do them is but this, that, though they be dead, their deserts yet live in the remembrance of many."

VI. George Bryan, as stated above, went to Denmark and Germany with Thomas Pope, where his name became Germanized into Beyzandt, and on his return he played the part of the Earl of Warwick in the "Seven Deadly Sins." According to Chalmers[4] he took the same character in "Henry VI." (1592); this is probably a mistake, however.[5] Where and when he died is as little known as where and when he was born, for his will has not yet been discovered.

VII. Henry Condell (the name is spelt thus in the first Folio, whereas the signature to his will is Cundall)[6] was co-editor with Heminge of the first Folio. It is not known where or when he was born; he died in December, 1627. Like his colleague Heminge, he lived in Aldermanbury, and was one of the "sidemen" of the parish. He was a large shareholder in the theatres, and a man of considerable wealth; one of his more important possessions was a country-house at

[1] All of the five men received a salary of 100 thalers, eight thalers for house-rent or lodging-money; in like manner each of them was to receive "yearly one coat," and to be "provided with a free table at court, also, when they travel, with free conveyance."

[2] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii. 506.

[3] Edited by Collier, p. 43.

[4] In Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii. p. 505.

[5] Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany*, p. xxvii. Cohn gives a facsimile of his handwriting; also facsimiles of the signatures of Pope, King, &c.

[6] In Marston's *Malcontent*, *Induction*, the name is spelt Cundale; in this *Induction* we not merely meet with Harry Cundale, but also with D. (*sic*) Burbidge, Sly, Sinckclow, and J. Lewin (Lowin), *in propria persona*.

Fulham, to which place he probably retired when the plague made its appearance in London. As an actor he was probably more useful than eminent (he is nowhere praised by his contemporaries); Collier, at least, thinks that he played a great number of different parts. In the "Seven Deadly Sins" he took the part of Ferrex; he also played in Ben Jonson's plays ("Every Man in His Humour," "Sejanus," "Volpone," "The Alchymist," and in "Catiline"), and no doubt also in Beaumont and Fletcher's plays. In Webster's "Duchess of Malfi" he was the original representative of the Cardinal. In the royal licence of 1603 his name is sixth on the list. Phillips left him a "thirty shillings peece in gould," exactly the same amount as he left to Shakespeare, whose name immediately precedes Condell's, and Shakespeare himself left Condell 26*s.* 8*d.* to buy himself a ring. Collier[1] has discovered that the pamphlet, "The Runaway's Answer," was dedicated to Condell. He had a large family, but only three children seem to have survived him; his widow survived him eight years, having died in 1635.

VIII. William Sly may probably have been a Warwickshire man, the name being a very common one there (as well as elsewhere); of his circumstances we know only that he never married, was the proprietor of a house (in Holywell Street), a shareholder of the Globe Theatre, and that he died in 1608, being termed a "gentleman" in the church register. His will is most irregular in character, and has no signature; very possibly it is not even genuine. Sly played Porrex in "The Seven Deadly Sins," and took parts in "Every Man in His Humour," "Every Man out of His Humour," "Sejanus," and "Volpone;" perhaps also he may have played Osric in "Hamlet," as Steevens has inferred from an allusion in the Induction to Marston's "Malcontent." In King James's licence of 1603 he stands seventh.

IX. Richard Cowley, of whose origin and birthplace nothing is known, is said to have lived in Holywell Street (according to Chalmers), and was buried in the churchyard of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, and, in fact, only three days before a grave was opened there for Richard Burbage. He left a family, but whether any property is not known, as no will of his exists. In "The Seven Deadly Sins" he played

[1] *Memoirs of the Principal Actors*, p. 142.

Giraldus; of the other characters he may have represented, we know only that he played Verges in "Much Ado About Nothing" (see Kempe). In the lists of actors prefixed to B. Jonson's, and to Beaumont and Fletcher's works, Cowley's name does not occur, and hence he can only have taken subordinate parts in their plays. The licence of King James of 1603 mentions him last. Augustin Phillips left him a legacy of 20*s.* in 1605.

X. JOHN LOWIN (LOWINE, LOWYN, LOWEN, or LEWIN in Marston,) was born in 1576, according to the date given on his portrait in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. From two passages in Henslowe's Diary[1] it would seem that Lowin was one of the Earl of Worcester's Players in 1602. In King James's licence of 1603 his name is not mentioned, and hence it is probable that he was not one of the King's Servants at the time, or, at all events, occupied some subordinate position. In 1604 his name occurs in the Induction to Marston's "Malcontent;" in 1605 he played in "Volpone," 1610 in "The Alchymist," and 1611 in "Catiline." In addition to this he took the part of Morose in "The Silent Woman," that of Bosola in "The Duchess of Malfi," and numerous other *rôles.* He is also said to have played Falstaff and Hamlet; but the latter—if at all—was certainly not played by him till after Shakespeare's death. The tradition[2] which speaks of Lowin having played Henry VIII., and "that he had his instructions from Mr. Shakespeare himself," is but weakly supported. After Heminge and Condell withdrew from the company, Lowin and Taylor seem to have been the two most distinguished members—at all events, they acted as the representatives of the company in a dispute which the company had with the Master of the Revels, Sir Henry Herbert, in 1633, concerning a play called "The Tamer Tamed."[3] The company had to give way, and the piece in question was not played till Sir Henry had cleared it of "oaths, prophaness, and ribaldrye;" and Lowin and Swanston had even to make an apology for "their ill manners." The Civil War deprived Lowin of his theatrical property, and he got into difficulty; in order to earn some small subsistence, in 1647 he joined nine of his

[1] Ed. Collier, pp. 234 and 244.
[2] *Outlines*, i. 223.
[3] Differently stated in Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii. 517.

fellow-actors in editing Beaumont and Fletcher's works, and in 1652, in conjunction with Joseph Taylor, published Fletcher's "Wild Goose Chase." Finally, we even find him, as an old man, the landlord of the Three Doves inn at Brentford, and in March, 1658-9, he died in London at the age of eighty-four.

XI. Samuel Cross's circumstances in life, as well as the position he occupied at the theatre and his accomplishments as an actor, are wholly unknown to us. Heywood,[1] it is true, speaks of an actor named Cross in terms of great praise, but adds that he had not himself seen him; hence, if his remark referred to Samuel Cross, the latter must either have died or have retired from the stage before 1600.

XII. Alexander Cooke. Malone conjectures that Cooke was the "Saunder" spoken of as having played the female characters in "The Seven Deadly Sins." That Cooke played the part of women is inferred from the fact that he is mentioned last in the list of actors prefixed to "Sejanus" and "Volpone." In the list given in "The Alchymist," his name is however mentioned fourth, and in "Catiline" he even stands second; hence in these two last-named dramas he can scarcely have played the part of women. He took part also in Beaumont and Fletcher's "Captain." Augustin Phillips bequeathed him 20*s.* in gold. He died in February, 1613-14, and left a widow *enceinte* and two children. From his will, written in his own handwriting, it is evident that he was a man in poor circumstances.

XIII. Samuel Gilburne was a pupil of Augustin Phillips, as is evident from Phillips' will, where we find the words: "Item, I geve to Samuell Gilborne my late apprentice, the Some of Fortye shillings and my mouse colloured Velvit hose and a White Taffety Dublet a blacke taffety sute my purple Cloke Sword and Dagger and my Base Viall." The "base viall" mentioned would, of course, have been useless to Gilburne, unless he had been musical, so we may presume that he was able to play it. Except in the list of actors in the first Folio, Gilburne's name is nowhere met with; perhaps he retired from the stage early, and died young.

XIV. Robert Arnim, according to Oldys' statement, was originally an apprentice to a goldsmith in Lombard Street, but had attracted Tarlton's attention, who took him as a

[1] *Apology for Actors*, ed. Collier, p. 43.

pupil and adopted him as a son.[1] Thereupon, for a time, he belonged to the company of Lord Chandos (who died in 1602), as we learn from his "Nest of Ninnies."[2] In King James's licence of 1603 Arnim's name is eighth in the list (hence the last but one). Phillips left him a legacy of 20*s*. Arnim played chiefly the part of fools and clowns, as is obvious from some verses addressed to him by Davies of Hereford in 1611. In 1610 he played in "The Alchymist." Collier[3] thinks that, in 1600, he must have been in Scotland with Lawrence Fletcher; however, this hypothesis is not sufficiently well founded. Arnim's name is not met with in the church registers, nor has his will been discovered; hence we know nothing of his domestic affairs, his pecuniary circumstances, or the time of his death. It would certainly seem that his means must have been small, otherwise he is not likely to have taken to writing as a means of making money. He is, however, almost more famous as an author than as an actor. As early as 1603 Gabriel Harvey calls him "one of the common pamphleteers of London." His best known pamphlet is his "Nest of Ninnies" (1608), which has been republished for the Shakespeare Society. Arnim was also the author of "The History of the Two Maids of Moreclacke" (Mortlake), which was played in 1609 by the Children of the King's Revels. He also wrote "The Italian Taylor and his Boy" (1608 or 1609), the subject having been taken from Straparola.[4] He may possibly also have been the author of the drama, "The Valiant Welshman," by R. A., Gent. (1615). And this certainly does not exhaust the list of his literary productions.

XV. William Ostler in 1601 was one of the Children of the Chapel Royal, and, in that capacity, took part in Jonson's "Poetaster" (together with Nat. Field and John Underwood). Subsequently he played in "The Alchymist," in "Catiline," in Beaumont and Fletcher's "Captain," "Bonduca," and "Valentinian;" he also, in 1623, represented Antonio in "The Duchess of Malfi." Ostler was a married man, and, according to Collier, had a son who was baptized Beaumont—

[1] *Tarlton's Jests and News out of Purgatory*, ed. Halliwell (for the Shakespeare Society).
[2] Ed. Collier, p. 37 ff.
[3] *Memoirs of the Principal Actors*, p. 196.
[4] A facsimile reprint of this tract was published in 1811.

possibly the poet was his godfather. It is not known when he died, for his will has not been found. John Davies of Hereford sings his praises in "The Scourge of Folly," as "The Roscius of these times."

XVI. NATHANIEL FIELD (also Nathan, and briefly Nat.) was talented and distinguished both as an actor and as a playwright. He was born in London as the son of a Puritanical clergyman (who died as early as March, 1587-8), and a zealous opponent of the theatre, both in word and action. This, at least, is stated by Collier, who has also discovered that Nathaniel had originally been an apprentice to a stationer, and that the subsequent Bishop of Llandaff and Hereford, Theophilus Field, was a brother of Nathaniel's.[1] It is known for certain that Nat. Field was one of the Boys of the Chapel Royal, and that, as such, he had played a principal part in B. Jonson's "Cynthia's Revels." It is probable also that he undertook female parts, for in outward appearance he seems to have been particularly well suited for this, as far as can be judged from his portrait at Dulwich. At a later date he played the chief parts in Jonson's "Poetaster" and "Epicœne," and the title-*rôle* in Chapman's "Bussy d'Ambois." He was a great favourite with B. Jonson, who considered him quite equal to Burbage;[2] nay, Flecknoe, in his "Short Discourse of the English Stage," considers him even superior to Burbage. Field seems to have acquired a considerable amount of money, but to have squandered it in a light-hearted, thoughtless manner, so that he fell into want, and even into debt.[3] He

[1] *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iv. 38; Collier's *Hist. Eng. Dram. Poetry*, i. 253; *Spenser's Works*, ed. Collier, i. lxxi.

[2] In *Bartholomew Fair*, v. 3, we find the following passage:—

Cokes. *Which is your Burbage now?*
Leath. *What mean you by that, sir?*
Cokes. *Your best actor, your Field?*
Lit. *Good, i' faith! you are even with me, sir.*
Leath. *This is he, that acts young Leander, sir; he is extremely beloved of the womankind, they do so affect his action, the green gamesters, that come here!*

If we may refer the last remark to Field, it would fit in with the other allusions, and it is all the more likely as Field himself took a part in *Bartholomew Fair*.

[3] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii. 337; *Memoirs of Edw. Alleyn*, ed. Collier, pp. 118, 120; *The Alleyn Papers*, ed. Collier, pp. 48, 65, 78. Field at the time belonged to Henslowe's Company, and only subsequently joined the King's Players.

was a married man (Collier has discovered that he was of a very jealous disposition, and therefore liked playing Othello); he had a family, and died in 1632-3 (without having made a will), after having, as it seems, for some time retired from the stage. At all events, Field did not take part in the performance of "The Duchess of Malfi" (1623). Of his dramatic works the best known is his "Woman's a Weathercock" (written about 1610, published 1612); he was also the author of "Amends for Ladies" (1618),[1] and, in conjunction with Massinger, "The Fatal Dowry" (1632). It has been doubted whether the playwright and the actor Field were one and the same person; but this doubt seems now to be satisfactorily settled. Chapman, in his "Commendatory Verses on Woman's a Weathercock," calls Field "his loved son," and speaks in praise of him also in the Prologue to his "Bussy d'Ambois" (1641).

XVII. John Underwood played in a great number of very different pieces; was therefore a very useful, although not an eminent actor; he was, in fact, one of those of whom it is said, that they never exactly spoil a part. He had been one of the Boys of the Chapel Royal, together with Nat. Field, and had played in "Cynthia's Revels" (1600), and in "The Poetaster" (1601). Subsequently he took part in "The Alchymist" (1610), and in "Catiline" (1611), and also played Delio in "The Duchess of Malfi." He likewise played in almost every one of Beaumont and Fletcher's dramas. He had shares in the Globe Theatre as well as in The Curtain, but nevertheless does not seem to have been in good circumstances; this is inferred from the fact that Nicholas Tooley, in his will of 1623, relieved him of some debt that was owing to him. Underwood died in January, 1624-5, his wife having died some time previously, and left five children. One of Underwood's sons received the name of Burbage; hence either Richard or Cuthbert Burbage had probably stood godfather to the child. Underwood's will is printed by Malone, and also by Collier; an unsigned codicil had been added to it after the testator's death.

XVIII. Nicholas Tooley, in a codicil to his will, states that his real name was Wilkinson; his object in making this

[1] Both this and the last-named play, *Woman's a Weathercock*, are printed by Dodsley, ed. Hazlitt, vol. xi.

admission is that his will—which is drawn up under the name of Tooley—may not be disputed. This, therefore, would seem to be the first instance of an actor not using his own name, but assuming one for the stage. Tooley was an intimate friend of the Burbage family; probably he had been a pupil of Richard Burbage's, for Tooley, in his will, calls Burbage "his late Mr. (= master) Richard Burbadge;" and besides, Tooley's name stands as one of the witnesses to Richard Burbage's will. During Tooley's last illness he was nursed in Cuthbert Burbage's house, and died there in June, 1623; from this we may infer that he was not a married man, or that he had been left a childless widower. In grateful acknowledgment he bequeaths to Mrs. (Elizabeth) Burbage the sum of £10 "as a remembrance of my love in respect of her motherlie care over me;" a legacy of the same amount is bequeathed to a daughter of Cuthbert's named Elizabeth, who, it seems, was unhappily married. However, it was not only with the Burbages that Tooley was upon intimate terms; Augustin Phillips, too, valued him as a friend, and left him 20*s.* as a mark of his affection. In fact, Tooley must have been a benevolent and good man, for he left £80 to be divided among the poor in the parishes of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, and St. Giles, Cripplegate Without, and the latter parish was to receive an additional legacy of £20. The clergyman who officiated at his burial was to receive £10, and he relieved all his creditors of the moneys due to him. Cuthbert Burbage and Henry Condell were appointed the executors of this generous will. With regard to Tooley's performances as an actor little can be said. In "The Seven Deadly Sins" it seems that he played Rodope; in Jonson's dramas his name does not appear, except in "The Alchymist" and "Catiline;" on the other hand, he appeared in, at least, fourteen plays by Beaumont and Fletcher; and lastly, in "The Duchess of Malfi," he played Forobosco (a silent part), and one of the Madmen.

XIX. William Ecclestone belonged to several different companies alternately.[1] He played in "The Alchymist" and in "Catiline," where his name stands last; in B. Jonson's other pieces he is not mentioned, but, on the other hand, he played in a number of Beaumont and Fletcher's dramas. No will of his has been found, and hence we know nothing of his

[1] See *Memoirs of Edw. Alleyn*, p. 98, and *The Alleyn Papers*, p. 78.

circumstances, except that Tooley, in his will, relieved him of a debt due to him.

XX. Joseph Taylor, one of the most eminent of the Shakespearean actors, is said to have been born in London in 1585, and to have belonged in succession to Prince Henry's Players, the King's Players, and to the Servants of the Princess Elizabeth.[1] His most famous representations were Hamlet and Iago; the part of Hamlet he undertook after Burbage's death, and played it "incomparably well," as Wright says in his "Historia Histrionica." According to an earlier supposition, Taylor was the original impersonator of Hamlet; however, this seems to be as incorrect as to suppose him to have been the painter of the Chandos portrait, and yet this has repeatedly been done. As Ferdinand in "The Duchess of Malfi" he was also a successor of Burbage. The numerous parts he played in Beaumont and Fletcher's dramas are unfortunately unknown to us, and, of course, he must also have acted in B. Jonson's and other dramas. In September, 1639, he was appointed Yeoman of the Revels, in which capacity he received 6*d.* a day, and when in the King's service £3. 6*s.* 8*d.* a month. Taylor was also, as we have already seen, one of the shareholders of the Globe and of Blackfriars Theatre. The Civil War deprived him of this portion of his income, and, like many of his fellow-actors, he fell into needy circumstances by the suppression of the theatres; it was this that induced him to become one of the editors of Beaumont and Fletcher's works, and of Fletcher's "Wild Goose Chase," in conjunction with Lowin. According to the "Historia Histrionica" he died at Richmond (probably in 1653), and was buried there. No will of his has been discovered.

XXI. Robert Benfield was probably a moderately good, but useful actor, and although not mentioned in B. Jonson's dramas, very likely played in various pieces of Beaumont and Fletcher. In "The Duchess of Malfi" he played Antonio in 1622, a part originally played by Ostler (1616);[2] he also undertook various other parts, which are enumerated by Malone. Of his circumstances in life we know nothing, owing to there being no will of his; we do know, however, that he was one of those who edited Beaumont and Fletcher's works. During the Civil War he probably sank into obscurity, perhaps into want.

[1] Cunningham, *Revels' Accounts*, Introd., p. xliv.

[2] See the *Works of John Webster*, ed. Dyce (London, 1857), in one vol., p. 57.

XXII. Robert Goughe (Goffe) played Aspasia in "The Seven Deadly Sins," and probably also played some of the female characters in Shakespeare's dramas. In Jonson's and Beaumont's works his name is nowhere mentioned; in 1611 he played the Tyrant in "The Second Maiden's Tragedy." Thomas Pope, in 1603, left his wardrobe and his weapons to Robert Goughe and John Edmonds, to be divided equally between them. It is very possible that the Alexander Gough—who was also famous as the representative of female characters, and who in 1652 published "The Widow," the joint work of Jonson, Fletcher, and Middleton—was a son of Robert Goughe. No will of Goughe's has been discovered, but Collier has found out, from the church registers, that he was buried on the 19th of February, 1624-5.

XXIII. Richard Robinson (commonly called Dick Robinson) was one of the youngest members of the company, and an admirable representative of female characters, as we learn from B. Jonson's "The Devil is an Ass "(ii. 8).[1] However, he played masculine parts as well; for instance, he acted in "Catiline" (1611) and in "The Duchess of Malfi," in which latter piece he played the Cardinal's part, which had originally been played by Condell, and in other dramas enumerated by Malone. Of his circumstances we know nothing, as no will of his exists, and the brief notices in the church registers are very misleading. The two names Richard and Robinson occur so frequently, not only singly, but together,

[1] The passage alluded to is the following:—

Eng. *There be some of them* (viz. the players)
Are very honest lads: there's Dickey Robinson,
A very pretty fellow, and comes often
To a gentleman's chamber, a friend of mine. We had
The merriest supper of it here, one night.
The gentleman's landlady invited him
To a gossip's feast: now he, sir, brought Dick Robinson
Drest like a lawyer's wife, amongst them all:
I lent him clothes.—But to see him behave it,
And lay the law, and carve and drink unto them,
And then talk bawdy, and send frolics! O,
It would have burst your buttons, or not left you
A seam.
Meer. *They say he's an ingenious youth.*
Eng. *O sir! and dresses himself the best, beyond*
Forty of your very ladies; did you never see him?
Meer. *No, I do seldom see those toys.*

that it would be impossible to identify the person unless some additional words were entered. For instance, the second husband of Winifred Burbage, as already stated, was called Robinson, and it has been assumed that this Robinson was the actor Richard Robinson; however, the supposition is purely a conjecture. Nicholas Tooley, in his last will, orders that the sum of £29 13*s.*, which Richard Robinson owes him, be paid to Sarah Burbage, a daughter of Richard's. In the royal patent of 1624 Robinson's name stands among the King's Players. According to the "Historia Histrionica" (p. 8), an actor named Robinson, who had served in the royal army during the Civil War, was killed—not to say murdered—in a shameful manner by the republican general Thomas Harrison, who was subsequently hanged at the capture of Basing House.[1] Robinson, in fact, had laid down his arms and begged for quarter; this Harrison refused, and sent a bullet through his head, exclaiming, "Cursed is he that doth the work of the Lord negligently." The question as to whether this unfortunate man was our Dick Robinson, Cunningham has, indeed, answered with a decided Yea;[2] and it is easy to believe that, of all the actors, the one who impersonated women would be the one most likely to rouse the wrath of the Puritan fanatic; still, the supposition is nevertheless incorrect. Dick Robinson is mentioned in 1647 among the ten editors of Beaumont and Fletcher's works; and besides, in the church register of St. Anne's, Blackfriars, an entry has been found which states that "Rich. Robinson, a player," was buried on the 23rd of March, 1647-8.

XXIV. John Shancke was a comedian, and played subordinate parts; for instance, Sir Roger, the parson, in Fletcher's "Scornful Lady," Hilario in "The Wild Goose Chase," and similar characters. In the royal patent of 1603 he is not mentioned, but is mentioned in that of the 4th of January, 1612-13, which grants a licence to the Players of the Count Palatine. Shancke was specially famous for his songs (couplets, as we should say nowadays) and jigs, and is very much praised for these performances in several later publica-

[1] This fortified and splendid mansion of the Duke of Winchester was taken by the Parliamentary troops, after a siege of two years, on the 16th of October, 1645, and razed to the ground.

[2] *Did General Harrison kill "Dick Robinson" the Player?* By Peter Cunningham, in *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, ii. 11-13.

tions.[1] He was himself the author of a favourite farce called "Shancke's Ordinary," which was played on the 16th of March, 1623 (and certainly on frequent other occasions), by the King's Players. If the church register of St. Giles, Cripplegate, can be trusted, Shancke was married and had children. In this church register he is sometimes called "player," sometimes "gentleman," and on one occasion even "a chandler"—of course taking it for granted that the name in all cases refers to one and the same person. It is said that there was another person of the name of John Shancke at the time, a blacksmith. Shancke was buried in the above-mentioned parish on the 27th of January, 1635-6. No will of his exists. How little the identity of a person can be established by the mere entry of a name is evident from this case again; for in "The Perfect Diurnal" of the 24th of October, 1642, a story is told of an actor Shancks living at the time, and who, accordingly, must have been an entirely different person from the Shancks of Shakespeare's day.

XXV. John Rice is almost wholly unknown to us, both as regards his circumstances in life and his accomplishments as an actor; in fact, less is known of him than of any other member of the company. We know only that in "The Duchess of Malfi" (1622) he took the subordinate part of Pescara, and also that he played in Beaumont and Fletcher's "The False One." No will of his exists, and we do not even know in what year he died.

With the addition of Shakespeare himself, the above twenty-five men are "the principal actors in all these plays," and this statement further shows that they were not the only players. We are, in fact, able to complete the list; and those still to be added have a special claim to our interest, in so far as in their case we have only to do with their performances in Shakespeare's dramas, whereas, unfortunately, as regards the "principal actors," we know but very little about them in their connection with Shakespeare's dramas, and have to follow Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, and others, to obtain our scanty information regarding their personal characters and their achievements. This is one of the losses which have

[1] See *Choyce Drollery, Songs, and Sonnets*, &c. (London, 1656), from which the poem in question was printed in *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iii. 172-174; *Turner's Dish of Stuffe; or a Gallimaufry* (London, 1662).

resulted from Shakespeare's well-known heedlessness in regard to such matters. If, like Ben Jonson, he had added to his dramas a list of the actors who had performed in them, we should have obtained a clearer insight into many points relating to the dramas themselves, and the insight thus gained would undoubtedly have thrown many a ray of light upon the right understanding of Shakespeare's poetry generally.

Among the Shakespearean actors—of insignificant talent certainly—of whom some meagre information has come down to us, we may first of all mention John Wilson, although he was not so much an actor as a singer. John Wilson played Balthazar in "Much Ado About Nothing," and sang the song (ii. 3), "Sigh no more, ladies," &c.; this is evident from the stage direction in the first Folio at this passage; we find there the words, "Enter Prince, Leonato, Claudio, and Jack Wilson." From an old—and it is to be hoped genuine—manuscript song, Collier points out that Wilson composed the music to the words, "Take, O take those lips away," &c.,[1] and hence supposes that the song in "Much Ado About Nothing" also was not merely sung by him, but that he had himself set the words to music.[2] A second actor, whom we also get to know from a misprint in the first Folio, was called Sincklo or Sincklow. He took the part of one of the Players in the Induction to the "Taming of the Shrew," but whether he represented the First Player (as Delius thinks), and "consequently Petrucchio also," seems doubtful. The same Sincklo played, in the Second Part of "Henry IV.," the part of the First Beadle, and in the Third Part of "Henry VI." (iii. 1) appeared as the first of the two Keepers.[3] And on this occasion, from the Folio, we even get to know the name of the impersonator of the Second Keeper; he was one Humfrey, *i.e.*, according to

[1] In *Measure for Measure*, iv. 1.

[2] *John Wilson, the Singer in Much Ado About Nothing, a Musical Composer in Shakespeare's Plays.* By J. Payne Collier, in *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, ii. 33-36. The manuscript was formerly in the possession of Lord Ferrers, but Collier does not state to whom it now belongs. Compare *Who was Jack Wilson, the Singer of Shakespeare's Stage?* By Edward F. Rimbault. London, 1846.

[3] See Delius, *Abhandlungen zu Shakspere*, pp. 8, 300, 305, and 308. Sincklo's name occurs also in Tarleton's *Platt of the Seven Deadly Sins*, and in the Introduction to Marston and Webster's *Malcontent*. See *The Dramatic Works of John Webster*, by Dyce, iv. 16. It also seems that Sincklo, for some length of time, was one of the jesters at the Court of the Emperor Maximilian II. See my *Notes on Elizabethan Dramatists*, ii. 160 ff.

Malone's supposition, Humfrey Jeaffes; and in Act ii. 2 of the same drama we, in the same way, become acquainted with a fourth actor—one who is otherwise wholly unknown to us—Gabriel by name, who played the Messenger. Malone[1] mentions also William Barksted, John Duke, and Christopher Beeston as members of the Lord Chamberlain's Players; however, there is not the smallest indication of their having taken any part in Shakespeare's dramas, and hence it is sufficient here to have given their names.

[1] Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, iii. 221.

Chapter V.

SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS.

AMONG the many curiosities connected with Shakespearean literature is the hypothesis that Shakespeare's dramas were not written by him, but by Lord Bacon, and hence that they are in verity "a deed without a name" ("Macbeth," iv. 1). This Bacon theory was brought forward in America and England almost simultaneously, and was first worked out by an American lady, a Miss Bacon, who may have been attracted to the great philosopher because of his name, and because she wished to make him out a great poet as well. This lady, Miss Delia Bacon, was born at New Haven in 1811, and the title of her work is, "The Philosophy of the Plays of Shakespeare unfolded; with a Preface by N. Hawthorne" (London, 1857).[1] In the same year there appeared a second

[1] Compare *The Athenæum*, April 11, 1857, and Oct. 3, p. 1863, 429 ff. The fundamental idea of this book—that Bacon, and not Shakespeare, was the author of the dramas known by the name of the latter—Delia Bacon had published as early as January, 1856, in Putnam's *Monthly Magazine*, and Hawthorne therefore declares the letter from Smith to Lord Ellesmere to be a plagiarism. To the oral communications of an English friend, who helped Miss Bacon with the publication of her work, I owe the following facts. The book was for the most part written in Stratford-on-Avon, where the authoress, who was suffering from an incurable disease, had been residing for months, and where she desired to be buried. Her wish to be laid in one and the same grave with Shakespeare, had become a fixed idea in her mind. When she was made to understand that it would be impossible to open Shakespeare's grave and to place an unknown person in it, she endeavoured to make an arrangement with the sexton that her body should be buried outside the church wall, but as close as possible to Shakespeare's grave, and then—under the pretext that some repairs were necessary at that part—the wall was to be broken through, and her coffin smuggled into the inside of the church and into Shakespeare's vault. However, circumstances occurred which demanded Delia Bacon's return to America, where she died in a lunatic asylum.—Wondrous are the aberrations of the human

work on the subject, entitled, "Bacon and Shakespeare: An Inquiry touching Players, Playhouses, and Playwriters in the Days of Elizabeth," by Wm. Henry Smith. The year before this same W. H. Smith had, in a Letter to Lord Ellesmere, pointed out that Bacon was the author of Shakespeare's works, which letter he had printed in manuscript form.[1] In the Preface to his first-mentioned work Smith denies having known anything about Delia Bacon's book, except by name, and maintains that his work was written altogether independently of hers, and that the substance was entirely his own. The author dilates upon every conceivable subject, but does not give either reasons or proofs for his assertions. Yet, in spite of its absolute want of evidence, J. George H. Townsend considered it necessary to refute Smith's theory, and this he did that same year anonymously; however, his dissertation treats only of a number of well-known facts that have no connection at all with the point in question.[2] Subsequently Nath. Holmes, an American, and others have dished up the subject again in bulky volumes, and have declared themselves in favour of the Bacon theory.[3] The subject, however, does not deserve any full discussion, or even serious refutation. Allibone says: "We have earned the right by hard labour to assert that there is not in the 1100 pages of Delia Bacon and Judge Holmes, the shadow of a shade of an argument to support their wild and most absurd hypothesis." So unmethodical and arbitrary

mind! In Miss Bacon's book—which was printed simultaneously with its production—the authoress endeavours to annihilate the poet Shakespeare, and her enthusiastic admiration of his works ended in madness! What could Shakespeare or Shakespeare's grave be to her, if Bacon, and not Shakespeare, had been the author of the immortal works? It was in Bacon's grave that she should have wished to find her last resting-place! Compare N. Hawthorne, *Our Old Home*, &c. (Boston, 1863), pp. 106-140. Hawthorne, although a zealous supporter of Miss Bacon's, himself admits on p. 128 that she was "crazy" and a "monomaniac," and that her book is founded upon a "prodigious error," and contains "a great amount of rubbish and nonsense."

[1] *Was Lord Bacon the Author of Shakespeare's Plays? A Letter to Lord Ellesmere.* By Wm. Henry Smith. London, 1856. Printed for private circulation.

[2] *Wm. Shakespeare not an Impostor; by an English Critic.* See Allibone, under *Shakespeareana*, No. 633 and No. 815.

[3] Holmes, *The Authorship of Shakespeare* (New York, 1867); Appleton Morgan, *The Shakspearean Myth*, &c. (Cincinnati, 1881); Mrs. Henry Pott, *The Promus of Formularies and Elegancies*, by Francis Bacon, &c. (Lond. 1883), &c.

are the proceedings of the originators and the advocates of the Bacon hypothesis, and so presumptuous the manner in which they disregard all the historical evidence and facts, that the whole subject is in reality turned completely upside down. Here, as so frequently happens elsewhere, we have to submit to the lamentable misfortune that the history of modern literature—unlike the literature of the ancient classics—is not beyond the reach of the officiousness and stupidity of dilettantism, and that owing to its very nature, in fact, it never can be beyond their reach. The so-called Bacon theory is a disease of the same species as table-turning and spiritualism.

Shakespeare's works are his own works, and his only. According to Lessing's assertion[1]—somewhat extravagant, it is true—not a single line can be wrested from Shakespeare any more than the club could be wrested from the hand of Hercules; yet every line does certainly bear the imperishable impress of his mental individuality. And, as Dryden says in his Prologue to "The Tempest":—

> Within that circle none durst walk but he.

That his works are among the incomparable productions of the human mind, and stand unrivalled in the whole realm of dramatic poetry, is the unanimous opinion of all competent critics; and the poets and great thinkers of all nations humbly acknowledge his superiority. De Quincey[2] goes so far as to say he considers that Shakespeare's works cannot be regarded as the productions of mere human skill, that they are grand natural phenomena, like the sun or the ocean, the stars or the flowers, "which are to be studied with entire submission of our own faculties, and in the perfect faith that in them there can be no too much or too little, nothing useless or inert—but that, the farther we press in our discoveries, the more we shall see proofs of design and self-supporting arrangement where the careless eye had seen nothing but accident." True as this is in a very great measure, still, taking the remark in a strictly literal sense, it is idolatry, and yet it is the poet's highest reward that he, and he alone, can lead us to such idolatry. In the main De Quincey's view is shared by Carlyle,[3] who says of Shakespeare, his "is what I call an unconscious intellect;

[1] *Dramaturgie*, p. 73. [2] *Shakespeare*, p. 90 ff.
[3] *On Heroes, Hero Worship, and the Heroic in History.*

there is more virtue in it than he himself is aware of. Novalis beautifully remarks of him, that those Dramas of his are Products of Nature too, deep as Nature herself. I find a truth in this saying. Shakespeare's Art is not Artifice; the noblest worth of it is not there by plan or precontrivance. It grows up from the deeps of Nature, through this noble sincere soul, who is a voice of Nature. . . . . It is Nature's highest reward to a true simple great soul, that he get thus to be a part of herself. Such a man's works, whatsoever he with utmost conscious exertion and forethought shall accomplish, grow up withal unconsciously, from the unknown deeps in him;—as the oak-tree grows from Earth's bosom, as the mountains and waters shape themselves."

Germany, too, has expressed her thoughts on the mystery of Shakespeare's unconscious creative power and the supreme position he occupies compared with every other poet; this has been done, more especially by Goethe, in various well-known passages. Goethe admits frankly that he reveres Shakespeare, that he cannot compare himself to him, that he looks up to him as to a star of the brightest magnitude, to which he owes the fulness of his own worth; he knows that Saturn Polyphemus has raised up Shakespeare to himself, in order to devour him. Goethe, in his famous lines in "Faust," compares the fabric of Shakespeare's imagination to a master work of Weber's:—

> Where a thousand threads one treadle throws,
> Where fly the shuttles hither and thither,
> Unseen the threads are knit together
> And an infinite combination grows.[1]

He says further:—

> Who takes no thought
> To him 'tis brought,
> 'Tis given unsought, unbidden.

And similarly he says in one of his Aphorisms:—

> Best doth our least conscious endeavour
> Ripen the strivings of the brain.
> How could the rose her beauty else attain
> If of the sun's transcendence conscious ever?

[1] The translation of the two passages is from Bayard Taylor's translation of Goethe's *Faust*.

He expresses himself more fully in a letter to Schiller (in 1800),[1] where he writes: "I think that everything that is done by genius as genius is done unconsciously. A person of genius can also act rationally, with reflection, from conviction, but this is all done, as it were, indirectly. No work of genius can be improved, or be freed from its faults by reflection and its immediate results, but genius can, by means of reflection and action, be gradually raised, in so far as in the end to produce exemplary works." The fullest, most accurate, and hence the most incontrovertible delineation of the poetic, creative faculty, such as is peculiar to the true, divinely inspired poet, has been given by Grillparzer;[2] and, in the same way as he wrote his "Ahnfrau" and his "Goldenes Vliess," genius must ever have worked, and must, accordingly, have been the way in which Shakespeare worked.

The fact that Shakespeare's dramas are the productions of this kind of unconscious, instinctive faculty of the mind is proved also by outward or historical indications. It is especially substantiated by the well-known remark of his editors, Heminge and Condell, and corroborated by B. Jonson, that "he scarcely blotted a line." It was precisely the same with Walter Scott, who only spoilt his work by striking out or altering passages, as is proved by his existing manuscripts. It is certain, both of Shakespeare and of Scott, that they worked with extraordinary rapidity; how otherwise are we to interpret Heminge's and Condell's assurance, with regard to Shakespeare, that "his mind and hand went together," or Webster's assertion regarding the "right happy and copious industry of Mr. Shakespeare"? The dramas of Shakespeare —like the romances of Walter Scott—were the result of the happy thought of a moment. Shakespeare's dramas were poured forth in one mighty flow, they were not—like Goethe's "Faust"—given to the world piecemeal, and did not take long years to be worked into one whole, or, like Goethe's "Iphigenia," remodelled three times before the satisfactory form was found.[3] This rapidity of production also accounts

[1] See *Correspondence between Schiller and Goethe*, translated from the 3rd ed. of the German by L. Dora Schmitz, under date of April 6, 1801.

[2] *Grillparzer's Werke*, 2 Ausg., x. pp. 76 ff., 96, 119 ff., 124.

[3] This point must be the more emphasized as Rümelin and others have maintained that Shakespeare wrote a number of scenes, and then, like a *metteur en pages*, strung the scenes together as occasion required.

for the many small inaccuracies and contradictions—particularly as regards dates—which therefore ought not to be altered.[1] Even where Shakespeare "newly corrected and augmented" his dramas, it was invariably more a partial remodelling than a quibbling or laborious polishing up of the diction or verse; and, besides, the corrections were certainly done more with a view of occasionally dishing up something new for the public than from any wish of his own to make improvements. Like Lord Byron, it was probably more to his liking and easier for him to write something fresh than to remodel an old work; this would, moreover, be perfectly in keeping with his acknowledged rapidity of production.[2] It is not surprising, therefore, that Shakespeare's and Scott's works, in all essential points, have the same merits and the same defects in common—that is to say, merits and defects that are necessarily the result of this style of composition. Among the defects we may mention, by way of example, every now and again a looseness in the connection, a want of symmetry in the development of the plot, at times episodical breadth, and at times again a hurried ending. As regards the last-mentioned point, we need only compare the concluding scene in "The Two Gentlemen of Verona," and its sudden, unsatisfactorily motived change of character, with Scott's "Woodstock" and his "Anne of Geierstein." Scott in his "Diary" himself exclaims: "But how to get my catastrophy packed into the compass allotted for it? There is no help for it—I must make a *tour de force*, and annihilate both time and space."[3] Accordingly those German æsthetic writers (of the stricter school) who regard Shakespeare's dramas as organic works of art of faultless perfection, even down to the smallest details, and, in fact, find every iota in perfect harmony with this æsthetic system, unquestionably go too far in their endeavours. It must be borne in mind that genius is not merely an innate creative faculty, but that it also possesses an instinctive consciousness of art. But in a genius, as Goethe has shown us, this consciousness of art, this innate

[1] Compare Dr. Aldis Wright, Preface to *Twelfth Night* (Clarendon Press Edition), p. xv., and Preface to *As You Like It* (Clarendon Press Edition), p. vi.

[2] Compare Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 283.

[3] Lockhart, *Memoirs of the Life of Sir W. Scott, Bart.* New edition in one vol., Edinburgh, 1845, p. 699.

sense of regularity, is also capable of refinement and elevation of thought by means of reflection. But how little this outward regularity and appreciation of art, laboriously acquired, is able to take the place of the creative faculty of genius is nowhere more evident—at least in the domain of English literature—than in Ben Jonson's works. One other trait which Shakespeare and Scott have in common, resulting in fact from their method of composition, is that they looked upon their works with a considerable amount of indifference; they both, to use an expression of Scott's, used them merely as "gold mines." Rarely have poets watched celebrity and immortality advancing towards them with more apparent indifference than did Scott and Shakespeare. Pope's severe lines on Shakespeare apply equally to both men:—

> Shakspear (whom you and ev'ry playhouse bill
> Style the divine, the matchless, what you will)
> For gain, not glory, wing'd his roving flight,
> And grew immortal in his own despight.[1]

Our object here, however, is not to offer a critical estimate of Shakespeare's works, but simply to give an historico-literary and philological account of them; we have not got to consider them as the outpourings of divine inspiration, but, on the contrary, to examine them from their most human and outward aspect.

In a previous chapter it has already been stated that in Shakespeare's day dramatic poetry had not yet come to be considered a legitimate branch of literature. A curious instance of the change of public opinion and of circumstances in this respect, is afforded by Sir Thomas Bodley (1545-1617), for it was in Shakespeare's day that the foundation of this world-renowned library was laid. Bodley is said to have unhesitatingly shown his contempt for dramatic poetry by declaring that such "riffe raffes" as plays should never be admitted into his library. And in our day it is the original editions of the Elizabethan dramas that are considered the priceless treasures of the Bodleian Library! In Shakespeare's day it was the custom for the playwright to sell his work to some

[1] *Imitations from Horace*, Bk. ii., *Epistle I.* 69-72.

theatrical company; thereupon it became the company's sole property, and the literary possession was guarded with the utmost jealousy. But although the author thus renounced the right to have his work printed, it was only natural that the public should evince a desire to be able to read the plays they had seen acted, and to have them black on white to take to their homes. This desire could, of course, be gratified only in an illegal manner—that is to say, only by the plays being taken down in shorthand writing during the performances, and then published surreptitiously by some enterprising bookseller with a more than ordinarily elastic conscience. Bonian and Walley, in the Preface to their edition of "Troilus and Cressida" (1609), express themselves quite frankly on the subject of their piratical proceeding: "But thank Fortune for the scape it hath made amongst you, since by the grand possessors' wills I believe you should have prayed for them rather than been prayed." Of all the publishers Pavier seems to have carried on this predatory system most extensively. Posterity has, however, every reason to be grateful to these piratical editors, for had it not been for them little or no knowledge of the dramatic writings of the Elizabethan period would have been handed down to us; had it not been for them we should probably have had no Shakespeare, and we have here an instance, in the literary domain, of what has been so often proved in the political domain, that the world has progressed principally through wrong-doing. For, naturally, the editions thus surreptitiously published were most defective and distorted, and hence the authors were forced, in self-defence, not only to consent to their plays being printed, but took care that they were published in proper form, and the theatrical companies were ultimately unable to offer any opposition. The course which things took is obvious from numerous proofs. Thus Marston, in the Preface to his "Malcontent" (1604), says: "Onely one thing afflicts me: to thinke that scenes invented meerely to be spoken, should be inforcively published to be read, and that the least hurt I can receive is to do my selfe the wrong. But since others otherwise would doe me more, the least inconvenience is to be accepted." Two years later Marston again says, in the Preface (To my Equall Reader) to his "Parasitaster": "If any shall wonder why I print a Comedie, whose life rests much in the actor's voice, let such know that it cannot avoide

publishing; let it therefore stand with good excuse that I have been my owne setter out." Thomas Heywood, in the Prologue to his "If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody" (1623)[1] says:—

> Some by Stenography drew
> The plot, put it in print (scarce one word true)
> And in that lameness it hath limp'd so long,
> The Author now, to vindicate that wrong,
> Hath took the pains upright upon its feet
> To teach it walk: so please you, sit and see 't.[2]

And in the Preface to Heywood's "Rape of Lucrece" (1630), finally, we find a similar remark: "For though some have used a double sale of their labours, first to the stage and after to the press, for my own part I here proclaim myself ever faithful to the first, and never guilty of the last; yet since some of my plays have (unknown to me, and without any of my direction) accidentally come into the printer's hands, and, therefore, so corrupt and mangled (copied only by the ear) that I have been as unable to know them as ashamed to challenge them," &c. The position assumed by the theatrical companies in regard to the matter is obvious from an entry in Henslowe's Diary,[3] according to which a printer is induced, by the offer of a fee of 40*s*., to refrain from printing "Patient Grissill," by H. Chettle, T. Dekker, and W. Haughton.

The form in which all of the pirated, as well as the genuine single editions of dramas were published, was the well-known small quarto, and they are therefore called by the common name of Quartos. The volumes vary in length between $6\frac{23}{32}$ and $7\frac{24}{32}$ inches, in breadth between $4\frac{12}{16}$ and $5\frac{14}{16}$ inches.[4] This form was very suitable for books of light poetic ware, and at the same time most convenient for distribution among the people. The price—when compared with the standard

[1] Published by Collier for the Shakespeare Society, p. vi. ff.

[2] The words *scarce one word true* prove that stenography was very far from having attained the perfection it has reached in our day. With regard to the brachygraphy of that day, discovered by Dr. Timothy Bright, and improved by Peter Bales (born 1547), compare Nash's *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, in Dodsley (ed. Hazlitt, viii. 41 ff.), with Collier's note. As is evident from Webster's *The Devil's Law Case* (iv. 2, 29 ff.), interesting legal cases were also taken down in shorthand, in order to furnish material for "scurvy pamphlets" and "lewd ballads."

[3] Edited by Collier, p. 167.

[4] According to Justin Winsor's *Superintendent's Monthly Reports.*

of our present cheap literature—was certainly not as low as might have been expected; according to the Preface in some (not all!) of the copies of the quartos of "Troilus and Cressida" (1609), the price of a copy was a "testerne," *i.e.* 6*d.*, or, according to our present value, about half-a-crown. It may, therefore, be doubted whether all the quartos were of equal value, and whether there may not have been cheaper copies, the price varying according to the number of sheets, or according to some other arrangement of the publisher.[1] Whatever may have been the case, this much is certain, that the quartos were, and were meant to be accessible to all the different strata of society, and we need not hesitate to conceive them as part of the popular literature of the day, among the "chapbooks, ballads, and broadsides." On the other hand, this small form of book had the disadvantage of being but little able to withstand the destructive influences of time; the pages of the greater portion of these lightly-bound little volumes, scattered abroad among the people, would readily get detached and lost. It would be difficult to say what is the total number of the quartos of Shakespeare's plays (*i.e.* copies, not editions) that have come down to us; but the number is small compared with the number of folios that exist. It would be even more difficult to form an estimate of the total number of quartos published—again copies merely—for we have no knowledge how many copies usually formed an edition.[2] Neil[3] has calculated that, up to the time of Shakespeare's death, there had appeared between sixty and sixty-five editions of his works, including the Poems; many of the dramas were received with so much favour that new editions had repeatedly to be issued.[4] Now, if we reckon but sixty editions, and that every edition represented 300 copies,

[1] Bolton Corney, *The Prices of the Shakespeare Quartos*, in *N. and Q.*, 1865, Aug. 12, No. 189, p. 124; Dr. Brinsley Nicholson in *N. and Q.*, 4th S., vol. v., p. 490, and 4th S., vol. vi. (July 2, 1870), p. 11.—Thornbury, *Shakespeare's England*, i. 53.

[2] From the fact that the publisher of Chettle's *Patient Grissill* was paid 40*s.*, it might perhaps be inferred that the size of an edition amounted to 500 copies, and that the price of a copy was 1*d.*; for the 40*s.* would exactly cover the expense of 480 copies, *i.e.* close upon the whole edition.

[3] Neil, *Shakespere; a Critical Biography*, p. 59.

[4] Compare *Life-Time Editions* in *Outlines* (4th ed.), pp. 321-329; according to Halliwell-Phillipps there were seventy or seventy-one editions, including the Poems. See *The Copyright Entries*, *l.c.*, pp. 379-381.

then, during Shakespeare's lifetime no less than 18,000 copies of those works of his which had been printed were distributed among the people. This is a very considerable number when we bear in mind that fluent reading was confined to a far smaller portion of the public than it is nowadays. The quartos fetch a high price now, although, of course, their value varies in accordance with the number of the existing copies of the respective drama, or according to the faultless or well-preserved condition of the copy, there being a great difference between them. A second copy of the first quarto of "Hamlet" (1603), discovered in Dublin, which we shall have to refer to again presently, was purchased by Halliwell for £120, whereas the quarto of "A Midsummer Night's Dream" (1600, James Roberts) was bought in 1865 for £23, and the quarto of "Henry V." (of 1608) was bought in 1864 for £12. The quarto of "Venus and Adonis" (1636), of which only two perfect copies exist, was purchased in 1871 for £55,[1] and the quarto of "Love's Labour's Lost" (1598) fetched as much as £346 10*s*. The highest price yet fetched by a Shakespeare quarto—as far as we know—is £350, which was given at Daniel's auction in 1864 for the "Venus and Adonis" of 1596.

Apart from the Poems there are quarto editions of sixteen of Shakespeare's dramas (including "Pericles" and taking the two Parts of "Henry IV." as one play); fifteen of these were published during his lifetime, that of "Othello" a few years after his death (1622). The other dramas were all first published in the Folio of 1623. The fifteen dramas published during the poet's lifetime are: "The Merry Wives of Windsor," "Much Ado About Nothing," "Love's Labour's Lost," "A Midsummer Night's Dream," "The Merchant of Venice," "Richard II.," "Henry IV." (first and second Parts), "Henry V.," "Richard III.," "Troilus and Cressida," "Titus Andronicus," "Romeo and Juliet," "Hamlet," "King Lear," and "Pericles."[2] These quartos are all printed in

[1] *Athenæum*, 1871, i. 240.—Compare the *Bibliography* in Allibone, under *Shakespeare*.

[2] [Halliwell ?] *A Brief Hand-List of the Early Quarto Editions of the Plays of Shakespeare*, London, 1860. Compare *Catalogue of the Shakespeare Museum at Stratford*, p. 156, No. 1092; Fleay, *On the Quarto Editions of Shakespeare's Works* in the *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, i. 40-50; *A Bibliography of the Original Quartos and Folios of Shake-*

Roman letters, not a single one in black-letter type. Collier[1] has published exact reprints of the title-pages of the earliest of these editions, together with the necessary explanations. That the pompous style of the title-pages was purely the work of the publishers, and that they did not pay the slightest regard to the author's wishes in this respect, is proved by the annoyance expressed on the subject by Nash in his "Pierce Penniless."[2] Nash there complains that while he was in the country the publisher had placed one of these preposterous title-pages in front of his book, and resolves that the second edition shall be provided with a perfectly simple one. He writes to his publisher: "Now, this is that I woulde have you to do in this second edition. First, cut off that longtayled title, and let mee not, in the forefront of my booke, make a tedious mountebank's oration to the reader, when in the whole there is nothing praise-worthie." Collier's facsimiles, however, have lost their interest since Halliwell, between the years 1861-67, had facsimile reprints made of all the plays that had appeared in quarto. These reprints are, however, not altogether free from faults; "they were traced by the hand and the tracing transferred to stone." Unfortunately the editor limited the number of these reprints of each play to fifty copies, and of these again nineteen copies of each play were destroyed, so that only thirty-one copies of each was preserved. It is obvious—apart from the high price of these facsimile reprints—such a small number of copies could not satisfy the demand in England alone, not to speak of other countries, and it is much to be regretted that an undertaking which might have been so important and advantageous for the study of Shakespeare has thus ended merely in gratifying the fancy of bibliophiles.[3] Halliwell has also had facsimile

speare, with Particular Reference to Copies in America. By Justin Winsor, Superintendent of the Boston Public Library. With Sixty-two Heliotype Facsimiles. Boston and London, 1875.

[1] *On the Earliest Quarto Editions of the Plays of Shakespeare,* in the *Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iii. 58-83.

[2] Ed. Collier, p. xiii. ff.

[3] Of these there are altogether fifty-four small volumes, a list of which is given in Halliwell's *Shakespeariana*, 1867, pp. 37-51, and in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, x. 387 ff. Compare the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, ii. 394, and iii. 414. Besides this collection of Halliwell's there are other photo-lithographic facsimiles of single plays; for instance, that of *Much Ado* (1600) published by Staunton, 1864 (see *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, i. 420); facsimiles of the two

reprints made of the quartos of "Venus and Adonis" and of "Lucrece," and appended these to the above list of dramas under the same conditions. Since then, at the instigation of Dr. Furnivall, of Mr. Griggs, and Mr. Prætorius, a series of photo-lithographic facsimiles of the quartos have been made; and we cannot here refrain from alluding to the advance made from facsimile reprints to facsimiles traced by the hand, and thence to photo-lithographic facsimiles.

Which of the quartos have to be considered pirated editions and which genuine is a question which it is difficult to answer, for, as we do not possess any outward evidence, we have to rely solely upon a critical examination of the text, and its relation to that of the folio, and therefore it is impossible to obtain any absolutely certain results. Knight[1] draws attention to the fact that Shakespeare seems to have been occupied, between the years 1597 and 1600, in publishing his works in their proper form, but that after 1600 he ceased doing so, probably in order not to interfere with the interests of his "fellows" at the theatre. The subjoined chronological survey will serve to place the subject in as clear a light as possible:[2]—

1597.—Three quartos, all without the poet's name: *Romeo and Juliet* (Danter); *Richard II.* (Valentine Simmes for Andrew Wise); and *Richard III.* (Valentine Sims for Andrew Wise).

1598.—Two quartos: *Henry IV., First Part* (P[eter] S[hort] for Andrew Wise), and *Love's Labour's Lost* (W[illiam] W[aterson] for Cuthbert Busby); the first without, the second with the poet's name.

1600.—Eight quartos, with the poet's name, except the last two to be mentioned: *Much Ado About Nothing* (V[alentine] S[immes] for Andrew Wise); *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (for Thomas Fisher); *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (James Roberts); *The Merchant of Venice* (James Roberts); *The Merchant of Venice* (J[ames] R[oberts] for Thomas

Hamlet quartos, by the Duke of Devonshire, 1858 and 1859, forty copies of each, and given away by him as presents; further, a facsimile reprint of the *Sonnets* and of *A Lover's Complaint* (1609), Lond., J. R. Smith, 1870; see *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, v. 381); lastly, a facsimile reprint of *Venus and Adonis* (1599) and of *The Passionate Pilgrim* (the so-called *Isham Reprints*, by Charles Edmonds, Lond., 1870). Compare *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, vi. 364 and 373.

[1] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 375.

[2] Compare Dowden's *Shakspere*, p. 31.

Heyes); *Henry IV., Second Part* (V[alentine] S[immes] for Andrew Wise and Wm. Aspley); *Henry V.* (Thomas Creede for Tho. Millington and John Busby); *Titus Andronicus* (J[ames] R[oberts] for Edw. White).

1602.—One quarto, with the poet's name: *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (T[homas] C[reede] for Arthur Johnson).

1603.—One quarto, with the poet's name: *Hamlet* (for N[icholas] L[ing] and John Trundell).

1608.—One quarto, with the poet's name: *King Lear* (for Nathaniel Butter).

1609.—Two quartos, both with the poet's name: *Troilus and Cressida* (G. Eld for R. Bonian and H. Walley); *Pericles* (for Henry Gosson).

1622.—One quarto, with the poet's name: *Othello* (N. O. for Thomas Walkley).

These, of course, are not all of the quartos, merely the *editiones principes*, but one remarkable fact is that in one and the same year there appeared two editions of "The Merchant of Venice," as well as of "A Midsummer Night's Dream," and that the two editions of "The Merchant of Venice" were printed in the same office for different publishers. That the dates of these *editiones principes* do not furnish any evidence as to the time when the dramas were written (except, of course, the *terminus ad quem*) must also expressly be stated, although it may seem superfluous, and indeed self-evident from what has been said above. It is a well-known and invariable phenomenon in the literature of the Elizabethan era that not only dramatic works, but works of the most different kinds, often existed in manuscript for years before they could be printed. This may partly have been owing to the custom of the day that a book could not be published unless under distinguished patronage. However, this would not apply to the quartos of Shakespeare's dramas, for not a single one of them was dedicated to anyone. In the case of the pirated editions this would, of course, not have been possible, and the genuine quartos were not dedicated to anyone because, as already said, they were not considered as within the province of actual literature. The delay in printing plays arose unquestionably from there being legal difficulties in the way, and the objection on the part of the authors, as well as of the theatrical companies, to their being printed.

That Shakespeare can have personally conducted the printing of several of the quartos it is difficult to believe, to judge from the nature of the text; for even though it cannot be denied that there are differences as regards accuracy and carefulness in the printing, and a more or less authentic reproduction of the text, still the differences are not so important as to make it appear beyond a doubt that the poet must himself have attended to the printing of the better quartos. It is possible that the differences arose simply from the fact that the spurious quartos were printed from shorthand notes, whereas those considered genuine were printed from the manuscripts handed to the printers by the theatrical companies; and these manuscripts were possibly, or rather probably, mere transcripts from the original, or had been put together piecemeal from the parts written out for the different actors. On the title-page of the second quarto of "Hamlet" (1604) we do indeed find the words "according to the true and perfect coppie," but this statement does not prove that the poet himself superintended the printing. The legitimate proprietors of the "true and perfect coppie" were the theatrical company; how the publisher obtained it from them is as yet an unsolved problem. No convincing reason seems to exist anywhere for assuming that the poet superintended the publication of any of his works. On the contrary, all the quartos, without exception, show carelessnesses and mistakes of various kinds, and the account which Skottowe[1] gives of them cannot be said to be exaggerated. The fact that none of the quartos (with the single exception of "Othello") are divided into acts and scenes must not be accounted a matter of carelessness, but entrances are frequently marked of persons who take no part in the business of the stage, whereas other persons, whose entrances are nowhere mentioned, take part in the action; exits are frequently marked at wrong points; very few stage directions are met with; speeches are frequently assigned to wrong characters, and sometimes even the name of the actor, who performed the part, is inserted in the text instead of that of the *dramatis persona*. The orthography is wretched throughout—*i.e.*, irregular and arbitrary; no principle or method is at all recognizable, and hence to retain or to restore the text, as has repeatedly been attempted, is quite

[1] *Life of Shakespeare*, i. 82 ff.

impracticable and useless. Uncommon words are deformed almost beyond the possibility of recognition; prose is often printed as verse, and verse as frequently in prose. Would all this have occurred to so great an extent if Shakespeare had himself furnished the printer with the original manuscript, and had revised the proof-sheets before the works were finally published? The later editions, according to Skottowe, surpass the earlier ones in errors of all kinds. But in spite of their defects, the quartos are an invaluable and indispensable means for restoring the Shakespearean text, nay, in some cases they offer a distinctly better and more original text than even the folio: for instance, the quarto edition of "Hamlet" of 1604, and perhaps the quarto of "Richard III."[1] Even in the least favourable cases the quartos afford a means —not hastily to be rejected—for emending the folio.

The mighty rise of the drama, its growth in importance and consideration, is reflected even in its most outward form. Dramas very soon laid claim to be termed "works," and the quarto form developed into the folio, which had previously been the sacred and privileged form for the works of scholars, more particularly for theological works. In this sense it may be said that with the folio edition the drama was admitted into the actual sphere of literature. Ben Jonson, the ambitious and pretentious, who, when in good humour, liked emphatically to style himself "the poet,"[2] was the first to accomplish the transition, by issuing in 1616 (the year of Shakespeare's death) a folio edition of his dramatic works. Sir John Suckling, in his "Sessions of the Poets," makes Ben Jonson say:—

> That he deserved the bays,
> For his were called Works, where others were but Plaies.[3]

After the folio edition of Jonson's works, there appeared in 1623 (the year in which Shakespeare's widow died) the folio edition of Shakespeare's works, then the folio of Beaumont and Fletcher (1647), of Killigrew (Comedies and Tragedies) in 1664 and (Four New Plays) in 1666, of Davenant in 1673,

[1] See, in reference to this, Delius in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, vii. 124-169, who takes an opposite view.

[2] *Conversations with Wm. Drummond*, ed. Laing, p. 38.

[3] *The Poems, Plays, and other Remains of Sir John Suckling.* A new edition. London, 1874., vol. i. p. 8.

and lastly, of Dryden in 1701-1706. Prynne says: "Some Play-books are growne Quarto into Folio; which yet beare so good a price and sale, that I cannot but with griefe relate it. — — Shackspeers [*sic*] Plaies are printed in the best Crowne-paper, far better than most Bibles."[1] The excellent crown paper here mentioned—we may at this opportunity state—was in all probability of German manufacture, from John Spielmann's famous paper-mills at Dartford; hence the Germans may even, in this respect, claim to have, in the first folio, stood in a certain connection with the great poet.[2] And not only as regards the first folio, for, no doubt, the paper used for the quartos had been manufactured at Spielmann's mill, and there is some degree of probability in Hermann Kurz's conjecture that Shakespeare himself may have used Dartford paper for his literary work.[3]

The first Folio, as is well known, was published by Shakespeare's "fellows," John Heminge and Henry Condell, and by them was dedicated to their Highnesses the Earls of Pembroke and of Montgomery, "the incomparable paire of brethren," because they had shown the poet special favour during his lifetime.[4] That this edition was an important

[1] In Farmer's *Essay*, &c., 3rd ed., p. 33; Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), i. 320; Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, p. 195.

[2] According to Rye, *l.c.*, p. lxxii., Spielmann was born at Lindau on the Lake of Constance, and subsequently settled at Dartford, where he erected his paper-mill in 1588. He was appointed "jeweller to the Queen's Majestie," and in 1589 was granted a licence "for the gathering of all manner of linen ragges." He employed no less than 600 men, and thousands of persons flocked to see the paper-mill set up by the foreigner, for in England hitherto there had been only a few and unsuccessful attempts made in the manufacture of paper. Thomas Churchyard wrote a very curious poem describing Spielmann's paper-mill and the blessings of paper in 1588, and in 1605 the great paper manufacturer was created a knight by James I. Spielmann died in 1626, and was buried in the church at Dartford. In the *Second Part of King Henry VI.* (iv. 7) Jack Cade denounces the paper-mill. He says to Lord Say: "*Whereas before our forefathers had no other books but the score and the tally, thou hast caused printing to be used, and, contrary to the king, his crown and dignity, thou hast built a paper-mill.*"

[3] Compare Zornlin, *Two Additional Notes on the Play of Henry VI., Part II.*, in *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iv. 50-56.

[4] See, with regard to the first folio, *The First Edition of Shakespeare*, 1623, in *The Retrospective Review*, vol. i.; Collier, *Memoirs of the Principal Actors*, pp. 65-69. According to a conjecture often made, the Dedication and Preface were written by B. Jonson. Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell, ii. 663 ff.

undertaking, not only from a literary, but also from a financial point of view, is evident from the circumstance that no less than four publishers united in order *viribus unitis* to be equal to the venture; these were W. Jaggard, Ed. Blount, J. Smethwick, and W. Aspley, of whom the second, in conjunction with Isaac Jaggard, undertook the printing. Whether Isaac Jaggard was in any way related to William Jaggard does not appear. The division of the work among two editors, four publishers, and two printers may probably account for the many irregularities and want of connection as regards form, paging, &c., which the folio exhibits, and which have not yet been sufficiently inquired into or explained. Irregularities in form are met with, in so far as by far the greater part of the sheets consist of six leaves, whereas the two sheets gg in "Henry IV.," Second Part, and in "Romeo and Juliet" contain eight each, and the missing sheet ii, between "Timon of Athens" and "Julius Cæsar," obviously possessed only four leaves (pp. 101-109).[1] The irregularity of the paging is even greater. "Julius Cæsar" begins with page 109, in place of 101, as it ought to have been; in "Hamlet" the number of the page suddenly jumps from 156 to 257, and then continues regularly in the second hundred; the numbers of several pages are repeated, thus pages 81 and 82 in "Timon of Athens;" whereas "Troilus and Cressida" is almost wholly unpaged All this may have arisen from carelessness, but it may also be that the printing was possibly being carried on at the two establishments simultaneously, and not always with the requisite amount of unanimity. At all events, the printing of so large a folio would take a considerable amount of time, and this may explain the fact that in one copy—another statement says two—the date given is 1622.[2] Dr. Brinsley Nichol-

[1] See the *Schlegel-Tieck'she Uebersetzung*, published by the German Shakespeare Society, x, 322. xi, 179; *N. and Q.*, 1867, No. 294, p. 122.

[2] One copy with the date 1622 Allibone has pointed out as in the possession of a Mr. J. Lenox in New York, and then adds that Mr. Lenox considers it possible that the last 2 in the date has been changed from a 3. Where the other supposed copy exists is not known, and hence it cannot be said what the true state of the case may have been. Compare Collier, *Memoirs of the Principal Actors*, pp. 65-69. Of the second folio, according to Lowndes, there is also said to be a copy with the date 1631 (in place of 1632); Bohn, however, does not believe this, and considers the statement to be erroneous.—Lowndes-Bohn, p. 2256. In *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, i. 38, an anonymous writer states that there also exists a

son[1] endeavours to account for the irregularity of the paging by assuming that the three parts of the folio—Histories, Comedies, and Tragedies—may have been printed separately, and arranged in such a manner as to be sold singly. He thinks this supposition is supported by the fact that these three Parts have each their separate pagination and signatures, and that although the Comedies, as well as Histories, end each on an imperfect quire (two or four instead of the usual six leaves), the succeeding part commences with a fresh quire. On the other hand, however, Dr. Nicholson thinks the supposition opposed by the circumstance that, as yet, not a single one of these three Parts, or even a copy of the complete folio with special titles for the three Parts, has been discovered. He further thinks it is evident that the pieces were not sold singly from the fact that, when a play ends about the middle of a sheet of six leaves, the next play begins on the following page, even when the previous work ends on the first page of a leaf. Dr. Nicholson supports his hypothesis by comparing the folio editions of B. Jonson's and Davenant's works. It is undeniable that Jonson's folio consists of four separate parts, for, as is obvious from his letters, Jonson himself sent separate portions of his folio to one of his patrons.[2] Nevertheless, in his folio of 1616 the paging, signatures, and quiring are continuous and regular throughout. But in the first folio of 1640 the paging, signatures, and quiring begin afresh at the "Epigrams," so that the only possible conclusion is that it was intended, when required, to sell the "Plays" and "Epigrams," "The Forest," and "Masques" separately. At the same time it would have been possible to sell any one play, or "The Epigrams" and "The Forest," or either "The King's or the Queen's Entertainments" or "The Masques," for, with the exception of "The Forest," each has a separately addressed and dated title-page. The arrangement of the second volume of this

copy of the third folio with the date 1663, instead of 1664. According to Allibone, there are even several copies dated 1663, and a few with both dates, 1663 and 1664. Those of 1663, of which the Boston Library, among others, possesses a copy, do not contain the seven doubtful plays. See Lowndes-Bohn, p. 2258; Hubbard, *Catalogue of the Barton Collection* (Boston, 1878), p. 2. Even more striking are the differences as regards dates in the case of Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Compare *The Poetical Works of J. Milton*, ed. Masson (1874), i. 7 ff.

[1] *N. and Q.*, 4th Series, vi., July 2, 1870, p. 11.

[2] See Gifford, *Memoirs of B. Jonson.*

folio edition corresponds with this exactly; it consists of four distinct parts, viz.: 1. "Bartholomew Fair," "The Staple of News," "The Devil is an Ass;" 2. "The Magnetic Lady," "Tale of a Tub," "The Sad Shepherd;" 3. "Horace's Art of Poetry," "English Grammar," "Timber;" 4. "Masques," "Underwoods," and, as an after edition, "Mortimer." In addition to this, every play has a special title-page. It is clear that any such division of the contents of the volume would greatly facilitate the sale of the book, and thus render the undertaking the more profitable. And for this reason it is by no means unlikely that the editors and publishers of Shakespeare's first folio may have made some similar arrangement. It may, of course, be asked whether such a division of the single plays or parts of the folio would not have injuriously affected the sale of the quartos—and both. Smethwick and Aspley were the proprietors of single quartos—and indeed have interfered with the sale of the work as a whole.

This leads us to the question of the price of the work and the size of the editions—a question which, as usual, it is easier to ask than to answer. For we are here again without any evidence whatever. The price of the first folio is generally assumed to have been £1. Dr. Brinsley Nicholson thinks that each of the three parts may have cost about 5*s.* a piece, and the size of the editions has been estimated at 500 copies each, the same as in the subsequent three folios; hence the undertaking was a pretty considerable one, bearing in mind the value of money in those days. Of these supposed 500 copies about a sixth part has come down to us; at least, the well-known bookseller and antiquary Thomas Rodd (who died a few years ago) in 1848 made out a catalogue of all the existing copies, and calculated that there existed about eighty copies, twenty-five of which belonged to public libraries, while the rest were in the possession of private persons.[1] This number is not reached by Allibone,[2] who has made a very careful list of all the copies that have been offered for sale, together with an exact statement regarding the owners, the prices, size, and condition of the copies in question, &c.; he reckons only

[1] Fennel's *Shakespeare Repository*, p. 4. The late American bibliographer, Henry Stevens, in 1876 (in an oral communication), estimated the number of the existing copies at about 150, as others had been discovered of late years.

[2] Under *Shakespeare.*

thirty-seven such copies, so that, if we assume the number of library copies as stationary, the sum would be sixty-two. It is, however, probable that Allibone's list, meritorious as it may be, nevertheless cannot be regarded as complete, and that the total number of the existing copies may be close upon the figure given by Rodd. In the Monthly Reports issued by the Librarian of the Boston Library, of April, 1874, seventeen more or less perfect copies of the first folio are mentioned as existing in America; of these, four are in Boston, six in New York, three in Philadelphia, and one in Newport, Providence, Cincinnati, and Chicago respectively. However, it is probable that this list, too, is not complete.[1] The copies, of course, vary very much as regards preservation and beauty; in fact, a considerable number of them are not free from defects and artificial restorations.[2] According to Boaden,[3] the title-page, in particular, is often missing, especially in the later folios, not because it was more exposed to being destroyed than the other leaves, but because it had been intentionally removed for the sake of the engraving by Droeshout, which was wanted for collections of portraits. In such cases the most various and ingenious operations were made to remedy the defect and to deceive the uninitiated. Another defect met with—according to Fennel—is that many copies have lost the front page with Ben Jonson's lines "To the Reader." Imperfect copies have frequently been restored by leaves and whole portions from the second or third folios. Complete and faultless copies—great value being attached to the margins not being too much cut down[4]—have not only been chemically cleaned with the utmost care, but have in most cases been bound in the most sumptuous manner; the famous actor Kemble even kept his copy locked up in a box of artistic manufacture.

[1] *Athenæum*, June 6, 1874, p. 764.

[2] A humorous description of the way in which the copies of the folios are furnished with the rather unlovely coating of the dirt of centuries is given by Steevens (in Drake, *Shakespeare and his Times*, ii. 535). He ends by saying that the first folio is the most costly English book: "*For what other English volume without plates, and printed since the year* 1600, *is known to have sold more than once for* £35 14s.?" Drake adds: "*Since this note was written, a copy of the first folio has produced the enormous price of one hundred pounds.*" Compare *Roxburghe Catalogue*, p. 112, No. 3786. And now?!!

[3] James Boaden, *An Inquiry into the Authenticity of the Various Pictures and Prints of Shakespeare* (Lond., 1824).

[4] The size of the folio varies between 12½ to 13½ inches in height, and from 8 to 9 inches in breadth.

His copy, although a restored one and "inlaid," was formerly considered the best, whereas at present the one in the possession of Lady Burdett-Coutts (the so-called Daniel-Moore copy) is considered the jewel of all the existing folios.[1] It is, at all events, the copy for which the highest price has yet been paid, viz., no less than £716 2*s.*! Boaden, in 1824, could not suppress his surprise at the price given for the costliest copy at that time—that is to say, Kemble's, which was purchased for only 107 guineas, whereas in our day three or four times as much would be given for a well-preserved copy. This extraordinary rise in the value is less owing to the general depreciation of money, than to the bibliomania among the wealthy classes, and the artificial screwing up of the subject by antiquaries and auctioneers, who find it only too much to their advantage to do so.[2] Imperfect and less valuable copies are

[1] Compare *The Times* newspaper, July 27, 1864. According to Dr. Ingleby, *A Complete View*, p. 22 ff., the so-called Bridgewater copy in the possession of the Earl of Ellesmere deserves to rank first.

[2] An account of the proceedings at an auction of this kind, and with special reference to Fol. 1, is given in *The Athenæum* of May 4, 1872, p. 561. Compare also *Sale of the Shakespearian Library of Wm. Nanson Lettsom* in *The Athen.*, 1865, ii. 810 (Dec. 9); *Shakespearian Sale* in *The Athen.*, 1867, ii. 85 ff.; *The Athen.*, 1868, i. 75 (a copy is offered for £345); *The Athen.*, 1869, i. 690; *N. and Q.*, 4th Series, v., March 19, 1870, p. 307 (Fol. 1, £360; Fol. 2, £25 10*s.*; Fol. 3, £200; Fol. 4, £20 10*s.*); *Athen.*, 1868, i. 800 (F. 2, £30); *Athen.*, 1871, i. 240 (Mr. Corser's Library: F. 1, £160; F. 2, £49; F. 3, £77; F. 4, £12; Sonnets (1609), £45); *N. and Q.*, 4th Series, vii., Feb. 25, 1871, p. 181. In *The Athen.*, March 15, 1873, p. 333, B. Quaritch offers for sale a F. 1 (12½ by 8 inches) for £200; F. 1 (12¾ by 8⅜ inches, Title and B. Jonson's verses, *Lines to the Memorie*, &c., List of Actors and a portion of the last leaf in facsimile), £90; F. 2 (Title, Portrait, and Verses in facsimile), £42; F. 2 (quite perfect), £72; F. 3 (good copy), £200; F. 3 (wanting Portrait and Title, Dedication defective, otherwise good, 13⅜ by 8⅞ inches), £48; F. 4 (very fine, large, clean copy), £21. In *The Athen.*, Oct. 31, 1885, p. 559, Quaritch offers for sale two copies of F. 1, the one for £700, the other for £800! A Fol. 1, "the same copy which brought only £110 5*s.* at Mr. Dent's sale, was run up at the sale of the Perkins Library (June, 1873) to £585, which is the highest price a Fol. 1 has ever fetched, excepting the Daniel copy, which, in 1864, was sold for £716." *Athen.*, 1873, i. 763.—Thomas Hayes, in Manchester, offers in *The Athen.*, 1873, ii. 133, a copy of F. 1, "a very fine and perfect copy, from the Perkins Library, red morocco extra, £715"; a F. 1, "another copy, wanting Title, Verses, four preliminary leaves, and last two leaves, calf, £105" (expressly for the restoration of another defective copy); F. 2, "fine copy, crimson morocco," £40; F. 4, a fine copy, calf, £25. At the public sale of Sir William Tite's Library in May, 1874, the following prices were paid: a F. 1, £440; F. 2, £45; F. 3, £79; F. 4, £18; *Hamlet* (1611), £33; *King Lear* (1605), £40 10*s.*; *Lochrine* (1595), £45; *Lucrece* (1594), £110; *Merchant of Venice* (1600), £46;

still to be had for from £25 to £40. No less varying, although on the whole considerably more moderate, are the prices asked for the later folios; all depends upon the whims of the book-fancier and upon the condition of the copy in question, so that the actual value cannot well be given.

Under these circumstances it is easy to understand that the costly remains of the first complete edition of Shakespeare's works—except those belonging to the great public libraries—are in the possession of bibliophiles of the aristocratic or wealthy classes. Shakespeare commentators and scholars must be content with, and thankful for, the substitutes of lesser value, and in recent times such substitutes have been made accessible in a manner that may be said, in some measure, to be satisfactory.[1] Chief among these substitutes is the photo-lithographic facsimile of the originals in Bridgewater House (Lord Ellesmere's), and that in the British Museum, reproduced under the superintendence of Howard Staunton.[2] Staunton's facsimile (not the original) was again reproduced by a lithographic process, but unfortunately too much reduced in size.[3] Besides these there are two facsimile reprints, the now-forgotten one of 1808[4] (£5 5*s.*) and the one by Lionel Booth (1864). The one of 1808 is very unreliable; Upcott, after carefully comparing it with the original, pointed out no less than 368 errors and mistakes.[5] No fault has been found with that of Lionel Booth, and it is convenient for use on account of its reduced size and moderate price.

The first folio was followed by a second in 1632, a third in 1664, and by a fourth and last in 1685; all these editions—it has been assumed, but without reliable evidence—consisted of

Midsummer Night's Dream (1600), £39 10*s.*; *Pericles* (1609), £53 10*s.*; *Romeo and Juliette* (1609), £49 10*s.*; *Shakespeare's Poems* (1640), £25 10*s.*; a complete set of facsimiles of the early quartos of the separate plays of Shakespeare, by Ashbee, under the superintendence of Mr. Halliwell, £136. —According to *The Athen.* June 6, 1874, p. 763.

[1] Horne Tooke, in his *Diversions of Purley*, was the first to point out the necessity of a facsimile reprint of the first folio; see Allibone under *Shakespeare.*

[2] London, 1866, Day and Son (price £8 8*s.*).

[3] Chatto and Windus, 1876. *The First Edition of Shakespeare*, 1623. *Mr. Wm. Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, &c. In reduced Facsimile, by a Photographic Process; thus ensuring the strictest Accuracy in every Detail. With an Introduction*, by J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, Esq.

[4] Reprinted by E. and J. Wright, for Vernor and Hood, fol.

[5] Compare *N. and Q.*, 1853, vii. 47; 1865, vii. 139.

the same number of copies as the first folio. They were printed from the first folio, and the second and third correspond with it page for page.[1] It is self-evident, therefore, that their critical value for the constitution of the text is but very small; here and there they do indeed correct an error, but upon the whole there is an increase in the number of the often senseless misprints and the ever-recurring slovenliness of the printer's work. Nevertheless, the price of these folios too has risen considerably; those who cannot acquire a first folio are glad to possess one of the later editions, whereas a regular bibliophile naturally takes pride in possessing a copy of all four folios. The Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, even boasts of possessing "two sets" of each! Allibone reckons that thirty-eight copies have been sold of the second folio, thirty-five of the third, and twenty-three of the fourth folio; the total number of the existing copies may, accordingly, be computed at about double this number. The third folio is frequently stated to be very scarce, as the greater portion of it was destroyed at the time of the Great Fire in London in 1666; however this supposition, which is not supported by any evidence, has very justly been doubted.[2] Among the copies of the second folio one has achieved a great but unenviable reputation, the one containing the forged manuscript corrections published by Collier, and now in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire.[3] Copies of this kind, furnished with marginal notes of an earlier or later date, are frequently met

[1] With regard to the later folios, see Lowndes-Bohn, Allibone, and Skottowe's *Life of Shakespeare*, i. 82-86. Skottowe says: "The second folio is described by all the editors of Shakespeare, with the exception of Steevens, as utterly worthless. It is a reprint of the former folio, with hundreds of additional errors, the productions of chance, negligence, and ignorance." Only by one addition does the second folio differ from the first, for it contains for the first time Milton's beautiful *Epitaph on the Admirable Dramatic Poet W. Shakespear*, which, as is well known, was the first poem of his that was ever published. This reminds us of the possibility that Milton, who was six years old at the time, may have seen Shakespeare upon his last visit to London; for Milton's father lived in Bread Street, close to the Mermaid. See Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, &c. (Cambridge, 1859), i. 32 ff.

[2] See Lowndes-Bohn, p. 2257.—"The publishers of the fourth folio appear to have considered the destruction of the third so effectual as to render it a nonentity, and accordingly say on their title-page 'unto which is added Seven Playes never before printed in folio.'"—Quaritch in *The Athenæum*, 1873, i. 333.

[3] See p. 6 f., note.

with; for instance, the copy of the fourth folio in the possession of G. Daniel, whose corrections have been published by Josiah Phillips Quincy.[1] Of the third folio, the most notable copy is that which belonged to Charles I., and was by him presented to his Groom of the Bed-Chamber, Sir Thomas Herbert; the copy was subsequently purchased by George III., and is now preserved in the Royal Private Library at Windsor. It contains written inscriptions by Charles I. (his motto, *Dum spiro spero, C. R.*), by Thom. Herbert, B. Jonson, and George III.[2] The most important feature of the third and fourth folios, and which distinguishes them from the first two folios, will be discussed later; this, as is well known, is the addition of seven dramas—the so-called doubtful plays—of which only "Pericles" has passed over into later editions of Shakespeare's works, the others having been rejected as spurious.

As regards the critical value of the first folio, the most opposite opinions have been expressed, from an almost blind veneration to an almost complete depreciation. For while Horne Tooke, in his "Diversions of Purley," declares it to be the only edition worthy of consideration, the "London Quarterly" (No. III.) is of the opinion that it is no edition at all; the writer says, "edited, in any proper sense of the word, it is not;"[3] and then adds, "bad as the editing was, the printing of this volume was no better." And there is, indeed, no evidence of an experienced or critical hand having attended to the text, or of a trained or accurate hand having revised the printing. Malone held the folio in high estimation, whereas Steevens, in a note referring to the notorious *Ullorxa* in "Timon of Athens," casts the bitterest reproach upon it; "types," he says, "shook out of a hat, or shot from a dice-box, would often assume forms as legitimate as the proper names transmitted to us by Messrs. Heminge, Condell and Co., who very probably did not accustom themselves to spell even their own appellations with accuracy, or always in the same manner." Although not actually unfounded, this condemnation shows an unquestionable spirit of hostility to Malone, who did not hesitate to introduce the more than

[1] *MS. Corrections from a Copy of the Fourth Folio of Shakespeare's Plays*, Boston, 1854, p. 51; Allibone under *Quincy*.

[2] See Lowndes, ed. Bohn, p. 2257.

[3] Compare *Cornhill Magazine*, Oct. 1867.

senseless *Ullorxa* into his edition; Steevens says, "like a cock in the fable, I am content to leave this gem on the stercoraceous spot where it was discovered."[1] Assuredly it cannot in any way be our object to judge Heminge and Condell by the standard of an editor or even of an emendator of the present day; they had no notion of any such duty when publishing the work, which they took upon themselves purely out of affection for their deceased friend; it is expressly stated, in their Dedication to the two Earls, that the undertaking would not be of profit to themselves; they were evidently—to use the well-known words in the Sonnet Dedication—"the onlie begetters" of the manuscripts. The editors' hands are recognizable in the text only in the following four points: they did away with the pompous title-pages of the quartos; they divided the plays—in accordance with their manuscripts—into acts and scenes; they corrected and filled in the stage directions, although, in this respect, some of the quartos are better than the folio; and, lastly, they struck out all the oaths and curses, for by Statute 3 of King James I., 1605-6, Chap. 21, it was strictly prohibited to take the Lord's name in vain in any theatrical play or interlude.[2] But neither can the printing of Messrs. Jaggard and Blount in any way be compared to the second- or third-rate printing of our day. Even a provincial town of moderate size would nowadays be ashamed to turn out such work as is exhibited in the first folio. And if the comparison with our own day seem unjust, still it cannot be denied that the folio—even when measured by the standard of its own day—must be termed a badly and carelessly printed book; this is sufficiently obvious upon comparing it with B. Jonson's folio of 1616, or with Spenser's "Fairie Queene" of 1609 (the so-called first folio of this poem), or with any other work of the same rank. The difference is the more unpleasant as Heminge and Condell may be said to remind one of the Queen in the play in "Hamlet," of whom Hamlet's mother says: "the lady protests too much, methinks." In their preface, the editors maintain that whereas readers formerly "were abused with divers stolen and surreptitious copies, maimed and deformed by the frauds and stealths of injurious impostors, that exposed them; even

[1] See the *Var. Ed. ad loc.*

[2] Compare Wm. Carew Hazlitt, *The English Drama and Stage under the Tudor and Stuart Princes*, p. 42.

those are now offered to your view cured, and perfect of their limbs, and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceived them." They even go so far as to intimate that they made use of the poet's own manuscripts, "and have scarce received from him a blot in his papers."[1] If the poet's faultless original manuscripts—where scarce a line, nay, scarce a word had been struck out or corrected—had been put into the printers' hands, it would be perfectly unintelligible how the printers—unless born idiots—could have introduced such a "sea of blunders." How could they—as frequently happens—have placed speeches in the mouths of wrong persons;[2] given the names of actors in place of the *dramatis personæ;*[3] displaced lines; printed verse as prose and prose as verse, and distorted proper names in such a way as to be often perfectly unrecognizable, &c.? The folio presents exactly the same defects, and perhaps even to a greater extent than the quartos which the editors refer to so contemptuously in their preface; in fact it can be proved that single plays, such as "Much Ado About Nothing," "The Merchant of Venice," "A Midsummer Night's Dream," "Richard II.," and others, were printed in the folio from one or other of the existing quartos.[4] It is difficult to believe that any other manuscripts were used for printing the folio than those that had been employed for the so-called legitimate quartos—of course apart from the pirated editions which had been manufactured from notes taken during the performances—or that these manuscripts could have been anything else than the so-called prompter's books; in some cases, perhaps, merely the placing together of the separate parts that had been written out for the different actors. When the folio was printed, the original manuscripts of the plays—written at the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth decade—would have reached the average age of a human life; and even the manuscripts of the later plays must have been at least ten or twelve years old, if we follow the usual chronological order, according to which, for instance, "Henry

[1] *Outlines*, i. 262-270.

[2] Compare S. Walker, *A Critical Examination, &c.* (Lond., 1860), ii. 185.

[3] This circumstance, too, must be regarded as a proof that the manuscripts from which the folio was compiled, were transcripts that had been made by actors for actors.

[4] Compare *Richard III., The First Quarto*, 1597, *a Facsimile in Photolithography*, by Wm. Griggs. With an Introduction by P. A. Daniel. Lond., 1885. Ingleby, *Complete View*, &c., p. 18 f.

VIII." is assigned to the year 1613. Are we to believe that the manuscripts had in no way suffered during that lapse of time? They had been in use for years, and had passed through a variety of hands, not in all cases the most careful; besides, a theatre is certainly not the best place for preserving manuscripts in their original cleanness and neatness, as a glance at a prompter's book at any one of our own theatres will sufficiently prove. Or are we to believe that Shakespeare's manuscripts had from the very outset, when he was still an unknown author, been carefully preserved as valuable treasures to be handed down to posterity? Are we to believe that they were never actually used, but that they had at once been transcribed, and the various parts for the different actors again copied from these transcripts? If this had been the case, the various transcripts would furnish us with an explanation for the differences, inaccuracies, and mistakes; the jealous proprietors and custodians of the original manuscripts would never have consented to trust them to the hands of typesetters—a printing establishment being as little a proper place for preserving valuable manuscripts as a theatre. In fact, from whatever side we look at the question, it seems extremely doubtful that Shakespeare's own manuscripts were used for printing the folio; and, indeed, it seems almost certain that they never were in a printer's hands, except the manuscript of his "Venus and Adonis" and his "Lucrece," which he published himself, and which, accordingly, are masterpieces of typography compared with the folio. The differences between the accuracy of the first-mentioned publications and the inaccuracies of the folio are an extremely eloquent proof of what has just been stated. We have, however, to submit to what is unalterable, and must not under-estimate the value of the folio in spite of all its shortcomings; for, as regards the greater portion of the plays, it is our sole authority. And, again, it must be remembered that, owing to this state of matters, the text-critic must be allowed incomparably greater freedom, and that, in the case of the plays that do not exclusively belong to the folio, only an eclectic text is possible, while the quartos and the folio must mutually serve to support and correct each other. It has already been stated that in some cases the quartos offer a better text than the folio; we will give but one reason for this circumstance, viz., that the so-called legitimate quartos were published at a time when the

corruption of the manuscripts by repeated copyings was not as great as it became later, when the folio was published. Dr. Ingleby[1] says: "The conclusion from these premises is inevitably this, that we possess no authoritative text at all; and, of course, the door is open to legitimate conjecture as to the readings to be adopted, wherever the defective state of the text of the quartos or first folio render emendations expedient."

As already said, the third and fourth folios contain seven plays more than the first and second folios; this leads us to the much discussed and disputed twofold question, as to whether, on the one hand, the folio contains all Shakespeare's dramatic works in their absolute entirety, and, on the other, whether one or other spurious or not altogether genuine work of Shakespeare's may not have found its way into the first folio. Camden, in one of the later editions of his "Britannia," says: "In the chancel (of the church in Stratford) lies William Shakspere, a native of this place, who has given ample proof of his genius and great abilities in the forty-eight plays he has left behind him."[2] According to this, and in opposition to the first folio, eleven pieces must have been lost. Or is the statement perhaps merely based upon a slip of the pen; in place of reading "forty-eight," may not thirty-eight have been meant? But even then—and admitting "Pericles" to be genuine—where would be the thirty-eighth play? Quite apart from their intrinsic merits, the thirty-six dramas of the first folio are a poetic legacy which in outward bulk has only rarely been exceeded (for instance by Calderon and Lope de Vega), unless we stoop to consider the manufactured ware of voluminous writers.[3] Æschylus, according to Suidas, is indeed

[1] *A Complete View*, p. 19.

[2] According to Beisly, *Shakespeare's Garden, Introduction*, xiii.

[3] A list of the number of lines in the various dramas of Shakespeare which appeared in the *Bath Herald* (1820), compiled from Bell's edition, and reprinted in Fennel's *Shakespeare Repository* (p. 5), proves that the majority of the plays consist of between 2,000 and 3,000 lines; the rest contain over 3,000. Only one play, the shortest of all, scarcely reaches 2,000; this is *The Comedy of Errors*, with 1,807 lines. The longest drama, as is well known, is *Hamlet*, with 4,058 lines; next to it comes the *Third Part of Henry VI.*, with 3,913; then *Coriolanus*, with 3,767, and *Cymbeline*, with 3,718 lines. The prose of course is included. On the other hand, none of Sophocles' tragedies amount to 2,000 lines; the longest, *Œdipus in Colonos*, amounts to about 1,780; the shortest, the *Trachiniæ*, to 1,280 lines. However, a calculation made by Richard Simpson in the *Transactions*

said to have written ninety dramas, Sophocles even a hundred, and Euripides between seventy and ninety; however, these are statements the trustworthiness of which may be doubted. Goethe—apart from his smaller and unfinished plays—has left only ten dramas, and Schiller only nine great dramas. The Elizabethan period was distinguished by extraordinary literary productivity, and the activity of its dramatists was devoted almost exclusively to the stage; they did not, like our modern poets, apply themselves to other kinds of poetry as well, or even to prose compositions, and this, to some extent, accounts for the unusually large number of their dramatic works. When we bear in mind that Beaumont and Fletcher wrote fifty-three dramas; that Henry Chettle—according to Henslowe's Diary—wrote no less than thirty-eight plays between February, 1597, and March, 1603; that Thomas Dekker, besides his miscellaneous works, wrote or assisted in the composition of thirty-two plays; that Thomas Middleton wrote twenty-four plays; and finally, that Thomas Heywood—according to his own statement—had a hand in no less than 220 pieces—it would seem as if Shakespeare's thirty-six or thirty-seven dramas could scarcely have called forth the praise bestowed upon the author by John Webster in the preface to his "Vittoria Corombona" (1612), where he speaks of "the right happy and copious industry of Mr. Shakespeare." Ben Jonson, who was considered a very slow writer by his contemporaries, has nevertheless left us seventeen dramas and thirty-one masques, not reckoning "Eastward Ho!" which he wrote in conjunction with Chapman and Marston. And his lyric poetry as well as his prose writings are also pretty voluminous. From a well-known passage in Francis Meres' "Palladis Tamia,"[1] it is evident that Shakespeare as early as 1598—hence at the age of thirty-four—had

of the New Shakspere Society, i. 115, does not agree with this, even though it be assumed that the calculation was made from a different edition. According to Simpson, *Antony and Cleopatra* is the longest play, amounting to 3,964 lines; *Hamlet*, on the other hand, has only 3,924, and *The Comedy of Errors*, 1,770.

[1] The passage runs thus: "*As Plautus and Seneca are accounted the best for Comedy and Tragedy among the Latines: so Shakespeare among ye English is the most excellent in both kinds for the stage; for Comedy, witness his Gentlemen of Verona, his Errors, his Love Labors lost, his Love's labours wonne, his Midsummers night dreame, and his Merchant of Venice: for Tragedy his Richard the* 2, *Richard the* 3, *Henry the* 4, *King John, Titus Andronicus and his Romeo and Juliet.*" In addition to these it is

written more than twelve dramas, for there can be no doubt that Meres by no means reckoned all of the plays which Shakespeare had written at the time, but only mentioned the more important ones by way of example—six of each of the two species (the Histories being reckoned among the Tragedies). Besides, Meres' book—like most others of the Elizabethan age—had probably been written some time before it was printed, a supposition which we have already repeatedly referred to.

These considerations lead us to the generally accepted opinion, not only that some of the doubtful plays must be regarded as having been written by Shakespeare, but, more especially, that Shakespeare—in his capacity of the dramatic poet of his company—had remodelled various earlier plays; indeed, that very probably he commenced his literary career by remodelling plays of this kind.[1] We possess absolutely no external or actual evidence with regard to this point, and accordingly subjective criticism—which is based upon internal evidence, upon similarities of style, &c.—has free scope for speculation. The investigations thus made have, of course, not led to any definite result, and, from the very nature of the case, cannot, in fact, lead to any result that might count upon general or even partial recognition. English commentators are pretty well unanimous in rejecting the doubtful plays, whereas German commentators—following Tieck's example—consider at least some of them to be Shakespeare's, and equal to his undoubted poetical works. Internal peculiarities are certainly very unsafe, and style and versification are apt to lead one astray. Shakespeare stood at the head of a school, or, at all events, of a tendency, and it is very likely that the peculiarity of his style was sometimes intentionally imitated, and sometimes unintentionally followed by other dramatists—in both cases, no doubt, to such an extent that, after the lapse of close upon three centuries, it must be impossible to form a decided opinion with any

most probable that previous to 1598 he had also written *Pericles*, *Henry VI.*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Hamlet* (in its first form), *i.e.*, therefore, six other plays (reckoning *Henry VI.* as three plays), altogether eighteen dramas. *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, perhaps, also belongs to this date. Many of the later plays are assigned to dates in a most arbitrary manner, without any evidence whatever.

[1] Compare *The Early Authorship of Shakespeare*, in *The North British Review*, No. 103, April, 1870.

degree of certainty. We have a striking instance of a similar case in our own century, in Walter Scott, and, indeed, both as regards his poetical works as well as his novels; for Scott, towards the end of his career, himself said that he had taught a hundred other gentlemen to write almost, even though not quite, as well as himself. Why, therefore, should not half or a quarter of a dozen dramatists have learned to adopt Shakespeare's style in such a measure as to deceive us? This consideration alone should warn us to use the utmost caution regarding the so-called doubtful plays, and we are supported in this by the thought that Heminge and Condell are not likely to have been guilty—either wittingly or unwittingly—of having left so large a gap in the works of their deceased friend, as would appear to be the case from the third folio. No plausible reason whatever can be imagined why they—after giving assurance of their affection for him—should have omitted seven of his plays if they were genuine; and, on the other hand, it is by no means an unusual proceeding to ascribe to deceased as well as to living writers works that in no way belong to them. Perhaps, however, the doubtful plays may be regarded as those which Shakespeare remodelled or wrote in conjunction with other dramatists, and which were, therefore, excluded by the editors, inasmuch as they admitted only those dramas which were the poet's sole and undisputed property. Shakespeare's having remodelled earlier plays, and having worked in conjunction with other writers, would, as we know, have been perfectly consistent with the customs of the day, and it would, in so far, be quite right not to exclude Shakespeare from the custom. "The Two Noble Kinsmen," which was published in 1684, was given out to have been the joint work of Shakespeare and Fletcher; however, it may be asked in how far the statement on the title-page—for it is on this alone that the supposition is founded—is to be relied upon. The statements on title-pages, and publisher's announcements, were by no means implicitly trustworthy in Shakespeare's day, and, moreover, the drama in question is certainly omitted in the first edition of Beaumont and Fletcher (1647), although unhesitatingly admitted into all subsequent editions.[1] The manufacture of works for the stage by several

[1] Compare *Letter on Shakespeare's Authorship of the Two Noble Kinsmen, a Drama, commonly ascribed to John Fletcher.* [By Professor W. Spalding.] Edinburgh, 1833; *Shakespeare's Share in the Two Noble Kinsmen dis-*

writers conjointly was, in fact, carried on no less systematically in those days, than in modern Paris by the Scribes and the Dumas. We know of the different categories of collaborators through Ben Jonson, who, in the Prologue to his "Volpone," boasts of having written the piece within five weeks, and, indeed, wholly without assistance, "without a coadjutor, novice, journeyman, or tutor." That Shakespeare, in the last-mentioned capacity, had a share in the writing of "A Larum for London; or, The Siege of Antwerp" (1602, but entered in the Stationers' Registers as early as 1600), is a supposition that has recently been brought forward by R. Simpson, with a keen insight into the subject and well-founded statements.[1] Tomlins even, and recently again Von Friesen[2] have expressed themselves against the general supposition that Shakespeare—in his capacity of dramatic poet to his company—was often engaged in remodelling and renovating earlier dramas that had fallen into disuse, in fact, deny that Shakespeare commenced his literary career with work of this kind. They, not unjustly, say it is a pleasanter thought to think that Shakespeare, with his great gifts, was animated with the irresistible impulse of accomplishing original work, than to imagine him to have been occupied merely in patching up old works. They also think that the remodellings generally attributed to young Shakespeare are much more like the work of an experienced and practised writer than that of an inexperienced beginner; that, in fact, if Shakespeare were the wild genius which most persons suppose him to have been, it would be perfectly unintelligible where he could have acquired his critical and accurate judgment of distinguishing the good from the bad, and of replacing the bad by the good. And what publisher was likely to credit the young and unknown man with the requisite amount of self-confidence,

tinguisht from Fletcher's, by the late Samuel Hickson, Esq., with *Notes of Confirmation*, by the Rev. F. G. Fleay, M.A., and F. J. Furnivall, Esq., M.A., in the *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, i. 25 ff.

[1] Simpson (*The School of Shakespeare, No. I., A Larum for London; or, The Siege of Antwerp*, &c., London, 1872,) assumes that the piece in question, which was played at the Globe Theatre by Shakespeare's company, "was written on the foundation of a tract of Gascoigne's, by Marston as the journeyman, under the direction and with the help of Shakespeare as manager and controller. Shakespeare's share in the work need not have amounted to more than a general supervision and direction. Perhaps Van Ende's message to Davila (p. 48) may come from his pen."

[2] *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, ii. 39 ff.

to commission him to remodel old plays that had fallen into disrepute, unless he had previously given proof of his ability by works of his own? These considerations are certainly worth taking to heart, even though they may not exclude contrary views. For instance, the proof required did not need to be a work of the poet's own creation—a successful remodelling made on his own account and not upon commission would have been sufficient. That Shakespeare was inclined to work upon existing materials, or upon a given subject, cannot be denied. It is also possible that he regarded this work of reviving or remodelling earlier works as a profitable undertaking, from a money point of view, and hence did not neglect his opportunity. If this conjecture be rejected, it will only become the more difficult to find a satisfactory explanation of the fact that, within a comparatively short period, the poet acquired an unusually large fortune. Besides, this purely mechanical work need not have prevented him from fulfilling an eager wish to produce independent work.

How much Shakespeare was inclined to work upon existing material is distinctly evident when we look round at the sources from which he drew his subjects. In his Comedies he made use of Italian and other romances, partly also Italian and early English plays; in his Histories he has followed Holinshed, Hall, and other chroniclers; in his Roman plays he has taken certain passages almost word for word from North's "Plutarch";[1] and in his Tragedies he borrowed his materials from old stories and legends. Are we to suppose that Shakespeare did not care to take the trouble of inventing his subjects, or are we—in accordance with the views of a modern writer—to believe that to invent stories is a gift peculiar to the Latin races, and one which Shakespeare possessed only to a small extent, whereas his true greatness consisted in the peculiarly Teutonic power of delineating cha-

[1] The Greenock Library (*The Watt Monument*) believes that it possesses the copy of North's *Plutarch* that belonged to Shakespeare. On the title-page are the initials *W.S.* Compare *North's Plutarch: Notes as to a Copy of this Work in the Greenock Library, supposed to have been Shakespeare's.* By A. P. Paton, Greenock, 1871, pp. 36 (privately printed); *Shakespeare's Plutarch. Being a Selection from the Lives in North's Plutarch*, &c. Ed. by the Rev. Walter Skeat, Lond., 1875, Preface, p. xii. ff.—The main objection raised against this belief is that the copy belongs to an edition (that of 1612) which was not published till after the production of Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar.* See *Notes and Queries*, Nov. 12th, 1870, p. 429.

racter? To invent subject-matter is, in fact, not the business of dramatic poetry; not merely in Shakespeare's case, but in the literatures of all countries, it habitually inclines towards historical or traditional subjects. We need only pass in review the French dramatists (Corneille, Racine, &c.) and the dramatists of Germany (Goethe, Schiller, Lessing). Those plays where the subject-matter is really the poet's own invention have never, as a rule, occupied a higher position than a second or even a third rank, except in the case of comedies. Now why should Shakespeare, and he alone, be reproached for having borrowed his subjects? This much is certain, that in Shakespeare's case there is never a question about imitation or spoliation—his work is invariably like a new creation. He was undoubtedly the Midas of poetry—everything he touched turned to gold—and Dr. Johnson's epitaph on Goldsmith (*nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*) is more applicable to Shakespeare than to any other writer. To enter upon the question regarding the sources of the several plays seems to us the less necessary here, as these sources have been collected and fully discussed both in England as well as in Germany.[1] Still these refer merely to the well-known and main sources, the novels from which Shakespeare borrowed the complete stories. The more, however, that English, Italian, and French literature is investigated, the more has the attention of commentators been directed to dramas and other poetic works which Shakespeare must have read and made use of, and from which he seems at times to have borrowed single features, descriptions, and striking turns of thought. This is one of the points to which the attention of the latest Shakespearean inquiry has been more especially directed, and particularly so in Germany. To give a complete list of all the passages, or the works which Shakespeare in all probability knew and made use of, would not be possible here, nor would there be any object in any such list. This is a subject for special inquiry and special criticism, and we shall only by way of example mention a few

[1] *Shakespeare's Library. A Collection of the Novels, Tales, and Romances used by Shakespeare in the Fabrication of his Dramas; now first collected and printed from the Early Editions, with introductory Notes*, by J. Payne Collier, Lond., 1843, 2 vols. Second edition [by William Carew Hazlitt], 1875, 2 parts in 6 vols.—*Die Quellen des Shakspeare in Novellen, Märchen, und Sagen mit sagengeschichtlichen Nachweisungen.* Von K. Simrock. 2 Aufl. Bonn, 1870, 2 Thle.

of the sources that have lately been discovered. Klein, in his "History of the Drama,"[1] has endeavoured to point out a comedy by an Italian, Bernardo Accolti (1513), entitled "Virginia," as one of the sources of "All's Well that Ends Well," and also points out a number of Italian plays which, in his opinion, were used by, or, at all events, known to Shakespeare. That Shakespeare was also not unacquainted with the Spanish drama has been conjectured by Carriere, by F. W. Cosens, and others.[2] Johann Meissner[3] believes that he has discovered new sources for "The Tempest," and P. Wislicenus[4] undertakes to prove that Shakespeare's "Comedy of Errors" is not only founded upon the "Menæchmi," but also upon the "Amphitruo" of Plautus. It has already repeatedly been stated that in Shakespeare there are various indications of his having studied Montaigne (thus the *état naturel* in "The Tempest," ii. 1; the music of the spheres in "The Merchant of Venice," v. 1, and elsewhere); but quotations also from Rabelais have been discovered by W. König,[5] whereas B. Tschischwitz[6] has followed up the track which points to Giordano Bruno's influence upon Shakespeare.[7] That the poet made use of Vasari, and obtained from him the two Latin epitaphs on Julio Romano seems likely from the circumstance that in "The Winter's Tale" Shakespeare introduces Romano as a sculptor, unless, indeed, he obtained the knowledge in Italy himself.[8] Thornbury[9] draws attention to Spenser's "Fairy Queene" as a rich source from which Shakespeare drew. He says that Don John's conspiracy to destroy Hero's good name is taken from Book II., Canto 6, and that the story of Lear is borrowed from Book I., Canto 10, and not from Geoffrey of Monmouth; that the names of Imogen and Oberon, the loves of Venus and Adonis (in Spenser, *Anchises*), and other things, are taken from Spenser; even Shylock, he thinks, was suggested by Spenser's miser Malbecco. In the Introductions and Com-

[1] *Geschichte des Dramas*, iv. 548 ff.
[2] *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, vi. 367 ff.; also vols. v. 348 and x. 376.
[3] In his *Untersuchungen über Den Sturm* (1872).
[4] In the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, xiv. 87-96.
[5] *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, ix. 195 ff.
[6] *Shakspere-Forschungen*, i. 50 ff.
[7] Compare W. König, *Shakespeare and Giordano Bruno* in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, xi. 97 ff.
[8] My *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 287 ff.
[9] *Shakespeare's England*, ii. 68 ff.

mentaries on the several plays there are numerous proofs and conjectures of this kind, but it cannot be denied that the utmost care has to be observed in this branch of inquiry, as agreements of this kind are as likely to have arisen from accidental coincidence as from intentional quotation or unintentional recollection. There are unquestionably a great number of thoughts and images which involuntarily occur to almost every poet in precisely the same words, and which, therefore, have the deceptive appearance of having been borrowed, without there being any reason for any such supposition. The chief interest of such investigations is to point out the intellectual correlation of the different literatures, and, in Shakespeare's case, the various tendencies and the extent of his reading, and, accordingly, to determine the degree of his culture by sure indications.

One of the most difficult chapters in the whole domain of Shakespearean controversy, and one which is hardly ever likely to be satisfactorily settled, is the chronological order in which his dramas were written. We are almost wholly without evidence sufficiently reliable to guide us in our uncertainty; the invaluable passage in Francis Meres' work gives an unalterable limit as regards the date for twelve plays, it is true, but merely the one limit forewards, not backwards. That the dates of the quartos are of no essential value, is obvious from what has already been stated; they are of use only as regards the smaller half of the plays, and even as regards these give nothing but the *terminus ad quem.* The entries in the Stationers' Registers also, upon which, since Malone's day, so much importance has been attached, do not in reality say much more, for a play may have existed several years, and have been performed, before a publisher had it entered in this register with a view to publication. The theatrical companies had, of course, an interest in withholding the plays in their possession from the press as long as possible. Hence the *terminus a quo* remains as uncertain as before. It is also a question whether the Stationers' Registers may not have been tampered with. No wonder, therefore, that gates and doors are thrown wide open for the fabrication of hypotheses of all kinds; and it is an undoubted fact that the dates of almost all of Shakespeare's dramas are more or less hypothetical. Even Malone's most meritorious work comes under this category; yet it was his work that opened the way for others on

the subject, and has not yet been superseded by later investigations.[1]

In instituting these inquiries various principles have been set up as the leading ones, and they must naturally go hand-in-hand if they are to lead to any result worth consideration. The first—although apparently unscientific—procedure is to leave the decision to external criteria, more especially to the testimonies of and allusions by contemporary writers, or such unequivocal indications as references to political events and other occurrences. This is the favourite method followed by the earlier English critics, and, upon the whole, leads to the safest conclusions, although even it cannot be said to be exempt from errors. Opposed to it we have the æsthetic method—if we may be allowed the expression—and it is pre-eminently favoured by German Shakespearean scholars. This method undertakes to fix the date of the several dramas from the style and peculiarities of the diction, as well as of the composition and the delineation of character. It is self-evident that the feeling for style, which is here the determinative point, is in a great measure subjective and unsafe; indeed, the æsthetic method has led to egregious mistakes, not only in the literary domain, but in that of plastic art as well. We have a famous instance of this in the story of the Cupid which Michael Angelo made, and then had buried, and which when unearthed was pronounced by all connoisseurs to be a masterpiece of ancient art; Michael Angelo, thereupon, to the consternation and discomfiture of the judges, produced the arm he had broken off his Cupid before burying it, and thus proved it to be his own work.[2] No less striking is the fact that in 1866 or 1867 Dr. Furnivall (who, with the utmost confidence, undertakes to assign every scene, nay, almost every line, to their real authors,) recognized that the Preface to Dr. Johnson's Dictionary was not the work of that readily recognizable writer, and with as much confidence ascribes it to the pen of Dr. Latham, and ran it down accordingly.[3] If

[1] *An Attempt to ascertain the Order in which the Plays of Shakespeare were written*, in Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. 288-468; Henry Paine Stokes, *An Attempt to Determine the Chronological Order of Shakspere's Plays*, Lond., 1878; Dr. Furnivall, *Introduction to the Leopold Shakspere*.

[2] Ulrici, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art*, translated by L. Dora Schmitz (Lond., 1876), ii. 363.

[3] See *The Pall Mall Gazette*, Jan. 18, 1867.

Shakespeare could rise from his grave and, *mutatis mutandis*, imitate the example of Michael Angelo, many a supposed connoisseur would be discomfited, and many a laboriously worked-out hypothesis would be overthrown. The æsthetic method, therefore, when employed for examining Shakespeare's works, must at all events make use of the aids and facts offered by philology, among which, at present, the most conspicuous are the metrical peculiarities relating to the feminine terminations, the enjambements, the rhyme, the cæsura, the use of Alexandrines, doggerel verse, and half verses. It would be difficult to say who first pointed out the percentage of the feminine endings and of the enjambements as a criterion for the chronology of the dramas; one of the first, however, was Spedding, in his treatise, "Who wrote Shakespeare's Henry VIII.?"[1] He was followed, in Germany, by Hertzberg,[2] who, in all probability, had no knowledge of Spedding's work. A systematic development of this method of inquiry has been undertaken by the New English Shakspere Society—mainly at the instigation of F. G. Fleay, who has devoted special attention to the subject, and has carried the method furthest.[3] By means of metrical criteria solely, he has not only divided the dramas into four periods, and assigned to each separate play its definite position, but by the same means he also distinguishes those scenes in "Henry VIII." and in "The Taming of the Shrew," in "Timon of Athens," "Pericles," &c., which are supposed not to have been written by Shakespeare. All this he does with enviable self-confidence, without being disconcerted at arriving at conclusions which are inadmissible in face of all other proofs, and which proofs throw the brightest light on the worthlessness of such one-sided measures and of riding pet hobbies. Starting with the axiom that there is a constant lessening of rhymes in Shakespeare, and that, on the contrary, there is a constant increase in the number of feminine termina-

[1] In the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Aug. 1850, pp. 115-123; reprinted in the *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, i. 1^{x}-18^{x}, together with additions by Hickson, Fleay, and Furnivall.

[2] In the *Shakespeare-Uebersetzung* for the German Shakespeare Society, iv. 5 and 22; viii. 288; xi. 347 ff.; xii. 292. Also the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, xiii. 248-266.

[3] The first volume of their *Transactions* is almost confined to investigations of this kind. Compare also, Fleay, *Metrical Tests applied to Shakespeare*, in Dr. Ingleby's *Occasional Papers on Shakespeare* (Lond., 1881), pp. 50-141; my *Notes on the Elizabethan Dramatists*, Halle, 1880-6, 3 vols.

tions, Fleay has calculated, almost mathematically, that "The Two Gentlemen of Verona" was written at a curiously late date; he places it after "A Midsummer Night's Dream," after "Romeo and Juliet," after "Richard II." and "Richard III.," after "Henry IV." and "Henry V." In this he has, as might have been expected, acted in direct opposition to the members of his own Society.[1] The supposition, hitherto very widely accepted, that Shakespeare in his earliest dramas exhibited a predilection for rhyme,[2] has justly been opposed by Simpson, Hales, Dr. Brinsley Nicholson, and others; they maintain that Shakespeare's direct predecessors, Marlowe and Greene, for instance, were by no means partial to rhymes; that the earliest notice we possess of Shakespeare—that by Greene in 1592—does not allude to his rhymes, but, on the contrary, says that Shakespeare considered himself able "to bombast out a blank verse as the best," and that the employment or non-employment of rhyme is by no means dependent upon the earlier or later origin of the plays, but upon the style and character of the works themselves, &c.[3] Dr. Brinsley Nicholson has applied the rhyme test (after the manner of Fleay) to Ben Jonson, and found that the result in no way corresponds with the chronological order of his works, and, in his case, we have authentic evidence regarding the dates of his works. For instance, his later drama, "Every Man out of his Humour," contains a greater percentage of rhymes than "Every Man in his Humour."

It would lead us too far to enter into further particulars, the more so as, from what has already been said, it is sufficiently clear that the metrical criterion can in no way claim to possess the certainty of a mathematical law, or sufficient evidence to drive all other methods from the field. The metrical criterion can claim no more consideration than any other, and, as already said, it is merely from the correlation and agreement of all the various criteria that a result can be expected possessing any relative certainty; but again, any such result could scarcely be said to be altogether non-hypothetical in character. In various dramas where the criteria in ques-

[1] *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society* (1874), i. 16 ff.

[2] Fleay terms the first period the period of rhymes, and assigns to it *Love's Labour's Lost, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Comedy of Errors, Romeo and Juliet*, and *Richard II.*

[3] Compare Dowden, *Shakspere*, p. 46.

tion either cannot be applied at all, or only to a very small extent, the date assigned to the dramas will hardly ever be more than a mere conjecture; they may, perhaps, be ascribed to a definite period, but not to any definite year. And the uncertainty is even greater—and will always remain so—where the question treats of a later remodelling of a play by the poet himself, or of the supposition that several persons had a hand in one and the same piece. Even with the utmost caution, the result obtained is a mere conjecture, more or less well supported, and does not exclude other methods of explanation; in fact, several hypotheses may exist side by side, and be all equally justified. Thus, for instance, it would seem as if the hypothesis relating to "Timon of Athens," brought forward by Ulrici,[1] and modified afterwards,[2] is in no way refuted or upturned by Fleay's supposition that the imperfect manuscript had been worked up by one of the editors of the folio[3] while it was passing through the press; on the contrary, it would seem as if a choice of various possibilities, all equally justified, were offered, but in every case the date of the origin of the piece would remain extremely doubtful.

Most closely connected with the question relating to the chronology of Shakespeare's dramas, is the question concerning the two points of time between which lies the period of Shakespeare's literary activity. Malone, Chalmers, Drake, and Fleay agree in so far that they assign his earliest work to the year 1591, and the last to 1613 (Malone to 1611), in doing which they indulge their conviction that the poet, in his retirement at Stratford, continued writing for the stage. However, Ward's[4] statement that Shakespeare provided the theatre with two plays annually after withdrawing to Stratford does not deserve credence for various reasons; hence we have no certain evidence regarding the time when Shakespeare may have ceased devoting himself to poetic productions. And it is equally uncertain when he first appeared as an author; several Shakespearean critics—for instance, Knight,[5] Delius, and others—have found themselves obliged to date it

[1] *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art* (English trans.), i. 522 ff.

[2] In the translation of Shakespeare's works for the *German Shakespeare Society*, x. 321 ff.

[3] *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, i. 137.

[4] Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, p. 327.

[5] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 347 ff.

as far back as the eighth decade.[1] This conclusion is demanded by a variety of reasons, which are fully entered into in my "Essays on Shakespeare,"[2] and can only be briefly referred to here. Shakespeare, like all other great geniuses, reached maturity at an early age—his marriage alone is sufficient to prove this,—and when he left Stratford in 1585 he very possibly (as has already been stated in a preceding chapter) had the manuscript of one or other of his dramas in his pocket; at any rate, it is not likely that six years went by without his having presented his first work to the public. Those who are opposed to this view can have no conception of the impetuous feelings of youthful poetic ardour. Any such delay is the less likely, as in 1592—according to Greene's biting remark—Shakespeare was already "the onelie Shakescene in a countrie." Could he have been so designated as a poet (or even as an actor) if his first play had appeared on the stage only one year previously? Richard Simpson has probably hit the point by assuming that "The Comedy of Errors" was written about Christmas, 1585, or during the following year.[3] This conjecture, however, not only affects the beginning, but also the end of the period of Shakespeare's poetic activity, which accordingly would have to be assigned to an earlier date than critics have hitherto accepted. In fact, good reasons speak in favour of the year 1604-5 as the close of the period of Shakespeare's regular literary work, with, it may be, one or two exceptions. Shakespeare's activity as a dramatic poet, accordingly, extends over a period of twenty years, and this would be the same length which Malone's scheme has assumed for it.[4] Chalmers, Drake, and Fleay, on the other hand, extend the period of Shakespeare's literary activity over twenty-two years, Delius over twenty-four; but these differences are of no essential importance.

In face of these uncertainties concerning the chronological order of the dramas, it seems our wisest plan, in examining the separate works, not to introduce any new chronological order which could be convincing only to its originator, but to

[1] Compare *The Early Authorship of Shakespeare*, in *The North British Review*, No. ciii., April, 1870.

[2] See my *Essays on Shakespeare*, pp. 18 f. and 40 f.

[3] *The North British Review*, July, 1870. Compare *Notes and Queries*, July 1, 1871, p. 3.

[4] De Quincey, *Shakespeare*, p. 65.

adopt the well-known order in which the dramas appear in the first folio. We shall place the lyrico-epic poems first, as they preceded all the dramas in regard to time of publication, and most of the dramas in regard to time of composition. These poems will be followed directly and appropriately by the Sonnets, although they were not published till a later period.

I. VENUS AND ADONIS. *Ed. pr. Venus and Adonis.*

Vilia miretur vulgus : mihi flauus Apollo
Pocula Castalia plena ministret aqua.

London, Imprinted by Richard Field, and are to be sold at the signe of the white Greyhound in Paules Church-yard 1593. 4*to.* 27 *leaves.*—The poet's name is omitted on the title-page, but stands below the Dedication. Entered in the Stationers' Registers on the 18th of April, 1593, and furnished with a licence from the Archbishop of Canterbury (Whitgift). On the title-page is Vautrollier's vignette, which Field had adopted with a trifling alteration, viz., an anchor, and round it the motto *Anchora spei.* We have already spoken somewhat fully of Vautrollier and his printing establishment on p. 121. As frequently happened in the Elizabethan age, the printer was the publisher as well, and so it was in the present case, and we here meet with one of those enigmas from which, unfortunately, there is no escape in the study of Shakespeare. His "Venus and Adonis"—as is distinctly proved by the number of editions published—was unquestionably what booksellers would call a saleable work. And yet, in place of the original publisher retaining possession of such a treasure, and benefiting by it, we find the right of publication passing from hand to hand. According to the entries in the Stationers' Registers, it was transferred to John Harrison as early as the 25th of June, 1594; subsequently—but when is not stated—it passed on to William Barrett, and he again sold it to John Parker in March, 1620. And even he was not the last proprietor of the work, for the editions of 1630 and 1636 were printed by I. H. and sold by Francis Coules (according to the title-page); and again, later, the right of publication was transferred to Edward Wright, who again transferred it to William Gilbertson on the 4th of April, 1655. Even in the case of the quarto edition of Shakespeare's dramas the change of publishers is remarkable; no poet ever had as many pub-

lishers as Shakespeare. Of all the editions of Shakespeare's works—according to Collier[1]—the *ed. pr.* of "Venus and Adonis" is the most accurately, and also the most handsomely printed of any, and the *ed. pr.* of "Lucrece" comes near it in excellence of typography, and the type employed is the same. Only one copy of this edition exists, and is preserved in the Bodleian Library, into which it passed from the possessions left by Malone, who had purchased it for £25. The facsimile edition by Ashbee, made for Halliwell in 1866, has already been referred to.

Of the following twelve editions of the single poem, up to the year 1675, we obtain the fullest and the most reliable information in the beautiful facsimile print of the only copy of the edition of 1599, discovered by Charles Edmonds in 1867 at Lamport Hall.[2] These editions are all extremely rare; the Bodleian Library possesses a copy of the supposed edition of 1600, as well as of one of the two editions of 1602, and of the editions of 1617 and 1630 (as unique copies). This may unhesitatingly be regarded as an indication of the extraordinary popularity of the poem, even among the middle and lower classes; had it circulated solely or chiefly among the aristocracy, so many editions could not possibly have vanished so entirely. This supposition is substantiated by the various allusions to the poem, which prove that it was the common property of amorous young persons of both sexes, and, indeed, not exclusively of the respectable classes of society. The best-known allusion to the poem is that by Gabriel Harvey (1598) in manuscript form (in Speght's "Chaucer"), "The younger sort take much delight in Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis; but his Lucrece and his Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, have it in them to please the wiser sort." John Davies (1610) more especially bears testimony to the fact that the poem found favour with women:—

> the coyest Dames,
> In private reade it for their Closset-games, &c.[3]

More interesting and more vigorous still is a scene from Thomas Heywood's "Fair Maid of the Exchange" (1607), where the lover Bowdler speaks of winning the favour of his

[1] *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iv. 38.

[2] In vol. i. of the so-called *Isham Reprints*, London, 1870 (only 131 copies of it are printed).

[3] Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, p. 96.

lady-love by quoting passages from "Venus and Adonis," and proposes to act as the poem describes. The passage runs thus:—

Crip[*ple*]. But hear you, sir! reading so much as you have done,
Do you not remember one pretty phrase,
To scale the walls of a fair wench's love?
Bow[*dler*]. I never read anything but "Venus and Adonis."
Crip. Why, that's the very quintessence of love.
If you remember but a verse or two,
I'll pawn my head, goods, lands, and all, 'twill do.
Bow. Why, then, have at her!
"Fondling, I say, since I have hemm'd thee here,
Within the circle of this ivory pale,
I'll be a park ——"
Moll. Hands off, fond Sir!
Bow. "And thou shalt be my deer.
Feed thou on me, and I will feed on thee;
And love shall feed us both."
Moll. Feed you on woodcocks; I can fast awhile.
Bow. "Vouchsafe, thou wonder, to alight thy steed."
Crip. Take heed; she's not on horseback.
Bow. Why, then, she is alighted.
"Come, sit thee down, where never serpent hisses;
And, being set, I'll smother thee with kisses." [1]

After such an application of the poem, it cannot be surprising that, by going a step further, we find it mentioned in Thomas Cranley's "Amanda" (1635) as among the possessions of a courtesan:—

And then a heap of bookes of thy devotion
Lying upon a shelf close underneath,
Which thou more think'st upon than on thy death;
They are not prayers of a grieved soul,
That with repentance doth his sins condole,

But amorous pamphlets, that best like thine eyes,
And songs of love and sonnets exquisite.
Among these Venus and Adonis lies,
With Salmacis and her Hermaphrodite:
Pygmalion's there, with his transform'd delight,

[1] The quotations are not quite accurate; in Shakespeare the words are: *Feed where thou wilt, on mountain or in dale.* The words *I'll be a park*, &c., prove, moreover, that Heywood made the quotation from one of the two earlier editions (1593 or 1594), for in the later editions of 1596 and henceforth the words are *I'll be the park*, &c. Compare Hugh Anderson, *Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis illustrated by his contemporary, Thomas Heywood*, in *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iii. 54 ff.; Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 81.—These same passages are also twisted about in Lewis Machin's *Dumb Knight* (1608).

And many merry comedies with this,
Where the Athenian Phryne acted is.[1]

Unpleasant as it is to think of the poet's work in such degraded surroundings, the more welcome is the endeavour which Benno Tschischwitz[2] has made to rescue its moral reputation. It cannot be denied that "Venus and Adonis" —brilliant as may be the stamp of genius it bears on its forehead—is somewhat of an opium-dream of sensual love, and that it is imbued with a spirit similar to that which pervades the much-discussed paintings of one of our modern artists—Hans Makart. In "Venus and Adonis" we have nothing of that species of nudity which, owing to its purity, has something of the divine about it, but what is exhibited is the unbridled and consuming passion of desire, and, as already said, this is placed mainly in the female breast. Lines like the following:—

Love is a spirit all compact of fire (149),

and:—

The sea hath bounds, but deep desire hath none (349),

give the key-note to the whole poem. Shakespeare has here —once and for all—given vent to the pulsating blood of his own youth, but has never returned to the subject in any similar way; "from this point of view" (to use Gervinus'[3] words) "the whole piece is one brilliant error, such as young poets so readily commit: immoderate sexual fervour is mistaken for poetry."

In the dedication of his poem to Lord Southampton, which is worded in the deferential style customary at the time, Shakespeare—as is well known—calls "Venus and Adonis" the first heir of his invention. As has already been stated, doubts have been raised respecting the true significance of these words. It is very likely that the poem was Shakespeare's first production in the actual sense of the word, and that he brought it with him from Stratford to London, where it was circulated in manuscript till Southampton accepted the dedication, and the poem then found a publisher. Meanwhile, however, Shakespeare had no doubt remodelled, as well

[1] Dr. Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 204.
[2] In the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, viii. 32-45.
[3] *Shakespeare Commentaries*, translated by F. E. Bunnètt, p. 36.

as written various plays—no patrons being required for stage pieces—and hence "Venus and Adonis" was not Shakespeare's first work that the public had become acquainted with, yet was nevertheless the first he had written. However, the matter admits of an entirely different interpretation. The firstfruits of Shakespeare's Muse may, notwithstanding, have been dramatic works, for, as the drama had not yet become a recognized branch of literature, the poet may not have reckoned his first dramatic attempts when describing "Venus and Adonis" as the first heir of his invention; the words might even be taken as an indication or a confession that Shakespeare's first dramatic efforts were not works of his own invention. It matters but little how this question be decided, for "Venus and Adonis" must in any case be regarded as one of the earliest of the poet's youthful works. Of incomparably greater importance is the other question raised by the remark "the first heir of my invention," viz., the relation in which "Venus and Adonis" stands to Henry Constable's poem, "The Shepherd's Song of Venus and Adonis," and to Lodge's "Scilla's Metamorphosis." Constable's "Shepherd's Song" was not indeed published till 1600 (in the well-known collection called "England's Helicon"), but may probably have been written some time previously, as Constable took his degree of B.A. at Cambridge in 1579, and hence was doubtless some years older than Shakespeare. This is all we know of him.[1] If "The Shepherd's Song" really be older than "Venus and Adonis," still, owing to its shortness, it could only have awakened Shakespeare's interest in or liking for the subject. Lodge's poem, which appeared as early as 1589, is not only written in the same stanzas, but begins with the same incidents as "Venus and Adonis," and in fact (according to James P. Reardon [2]) Lodge seems in every respect to have taken Shakespeare's "Venus and Adonis" as his model—of course taking it for granted that Lodge had become acquainted with Shakespeare's poem in manuscript. This supposition cannot, however, in any way be accepted in all good faith as either certain or self-evident; the two dates 1589 and 1593 as the years when the two works were first

[1] Drake, *Shakspeare and His Times*, i. 609 ff.

[2] *Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis and Lodge's Scilla's Metamorphosis*, by James P. Reardon, in the *Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iii. 143-146.

published are a hard fact, and it is a hazardous undertaking to seek to upset it by a mere conjecture. Shakespeare has made use of Lodge's "Rosalynde" in "As You Like It;" why may he not—if undoubted similarities exist—have made use of his "Scilla's Metamorphosis"? It would not in any way be contrary to Shakespeare's literary character. At all events, we cannot unhesitatingly agree with Collier, who, in his "Life of Shakespeare," confidently maintains that "Venus and Adonis" was a poem entirely new of its kind, and not founded upon any earlier or later model. If this statement may apply to the substance, still the form must be taken into consideration as well. Lodge's "Scilla's Metamorphosis" was evidently not a success; only one other edition of it was published (1610), and this, according to Reardon, is merely an edition with a new title-page. Now, of "Venus and Adonis," on the other hand, there had appeared no less than four or five editions up to 1600, which would certainly give the impression that Shakespeare, so to say, had taken the shine out of Lodge. We have an imitation (with satirical intent?) of "Venus and Adonis" in John Marston's "The Metamorphosis of Pygmalion's Image" (1598), to which Shakespeare himself alludes in his "Measure for Measure," iii. 2.[1] But, as generally happens with imitations, so in this case also the poetic brilliancy and grandeur is lost in Marston, and we have nothing but sensuality. Among the books belonging to the courtesan mentioned above, we find "Pygmalion's Metamorphosis" as well as "Venus and Adonis."

Another question that might be raised regarding "Venus and Adonis," namely, whether Shakespeare can have known of Marini's "Adone" while writing his poem, has already been discussed on p. 136.

II. LUCRECE. *Ed. pr. Lucrece. London. Printed by Richard Field, for John Harrison, and are to be sold at the sign of the white Greyhound in Paule's Churchyard*, 1594. *4to.* 47 *leaves.* Entered in the Stationers' Registers on the 9th of May, 1594, under the title of "A Booke intitled the Ravyshement of

[1] "*What, is there none of Pygmalion's images, newly made woman, to be had now, for putting the hand in the pocket and extracting it clutched?*" Compare Warton, *History of Eng. Poetry* (1840), iii. 337a, 410, 441; Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 397.—Just as Shakespeare styles his *Venus and Adonis* as *the first heir of my invention*, Marston in the Prologue (to his Mistress) calls his poem *the first bloomes of my poesie.*

Lucrece." The publisher, John Harrison, was also, as we have seen, the proprietor of "Venus and Adonis" at the time. There exist at least six copies of this edition, at all events, Lowndes-Bohn gives this number. According to the same authority, up to the year 1655 other seven single editions of it had appeared; with the fifth edition (1616) the title becomes "The Rape of Lucrece," which, in fact, was the running title in the *ed. pr.* This alteration is probably connected with the change of publisher, for the name of Roger Jackson henceforth takes the place of John Harrison. The last edition (1655) was published in the joint establishment of John Stafford and the same William Gilbertson who, as we have seen, that same year acquired the right to "Venus and Adonis."

"Lucrece" is also dedicated to the Earl of Southampton, and the wording and tone of the dedication prove that the feeling of friendship and esteem between the poet and his noble patron had become strengthened since the first poem had been dedicated to him. And yet this dedication is the last thing we know about the relation in which they stood to each other, and is also the last dedication which proceeded from Shakespeare's pen.

The fact of "Lucrece" having appeared only one year after "Venus and Adonis," proves nothing with regard to the lapse of time between the origin of the two poems, and accordingly the interval may have been a year or two longer. It is, indeed, true that Shakespeare, in the dedication of his "Venus and Adonis," promises the Earl that, in return for his acceptance of the dedication and this proof of his favour, he will "take advantage of all idle hours, till I have honoured you with some graver labour." This "graver labour," according to Delius,[1] is no other than "Lucrece," which accordingly must have been written after the publication of "Venus and Adonis" in 1593. Be this as it may, "Lucrece," at all events, exhibits important progress in the poet's mental development. The delineation of passionate sensuality does, it is true, again occupy a prominent position, but we have now a man as the owner of this vehement passion, and his sensuality is contrasted with the chastity of the matron in whom strength of will and morality carry off a tragic victory. This moral progress was recognized even by his contemporaries, and

[1] His Introduction to *Lucrece.*

the poem on the chaste Lucrece was contrasted with the unchaste poem of "Venus and Adonis."[1]

In regard to style and metre, "Lucrece" is distinguished from "Venus and Adonis" only by a different stanza having been chosen (Chaucer's rhythm royal), and suffers from the same diffuseness of which not a trace is to be found in Shakespeare's dramas. The story which Ovid tells in sixty-four distichs is swelled out to no less than 265 seven-lined stanzas, although —owing to the whole incident happening indoors—the poet had not the opportunity of indulging in those descriptions of nature with which he has so profusely and charmingly adorned his "Venus and Adonis." This diffuseness is, however, only the reverse side of an extraordinary merit which distinguishes both poems, and is exhibited in his dramas of a later period, namely, the psychological depth, the rare knowledge of the human heart—every fold and fibre of which, in spite of his youth, the poet seems to have been acquainted with, for not even the slightest or most secret emotion escaped him. His early marriage may in this respect certainly have proved an excellent instructor.

III. The Passionate Pilgrim. *Ed. pr. The Passionate Pilgrime. By W. Shakespeare. At London. Printed for W. Jaggard, and are to be sold by W. Leake, at the Greyhound in Paules Churchyard.* 1599. 16*mo.* 30 *leaves.* On leaf 18 there is a special title: *Sonnets to Sundry Notes of Musicke.* The copy in Capell's Collection, Trinity College, Cambridge, was considered a unique copy till, in September, 1867, a second one was discovered by Charles Edmonds in Lamport Hall.[2] Of the second edition not one copy has been preserved, and the existence of a second edition is inferred only from the appearance of a third in 1612. This third edition also contains two love-letters—one from Paris to Helen and one from Helen to Paris—written by Thomas Heywood, who that same year wrote a letter to

[1] Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, p. 106. Also in Barnfield's *Encomion of Lady Pecunia* (1598), and in Dekker's *The Owles Almanacke*, 1618, mention is made of *Lucrece, sweet and chaste*, and of *Chaste Lucrece* (according to the *Athenæum*, 1871, ii. 90), and there is a tragedy by Thomas Heywood called *The Rape of Lucrece*, which was first published in 1608, and ran through several editions.

[2] Bound up with *Venus and Adonis*, 1620. At the end of the volume is an old manuscript notice that the book had cost a penny-halfpenny in spite of the loss of one leaf (*Venus and Adonis*, c. 7). To-day it is not to be had at any price.

his publisher, Nicholas Okes (printed in his "Apology for Actors"), claiming them as his. In this letter he at the same time adds that Shakespeare himself had been annoyed at his name having been misapplied.[1] In consequence of this, Jaggard could not do otherwise than have another title-page printed with the omission of Shakespeare's name, and hence there exist copies with and without the names of the supposed author. This fact furnishes one of the strongest proofs, on the one hand, with what barefacedness piracy was carried on by booksellers, and on the other, also, with what unparalleled heedlessness and indifference Shakespeare allowed things to take their own course, and neither troubled himself about the fate of his genuine works, nor about such as were wrongfully ascribed to him. Even in the present case he appears to have been satisfied with having expressed his annoyance in private conversation, whereas nowadays (in so far as such an occurrence is possible) a public explanation would be unavoidable, and indeed inevitable. There was as yet, of course, no legal protection for mental property. From what has been said, it may at once be imagined what claim to genuineness the other portions of "The Passionate Pilgrim" can possess. In fact, even after a most careful examination, it cannot be said how much of it is genuine, and this much alone seems certain, that the really genuine portion is very inconsiderable. Some of the poems in it also occur among "The Sonnets;" one also in the first quarto of "Love's Labour's Lost" (1598); others are met with in the "Encomion of Lady Pecunia," a small collection of poems by Richard Barnfield, which appeared in 1598. Collier nevertheless declares this latter to be Shakespeare's property.[2]

IV. The Phœnix and the Turtle. This poem is given in a collection published by Robert Chester in 1601, under the following title: *Loves Martyr; or, Rosalins Complaint. Allegorically shadowing the truth of Loue in the constant Fate of the Phœnix and Turtle. A Poeme enterlaced with much varietie and raritie; now first translated out of the venerable Italian Tor-*

[1] "*As I must acknowledge my lines not worthy his patronage under whom he has published them, so the author I know much offended with M. Jaggard, that (altogether unknown to him) presumed to make so bold with his name.*" Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 99.

[2] *Athenæum*, May 17th, 1856; *Notes and Queries*, July 5th, 1856. Compare *Outlines*, i. 375-378.

quato Cœliano, by Robert Chester. With the true legend of famous King Arthur, the last of the nine Worthies, being the first Essay of a new Brytish poet: collected out of diuerse Authenticall Records. To these are added some new compositions, of seuerall moderne Writers whose names are subscribed to their seuerall workes, upon the first subject: viz., the Phœnix and Turtle. These "new compositions" are prefaced by the following title: *Hereafter follow diverse Poeticall Essaies on the former Subiect; viz., The Turtle and Phœnix. Done by the best and chiefest of our moderne writers, with their names subscribed to their particular workes: neuer before extant. And (now first) consecrated by them all generally to the loue and merite of the true noble Knight, Sir John Salisburie.* According to Drake[1] there exists but one copy of this *ed. pr.*; however, this is in all probability a mistake. A new edition appeared in 1611, of which likewise it is presumed that but one copy exists.[2] Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps in his "Outlines"[3] gives photo-lithographic facsimiles both of the second title-page (*Hereafter follow*, &c.) as well as of the concluding stanzas (Threnos) of Shakespeare's contribution.

V. SONNETS. *Ed. pr. Shake-speare's Sonnets. Neuer before Imprinted. At London By G. Eld for T. T. and are to be solde by Iohn Wright, dwelling at Christ Church gate. London*, 1609. 4*to.* 40 *leaves.* Some copies have a somewhat different title, in so far as it is said on some of them: *and are to be solde by William Aspley.* The name of the publisher is obtained from the entry in the Stationers' Register, which runs thus: 20 *May*, 1609. *Tho. Thorpe.*[4] *A booke called Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Copies are preserved in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, in Trinity College, Cambridge (imperfect), and in various private libraries; a photo-zincographic facsimile-reprint of the copy belonging to Lord Ellesmere, produced under the supervision of Sir Henry James, was published in 1862.[5] *Shakespeare's Sonnets: The First Quarto*, 1609. *A Facsimile in Photo-lithography by Charles Prœtorius. With an Introduction*

[1] *Shakspeare and his Times*, i. 728.

[2] Compare Robert Chester's *Loves Martyr; or, Rosalins Complaint* (1601), &c., ed. by the Rev. Al. Grosart for the New Shakspere Society, 1878.

[3] ii. 334 ff.

[4] According to the Manuscripts of the Rev. J. Hunter, preserved in the British Museum, Thomas Thorpe was a native of Warwickshire. Henry Brown, *The Sonnets of Shakespeare Solved*, ii.

[5] London, Lowell Reeve (10*s.* 6*d.*).

by Thom. Tyler. London, 1886. No other quarto editions were published till the appearance of the Poems in 1640.

The "Sonnets," as is well known, are one of the *cruces* of Shakespearean scholars. On the very threshold lies a difficulty of great weight, namely, the much-discussed Dedication, regarding which English, German, and French critics have alternately ransacked their brains. The following are the words of the Dedication: *To . the . onlie . begetter . of ./ these . insving . sonnets ./ Mr. W. H. all . happinesse ./ and . that . eternitie ./ promised ./ by ./ ovr . ever-liuing . poet ./ wisheth ./ the . well-wishing ./ adventvrer . in ./ setting ./ forth ./ T. T.*[1] That is to say, Thomas Thorpe, who had undertaken the risk of publishing the book, dedicated the ensuing sonnets to their "onlie begetter," Mr. W. H. What, however, is the meaning of "begetter"? Some say it means much the same as "inspirer;" others imagine it to be much the same thing as "obtainer;" it is either the person who inspired the poet to write the sonnets, or the person who obtained the manuscript for the publisher.[2] Hence those who favour the former opinion find the mysterious W. H. to stand either for Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, or for the Earl of Pembroke, who is said to be addressed as Master William Herbert. The first hypothesis emanates from Drake, the second from Boaden;[3] both leave it unexplained why Thorpe did not give his supposed patron his proper title, and why—in the case of Southampton more especially—the initials of his name, Henry Wriothesley, should have been reversed. Perhaps merely by way of a game at hide and seek with the noble patrons! Anyone with even a slight acquaintance with the rules of etiquette in England, must admit that it would have been impossible to speak of, much less to address a lord in any such fashion. To have addressed Lord Southampton as Mr. Henry Wriothesley, or the Earl of Pembroke as Mr. William Herbert, at a time when both men were in possession of their titles, would have been an

[1] In the second edition of the Sonnets (*Poems*, 1640), this dedication is omitted, which is a sign that no great importance was attached to it, and that it was not addressed to any person of rank. In fact, the original meaning may, meanwhile, have been forgotten.

[2] According to Ingleby *onlie begetter* means *sole author*, and *W. H.* is said to be a misprint for *W. S.*—in fact, that the *Sonnets* are dedicated to the poet himself. *Athenæum*, 1873, ii. 18 ff., 147 ff. This is quite out of the question.

[3] *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1832, p. 217 ff.

unparalleled piece of impertinence or ridiculous stupidity. We need only compare it with Shakespeare's own two dedications, or with that attached to the first folio, where the two earls, Pembroke and Montgomery, are addressed as "Their Highnesses." In 1610 a translation of Augustinus' *De civitate Dei* was dedicated to the Earl of Pembroke by Th. Th., and Henry Brown [1] maintains this Th. Th. to be the same T. T. who published the Sonnets; however, this is far from proving anything in favour of the W. H. standing for Master William Herbert, as Brown thinks; indeed, the circumstance speaks emphatically against any such interpretation. Look but at the wording of the dedication in Augustinus: *To the Hon. Patron of Muses and good Mindes Lord William Earl of Pembroke, Knight of the Hon. Order*, &c. A comparison with the dedication of Davies' "Mirum in Modum" (1602) is even more to the point, for not only is the Earl of Pembroke mentioned in it, but also a person of the name of Herbert. It runs thus: *To the most noble, judicious, and my best beloved Lord William, Earle of Pembroke, the most honourable Sir Robert Sidney, Knight, and right worshipful Edward Herbert, of Montgomery, Esquire, my most honoured and respected friends.* This is the regular style in which dedications were worded in those days, and it is absolutely inconceivable that the Earl should have been addressed as Master William Herbert. And yet the Earl of Pembroke, or (as Drake says) the Earl of Southampton, is—according to this interpretation of the dedication—supposed to have been the same person to whom the "Sonnets" were addressed. It is unnecessary to pass separately in review here all the reasons which oppose this supposition—a single one will suffice. To interpret the expression "begetter" as "inspirer" is out of the question, if only because no commentator can deny that the "Sonnets" are not, by any means, all addressed to one and the same person—accordingly, that there can be no question whatever of an "onlie begetter" in the sense of "inspirer." [2] On the contrary, it is perfectly

[1] *The Sonnets of Shakespeare Solved*, p. 11.

[2] If a number of the *Sonnets* (principally 1-26) must absolutely be considered as addressed to one of these two earls, it would seem as if there were more reason for supposing the subject to have been the Earl of Pembroke than Lord Southampton. The Earl of Pembroke (1580-1639) was, first of all, a great admirer and patron of poetry, to whom numerous works and poems were dedicated (among others, Ben Jonson's *Catiline*, 1616). That he was disinclined to marry is proved by a letter of Rowland White's to Sir Robert

clear that in the present case "begetter" cannot in any way signify the "inspirer"—in fact, must stand for the "obtainer" of the Sonnets, as Chalmers, among others, has justly pointed out. That "to beget" can be used in this sense admits of no doubt; this is proved from Minsheu's Dictionary (1616) and other authorities. It cannot be denied that the dedication is written in a formal and ornate style, the less so as, to all appearance, it was considered to be so by contemporary writers; this, at all events, may be gathered from the humorous manner in which it was parodied by George Wither, who (two years after the publication of the "Sonnets") dedicated his satirical poems to himself in the words "*G. W. wisheth himself all happiness.*"[1] And, besides, he would scarcely have ventured upon such a piece of persiflage if one of the high aristocracy had been concealed under the expression "Mr. W. H." George Wither (owing to the custom of the day) could not have found anything unusual in a man in the Earl of Pembroke's position being wished "all happiness;" but that so solemn a wish, and one expressed in such high-flown and stilted language, should have been addressed to some unknown gentleman, or subordinate person, whose only merit was in having obtained a valuable manuscript for the publisher, would be very likely to call forth ridicule as being altogether contrary to the custom of the day, and an absurd piece of extravagance.

If we take a common-sense view of the case, the difficulties drop off of their own accord. We know, from the often-quoted passage from Meres' "Palladis Tamia,"[2] that Shake-

Sidney (1599), where he says of Pembroke: "*I don't find any disposition at all in this gallant young Lord to marry.*" Pembroke was throughout life considered a "voluptuary." Davies, too, in one of his *Sonnets*, urges him to marry (in *Wit's Pilgrimage*, according to Henry Brown, p. 187). If those of *Shakespeare's Sonnets* referred to were really addressed to Pembroke, they attained their object, for Pembroke married on the 17th of September, 1603. These *Sonnets*, moreover, bear a strong resemblance to Sidney's *Arcadia* (1590), Bk. iii., where, on the one hand, Cecropia used the same arguments in speaking to her nieces Philoclea and Pamela, and, on the other hand, where Geron addresses Histor on the subject of marriage. Compare Massey, *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, p. 36 ff. It may further be remarked, for the proper understanding of the dedication of the *Sonnets*, that Pembroke inherited his title in 1601, and had the Order of the Garter conferred upon him in 1604.

[1] According to Henry Brown, *l.c.*, p. 11 ff.

[2] *As the soule of Euphorbus was thought to live in Pythagoras; so the*

speare's "Sonnets" were circulated among his private friends as early as 1598; Meres could not have known this unless he had himself either been one of these intimate friends, or—as seems more probable—the fame of these "Sonnets" had already extended beyond the small circle of friends. From their having been mentioned by Meres, the existence of the "Sonnets" (which no doubt increased in number year by year) would become known to the whole town, and thus be, as it were, an open secret. No wonder then that an enterprising publisher, or some person connected with the circle in question, took it into his head to utilize these literary treasures, the more so as the poet himself seemed, if possible, more indifferent to these children of his Muse than to his dramas. Regarded from this point of view, the one hypothesis above all others that seems most plausible, is that brought forward by Samuel Neil, according to whom the letters *W. H.* stand for Shakespeare's brother-in-law, William Hathaway.[1] Neil thus, if we may be allowed the expression, caught three mice in one trap, for not only would Hathaway have thus promoted his brother-in-law's reputation, but he would have supplied the publisher with a manuscript likely to prove profitable, and lastly—though not least—he may have induced the publisher to make him some return in the shape of a pecuniary reward. Shakespeare is scarcely likely to have objected to

sweete, wittie soule of Ovid lives in mellifluous and honey-tongued Shakespeare. Witness his "Venus and Adonis," his "Lucrece," his sugred sonnets among his private friends, &c.

[1] Samuel Neil, *Shakespeare, a Critical Biography*, London, 1863, p. 104 ff.—Philarète Chasles disputes the priority of this hypothesis being Neil's; he maintains, at all events, that he arrived at the same conclusion quite independently. Neil, however, has declared that he sent Chasles a copy of his book, and that Chasles drew his hypothesis from it. Compare Ph. Chasles in *The Athenæum*, Jan. 25th, 1862, and the correspondence between the two men in *The Athenæum*, 1867, i. 223 ff., 254, 323, 355, 486 ff., 551 ff., 662 ff.—Bolton Corney, *The Sonnets of Wm. Shakespeare; a Critical Disquisition suggested by a Recent Discovery*, London, 1862, pp. 16 (*privately printed*). Compare also *Notes and Queries*, 1865, No. 205, p. 449; No. 206, p. 482.—William Hathaway, according to Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 114, was baptized on the 30th of Nov., 1578, and is mentioned in his father's will (1581), as well as in the settlement of Shakespeare's property, 1647 (in Halliwell, p. 314 ff.), as an interested party. In the latter he is described as a yeoman of Weston-upon-Avon in the county of Gloucester, however this is probably not the William spoken of above, but his son; at least, he would have been sixty-nine years of age at the time. See Halliwell, *New Place*, p. 130 ff.

the transaction, to which Hathaway may be said to have acquired the right by having collected and arranged the scattered manuscripts, even though this was not done in a very critical manner. What was more natural under the circumstances than that Thorpe should dedicate the volume to Hathaway, and wish him the same "eternitie" that the poet promises the subject of his sonnets? Nay, who can say whether the artful and experienced "adventurer" may not have made it a condition that the dedication formed a part of the remuneration required, and thus procured the manuscript at a somewhat lower price. The words, "the onlie begetter," may possibly, however, have a deeper significance. Why "onlie?" If Thorpe had wished to publish the "Sonnets," the most natural procedure would obviously have been for him to have addressed the author and to have asked him for the manuscript. The author, however, may have refused the request, and Thorpe may even have appealed in vain to one or other of the private friends who possessed the "sugred sonnets," till at last he found his man in Master William Hathaway, the only one who yielded to his request and got the matter settled for him.[1] We have a precisely similar case in the publication of Spenser's "Complaints" in 1591, as we know for certain from "the Printer," in his short Preface "to the Gentle Reader." It is strange that this analogous case has never yet—as far as I know—been referred to by anyone.

This explanation seems to be opposed by an interesting discovery lately made. For Charles Edmonds, in 1873, at Lamport Hall, found a copy (unfortunately an imperfect one) of an hitherto unknown work of Robert Southwell, a work less remarkable for its own sake than for the preface, which is subscribed by the initials "W. H."[2] The work contains four different poems of Southwell's (*a foure-fould Meditation of the foure last Things*, &c.) which this "W. H." had collected and procured for publication. They had long, so he says, existed in obscurity, and would probably never have seen the light of day were it not that they had fallen into his hands by accident. Edmonds, therefore, considers it very likely that

[1] See *Outlines*, i. 208 ff.

[2] Published as No. 3 of the *Isham Reprints*.—*Athen.*, 1873, ii. 528 ff. and 661 ff.

Southwell's W. H. and Shakespeare's W. H. may have been one and the same person, the more so as Southwell's little work was printed in 1606 by G. Eld for Francis Burton, and Shakespeare's "Sonnets" were published only three years later, having been printed at the same house. That two different persons of the same name (or at least the same initials) should, within so short a period, have been engaged in the same occupation and made use of the same printing establishment, Edmonds declares to be too improbable to require refutation. Still there seems no reason why this twice-occurring W. H. may not have been Shakespeare's brother-in-law, unless indeed we doubt that he had any such literary interests, more especially if it be true that he ended his life as a farmer at Weston-upon-Avon; yet this would not necessarily exclude his having literary tastes of the kind described. However, it is not as important to point out who this enigmatical W. H. was, as to prove who he was not, and it may, at all events, be regarded as a settled point that he was not the person to whom the "Sonnets" were addressed, and, moreover, in no way connected with the poems. The question as to whom the "Sonnets" were addressed, has lost its point since the hypothesis of conceiving the poems to be an autobiographical confession, has been set aside. We shall have to return to this question on a future occasion, and shall thus mention here only a few other attempts that have been made to elucidate the matter, which attempts deserve a place as show-pieces in the chamber of literary curiosities.

That Dr. Farmer could believe the "Sonnets" to have been addressed to William Hart, the poet's nephew, and that Tyrwhitt could infer from Sonnet 20 (*A man in hue, all Hews in his controlling*) that one William Hughes or Hews was the object of the poet's devoted friendship is, at all events, within the range of methodical speculation. Dr. Farmer's conjecture is opposed merely by the fact that William Hart was not born till 1600, whereas the "Sonnets" are eulogized by Meres as early as 1598; and Tyrwhitt's supposition must be rejected, if only because no such conclusion as he draws from the lines mentioned can be inferred except by a forced interpretation.[1] On the other hand, absolutely untenable are

[1] In the *Athen.*, 1873, ii. 277 and 335 ff., C. Elliott Browne has certainly pointed out a William Hewes, as well as a John Hewes, both of whom may have belonged to the circle of Shakespeare's acquaintance. Both were

the romances which Ch. A. Brown and Gerald Massey have woven out of the "Sonnets."[1] Ch. A. Brown considers all the "Sonnets" to be one connected poem, the single sonnets merely the different cantos. However, the "Sonnets" are anything but arranged according to a specific plan, and in the second edition ("Poems," 1640)—apart from some omissions and additions—the arrangement is altogether different, and the single sonnets are even furnished with headings. A systematic arrangement of the "Sonnets" has only recently been attempted by Von Bodenstedt, François V. Hugo, Charles Knight, Gerald Massey, and others. According to Gerald Massey the "Sonnets" contain the story of the loves of Lord Southampton and Elizabeth Vernon, and were for the most part written by Shakespeare at the request of the lovers. The supposition that Shakespeare had addressed the greater portion of the "Sonnets" to his wife we have already discussed. The various interpretations of the "Sonnets," in fact, present the oddest and strangest contradictions, and in thinking of those given by George Chalmers, Henry Brown, Barnstorff, and Karpf, we hardly know who deserves the prize for eccentricity—the two Englishmen or the two Germans. Chalmers assumes that all the sonnets were addressed to Queen Elizabeth, whom the poet represents as a man, out of courtesy to his sovereign. Henry Brown brings forward the hypothesis that the "Sonnets" are satires on the love-sonnets and sonnet-writers of the Elizabethan age, and that they are more especially aimed at Drayton and Davies; he

musicians; the former was a favourite of the Earl of Essex, and is mentioned in Waterhouse's account of the Earl's last hours (in Hearne's edition of *Camden's Annals*); the latter is spoken of in the dedication of Drayton's *Ode to Sir Henry Goodere* (about 1605), where Drayton praises his music:—

Which oft at Powlsworth by the fire
Hath made us gravely merry.

Powlesworth is only a few miles from Stratford. Whether these two Hewes were in any way related or acquainted with each other is not known. It is not impossible that William Hewes (Hughes) may have been the Mr. W. H. of the *Dedication*, but he was not the subject of the *Sonnets*, nor were they addressed to him.

[1] Ch. A. Brown, *Shakespeare's Autobiographical Poems. Being his Sonnets clearly developed with his Character drawn chiefly from his Works.* Lond., 1838; Gerald Massey, *Shakespeare's Sonnets never before interpreted.* Lond., 1866.

nevertheless holds to his opinion that the Sonnets have an autobiographical significance. The climax of eccentricity is reached by Barnstorff and Karpf, who think that Shakespeare in his "Sonnets" addressed himself or his genius. Barnstorff interprets the dedication as addressed to *Mr. William Himself*, and maintains the Sonnets of Shakespeare to be "appeals of the mortal to the immortal man within him." Karpf, on the other hand, construes the dedication thus: *To the onlie begetter of these ensuing Sonnets Mr. W. H. wisheth all happiness and that eternitie promised by our ever-living poet.—The well-wishing adventurer in setting forth* (is) *T. T.*[1] Karpf, who seems not to have known his predecessor Barnstorff, makes out that Shakespeare is an Aristotelian, and that he addresses the Sonnets to the action of Reason as it exists in and of itself, where, he says, Man has communion with the Divine Essence. The poet is said to have written the Sonnets, as it were, in special certification of the Divine spirit he felt within him, and also for the purpose of giving posterity a certification of his mental state. Karpf, in fact, seems to have written his book in certification of *his* mental state, though not exactly for posterity!

Shakespeare's contemporaries were unanimous in their admiration of his "Sonnets;" for some length of time after this, we hear nothing of them, and in the eighteenth century they fell into such disrepute that Steevens—although a critic of power and taste—did not introduce them into his edition of the poet's works, for he says, "the strongest act of parliament that could be framed would fail to compel readers into their service."[2] If Shakespeare, he adds, had "produced no other works than these Sonnets, his name would have reached us with as little celebrity as time has conferred on that of Thomas Watson, an older and much more elegant sonnetteer." Our day has pronounced this judgment to be erroneous, for since the beginning of our century the Sonnet has become more and more a favourite subject for æsthetic criticism. This can scarcely be called an exaggerated form of Shakespeare-worship, for even those æsthetic writers who condemn sonnet-poetry, nevertheless willingly admit that Shakespeare's

[1] This construction of the *Dedication* was (as far as I know) first suggested by Philarète Chasles (*Athen.*, Jan. 25, 1862).

[2] Malone's *Shakspeare*, by Boswell (1821), i. 258.

sonnets are unparalleled in their way, and that they stand preeminent among this species of English poetry. Dyce places Milton's alone on a par with them, and from Milton we have, as is well known, but a very small number of sonnets. In opposition to Steevens, it may be maintained that Shakespeare would have become immortal as the greatest English sonnet-writer, even though he had never produced anything but his "Sonnets." Shakespeare's immediate prototype as a sonnet-writer—for even in this he but followed his predecessors—was Samuel Daniel.[1] These lyrics of Shakespeare's —precisely as in the case of his dramatic works—brought a pre-existing and gradually developed species to a climax and a close. Shakespeare in his "Sonnets" not only adopted the form—which his predecessors had borrowed from the Italian original with some unimportant deviations—and handled it in a masterly fashion, but he placed within the given form, substance of the fullest, highest, and richest kind that it was capable of holding. In nobility of sentiment, in depth and wealth of feeling and of thought, as well as in breadth of view, Shakespeare's "Sonnets" are far superior to those of any of his predecessors and contemporaries. Of the subject-matter we shall have to speak again on a future occasion.[2]

VI. A Lover's Complaint appeared originally as an appendix to the *ed. pr.* of the "Sonnets," and in form and substance is allied to "Venus and Adonis" and to "Lucrece." The stanzas are the same as in "Lucrece." In place of the amorous goddess seeking her own pleasure, as in "Venus and Adonis," we have here a forsaken earthly maiden who repents of the pleasures she has enjoyed, but nevertheless revels in the remembrance of the fascinating beauty of her lover, and admits to herself that were she again tempted in the same manner, she would have no more strength to resist than before.

VII. The Tempest. First published in Folio 1. According to Malone and Drake it was written in 1611; according to

[1] Dr. Brinsley Nicholson, *Parallel Passages in Shakespeare and Daniel*, in *N. and Q.*, 1865, No. 174, p. 335; Samuel Daniel, *Delia* (1591, reprinted in Arber's *English Garner*, iii. 599 ff.); *The Complete Works of Samuel Daniel*, ed. Grosart, Lond. 1885, 4 vols.

[2] See *The Sonnets of Wm. Shakspere*, ed. by Edward Dowden, London, 1881.

Fleay in 1610; but it seems much more likely that the play ought to be assigned to the year 1604.[1]

VIII. THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA. First published in Folio 1. One of the earliest plays; according to Delius it was written previous to 1591; according to Malone in 1591; according to Chalmers, Drake, and Fleay, in 1595. Most probably, however, previous to 1590.

IX. THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR. *Ed. pr. A Most pleasaunt and excellent conceited Comedie, of Syr John Falstaffe, and the merrie Wiues of Windsor. Entermixed with sundrie variable and pleasing humors, of Syr Hugh the Welch Knight, Iustice Shallow, and his wise Cousin M. Slender. With the swaggering vaine of Auncient Pistoll and Corporall Nym. By William Shakespeare. As it hath bene diuers times Acted by the right Honorable my Lord Chamberlaines seruants. Both before her Maiestie, and else-where, London, Printed by T. C. for Arthur Johnson, and are to be sold at his shop in Powles Churchyard, at the signe of the Flower de Leuse and the Crowne*, 1602. —T. C. is Thomas Creede. This is a pirated edition, and a very imperfect one; the manuscript is said to have been procured for the publisher by John Busby; this, at least, is Collier's statement.[2] The quarto of 1619, published by the same Arthur Johnson, is merely a repetition of the *ed. pr.* with all its errors. It is entered in the Stationers' Registers under the date of the 18th of January, 1602. The drama did not appear in its present form till published in the first folio.[3] According to Malone, Drake, and Fleay, the play was written in 1601; according to Chalmers in 1596; according to Delius 1598, and according to Hermann Kurz 1595; however, from what has been stated on p. 112, the play must have been written before 1600, for that was the year of Sir Thomas Lucy's death.[4] Halliwell-Phillipps, in his "Outlines," even thinks it probable that the play was written before the production of "Henry V." in 1599. He has published a first sketch of this drama under the title of "The First Sketch of Shakespeare's Merry Wives of Windsor" (ed. by J. O. Halliwell, London, 1842). The

[1] See my *Essays on Shakespeare*, pp. 1-29. Compare Alb. Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany*, ii. 1-75.

[2] *Shakespeare Society's Papers*, iii. 75.

[3] The quarto of 1602 is reprinted in *Shakespeare's Library; a Collection of the Novels*, &c., 2nd ed., pt. ii. vol. ii. p. 107 ff.

[4] *Outlines*, i. 144 ff.

tradition which speaks of this drama having been written at the request of Queen Elizabeth within a fortnight, is first met with in Dennis, "The Comical Gallant; or, The Amours of Sir John Falstaff, 1702," where the story is related in the Epistle Dedicatory in the following words: "I knew very well, that it had pleased one of the greatest queens that ever was in the world, great not only for her wisdom in the arts of government, but for her knowledge of polite learning, and her nice taste of the drama, for such a taste we may be sure she had, by the relish which she had of the ancients. This comedy was written at her command, and by her direction, and she was so eager to see it acted, that she commanded it to be finished in fourteen days; and was afterwards, as tradition tells us, very well pleased at the representation." In 1709 this story was again related by Rowe, and has since then been repeated traditionally. With regard to the interesting allusions in this play to incidents of the time, we may refer the reader more especially to the works of Herm. Kurz [1] and Charles Knight.[2]

X. Measure for Measure. First published in Folio 1. According to Malone, Drake, and Fleay, it was written in 1603; according to Chalmers in 1604; both dates are obviously too late. According to Cunningham [3] the play was performed on the 26th of December, 1604, before the Court at Whitehall. The subject-matter had already been made use of in "Promos and Cassandra," by Whetstone, in 1578, who had borrowed it from Giraldi Cinthio's "Hecatommithi."[4] In England, as well as in Germany, the drama has been frequently remodelled to adapt it to the modern stage. With regard to Davenant's having made use of it in his "Law against Lovers," see my "Essays on Shakespeare," p. 359 ff.

XI. The Comedy of Errors. Mentioned by Meres in his "Palladis Tamia," 1598, but was first published in Folio 1. According to Malone it was written in 1592; according to Chalmers, Drake, and Delius, in 1591; according to Fleay in 1593; it seems to us, however, that it must be moved back to the eighth decade, as it is one of the earliest dramas. Compare Richard Simpson's hypothesis mentioned on p. 310. This

[1] *Zu Shakespeare's Leben und Schaffen*, Munich, 1868.
[2] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 362 ff.
[3] *Revels at Court*, p. 204.
[4] Compare *Shakespeare's Library* (2nd ed.), pt. i. vol. iii. p. 153 ff.

tallies with a remark made by Thornbury,[1] that Shakespeare had clearly been induced to write this play by the birth of his own twin-children at the end of January, 1585. The association of ideas roused in his mind by this event, occupied his thoughts so variously and continuously that he returns to the subject in "Twelfth Night." In "The Comedy of Errors" we have two pairs of twins, in "Twelfth Night" only one. In the first-named play all four children are boys, in the latter the twins are a boy and girl, which was the case in Shakespeare's own family. In "The Comedy of Errors" we have a chaotic state of confusion which exceeds the limits of credibility, whereas this is in no way the case in "Twelfth Night." When it is considered what great use the poet made of the "Menæchmi" and of the "Amphitruo" (see p. 304) in "The Comedy of Errors," it may undoubtedly be said to smack of the schoolroom, and to have, in all probability, been drawn up in outline while the poet was still living in Stratford, after the birth of his twin-children. From a political allusion in Act iii. 2 (*Ant. S.* Where France? *Dro. S.* In her forehead; armed and reverted, making war against her heir), Hallam inferred that the play must have been written before the capture of Paris by Henry IV. (1594). But this again gives us merely a *terminus ad quem*, and Hallam thinks it somewhat hazardous to assume as early a date as 1591. The censure indirectly cast upon "The Comedy of Errors" and "Twelfth Night" by Ben Jonson has already been referred to on p. 161.

XII. Much Ado About Nothing. *Ed. pr. Much adoe about Nothing. As it hath been sundrie times publikely acted by the right honourable, the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants. Written by William Shakespeare. London. Printed by V. S. for Andrew Wise and William Aspley.* 1600. 4*to.* (not divided into acts).—V. S. is Valentine Simmes. Copies exist in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, and in Trinity College, Cambridge. Another well-preserved copy was purchased in 1868 for £235.[2] According to Malone and Fleay it was written in 1600; according to Chalmers, Drake, and Delius, in 1599. The subject is taken from Ariosto. In Harrington's version of Ariosto, p. 39 (1591), it is said: "The tale is a pretie comicall matter, and hath bin written in

[1] *Shakespeare's England*, ii. 39.
[2] See *Athen.*, June 6, 1868, p. 800.

English verse some few years past, learnedly and with good grace, by M. George Turbervil." Dr. Farmer[1] thinks that Shakespeare confined himself to Turbervil's version ("Genevra") without having troubled himself about Ariosto's original.

XIII. Love's Labour's Lost. *Ed. pr. A pleasant Conceited Comedy called, Loues labors lost. As it was presented before her Highnes this last Christmas. Newly corrected and augmented By W. Shakespere. Imprinted at London by W. W. for Cutbert Burby.* 1598.—W. W. probably stands for William Waterson. It is odd that an *ed. pr.* should be described as "newly corrected and augmented;" we may probably infer from this that the original *ed. pr.* had been lost, and that the new one was made to represent it—was, in reality, the second, or even third edition. Otherwise the words would have to be referred to the text that had been obtained at the time of the performances, or, in fact, to a false assertion of the publisher, whose object was merely to delude the public. Another point worthy of note is, that Shakespeare's name is spelt without an *a* in the second syllable, a form that does not occur in any other of the quartos. And no other quarto of this play was published till the time of the first folio; the year 1631 witnessed the appearance of the second and last. Copies of the first quarto are preserved in the Bodleian Library, Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. According to Malone it was written in 1594; Chalmers assumes 1592; Drake, Fleay, and Delius, 1591.[2] At the beginning of Tofte's "Alba" it is said: "Love's Labour's Lost *I once* did see," which proves that the play must have been for years on the stage before it was printed.

XIV. A Midsummer Night's Dream. *Edd. prr.* 1. *A Midsommer night's dreame. As it hath beene sundry times publickely acted, by the Right honourable, the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants. Written by William Shakespeare. Imprinted at London, for Thomas Fisher, and are to be soulde at his shoppe, at the Signe of the White Hart, in Fleetstreete.* 1600.—2. *A Midsommer nights dreame. As it hath beene sundry times publikely acted, by the Right Honourable, the Lord Chamber-*

[1] *An Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare*, &c., 3rd ed., p. 23.

[2] See J. O. Halliwell, "*Account of Tofte's 'Alba,'* 1598, *containing the earliest Notice of Love's Labour's Lost.*" *London*, 1685 *(ten copies)*. See also Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, p. 25.

laine his Seruants. Written by William Shakespeare. Printed by James Roberts. 1600.

Again a Shakespearean enigma: two different *edd. prr.* published in one and the same year. Fisher's edition was entered in the Stationers' registers in October, 1600; that of Roberts is not entered,—hence we do not know whether it appeared before or after Fisher's. Halliwell-Phillipps[1] considers Roberts's the original edition, but Steevens declared himself in favour of Fisher's, and since then Fisher's has pretty generally been regarded as the original edition. Roberts's edition is full of misprints; but, notwithstanding, the editors of the folio made use of it without any reference to the distinctly better text of Fisher's edition, which, indeed, they do not seem to have known. Roberts was, perhaps, merely a printer, and not a publisher as well. Copies of both quartos are preserved in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, and in Trinity College, Cambridge. According to Chalmers the play was written in 1598; Delius assumes 1595; Malone 1594; Drake 1593; Fleay 1592; in all probability it was written after 1590, for the wedding of the Earl of Essex, and first performed on the 1st of May of that year.[2] The comic part of this play was published separately as early as 1646, by Robert Cox, under the title of "The Merry conceited Humours of Bottom the Weaver." Mendelssohn was not the first to make it the subject of a musical composition; this had been done as early as 1692 by an unknown composer, and then by Garrick and Smith in 1755. Among the illustrations to this play, the silhouette pictures by Konewka deserve to be honourably mentioned.

XV. The Merchant of Venice. *Edd. prr.* 1. *The excellent History of the Merchant of Venice. With the extreme cruelty of Shylocke the Jew towards the saide Merchant, in cutting a iust pound of his flesh. And the obtaining of Portia, by the choyse of the three caskets. Written by W. Shakespeare. Printed by J. Roberts.* 1600.—2. *The Most excellent Historie of the Merchant of Venice. With the extreame crueltie of Shylocke the Jewe towards the sayd Merchant, in cutting a iust pound of his flesh : and the obtayning of Portia by the choyse of three chests. As it hath beene diuers times acted by the Lord*

[1] *Shakespeare's Works*, v. 11.

[2] See my *Essays on Shakespeare*, pp. 30-66, aad Herm. Kurz, *Zum Sommersnachtstraum, Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, iv. 268 ff.

Chamberlaine his Seruants. Written by William Shakespeare. At London, Printed by I. R. for Thomas Heyes, and are to be sold in Paules Church-yard, at the signe of the Greene Dragon. 1600.

We here again meet with the same puzzle as in the case of "A Midsummer Night's Dream;" and it is the same James Roberts who leaves it for us to solve. What connection there is between these two editions printed at the same office, but nevertheless different, is still a matter of doubt. It has been assumed that the edition by Roberts (No. 1) is the one that is entered at Stationers' Hall under the date of the 22nd of July, 1598, whereas Heyes (No. 2) had his entered on the 28th of October, 1600; however, this supposition—according to Lowndes-Bohn—does not stand unopposed. Steevens, Dyce, and Halliwell consider the edition of Heyes to be the actual *ed. pr.;* moreover, it formed the basis of the text of the first folio (not without alterations, certainly), and in the folio was divided into acts for the first time. The only way the two editions can be accounted for is that Roberts married a daughter of Heyes, and that he did not start a publishing house of his own till his father-in-law gave up his.[1] Copies of the two quartos are preserved in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, in Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. According to Malone and Delius, the play was written in 1594; according to Chalmers, Drake, and Fleay, in 1597. We must emphatically declare ourselves in favour of Malone's and Delius's opinion.[2]

XVI. As You Like It. To judge from an entry in the register of the Stationers' Company, a quarto edition of this play was certainly contemplated, but, for unknown reasons, none ever appeared, and the play was printed for the first time in Folio 1.[3] According to Malone and Fleay it was written in 1599; Drake assumes 1601; Chalmers 1602; Delius thinks between 1598 and 1600, as the play is not mentioned by Meres, and as the entry in the Stationers' Register, spoken of above, very probably belongs to the year 1600, for the pre-

[1] According to Lowndes-Bohn.

[2] See my *Essays on Shakespeare*, pp. 67-117.

[3] The entry is as follows: 4 *August. As you like yt, a book. Henry the fifth, a book. Every man in his humour, a book. The Comedie of Much adoo about nothinge, a book. To be staied.* Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. 367.

ceding entry belongs to that year. As already remarked, however, Meres not mentioning a play proves as little regarding its existence or non-existence as an entry in the Stationers' Register regarding the date of its production. The subject is borrowed from Lodge's "Rosalynde" (first published in 1590, then in 1592).

XVII. The Taming of the Shrew. First published in Folio 1. According to Malone the play was written in 1596; Chalmers assumes 1599; Drake and Delius 1594; Fleay 1600. Shakespeare has here followed an earlier drama, published in 1594 under the title of "A Pleasant Concerted Historie called The Taming of a Shrew," &c., and has also made use of Gascoigne's translation of Ariosto's "Suppositi." According to Pope's supposition, the earlier drama was a youthful production of the poet's own, whereas Hickson considers it to have been written in imitation of Shakespeare. The subject might be traced back to the "Arabian Nights;" the story is specially well-known in the "Conde Lucanor,"[1] but it is also met with in Danish stories. This comedy seems to have become known in Germany soon after Shakespeare's death. We learn from Gottsched that it was performed under the title of "*Die wunderbare Heurath Petruvio mit der bösen Catharine*," in March, 1658, and that it was also played in Zittau, probably by the pupils of the grammar-school; in Dresden it was performed in 1672, under the title of the First and Second Parts "*Von der bösen Catharina.*"[2]

XVIII. All's Well that Ends Well. Published first in Folio 1. Written, according to Malone and Chalmers, in 1606; Drake and Delius assume 1598; Fleay 1602 or 1604. Knight considers this play one of those of which we have not the smallest evidence that it may not have been produced before 1590; we cannot, however, help believing—with Gervinus and Von Friesen—that it was remodelled at a later date. In all probability it is identical with the play mentioned by Meres under the title of "Love's Labour's Won." The story is taken from "The Decameron," and an English version of it appeared in William Paynter's "Palace of Pleasure" (1566 ff.).[3]

[1] A Collection of Stories by Don Juan Manuel, born in Escalona 1282.

[2] Compare *Kunst über alle Kunst Ein bös Weibgut zu machen.* A German translation of Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*, from the year 1672, republished, &c., by Reinhold Köhler, Berlin, 1864.

[3] See my *Essays on Shakespeare*, pp. 118-150.

XIX. TWELFTH NIGHT; OR, WHAT YOU WILL. First published in Folio 1. Written, according to Malone, in 1607; Chalmers and Drake assume 1613; Delius thinks previous to 1602; Fleay assumes 1598. A passage in Ben Jonson's "Every Man out of His Humour," iii. 1 (*that the argument of his comedy might have been of some other nature*, &c.), is an unquestionable allusion to "Twelfth Night." The story is met with in a volume of tales collected by Bandello and Belleforest, and also in Riche's "Farewell to Military Profession" (1581).[1] It by no means follows from the entry in Manningham's "Diary" that the play he saw performed at the Middle Temple in 1602 was a new piece.[2] Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps[3] praises "Twelfth Night," as "the perfection of English comedy and the most fascinating drama in the language."

XX. THE WINTER'S TALE. First published in Folio 1. Written, according to Malone, Chalmers, and Fleay, in 1611; Drake and Delius assume 1610. Dr. Simon Forman, in his "Diary," relates that he witnessed a performance of this play at the Globe Theatre on the 15th of May, 1611, but does not say that it was a new piece; it seemed also to have been played before the Court that same year, if the notice concerning it can be trusted. But as usual these dates give only the *terminus ad quem*, and "The Winter's Tale" may very well have been written previous to 1611, although in its present form it is not of the latest of Shakespeare's dramas. The subject is taken from one of Robert Greene's stories, which appeared first (in 1588) under the title of "The Triumph of Time," and elaer as "The Historie of Dorastus and Fawnia," which was originally only a secondary title; the story was so immensely popular that, according to Neil, it ran through fourteen editions.[4] In no other of his dramas has Shakespeare so closely

[1] Ed. by Collier for the Shakespeare Society, 1846.

[2] See *The Diary of John Manningham*, ed. by John Bruce for the Camden Society, 1869; *Outlines*, ii. 82.

[3] *Outlines*, i. 183.

[4] Neil, *Shakespeare, a Critical Biog.*, p. 28; reprinted in *Shakespeare's Library* (2nd ed.), part i. vol. iv. See also *The Fortunate Lovers; or, The Historie of Dorastus, Prince of Sicily, and Fawnia, only Daughter and Heir to the King of Bohemia*, London, 1735.—*Dorastus and Fawnia, The Foundation Story of Shakespeare's Winter's Tale*, ed. by J. O. Halliwell, London, 1859 (26 copies privately printed).—*The Fisherman's Tale of the Famous Actes, Life and Love of Cassander, A Grecian Knight*, founded on the Story used by Shakespeare in *The Winter's Tale*, by F. Sabie (in verse), 1595, ed. by J. O. Halliwell, London, 1867 (10 copies).

followed the story which gave him his subject, as in this play and in "As You Like It," a fact that certainly tends to support the conjecture brought forward by Samuel Neil. For if, as Neil says, we assume that these two plays appeared on the stage before the publication of Greene's "Groatsworth of Wit" (1592), and that they were subsequently remodelled, we not only obtain a satisfactory foundation for the plagiarism of which Greene accuses Shakespeare (*an upstart crow beautified with our feathers*), but also an explanation of the way in which the poet earned his livelihood at the beginning of his career in London. The passage already quoted on p. 142 from Marlowe's and Nash's "Dido, Queen of Carthage," iii. 4 (which appeared in 1594), would also receive its proper interpretation:

> Who would not undergo all kinds of toil,
> To be well stored with such a Winter's Tale.

XXI. The Life and Death of King John. First published in Folio 1. Written, according to Malone and Fleay, in 1596; Chalmers and Drake assume 1598. Is mentioned by Meres. An earlier play on the same subject, entitled "The Troublesome Raigne of K. John," appeared in 1591 without giving the author's name; in 1611 it appeared with the initials W. Sh., and in 1622 with the full name of William Shakespeare on the title-page. But, notwithstanding this, almost all critics are agreed in thinking that this earlier piece (which is reprinted in Steevens's "Twenty Plays," and in Nichol's "Six Old Plays," &c.), was not written by Shakespeare; that it was merely remodelled by him, or that, at most, he may have helped in its production. Tieck[1] alone maintains that every line of the earlier play (which he has translated) bears the impress of Shakespeare's hand, and even maintains it to be superior to the later version. "King John" contains no prose passages, and this occurs only in four other of Shakespeare's dramas, all of them works of his younger days.

XXII. The Life and Death of King Richard II. *Ed. pr. The Tragedie of King Richard the second. As it hath beene publikely acted by the right Honourable the Lorde Chamberlaine his Seruants. London Printed by Valentine Simmes for Andrew Wise, and are to be sold at his shop in Paules church yard*

[1] *Alt-Englisches Theatre*, vol. i. p. xvi.

at the signe of the Angel. 1597. 37 *leaves.*—Shakespeare's name is not given. Only two copies are known: the one in Trinity College, Cambridge; the other in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. Up to the date of the first folio there had appeared other four editions, all with the poet's name; the quarto of 1608 has "new additions of the Parliament sceane." (See above, p. 244.) Malone assigns this play to 1593; Chalmers and Drake to 1596; Fleay to 1594. According to Knight, Shakespeare, besides making use of Holinshed, also drew his material from Samuel Daniel's poem "The Civil Wars" (1595), whereas Delius very justly maintains it to be quite possible that Shakespeare's play may have appeared before Daniel's poem. The play contains no prose passages. Forman in 1611 witnessed the performance of a "Richard II.;" it is, however, doubtful whether this was Shakespeare's drama. Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps[1] thinks it was not; Dr. Furnivall[2] assumes that it was.

XXIII. King Henry IV., Part I. *Ed. pr. The History of Henrie the Fourth; With the battell at Shrewsburie betweene the King and Lord Henry Percy, surnamed Henrie Hotspur of the North. With the humorous conceits of Sir Iohn Falstaffe. At London, Printed by P. S. for Andrew Wise, dwelling in Paules Churchyard, at the signe of the Angell.* 1598. 40 *leaves.*—Without the author's name. Copies in the British Museum, Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. Up to the time of the first folio other four quartos had been published with the poet's name; the second (1599) is designated as "newly corrected." According to Malone, Chalmers, Fleay, and Delius it was written in 1597; Drake assumes 1596. In several scenes Shakespeare follows an earlier play written before 1588, called "The famous Victories of Henry the Fifth, containing the honourable Battel of Agin Court," a piece that was popular in spite of its heaviness, and which had passed through a number of editions since 1598. Halliwell-Phillipps has had ten photographic facsimiles made of the second edition of 1617, copies of which are preserved in the British Museum and in Trinity College, Cambridge. It has also been reprinted in Nichol's "Six Old Plays."

XXIV. King Henry IV., Part II. *Ed. pr. The Second*

[1] *Outlines*, i. 174-177, and ii. 359, 362.
[2] In the *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, 1875-6, p. 414.

part of Henrie the fourth, continuing to his death, and coronation of Henrie the fift. With the humours of Sir Iohn Falstaffe, and swaggering Pistol. As it hath been sundrie times publikely acted by the right honourable, the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants. Written by William Shakespeare. London Printed by V. S. for Andrew Wise, and William Aspley. 1600. 43 *leaves.*—V. S. is Valentine Simmes. Copies in the British Museum, the Bodleian, Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. According to Malone it was written in 1599; Chalmers assumes 1597; Drake 1596; Fleay 1598. As Justice Silence is spoken of in "Every Man in His Humour," v. 2 (1599), the play must have been written previous to that date. It was not till 1700 that a second quarto edition appeared, with alterations by Betterton.[1]

XXV. King Henry V. *Ed. pr. The Chronicle History of Henry the fift, With his battell fought at Agin Court in France. Togither with Auntient Pistoll. As it hath bene sundry times playd by the Right honorable the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants. London Printed by Thomas Creede, for Tho. Millington and Iohn Busby. And are to be sold at his house in Carter Lane, next the Powle head.* 1600. 27 *leaves.*—Copies in the British Museum, in the Bodleian, Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Duke of Devonshire's Library. This and the following quartos of 1602 and 1608 seem to have been pirated editions, as may even be inferred from the absence of the author's name. The text is very corrupt and imperfect, whereas that of the first folio has been carefully revised and corrected; the former (according to Delius) consists of about 1,800 lines, while the folio amounts to 3,500. It is possible, however, that the quartos contain the poet's first sketch of the play, as in the case of his "Romeo and Juliet," and that the play only subsequently became extended to its present size. Malone, Drake, Fleay, and Delius assign it to the year 1599; Chalmers to 1597, and Halliwell-Phillipps[2] places it after "The Merry Wives of Windsor." From the prologue to the fifth act, it is evident that the drama was performed (but not necessarily for the first time) while the Earl of Essex was in Ireland, *i.e.* between March and September of the year 1599.

[1] Compare J. Gairdner, *The Historical Element in Shakespeare's Falstaff*, in *The Fortnightly Review*, March, 1873.

[2] *Outlines*, i. 144 ff.

Meres does not mention "Henry V."[1] A passage in Nash's "Pierce Penniless"[2] seems to suggest that in addition to "The Famous Victories of Henry V.," there must have been a second earlier play on the same subject. Nash says: "What a glorious thing it is, to have Henry the Fifth represented on the stage, leading the French king prisoner and forcing both him and the Dolphin sweare fealtie." No such scene, Collier says, occurs in Shakespeare's play, or in "The Famous Victories," so that there is no alternative but to assume that there did exist a third "Henry V."

XXVI. King Henry VI., Parts 1—3. All three Parts first published in Folio 1. The First Part had never been published previously, the two latter never in their present form. The Second and Third Parts show a striking resemblance to two anonymous dramas that had been published as early as 1594 and 1595 under the following titles: 1. The First part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the death of the good Duke Humphrey: And the banishment and death of the Duke of Suffolke, and the Tragicall end of the proud Cardinall of Winchester, with the notable Rebellion of Iacke Cade: And the Duke of Yorkes first claime vnto the Crowne. London Printed by Thomas Creed, for Thomas Millington, and are to be sold at his shop vnder Saint Peters Church in Cornwall. 1594.—2. The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henrie the Sixt, with the whole contention betweene the two Houses Lancaster and Yorke, as it was sundrie times acted by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembroke his seruants. Printed at London by P. S. for Thomas Millington, and are to be sold at his shoppe vnder Saint Peters Church in Cornwal. 1595.—There exists only one copy of each of the two editions, and these are preserved in the Bodleian Library. In 1600 both plays were republished, and in 1619 they appeared together under the title of "The whole Contention betweene the two famous Houses Lancaster and Yorke. With the Tragicall ends of the good Duke Humfrey, Richard Duke of Yorke, and King Henrie the Sixt. Diuided into two Parts: and newly corrected and enlarged. Written by William Shakespeare, Gent. Printed at London for T[homas]

[1] See Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, pp. 401 ff., 405 ff.
[2] Ed. by Collier, p. 60; compare p. vi. ff.

P[avier]." N. d. (1619.) 4to.—Copies are preserved in the British Museum and in the Bodleian. Both plays were reprinted for the first English Shakespeare Society by J. O. Halliwell, under the title of "The First Sketches of the Second and Third Parts of King Henry the Sixth. London, 1843." Subsequently they were printed in the Cambridge Edition of Shakespeare, and also by Delius.

The actual relation between these plays and the two last Parts of "Henry VI." in the first folio, is sufficiently characterized by the fact that, according to Malone's calculation, the two Parts contain 1,171 lines which correspond exactly with the earlier plays, 2,373 lines that correspond with some small differences, and only 1,899 that are absolutely new.[1] There are three possibilities to choose from in accounting for this agreement, all of which possibilities have been supported by well-known Shakespearean commentators, although the first and third possibilities are diametrically opposed to each other. Malone, Collier, and Dyce reject the suggestion that the poet wrote the Second and Third Parts of "Henry VI.;" Coleridge, Hallam, and Halliwell-Phillipps[2] assume that Shakespeare remodelled the older plays, while all the German commentators —Schlegel, Tieck, Ulrici, Delius, and Al. Schmidt, with the exception of Gervinus—ascribe the two Parts, and hence also the two earlier plays as well, unquestionably to Shakespeare. Knight was the only one among the English Shakespearean scholars who adopted the last-mentioned hypothesis; Halliwell-Phillipps, however, has recently come round to the same view by having given up his former opinion. We cannot here enter upon a critical examination of the work. The external evidence of their being Shakespeare's own is sufficient of itself, for if he had merely been the remodeller of the earlier plays Heminge and Condell would assuredly not have included these remodellings among his works, and thus branded their friend as an unparalleled plagiarist. Another proof we have from the poet's own lips, and, although it is not said expressly, it is unmistakable; for in the Epilogue to "Henry V." the poet seems in the following words actually to claim the pieces as his own property:—

[1] *Dissertation on the Three Parts of King Henry VI.* in Malone's *Shakespeare*, by Boswell (1821), vol. xviii.
[2] *The First Sketches*, &c., Introduction.

Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crown'd King
  Of France and England, did this King succeed;
Whose state so many had the managing,
  That they lost France and made his England bleed:
Which oft our stage has shown; and, for their sake,
In your fair minds let this acceptance take.

In addition to this, we have the facts that in the edition of 1619 Shakespeare is named the author, and that Thomas Pavier, who had acquired the right to publish the two earlier plays, had them entered in the Stationers' Register on the 19th of April, 1602, as the First and Second Parts of "Henry Sixth." We have, of course, to take it for granted that this entry is genuine. Those critics who maintain that Shakespeare remodelled the earlier plays support their opinion upon Greene's well-known remark that Shakespeare beautified himself with borrowed plumes, which remark they think was coined for this very case, and are further inclined to believe that Greene was himself the author of the older pieces. But—apart from other reasons connected with style—this supposition is opposed by two considerations: in the first place, if this was really a case of plagiarism, Chettle could not possibly have unreservedly withdrawn the charge; he would have taken his deceased friend under his protection, and joined in the accusation against Shakespeare; and Nash, who is scarcely likely to have felt any friendly disposition towards Shakespeare, would not have called Greene's pamphlet "a scald, trivial, lying pamphlet."[1] In the second place, Greene's attack would have been wholly wanting in point if the line which he parodies, and which occurs in "The True Tragedy,"[2]

O! Tiger's heart, wrapt in a woman's hide,

had been his own and not Shakespeare's. That Marlowe, to whom Malone and Dyce ascribe the older plays, did not write them, has been pointed out by German critics from internal evidence, and in a manner that scarcely leaves any doubt. However, even in this case, we must bear in mind the uncertainty there is in internal evidence and the appreciation of style. Shakespearean scholars differ so widely in this respect from one another, that one commentator will declare a passage

[1] See above, p. 142.
[2] *The First Sketches*, &c., p. 132.

to be undoubtedly Shakespeare's where another will maintain it to be absolutely unworthy of him, and that it cannot possibly have proceeded from his pen; one commentator fancies he can recognize with certainty Marlowe's hand in the plays in question, while another will declare them to be anyone's work but Marlowe's. Hence, in this case again, it is obvious how much more external evidence is to be relied upon. What seems to us to come nearest the truth, after examining all the investigations made on the subject, is as follows: the two earlier plays were written by Shakespeare himself, but are disfigured and mangled in various ways, being clearly pirated editions, patched together from shorthand notes; and it has already been shown on p. 276, from remarks quoted from Heywood and others, how little such editions are to be relied upon. The plays are youthful productions of Shakespeare's, probably his first attempts in the domain of history, and Ulrici has justly pointed out how erroneous it is to expect to find the same brilliant qualities in the poet's youthful works, that distinguish the masterpieces of his later years, and to reject everything as un-Shakespearean that cannot be measured by the standard of those masterpieces. It can scarcely be doubted that Shakespeare wrote the First Part after having written the Second and Third Parts. The two last Parts, according to Ulrici, had been performed on the stage towards 1589-1590, and the First Part was given subsequently in 1591. That these are the latest possible dates is proved by the allusion in Greene's "Groatsworth of Wit," which must have been written at latest during the first half of 1592, and by the passage quoted on p. 64, from "Pierce Penniless" (which likewise appeared in 1592), according to which brave Talbot, the terror of the French, was again triumphant on the stage after having lain in his tomb for 200 years. This passage can, in fact, refer only to the "First Part of Henry Sixth," at least no other play is known to which it could refer.[1] In F. G. Fleay's essay, entitled "Who wrote Henry VI.?"[2] we have the latest form assumed by Shakespearean controversy towards this drama. The First and Third Parts contain no prose.

XXVII. The Tragedy of K. Richard III. *Ed. pr. The*

[1] See *Outlines*, ii. 81.
[2] See *Macmillan's Magazine*, Nov. 1875.

Tragedy of King Richard the third. Containing, His treacherous Plots against his brother Clarence: the pittieful murther of his innocent nephewes: his tyrannicall vsurpation: with the whole course of his detested life, and most deserued death. As it hath beene lately Acted by the Right honourable the Lord Chamberlaine his seruants. At London, Printed by Valentine Sims, for Andrew Wise, dwelling in Paules Churchyard, at the signe of the Angell. 1597. 47 *leaves.*—Copies are preserved in the Bodleian Library, at Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. The poet's name was not given to the play till the following year, in the second quarto edition, issued by the same publisher, but a different printer. The following quartos (and seven appeared up to the date of the first folio) are falsely described as "newly augmented," for there was no alteration of, or addition to the text till the publication of the first folio. Malone considered the quarto text to be the best; Steevens, and recently again Delius, have declared themselves in favour of the folio.[1] According to Malone the play was written in 1593; Chalmers assumes 1596; Drake and Fleay 1595; Delius is inclined to agree with Malone, and maintains that it cannot have been written much later; the play is mentioned by Meres. The subject had been treated dramatically by writers before Shakespeare. As early as the year 1579 a Latin play of "Richardus Tertius," by Dr. Legge, had been performed with success at St. John's College, Cambridge, and an English tragedy on the same subject, by an unknown author, was published in 1594, under the title of: "The True Tragedie of Richard the third: Wherein is showne the death of Edward the fourth, with the smothering of the two yoong Princes in the Tower: With the lamentable ende of Shore's wife, an example for all wicked women. And lastly, the coniunction and ioyning of the two noble Houses, Lancaster and Yorke. As it was playd by the Queene's Maiesties Players. London, Printed by Thomas Creede, and are to be sold by William Barley, &c. 1594."[2]—The fact of Shakespeare not having made use of this play, but

[1] See Delius in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, vii. 124-169, *Ueber den ursprünglichen Text des King Richard III.* R. Koppel opposes Delius's opinion, and speaks in favour of the quarto text in his *Textkritische Studien zu Richard III. und King Lear*, Dresden, 1877.

[2] This *True Tragedie of Richard the Third*, together with Dr. Legge's *Richardus Tertius*, have been published for the English Shakespeare Society by Barron Field (1844).

confining himself to Hall and Holinshed, is a proof that his drama was written earlier, or, at all events, about the same time. But even Shakespeare's play was not considered to have dramatically exhausted the subject, for B. Jonson in 1602 (hence during Shakespeare's lifetime) received from Henslowe £10, in advance, for a drama on Richard Crookback, which he was, and meant to have written, to compete with his friend.

XXVIII. KING HENRY VIII. Appeared first in Folio 1. According to Malone and Chalmers it was written in 1603; Drake assumes 1602; Fleay and Delius 1613. Collier and Halliwell-Phillipps[1] assign it to the year 1604. In all probability it was first written in 1602-3, and remodelled in 1612-13.[2] From letters of Thomas Lorkin and Sir Henry Wotton, it is known that during a performance of this piece the Globe Theatre was burned down on the 29th of June, 1613. It contains no prose except in the last scene but one, which favours the supposition of its early origin.

XXIX. TROILUS AND CRESSIDA. *Ed. pr. The Famous Historie of Troilus and Cresseid. Excellently expressing the beginning of their loues, with the conceited wooing of Pandarus Prince of Licia. Written by William Shakespeare. London Imprinted by G. Eld for R. Bonian and H. Walley, and are to be sold at the spred Eagle in Paules Churchyeard, ouer against the great North doore.* 1609. 46 *leaves.*—Copies in the British Museum, the Bodleian Library, Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. A new title-page to this quarto was issued by the same firm that same year; very likely the first edition was published before the performance of the play at the Globe, and the new title-page was printed merely to announce this fact. The list of contents on the title-page, as well as the explanatory preface, could then be omitted, as the play itself was then sufficiently well-known and popular. The text of the second edition differs from that of the first only by a few improvements in the type, which were doubtless made while the play was being printed. The title of the second edition is, "The Historie of Troylus and Cresseida. As it was acted by the Kings Maiesties seruants at the Globe. Written by William

[1] *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, ii. 151 ff.

[2] My *Essays on Shakespeare*, pp. 151-192. Also James Spedding's *Shakspere's Share in Henry VIII. distinguisht from Fletcher's*, in the *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, 1874, i. 1 ff.

Shakespeare. London Imprinted by G. Eld for R. Bonian and H. Walley, and are to be sold at the spred Eagle in Paules Church-yeard, ouer against the great North doore. 1609." 45 leaves.—In the Stationers' Register the piece is entered under the date of the 28th of January, 1608-9, under the title of "The History of Troylus and Cressula." According to Malone and Fleay it was written in 1602; Chalmers assumes 1610, and Drake 1606. Dryden, on the other hand, in the preface to his version of the play, considers it one of Shakespeare's youthful works. He says: "Shakespeare, in the apprenticeship of his writing, modelled it into that play which is now called by the name of Troilus and Cressida." This play has, of late years especially, been the subject of numerous inquiries. Even Shakespeare's contemporaries seem to have been doubtful as to which species of drama it belonged; in the preface to the first quarto it is mentioned as one of the comedies, and compared with the best works of Terence or Plautus; in the Register of the Stationers' Company, and on the title-page of the quartos, it is termed a history, and in the folio it is described as a tragedy. The position it occupies in the folio, between the Histories and the Tragedies, and without paging, is indeed strange, and this has given rise to various speculations.[1] The question to which class of Shakespeare's plays "Troilus and Cressida" belongs, is by no means one of mere external importance, but is most intimately connected with the question whether we have to consider it as a parody on ancient history and ancient views of life, or as a romantic picture suggested by the mediæval offshoots of Greek mythology, and interwoven with antique views of life. The latter supposition is Hertzberg's;[2] it is worked out with as much ingenuity as sound scholarship, and presented in such a manner as to be in the highest degree probable.

XXX. Coriolanus. First published in Folio 1. According to Malone it was written in 1610; Chalmers and Drake assume 1609; Fleay 1606; Delius ascribes it to the poet's last period, which commences about the year 1608. This tragedy has not offered much material for critical investigation or controversy

[1] Drake, *Shakspeare and his Times*, ii. 264, concludes, from the want of pagination, that through some oversight the piece had not been printed with the other dramas, and that it had been added subsequently.

[2] See *Die Quellen der Troilus-Sage in ihrem Verhältniss zu Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida*, in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, vi. 169-225; also the

in any direction. Knight[1] thinks that, owing to its length, it can never have been played during Shakespeare's lifetime. As if "Hamlet" (according to one calculation) did not contain some hundred lines more!

XXXI. TITUS ANDRONICUS. *Ed. pr. The most lamentable Romaine Tragedie of Titus Andronicus. As it hath sundry times been playde by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembrooke, the Earle of Darbie, the Earle of Sussex, and the Lorde Chamberlaine theyr Seruants. At London, Printed by I. R. for Edward White, and are to bee solde at his shoppe, little North doore of Paules, at the signe of the Gun.* 1600. 40 *leaves.*—I. R. is James Roberts. In the Register of the Stationers' Company, "Titus Andronicus" was entered as early as the 6th of February, 1593, under the title of "A booke entitled 'A Noble Roman historie of Titus Andronicus,'" and Langbaine[2] reports that the first quarto of the play appeared in 1594, but no copy of that edition is known. With the exception of Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps,[3] almost all English commentators are agreed that Shakespeare—for æsthetic reasons—cannot have been the author of this drama, but they do not enter fully into what they believe to be the self-evident statements.[4] Such expressions of mere feeling can in no way shake external evidence (as, for instance, its having been mentioned by Meres and its admission in the folio), and this has been pointed out by German critics in the most convincing

Essays in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, iii. 252-300 (by Eitner), vii. 238-300 (by Hense), and ix. 26-40 (by Ulrici).—Körting, *Dictys und Dares, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Troja-Saga*, &c., Halle, 1874.

[1] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 523.

[2] *Account of English Dramatic Poets*, 1691.

[3] *Outlines*, i. 97-103; i. 267-269; ii. 261 ff.

[4] An unfortunate attempt to prove this has been made by F. G. Fleay in the *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, i. 98 ff., inasmuch as he has collected a list of words which occur only in *Titus Andronicus* and in no undoubted play of Shakespeare's. This argument has, however, been brilliantly refuted by Mr. Richard Simpson (*Transactions*, &c., i. 114 ff.), who has made out a list of the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* in every play, and according to his calculation *Titus Andronicus* (together with *Measure for Measure*, *King John*, and *Richard II.*) occupies the twenty-fifth, and *Henry V.* the first place; that is to say, *Henry V.* contains relatively (judging by its length) the largest number of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, namely, 549, *i.e.* one to every six lines, whereas *Titus Andronicus* has only 196, *i.e.* one to every thirteen lines. Mr. Simpson thus points out that the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* are absolutely no criterion for the genuineness or spuriousness of a Shakespearean play.

manner, more especially by Hertzberg.[1] I unhesitatingly agree with his ingenious and scholarly arguments, and with Ulrici's, which agree with Hertzberg's, more particularly as regards the date when the drama was written (1587 or 1588) and the date of the ballad in Percy's "Reliques," "The Tragical History of Titus Andronicus," which was undoubtedly written after Shakespeare's drama. This date for the origin of the play is supported not only by the most important internal characteristics, but also by an allusion in the Introduction to Ben Jonson's "Bartholomew Fair," which English commentators, for no reason, refer to a non-Shakespearean drama. The passage is: "He that will swear Jeronimo or Andronicus are the best plays yet, shall pass unexcepted at here, as a man whose judgment shows it is constant, and hath stood still these five-and-twenty or thirty years."—"Titus Andronicus" is one of the five plays which contain no prose.

XXXII. ROMEO AND JULIET. *Ed. pr. An excellent conceited Tragedie of Romeo and Juliet. As it hath been often (with great applause) plaid publiquely by the right Honourable the L. of Hunsdon his Seruants. London Printed by Iohn Danter*, 1597. 39 *leaves*.—Copies in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, and in Trinity College, Cambridge. This is probably a disfigured, pirated edition of an earlier version. The last and final redaction is found in the following quarto, with which the later quartos and the folios correspond. The title of this second quarto is: "The most excellent and lamentable Tragedie of Romeo and Juliet. Newly corrected, augmented, and amended: As it hath bene sundry times publiquely acted, by the Honourable the Lord Chamberlaine his Seruants. London Printed by Thomas Creede, for Cuthbert Burby, and are to be sold at his shop neare the Exchange. 1599." 46 leaves.—Copies are preserved in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, and at Trinity College, Cambridge. Shakespeare's name is omitted both in the first and second quartos. According to Malone it was written in 1596; Chalmers assumes 1592; Drake and Fleay 1593, and Delius somewhere about 1591. The sources from which Shakespeare drew his material have been very fully discussed; they appear to have been more abundant in this case than in that of any other of the poet's

[1] In the Schlegel-Tieck translation, ix. 289-304, published by the German Shakespeare Society.

dramas. It is now regarded as certain that an English piece on the same subject existed as early as 1560. Well known is Arthur Brooke's poem that appeared in 1562, entitled "The Tragicall Historye of Romeus and Iuliet, written first in Italian by Bandell, and nowe in English by Ar. Br."[1] And the Shakespeare Society's Papers (vol. iv. 6-16) point out an older Italian poem, called "L'Infelice Amore dei due Fedelissime Amanti Giulia e Romeo, scritto in Ottava Rima da Clitia, nobile Veronese, ad Ardeo suo. Veneggia, 1553." This poem consists of four cantos, and in all the main features—even the manner of Juliet's death—corresponds with Shakespeare's work, so that there is no doubt that Shakespeare must have known it. The Spanish drama too had treated the subject before Shakespeare's day.[2]

XXXIII. Timon of Athens. First published in Folio 1. According to Malone and Chalmers it was written in 1610; Drake assumes 1602; Fleay 1606; Delius thinks towards 1608. There is no doubt that this drama has come down to us in a mutilated form; it cannot possibly have been produced by Shakespeare as we now have it. Numerous speculations have been made by commentators to account for the corrupt form, but no unanimous conclusion has been arrived at. Most critics (and Knight at their head) assume two different hands as recognizable in this drama, and Fleay—with most enviable self-assurance—has separated the portion declared to be genuine, *i.e.* Shakespeare's own work, and has published it by itself in the Transactions of the New Shakspere Society.[3] There probably existed an older "Timon," which, to judge from what Delius says, was very likely written by George Wilkins and partially remodelled by Shakespeare. In opposition to this hypothesis Tschischwitz maintains that Shake-

[1] Ed. by P. A. Daniel for the New Shakspere Society, Lond., 1875.

[2] Compare *Castelvines y Monteses, Tragi-Comedia*, by Frey Lope Felix de Vaga Carpio, translated by F. W. Cosens, London, 1869; *Los Bandos de Verona, Monteses y Capeletes*, by Francisco de Rojas y Zorrilla, Englished by F. W. Cosens, London, 1874. See also *Shakespeare's Romeo and Julia, Eine kritische Ausgabe des überlieferten Doppeltextes mit vollständiger Varia Lectio bis auf Rowe, nebst einer Einleitung über den Werth der Textquellen und den Versbau Shakespeare's*, by Tycho Mommsen, Oldenburg, 1859; F. G. Fleay, *Romeo and Juliet*, in *Macmillan's Magazine*, July, 1877.

[3] *The Life of Tymon of Athens, as written by W. Shakspere, from the folio of* 1623 (*the usual insertions by another hand in the play being left out*), edited by F. G. Fleay.

speare was the original author, and that his play was, at a later date, arranged by some stage-poet for representation. Ulrici assumes that the play was subsequently remodelled by Shakespeare himself (independently of any other second hand), and infers, from the signatures and the paging of the folio, that the MS. was not ready at the time, but had been hurriedly put together from the transcripts made for the various actors. It does not seem unlikely that, intentionally or unintentionally, some portions of the older "Timon" got introduced into the play when it was being thus hurriedly put together.[1]

XXXIV. JULIUS CÆSAR. First published in Folio 1. According to Malone, Chalmers, Drake, and Fleay it was written in 1607, obviously too late a date; Delius thinks previous to December, 1604. The simpler treatment of the subject, the lesser degree of conciseness, and the more regular form of the versification prove—as Delius very justly points out in his introduction to "Julius Cæsar"—that we must assign this play to an earlier date than the two other Roman plays. In Weever's "Mirror of Martyrs" (1601), there is a most unequivocal allusion to Shakespeare's "Julius Cæsar;" hence it must have been written before 1601, nay, even before 1599, for Weever says that his book had lain for two years in his desk ready for the press.[2] This is a striking proof in favour of the opinion that Shakespeare's career began and ended earlier than is generally supposed. With regard to the relation between Shakespeare's drama and Lord Stirling's piece of the same name (1604) conjectures alone can be made, and the statements in Henslowe's "Diary" about an apparently rival piece in 1602, must be accepted with the utmost caution. That the subject should have repeatedly been made use of for dramatic treatment is only natural.

XXXV. MACBETH. First published in Folio 1. According to Malone, Chalmers, and Drake it was written in 1606; Fleay assumes 1603; Delius between 1603-1610. That this tragedy was written after James's accession to the throne is proved by

[1] Delius, *Ueber Shakespeare's Timon of Athens*, in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, ii. 335-361; Tschischwitz, *Timon of Athens, Ein kritischer Versuch*, in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, pp. 160-197; Schlegel-Tieck's translation published by the German Shakespeare Society, x. 315 ff.; Georg Kullmann, in Schnorr von Carolsfeld's *Archiv für Literatur-Geschichte*, vol. xi. pp. 196-245.

[2] Compare Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*. pp. 42 and 165.

Macbeth's mentioning among the descendants of Banquo also such "that twofold balls and treble sceptres carry," and also from the fact that in Act iv. 3, allusion is made to the "touching for the evil," a means of cure which was reintroduced by King James. That the play existed in 1610 seems to be proved by a detailed description of a performance of it on the 20th of April, 1610, in Dr. Simon Forman's "Diary," which however was discovered by Collier, and hence must be accepted with caution. The internal evidence corresponds with what has been said above, in so far as it would assign the drama to Shakespeare's last period.

XXXVI. HAMLET, PRINCE OF DENMARK. *Ed. pr. The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke. By William Shake-speare. As it hath beene diuerse times acted by his Highnesse seruants in the Cittie of London: as also in the two Vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxford, and elsewhere. At London printed for N. L. and Iohn Trundell.* 1603. 33 *leaves.* —N. L. stands for Nicholas Ling. Only two copies are known to exist: in the one copy, discovered in 1823 and purchased by the Duke of Devonshire, the last leaf is wanting; in the other, which was discovered in Dublin and is now in the British Museum, the title-page is wanting. The first quarto is a pirated edition, and, in the opinion of various critics, not only has a mutilated text, but is an earlier version; the final redaction has come down to us in the second quarto, published one year later, under the title of "The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke. By William Shakespeare. Newly imprinted and enlarged to almost as much againe as it was, according to the true and perfect Coppie. At London, Printed by I. R. for N. L., and are to be sold at his shoppe vnder Saint Dunstons Church in Fleetstreet. 1604." 51 leaves.—Only three copies are known to exist, and are in the possession respectively of the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Howe, and Mr. Huth. Of the first quarto there is both an English reprint (London, 1825) and a German one (Leipzig, 1825). We have already referred to the photolithographic facsimiles. S. Timmins has published an instructive set of reprints of the quartos, printed on opposite pages.[1] According to Malone the drama was written in 1600;

[1] *Hamlet*, 1603, *and Hamlet*, 1604; *being exact Reprints of the First and Second editions from the Originals in the Possession of the Duke of Devonshire*, &c., London, 1859.

Chalmers assumes 1598; Drake assigns the first edition to 1597 and the second to 1600; Fleay assumes 1604; Delius 1600-1602. Many commentators believe in the existence of a pre-Shakespearean "Hamlet" by an unknown author (that Kyd is said to have written it is a mere conjecture); other commentators maintain that this older "Hamlet" was nothing but a youthful work of Shakespeare's own, and an earlier redaction of the play. This question, as well as other points connected with the date of its origin, the sources of the plot, the relation in which the folio stands to the quartos, and these to one another, and, above all, the question of the intention and significance of the play, are subjects of investigation never yet solved either in England or in Germany, and indeed are insolvable. Of all Shakespeare's dramas no other has called forth such an extensive literature of its own as "Hamlet;" it is impossible, accordingly, to mention here even the principal editions, commentaries, and critical essays on this drama.

XXXVII. KING LEAR. *Edd. prr. M. William Shakspeare: His True Chronicle Historie of the life and death of King Lear and his three Daughters. With the vnfortunate life of Edgar, sonne and heire to the Earle of Gloster, and his sullen and assumed humor of Tom of Bedlam. As it was played before the Kings Maiestie at Whitehall vpon S. Stephens night in Christmas Hollidayes. By his Maiesties seruants playing vsually at the Gloabe on the Bancke-side. London Printed for Nathaniel Butter, and are to be sold at his shop in Paul's Churchyard at the signe of the Pide Bull neere St. Austin's gate.* 1608. 41 *leaves.*—*M. William Shake-speare, His True Chronicle History of the life and death of King Lear and his three Daughters. With the vnfortunate life of Edgar, sonne and heire to the Earle of Glocester, and his sullen and assumed humour of Tom of Bedlam. As it was plaid before the King's Maiesty at White-Hall, vppon S. Stephens night, in Christmas Hollidaies. By his Maiesties Seruants, playing vsually at the Globe on the Bancke-side. Printed for Nathaniel Butter.* 1608. 44 *leaves.*—Copies of both quartos are preserved in the, British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, at Trinity College Cambridge, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. According to Steevens there was a third quarto of the same year, a reprint of the first. What the circumstances were that produced these two or three simultaneous editions from

the same publishing house, have not yet been explained. The entry of the piece in the Stationers' Register was made by Butter and Busby conjointly, on the 26th of November, 1607. After this no quarto edition appeared again till 1655. According to Malone, Chalmers, and Fleay the play was written in 1605; Drake assumes 1604; Delius 1604-5; Furness somewhere between 1603-1606. An older play, entitled "The True Chronicle History of King Leir and his three Daughters, Gonerill, Ragan and Cordelia," which was entered in the Stationers' Register in 1594, and published in 1605, is reprinted in Steevens's "Twenty Plays," and by Nichols in his "Six Old Plays." Shakespeare has made only small use of it; his principal sources were Holinshed's Chronicle, Harsnet's "Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures" (1603), and Sidney's "Arcadia" (for the episode of Gloucester and his sons). The story is also met with in Spenser's "Fairie Queene" (ii. 10) and in Higgins's "Mirror for Magistrates," but Shakespeare has scarcely borrowed anything from either of these works. The ballad of King Lear in Percy's "Reliques" is undoubtedly post-Shakespearean.[1]

XXXVIII. Othello, The Moor of Venice. *Ed. pr. The Tragoedy of Othello, The Moore of Venice. As it hath beene diuerse times acted at the Globe, and at the Black Friers, by his Maiesties Seruants. Written by William Shakespeare. London, Printed by N. O. for Thomas Walkley, and are to be sold at his shop, at the Eagle and Child, in Brittans Bursse.* 1622. 48 *leaves.*—The printer N. O. seems to be unknown. Copies are preserved in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, and at Trinity College, Cambridge. The play is entered in the Stationers' Register under the date of the 6th of October, 1621. Malone assumes the play to have been written in 1604; Chalmers 1613; Drake 1612; Fleay 1605. The subject is taken from Giraldi Cinthio's "Hecatommithi," which was translated into French in 1584. As no English translation is known, the poet must either have used the Italian original or the French translation.

XXXIX. Antony and Cleopatra. First published in Folio 1. According to Malone, Chalmers, Drake, and Fleay, the play

[1] See Delius, *Ueber den ursprünglichen Text des King Lear*, in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, x. 50 ff.; R. Koppel, *Textkritische Studien zu Richard III. und K. Lear*, Dresden, 1877.

was written in 1608—a rare instance of unanimity! Delius very justly does not fix upon any definite year. On the 20th of May, 1608, "a book called Anthony and Cleopatra" was entered in the Stationers' Register. This is one of the pieces remodelled by Dryden. Knight[1] thinks that, owing to its great length, the tragedy can never have been played during Shakespeare's lifetime, but the reasons he gives for this supposition are in no way satisfactory.

XL. CYMBELINE. First published in Folio 1. Malone assumes it to have been written in 1609; Chalmers in 1606; Drake 1605; Fleay says probably in 1604; Delius thinks not much before 1610-11. Delius supports his argument upon an entry in Dr. Simon Forman's "Diary."[2] The poet took his subject partly from Holinshed, partly from Boccaccio.[3]

XLI. PERICLES. *Ed. pr. The late, And much admired Play, called Pericles, Prince of Tyre. With the true Relation of the whole Historie, aduentures, and fortunes of the said Prince: As also, The no lesse strange, and worthy accidents, in the Birth and Life, of his Daughter Marina. As it hath been diuers and sundry times acted by his Maiesties Seruants, at the Globe on the Banck-side. By William Shakespeare. Imprinted at London for Henry Gosson, and are to be sold at the sign of the Sunne in Paternoster row, &c.* 1609. 35 *leaves.*[4]—Copies are preserved in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, and at Trinity College, Cambridge. The play was entered in the Stationers' Register on the 20th of May, 1608; how the right of publication was acquired by Gosson is not known. Possibly the change was connected with the circumstance that before Gosson's edition appeared, Nathaniel Butter had obtained from George Wilkins the right to publish a novel that had been founded upon the play, and that, in fact, the novel was published before the play had appeared in print. The novel, which has been reprinted by Tycho Mommsen (Oldenburg, 1857), is called "The Painful Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre. Being the true History of the Play of Pericles, as it was lately presented by the worthy and ancient Poet John Gower. At London, Printed

[1] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 523. [2] See above, p. 246.
[3] *Giornata II., Novella* 9.
[4] The Cambridge editors have pointed out two quartos from the year 1609.

by T. P. for Nat. Butter, 1608." 4to. 40 leaves.[1] The drama appeared in other four quarto editions (in 1611, 1619, 1630, and 1635), and was then, in 1664, admitted into the third folio, after having been omitted in the first two folios. By many commentators "Pericles" is considered not Shakespeare's work, partly at least (more especially the first two acts), and Fleay has, in this case also, separated the supposed spurious portions, and published the rest as a connected whole.[2] Fleay—in the same way as S. Walker[3] had previously done—distinguishes no less than three different hands (firstly Shakespeare, secondly the author of the brothel scenes, and thirdly the "arranger"); it is obvious, therefore, what degree of trust can be placed in such proceedings, which no metrical calculation can divest of the character of the most subjective arbitrariness. Delius is incomparably more careful and thorough in working out his ingenious hypothesis, that George Wilkins, the author of the novel "Pericles," was also the original author of the two dramas "Pericles" and of "Timon," both of which, he considers, were subsequently remodelled by Shakespeare. The objections which underlie this hypothesis have been ingeniously worked out by Ulrici, and in all essential points I fully endorse what he says. The external evidence by which "Pericles" is accounted a genuine work of Shakespeare's is so unequivocal, that it cannot well be opposed either by the omission of the play in the first and second folios, or by the undeniable and excessive corruption of the text; and, in fact, this very corruption of the text seems to allow of the possibility of Shakespeare having been the author. There seems no reason to doubt that Dryden was right when—in the preface to Davenant's "Circe" (1677)—he described "Pericles" as the first product of Shakespeare's Muse:—

Shakespeare's own Muse his Pericles first bore.

In any case, it was one of the poet's first works, and this, when rightly understood, is perfectly in accordance with the

[1] This novel differs in a remarkable manner from *The Historie of Hamblet* and from Percy's *Ballads*, &c., by frankly and honestly admitting on the title-page its connection with the drama.

[2] Published under the title of *The Strange and Worthy Accidents in the Birth and Life of Marina. By William Shakspere.* In the *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, i. 195 ff.

[3] *Critical Examination*, iii. 333.

internal characteristics of style, versification, &c. The other passages where "Pericles" is alluded to, and in most cases highly praised, but also at times severely censured, are well known.[1] In the case of "Timon," we were forced to assume that the MS. was obtained in a mutilated and incomplete condition, and we are in the present case also obliged to adopt a similar hypothesis; and, in fact, as we have here to do with a youthful work, such a state of matters is even much more likely and self-evident. In the case of "Timon," Heminge and Condell had to procure the MS. by hook or by crook, for as space had been left for the play, it had to be introduced somehow. The result, however, was so unsatisfactory, and so little in accordance with the editors' intention, that, when they found themselves in the same predicament with regard to "Pericles," they preferred omitting the play altogether, rather than offering it to their readers in the mutilated condition in which it existed in the quartos. Another circumstance that proved even a more serious obstacle to their reprinting the quartos was that the right of publication was not theirs, and that they could not come to terms with the proprietor. For there can be no doubt that even so-called pirated editions could not be reprinted; this is evident from two circumstances. First of all, they were entered in the Stationers' Register like any other publications, and secondly, the copyright was transferred from one publisher to another by purchase. Both procedures would have been senseless and useless if works could have been reprinted at will. Whether the editors of the first folio added the thirty-seventh play to the other thirty-six plays belonging to their friend, was naturally a matter of much less importance in those days than it is for us nowadays, when we are inclined to look upon every syllable that has proceeded from Shakespeare's pen with reverence. They knew that even without this youthful work, a *monumentum ære perennius* was being erected to the memory of their friend; they had done their duty to him and to posterity, and had, above all things, secured to posterity the grand masterpieces of the poet's maturest period. They could, therefore, with a clear conscience, decide to omit "Pericles" rather than hand it down to posterity in a

[1] See Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, pp. 58, 64, 117, 118, 203, 265.

crippled form. Owing to the fresh and vigorous spirit that pervaded the life and poetic productions of those days, less importance was attached to the preservation of the weaker mental offspring than is done in our day; if one or other was lost, a new one was produced—substitutes sprang up in every breach. The reverence for mental work is a sentiment of modern times.

The question as to how the text of the quartos was procured cannot be fully entered into here, but it may be assumed that the last three acts were put together from portions of the prompter's book that still existed, the first two acts from the transcripts made for the actors, or, what is more probable still, from the actors' recollection of their parts. Any *Johannes factotum* of the stage would have been equal to such a task—George Wilkins as well as any other—for Shakespeare himself had already retired from the stage when the first quarto was published. If this was what actually happened, it would also explain how it is that the style of verse in the first two acts, and more especially the much-discussed feminine terminations, have a more modern appearance than the three other acts; the actors unconsciously modernized them in the course of years, and the rigid blank verse of the eighth decade gradually became rounded off into the freer form of the seventeenth century, whereas the MS. —in so far as it had been preserved—gave the original form of the poet's words much more faithfully, even though not altogether correctly. Yet it was not the actors alone who were to blame for the differences in the metrical form—the stage-poet who wrote down and collected the various parts was even more responsible for the alterations. If all these circumstances are carefully considered without prejudice, two points seem beyond a doubt: in the first place, that "Pericles" is a genuine work of Shakespeare's, and moreover one of his earliest, if not absolutely his first, as Dryden maintains; and secondly, that the drama—especially the first two acts—has not been preserved in its original form, and was omitted by the editors of the first folio because they were unable to procure the original. The publishers of the third folio were less scrupulous, and considered it advisable to arouse the interest of the public and to attract purchasers by adding new plays. These additions, as is well known, consisted of "Pericles" and six other dramas, which are usually classed together as

the "doubtful plays." Of late years this designation has been made to include not a few other plays which it would have been wiser to have described as spurious or pseudo-Shakespearean. English critics, as a rule, reject them all, whereas in Germany many commentators have expressed themselves in favour of them. It is distinctly evident here how much depends upon external evidence, for in the case of these doubtful plays, where the decision rests solely upon style and metrical peculiarities, differences of opinion have arisen that are scarcely likely ever to be satisfactorily settled; the less so, as it cannot be ascertained how far the dishonest speculations of booksellers may have intentionally concealed or perverted the true state of matters. The name of Thomas Pavier, which recurs over and over again in connection with this question, is enough to raise a feeling of distrust at every step, for his name is not met with upon any one of Shakespeare's undoubted works, with the exception of "Henry V." and the Two Parts of "Henry VI.," of which plays Pavier published editions that were obviously pirated and distorted. The seven doubtful plays have been republished, sometimes all together, sometimes in connection with other pseudo-Shakespearean dramas, and sometimes singly;[1] they have also been translated into German by various writers, and accordingly deserve more consideration than they generally receive. We shall enumerate them in the order in which they are mentioned on the title-page of the third folio.[2]

XLII. THE LONDON PRODIGAL. *Ed. pr. The London Prodigall. As it was plaide by the Kings Maiesties seruants. By William Shakespeare. London, Printed by T. C. for Nathaniel Butter, &c.* 1605. 4*to.*—T. C. is Thomas Creede. Copies are preserved in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, at Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. No entry of this play has been found in the Register of the Stationers' Company, but, to judge

[1] *Supplement to the Edition of Shakespeare's Plays*, published in 1778 by Samuel Johnson and George Steevens (by Edm. Malone), London, 1780, 2 vols.; *The Supplementary Works of Wm. Shakespeare*, ed. by Wm. Hazlitt, London, 1859.

[2] In Malone's *Supplement*, given by Hazlitt (*Supplementary Works*), &c., the original order is changed thus: *Locrine, Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cromwell, The London Prodigal, The Puritan, A Yorkshire Tragedy.* The reason of this alteration I cannot understand. The third folio itself I have no opportunity of consulting.

from a passage in the first act, it must have been written in 1603 or 1604. Malone says he does not know whether to be more surprised at the publisher's impudence in placing Shakespeare's name on the title-page of such a work, of which he probably never wrote one line, or at Shakespeare's own indifference to the matter, and of his having calmly allowed such a piece of forgery to be practised unheeded. Hazlitt says: "If it is Shakespeare's at all, it must have been among the sins of his youth." Ulrici[1] thinks it is "unquestionably spurious." On the other hand, Coleridge[2] declares it to be genuine, and, according to Schlegel,[3] Lessing also pronounced himself in favour of it, and intimated that it was his intention to put the play upon the German stage.[4]

XLIII. LORD CROMWELL. *Ed. pr. The True Chronicle Historie of the whole life and death of Thomas Lord Cromwell. As it hath beene sundry times publickely Acted by the King's Maiesties Seruants. Written by W. S. London Printed by Thomas Snodham.* 1613. *4to.*—Copies are preserved in the Bodleian Library, at Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. As early as the 11th of August, 1602, there is an entry in the Register of the Stationers' Company, by William Cotton, of "a booke called: The Lyfe and Death of the Lord Cromwell, as y^t^ was lately acted by the Lord Chamberleyn his Seruantes"; and Malone[5] states that he was told it had been printed that same year; however, no copy exists of that supposed edition. The initials W. S., which several English critics have referred to Wentworth Smith, Malone thinks had nothing whatever to do with the initials of the real author, but were placed on the title-page to deceive the public; the publisher, in fact, wished to awaken the belief that the play was a continuation of "Henry VIII.," for which reason he had a second edition issued in 1613, at the time of the revival of "Henry VIII." Dr. Farmer assumes that Thomas Heywood was the author of it.[6]

XLIV. SIR JOHN OLDCASTLE. *Ed. pr. The first part of*

[1] *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art*, ii. 372.
[2] *Literary Remains*, ii. 86 ff.
[3] *Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst* (Heidelberg, 1809), ii. 2, 238.
[4] Compare *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, 1874, p. 256, note.
[5] *Supplement*, ii. 373.
[6] Malone's *Supplement*, ii. 446.

the true and honorable history of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the good Lord Cobham. As it hath bene lately acted by the Right honorable the Earle of Nottingham Lord High Admirall of England, his Seruants. Written by William Shakespeare. London, Printed for T. P. 1600. 4*to.*—T. P. is Thomas Pavier. Copies are preserved in the British Museum and at Trinity College, Cambridge. It was entered at Stationers' Hall on the 4th of August, 1600, by Thomas Pavier, under the title of "The First Part of the History of Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham." Upon the same occasion there was also entered "The Second Part of the History of Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, with his Martyrdom;" this second part was, however, never published. The author's name is not mentioned in either of the two entries. The subject is taken from Holinshed. From the Prologue, which makes the hero of the play an evident contrast to Falstaff, it is perfectly clear that Shakespeare cannot have been the author of "Sir John Oldcastle," and from Henslowe's "Diary," in fact, it is clear that the play was written in 1599 by Munday, Drayton, Wilson, and Hathway—although of course it must be left uncertain how far Henslowe's "Diary" is an uncorrupted source. Dr. Farmer ascribes this play also to Heywood, whereas Schlegel[1] classes it with "Lord Cromwell" and "The Yorkshire Tragedy" as undoubtedly among "the best and maturest" of Shakespeare's works.

XLV. The Puritan. *Ed. pr. The Pvritaine or the Widdow of Watling-streete. Acted by the Children of Paules. Written by W. S. Imprinted at London by G. Eld,* 1607. 4*to.*—Copies are preserved in the British Museum, at Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. The piece was entered at Stationers' Hall on the 6th of August, 1607, by G. Eld, under the title of "A booke called The Comedie of the Puritan Wydowe." Malone[2] refers the initials to William Smith; however, Malone had, of course, never heard of the dramatist Wentworth Smith, whom we know of from Henslowe's "Diary," otherwise he would have probably considered him the author, in place of William Smith, who is known only as a sonnet-writer.

XLVI. A Yorkshire Tragedy. *Ed. pr. A Yorkshire Tragedy. Not so New as Lamentable and true. Acted by his*

[1] *Vorlesungen*, &c., 1809, ii. 2, 238.
[2] *Supplement*, ii. 190.

Maiesties Players at the Globe. Written by W. Shakspeare. London, printed by R. B. for Thomas Pauier, &c. 1608. 4*to.* —Copies are preserved in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. A second quarto appeared in 1619, also published by Pavier. The entry in the Stationers' Register was made by Pavier on the 2nd of May, 1608, under the title of "A booke called A Yorkshire Tragedy." According to Ulrici[1] the entry gives Shakespeare's name as the author. This piece was performed at the Globe, together with three other short plays, under the common title of "All's One," as is evident from the title, "All's One, or one of the four plaies in one, called a Yorkshire tragedy." The murder upon which the play is founded is reported in Stowe's "Chronicle," and was perpetrated in 1604. Collier, Dyce, Ulrici, and others are inclined to think that Shakespeare had an important hand in this drama, without seeing any objection in the fact that Shakespeare never, in any other instance, brought the domestic troubles of everyday life upon the stage, and never introduced an ordinary crime into the realm of the Tragic Muse.

XLVII. LOCRINE. *Ed. pr. The lamentable Tragedie of Locrine, the eldest sonne of King Brutus, discoursing the warres of the Britaines and Hunnes, with their Discomfiture: The Britaines victorie with their Accidents, and the Death of Albanact. No lesse pleasant than profitable. Newly set foorth, ouerseene and corrected by W. S. London, printed by Thomas Creede* 1595. 4*to.*—Copies at Trinity College, Cambridge, and in the Duke of Devonshire's Library. The play was entered at Stationers' Hall on the 20th of July, 1594, by Thomas Creede, without the author's name. In Kirkman's "Catalogue of Plays," printed in 1661, the piece is not yet ascribed to Shakespeare, and the editor (publisher or printer) of the third folio—hence in no way an important authority—seems to have been the first to refer the initials W. S. to Shakespeare. Dr. Farmer considered the author to be identical with the author of "Titus Andronicus;" Malone ascribes the play to Marlowe, and is convinced that W. S. stood for William Smith, who had revised the play for the press after Marlowe's death in 1593. Ulrici maintains that the comic portions are Shakespeare's. "Locrine" is crammed full of pedantic

[1] *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art*, ii. 397.

phrases and a ridiculous show of learning, and for this reason alone cannot be Shakespeare's work.

This closes our review of those works of Shakespeare contained in the original editions, but not by any means the series of dramas that have been ascribed to Shakespeare by various commentators. The latter series is, in fact, inexhaustible, in so far as it every day produces new aspirants to this honour. In addition to the plays already discussed, there are a few others which must not be passed over altogether unnoticed, viz., "Edward III.,"[1] "Arden of Feversham," "Mucedorus," "Fair Em," "The Birth of Merlin," "The Merry Devil of Edmonton," "The Double Falsehood," &c.[2] Full particulars concerning these plays will be found in the various editions and translations of the Doubtful or Pseudo-Shakespearean plays. Special mention must, however, be made of the drama "Sir Thomas More,"[3] for Richard Simpson, in an ingenious essay,[4] brings forward evidence, not only that the play was remodelled by Shakespeare, but even that scenes which Shakespeare had added to the play or rewritten were preserved in his own handwriting. Simpson's account of the MS.[5] is, in fact, of interest, and deserves consideration even though we may not be inclined to agree with his hypothesis. He places "Sir Thomas More" on a level with "Thomas Lord Cromwell" and "Pericles," and concludes his argumentation with the following words: "'Pericles' is Shakespeare's, 'Cromwell' was printed with his initials in his lifetime, and 'More' is much more worthy of him than 'Cromwell.' All three belonged to his company of actors."

And not only dramas, but even smaller poems have, in recent days, been brought forward with the claim of being productions of Shakespeare's Muse. It will be sufficient here to refer to the much-discussed poem, "My thoughts are winged with hopes," discovered in a collection of poems in

[1] Collier, in *The Athenæum* of 1874, i. 426, has emphatically declared himself in favour of *Edward III.* being a play of Shakespeare's. Von Friesen, in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, ii. 64-89, opposes the supposition.

[2] With regard to *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, see above, p. 300.

[3] Published by Dyce for the Shakespeare Society.

[4] The essay appeared in *Notes and Queries*, July 1, 1871 (vol. viii. pp. 1-3), under the title of *Are there any extant MSS. in Shakespeare's Handwriting?*

[5] *MS. Harleian* 7368, in the British Museum.

the Hamburg Library, but no longer to be found there, and of which poem Goethe[1] published a translation, with a commentary and Shakespeare's signature.

[1] In *Kunst und Alterthum*, ii. 52, and iii. 1, 56.

Chapter VI.

SHAKESPEARE'S INTELLECTUAL CULTURE.

MORE than a hundred years have passed since Dr. Farmer[1] published his famous "Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare," an essay which to a certain extent may be said to mark an epoch, and of which Dr. Warton said that it had exhausted the subject once and for ever. But although, in our day, no one becomes so readily famous—every beginner and dilettante in the study of Shakespeare is expected to know Farmer's "Essay"—it is pleasant in this instance to have unquestionable testimony that the uninterrupted work and investigations of a century have not been in vain. Nowadays we no longer inquire into Shakespeare's "learning"—of which there can scarcely be any question—but into his intellectual culture,[2] and we now possess an incomparably greater amount of material to enable us to answer the inquiry from a freer and wider range of view, and one which, at the same time, penetrates more deeply into the subject. For Farmer nowhere advances beyond the point of comparing passages and giving quotations. That a hundred years hence the Shakespearean

[1] *An Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare, addressed to Joseph Cradock, Esq.*, by Richard Farmer, M.A., Cambridge, 1767. A second and greatly enlarged edition appeared that same year. Subsequent editions appeared in 1789 and 1821, in addition to one issued at Bâsle in 1800.—Farmer was born at Leicester on the 28th of August, 1735, and died at Cambridge on the 8th of September, 1797. He accomplished nothing in the domain of literature beyond this *Essay*, but he deserves to be remembered as having been one of the first to collect a valuable library of Elizabethan literature which cost him about £500, and was sold by auction after his death, bringing in over £2,000. See a series of learned and spirited papers by Dr. Maginn on Farmer's *Essay*, printed in *Fraser's Magazine*, 1839; Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 111.

[2] In order at once to prevent any misapprehension, it must be emphatically stated that by *intellectual culture* I mean all positive or acquired knowledge, in contrast to what may be conferred by nature.

scholars of the future may regard our present work somewhat in the same way as we do Farmer's is in no way a depressing thought; on the contrary, we consider it encouraging. If Farmer and his contemporaries had not acted as pioneers, we should not have arrived at our better knowledge of the subject, and if we were now to sit with our hands idle, the next century would be no further than the point which Farmer reached. The smallest, as well as the greatest efforts, accordingly, teach us the necessity for, and the blessings of incessant mental work continued on an uninterrupted chain of thought.

Farmer understood learning to mean exclusively a knowledge of languages, and, indeed, more especially a knowledge of the classical languages.[1] It is almost inconceivable to us nowadays to think how zealously Farmer's predecessors (Gildon, Sewel, Grey, Whalley, Upton, &c.) endeavoured to prove Shakespeare's classical learning. Every image, every sentence, every description, nay, almost every good thought met with in Shakespeare, he was supposed to have borrowed from the ancients. Upton even maintained the ancient form of metre to be recognizable in Shakespeare, and found a deep significance in the fact that Shakespeare made the witches in "Macbeth" speak in ithyphallic lines (brachy-catalectic trochaic dimeters).[2] Gildon was so far carried away as to exclaim, "The man who doubts the learning of Shakespeare hath none of his own."[3] It was inevitable that so one-sided and extravagant a tendency should undergo a change, especially as it was not based upon any satisfactory foundation; and the tendency did experience a change through Farmer's work. But even before Farmer's day—if the tradition is to be trusted—John Hales of Eton (1584-1656), whom Malone calls "the ever-memorable," may claim to have rendered a somewhat similar service by having compared Shake-

[1] Ch. A. Brown (*Autobiographical Poems*), in addition to giving a chapter with the same heading as Farmer's, has a second one on *Shakespeare's Knowledge*.

[2] John Upton, *Critical Observations on Shakespeare*, London, 1746 (2nd ed. 1748). The work is, however, not without value. See R. Gr. White, *Shakespeare's Works*, i. cclxxv.

[3] An absolute contrast to these words of Gildon's are found in a remark of John Dennis, who says, "*He who allows Shakspeare had learning, and a familiar acquaintance with the Ancients, ought to be looked upon as a detractor from the glory of Great-Britain.*"—Farmer (3rd ed.), p. 6.

speare's poetry with the writings of the ancients, nay, of having even classed Shakespeare as superior to the ancient writers, without, however, having entered upon the question as to what Shakespeare had borrowed from them. This tradition, which is first met with in Dryden's "Essay of Dramatic Poesy" (1668), again in Nahum Tate (1680), then in Gildon's "Letters and Essays" (1694), and lastly in Rowe (1709), turns upon an assertion of Hales: "that there was no subject of which any Poet ever writ, but he would produce it much better treated of in Shakespeare." This is Dryden's version of the story. The remark was improved upon as it passed from hand to hand, till it took the form of a story of a solemn academical meeting held at Hales's rooms at Eton, where a discussion took place on the relative merits of the ancients on the one hand, and of Shakespeare on the other. Gifford has given a clever account of the gradual growth of this tradition, of course not without turning it to the advantage of his beloved B. Jonson; he thinks the story was got up merely in order to cast censure upon Ben Jonson, who is introduced as Shakespeare's accuser, and that the original statement was not made by Hales but by Jonson, and hence that if Hales made use of the remark he was a plagiarist.[1]

Farmer, in the preface to his second edition, says: "Had I not stept in to his rescue, poor Shakespeare had been stript as naked of ornament, as when he first held horses at the door of the playhouse," for "this was stolen from one classick—that from another." Without too closely approaching the poet, whom he reverences, Farmer points out with clearness and insight, that Shakespeare by no means possessed the intimate knowledge of the languages and literatures of the ancients which had been generally ascribed to him, and that all the allusions to and imitations of the classic authors were not derived from the original works but from translations, and hence that these must have been widely known in Queen Elizabeth's day.[2] Farmer's unquestionable merit lay in having (to use his own

[1] Gifford, *B. Jonson's Works*, i. cclxii.; Dr. Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, pp. 198 ff. and 341.

[2] The passages quoted in proof of this are of course those where Shakespeare has followed the mistakes and deviations in the existing translations. Thus the line *Redime te captum quam queas minimo* in *The Taming of the Shrew*, i. 1, is not taken from the original, but quoted as it stands in Lily's *Grammar*. The lines *Ye Elves of hills, of standing Lakes and Groves*, &c., in *The Tempest*, v. 1, correspond almost word for word with Golding's

expression) "removed a deal of the learned rubbish," and in having pointed out the actual sources Shakespeare made use of, and which had up to that time been almost unknown. In our day it makes a somewhat comic impression to find Farmer excusing himself for the work he proposes to undertake. It is characteristic of the times, when professional scholars considered it much beneath their dignity to occupy themselves with national literature, and Farmer thinks that people may smile at "all such reading, as was never read," and possibly, he thought, he may have gone too far in this, but that "the reading was necessary for a Comment on Shakspeare."

It is not in this direction that Farmer has gone too far, but in having finally arrived at the conclusion that the *Hig, hag, hog* of the Welsh parson in "The Merry Wives of Windsor" may have been the only Latin which Shakespeare remembered from his school-days. He consoles himself and his readers with a remark fuller of good sounding words than of good sense, viz., that Shakespeare did not require "the stilts of languages to raise him above all other men." Farmer's whole inquiry is based upon Ben Jonson's well-known words that Shakespeare knew little Latin and less Greek. Farmer's duty ought clearly to have been, in the first place, to test Ben Jonson's assertion from Jonson's own point of view, in order to ascertain how far he was capable of judging, and what interpretation was to be put on the word *little*. Jonson, as is well known, wished to be considered a very learned man, and was all the prouder of his classical knowledge because it had been, for the most part, acquired in a laborious, autodidactic fashion; it was not till he had reached the age of forty-five that he obtained the degree of M.A. at Oxford.[1] He himself calmly uttered the famous words, that "he was better versed, and knew more in Greek and Latin than all the Poets in Eng-

translation of the *Metamorphoses* (vii. 197). In *Julius Cæsar*, iii., Antony says wrongly: *On this side Tiber*, in place of *On that side Tiber*, as Theobald has corrected it. And North translated it thus, whereas the Greek is πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ. In the same way the line: *Made her Of Lower Syria, Cyprus, Lydia Absolute Queen* (in *Antony and Cleopatra*, iii. 6), is a mistake of North's; in the original it is quite rightly put Λιβύης.

[1] Ch. A. Brown (*Autobiog. Poems*, p. 136) says: "It will, I am aware, be impossible to prove that Shakespeare would have been better or worse, if qualified for Master of Arts, but the bare notion of such a consummation is awful."

land,"[1] to which, unquestionably, Upton's very pertinent remark may be added, that "people will allow others any qualities but those upon which they highly value themselves."[2] To the detriment of his poetry, Jonson, as already intimated, made a great display of his knowledge of classic antiquity, and did so in a pedantic and affected manner; in his "Catiline" (act iv.) he has inserted a complete speech of Cicero's (337 lines); in his "Poetaster" (v. 1) a number of lines from the "Æneid" (iv. 160 ff.), and so on;[3] and his "Masques" are almost smothered by learned notes, without which, however, they would be unintelligible both to men and gods. This is the usual style employed by persons who have acquired their knowledge laboriously. And, as was but natural, Ben Jonson was ridiculed for it by his contemporaries. Chapman, who possessed no inconsiderable knowledge of the ancient languages himself, charges Jonson with this in a sarcastic epigram, which even Gifford is unable to rid of its sting except by declaring such "malicious trash" as not genuine:—

> Greate-learned wittie Ben, be pleased to light
> The world with that threeforked fire; nor fight
> All us, the sub-learn'd, with Luciferus' boast
> That thou art most great learn'd, of all the earth,
> As being a thing betwixt a humane birth
> And an infernal, no humanitye
> Of the divine soule shewing man in thee,[4] &c.

The anecdote which speaks of Shakespeare himself having upon one occasion ridiculed his friend's pedantic learning with the "latten spoons," has already been referred to on p. 152.

A man who looked down upon the learning of other men with such contempt cannot possibly be an impartial judge of their achievements. What Jonson calls *little* Latin and *less* Greek might have been a pretty considerable amount, although it is scarcely likely that Shakespeare—owing to the short time he attended school—ever acquired great facility or

[1] B. Jonson's *Conversations with Drummond*, ed. D. Laing, p. 37.

[2] Farmer, *l.c.*, 3rd ed., p. 4.

[3] "There is scarce a poet or historian," says Dryden, in his *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, "among the Roman authors of those times, whom he has not translated in *Sejanus* and *Catiline*. But he has done his robberies so openly, that one may see he fears not to be taxed by any law. He invades authors like a monarch, and what would be theft in other poets, is only victory in him," &c. Everything can be defended or excused in such a manner.

[4] Compare Chapman, *The Iliad of Homer*, ed. Rich. Hooper (1865), i. xlvii. ff.; *B. Jonson's Works* (in one vol. 1838), p. 32.

accuracy in Latin, or have learned much more than the first elements of Greek. It was not only Ben Jonson, however, who spoke thus; other contemporaries of the poet, in their envy and malice, fancied that this was the weak point where Shakespeare was assailable. Nash has attacked him in the passages already quoted on pp. 86 and 141, and although Shakespeare's name is not directly mentioned there, the passages can scarcely have any significance except in connection with him. Whether, and how far, Nash exaggerates the smallness of Shakespeare's classical knowledge may be left undecided; malice and envy are too plainly written on his brow for him to be looked upon as an impartial witness. Shakespeare must, to some extent, have carried on the work he began at school; it may perhaps have been—as already intimated—that "Phrases Linguæ Latinæ," and other similar books published at Vautrollier's establishment, rendered him good service in this respect. Shakespeare's having acquired some knowledge of classical mythology need not exactly be regarded as remarkable, for it was a common possession in the Elizabethan period. In his earliest works more particularly Shakespeare occupied himself mainly with classical subjects, and he only gradually threw off the pedantry of classic allusions.[1] At all events he acquired a right understanding of and appreciation for the relation in which his mother-tongue stood to the Latin language, and for the formation of words. Even Theobald (in the Preface to his "Essay") drew attention to the fact that no poet has ever made such extensive use of the Latin element in the English vocabulary as Shakespeare; but this very just and important remark is immediately followed by the reservation that it must not be inferred from this that Shakespeare was intimately acquainted with the ancient languages.[2] How-

[1] And in the poet's earliest works we find Latin-English words of peculiar formation which are perhaps Shakespeare's own invention; for instance, in A LOVER'S COMPLAINT: *And credent soul to that strong-bonded oath—Appertainings—must your oblations be—And dialogued for him what he would say—The mind and sight distractedly commix'd—These often bathed she in her fluxive tears*, &c. And the wrong quantities Andrónicus, Hypérion, Posthúmus, Arvirágus, &c., may also be mentioned, although they do not prove anything against Shakespeare, as it was a usual custom. Otherwise he has used the Greek names perfectly correctly, as John W. Hales has pointed out in his *Notes and Essays on Shakespeare* (1884), pp. 105-119.

[2] Ch. A. Brown, *Autobio. Poems*, p. 124 ff. See also Hallam. *Introd.*

ever, the employment of this element of the language—which is nowhere strikingly or inappropriately conspicuous, but used everywhere with propriety and ingenuity—surely furnishes, at least, a not unimportant proof of Shakespeare's appreciation of language. But besides this, Shakespeare also makes use of the Latin-English element of the language, with good results, in describing ridiculous pedantry, boastful foolishness, and vainglorious ignorance—a point which Farmer passes over in silence. In proof of this we need only refer to the Latinized phrases used by Armado, to the flourishes and quotations used by Holofernes and Sir Nathaniel, and to the comical manner in which Mrs. Quickly and the two Gobbos misapply their words.[1] This humorous application of linguistic knowledge Dr. Farmer, with all his learning, would scarcely have managed, and Ben Jonson, too, is far inferior to Shakespeare in this respect; it further proves, moreover, that Shakespeare had undoubtedly got beyond his *Hig, hag, hog*.

But nevertheless we willingly admit that Shakespeare may not have been a fluent reader of Latin, much less of Greek authors, and that he was very far from being a regular student of languages. And yet would not the case have been much the same with any other great poet? To Shakespeare as to Scott, Byron, Goethe, Schiller, and others, languages were not the object, but the means by which the treasures of foreign literature were opened up to them; no poet as ever disdained the use of translations, if by their aid he could attain his object at less expense of time and labour. Shakespeare was in the fortunate position of being able to have access, at all events, to most of the achievements of the Latin authors, by means of a series of translations; they answered his purpose sufficiently

Lit. Eur. (1854), ii. 180, who points out, in proof of Shakespeare's knowledge, several expressions which are used in their original Latin meaning, and not in the meaning they subsequently acquired in English. Hallam might have added to the examples he gives, the word "*excess*" in THE MERCHANT OF VENICE, i. 3: *By taking nor by giving of excess.*

[1] LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST: *Tender juvenal—condign praise—festinately hither—dost thou infamonise me?*—SECOND PART OF KING HENRY IV.: *rampallian—fustilarian—he's an infinitive thing upon my score—excellent good temperality—cannot one bear with another's confirmities—aggravate your choler*—MERCHANT OF VENICE: *as my father shall frutify—the suit is impertinent to myself—that is the very defect of the matter—he has a great infection—my young master doth expect your reproach*, &c.

well, although of course the translations were far inferior to the versions we now possess, as a result of the enormous increase and depth of our knowledge of antiquity, and also of the increased development and pliability of our modern languages. The revival of the study of the classics, which was carried on with peculiar zeal in England, produced towards the middle of the sixteenth century a voluminous literature of translations. Of Latin authors, the English had at that time versions of some, if not of all, the works of Vergil, Ovid, Horace, Lucan, and Seneca, of Livy, Tacitus, Sallust, Suetonius, Cæsar, Curtius, and others.[1] No translation of Plautus' "Menæchmi" appeared till 1595,[2] and no translation of Terence till 1598,[3] so that it is doubtful in how far Shakespeare can have made use of these translations (or whether he used the originals).[4] The dressing up of the Pedant in "The Taming of the Shrew" was certainly taken from the "Trinummus," but by means of "The Supposes;" the names Tranio and Grumio in the same play are taken from the "Mostellaria." Of the later Latin authors, Shakespeare must certainly have known Baptista Mantuanus,[5]

[1] Vergil's *Bucolica*, translated by Abraham Fleming, 1575; by William Webbe, 1586 (in hexameters): *The Georgics*, by the same, 1589; the *Æneid*, by Phaier and Twyne, 1573. Also the first four Books by Stanihurst, 1583 (a ridiculous, unenjoyable caricature, in hexameters). Who, in reading the *Æneid*, does not think of *Hamlet*, ii. 2: *One speech in it I chiefly loved; 'twas Æneas' tale to Dido?—The Metamorphoses*, by Arthur Golding, 1567. *Horace*, the first two *Satires* of the first Book, by Lewis Evans, 1564; his *Poetic Art*, *Epistles and Satires*, by Thomas Drant, 1567. Lucan's *Pharsalia*, by Sir Arthur Georges, 1614. Seneca's *Tragedies*, by Studley, Nevile, Nuce, Jasper Heywood, and Thomas Newton, complete, 1581. *Livy*, by Philemon Holland, 1600. *Tacitus*, by Sir Henry Saville and Richard Grenaway, 1591 and 1598. *Sallust*, by Thomas Paynell and Thomas Heywood, 1557 and 1608. *Suetonius*, by Philemon Holland, 1606. *Cæsar*, by Arthur Golding, 1565, and Clement Edmundes, 1600. *Curtius*, by John Brande, 1561. *Cicero de Officiis*, by Robert Whytinton, 1533, and by Nicholas Grimald about 1553. (From this translation is taken the passage in the Second Part of *Henry VI.*, iv. 1: *Than Bargulus, the strong Illyrian pirate.*) *Ammianus Marcellinus*, by Philemon Holland, 1609 (according to Meissner's *Investigations on Shakespeare's Tempest*, 62 ff., it was made use of in *The Tempest*). See Drake, *Shakspeare and his Times*, i. 483 ff.

[2] By W. W. (William Warner ?).

[3] By Richard Bernard, *Terence's Comedies translated into English.*

[4] *Plautus and Shakespeare*, in *N. and Q.*, 25 June, 1870, No. 130, p. 594. With regard to the *Amphitruo* as the source of the *Comedy of Errors*, see above, p. 304.

[5] In reality Baptista Spagnolus of Mantua, about 1400; see Hallam,

whose works were in those days so generally used in schools, for in "Love's Labour's Lost," iv. 2, he makes a tender allusion to him. Greek literature was less well represented by translations; the Greek tragedies in particular were wanting, and in some cases the translators did not use the original works, but were content with Latin or French versions. Hence it is obvious that not only Shakespeare, but people generally, to use Jonson's expression, knew less Greek than Latin. Still, Homer (only partially it is true), Herodotus and Polybius (also only partially), Thucydides, Diodorus Siculus, Appian, Ælian, Josephus, and—last, not least—Plutarch, had all been transplanted on to English soil.[1] That Shakespeare was acquainted with Heliodorus' *Æthiopica*, in Thomas Underdowne's translation,[2] is inferred from a passage in "Twelfth Night" (v. 1, 112).[3] What industrious use Shakespeare made of North's Plutarch is well known. Plutarch was his almost exclusive authority, his one and all, in connection with ancient history. In "Coriolanus" (v. 3, for instance,) the speech of Volumnia ("Should we be silent and not speak," &c.) is taken almost word for word from him. With regard to the other translations, Shakespeare seems to have been more especially well acquainted with Golding's version of the "Metamorphoses," and with Seneca, who was held in high esteem in those days. Shakespeare's contemporaries repeatedly compare him to the honey-sweet Ovid, and call him the English Seneca. According to the passage from Nash quoted on p. 86, Shakespeare had studied an English

Introd. Lit. Eur. (1854), i. 222 ff. Of *Mantuanus* there was also an English translation by George Turberville, 1567; a new edition in 1594. Warton, *History of English Poetry* (1840), ii. 432; Drake, *l.c.*, i. 28.

[1] *Ten Books of Homer's Iliad*, by Arthur Hall (after Hugues Salel), 1581. Of Chapman's translation, the first seven Books of the *Iliad* appeared in 1598 (the remainder and the *Odyssey* not till later). *Herodotus*, Books i. and ii., 1584. *Polybius*, by Christopher Watson, 1568. *Thucydides* (from the French of Claude de Seyssel), by Thomas Nicolls, 1550. *Diodorus Siculus*, by Thomas Hocker, 1569. *Ælian*, by Abraham Fleming, 1576. *Josephus*, by Thomas Lodge, 1602. *Plutarch's Lives* (from the French by Amyot), by Sir Thomas North, 1579. George Gascoigne's *A Hundredth Sundrie Flowres bounde up in one small Poesie* (1572), contains translations from *Euripides*, *Ovid*, *Petrarch*, and *Ariosto*.—Charles Fox and Dr. Latham believe that Shakespeare knew *Euripides;* Dyce, on the other hand, rejects the supposition as "*a mere fancy*."—*The Athenæum*, 1871, ii. 561, and 1872, i. 346.

[2] Licensed to Francis Coldocke in 1568-9; another edition appeared in 1587.

[3] See Dr. Aldis Wright, *ad loc.*

translation of Seneca "by candle-light," and drawn many a good idea from him. But that Seneca could not for any length of time have either captivated or inspired him is perfectly clear; for in "Hamlet," ii. 2, he gives him the attribute of being "too heavy." He says, "Seneca cannot be too heavy, nor Plautus too light." Ovid he describes as "the most capricious poet, honest Ovid," and refers to his banishment "among the Goths" (ought not the word perhaps to be read *Getes?*) in "As You Like it," iii. 3.

But whether Shakespeare derived his knowledge from study or from intuition, this much is certain, he has conceived the spirit and character of classic antiquity more correctly, and in a truer and grander spirit, than many a mere book-scholar who might boast, not only of being able to read Greek and Latin authors without the aid of a dictionary, but able to write the languages as well—able, in fact, to boast of a great deal of Greek and even more of Latin, as opposed to Shakespeare's "little Latin and less Greek." In this respect also Shakespeare stands pre-eminent above all other poets, as is sufficiently proved by his Roman plays. In form and unessential minor matters they are anything but antique, certainly; drums, cannons, clocks, and such things, are introduced into the Roman plays without the slightest compunction. But his characters—his Cæsar, Brutus, Portia, Coriolanus, Antony, Ulysses (in "Troilus and Cressida")—where can they be matched in antique truth and grandeur? We need only take the classic drama of France to observe the difference at a glance. As regards "Troilus and Cressida," it can scarcely be said that classic antiquity is there held up to ridicule, for the play is not founded upon the Homeric poems, but upon the fantastic, mediæval outcome and excrescences of the Homeric elements. (See p. 347.) Classic antiquity Shakespeare found described in Plutarch in such a worthy and definite form, that he would surely have been loth to parody that which had furnished him with grand dramatic subjects. What he did parody (if indeed there can be any question about parodying) was the mediæval form of hyper-romanticism; and if in so doing genuinely antique elements dropped from his pen, this need hardly surprise us, seeing that for years he had been occupied with them. It cannot be doubted that Shakespeare must, with sympathetic joy, have welcomed the revival of the study of the classics,

and that he thoroughly appreciated the world-embracing significance of Humanism. The elevating and refining influence upon taste which proceeded from Humanism, as well as from the study of modern poetry (of Italian poetry in particular), he experienced not only in his own case, but recognized it in the wider sphere of the national life and literature. And he is scarcely likely to have regarded Humanism as existing for itself, but as a factor in the national development. Humanism was not to check the peculiar development of his nation, but to promote and to elevate it; and in the same way as he made use of the foreign elements himself, he expected it of the nation likewise. If learning were to be of any value, it must not be lifeless, but must act as a stimulant upon the civilization and culture of the people.

We must now return to Farmer's work, for he discusses not only Shakespeare's knowledge—or, as he says, Shakespeare's want of knowledge—of the ancient languages, but also his acquaintance with the modern languages. Farmer, however, regards this as a matter of secondary importance. And in this respect he does the poet obvious injustice. For he undertakes to prove, by an external method of examination, that the Italian phrases and expressions used by Shakespeare are not so much his own property as the common property of the day, and that these expressions occur repeatedly in contemporary writers. With regard to the French words and phrases, Farmer maintains that the first editions of Shakespeare's works do not contain half as many as the later editions, and that every sentence, or rather, that every word, is incorrectly used in the most ludicrous manner. In making this assertion Farmer omits to consider that this ludicrous incorrectness is often intentional. He thinks that the poet cannot possibly, for various reasons, have written these himself, and that probably the French "ribaldry" was inserted by another hand, and, indeed, after the poet had retired from the stage. According to Farmer,[1] this was even the opinion of Dr. Johnson. As a proof of this strange and untenable assertion Farmer quotes a remark of Hawkins, who used it in reference to a passage in "Henry V." A French soldier in that play asks, *Est-il impossible d'échapper la force de ton bras?* To which Pistol replies: *Brass cur! Thou damned and luxurious moun-*

[1] Third ed., p. 87.

tain goat, offer'st me brass? Hawkins says, almost everybody knows that the French word *bras* is pronounced *brau*, and what similarity is there between this and *brass?* However, Hawkins and Farmer are both wrong, and in the play upon the words Shakespeare was perfectly right, for the last *s* in in the French word was (in the case referred to) still sounded in those days, whereas nothing is known of the word ever having been pronounced *brau*.[1] By means of this and a few other arguments of a similar kind,[2] Farmer fancies that he has given striking proofs against Shakespeare's having any claim to have possessed a knowledge of the French language; but these assertions have been most brilliantly refuted, more especially by Hunter. Of Spanish, Farmer, of course, allows Shakespeare even less knowledge, and of German and Dutch none whatever.

And even though Farmer had no other means for deciding the question beyond Shakespeare's own works, he might nevertheless (as will immediately be shown) have, and ought to have, come to a different conclusion. In the first place let us consider the relation in which Shakespeare's contemporaries generally stood to the modern languages, for the poet cannot be understood or judged except in connection with the period in which he lived. As a consequence of the animated international intercourse in political and mercantile affairs, the international intercourse in literary and linguistic matters was much more animated in Queen Elizabeth's day than Farmer could have imagined; it is only as a result of the unwearied investigation of the literature of the Elizabethan period that this fact has become clear to us. The modern languages were zealously studied by the aristocratic as well as the literary circles in London, and were considered so indis-

[1] Compare, Jean Palsgrave, *L'Eclaircissement de la Langue Française*, &c.; *La Grammaire de Giles du Guez*, &c., publiés par F. Génin (Paris, 1852), pp. 24, 36, and 899. Also Theod. Beza, *De Francicæ linguæ recta pronuntiatione* (Genevæ, 1584), ed. A. Tobler (Berlin, 1868), pp. 31 and 79. See also the Shakespearean proper names Fortinbras, Jacques (used as a dissyllable), and Parolles (used as a word of three syllables. *All's Well*, ii. 3, 289; iii. 2, 87; iii. 5, 61; iv. 3, 373). With regard to Jacques, compare *The Athen.*, July 31, 1880, p. 146.

[2] Among these, for instance, is the translation of *notre très-cher fils* (in *Henry V.*, v. 2) by *præclarissimus filius notre* in place of *præcarissimus*, which, according to Farmer, is nothing but a misprint in Holinshed, which Shakespeare did not perceive because he had no knowledge whatever of Latin or of French. See Hunter, *New Illustrations* (Lond., 1845), ii. 313-330.

pensable an accomplishment for every well-educated person that Shakespeare could not possibly have got on without them; he too had "to have the tongues," as the expression was in those days.[1] It is true that every now and again Shakespeare ridicules the fashionable craze regarding languages; however, the abuse of a thing, as is well known, does not disprove its use; and it was by no means only fashionable fools that busied themselves with foreign languages.[2] Roger Ascham too raised his voice against the inundation of Italian; he says, "These be the inchantments of Circe, brought out of Italie, to marre men's manners in Englande; much by example of ill life, but more of precepts of fond books, of late translated out of Italian into Englishe, sold in every shop in London:—there be moe of these ungratious bookes set out in printe within these few monethes, than have been seen in Englande many score yeares before.—Then they have in more reverence the triumphes of Petrarche, than the Genesis of Moses; they make more account of a tale in Boccace, than a storie of the Bible." It is well known that a great many Italians settled in England and carried on mercantile pursuits there; Perlin[3] reports that "*les Italiens hantent fort le pays pour raison de la bancque.*" It is related of Robert Greene's wife (who neither lived in London, nor, as far as we know, was educated there) that she gave expression to her grief at her husband's faithlessness "by repeating to her cittern some applicable verses from the Italian of Ariosto."[4] She may very probably have used a translation; however, the case is, at all events, another proof of the fact how greatly the indirect knowledge of Italian poetry had affected English life—and not merely in London. We can but subscribe to a remark of D. Laing's,[5] who says that Englishmen in those days were much better acquainted with foreign languages than is the case now; and Elizabeth and her Court set a good example in this.[6]

[1] Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. 271 ff.

[2] Compare, TWO GENTLEMEN, iv. 1: *Have you the tongues?* MUCH ADO, v. 1: *Nay, said I, he hath the tongues.* TWELFTH NIGHT, i. 3: *Speaks three or four languages*, and *I had bestowed that time in the tongues.* LOVES' LABOUR'S LOST, v. 1: *a great feast of languages.* ALL'S WELL, iv. 1: *a smack of all neighbouring languages*, &c.

[3] Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. lxxxviii.

[4] Drake, i. 492.

[5] B. Jonson's *Conversations with Wm. Drummond*, p. 5. See also Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. xxx.

[6] Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. 271 ff.

John Selden, the famous author of "Table Talk," was (according to a statement of Jonson's to Drummond) "the bravest in all languages." Drummond, on the other hand, in speaking of Jonson, makes the astonishing remark that he did not understand either French or Italian, which remark seems all the more astonishing as it is made in connection with Jonson's opinion that of all Ronsard's writings his Odes were the best, which would surely presuppose Jonson to have been acquainted with them. In fact, Jonson's "Conversations with Drummond" furnish a variety of proofs that he was not unacquainted with French literature; and, moreover, in 1613 he accompanied a son of Sir Walter Raleigh's to Paris. Jonson gives proof of his acquaintance with Italian literature in his "Volpone" more especially, although it would seem that he learned a good deal specially for the purpose while writing the piece. Hence Drummond's statement must be understood to mean that Jonson—being a pedantic scholar—had not managed to acquire the faculty of speaking the two languages, and that Drummond himself—the aristocratic man of the world—outdid him in this. In so far, therefore, Jonson found Drummond his master, and Drummond may *mutatis mutandis* have said of Jonson that (as Jonson had said of Shakespeare) he knew little French and less Italian.

But to come even closer to Shakespeare's own circle, both of his sons-in-law were men with a knowledge of foreign languages, from which an inference might be drawn with regard to Shakespeare himself. James Cooke, in his preface to Dr. Hall's "Select Observations," says of the author that "he had been a traveller, acquainted with the French tongue, as appeared by some part of some observations, which I got help to make English;" and it is reported of Thomas Quiney, in the above-mentioned work[1] by his brother-in-law, that "he was of a good wit, expert in tongues, and very learned." Sir Thomas Lucy the younger (who died in 1604 or 1605), the son of Shakespeare's adversary, was the owner of a large library at Charlecote, and in his will mentions his "French and Italian books," which he bequeaths to his son.[2] It has already been pointed out that Florio, the most eminent representative of modern languages in Shakespeare's London, was in all probability a personal acquaintance of the poet's. Lane-

[1] See p. 52. Also Fennel's *Repository*, p. 11.
[2] Hunter's *Illustrations*, i. 61.

ham, the author of the "Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth," boasts of his knowledge of foreign languages in a letter to his friend Master Humphrey Martin. He writes, "And here doth my languages now and then stand me in good stead—my French, my Spanish, my Dutch, and my Latin; sometimes among ambassadors' men, if their masters be within the council, sometime with the ambassador himself, often to call his lacquey or ask me what o'clock; and I warrant you I answer him roundly, that they marvel to see such a man there; then laugh I and say nothing." Laneham had not received a classic education, but was "a mercer" by trade, and had travelled in that capacity; through the influence of the Earl of Leicester he obtained a subordinate position at Court. Curiously enough he appears not to have known Italian.[1] Lady Rich was not only well versed in French and Italian, but, as Bartholomew Young expressly proves, was also well acquainted with Spanish. It was to Lady Rich that Florio dedicated his translation of Montaigne's "Essays," and Young his version of Montemayor's "Diana" (1598). In his preface, Young states that, a few years previously, a public meeting had been held in the Middle Temple, "a regular feast of languages,"[2] where the young men, in the presence of a number of lords and ladies—Lady Rich among the number—gave proof of their skill in the different languages. Young praises the performances and the "general skill in tongues;" he himself delivered a speech in French, with some degree of nervousness, in the presence of his critical patroness, who was herself so well versed in languages. Shortly after Shakespeare's death, Bacon's "Essays" were translated by two Englishmen into Italian as well as into French. The Italian version was made by Tobie Matthews (1618, and published in London), and had undoubtedly been undertaken with Bacon's sanction, if not at his suggestion, for it contained an essay that had not appeared in the original edition; the translation was dedicated to the Grand-Duke Cosmo, and a revised edition was published in Florence during the following year. The French translation was made by Sir Arthur Georges.[3]

Now, is it to be supposed that—amidst all this widespread

[1] According to Thornbury, *Shakespeare's England*, i. 216.
[2] See *Love's Labour's Lost*, v. 1, 40.
[3] Bacon's *Essays*, ed. W. Aldis Wright (Cambridge and London, 1865), p. xvi. ff.

knowledge and the attention bestowed upon foreign languages —Shakespeare alone proved himself an ignoramus? He, who seems to have had a thirst for knowledge of every kind, an extraordinary power of perception and facility for learning? He, who must have been aware that only the acquisition of aristocratic culture would enable him to rise from his low rank as an actor; he, who cannot possibly have been ignorant of the fact that by this means only he could gain for himself a position of respect? In fact, he must have endeavoured to extend and increase his knowledge, the seeds of which had been sown in Stratford. Can Shakespeare, who had at his command all the elements of human knowledge and of social culture, and turned these to account in his poetry, can he be supposed to have allowed French phrases and dialogues to have been inserted into his dramas by a strange hand? How unlikely this is, apart from all other considerations, is very evident; but there are, in addition, positive proofs of Shakespeare's having possessed the knowledge himself; in his works are found descriptions from, allusions to, and imitations of foreign works, of which, in spite of the most zealous inquiry, no translations are known to have existed previous to his day. Even Upton[1] draws attention to the fact that Shakespeare must have known Rabelais; he says, "Shakespeare was a reader of Rabelais, as may be proved from many imitations of him; and here plainly he has that facetious Frenchman in view. Here (*i.e.* in 'King Lear,' iii. 6) Frateretto calls me and tells me that Nero is an angler in the lake of darkness." Rabelais (ii. 30) calls Nero a fiddler in hell and Trajan an angler. As already stated on p. 304, König[2] has recently inquired into this matter somewhat more closely, and has pointed out a whole series of resemblances to Rabelais. In the "Censura Literaria," iv. 265,[3] it is shown that Shakespeare borrowed the well-known line in "As You Like It," ii. 7:—

Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything,

from a passage in Garnier's "Henriade" (1594), of which no English translation existed at the time. R. Gr. White[4] has discovered that the passage in "Othello," iii. 4:—

[1] *Critical Observations on Shakespeare* [1746], p. 225.
[2] *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, ix. 195 ff.
[3] Drake, *l.c.*, i. 54 ff.
[4] *Shakespeare's Works*, i. xxi. ff.

A sibyl, that had number'd in the world
The sun to course two hundred compasses,
In her prophetic fury, sewed the work, &c.,

corresponds exactly with a passage in "Orlando Furioso" (canto xlvi. st. 80), (where we also have *furor profetico*), whereas in Sir John Harrington's translation, the only existing one at the time, no similar expression is met with in the stanza in question. A second passage in "Othello" (iii. 3) :—

Who steals my purse, steals trash ; 'tis something, nothing, &c.,

has its Italian prototype in Berni's "Orlando Inamorato" (canto 51, st. 1), of which work only the first three cantos were translated into English.[1] Klein,[2] as already stated, came to the conclusion that Shakespeare in his "All's Well that Ends Well," not only made use of Boccaccio's novels, but also of Bernardo Accolti's "Virginia," which ran through seven editions between 1513 and 1535, but was not translated into English; and both Tschischwitz[3] and Klein[4] assume Shakespeare to have been acquainted with Giordano Bruno's "Dialogues," of which likewise no translation existed.[5] Even more striking is the case concerning the "Pecorone," from which the story of the lady of Belmont is taken. Of it, likewise, no translation is known to have existed, and the conjecture of Dunlop-Liebrecht and of Delius,[6] that some translation must have existed that is now lost, is not any more likely than the other supposition that the poet had read the original. Truly this may be said to be inventing devices by way of denying that Shakespeare possessed a knowledge enjoyed by most of the educated men of his day. The Italian as well as the French quotations and phrases which are found scattered through Shakespeare's dramas may, for the most part, have been the common property of his day, still it cannot be maintained that he possessed no knowledge of foreign languages

[1] By Tofte, in 1598.
[2] *Geschichte des Dramas*, iv. 548 ff.
[3] *Shakespeare-Forschungen*, i. 50 ff.
[4] *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, xi. 97 ff.
[5] Bruno lived in London from 1583 to 1586, and there wrote his *Dialogues*, as well as his comedy *Il Candeljo;* he was so remarkable a man, owing to his writings, his vicissitudes of fortune, and his position to the Church, that he must have attracted the interest of young Shakespeare, in the same way as he seems to have attracted the notice of the English aristocracy; at all events, he dedicated one of his *Dialogues* to Sir Philip Sidney. How far Shakespeare was acquainted with the works of Giordano Bruno, and whether he had read them in the original, is nevertheless doubtful.
[6] In his Introduction to *The Merchant of Venice.*

himself, even though it may not be believed that he had himself been to the city of gondolas. As regards the errors in the quotations and phrases, the first thing to be done is to inquire how many have to be laid to the account of the well-educated poet himself and how many to the account of his uneducated copyist or printer.[1] With regard to Italian and French, however, it may be admitted that Shakespeare did not study the languages in any learned fashion, or acquire the facility of using them conversationally. His object would merely be to master them in so far as to make use of the poetic treasures they contained, and it is quite in keeping with this supposition that the subject of his "Hamlet" may have been taken directly from Fr. de Belleforest, inasmuch as "The Historie of Hamblet" (as I have shown elsewhere)[2] must unquestionably be dated later than Shakespeare's tragedy; at all events, it is difficult to see why he should in this have proved himself inferior to an unknown translator. Hence it is also extremely probable that Shakespeare read Montaigne in the original, and that he did not know him merely from Florio's translation. We are led to this supposition by the resemblances to Montaigne in "Hamlet," which probably belong to a date when the poet could not have made use of Florio's translation even in MS. An even stronger proof seems to be offered by the idea of the music of the spheres (likewise from Montaigne) introduced in "The Merchant of Venice," which play has most probably to be assigned to the year 1594. If Florio's translation existed in manuscript at that early date, it must have had to wait the nine prescribed years before being printed.

A brilliant proof of Shakespeare's knowledge of languages —which may be compared with his humorous use of the Latin-English element—is the masterly way in which he makes Dr. Caius murder the English language in "The Merry Wives." Those who have ever heard a Frenchman "clip" the Queen's English will not hesitate to admit that

[1] How great their ignorance was is evident, for instance, from the almost inconceivable corruption of the lines in *Love's Labour's Lost*, iv. 2, "*Vinegia, Vinegia*," &c., which in the first folio are, *vemchie, vencha, que non te vnde, que non te perreche.*

[2] See *Shakespeare's Hamlet*, edited by K. Elze, p. xv. ff.; *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, xiv. 347 ff.; *Hamlet*, ed. H. H. Furness, ii. 89. According to Warton, *l.c.* (1840), iii. 393, a translation of Belleforest was entered at Stationers' Hall in 1596, but was never published—at least, no copy of it is known.

the poet has grasped and reproduced this jargon with inimitable truth and in the wittiest manner.[1] And, as far as is known, Shakespeare had no model in any contemporary writer for this character of his. Are we to believe that he engaged an assistant with a knowledge of French for the occasion? This would be a most arbitrary and unwarrantable assumption, and it is only a prejudiced mind that could come to any such conclusion. Shakespeare undoubtedly, in this case also, made his studies from real life; in London there were numerous representatives of the different nationalities with whom he might easily have come in contact. This is another point that must be taken into consideration if a correct idea is to be formed of the degree of Shakespeare's linguistic knowledge, and of the manner in which he acquired it. That Shakespeare made industrious use of the existing translations of modern authors, in the same way as he did of works originally written in Latin or Greek, is a fact too well known to admit of a doubt; but it is only a very limited argument against his having known the languages. It would be absurd to imagine that he despised translations of French and Italian romances, for the latter, more especially, had been a mine full of valuable material to him.[2]

Spanish, too, was by no means an altogether unknown language to Englishmen in Shakespeare's day, and the dramatic poetry of England and that of Spain—both of which reached their zenith about the same time—were very possibly here and there connected by threads that have yet to be accounted

[1] Compare, on the other hand, the French Cook in John Lacy's *The Old Troop; or, Monsieur Raggou* (1698), Canton, the Swiss, in Garrick's *Clandestine Marriage*, among others, whose jargon is much inferior to that of Dr. Caius.

[2] Of translations from the French then existing we may mention Fortescue, *The Forest or Collection of Historyes*, &c. (1571); *The Hundred Merry Tales* (1575). Of translations from the Italian there was, first of all, William Payter's famous collection, *The Pallace of Pleasure*, in two vols. (1566-67, containing the greater part of *The Decameron*, a complete translation of which was not published till 1620); W. W.'s (Wm. Warner or Wm. Webbe) translation of Bandello (1580?); Geo. Whetstone's *Heptameron* (1582), partly after Giraldi Cinthio (the subject of Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* is taken from the *Story of Promos and Cassandra*, which Madame Isabella relates on the fourth day); Carew, *Five Cantos from Tasso* (1594); Tofte, *Two Tales out of Ariosto* (1597); Tofte, *Orlando Inamorato* (1598); Beverley, *The History of Ariodanto*, from Ariosto (1600); Gervase Markham, *Ariosto's Satyres* (1608), &c. &c.

for.[1] The translations from the Spanish published before and during Shakespeare's lifetime are not unimportant works, and prove that Englishmen consulted Spanish literature—a circumstance which was very possibly the result of the marriage of Queen Mary with Philip of Spain, and of the latter's sojourn in England. Chief among these translations stand the already mentioned "Diana" of Montemayor, the English version by Young, and "Amadis, Palmerin of England and Palmerin of Oliva." It is probable also that Shakespeare knew the beginning of "Don Quixote," *i.e.* Skelton's English version, the first part of which appeared in 1612; the second part of the original was not published till 1615, and the translation of it not till 1620. Whether Skelton may have made his translation—as some suppose—from the Italian by Franciosini, or from the Brussels edition of 1607, is a matter of little importance.[2] During the first half of the seventeenth century there appeared a long series of English dramas which in one way or another referred to Spain, and hence are described on the title-page as "Spanish." In addition to the earlier "Jeronimo," and "The Spanish Tragedy," ascribed to Kyd, we may mention the following: "The Spanish Morris" (or Moors ?), mentioned by Henslowe, 1599); "The Spanish Fig" (1601-2); "The Spanish Maze" (1605); "The Spanish Curate," by Beaumont and Fletcher (1622); "The Spanish Bawd" (1631); "The Spanish Soldier" (by Thomas Dekker, 1631); "The Spanish Lovers" (by Davenant, 1639); "The Spaniards in Peru" (by Davenant, 1648); "The Spanish Duke of Lerma" (by Henry Shirley, 1653); "The Spanish Gipsie" (by Middleton and Rowley, 1653); "The Spanish Viceroy" (by Philip Massinger, 1653, but played as early as 1624); "The Spanish Rogue" (1674), &c. Spanish words and phrases are by no means scarce in the dramatists of the Elizabethan era (for instance, in Beaumont and Fletcher), and a few are met with in Shakespeare (*paucas palabris*, in the Induction to "The Taming of the Shrew;" *miching malheco*

[1] Compare the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, v. 350 f.; vi. 367 f.; xi. 202 ff.

[2] See Walter Thornbury in *N. and Q.*, 4th Series, vol. viii. 201 (Sept. 9, 1871), pp. 295, 444.—*The Athenæum*, July 26, 1879, p. 113, and Aug. 2, 1879, p. 145.—If, accordingly, Shakespeare, in the last years of his life, may have known the first part of *Don Quixote* (in the English translation), still he cannot have made use of it, and his Armado is an original creation and a precursor of Don Quixote, unless we are to suppose that he had read Cervantes' work in the original.

in "Hamlet," iii. 2; *passādo*, &c., in "Love's Labour's Lost"). If these be considered of but small importance in Shakespeare, the description he gives in "Love's Labour's Lost," i. 1, of the Spanish language, will be found the more worthy of consideration:—

> Our Court, you know, is haunted
> With a refined traveller of Spain;
> A man in all the world's new fashion planted,
> That hath a mint of phrases in his brain;
> One whom the music of his own vain tongue
> Doth ravish like enchanting harmony;
>
> . . . . . .
>
> This child of fancy that Armado hight
> For interim to our studies shall relate,
> In high-born words, the worth of many a knight
> From tawny Spain lost in the world's debate.

Could there be anything more to the point than this? Could he who thus describes the character of a language with such clearness and insight have himself been wholly unacquainted with the language? Besides, Shakespeare had close at hand a remarkably good opportunity for learning Spanish. His own publisher, Nathaniel Butter, issued in 1611 "Προπύλαιον; or, An Entrance to the Spanish Tongue."[1] And that this was not the first edition, as stated in Allibone,[2] is evident from the following words of the Dedication: *Domino Doctori Langtono, etc., Johannes Sanfordus Hispanicam hanc suam Grammaticam, nunc iterum discessurus, nuncupat et in clientelam tradit.*[3] It is hardly likely that Shakespeare omitted to consult a book that offered so easy a means of furnishing information. There was another book, also, that he might have used, the "Bibliotheca Hispanica, containing a Grammar with a Dictionarie in Spanish, English, and Latine," &c., by Percyuall, London, 1591.

Still there can be no doubt that Shakespeare's principal reading was confined to his mother-tongue, and that he was especially well read in his Bible and in the popular literature of his day, as was pointed out in our first chapter. This, however, does not by any means deny his acquaintance with

[1] John Sanford, Printed by Th. Haveland for Nath. Butter, pp. 64.

[2] Under *Sanford*.

[3] When the first edition appeared is not known; in Lowndes, ed. Bohn, there is no mention either of the book or the author. The same John Sanford also published an elementary French book, *Le Guichet François* (Oxford, 1604).

works of other kinds.[1] His reading was methodical in the one case as well as in the other; he read chiefly what he could turn to account, and indeed always turned to account what he had read. As regards the Bible, Shakespeare, like all other English poets—Scott and Byron, too—was intimately acquainted with it, and must have read it diligently.[2] His position to the Bible is a question which will be considered in our next chapter; but it may here be stated that, as the authorized English version of the Bible was not published till 1611, Shakespeare could only have made use of it during the last years of his life. Halliwell[3] has endeavoured to point out which version Shakespeare is likely to have read up to that time. According to Bishop Wordsworth, the translations of the Bible most generally used between 1590 and 1611 were Parker's Bible of 1568, also called the Bishop's Bible, which was prescribed for use in the churches; further, the various reprints of the Geneva Bible of 1560, which had been translated by John Knox, and was very widely circulated in private families; lastly, the Catholic translation of the New Testament (Rheims, 1582), and the complete Bible (Douay, 1609). According to the observations on the name Jessica in my "Essays on Shakespeare," it would seem as if Shakespeare had either used the Bible translated by Th. Matthewe (1549, printed by Th. Raynalde et Will. Hyll, fol.), or the one printed by Thomas Petyt (1551, fol.).[4]

It is, however, time to pass on from our inquiry into Shakespeare's acquaintance with the different languages and literatures, to a higher and more comprehensive point of view. For Shakespeare commanded the whole realm of knowledge and of human experience. By this we do not mean that he was a Poly-

[1] For instance, Drake, *l.c.*, i. 517, is convinced that Shakespeare had read Bacon's *Essays*.

[2] The only mistake which Shakespeare can be accused of in quoting from the Bible is met with in *The Merchant of Venice*, i. 3, where he uses the word *Nazarite* in place of *Nazarene*. Or do the earlier translations of the Bible use the form Nazarite in the sense of Nazarene? May not this give us a clue as to which translation Shakespeare made use of? Compare, *Shakespeare and the Bible, showing the Great Dramatist's profound Knowledge of Holy Writ*, by the Rev. T. R. Eaton, 3rd ed., 1860.

[3] Halliwell, *Attempt to discover which Version of the Bible was that ordinarily used by Shakespeare*, London, 1867. (Unfortunately only ten copies of this book were printed, so that it is quite inaccessible).

[4] Christian D. Ginsburg, *Shakespeare's Use of the Bible*, in the *Athenæum*, April 28, 1883, p. 541 ff.

histor, or that he had entered deeply into one or the other of the several sciences—that he penetrated or fathomed them after the manner of a specialist. We mean rather that his breadth of view was such that he could survey the whole realm of human knowledge and experience, that he could assign every single part its appropriate position in the great organism of the whole, knew how to value its importance to the whole, and correctly estimated its relation to the other parts, and their mutual correlation. Another mind of the same universality as Shakespeare's we find in Bacon, who, however, as is well known, has nowhere mentioned the poet. Those who believe that these two great minds must necessarily have attracted each other and come into contact, draw their conclusion without properly understanding the circumstances of the age. It could never have occurred to Bacon—in his high social position and with his peculiar culture—to suspect that he would have met with equally high culture, equal depth of knowledge and wisdom of experience, in a man connected with the national theatre, which had only just commenced to show signs of life, or to suspect that there was such a man in the dramatic field, which had not yet secured a full acknowledgment of its worth. Bacon could not have expected to find such wisdom except in the circles of professional men or of practical statesmen, and, in fact, probably knew but little or nothing about the dramatic poetry of his day; and yet in his "Essay of Travel" he recommends a visit to the play as a means of culture, and maintains that the young traveller in foreign countries should attend the performances of such comedies as are patronized by the better portion of the public. In one of his treatises, *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (lib. ii. cap. 13), it is distinctly evident that he himself patronized the classic form of drama; accordingly, that he opposed the romantic school, and hence also the Shakespearean or national drama. Indeed, this could scarcely have been otherwise, considering his whole mode of life and style of culture. Shakespeare's positive knowledge may, from a specialist's point of view, have been superficial or defective, for he did not acquire it by means of systematic study, but chiefly through his extraordinary powers of observation, of perception and apprehension. We may apply his own words from "Cymbeline" to himself; he

> Puts to him all the learnings that his time
> Could make him the receiver of; which he took,

As we do air, fast as 'twas minister'd, and
In's spring became a harvest.

It is in his marvellous power of observation and apprehension that we see the truly godlike force of his genius. Nothing in the organic or the inorganic world, nothing in the great or in the narrower spheres of life, escaped his notice. No poet has ever furnished such an endless variety of pictures and allusions from nature, and from the most varied forms of human industry, as Shakespeare, and not in any one case has he committed an error or a mistake. Without being blinded by appearance, he everywhere, with unerring insight, has recognized the nature and very essence of the matter. And nowhere does he boast of his knowledge, like Ben Jonson, for instance; everything he has written seems to have dropped from his pen naturally and as a matter of course, as if he owed his positive knowledge to divine inspiration. And, indeed, the character of true genius is that it nowhere shows a sign of work, that even that which is positive and technical, so to say, came to him of its own accord. In looking at the Sistine, who is ever reminded of the fact that Raphael had to learn how to mix his colours and to wield his brush? Who can detect from Mozart's operas that he had to study hard at the laws of harmony and of counterpoint like any other musical composer? We need not hesitate to believe that both the universality as well as the peculiarity of the method of learning which Shakespeare praises in his favourite hero—perhaps a likeness of himself—in Henry V., upon his return to a nobler life (i. 1), are absolutely a description of his own case:—

Cant. Never was such a sudden scholar made . . . .
Hear him but reason in divinity,
And, all-admiring, with an inward wish
You would desire the king were made a prelate:
Hear him debate of commonwealth affairs,
You would say it hath been all-in-all his study:
List his discourse of war, and you shall hear
A fearful battle render'd you in music:
Turn him to any cause of policy,
The Gordian knot of it he will unloose,
Familiar as his garter;[1] that, when he speaks,

[1] Very much in the same way it is reported of Bacon: *So as I have heard him* (viz. Bacon) *entertain a country lord in the proper terms relating to hawks and dogs, and at another time out-cant a London chirurgeon.*"—Osborne, *Advice to a Son*, Part ii. sec. 24 (according to Smith, *Bacon and Shakespeare*, p. 103).

The air, a charter'd libertine, is still,
And the mute wonder lurketh in men's ears,
To steal his sweet and honey'd sentences;
So that the art and practic part of life
Must be the mistress to this theoric:
Which is a wonder how his grace should glean it,
Since his addiction was to courses vain,
His companies unletter'd, rude and shallow,
His hours fill'd up with riots, banquets, sports,
And never noted in him any study,
Any retirement, any sequestration
From open haunts and popularity.
Ely. The strawberry grows underneath the nettle,
And wholesome berries thrive and ripen best
Neighbour'd by fruit of baser quality:
And so the prince obscured his contemplation
Under the veil of wildness; which, no doubt,
Grew like the summer grass, fastest by night,
Unseen, yet crescive in his faculty.
Cant. It must be so; for miracles are ceased;
And therefore we must needs admit the means
How things are perfected.

Is not this Shakespeare himself and the course of his own intellectual culture? Could his own inward growth and development, and the all-embracing breadth of his mind, be described in more striking words? A remarkable and brilliant proof of Shakespeare's unparalleled universality is furnished by the unsurpassed wealth of his vocabulary. The libretto of an Italian opera rarely contains more than from 600 to 700 words. A well-educated Englishman, who has passed through one of the public schools and studied at one of the universities, who reads his Bible, his Shakespeare, the "Times," and the books supplied by Mudie's Library, rarely uses in conversation more than from 3,000 to 4,000 words. Men of speculative thought, who avoid inaccurate and ordinary expressions, and endeavour to employ appropriate terms, make use of a much greater variety, and eloquent speakers have, at times, had the command of over 10,000 words. The Hebrew Testament tells all it has to tell with 5,642 words, and Milton accomplished his works with 8,000, while Shakespeare possesses a vocabulary of about 15,000 words.[1] This alone is

[1] Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language* (6th ed.), i. 309. (See also Renan, *Histoire des Langues sémitiques*, p. 138.)—Marsh, *Lectures on the English Language* (1872), p. 182. Of the 15,000 words used by Shakespeare, only from 500 to 600 have become obsolete; of Milton's 8,000 words only some 100; according to Marsh, *Lectures on the English Language*, p. 264.—Very

surely sufficient to prove that in range of thought, in command of language, and in wealth of expression he surpasses all other poets and philosophers.

If, in the first place, we inquire into Shakespeare's knowledge of nature, he does not, indeed, appear to have got beyond the Ptolemaic system of the universe, and this is one of the few points where he was not in advance of his day. The proof given in support of this supposition is the famous speech of Ulysses in "Troilus and Cressida," i. 3:—

> The heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre,
> Observe degree, priority, and place,
> Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
> Office, and custom, in all line of order:
> And therefore is the glorious planet Sol
> In noble eminence enthron'd and spher'd
> Amidst the other.

According to this interpretation it would seem as if a deeper significance should be attached to the well-known line in "Hamlet" as well (ii. 2),—

> Doubt that the sun doth move,—

and as if it ought to be referred not merely to the sun's apparent, but to its actual movement. The Copernican system had not by any means been universally adopted in England in Shakespeare's day; it was, in fact, still frequently spoken of as absurd and ridiculous. Even Milton in his "Paradise Lost"

different statements are given by Prof. Edward Holden, of Washington, in a lecture on *The Number of Words used in speaking and writing English;* starting with Clarke's *Concordance* he, for instance, estimates the number of Shakespeare's words at 24,000, omitting the verbs which are the same as the substantives, but otherwise including all derivatives. According to Holden's calculation, Milton's vocabulary amounts to over 17,000 words, and the English Bible is said to contain 7,200 words. There is one agreement between these statements and those of M. Müller and Marsh, in so far as in both cases Shakespeare's vocabulary exceeds Milton's by some 7,000 words. See *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Session of the American Philological Association, held at Newport, R. I.*, July, 1875, Hartford, 1875, p. 4 ff. Shakespeare's vocabulary has been treated lexically by Samuel Ayscough (*An Index to the Remarkable Passages and Words*, &c. 1790), by N. Delius (*Shakespeare-Lexicon*, Bonn, 1852), and best of all by Al. Schmidt (*Shakespeare Lexicon*, Berlin, 1874, 2 vols.). Indispensable works are also Mrs. Cowden Clarke's *Concordance to Shakspere* (refers only to the dramas), Mrs. H. H. Furness's *Concordance to Shakespeare's Poems* (Philadelphia, 1874), and Dr. E. A. Abbott's *Shakespearian Grammar* (New ed., Lond., 1875).

proves himself to be a disciple of the Ptolemaic system.[1] We seem to have a remarkable contrast to this antiquated system of the universe, in the circumstance that the poet appears to know of gravitation fifty years before Newton's birth, although Newton was the first to discover the laws of gravitation. In "Troilus and Cressida" it is said:—

> But the strong base and building of my love
> Is as the very centre of the Earth
> Drawing all things to it!

In now leaving the ethereal regions and coming down to the earth, and inquiring as to what was Shakespeare's knowledge of it, the question may be answered by the words of the Soothsayer in "Antony and Cleopatra" (i. 2), who, upon being asked, "Is this the man? Is't you, sir, that knows things?" replies,—

> In nature's infinite book of secresy
> A little can I read.

Between these lines here we have also evidence of the poet's modesty, which made him conscious of the insufficiency of human knowledge to fathom the marvels and mysteries in nature. And yet it was Shakespeare above all others who could not merely read "a little," but a very great deal in "nature's infinite book of secresy;" and no other poet has in his works managed to put as much intellectual and moral substance into nature as he. Perfectly applicable to his own case are the lines which he puts into the mouth of the banished Duke in "As You Like It":—

> And this our life . . . .
> Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
> Sermons in stones, and good in everything.

In every direction we feel that his view of nature is independent and original, and that his heart is as much at work as his intellect. Nowhere do we find him giving a mere repetition of academic images and similes, such as have been handed down from book to book. This extraordinary knowledge of

[1] *The Poetical Works of John Milton*, ed. David Masson (London, 1874), i. 89 ff. The passages: "certain stars shot madly from their spheres" (*Midsummer Night's Dream*, ii. 1); "you stars that move in your right spheres" (*K. John*, v. 7); "like stars, start from their spheres" (*Hamlet*, i. 5), and "as the star moves not but in his sphere" (*Hamlet*, iv. 7), according to Masson, *l.c.*, may also be recognized as pointing to the Ptolemaic spheres. Compare Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, &c., ed. A. W. Ward (Oxford, 1878), p. 20 and p. 161.

nature exhibited in Shakespeare's works has called forth a number of monographs which praise him as a zoologist even, and more especially as an ornithologist and botanist [1]—it is only the mineralogists who have not yet claimed him as one of their number, and indeed they are hardly likely to find a handle for any such supposition in the poet's works. The most notable of these monographs is that by Harting, who is not only inclined to dub Shakespeare a naturalist, but a sportsman as well—on the title-page of his work Shakespeare being represented with a hawk on his wrist! The author enters into the most minute details, and maintains that no other poet has ever possessed so extensive and sound a knowledge of animals, their ways and peculiarities, as Shakespeare. A remarkable instance of this knowledge is his description of an eagle eating, in "Venus and Adonis" (55-60). How could the poet have known it to be the eagle's habit to shake its wings while eating? From books, or from personal observation? Zoological gardens were unknown in those days. The passage in "Hamlet" (v. 1) :—

> Anon as patient as the female dove,
> When that her golden couplets are disclosed,

may also be mentioned here. Shakespeare's having made use of the fables connected with natural history, and which were an outcome of popular superstition, does not in any way affect what has been said above. Popular beliefs undoubtedly form an essential element in Shakespeare's poetry, but this circumstance is explained by the fact that these myths were much too poetic for him to pass by unheeded. Among these popular myths may be mentioned: the precious jewel in the toad's head (in "As You Like It," ii. 1); the chameleon that feeds on air (in "Hamlet," iii. 2); the phœnix in Arabia (in "The Tempest," iii. 2); the deadly glance of the basilisk (in Second Part of "King Henry VI.," iii. 2); the unlicked bear-whelp (in Third Part of "King Henry VI.," iii. 2), and the story of being turned into barnacles (in "The Tempest," iv. 1).[2]

[1] James Edmund Harting, *The Ornithology of Shakespeare*, Lond., 1871; Robert Paterson, *Letters on the Natural History of the Insects mentioned in Shakespeare's Plays*, Lond., 1841; Sidney Beisly, *Shakespeare's Garden, or the Plants and Flowers named in his Works described and defined*, Lond., 1864; Emma Phipson, *The Animal-Lore of Shakespeare's Time*, &c., Lond., 1883.

[2] As regards the *barnacles*, see Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of*

This information the poet probably obtained from the works of Edward Fenton[1] and Bateman.[2] Shakespeare himself assuredly did not believe in these or any other similar romantic excrescences of mediæval science; indeed, he seems to have been perfectly free from superstition, and well able to distinguish between popular beliefs and scientific facts. The passage in the First Part of "Henry IV." (iii. 1) is specially characteristic of him in this respect; Glendower—who boasts of being a sorcerer—there relates that at his birth "the frame and huge foundation of the earth shaked like a coward," to which Percy replies: "Why, so it would have done at the same season, if your mother's cat had but kittened, though yourself had ne'er been born." Perfectly in keeping with this is the idea conveyed in a passage in "The Tempest," iii. 3:—

> Now I will believe
> That there are unicorns, that in Arabia
> There is one tree, the phœnix' throne, one phœnix
> At this hour reigning there—

and the ridicule cast upon chiromancy and the interpretation of dreams in "The Merchant of Venice," ii. 2 and ii. 5.

Harting suggests three things that may have contributed to Shakespeare's knowledge of natural history. In the first place, that he had had practical experience in falconry; secondly, that he was an industrious reader, with an excellent memory; and thirdly, that he must have had the instinctive power of observation peculiar to a naturalist. When, under Harting's expert guidance, we examine the numerous passages where the poet makes characteristic and poetic use of the technical expressions used in falconry, and find them all correct down to the minutest detail, it strikes us as anything but unlikely that the poet may have in his younger days enjoyed the sport of hawking.[3] No other poet makes such frequent allusion to this national sport with such unmistakable predilection and know-

Language, 6th ed., ii. 583 ff.; Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. xxxii.; also Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 239.

[1] *Certaine Secretes and Wonders of Nature*, 1569.

[2] *Uppon Bartholome his Booke De proprietatibus rerum*, 1582.

[3] This is likewise the opinion of Prof. Baynes, *New Shakespearean Interpretations*, in the *Edinburgh Review*, Oct., 1872, p. 351 ff. Prof. Baynes draws attention to the fact that the neighbourhood of Stratford was specially favourable for hawking water-birds. If J. C. Heath's explanation of

ledge of the subject; yet hawking was a common and popular sport in those days. In some instances it is almost impossible thoroughly to understand the passages in question without an intimate knowledge of the technicalities—precisely as in the case of the legal figures of speech pointed out by Lord Campbell.[1] That Shakespeare was no less well acquainted with coursing and stag-hunting need not surprise us, if it be true that on several occasions he put in an appearance in Charlecote Park uninvited. When discussing this youthful escapade of Shakespeare's (on p. 107), we referred to the fact with what accuracy the poet has described a hunt, the stag's death, the division of the spoil among the sportsmen, and the peculiarities of the different sporting dogs; all this induces one to believe that the poet must himself have been the owner of dogs such as are referred to in his works, viz., of a Silver, Fury, Mountain, Brabbler, Sowter, Crab or Tyrant, of a Merriman, Troilus, Lady, or Sweetheart;[2] and in this fondness for dogs he again resembles Sir Walter Scott. Various species of dogs are mentioned in "Macbeth," iii. 1, and in "King Lear," iii. 6. It is, however, strange that Shakespeare nowhere alludes to the moral qualities of the dog, to his watchfulness, his fidelity and affection. In his description of the Spartan dogs (in "A Midsummer Night's Dream," iv. 1) the

the passage in *Hamlet*, ii. 2, 360 (*I am but mad north-north-west*, &c.) be correct—and everything seems to favour the interpretation—then it can scarcely be doubted that Shakespeare knew falconry from having joined in the sport himself. Sporting expressions, and those relating to hawking more especially, were used by all classes of society, as is evident from Ben Jonson's *Every Man in His Humour*, i. 1, who there says, not without some degree of irritation, *Why, you know, an a man have not skill in hawking and hunting languages nowadays, I'll not give a rush for him. They are more studied than the Greek or the Latin.*

[1] Take, for instance, the detailed account of the hunt in *The Second Part of Henry VI.*, ii. 1; the taming of the hawk by hunger in *The Taming of the Shrew;* the technical terms "*to imp*" and "*to seel*" in *Richard II.*, ii. 1; *Antony and Cleopatra*, iii. 13, v. 2; *The Second Part of Henry IV.*, iii. 1; *Othello*, i. 3, iii. 3; "*to tire*" in *The Third Part of Henry VI.*, i. 1; *Timon of Athens*, iii. 6; "*to tower*" and "*to souse*" in *King John*, v. 2; "*when the kite builds, look to lessen linen*," in *The Winter's Tale*, iv. 2; "*the maws of kites*," *Macbeth*, iii. 4, and in *Romeo and Juliet*, v. 3, &c. What was said by earlier commentators on these points was unsatisfactory; Harting was the first to give a reliable and clear explanation of them.

[2] These are the names of dogs met with in Shakespeare's works. See [Baynes] *New Shakespearian Interpretations* (*Edinburgh Review*, Oct., 1872, p. 339 ff.), and *Shakespeare and the Dog*, in *N. and Q.*, July 27, 1872, p. 69,

poet very probably took the famous Talbot dogs as his model, but he certainly must also have made use of the account of Actæon's hunt and death in Golding's translation of the "Metamorphoses." Nor is Shakespeare likely to have looked into the sporting books of the day without turning them to account (for instance, Turberville's "Booke of Faulconrie, or Hawking," and Gervase Markham's "Treatise on Hawking," &c.). However, he not only seems to have been acquainted with hunting and hawking, but also with fishing and angling, and H. N. Ellacombe even claims him as a "brother angler."[1] And, indeed, we can readily believe that, in his younger days especially, Shakespeare may have had many an hour's fishing in the Avon. The poet seems to know and to mention all the freshwater fishes, with but few exceptions (sea-fishes are not taken into consideration), and on many occasions he alludes to angling with a thorough knowledge of the subject, and refers to it figuratively. All this would not prove much, but the poet at the same time exhibits an intimate acquaintance with circumstances, proverbial phrases (for instance, *hold hook and line*, in the Second Part of "Henry IV.," ii. 4, 172), and superstitions that are generally known only to anglers. He knows that trout are caught by tickling ("Twelfth Night," ii. 5, 24), and that in thunderstorms eels are in extraordinary commotion (*thunder awakens the beds of eels*, "Pericles," iv. 2, 154). Ellacombe also quotes a passage from "The Two Noble Kinsmen" (i. 1, 71) as Shakespeare's, where it is said that the osprey fascinates the fish (as the rattlesnake does the birds). Whether the words, *I am stung like a tench*, betray a still deeper knowledge of the matter, as Ellacombe[2] maintains, may be left undecided; on the other hand, a remark of Ellacombe's well worth consideration is that, unlike Shakespeare, Milton nowhere alludes to fishes and fishing, except in his account of the Creation, where the subject could not be avoided. That Shakespeare had a tender and deep sympathy for animals, even the lower ones, is proved by two beautiful passages, one of which (in "Titus Andronicus," iii. 2) refers to a common fly which Marcus kills with a knife, and

Aug. 17, 1872, p. 135, Sept. 14, 1872, p. 211; George R. Jesse, *Researches into the History of the British Dog*, &c. (London, 1866, 2 vols.), ii. 266-280, (on *Shakespeare's Dogs*); Emma Phipson, *The Animal-Lore*, &c., p. 40 ff.

[1] *Shakespeare as an Angler*, London, 1883.

[2] *l.c.*, p. 37.

the other to a beetle, of which Isabella (in "Measure for Measure," iii. 1) says:—

> And the poor beetle that we tread upon,
> In corporal sufferance finds a pang as great
> As when a giant dies.

Harting is amazed at the great number of insects which Shakespeare mentions, and at the scientific as well as poetical truth of his description of the life and doings in a beehive, such as we find in "Henry V.," i. 2; this information, however, he very probably obtained from a similar description in Lilly's "Euphues and his England."[1] And yet with a correct feeling for his subject Shakespeare turned Lilly's poetic embellishments back to the true state of the case, for he does not make the bees choose a king, call a parliament, and consult for laws, but the bees "have a king and officers of sorts, by a rule in nature." The marvellous commonwealth of a beehive seems, in fact, to have made a deep impression upon the poet's mind, and Robert Paterson[2] comes to the conclusion, from Shakespeare's numerous allusions to bees, that they must have been a favourite study with him. Shakespeare also speaks of the "red-tailed humble-bee," and of wasps liking honey, of their robbing the bees of their honey, and often killing them for it. However, in the Second Part of "Henry VI.," iv. 1, and in "Pericles," ii. (Induction, 18 ff.) and in ii. 1 (45 ff.), the poet confounds the drones with the wasps by accusing them of stealing honey; and again, in the Second Part of "Henry IV.," iv. 4, where it is said of bees, their "thighs are packed with wax," the poet has followed the erroneous opinion of his day with regard to the preparation of the wax, a mistake that is even met with nowadays.

Shakespeare shows himself no less well acquainted with the vegetable kingdom; he mentions not only a large number of flowers and herbs (Beisly reckons 126 species, Ellacombe as many as 190), but he invariably refers to them in the most appropriate manner, and is free from the fault met with in Milton, of referring the different flowers to wrong seasons of the year. In Milton's "Lycidas" (142-151) and in "Paradise Lost" (iv. 695 ff.) spring and summer flowers are confounded, whereas in Perdita's distribution of flowers (in "The

[1] Ed. Arber, p. 261 ff.
[2] *The Natural History of the Insects*, &c., pp. 116-126.

Winter's Tale," iv. 4) all is in perfect harmony.[1] As consistent and as poetically beautiful is Lorenzo's account of the medicinal plants in "Romeo and Juliet" (ii. 3), of the flowers that formed the crown of Lear when mad, and also of the flowers chosen for Ophelia's wreath, in "Hamlet," iv. 7. It is a remarkable fact that Shakespeare nowhere mentions any cultivated garden flowers, only wild flowers, which, moreover, he is fond of calling by their popular names; and yet the subject of gardening is fully entered into in "Richard II.," iii. 4, and in "The Winter's Tale," iv. 3. And although the poet nowhere mentions some of the commonest flowers, such as the lily of the valley, forget-me-not, the hawthorn, and the foxglove, the reason is simply that the subject and train of thought in his dramas and poems did not give him the opportunity of alluding to them, and it was not his habit to drag in superfluous things as embellishments. Grafting is repeatedly referred to, as, for instance, in "As You Like It," iii. 2, a passage which Steevens interpreted wrongly, and hence thought himself justified in remarking that "Shakespeare seems to have had little knowledge of gardening"—whereas it was, in reality, exactly the reverse; so much so that an anonymous writer in "The Gardener's Chronicle"[2] maintains, in all seriousness, that Shakespeare must have possessed a practical knowledge of gardening, and Ellacombe fancies he may claim him as a "brother gardener." It has already been pointed out on p. 47 that the rich orchards of Warwickshire must undoubtedly have had a great attraction to Shakespeare as a boy and youth, and they may probably have been the origin of his love of gardening.[3]

When we bear in mind the circumstances of Shakespeare's childhood and early boyhood, it is not surprising that he should have had an intimate knowledge of domestic concerns, of the management of land and cattle, as well as of gardening, but the more carefully we follow him in this respect, the more we are filled with admiration in seeing, not merely with what accuracy, but with what appreciation and truly poetic instinct he has treated the subjects. Owing

[1] Paterson, *The Natural History of the Insects*, &c., p. 9 ff.

[2] *The Gardener's Chronicle* of May 20, 1841.

[3] See *Shakespeare on Timber Trees; Shakespeare's Use of Timber Trade Terms; Shakespeare-Trees, their Legends and Histories*, in *The Timber Trades Journal*, 1873-4.

to his grand appreciation of nature, all the outcomes and effects of common reality and of ordinary life were not to him unworthy of notice; his power of observation—and partially also his experience—extended over the domains of everyday work and the various branches of industry. He is acquainted with them all, employs them all in their proper places, and makes use of them also in his delineation of mankind and of human life. In "The Merry Wives" he gives us an insight into the home-life of ordinary citizens; in the Second Part of "Henry IV.," v. 1, Shallow, Silence, and Davy converse about domestic concerns; in "The Taming of the Shrew" the poet surprises us by his knowledge of the diseases to which horses are subject; in "A Midsummer Night's Dream," ii. 1, where inundations are spoken of, we hear about agricultural prospects, and in "Troilus and Cressida," i. 1, we have an account of bread-baking. C. Roach Smith[1] has examined Shakespeare's life and his poetry from this point of view, but the main merit of his work consists in the collection of the passages from the poet's writings which refer to the subject. Ridicule has been cast upon many of the proofs—sometimes rather far-fetched, certainly—that have been brought forward to show Shakespeare's intimate acquaintance with the most various branches of human activity, from seamanship[2] to a printer's work. One anonymous writer, with apparent seriousness, has endeavoured to prove that even though Shakespeare did not belong to every one of the city guilds, he nevertheless possessed as much technical knowledge as though he had been a member of them all,[3]—rather a cheap piece of ridicule, which might apply to Shakespeare's critics, but certainly not to the poet himself; and does not oppose the fact that Shakespeare exhibits a more extensive knowledge of such matters than any other poet before or after him. But, as Wm. Blades[4] observes, all these various proofs only show that Shakespeare is, in reality, "all things to all men."[5]

[1] *The Rural Life of Shakespeare*, London, 1870.

[2] *Shakespeare a Seaman; Shakespeare's Sea Lore*, in *St. James's Magazine*, 1862. See also Lord Mulgrave on *The Tempest*, i. 1 (in the *Var. Ed.*, &c.).

[3] In the *Temple Bar* magazine, according to *The Athenæum* of 1871, i. 400.

[4] *Shakespeare and Typography*, p. 22.

[5] 1 *Corinthians* ix. 22.

Yet, it is not only the domain of industrial and agricultural pursuits, in fact, not only the material world, but the domain of thought, which forms the main substance of Shakespeare's works; and it is in this domain that we meet with the astounding fact—which has only of late years received due consideration—that Shakespeare's knowledge extended beyond the realm of mere ordinary observation, to subjects which belong absolutely to the domain of scientific study.[1] Shakespeare has, as Goethe says, fathomed the whole domain of human nature in every direction; he has explored all its heights and all its depths, and has not only proved him-himself a psychologist, but a physiologist as well, inasmuch as the characters of individuals must correspond with their psychological nature. In the first place, as is perfectly evident from numerous passages (more particularly in the Second Part of "Henry IV.," iv. 3), Shakespeare must have known the great physiological fact of the circulation of the blood, although he nowhere, in this connection, makes use of the expression *circulation* or *to circulate*. Whether or not he had a clear idea of the heart's function is another matter. According to the passage just referred to, it would seem that the poet followed Galen's doctrine,[2] that the arteries carry the blood from the heart and then lead it back to the heart, whereas the blood in the veins was supposed to proceed from the liver and to flow back to it. Whether the lines in "Othello," iv. 2,—

> Where I have garner'd up my heart,
> The fountain from which my current runs,
> Or else dries up—

are altogether in accordance with this, may be left undecided. From the well-known words of the Ghost in "Hamlet,"—

> It courses through
> The natural gates and alleys of the body,—

James Henry Hackett—who has most carefully examined the whole question[3]—draws the inference that Shakespeare must

[1] A. O. Kellogg, *Shakespeare's Delineations of Insanity, Imbecility, and Suicide*, New York, 1866, p. 1 ff.

[2] No doubt learned from Rabelais.

[3] *Notes and Comments upon Certain Plays and Actors of Shakespeare*, &c. (New York, 1864), pp. 268-295; Thomas Nimmo in *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, ii. 109 ff.; Hallam, *Introd. Lit. Eur.* (1854), iii. 213 ff. Dr. Bucknill's explanations on this point are unsatisfactory; see his *The Medical Knowledge of Shakespeare*, pp. 74, 133, 157, 201, 213 ff.

also have known of the valves of the heart, as otherwise the word *gates* would be meaningless. Of the different functions of the arteries and veins Shakespeare does not seem to have had any knowledge; in fact, this and the heart's action were the actual points of Harvey's discovery. And Shakespeare cannot have received his information from Harvey, whether or not he was personally acquainted with him, and this is a very remarkable truth. Harvey returned from Italy in 1602, but was not appointed Lecturer to the Royal College of Physicians till 1615 (hence only one year before Shakespeare's death), and did not bring forward his theory till 1618 or 1619. Harvey's work, *Exercitatio Anatomica de motu cordis et sanguinis circulatione*, where his theory first appeared in print, was not published till 1620, whereas the Second Part of "Henry IV." was published as early as 1600, and had certainly been written previous to 1598.

What a close correlation there is between the physical and psychical life, and how the latter is always a result of the former, Shakespeare has shown in numerous instances, at times in so many words, at others in the delineation of his characters.[1] Shakespeare has, however, shown peculiar interest in the diseased conditions of, and disturbances in the human mind; and the investigations of English, American, and German doctors of lunacy—made independently—have all proved that the poet exhibits a knowledge of the subject far surpassing that of his contemporaries, and, indeed, that he was a couple of centuries in advance of his day.[2] All of these doctors of lunacy are unanimous in their admiration of Shakespeare in this respect, and Schlegel[3] does not exaggerate the

[1] Compare the famous delineation of the character of Cassius in *Julius Cæsar*, i. 2 (*Let me have men about me*, &c.), and in contrast to the lean-looking conspirator Cassius, Hamlet, the non-dangerous thinker, is "*fat and scant of breath*" (v. 2).

[2] Dr. Isaac Ray, *Shakespeare's Delineations of Insanity*, in the *American Journal of Insanity*, vol. iii.; Bucknill, *Remarks on the Medical Knowledge of Shakespeare*, London, 1860; Bucknill, *The Psychology of Shakespeare*, London, 1859; Ch. W. Stearns, *Shakespeare's Medical Knowledge*, New York, 1865; Conolly, *A Study of Hamlet*, London, 1863; Dr. Heinrich Neumann, *Ueber Lear und Ophelia*, Breslau, 1866.—An American doctor of insanity, Amariah Brigham (1798-1849), stated that in the asylum at Utica he had watched all the various forms of mental disease described by Shakespeare, and that Shakespeare himself he considered as great a psychological phenomenon as any case of madness that he had met with. See Kellogg, p. 9.

[3] *Lectures on Dramatic Art* (1809), ii. 2, 61.

case in maintaining that Shakespeare—and he alone of all poets—has described mental diseases with such absolute and invariable truth, that a medical man might make his observations from Shakespeare's delineations, as well as from existing cases. Shakespeare can transport himself not only into every phase of a healthy mental state, but also into every phase of a diseased state of mind, exactly as if he had himself experienced the condition, and he then contemplates it from a higher and superhuman point of view with unerring insight and actuality. Disease both physical and psychological is undoubtedly ugly in itself, and, in fact, does not belong to the domain of art, and least of all do we wish to see it represented on the stage. Shakespeare alone has succeeded in making psychological disease a poetical agent, more particularly in "King Lear," a tragedy of overwhelming, nay, of almost superhuman force. He has, however, even ventured to bring physical disease on to the stage, but does so only episodically in "All's Well that Ends Well." And even his representations of dying persons are both artistic and scientifically correct; for instance, the death of King John, of Queen Katharine in "Henry VIII," and the report of Falstaff's death in "Henry V.," ii. 3; the sole exception being the death of Desdemona, who speaks after she has been smothered. The greatness of Shakespeare's art in this respect does not become evident till we compare his work with similar experiments made by other poets. The only British poet besides Shakespeare who has been successful in the creation of real insane characters is Walter Scott, and his name must here again be placed by the side of that of the "Swan of Avon." This is the testimony of men of the medical profession, but it cannot be denied that Scott's treatment of the subject in no way equals Shakespeare's, either in fulness or grandeur. Scott's Madge Wildfire (in "The Heart of Midlothian"), his Clara Mowbray (in "St. Ronan's Well"), and Norma (in "The Pirate") are eminently successful characters, true to the life, characters with which the stricter science of our day can find no fault.[1] According to Kellogg there were two medical schools in Shakespeare's day, the *solidists* and the *humoralists*. The former maintained that all diseases proceeded from variations in the solid tissues of the human body, and ascribed all the vital energies, and their suscepti-

[1] Dr. Isaac Ray, *American Journal of Insanity*, vol. iv., pt. 2, according to Cless, *Medizinische Blumenlese aus Shakespeare* (Stuttgart), 1865.

bility to external influences, exclusively to these solid parts, for they even denied the vitality of the blood. The Humoralists or Galenists, on the other hand, ascribed the causes of disease exclusively to a corrupt state of the fluid parts. Shakespeare, Kellogg says, was in advance of both schools, and had more especially recognized the great physiological fact that most medicines as well as poisons took effect in the first place by finding their way into the blood.[1] Shakespeare, therefore, could not possibly have owed his knowledge of physiological and psychological phenomena to his contemporaries, for there were as yet no scientific works on these subjects; he could have obtained it only from his own observation of nature. The treatment and remedies applied to mental disease were still altogether mistaken. Insane persons were looked upon as "possessed of the devil," and charms and amulets were supposed to work a cure. Shakespeare gives us incidentally in "The Comedy of Errors" a hastily-drawn sketch of an ordinary doctor of lunacy in his day, viz., the Schoolmaster Pinch, a pitiable enough character truly. Even the famous doctor Sir Theodore Mayence believed in supernatural means for the cure of mental afflictions. When insane persons were harmless, they were allowed to remain unmolested in the family, or to wander about the country (begging?), as is described in "King Lear."[2] Hence Shakespeare might have had opportunity enough for observing demented persons of this kind on the high roads. There existed but one asylum for these unhappy persons, and that was Bethlehem Hospital, which was a small and miserable institution in those days. In the reign of Henry VIII. the building, which had belonged to an ecclesiastic body, was confiscated, secularized, and presented to the

[1] Compare, *King John*, v. 7 : *It is too late; the life of all his blood Is touched corruptibly. Hamlet*, i. 5 : *whose effect Holds such an enmity with blood of man*—a rash, as a result of poison, is perfectly correct. *Romeo and Juliet*, v. 1 : *let me have A dram of poison, such soon speeding gear As will disperse itself through all the veins*, &c. And it was mainly as regards poisonings that many absurd superstitions prevailed in Shakespeare's day.

[2] Edgar says of himself in *King Lear* (iii. 4) : *whipped from tithing to tithing, and stock-punished and imprisoned.* And we have a faithful picture in "*Poor Tom*" of the so-called "Abram men, a well-known class of impostors in Shakespeare's day, who affected to be either idiots or madmen lately discharged from Bedlam." They generally called themselves "Poor Tom," and went about half-naked, just as related in Shakespeare. See Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. 218; Thornbury, *Shakespeare's England*, i. 277-279; Greene's *Groundwork of Coney Catching*, chap. ix.

City of London to be used as a lunatic asylum. Dangerous lunatics, and even such as merely created disturbances, were whipped, bound, locked into dark rooms, and addressed by exorcists, as we may see from "The Comedy of Errors" (iv. 4, and v. 1), and from "Twelfth Night" (iii. 4, and iv. 2), where Antipholus and Malvolio are subjected to this kind of treatment.[1] Shakespeare, on the other hand, recognizes that bodily and mental disturbances are in perpetual correlation, and that the only true remedy for madness is physical, psychical, and moral comfort, and it is astonishing to think that science took two centuries longer in coming to the same conclusion, before being able, for instance, to sanction the treatment of Lear's case in every detail.[2] With a deep insight into the subject Lear's physician says (iv. 4),—

> Our foster-nurse of nature is repose,
> The which he lacks; that to provoke in him,
> Are many simples operative, whose power
> Will close the eye of anguish.

After the fury has subsided, Lear falls into a deep sleep, from which he awakes cured; nay, when he is about to awake, the physician even makes use of music, a very important means in our latest method of treating lunacy.[3] In "The Tempest" also, Prospero, when speaking of Alonzo, who is insane, refers with unequivocal words to this effect of music (v. 1, 58 ff.) :—

> A solemn air and best comforter
> To an unsettled fancy cure thy brains.

No less clear are Richard II.'s words on the subject in his last monologue (v. 4) :—

> This music mads me, let it sound no more;
> For though it have holp madmen to their wits,
> In me it seems it will make wise men mad.

In "All's Well that Ends Well" the King is likewise cured by the sleep which he obtained from Helena's medicines; still, the doctors of our day, when treating a patient for fistula, would scarcely expect a complete cure from the remedy employed. On the other hand, the dagger-scene and Lady

[1] See also *As You Like It*, iii. 2: *Love is merely a madness, and I tell you, deserves as well a dark house and a whip as madmen do*, &c.
[2] Stark, *König Lear, eine psychiatrische Studie*, Stuttgart, 1871.
[3] The line is to be met with in the quartos, but is wanting in the folio.

Macbeth's walking in her sleep are wonderful descriptions of hallucination and somnambulism, and of such accuracy and overwhelming power, that they can never be surpassed as poetical creations or questioned upon scientific grounds. No less remarkable is the skill with which Edgar's feigned madness is distinguished from King Lear's real insanity. It is only in the poet's interpretation of melancholy and of the various stages of madness (*sadness, fast, watch, weakness, lightness, madness*—according to Polonius) presented in "The Comedy Errors" (v. 1), in "Hamlet" (ii. 2), and in "The Taming of the Shrew" (the Induction), that we fancy we perceive the mistaken ideas of his day, which Shakespeare very probably drew from a work on "Melancholy" published by Vautrollier.[1] In every other instance it may be regarded as an undeniable fact, that Shakespeare perceived and represented the nature of insanity, in its most varied aspects, with such consummate knowledge of the subject as no other poet before or after him has ever done. This assertion is in no way affected by the question that the doctors of insanity, when analyzing Shakespeare's characters, are at times apt to go beyond the mark, and inclined to find symptoms of mental derangement or disease where the non-professional cannot detect a trace of either.

We have now to face the difficult question how far Shakespeare's knowledge of physical and psychical life, and its phenomena, was of divine inspiration or an acquired gift; our present discussion, however, has to do merely with the latter point. Philosophical critics endeavour, in this respect also, to describe the poet as possessing "an imaginative faculty of observation" without limit, a power of presentiment that embraced all subjects; and ridicule is then cast upon all the attempts made to point out the means by which Shakespeare must have acquired and increased his positive knowledge.[2] But no power of presentiment or mere faculty of observation can confer positive knowledge; it could neither give the poet a positive knowledge of legal concerns, nor of naval tactics, of the topography of Venice, of Giulio Romano's works, or of the fact that insane persons have a strong desire to get rid of their clothes, to decorate themselves fantastically with flowers, or to set off running, and that delirious persons are apt to

[1] See above, p. 122.

[2] See Michael Bernays, *Shakespeare als Kenner des Wahnsinns*, in the German periodical *Im Neuen Reich*, 1871, No. 29, p. 83 f.

imagine themselves surrounded by small creeping animals.[1] This species of knowledge can be obtained only by personal observation, or by its having been heard of in some way, and hence we fully agree with those doctors of mental disease who maintain it to be undeniable, that Shakespeare must have had an opportunity of observing persons afflicted in mind. Professor Neumann[2] very justly remarks concerning Ophelia's case: "Whence could Shakespeare have known that persons thus afflicted decorate themselves with flowers, offer them to other people, and sing away to themselves; I myself cannot conceive where. This is, in fact, one of those subtle points which, in my opinion, Shakespeare can have become acquainted with only from watching and listening to nature. Even though he had been equipped with the deepest insight into psychology, he could not have known this *a priori;* and yet it is in these small details that Shakespeare shows himself to be infinitely true." Dr. Bucknill[3] even maintains that watching persons mentally afflicted must have been a favourite study of Shakespeare's; he infers this from the large number of insane persons that are met with in the poet's works. In his preface (p. vii.) he says, "On no other subject except love and ambition, the blood and chyle of dramatic poetry, has he written so much. On no other has he written with such mighty power." Taking everything into consideration, we are inclined to go even a step further, and to assume that Shakespeare undoubtedly not only drew his information from books on the subject, but that he obtained it also in his intercourse with experienced and enlightened medical men. Dr. Hall, it is true, did not become Shakespeare's son-in-law till "King Lear" and "Hamlet," and probably all his other dramas (with but few exceptions), had been written; however, Dr. Hall had resided in Stratford for many years, so that Shakespeare, no doubt, had been acquainted with him some time previously, and Dr. Hall was the very man to be of use to his future father-in-law, as a guide into the mysterious world of the physical and psychological processes of life. But there were other medical men, in London especially, with whom Sakespeare was doubtless acquainted, and met from time to time. Without, therefore, treading too closely upon the poet's supposed power of divination, we

[1] *King Lear*, iii. 4, iv. 6. [2] *Ueber Lear und Ophelia*, p. 13.
[3] *Remarks on the Medical Knowledge of Shakespeare.*

cannot help maintaining that the poet obtained positive knowledge in this province as well, and consider this to have been an essential part of his intellectual culture.

The domains in which Shakespeare is supposed to have had the smallest amount of positive knowledge—in direct contrast to his intimate acquaintance with the aberrations of the human mind—are history, and even more so geography. It has been said that here, if anywhere, is the Achilles'-heel of his culture, and this is much more likely than what Farmer felt convinced was the poet's weak point, viz., a defective knowledge of languages. And, indeed, with regard to historical and geographical shortcomings, a most convenient handle is offered by the much-discussed *anachronisms* and *anatopisms* met with in his works. History and geography were not, indeed, subjects of regular instruction in those days—or, at all events, were taught most superficially—and of any such store of information as is presented by the school-books of our day people had not the faintest idea, either in London or in Stratford. Moreover, the aristocratic and literary circles in the metropolis, probably did not trouble themselves much about history or geography—less, at any rate, than about languages and poetry; still, Shakespeare's knowledge of them cannot possibly have been as meagre as many critics have supposed. Any gaps in his positive knowledge he would have bridged over by his ingenious conception of the subject, for this would have enabled him correctly to perceive the inner connection between the historical occurrences, the actual pulsations of historical life. Rümelin's judgment of Shakespeare's knowledge, or rather of his appreciation of history, is absolutely wrong. Shakespeare's positive knowledge of ancient history was, it is true, based solely upon North's "Plutarch," and his knowledge of modern history upon Hall and Holinshed, whom he has frequently copied word for word—as in the case of the speech of the Archbishop in "Henry V." (i. 2); and anyone not acquainted with the passage in question would be astounded at the historical knowledge displayed by the poet.[1] But look what he has contrived to make out of the scanty material offered! What

[1] The edition of Holinshed used by Shakespeare was that of 1586-7, as is evident from the fact that even the misprints met with there have slipped into the dramas. Compare also the Schlegel-Tieck translation published by the German Shakespeare Society, ii. 312, note, and iii. 341, note. Previous

grandly conceived, intrinsically correct, and inimitable pictures he has unrolled to our view! Those who have wished to obtain a lifelike representation of English history, have not unjustly been referred to the cycle of Shakespeare's Histories, for in the whole realm of dramatic poetry there is nothing to equal them. The well-known anachronisms, such as the clock that strikes in "Julius Cæsar" (ii. 1);[1] the drums in "Troilus and Cressida," and in "Coriolanus;" the pistols in "Pericles" (i. 1); the billiards in "Antony and Cleopatra;" the cannons and cannoneers in "King John;" Giulio Romano as contemporary with the Delphic oracle in "The Winter's Tale;" Robin Hood in "The Two Gentlemen of Verona," &c., can the less be taken into consideration, as they are emphatically not to be accounted the result of ignorance, but are points where Shakespeare made intentional use of his poetic licence.[2] The same may be said of the supposed geographical blunders which accompany the historical ones. Those referring to Italy I have already fully entered into in another work,[3] so that it is only the much-debated point relating to the Bohemian coast in "The Winter's Tale" that need be taken into consideration here. This is a point, moreover, which, from Ben Jonson's day up to Rümelin's recent statements, has been a subject of censure against Shakespeare as unjustifiable as it has been vehement. Ben Jonson's remark to Drummond that Shakespeare had caused some persons to be shipwrecked in Bohemia, a country a few hundred miles from the sea, unfortunately gives us no indication as to whether Jonson ascribed the fact to the poet's ignorance or as mere want of good taste.[4] Gifford makes it a special duty to stand up for his favourite upon this occasion, and declares it to be an irrefutable proof against Drummond's character for

to the year 1586 Shakespeare had made use of Hall's Chronicle, as Al. Schmidt no doubt rightly supposes.

[1] Ben Jonson, who boasted so of his classical knowledge, may be accused of a similar anachronism in *Sejanus*, i. 1, 40.

[2] See Meyer, *Shakespeare's Verletzung der historischen und natürlichen Wahrheit*, Schwerin, 1863.

[3] My *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 295 ff.

[4] *Conversations*, ed. Laing, p. 16 (compare p. 46). In Drummond's *Works*, p. 224 ff., the passage is somewhat different. The words here are: "he (Jonson) said, Shakespeare wanted art and sometimes sense; for in one of his plays he brought in a number of men, saying they had suffered shipwreck in Bohemia, where is no sea near by 100 miles." But, as Laing points out, this version can scarcely be regarded as authentic.

him thus to have pilloried Jonson, as if he had uttered "the most deliberate and spiteful calumny." Whether Jonson was quite free from blame is a point that need not be entered into here; but, at all events, he ought to have known that there was no question of a "blunder," as Gifford puts it, or of an "absurdity," as Dr. Johnson expresses it. For although Ben Jonson may have been very much better acquainted with Latin and Greek than Shakespeare, still Jonson assuredly did not excel him in general culture. Hence, if Jonson knew that Bohemia was one hundred miles or more from the sea-coast, Shakespeare certainly knew it as well. If Jonson's remark—as is very likely—merely referred to the unwarrantableness of the licence, it must certainly be confessed that Jonson never exposed himself in any such manner; his poetry moves invariably within the bounds of pedantic learning, and he would have preferred abiding by sober prose to providing Bohemia with a sea-coast. Meyer (in the work already referred to) says, "that every person in the theatre must have known that Bohemia was not a country on the coast; an English king whom Shakespeare had put upon the stage, viz., Richard II., had married the Princess Anne of Bohemia as his first wife, and the connection between the doctrines of Wicliffe and Huss had also been the subject of numerous treatises during the course of the Reformation in England." To this it may be added, that the political and ecclesiastical dissensions in Germany which had led to the Thirty Years' War, were followed by Englishmen with great interest. Further, the Count Palatine, King James's son-in-law, was, as is well known, made King of Bohemia only a few years after Shakespeare's death. In short, it is inconceivable that Shakespeare should have been ignorant about the position of Bohemia. Or is it to be accounted ignorance in him to have introduced palms and lions into the Ardennes forest in "As You Like It"?[1] And yet—not to mention his knowledge of places in Upper Italy exhibited in "The Merchant of Venice," in "Othello," and in "Romeo and Juliet"—the poet proves himself very well acquainted with the geographical circumstances of

[1] C. Roach Smith (*The Rural Life of Shakespeare*, p. 14) has lately endeavoured to explain away the mention of the *palms* by taking the word to stand for willows, the so-called English palms. Compare also Miss Baker, *Glossary of Northamptonshire Words and Phrases* (1854), under *Palm*.

Egypt in "Antony and Cleopatra" (ii. 7), and even speaks of the "scales in the pyramids" for measuring the rise and fall of the Nile, which information he probably gathered from Holland's "Pliny" (v. 9), or from Leo's "History of Africa," translated by John Pary (1600). Shakespeare introduced the Bohemian sea-coast from the source from which he had borrowed his subject, viz., from Greene's "Dorastus and Fawnia," and troubled himself the less about the inconsistency as—owing to the fictitious character of his drama—he felt himself less than ever bound by the laws of place and time. Besides, the plays of "As You Like It" and "A Midsummer Night's Dream" are both of the same romantic and fictitious character; Shakespeare perfectly recognized the difference between the various species of dramas, and never took any such licence in his Histories. As Meyer[1] points out, Art has to do with the ideal truth merely, not with actual truth, with the truth which coincides with common reality—with the essential or internal truth—not with accidental or external truth. If the external truth were to be elaborately worked out, the internal truth would suffer in consequence, as the poet would thus withdraw the reader's or listener's attention and interest from the development of the leading idea—"learning would thereby give the death-blow to Art." Ben Jonson, who followed this principle, has shown us clearly what the result of such work is. In art—and especially in romantic art—the limitations of locality and time must, to a certain extent, be ignored, and this licence is so universally made use of, that it seems strange and unjust that Shakespeare, and he alone, should be found fault with for having done so. Almost every one of the poets, since Horace, has taken some liberty with historical and geographical facts. Even Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe, not merely allowed themselves licence in these domains, but have even expressly stated how unwarrantable it is to judge a poet with regard to such matters. Peculiarly pertinent is a passage in the seventeenth piece of the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, where Lessing defends Regnard's "Democritus" against the same species of censure. "Regnard," says Lessing, "knew as well as anyone that there was no desert, or tigers, or bears in the neighbourhood of

[1] In the work already referred to.

Athens, and that no king reigned there in the days of Democritus, &c. But he ignored all this for the moment, his intention being to describe the customs of his own country under foreign names. The main work of the comic poet lies in this kind of description, not in describing historical truth." Schiller, in his "Essay on Tragic Art," protests against the very narrow ideas that prevail respecting tragic art, nay, respecting poetic art in general, and which is exhibited especially in the case of those critics who drag the tragic poet before the tribunal of history, and who expect instruction from the poet, whose only vocation is to arouse emotion and ecstasy. Schiller goes on to say that, "even when the poet, in anxious submissiveness towards historical truth, may have yielded his right as an artist, and have silently conceded to history the privilege of judging his work, Art, with equal justice, will summon him before her tribunal." Schiller in this fully agrees with Sidney's views on the subject (a writer whom he certainly cannot have known). In Sidney's "Apologie for Poetry"[1] we have the following: "And doe they not knowe, that a Tragedie is tied to the lawes of Poesie, and not of Historie? not bound to follow the storie, but hauing liberty, either to faine a quite newe matter, or to frame the history, to the most tragicall conueniency."

In painting, too, *anachronisms* and *anatopisms* are met with every day. Or is there any other explanation of the fact that in the Netherland and Early German Schools we find Netherland and early German costumes introduced into paintings describing the life of Jesus?[2] And even though stricter principles regarding style and historical truth are adopted nowadays, still up to quite recent times the artist has been allowed to act freely in this respect. No picture can furnish a more striking proof of the fact that the ideal truth of a work of art is vastly superior to the geographical and chronological truth than Kaulbach's famous picture in the New Museum in Berlin, representing a scene from the time of the Reformation. The point in question here has nothing whatever to do with æsthetic investigation, and the final decision of a critical

[1] Ed. Arber, p. 64.

[2] For instance, in L. Cranach's picture of "The Adulteress before Christ," and in Wohlgemuth's "Crucifixion," both in the Old Pinakothek in Munich. In the first-mentioned picture an old man is to be seen, to the left, forcing his way to the foreground, with a so-called *pince-nez* on his nose.

examination of the work may end as it will; this much is certain—that no inferences would ever be drawn from this picture, of the artist's knowledge or ignorance of chronological or geographical facts. Why should not Shakespeare be granted similar justice? Why should he be judged differently from Cranach and Kaulbach? And even though the Bohemian sea-coast were positively to be regarded as an error or mistake, this would absolutely be no proof of the poet's defective knowledge, but an æsthetic blunder or an error in style, and indeed would appear the more pardonable when it is remembered that Shakespeare's stage was altogether without any decorations to produce geographical or historical illusion, and that the poet could without further ado trust to the *naïveté* of his public.

We have now, in conclusion, only to consider Shakespeare's relation to Art, or, more correctly speaking, to the so-called Fine Arts, and in this case there is less than ever any question of the poet's having acquired his information by study. Both as regards music and painting he is hardly likely to have received actual instruction, and accordingly he cannot have possessed any practical skill in these arts; whether he had the natural gift of being able to sing we do not know, and our imagination has here again scope for free play. The instrumental music of Shakespeare's day—from the little we know of it—sounds somewhat strange, but it must have been pretty fully developed in its own peculiar way. Vocal music was cultivated mainly by the Boys of the Chapel Royal, new members for which had to be pressed into the service much in the same way as—at a later period—sailors were procured for the fleet. The Chapel Boys were originally employed only for church music, but were eventually, as we have already seen, engaged for dramatic representations. The Queen's band of musicians in 1587, consisted of sixteen trumpeters, a chief lute-player, a chief harpist, a piper, nine minstrels, six boys, eight players on the violin, three players on the virginal, three drummers, two flautists, and various other assistants and instrument-makers.[1] The chief lute-player received an annual salary of £60, the chief harpist and violinist each £20. The high aristocracy no doubt kept their private bands of musicians, as we hear of Portia doing in

[1] According to Friedrich Förster, *Shakespeare und die Tonkunst*, in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, ii. 155-183.

"The Merchant of Venice;" in fact, it would seem that in "merry old England" there must have been much more music than is to be heard nowadays. In 1598 it is reported of the English by Paul Hentzer,[1] that "they excel in dancing and music." To the Puritans both of these accomplishments were an abomination, and they succeeded in crushing both so completely that the country can scarcely yet be said to have quite recovered from the effects of Puritanical ideas. English musicians paid frequent visits to the Continent, and were enthusiastically received wherever they went, and even obtained appointments at the German Courts.[2] Music seems to have been very generally practised by amateurs, and especially by ladies, although, no doubt, their performances could scarcely be compared with the results of our modern craze for pianoforte-playing. Queen Elizabeth set an example in this respect, and is spoken of as an excellent performer on the spinet and cittern. The spinet or virginal was the favourite instrument of the day; they were to be met with even in barbers' shops for the use of such customers as were kept waiting, and who could thus pass the time pleasantly. England could boast of a number of musical composers—usually trained on the principles of the Italian school—who wrote music for the spinet, and likewise furnished music for social gatherings (madrigals, canons, rounds, and catches). Laneham, who has already been spoken of as a distinguished linguist, speaks in a very self-satisfied way of his musical accomplishments as a singer and as a virtuoso on the guitar, the cittern, and the spinet, and the lady to whom Shakespeare addresses the 128th Sonnet was also a performer on the spinet. The poet on this occasion gives us a description of the instrument and how it was played, and if not himself a performer, he would seem, at all events, to have been passionately fond of listening to music. If, as has already been stated, Shakespeare was personally acquainted with Dowland, this "rarest musician" of the Elizabethan age may have given the poet some information concerning the technicalities of music, or else the poet may have known and made use of the book entitled "The Pathway to Music" (1596). At all events, this much is certain, that in his allusions to musical

[1] Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. lxv.
[2] A. Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany*, passim.

matters Shakespeare has nowhere made any wrong observation. On the contrary, here again we find him acquainted with all the technical expressions, and find them applied with perfect accuracy. We have a proof of this not only in "The Taming of the Shrew" (iii. 1), where the two sisters have a music lesson, but even more so in "The Two Gentlemen of Verona" (i. 2), where Julia, while composing music, is conversing with her maid. The directions which are there given for singing may, in a certain sense, be said to be a *pendant* to the famous rules for the actor's art in "Hamlet;" and as the latter serve to confirm the supposition, which is favoured by other reasons as well, that Shakespeare must have been an excellent actor, the directions given for singing incline us to the belief that Shakespeare must also have been an excellent singer. But even more remarkable than this theoretical knowledge, is the knowledge which Shakespeare everywhere exhibits of the nature and purpose of music. He must clearly have possessed an innate appreciation of music, and it was he, if anyone, who had "music in himself," to use his own words from "The Merchant of Venice" (v. 1). All the moral and ennobling influences which he indirectly ascribes to the power of music in this famous scene are manifested in himself. In speaking of this scene, Friedrich Förster justly maintains that everything there, "the scenery, the situation, the discourse, every word and every sentiment expressed, is music;" and, indeed, there is perhaps no other scene in the whole realm of dramatic art which is so perfectly musical in the highest and deepest sense of the word. What an accurate knowledge Shakespeare had of the effect of music upon the mind, and which he no doubt had experienced in his own case, is evident from the characteristic remark of Jessica's, that "sweet music" made her sad. He is also aware that music produces greater effect in the silence of the night than in the daytime. He even knows, as we have seen, the power of music as a comforter and a remedy for melancholy and mental disease. Can the poet have acquired this knowledge in any other way than by experience and observation? It is astonishing with what deep insight and accuracy the poet has fathomed the relation in which his various characters stood to music; think of Shylock's remark (ii. 5) about the "vile squealing of the wry-necked fife," and of his command to Jessica to "stop" his house's ears; think of the dangerous

conspirator Cassius, with his lean body and hollow eye, of whom Cæsar says, that he hated plays as well as music ("Julius Cæsar," i. 2); think of Caliban, whom the invisible music on his island calms to such an extent that he falls asleep and dreams, and on awakening calls out for more dreams; think of Duke Orsino, in "Twelfth Night," to whom music is food for love, and who has songs sung to him which relieve the sweet pangs of love (ii. 4)—who asks for an old and plain song, such as :—

> The spinsters and the knitters in the sun
> And the free maids that weave their thread with bones
> Do use to chant it;

think of Silence, the monosyllabic Justice of the Peace, who, in the Second Part of "Henry IV." (iii. 1), bursts out singing as the involuntary result of a bacchanalian feast; and lastly, think of Polonius, who, among other things, commissions Reynaldo to see that Laertes "plys his music;" in the case of Laertes, music is emphasized only as a fashionable accomplishment, a necessary item in the education of a gentleman, that might prove useful to Laertes at a future day in his position at Court. We find music played during the choice of the caskets in "The Merchant of Venice," and Portia speaks golden words concerning its importance in sorrow and joy. Music is not even wanting in its effect upon untrained foals, according to the beautiful description in "The Tempest," iv. 1, 175, and in "The Merchant of Venice," v. 1, 75 ff.

And even the sister art of dancing was not beyond Shakespeare's appreciation, as is evident from Beatrice's explanation of the different dances to her cousin Hero in "Much Ado about Nothing." How frequently, appropriately, and characteristically he introduces dancing into his plays! In his youth the poet must assuredly have been a merry, and perhaps even an enthusiastic lover of dancing, in the same way as, when amid a merry company, he must have been able to join in some such lively roundelay as we hear sung by the noisy fellows in "Twelfth Night" (ii. 3), under the leadership of the Clown. Why should not Shakespeare on his youthful rambles, or on his later rides from London to Stratford or elsewhere, have given vent to merry or sad feelings by singing one or other of the popular songs of the day, of which he knew such an astonishing number, and for

which he has invariably shown such fondness? His own poems prove how well he has succeeded in imitating the genuinely national style of song, and in this no other poet has ever equalled him. Shakespeare has at his command the whole range of lyric notes, from the most ribald of clownish songs to the heart-stirring strains of the old willow-song, which comes into Desdemona's mind in her deathly terror. Poetry and music are to Shakespeare invariably two sister-arts that go hand-in-hand, the one flowing over into the other; and being thus a truly musical poet, he has also shown an appreciation for all the music in nature—from the warbling of the skylark, the song of the nightingales, and the music of the reeds, to the heavenly music of the spheres, which he has described in immortal and unparalleled words in the scene already alluded to in "The Merchant of Venice." And yet he is perfectly free from one-sided or extravagant sentimentality; the highest praise he has to bestow upon music is that he makes it go hand-in-hand with morality and human kindliness.[1] That the aim of Music, as an art, was the cultivation of the Beautiful, Shakespeare could not then have imagined, and therefore he assigns it rather too low than too high a position in the domain of mental life. For Lucentio, in "The Taming of the Shrew" (iii. 1), addresses Florentio with the words:—

> Preposterous ass, that never read so far
> To know the cause why music was ordain'd!
> Was it not to refresh the mind of man
> After his studies or his usual pain?

If, from all that has been said above, it would appear that Shakespeare was intimately acquainted only with secular music, the circumstance is corroborated in a striking manner by the idea conceived in the above lines of the purpose of music. Of music as the expression of divine veneration, an element in religious service, Shakespeare makes no allusion—not that he did not know it as such, for of course music was a regular part of the church service[2]—but he did not wish to acknowledge it as such. Sacred music, or, so to say, church

[1] *The Merchant of Venice*, v. 1.

[2] Hentzer (apud Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, p. 105) praises the "excellent music" in the Queen's chapel. See also Harrison, ed. Furnivall, pp. lxxii. and lxxvii.

music, was to him to be heard only in the music of the spheres, a form of music unintelligible to us while our spirits inhabit their earthly and perishable bodies. Those who are inclined to make Shakespeare out an orthodox Christian, or even an orthodox Catholic, should give this point its due consideration.

As to Shakespeare's relation to the plastic arts, he can have known but little about architecture or sculpture unless he had been to Italy; for the only important buildings with which he can with certainty be assumed to have been acquainted, were the Gothic and Norman churches and halls of his own country, and especially those in London and Oxford. And nowhere do we gather that these had made any great impression upon him, or that they had occupied his thoughts subsequently. Even the palaces of Venice, if he had seen them, did not rouse his enthusiasm as architectural works, and, in fact, architecture is almost the only branch of human art or industry the technicalities of which Shakespeare has not mastered, or rather not employed for poetic images or similes. He alludes to sculpture only when speaking of the statue of Hermione in "The Winter's Tale," and gives there eloquent and unequivocal expression to his conception of art (v. 1). All the more deep seems to have been the impression made upon Shakespeare by the art of painting, and W. König has pointed out that this appreciation for painting can be perceived in the very construction of his dramas.[1] As already stated, it is by no means probable that Shakespeare ever received instruction in drawing, for amateurs were certainly not in those days as well skilled in this branch of art as in the practice of music. Still the poet may have had various opportunities of seeing good and famous paintings, and his genius has here enabled him to form a conception of art which, in clearness and definiteness, is all that could be desired, and is in perfect accordance with his own inmost nature. If Shakespeare's love of painting found no encouragement in Stratford, he must, at all events, have subsequently in London come across some of the best productions of the German and Netherland schools of painting. The English themselves had not yet achieved anything worth mentioning in the domain of the fine arts, and what had been accomplished in the country was purely the work of the

[1] König, *Shakespeare und Dante*, in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, vii. 199 ff.

foreigners who had settled in London. As early as the reign of Henry VIII., Holbein had considerably promoted the taste and the development of art in England, and had painted a number of works, many of which still adorn the picture galleries of the English aristocracy and of the guild-halls. We have already, on p. 148, spoken of Holbein's paintings in the Great Hall at Steele Yard and of those in the Barber-Surgeons' Hall, and shown that Shakespeare had here and elsewhere ample opportunity of becoming acquainted with the works of this artist. Even better known were the works of those Dutch portrait-painters who resided in London and who were more especially patronized by the aristocracy. A Dutchman named Guillem Straete was Court portrait-painter to Edward VI., and towards 1577 Cornelis Ketteller and Peter Gilbart, and, later again, Van Somer and Adam Willaerts are mentioned as painters in London.[1] A catalogue from the year 1613 gives a list of the pictures and objects of art in the royal palaces (with the exception of those at Hampton Court); this catalogue we owe to Prince Johann Ernst of Saxe-Weimar, the founder of the famous *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*, who visited London in that year.[2] The pictures are for the most part portraits, and as far as can be inferred, none are Italian pictures. Two paintings which the Prince of Weimar saw at Whitehall claim our special attention, for one represents Julius Cæsar ("also small—a fine picture") and another Lucrece ("very artistically painted"); the latter Hentzer had spoken of as early as 1598, and it must certainly have been a celebrated and important work, although no reference is made as to who painted it. Hentzer describes it as "a Grecian bride in her nuptial habit." Is it too bold an hypothesis to assume that Shakespeare had seen and admired this picture? And may it not possibly have suggested to him the subject of his poem (1594)? No less suggestive to the poet must have been the "tapestries with Roman histories worked on them," which the Prince of Weimar mentions as existing at Theobalds;[3] for does he not himself, in "Cymbeline" (ii. 4), give us the description of an imaginary piece of tapestry of this kind, upon which the meeting of Cleopatra and Antony is depicted with marvellous

[1] Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, pp. 205, 281.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 157-164. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 167.

fidelity? However, the most important of the then existing royal palaces, from an artistic point of view, was undoubtedly that called Nonesuch, near Cheam in Surrey, which was an object of admiration to all travellers.[1] It had been built in the reign of Henry VII., in all probability by the Italian painter and architect Antonio Poto del Nunziato, who resided in London for twenty years; at all events, Vasari says of him that he built the King of England's principal palace. When Elizabeth ascended the throne, the mansion of Nonesuch had been purchased by the Duke of Arundel, a great patron of art, and the building was completed and decorated by him. The Queen was his guest there for five days, and was so delighted with the mansion and gardens that she induced Lord Arundel's son-in-law, Lord Lumley, to give her Nonesuch in exchange for another estate. At a later date Charles II. presented the place to his mistress, the Countess of Castlemaine, and created her Baroness of Nonesuch; but she allowed the palace and gardens to fall into a melancholy state of disrepair.[2] According to this it may be assumed that during the ninth decade of the seventeenth century, the palace of Nonesuch was at its prime, and that Shakespeare, if he ever visited the place, must have received important and lasting impressions there. In fact, those who oppose the hypothesis that Shakespeare ever visited Italy, might set up the counter-hypothesis that Nonesuch may have suggested and matured in his mind the idea of Portia's garden. The poet would there have seen art in all its splendour amidst beautiful scenery, a sight such as was, perhaps, nowhere else to be seen in the England of those days. Exotic trees and flowers, grottoes and fountains, groves and avenues, and the richest decorations in architecture and sculpture about

[1] See *The Gentleman's Magazine*, August, 1837 (an account by J. Gough Nicols); Rye, *l.c.*, p. 242 ff.

[2] Pepys, who visited Nonesuch on the 21st of September, 1665, gives the following account of it (*Diary*, ed. Alex. Murray, p. 301): *To Nonsuch, to the Exchequer, by appointment, and walked up and down the house and park; and a fine place it hath heretofore been, and a fine prospect about the house. A great walk of an elme and a walnutt set one after another in order. And all the house on the outside filled with figures of stories, and good painting of Rubens' or Holben's doing. And one great thing is, that most of the house is covered, I mean, the posts and quarters in the walls, with lead, and gilded. I walked, also, in the ruined garden.* See also *Evelyn's Diary*, ed. Wm. Bray, January 3, 1666.

the building itself, and in the galleries and chambers, made the mansion one of the most celebrated and perfect creations of the Renaissance. Of the plastic representations from mythology, of which there existed an abundance, traces of two may perhaps be found in Shakespeare, the Metamorphosis of Actæon which stood in the grove (or grotto) of Diana, and a work representing the goddess herself; the former Shakespeare describes in "Titus Andronicus" (ii. 3),[1] and the latter is referred to in "Cymbeline" (ii. 4), where the chimney-piece is described as decorated with a sculptured relief representing Diana bathing. The palace of Nonesuch was specially famous for its decorations in relief, and Evelyn in his "Diary" states it to be his conviction that these must have been the work of some distinguished Italian artist.

The question whether Shakespeare ever became acquainted with the works of the Italian painters—of which pictures, as has been proved, no originals or copies existed in England at the time—and how he can have formed his excellent judgment respecting Giulio Romano, are points that have been fully discussed in my "Essays on Shakespeare," in connection with the hypothesis whether Shakespeare ever visited Italy. And whether this hypothesis be accepted or rejected, this much cannot be denied by anyone acquainted with Shakespeare's works, that his appreciation and judgment of paintings must have been encouraged and developed by repeated and attentive contemplation of good pictures. How otherwise would he have been able to describe paintings in the striking manner he has done, whether the pictures really existed or not? The description of the great painting representing the destruction of Troy in "Lucrece" (lines 1366-1443) is masterly, in spite of some strange bits, as in line 1383 f. And Shakespeare by no means leaves us in the dark as to the standard by which he judges the worth of a picture; he demands from it intelligibleness above all things—it must itself explain its own meaning—and be true to nature.[2] This is, moreover, the reason why the poet sets so much value on Giulio Romano's works. Shakespeare has said again and again that the artist must learn from nature, must try to find out her

[1] See also *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, ii. 1, and iii. 2.

[2] See *Cymbeline*, ii. 4; *Timon of Athens*, i. 1; *The Merchant of Venice*, iii. 2; *The Winter's Tale*, v. 1; *The Taming of the Shrew*, Induction.

mysterious ways, must "master" and "surpass" them. In "Timon of Athens" (i. 1) it is said of a painting:—

> It tutors nature: artificial strife
> Lives in these touches, livelier than life.

Nay, Timon himself goes so far as to place the truth of a picture, in a certain sense, above the truth of human nature; the latter, he says, shows a treacherous exterior, whereas the former does not strive or wish to be more or different to what it actually is. He says:—

> Painting is welcome,
> The painting is almost natural man;
> For since dishonour traffics with man's nature,
> He is but outside: these pencill'd figures are
> Even such as they give out.

In the Induction to "The Taming of the Shrew" the truth to nature in the pictures described is praised in the most eloquent words. The poet says:—

> Adonis painted by a running brook,
> And Cytherea all in sedges hid,
> Which seem to move and wanton with her breath,
> Even as the waving sedges play with wind . . . .
> Or Daphne roaming through a thorny wood,
> Scratching her legs that one shall swear she bleeds,
> And at that sight shall sad Apollo weep,
> So workmanly the blood and tears are drawn.

In speaking of Portia's portrait also, the artist is called a "demi-god" for coming "so near creation." It is obvious that this realistic conception of the painter's art harmonizes perfectly with the poet's conception of music as a secular art, and as a relaxation after the day's work and study. Of paintings on ecclesiastical or religious subjects there is no mention whatever in Shakespeare, any more than there is of religious or church music, and it is evident that he who regards truth to nature and sensuous fulness of life as the highest aim of art cannot possibly have formed a high opinion of paintings on religious subjects or the representation of saints. He who judges Giulio Romano as correctly as Shakespeare does must have had some knowledge of Raphael, his master, and of the chief works of the religious pictorial art of Italy; it can only be said that he intentionally ignored their existence because, in his poetic delineation of life, there was no suitable or appropriate place

for them. What we have already said in reference to Shakespeare's relation to music must be repeated here: those who would wish to make Shakespeare out an orthodox Christian should well consider his conception of art; it positively contradicts any such supposition.

Shakespeare accordingly in every direction proves himself to have been a man of the most varied and sound culture—a man gifted with a rare thirst for knowledge, with a marvellous memory, and, above all things, with an unparalleled faculty of observation, and with the power of turning it to account; in fact, a man who, with the keenest penetration and insight, surveyed the whole realm of mental as well as of material life. Nothing was unfamiliar to him, from the subtlest stir of a healthy or diseased mind, down to the most ordinary transactions in domestic affairs; nay, his knowledge and conception of the various states of the human mind was so far in advance of his day, that it is only as a result of the most recent investigations on the subject by professional men, that Shakespeare's full worth in this respect has been properly estimated. Without having been a student of or an inquirer into any special subject, he has invariably and with a truly poetic spirit made use of his positive knowledge and his observations only in order to provide his dramatic representations of life with ever new features and colours, and it may be said without exaggeration that his dramatic representations come nearer to actual life in unfathomable depth and manysidedness than any other delineations drawn by the hand of man. "Shakespeare," says Goethe,[1] "has identified himself with the Spirit of the universe; he penetrates it as the Spirit itself does; to both nothing is unrevealed." To this remark we must add, that in order to be able to do this, a high degree of positive culture was indispensable, and we should have to grant that the poet possessed this positive culture *a priori*, were it not that it can be proved, so to say, by the dissecting knife of criticism, that he acquired it *a posteriori*. In oneness of purpose, in the intimate blending of an all-embracing culture and the highest form of poetical imagination, Shakespeare stands absolutely unapproached. Nowhere is there a superfluity of anything, everything becomes an integral part of the whole; and when

[1] *Shakespeare und kein Ende*, i.

it is considered that these two factors could not fail to resolve themselves into immutable and sublime moral excellence, we cannot but recognize in Shakespeare's works structures of the truest and purest form of humanity, in the fullest sense of the word.

Chapter VII.

SHAKESPEARE'S CHARACTER. HIS CONCEPTION OF HUMAN NATURE.

NO great poet has ever made it so difficult for posterity to obtain a clear and trustworthy idea of his moral nature and his conception of life as Shakespeare, and yet this is exactly the point respecting which every admirer of Shakespeare's genius would, above all things, like to have reliable information, with as many and as full particulars as possible. Our knowledge of Shakespeare's relation to his parents and brothers and sisters, to his wife and children, to his friends and fellow-men in general, is so extremely meagre that only disconnected and uncertain inferences can be formed. And the idea we obtain of his moral nature from his works is as little satisfactory, for, according to Schiller's well-known words, "Shakespeare (like all true poets) stands behind his work like the Deity behind the organization of the universe, he is the work and the work is he." Hence in this case again we can proceed only with the aid of combinations and hypotheses, and everything must depend upon the foundation and internal truth of these hypotheses being as incontrovertible as possible.

An actual handle is offered us in the first place by the estimation in which the poet was held by his contemporaries, and the opinion they formed of him, in so far as this information has been handed down to us. The epithets used in connection with Shakespeare's name by his contemporaries are *gentle*, *worthy*, *beloved*, and *friendly*; and, indeed, the sobriquet *Gentle Shakespeare*, in particular, has become the standing designation for him, in the same way as we speak of the *Venerable Bede*, *Judicious Hooker*, &c.[1] All the various testimonies speak

[1] *Shakespeare*, by Thomas De Quincey, Edinburgh, 1864, p. 59.

unanimously in praise of Shakespeare, and chief among these testimonies is that of Ben Jonson, who, in spite of his unquestionable jealousy of Shakespeare—and of the disputes to which it gave rise—could not but admit in the end that "*I loved the man, and do honour his memory, on this side idolatry, as much as any.*"[1] The indirect attacks upon Shakespeare by Greene and Nash, which we have already discussed, are entirely cancelled by Chettle's subsequent and honourable declaration that he withdrew the charges, and this is all the more important as it harmonizes perfectly with what we otherwise know or can infer of Shakespeare; and Nash's condemnation of Greene's pamphlet, especially, agrees absolutely with Chettle's statement. Shakespeare, as Chettle assures us from his own experience, was in "*his demeanour no lesse civill than exelent in the qualitie he professes.*" Accordingly, Shakespeare no doubt met Greene's attacks upon him (which Chettle published) with the tact of good breeding and of a true gentleman, with the supreme composure and dignity of a great mind. Shakespeare stood high above ordinary quibblings and petty animosities; his spirit remained unruffled, like the moon barked at by a dog, as the fairy tale puts it. And the fact that the poet's "*honesty and uprighteousness of dealing*" is expressly mentioned, is all the more significant as—owing to Shakespeare's undoubted endeavours to acquire wealth and property—it might have been inferred that he at times fell into temptation.

If, therefore, we assume the poet's conduct to have been noble and estimable, and perhaps self-conscious, our conception of his character is confirmed by the fact that—in contradistinction from many of his contemporaries—he was not a flatterer. He never pushed himself into the favour of the Court or of the aristocracy, although he came into contact with both circles. The fact of his having dedicated his poems ("Venus and Adonis" and "Lucrece") to a noble patron cannot be called an act of flattery, for it was a custom, and, indeed, a necessity of the age. Ben Jonson has dedicated every single one of his dramas to a noble patron, whereas Shakespeare has done no such thing. If the Sonnets addressed to the young friend—no matter whether this friend were Lord Southampton or the Earl of Pembroke—could be regarded as an absolutely autobiographical con-

[1] See above, p. 154.

fession, then indeed it would be hard to absolve the poet from contemptible flattery; but this is a point that will be fully entered into immediately. In his dramas, on the other hand, there are only a few passages that can be regarded as complimentary speeches to Queen Elizabeth and King James, and these are distinguished not merely by extraordinary delicacy of feeling and poetic beauty, but are far from equalling what both monarchs must have expected, if their inordinate and contemptible vanity were to be satisfied. Ben Jonson acted very differently; he was at all times ready not only to fulfil the barefaced demands made by the Court circle with regard to flattery, but was, if possible, bent upon exceeding the demands made, and was accordingly appointed poet-laureate and granted a pension. Even in this respect Jonson was a direct contrast to Shakespeare, who in "Twelfth Night" (iii. 1) makes a noteworthy remark, and one which we may surely assume to be a sentiment of his own:—

> 'Twas never merry world
> Since lowly feigning was called compliment.

Shakespeare's complimentary speeches addressed to Elizabeth in "A Midsummer Night's Dream," in "Henry VI.," and in "Henry VIII.," as well as those addressed to King James in "Henry VIII." and in "Macbeth," are certainly anything but base flattery, and the blessing which Mrs. Quickly at the end of "The Merry Wives of Windsor"—in speaking for the elves—calls down upon Windsor Castle, cannot be termed flattery. In my "Essays on Shakespeare" (p. 50) I have pointed out that probably the passage in "A Midsummer Night's Dream" (Oberon's vision) was meant by the poet to obtain the royal favour for the Earl of Essex. As regards the praise which in "Henry VI." is lavished upon the future King Henry VII. (Queen Elizabeth's direct ancestor)—as opposed to Richard III.[1]—the poet merely followed his authority (Holinshed) word for word, and was the more inclined to do this because, for reasons connected with dramatic composition, he had to represent the first Tudor faultless as a direct contrast to the villain Richard. The remark which Dr.

[1] The passage in question occurs in *Henry VI., Part III.* (iv. 6), where the King blesses the young Earl of Richmond:—

> *Come hither, England's hope! If secret powers*
> *Suggest but truth to my divining thoughts,*
> *This pretty lad will prove our country's bliss*, &c.

Johnson made concerning this passage, viz., "that Shakespeare knew his trade," is, therefore, of absolutely no value. The closing scene in "Henry VIII." might seem more doubtful in this respect, for, as is well known, the poet there casts a halo of glory around both Queen Elizabeth and King James. However, in the first place, it is extremely doubtful, nay, altogether improbable, that the play was performed during Elizabeth's lifetime, and, in the second place, the compliment to James attached to it was very probably not written by Shakespeare, but by some person who remodelled the play.[1] Besides, whoever the author may have been, he guards himself against the possibility of any accusation of flattery by the *exceptio veritatis;* Cranmer's speech begins with the words:—

> Let me speak, sir,
> For heaven now bids me; and the words I utter
> Let none think flattery, for they'll find 'em true.

The whitewashing of Banquo's character, in "Macbeth," is in so far complimentary to James, as Banquo was an ancestor of his. Even Upton drew attention to the fact that, according to the Scotch chroniclers, Banquo had as much a hand in Duncan's murder as Macbeth, but admits that Shakespeare, by giving a different version of the case, not only obtained a compliment for James, but also a variety and an appropriate contrast in the characters of his drama. Another compliment to James is found in the cures miraculously effected by Malcolm (iv. 3), who, according to the poet's words, bequeaths "the healing benediction" to the succeeding royalty.[2] The poet's own incredulous position towards this superstition (which lasted up to the days of George I.) seems to be clearly indicated by the words "*'tis spoken.*"

How little all this corresponds with the idea of flattery, as understood in the Elizabethan age, may be gathered with but little trouble by contrasting the passages in question with, for instance, the account given in the so-called "Princelie Pleasures." But even though we take the quoted passages literally as they are, without any hypothetical interpretation, surely it would be unjustifiable to accuse a writer of flattery merely on account of these few passages, or declare him a "tufthunter" because of them. If such had been Shake-

[1] See my *Essays on Shakespeare*, pp. 184 and 191.
[2] See above, p. 196.

speare's character, there would assuredly have been no need to request him at the time of the Queen's death—and moreover in vain—to write something in honour of her memory, of her, who is said to have distinguished him by her favour. Shakespeare did not upon this, or any other occasion, raise his voice in commemoration either of joyful or of mournful events in the royal household,[1] except in the one case of "Henry VIII.," which drama can scarcely be regarded in any other light than as a tribute to Elizabeth and her royal parents. It may also be mentioned here that Shakespeare never wrote any "Commendatory Verses" whatsoever, and this perhaps is a misfortune to his biographer or the literary historian, for if Shakespeare had lavished encomiums on his brother poets, they would assuredly have made him ample return, and we might thus have been in the possession of fuller biographical material. The only one who is praised by Shakespeare, and on one occasion only, is Spenser, who is referred to in one of the sonnets of "The Passionate Pilgrim" in the words:—

> Whose deep conceit is such,
> As passing all conceit, needs no defence.

But, as was said on p. 139, this sonnet was probably not written by Shakespeare; and even though it should be his, the praise is all the more free from objection as it was not published till after Spenser's death.

It is much easier to believe that pride, rather than flattery, was a characteristic feature in Shakespeare; for, however unconscious he may have been of his own poetic gifts, still he cannot have been unconscious of his intellectual superiority, and this consciousness must have raised him above his companions in rank, and placed him on a level with the aristocracy. That Shakespeare's lament of the lowness of his social position (in Sonnet 111) is not a mere fancy, but an involuntary autobiographical sigh, can scarcely be denied when taken in connection with the other circumstances of his life; and the correctness of this supposition is supported by the poet's father having applied for the grant of a coat-of-arms, doubtless at the son's instigation. It was undeniably the poet's wish and endeavour, not merely to be called a gentleman, but to be one in the fullest and noblest sense of the word. His aim

[1] Hunter, *New Illustrations*, ii. 105.

was independence; to become a gentleman of property and position was the main object he had in view. On the other hand, it is a very remarkable fact that his ambition to rank among the upper classes was not based upon his literary achievements, but solely upon the wealth he had acquired. With regard to his literary work, Shakespeare throughout life was absolutely unassuming and modest, and herein again he shows a striking resemblance to Sir Walter Scott. For Scott, in spite of his admiration of the aristocracy, was no flatterer, and he, too, based his claim to be accounted one of them, not upon his works (most of which, as is well known, he denied to be his), but upon his landed possessions; the knowledge of his aristocratic descent certainly influenced him in this, and it is very possible that Shakespeare may have been affected by somewhat similar feelings owing to his mother's family.[1] But both poets knew that descent alone did not make the gentleman; in "The Winter's Tale" (i. 2) Shakespeare says:—

> As you are certainly a gentleman; thereto
> Clerk-like experienced, which no less adorns
> Our gentry than our parents' noble names,
> In whose success we are gentle.

If we appeal to Shakespeare's works with the object of obtaining information concerning his moral nature, we find ourselves in the first place obliged to turn to the Sonnets, the interpretation of which most intimately affects the question of Shakespeare's character. In the opinion of many, and especially of English commentators, the Sonnets are purely autobiographical material or an autobiographical confession; and Bishop Wordsworth[2] has even ventured to maintain that "with this key Shakspeare unlocked his heart." In Germany, on the other hand, a conviction has recently been gaining ground, developed more especially by Delius and Gildemeister, that his Sonnets are entirely the productions of a free, poetic imagination.[3]

[1] Shakespeare's supposed aristocratic notions are discussed by Hartley Coleridge, *Shakespeare a Tory and a Gentleman*, in his *Essays and Marginalia* (London, 1852); also in *A Gentleman according to Shakespeare*, in the *Temple Bar Magazine*, April, 1868.

[2] *On Shakespeare's Knowledge*, etc.

[3] Delius, *Ueber Shakespeare's Sonette*, in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, i. 18-56; *Shakespeare's Sonette*, translated by O. Gildemeister, Leipzig, 1871. Hallam, in his *Introd. Lit. Eur.* (1854), says that from an autobiographical point of view it is to be wished that Shakespeare's Sonnets had never been written.

Gildemeister lays great stress upon the result obtained regarding Shakespeare's character from this autobiographical theory; for, according to this interpretation, the poet must have been a most weak and irresolute character, a man scarcely to be respected in any way. This same conclusion was arrived at by T. Kenny,[1] even before Gildemeister, but with this difference, that Kenny accepts the inference thus obtained, whereas Gildemeister emphatically rejects it, and expresses it as his conviction that those who accept the autobiographical theory are led *ad absurdum*. According to Kenny, the main point of the whole controversy is the unworthy, and indeed objectionable kind of affection which the poet exhibits for his friend. Kenny maintains, "The greatest imaginative genius the world has ever known, prostrates himself before some obscure idol, and in the frenzy of a tremulous devotion renounces his self-respect and abdicates the commonest rights of humanity." Kenny's idea is that in "creative imagination, as in all creative power, there is a feminine element," and adds, "it is through a yearning tenderness, through an unsatisfied want, through a vague and insatiable sensibility that the genius of the poet is most nearly allied to the mighty forms of the world around him. We (says Kenny) readily admit that in the Sonnets of Shakespeare this restless passion is exhibited in a peculiarly exaggerated and unwelcome form. But its very extravagance renders it the more unlikely that it was chosen without any personal reference as a theme for detailed and elaborate illustration." Kenny feels convinced that those writers who regard the Sonnets as the mere accidental creations of a perfectly disengaged fancy, and who cannot adopt his conclusion, are led to an opposite view from their unwillingness "to associate with their profound admiration of Shakespeare's genius, those manifestations of a weak and erring emotional and moral nature which nearly every page of the Sonnets conveys. We (Kenny says) find that the Sonnets, as well as the Poems of Shakespeare, indicate throughout precisely the same imaginative and emotional tendencies; all are filled with the same theme—with love—unrequited, ardent, longing, lingering, agitating, helplessly consuming love. They deal, too, with the various phases of the passion with an extravagant minuteness of detail;

[1] *The Life and Genius of Shakespeare*, London, 1864, p. 79 ff.

they exhibit throughout a teeming, unchecked, more or less disordered profusion of thought and imagery in the mind of the writer. Diffusion is their most striking characteristic."

Hence in Kenny's opinion the Sonnets are perfectly in accordance with the "extravagant impressionability," which he considers a fundamental feature of Shakespeare's character. He thinks that it is perfectly evident from Shakespeare's unparalleled faculty of transporting himself into the state of mind and character of every species of human being, that the poet cannot have possessed a firm or resolute character of his own. It seems strange that Kenny did not extend this judgment to Walter Scott and Charles Dickens, in so far as they, of all British authors at least, have created or described the largest number of characters after Shakespeare. But as we possess full and authentic information of the characters of Scott and Dickens, any such further development of Kenny's idea would at once be proved untenable. Kenny [1] maintains that "Shakespeare had no firm, commanding originality of character,—he had no visible and striking energy of purpose;" and in another passage says, "his very want of a firm, distinctly-marked individuality enabled him the more readily to restore its own boundless life to the wonderful universe beyond him." Kenny thinks that in the same way as a great painter or musician is frequently a man of the most limited intellectual vision, Shakespeare may have been a man who had no greatness to exhibit beyond his own special branch of art. He further states that "all the work, since the world began, that has most powerfully contributed to irradiate the forms of our mortal existence, has been done by men who passed like shadows over the earth." Kenny therefore declares that Shakespeare also may have been a comparatively insignificant person apart from his dramatic work, and that he too may have glided through life silently and without pretension, and that, although the greatest poet the world has ever seen, he may nevertheless have not had either a great or an eventful life. Kenny supposes this to have been the reason why Shakespeare's contemporaries could see nothing remarkable in him, and, at the same time, the reason why we know so little of the circumstances of his life,

[1] Kenny, *l.c.*, pp. 78 and 101.

of his position in regard to his contemporaries, and of his character.

All this, at first sight, seems perfectly intelligible and even plausible, but various arguments speak emphatically against any such supposition. In the first place, Kenny's interpretation of the Sonnets cannot be accepted without fuller inquiry into particulars, for he has not judged them at all from Shakespeare's intellectual surroundings, nor from the ideas and customs of his day. For, in the same way as Shakespeare brought the English drama to its fullest development, the English sonnet in his hands was brought to its climax, and surpassed all that had been accomplished by his predecessors in this respect.[1] All the characteristic features of English sonnet-poetry are brought to their fullest development in him, indeed, are so fully developed that, it may be said, one step further—in either case—and the Shakespearean sonnet as well as the Shakespearean drama would be caricatures. Now the most essential characteristic of sonnet-poetry is the excessive praise bestowed upon love and friendship, and the substance of this species of poetry is no less conventional than its form; we have in German literature an analogous case in Platen's sonnets, which exhibit the same kind of excessive praise of friendship, and which H. Heine interprets in such a disgraceful manner in his "Reisebilder." Nash[2] says: "Somtimes (because Love commonly wears the linerie of wit) hee [viz. the upstart] will be an Inamorato Poeta, and sonnet a whole quire of paper in praise of Ladie Manibetter, his yelow-faced mistress, and wear a feather of her rainbeaten fanne for a favour, like a fore-horse." That this extravagance of language in love-sonnets was even surpassed by the extravagant language employed in praise of friendship, has been pointed out, more especially by Henry Brown, by a list of striking quotations.[3] Friendship, on account of its being considered an absolutely moral connection, was placed far above love, which was considered to be partially a physical connection; friendship was not only regarded as a connection, but a marriage. "Friendships," says Jeremiah Taylor,[4] "are

[1] See above, p. 329.

[2] *Pierce Penniless*, ed. Collier, p. 17. See also Biron's remarks on sonnet-poetry in *Love's Labour's Lost*.

[3] *The Sonnets of Shakespeare Solved*, London, 1870.

[4] *Measures of Friendship*.

marriages of the soul, and of fortunes, and interests and counsels." A precisely similar passage occurs in "The Whole Duty of Man": "When men have contracted friendship, and espoused their souls and minds to one another, there arises a new relation between them, for in this close and new relation men give each other a property in themselves." In Allot's "Wit's Commonwealth" (1598), it is said: "The love of men and women is a thing common and of course, but the friendship of man to man infinite and immortal." In Meres' "Wit's Commonwealth," we read: "Friendship ought to resemble the love between man and wife, that is, two bodies made one will and affection." Edwards, in his comedy "Damon and Pithias," which may be said to be an enthusiastic eulogy on friendship, says that a man does more for his friend than for his wife, and considers this as it should be. Regarded from this point of view, it is perhaps not mere accident that Edwards does not introduce any female character into his play; everything turns upon friendship—true and false friendship. He, too, repeats that friends "in two bodies have but one heart," and that true and virtuous friendship "is the greatest gift that God can give to man." Even Bacon, the experienced man of the world, has, from his sober point of view, written an essay "Of Friendship," that may almost be called extravagant, and Dryden, in comparing Shakespeare and Fletcher, refers to them in the following words: "The excellency of that Poet (viz. Shakespeare) was in the more manly passions; Fletcher in the softer: Shakespear writ better betwixt man and man; Fletcher, between man and woman; consequently, the one describ'd friendship better; the other love: yet Shakespear taught Fletcher to write love; and Juliet, and Desdemona, are Originals. 'Tis true, the Scholar had the softer soul; but the Master had the kinder. Friendship is both a virtue, and a Passion essentially; love is a passion only in its nature, and is not a virtue but by Accident: good nature makes Friendship; but effeminacy Love."[1] Richard Barnefield in 1595 wrote a poem consisting of twenty sonnets, called "The Affectionate Shepherd," which (in imitation of Virgil's Second Eclogue) describes the love of a shepherd for a beautiful boy, in Arcadian simplicity. This poem was Barnefield's first poetic production; it ran through

[1] Preface to *Troilus and Cressida; or, Truth found too late*, by John Dryden (1679).—See Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 374 f.

several editions, and speedily became very widely known. Delius has very justly pointed out the similarity in the subjects of Daniel's Sonnets, and Daniel was Shakespeare's immediate predecessor in sonnet-poetry.

These indications and comparisons lead to the conviction that the current of thought in Shakespeare's Sonnets was not so much the poet's own and exclusive property, as the substance and leading idea in the general current of thought of his day. Strange and objectionable as the "master-mistress" of the Sonnets (20, 105, and 116) may appear to us nowadays, it cannot cause surprise to find Shakespeare moving within the range of these ideas; indeed, the reverse only could seem strange. In his dramas friendship is also placed unusually high,[1] and is described as a nobler and purer form of love; hence it is difficult to avoid the thought that Shakespeare—having himself been shipwrecked in love, and bearing the burden of an unhappy marriage—may have been driven to seek, in friendship, compensation for the loss of conjugal happiness, and to have thrown himself into the arms of the sentimental ideas prevailing at the time. At all events, the poet shows a great leaning towards the prevailing ideas of friendship. What glowing warmth and devotion is exhibited in the friendship between Antonio and Bassanio, between Hamlet and Horatio, between Lear and Kent, and between Antonio and Sebastian! Portia expresses her ideas of the "godlike amity," of which Lorenzo thinks her capable, in the following words:—

> For in companions
> That do converse and waste the time together,
> Whose souls do bear an equal yoke of love,
> There must be needs a like proportion
> Of lineaments, of manners, and of spirit.

The Countess of Rousillon, in "All's Well that Ends Well" (i. 1), in giving advice to her son on entering his career in life, says:—

> Keep thy friend
> Under thy own life's key.

Hamlet assures his friend that he wears him in his heart of hearts, and Polonius says to Laertes, that:—

[1] See Delius, *Die Freundschaft in Shakespeare's Dramas*, in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, xix. 19-41.

Those friends thou hast, and their adoption tried,
Grapple them to thy soul with hoops of steel.

But—to return to the Sonnets—what determines our judgment of the case is, that the whole story of the friendship, even the seduction of the beloved lady by the friend, and the subsequent reconciliation of the friends, is met with in Lilly's "Euphues" (The Anatomy of Wit), and that it is ridiculed by Ben Jonson in his "Bartholomew Fair" (v. 3), by means of the puppet-show, entitled "*The ancient modern history of Hero and Leander, otherwise called the Touchstone of true love, with as true a trial of friendship between Damon and Pythias, two faithful friends o' the Bankside.*" Damon and Pythias have each trifled with each other's ladylove ("I say between you, you have both but one drab"), namely, Hero of Fish Street, for whose sake Leander means to swim across the Thames; they abuse each other pretty vehemently, then speedily become reconciled, remain the best of friends as before, and finally appear with the "Dunmow Flitch of Bacon" as a sign of their unclouded, truly conjugal unanimity.[1] Besides, from Jonson's Conversations with Drummond,[2] we know that he was strongly opposed to sonnet-writing: "he cursed Petrarch for redacting verses to sonnets; which he said were like that Tirrant's bed, where some who were too short were racked, others too long cut short." Those critics who will not admit that Jonson sneered at Shakespeare, have a difficult point to deal with here, unless, like Gifford, they pass over the puppet-show in silence. It might be said that the passage was coined for Lilly, but what spectator in watching a performance of "Bartholomew Fair," would be likely to think of the "Euphues," which was thirty years old at the time, and not of the Sonnets, that had appeared only five years previously. It would seem as if the conflict between friendship and love, the infidelity of a friend in the field of love, had been a much disputed and favourite theme in those days—as it were, a dialectic or poetic problem which everyone was eager to solve, somewhat as the Troubadours were given the subtle theme to work out in the Provençal (or north-French?) courts of love. Shakespeare not only returns to the theme in "Much Ado About Nothing" (ii. 1), but has given a variation of the same subject in "The Two Gentlemen of

[1] See above, p. 188. [2] Edited by Laing, p. 4.

Verona." That the poet cannot by any means have regarded treachery to friendship in a light manner is shown in "Hamlet," where Rosencrantz and Guildenstern come to an untimely end because of their being traitors to their youthful friendship with Hamlet.

From this point of view, accordingly, there can be no reason for supposing that this portion of the sonnets, at least, had an autobiographical significance; and this again clearly shows how careful we need be in judging of the other Sonnets. It is possible that the Sonnets, like Goethe's Autobiography, are a mixture of fiction and truth—fiction, it must be remembered, was originally the main part—and that the Sonnets every now and again give expression to some outward and inward experience, to states of mind that the poet had himself passed through. Poets are known to be fond of making confessions *sub rosa*, as Goethe says; still it will always prove a vain endeavour to separate the autobiographical substance, with any degree of certainty. By way of example merely, we may mention the poet's lament at the lowness of his social position (in Sonnets 29 and 111), and at the consciousness of his age (in Sonnet 73). And may it not be that the sonnets addressed to the dark lady, owed their origin to some prosaic incident? Who can say? But, in any case, there can be no doubt that Shakespeare's nature was one of an impulsive and strongly developed sensuousness, such as is peculiar to most great geniuses, and he must undoubtedly have had his love-affairs in London. Still the sonnets in question may have been mere poetical conceits with which Shakespeare amused himself and his friends; and, indeed, we are not sure that he may not have written other sonnets, at the request of friends, not to say upon commission. It is evident from various passages (especially from "A Lover's Complaint") that tokens of affection were generally accompanied by a sonnet; nothing is more likely, therefore, than that the givers of presents, who—like Hamlet—could not put their love-sighs into rhyme, should have obtained the services of someone who stood high in the favour of the Muses.[1] May not Shakespeare—if we may be

[1] That such sonnets were written upon commission is proved, among others, from *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (ii. 1); Dekker, *The Honest Whore*, Part II., iii. 1 (Middleton, ed. Dyce, iii. 170); Marston, *The Insatiate Countess*, iv. (*Works*, ed. Halliwell, iii. 162); Drayton, *Sonnet* 31.

allowed the expression—have shaken many a sonnet out of his sleeve, and given it away? May not his sonnets—among a large circle of persons—have been regarded as *articles de luxe*, to possess which was considered a sign of belonging to good society? At all events, Meres' well-known allusion to Shakespeare's "sugred sonnets" awakens conjectures of this sort. But whatever the true state of the case may have been, this much is certain, that no importance can be attached to any attempt made to form an idea of Shakespeare's disposition from the Sonnets, and least of all can they serve as a foundation, or as evidence for the delineation of the poet's character.

But it is not only in his interpretation of the Sonnets that Kenny is mistaken, but also in denying that Shakespeare possessed any "visible and striking energy of purpose." Amid the obscurity which enshrouds Shakespeare's life, and which it is to be feared will always enshroud it, one bright point is distinctly apparent, viz., that the poet was pressing forward unremittingly towards one fixed purpose, and attained it by caution, energy, and perseverance. That this purpose should have been the very reverse of that idealism which we are accustomed to conceive as inseparable from a great poet, and, in fact, of an absolutely mundane character, has nothing to do with the matter, when the point in question is merely whether we consider the poet as possessing a conscious purpose in life and the requisite force of will and strength of character to attain his object. Kenny has discussed this point without being aware of the contradiction he himself gets into; for he does not in any way deny that Shakespeare eminently understood how to acquire money, and that he was a thorough man of business—indeed, if we know anything of the poet's life with certainty, it is this. It is not our intention here to enter into any explanation or criticism of this trait in his character, and we merely wish to maintain that Shakespeare's main object in life, his obvious and strenuous effort to attain it, directly opposes the supposition of the feminine submissiveness, sickly sentimentality, and the hesitating weakness which Kenny infers—from the Sonnets—to have been the principal features of his character.

Kenny's mistake is evident from a third point, which is, perhaps, the most important of all, in so far as it is aimed at the very essence of Shakespeare's mental life. There can be

no doubt that the inferences touching the poet's character which are drawn from his works, are, in a very great measure, unsafe; still we learn from these works on all sides that the author must have wrestled with the deepest mysteries of human nature and of human life, and that he was able to comprehend and to solve them, so far as they can be comprehended and solved by the human mind. We find even that this knowledge of Shakespeare's was by no means exclusively the result of intuition or inspiration, but that he had honestly worked to obtain it, that he had acquired his positive knowledge simply by the most searching observation and unremitting self-culture. In this respect, the poet's art, and above all the art of the dramatic poet, is distinguished from that of the musician and painter, with whom Kenny compares poets; in the case of the musician and painter, positive knowledge and independent thought play but a very subordinate part. Shakespeare, on the other hand, the thousand-souled—*μυριόνους*—as Coleridge calls him, thought out and himself lived through all the varied emotions which move the human heart and mind; and that this incessant mental work, this all-embracing inward experience, induced anything but a cheerful or light-hearted state of mind, of this we have unequivocal testimony in his own works. In fact, these experiences cast a gloom over him, and he no doubt had many a hard year to live through, and inward struggles to contend with; this has been convincingly pointed out by Gervinus more especially. What a difference there is between the profound, embittered seriousness and the majestic weight of thought in Shakespeare's later tragedies, compared with the buoyancy and joyousness exhibited in the dramas of his youthful days, and what a period of increasing depth of thought lies between them! He who has felt the transitoriness of earthly things, who has brooded over life and destiny, in the way the author of "Hamlet" and of "The Tempest" must have done, cannot possibly have been a superficial, irresolute, and wavering character, or have passed over the surface of life lightly, as Kenny maintains. Kenny has, in fact, not grasped the matter in the right spirit; for Shakespeare was, in truth, modest, or, correctly speaking, upright and unpretentious. Being a declared enemy of every species of arrogance, conceit, and vanity, he would never have tolerated any such failings in himself. This unassuming demeanour is, with rare exceptions, the inheritance of all great minds, whereas arrogance, as

a rule, is characteristic of a mind of the second or third rank. In this respect, again, Shakespeare shows an unmistakable resemblance to Walter Scott, of whom Robert Chambers[1] says: "along with the most perfect uprightness of conduct, he was characterized by extraordinary simplicity of manners. He was invariably gracious and kind, and it was impossible ever to detect in his conversation a symptom of his grounding the slightest title to consideration upon his literary fame, or of his even being conscious of it. Of all men living, the most modest, as likewise the greatest and most virtuous, was Sir W. Scott." The application of this judgment to Shakespeare could not be opposed on any one point, unless it were those passages in the Sonnets where the poet speaks of the immortality of his poems and wishes his eulogized friend the same immortal fame. These expressions, however, are so directly contradicted by the poet's well-known observations on the transitoriness of all earthly things, and by his treatment of his own works, that we can hardly be wrong in describing the passages referred to as the customary substance and the conventional style of language of sonnet-poetry. Had Shakespeare meant the remark to be taken seriously, he would surely, and above all things, have attended to the printing of his Sonnets, in place of distributing them in MS.; no legal consideration would have prevented his doing so, as in the case of the publication of his dramatic works. Yet, very far from making any attempt to have his Sonnets published, Shakespeare seems rather to have put difficulties in the way of this; at all events the praise which is bestowed in the dedication upon Mr. W. H. as "the onlie begetter," contains an indirect reproach of this kind against Shakespeare. However, the poet in his Sonnets also speaks with indifference of fame, criticism, and adulation, and the words in Sonnet 112 may perhaps more justly be regarded as an outpouring of his own personal conviction, than the above-quoted remarks on immortality. In Sonnet 112 he says:—

> In so profound abysm I throw all care
> Of others' voices, that my adder's sense
> To critic and to flatterer stopped are.

We find ourselves even less able to follow Kenny's inter-

[1] *Life of Scott* (1871), p. 105.

pretation of Shakespeare's character, when—in our endeavour to unravel the poet's ideas of life and nature—we turn to his dramatic works for information. This is an endeavour that has already frequently been made, and has invariably led to different conclusions, so that Goethe's words:—

> For after all each reader
> Finds in the Book only a reflection of himself,

may very properly be applied here. But nevertheless we have, nay, are obliged to return to the subject again and again, for it must necessarily happen that fresh traits are discovered—traits that may become generally accepted as true—and thus, in the end, we may succeed in obtaining a delineation of character that can claim to be in some degree reliable, at all events, in outline. And even though here, as elsewhere, the truth should be withheld from us, still the desire for truth is deeply implanted in our natures, and the desire is both a necessity and a blessing. And although we may here again have merely a variation of Goethe's words:—

> What you the Spirit of the Ages call,
> Is nothing but the spirit of you all
> Wherein the Ages are reflected,[1]

this reflex of one generation after another in the imperishable mirror of Shakespeare's poetry has its full justification, and to a certain extent serves as a standard for measuring the ebb and flow in the culture of these generations.

At the head of all these investigations naturally stands Shakespeare's relation to Religion and to the Church. English as well as German commentators have repeatedly examined Shakespeare's plays with a view to their religious character,[2] and it has been found, in the first place, that Shakespeare like all other English poets was intimately acquainted with the Bible, and that from an æsthetic point of view—as is admitted on all sides—the poet has invariably made appropriate and characteristic use of it. That the Bible should have thus been made use of by a secular, and above all by a dramatic poet, is an insurmountable objection to a great many

[1] Goethe's *Faust*, translated by Bayard Taylor (scene 1).
[2] See above, p. 386.

Englishmen, so much so that Bowdler has even outstripped King James's famous decree that all oaths and references to God's name be struck out of Shakespeare's works, for in his Family edition of the poet's works Bowdler has eliminated every reference to the Bible as a profanation.[1] How far this principle is carried is proved by a passage in the Second Part of "King Henry IV." (iii. 2), where Justice Shallow says: "Death, as the Psalmist saith, is certain to all; all shall die;" now the Folio omits the word "as the Psalmist says," and Bowdler follows the Folio, thus showing that he considers the reference to be objectionable for his Family edition. Such a proceeding is, to say the least, an outcome of the most narrow-minded prejudice. That Bowdler does not stand alone in this view of the case is proved, not only by the numerous editions of his "Family Shakespeare," but also by the opinions and remarks made by many other commentators and literary historians. Gifford speaks of his idolized Jonson as a brilliant example to Shakespeare in this respect; "Shakespeare," he says, "is in truth the coryphæus of profanation."[2] Upon the same grounds, the whole Puritanical mediocrity, up to our own day, has exalted Milton at Shakespeare's expense, in doing which, naturally, the obscenities in Shakespeare are made the most striking evidence of his total moral depravity, and there are not a few people who consider Shakespeare not "decent reading" for a Christian. The book which perhaps goes furthest upon these lines is one written by W. J. Birch, a work of unparalleled worthlessness and prejudice.[3] The author does nothing but run through the various plays, and any passages referring to the point in question, even the most innocent ones, are forced on to the Procrustes' bed of his one and exclusive idea, that Shakespeare was an atheist, a blasphemer, and a despiser of all religions, like Montaigne and Bacon, whose writings Shakespeare must have studied and highly valued. Birch does not distinguish in the slightest degree between what Shakespeare's personages have and are obliged to say in accordance with their characters, and what

[1] Of course all ribald and immoral passages are likewise struck out. Bowdler has also published a *Family Gibbon, with the careful Omission of all Passages of an Irreligious or Immoral Tendency.*

[2] Gifford, *The Works of B. Jonson*, London, 1853 (Moxon), p. lv.

[3] *An Inquiry into the Philosophy and Religion of Shakespeare* (London, 1848).

may be regarded as the poet's own personal views; indeed, Birch's "Inquiry" is neither consistent nor exhaustive in any way. Every word uttered by the poet's dramatic personages, whether by a clown like Dogberry, or by a wretch like Iago, is put down to the poet's account. Portia, who is eulogized by Von Hebler as a model Christian lady,[1] Birch declares to be no Christian at all; he sees nothing in her but "profane levity." And Birch, moreover, makes such false quotations that one is disposed to doubt the author's honesty. For instance, he makes Shakespeare say in "A Midsummer Night's Dream," "the religious, the lunatic, and the poet are of imagination all compact," in place of "the lover, the lunatic," &c. Birch further considers that Sonnet 74 contains a denial of the Redemption, and the famous epitaph, "Good friend, for Jesus' sake forbear" (which is clearly not Shakespeare's at all), he regards as a frivolous jest. Birch does not say anything directly against Shakespeare's morality, he merely asks in Tartuffe's fashion: "Is there nothing in the works of this celebrated man to justify the suspicion of immorality?" He gives no answer to the question himself, but every reader must feel that the answer he had in his mind was, "Yes, there is." Those who do not agree with him, or think differently, are, from his point of view, *ipso facto* immoral good-for-nothings, if not veritable wretches; this is so common a method of criticism that it cannot cause surprise.

However, there are, even among the clergy, men of clearer thought who do not share these narrow views. Chief among these stands Charles Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrew's, who, in his intelligent and careful work, expressly defends the poet against Bowdler's assertions, and indeed, compared with Bowdler's work, Bishop Wordsworth's may be said to have rendered little less than a courageous and meritorious service. It is characteristic, however, that even this liberal-minded ecclesiastic should have found it necessary, in his preface, to seek the shelter of high and venerated authorities for the circumstance that his name—that of a Bishop!—is found on the title-page of a work on Shakespeare. Wordsworth had, in fact, originally intended to publish his work anonymously, but eventually submitted to the wish of his publishers. He

[1] My *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 104.

consoles himself, therefore, with a remark of Dr. John Sharp (1644-1714), who on one occasion said, "The Bible and Shakespeare have made me Archbishop of York," and with St. Chrysostom, whose favourite author was Aristophanes. From the same garland of quotations, from which Birch could draw nothing but sceptical and atheistical poison, Wordsworth gathers the episcopal honey of Bible-Christianity. He proves not only that Shakespeare had a rare knowledge of the Bible (which scarcely needed proving), but also that he never degenerates into profanity; that, in fact, his references to the Bible are invariably highly poetic, exhibiting deep earnestness and true reverence. Shakespeare's subordinate characters, his "fools" and "madmen"—as the Bishop points out to his own and to his readers' satisfaction—do not indeed always refer to Holy Scripture with that reverence which is expected in our day; still, many of their immodest jests, the Bishop thinks, were certainly not written by the poet, but were introduced into the text by the actors. The Bishop supports this statement upon Dr. Farmer's unfounded supposition that the French obscenities in the last scene of "Henry V." were the work of some other hand.[1] The conclusion to which Bishop Wordsworth comes, after discussing the various passages, will probably be accepted only by those who are specifically of the same mind as himself. He thinks, namely, that—apart from those authors who have written on religion or theology—no other English author shows himself to have been so intimately acquainted with the Bible, or to have made use of it to the same extent as Shakespeare. This phenomenon, says the Bishop, may be looked at from several points of view, but that he views it only in its connection with the undoubted fact that Shakespeare is universally regarded as the greatest and best of all English writers. Bishop Wordsworth not only subscribes to Charles Lamb's[2] words, that "Shakespeare, in his divine mind and manners, surpassed not only the great men his contemporaries, but all mankind," but goes even a step further by maintaining that it is "those only who have disputed the superior merit and excellency of our poet, who have denied the value and the authority of Holy Scriptures. The disparagement of such judges, and especially

[1] See above, p. 376.
[2] *Specimens of English Dramatic Poets*, i. 71 (Preface).

of Voltaire and David Hume," he says, "is an additional confirmation of the otherwise unanimous panegyric with which Shakespeare has been honoured." It is only an ecclesiastic, however, who could discover any mysterious causal connection in this coincidence, and it is not even altogether correct.

Those of the German clergy who have taken up the study of Shakespeare have come to a different, and in some measure to an opposite conclusion; and, in fact, their decision is even less to the point than that of their English brethren. For, while the highest excellence which the English have attributed to Shakespeare is his Bible-Christianity—though many are inclined to deny him to have been a Christian at all[1]—the German clergy fancy they find in him a reflex of their own rigorous confessionalism; they find that Shakespeare—to use an expression of Ebrard's[2]—"is firmly rooted in the soil of positive Christianity and of the Christian Faith." To all of these ecclesiastical commentators, English as well as German, the actor Quin might have addressed the same angry words which were provoked in him upon hearing that Bishop Warburton was about to publish an edition of Shakespeare's works: "I wish he would stick to his own Bible and leave us ours!"

When unaffected by theological prejudice, the case assumes the following form. Bible and Christianity have for centuries been an indissoluble part of our civilization, an inseparable mental and ethical element in our culture; like leaven they have permeated the whole system of our outward and inward life, our State institutions, our educational establishments, our literature, and our art. This is an historical fact, whatever may be thought of it. Anyone, therefore, who undertakes to depict human nature—who, in fact, like Shakespeare, wishes to hold a mirror up to the century—cannot avoid exhibiting its relation to Christianity and to the Bible

[1] See *Shakespeare, was he a Christian?* By a Cosmopolite. London, 1862.

[2] *Betrachtungen über die religiöse Bedeutung Shakespeare's*, Heidelberg, 1858; Aug. Schwatzkopff, *Shakespeare in seiner Bedeutung für die Kirche unserer Tage dagestellt*, Halle, 1865; Mor. Petri, *Zur Einführung Shakespeare's in die christliche Familie. Eine Gabe zunächst für Frauen und Jungfrauen*, Hannover, 1868; *Das Verhältniss Shakespeare's zum Christenthum.* Dr. Aug. Ebrard, Erlangen, 1870. This view also finds a representative in Von Friessen, *Das Buch: Shakspere von Gervinus. Ein Wort über dasselbe*, Leipzig, 1869.

in all its various phases, the religious fanatic as well as the devil who "can cite Scripture for his purpose."[1] Hence the use which Shakespeare, like all other poets, has made of the Bible, is shown not only to be justified but necessary. How could a Tartuffe or a Richard III. be depicted according to Bowdler's principles, when in his famous monologue (i. 3) Richard describes himself in the words :—

> And thus I clothe my naked villainy
> With old odd ends stolen out of holy writ,
> And seem a saint, when most I play the devil.

Shakespeare's position towards revealed religion is in keeping with his whole character, and, in the first place, is dramatico-objective, as Scott's is epico-objective, which is again a point of remarkable resemblance between the two poets ;[2] both have represented the relation between nature and religion altogether from an objective point of view—their reproduction of nature and human life would otherwise show an essential gap. Both poets, accordingly, are treated in the same derogatory manner by theological narrow-mindedness and prejudice, inasmuch as the poet's objectivity is perfectly unintelligible to them, and much less can they adopt his point of view.

Shakespeare, however, not only recognized Christianity to be a factor in the human world he wished to represent, but it was to himself personally an element of culture from which he could as little free himself entirely as anyone else, even though he had wished to do so. For even those who reject so-called revelation, and trace the historical and dogmatical elements of revealed religion back to mythology, to them also may be applied Horace's words (Ep. I. ii. 69) :—

> Quo semel est imbuta recens, servabit odorem
> Testa diu.

The poetic garb of Christianity exercises such a powerful and lasting impression upon the minds of the young, that the full-grown man, and more especially the poet, cannot entirely free himself from its influence. The poet, and above all the dramatic poet, moves within the mental atmosphere of Christian

[1] *The Merchant of Venice*, i. 3.
[2] See *Sir W. Scott.* by Richard H. Hutton (Lond., 1878), p. 126 ff.

conceptions, ideas, and figures of speech, and it is impossible in every single case to point out with certainty how far the poet is actually imbued with its substance, or how far the thoughts, hopes, feelings, and convictions expressed in his works are identical with his own. It has, moreover, repeatedly been shown that nowhere is it so difficult and unsafe to point to any such conclusion as in Shakespeare's case, for he surpasses all other writers in "desperate objectivity." What different attitudes Shakespeare assumes towards Christian ideas and phrases, and how little possible it is, accordingly, to form any reliable inference from them respecting his own religious convictions, is evident from the fact that he does not hesitate to put Christian, or, at all events, Biblical expressions in the mouths of his heathen personages, as for instance in "Julius Cæsar" (i. 2), where he makes Cassius say:—

> There was a Brutus once that would have brook'd
> The eternal devil to keep his state in Rome
> As easily as a king,

or when, in "Antony and Cleopatra," Antony exclaims:—

> O, that I were
> Upon the hill of Basan, to outroar
> The horned herd!

Cleopatra speaks of sin, and it seems doubtful how far this word may be based upon the specifically Christian idea of sin.[1] It is precisely the same when, in "The Merchant of Venice," we find the Jew Shylock referring to the publicans of the New Testament ("*how like a fawning publican he looks*"), and to the herd of swine into which Jesus cast the devils. Shakespeare's dramas, in fact, present a mixture of heathen and Christian phrases, and it is impossible to maintain that he has given or intended to give any one of his plays a distinctly heathen, just as little as it was his intention to give any a distinctly Christian character. It might, indeed, seem as if in "King John" he had given utterance to his belief in the immortality of the soul, in "The Merchant of Venice" to the idea of divine mercy, and elsewhere to other

[1] *Antony and Cleopatra*, iv. 13:—

> *Then it is sin*
> *To rush into the secret house of death,*
> *Ere death dare come to us.*

of the principal doctrines of the Christian Church, and that he has thus revealed his own personal convictions. However, upon a careful examination of the matter, this proves to be a mere delusion. When Portia discourses upon mercy as the essence of true religion, she does not allude to anything beyond this life; indeed, she seems rather to wish it to be understood that the sphere of mercy belongs to our earthly life;[1] mercy is to be practised by men towards men, and the lovely discourser maintains it to be one and the same thing as charity, love for our fellow-creatures, gentleness, and sympathetic goodwill. That it was Shakespeare's endeavour to make mercy (which he thus reverences so highly) the guiding star of his own life, seems to be confirmed by the epithet "*gentle*" generally conferred upon him by his contemporaries. And he must surely also have been "*gentle*" in his religious life, in advance of his contemporaries in tolerance, as may be inferred from his "Merchant of Venice," and he is scarcely likely to have agreed with them in their vehement hatred of the Jews; in this respect, therefore, he did not conform to the doctrines taught by the Church.[2] Bishop Wordsworth has silently passed over the garden-scene with Jessica, Lancelot, and Lorenzo (iii. 5), and yet this scene gives a clearer indication of Shakespeare's religious tendency, and of his position towards the dogmas of the Church, than the whole question of the so-called free use of the Bible and the irreverent jests of the clowns. The poet frequently returns to the necessity of—so to say—earthly mercy; for instance, in "Hamlet" (ii. 2), but above all in "Measure for Measure" (ii. 2), where mercy is again shown that her sphere of action is in this world, with reference, it is true, to divine mercy and redemption:—

> All the souls that were, were forfeit once;
> And He that might the vantage best have took
> Found out the remedy. How would you be,
> If He, which is the top of judgment, should
> But judge you as you are? O, think on that;
> And mercy then will breathe within your lips,
> Like man new made.

And as regards the doctrine of the Redemption, Edward IV.

[1] The same idea of mercy is met with in *The Passionate Morrice* (1593), in *Tell-Trothes New Yeares Gift*, ed. Furnivall (for the *New Shakspere Society*), p. 103, and in Dryden, *The Hind and the Panther*, i. 259 ff.

[2] See my *Essays on Shakespeare*, p. 109 ff.

in "King Richard III." (ii. 1) speaks of his Redeemer, whom he hopes may call him to Him, but whether Edward is used as the mouthpiece for the poet's own inward conviction, or merely as an historical character, it is impossible to say.[1]

As little can it be determined what was Shakespeare's personal view with regard to immortality, for those commentators who appeal—in vindication of the poet's belief in immortality—to the hope expressed by Lady Constance in "King John," will have to account for Lear's lament over Cordelia's corpse; and anyone who has ever heard a great actor give utterance to Lear's cry of anguish in the word "Never," five times repeated, is not likely to forget the depth of infinite grief there expressed, nor can it be doubted that such a cry of anguish could only have been wrung from a person to whom the next world is, at most, the great Perhaps. In explanation of this contradiction, it might be said that Lady Constance speaks believingly, like a woman, and Lear unbelievingly, like a man. The fact of "King Lear" playing in ante-Christian times does not—according to what has been said above—offer any plausible explanation of the case, and, indeed, it is a matter of absolute indifference in this respect whether the poet's personages are heathens or Christians. What strange anomalies of this kind are met with in Shakespeare, is proved by the following circumstance. No poet has introduced so many persons on the point of death as Shakespeare, but, of all these, it is only the heathens Antony and Cleopatra who allude to meeting again after death, and Cleopatra, moreover, in doing so directly contradicts herself, for shortly before her death she speaks in praise of death as eternal sleep.[2] And even at the death of Queen Katharine (in "Henry VIII."), who dies like a saint with a vision of heaven opening to receive her, there is no word of a meeting beyond the grave. And nowhere else in Shakespeare is any hopeful or comforting prospect offered of a future life, and in the outbursts of grief over the beloved dead, nowhere do we find any of the Christian forms of consolation; the refrain is ever that

[1] See also *Macbeth*, iv. 3:—

Angels are bright still, though the brightest fell;
Though all things foul would wear the brows of grace,
Yet grace must still look so.

[2] *Antony and Cleopatra*, iv. 14, and v. 2. See above, p. 190, note 2.

death is our inevitable destiny, a fate common to all. Excessive grief is said to be

> A fault to heaven,
> A fault against the dead, a fault to nature,
> To reason most absurd; whose common theme
> Is death of fathers, and who still hath cried
> From the first corse till he that died to-day,
> "This must be so."

This idea is expressed not only by King Claudius to Hamlet, but even more emphatically by the Countess of Rousillon and Lafeu, to Helena, without either one or other of them trying to console the orphans with a prospect of a meeting in another world, which might at least have been expected from the Countess as the woman. This view, however, can again be opposed by the lovely description of the music of the spheres which, we are told in "The Merchant of Venice," we shall one day hear when we have cast aside our "vesture of decay." Still, from an examination of single passages it is impossible to arrive at any definite conclusion, for, as already proved by the above quotations, every passage can be contrasted with one exactly its reverse; and, accordingly, it can never be inferred with certainty where the poet is expressing his own personal conviction and where merely allowing his dramatic personages to speak. Hence all such remarks as "heaven keeps his part in eternal life" ("Romeo and Juliet," iv. 5, 70), "her immortal part with angels lives" (ibid. v. 1, 19), "mine eternal jewel" ("Macbeth," iii. 1, 68), "my soul Being a thing immortal," &c. ("Hamlet," i. 4, 66), prove nothing whatever. To examine all the passages that apply to the question would fill a book, and yet lead to no result; and it is surely too mechanical a proceeding that Gervinus recommends, to collect all the maxims in Shakespeare's works, and note which recur the most frequently, and thus obtain the sum-total of the poet's ideas. For, can all these maxims be regarded as the expressions of Shakespeare's personal convictions? His works might, in fact, be made to prove anything, like the Bible, and with some degree of constraint Shakespeare might—according to each one's pleasure—be made out an orthodox Catholic or a Protestant, a possibility which most clearly proves the worthlessness of arriving at conclusions obtained from such a method. We are, therefore, obliged to look round for a different and, if possible, for more trust-

worthy evidence, and this we find to be nothing less than Shakespeare's objectivity.

Shakespeare's objectivity is, in fact, so marvellous and unparalleled, and at the same time so indisputable—even as regards religious matters—that it is one of the few points in Shakespeare controversy on which all commentators and critics, without exception, are agreed.[1] Shakespeare gives every form of faith and every expression of faith its due, without showing preference for the one or the other form; the same wind and the same sun for all alike, is his motto here also. His supposed preference for Catholicism—a question which has repeatedly been discussed—in no way contradicts the poet's almost superhuman justice and impartiality, as will be shown immediately. This unparalleled objectivity would not have been possible to Shakespeare had he been a strictly orthodox follower of any one special religious body. Religious credulity and objectivity neutralize each other, owing to their very nature; the former must inevitably be narrow-minded or exclusive, while the latter is completely the reverse. Shakespeare's religious objectivity, and we may add his moral objectivity as well, prove that his point of view was above all Church doctrines, and as far removed from the Protestant as from the Roman Catholic dogmas—in other words, his point of view was humanity. Had he been imbued with any special religious faith he could not have avoided referring to his sentiments, although he need not have exactly expressed them openly, and he would also have unconsciously applied them as his standard. Goethe[2] has called Shakespeare "a truly pious nature," who "cultivated his pure, inward nature without regard to any definite religion." With this remark we cannot but cordially agree. Shakespeare never attacks anything that men of thought and feeling held to be great, sublime, reverent, or sacred. And although in some instances he does direct the point of his wit against dogmatism, still he is anything but a blasphemer. Shakespeare finds the central point of religion to be our conscience, the fulfilment of our duty, not dogma; in every case he insists upon an active life in the service of morality and the active exercise of charity.[3]

[1] *Outlines*, i. vi. ff.

[2] *Shakespeare und kein Ende*, ii.

[3] *Love's Labour's Lost*, i. 1; Gervinus, *Shakespeare Commentaries;* König in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, vi. 290.

He abhors idleness, lifeless learning, and the abuse of the powers bestowed upon us. Gervinus says that to Shakespeare manly honour and energy are one and the same thing; at any rate, Shakespeare knows that "the web of our life is of a mingled yarn, good and ill together," and that the "best men are moulded out of faults."[1] But this very fact, as the poet has repeatedly and emphatically stated, enforces upon us the duty of moral purification, by curbing our passions, and by keeping within due bounds in all human things; against excess the poet expresses himself everywhere directly, and even more so indirectly, and repeatedly demands that blood, *i.e.*, passion and desire, shall be curbed by judgment, *i.e.*, by reason. Gervinus very justly remarks that it is not virtue by habit, but on principle, not virtue by instinct, but tested by experience, the outcome of reason and strength of will, that Shakespeare values most highly. Without doubt, the poet learned the necessity of moral purification both from outward experience as well as from a knowledge of his own inmost heart, and, unless we are misled on all hands, he had to undergo this purifying process himself. True repentance and atonement, Shakespeare considers a new lease of life, as Hamlet distinctly tells his mother in the closet-scene. Whether man will or will not fulfil the moral task required of him, is a matter for himself to decide, and the only power that will help him towards fulfilling the task is his own conscience. All the poet's dramatic personages act of their own free will and choice; Shakespeare is no fatalist, and in every instance speaks in favour of free will; according to him, not only is each one of us the maker of our own individual happiness or unhappiness (as he was of his), but each one of us is wholly responsible for our own actions; in this idea Christianity and Humanism are alike. Schiller's words from "Wallenstein" might be applied to Shakespeare's idea—

In thine own breast is thy destiny's star.

In our own breasts lie our determination and the responsibility, our reward or punishment, our happiness or unhappiness. Nothing, according to Shakespeare, is more unreasonable and foolish than to make the stars answerable for our own wrong-doings, "as if we were villains by necessity." There can be no more unequivocal and emphatic declaration on this

[1] *All's Well that Ends Well*, iv. 3; *Measure for Measure*, v. 1.

point than the unanimous expressions of the two wretches Edmund and Iago;[1] and Richard III. also, says he is a villain, not because fate has made him one, but because he has determined to be one.

Shakespeare is quite logical in further assuming the world itself to be a moral organism, in which the single individual is, of inner necessity, merely a part of the whole. No one has a separate existence, but exists rather through and for the whole. The poet does, indeed, in hours of trouble, doubt our destiny; he then thinks that "a man's life is no more than to say 'One;'" man is but

> A poor player,
> That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
> And then is heard no more: it is a tale
> Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
> Signifying nothing.[1]

These utterances of despair, however, come from the lips of Hamlet and Macbeth, and we have here again to face the problem as to how much may be the poet's own personal and final conviction. Perhaps we approach the truth more nearly with the thought that it is only through the organism as a whole, that the individual can possibly attain the moral perfection which is the aim of all life, and which the individual owes to himself as well as to the organism as a whole; and for this reason—in accordance with the Divine command—no one dare set a limit to his own life. This is not only said by Hamlet, but is also emphasized by others of the poet's characters. This ethical world-organism exists in and for itself; it has the power to reward and to punish good and evil, "the world's history is the world's own judgment." It does not require any fulfilment in a world beyond the grave, and in Shakespeare nowhere is this held in prospect. The poet does indeed in "Hamlet" (v. 2) say, "the readiness is all," and again in "King Lear" (v. 2), "the ripeness is all;" but this is said of our task in this world, a task that had to be fulfilled if we wish to be able to look death calmly in the face. What is to come after death is not known, as no one has ever yet returned from the unknown land. The Beyond is and remains an eternal mystery. And the poet is perfectly conscious that it is impossible to fathom the supernatural. Still he does not allow this knowledge to lead him either into mysticism

[1] *Hamlet*, v. 2, and *Macbeth*, v. 5.

or into superstition, but calmly confronts these supernatural mysteries; and this is certainly another proof that revealed religion did not solve the mystery for him. That philosophy was unable to explain them he has repeatedly said, and this leads one to conjecture that it was by philosophy and not by religion that he expected these mysteries to be solved; Hamlet says, "there are more things in heaven and earth, than are dreamt of in philosophy," and Lafeu (in "All's Well that Ends Well") thinks that the days of "miracles are past; and we have our philosophical persons, to make modern and familiar things supernatural and causeless; hence is it that we make trifles of terrors, ensconcing ourselves into seeming knowledge, when we should submit ourselves to an unknown fear." This unknown fear, therefore, we are not to speculate about further, but to accept it as something inevitable. Edgar (in "King Lear," v. 2) says in the clearest manner:—

> Men must endure
> Their going hence, even as their coming hither.

And Prospero (in "The Tempest," iv. 1) adds:—

> We are such stuff
> As dreams are made on, and our little life
> Is rounded with a sleep.

That is to say, we come from Nothing and return to Nothing.[1] The same thought is met with again in "Titus Andronicus" (i. 2), where Titus in front of the sepulchre says:—

> Here are no storms,
> No noise, but silence and eternal sleep.

Hamlet is, indeed, troubled by the thought that dreams may perchance disturb us in that eternal sleep; but the mystery is beyond him and he lets the question drop. Accordingly, as all this is so absolutely uncertain, Shakespeare makes man fulfil his destiny in this world, "the rest is silence."[2]

But it is not only as regards immortality that Shakespeare leaves dogma out of the question, he does so also with regard to things in general. It is not faith but knowledge that he praises as the highest human acquisition, in the splendid lines:—

[1] See, De Quincey, *Shakespeare* (Edin., 1864), p. 66; Green, *A Short History of the English People* (1875), p. 428.

[2] The word immortality occurs only twice in Shakespeare, in *Pericles*, iii. 2, and in *Lucrece*, l. 725; the first quotation refers to earthly immortality, whereas Lucrece, the heathen, refers to her "immortal part."

Ignorance is the curse of God,
Knowledge the wing wherewith we fly to heaven.[1]

Shakespeare had passed from revealed religion to the purest and noblest form of Humanism, and is a Christian poet only in so far as true Christianity and true Humanism are synonymous. He who would perceive this at a glance need only compare Shakespeare with Milton, Dante, Calderon, or Klopstock, the latter are poets who profess revealed religion, whereas before Shakespeare's day revealed religion appeared an historical phenomenon, and Shakespeare, with his world-embracing insight, viewed it in all its different forms and phases. In fact, Shakespeare—like the writers of the classic age in German literature—confesses his ideal to be Humanism; this is also the reason why all the different forms of faith find themselves mirrored in him and attest his moral greatness, and why even the most narrow-minded dogmatist cannot deny this to be his ideal. We find this also to be the reason why the German classic writers—Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe—felt themselves irresistibly drawn to Shakespeare; they felt themselves, in this respect also, to be his nearest intellectual kinsmen, in fact, flesh of his flesh.

When the religious and ecclesiastical character of the Shakespearean age is carefully studied, it becomes distinctly evident why and how it was that not only Shakespeare, but the better portion of his contemporaries, had to turn from the dogmatic conception of religion and to adopt the ideal of Humanism. Church and religion had been dragged so completely into the whirl of politics that they had almost lost their independent existence, their aim and purpose. The Reformation in England was mainly political in character, the Puritans first gave it a religious and ecclesiastical aspect, but overshot the mark, and fell into the opposite extreme themselves. The Reformation in England was not the work of the people, as it had been in Germany, but was a State arrangement, it may, indeed, be said to have been the mere whim of an unbridled despot; it did not arise in England, as it had done in Germany, from the national conscience, but from the political views of a dynasty. Macaulay, in his ingenious Essay on "Lord Burleigh and His Times," points out

[1] In *Henry VI.* Part II. iv. 7.

that there existed, indeed, a Catholic as well as a Protestant party—both comparatively small—but adds that the nation at large had fallen into a strange and heedless mixture of the two religious systems, like those Samaritan settlers spoken of in the Second Book of Kings (chap. xvii.), who feared the Lord and yet worshipped idols. The mass of the people seemed as ready to belong to the Protestant as to the Catholic Church. How otherwise could they so calmly have tolerated the return of Catholicism under the Bloody Mary, and then again a return to Protestantism under Elizabeth? These abrupt changes in the form of religion—which were not supported by any movement among the people themselves—produced a feeling of vacillation and unrest, which finally led to a feeling of absolute indifference towards ecclesiastical and religious life. Owing to the persecutions by both parties, it was no less dangerous openly to follow the Old Faith, than emphatically to give preference to the New form. By means of strict laws and threats of punishment the people—as is well known—were forced to attend church and to give some outward sign of their religious confession. What was more natural, under such circumstances, than secret aversion to every form of religion? What else could enlightened men do but seek in some other province the inward satisfaction denied them here? And this satisfaction was found in Humanism, the Renaissance of literature and philosophy, which, in continuous progress, developed a rich and vigorous life in England during the sixteenth century, and offered poets and writers full compensation; accordingly in the most natural way, and almost unperceived, Humanism came to take the place of ecclesiasticism. This process was powerfully stimulated by the active study of the modern literatures—themselves in a state of full vigour—more particularly the literatures of France and Italy; they had been urged forward towards ideal Humanism by the effects of the Reformation and the study of the classics.

It is obvious, for instance, that Montaigne must have aroused a varied and lasting influence among English thinkers and writers, by the captivating and insinuating scepticism of his "Essays" that were so widely read. The singular religious position occupied by the Elizabethan dramatists does not seem to have been altogether rightly interpreted by Macaulay,[1] inasmuch as he does not consider that this position was the result

[1] *Lord Burleigh and His Times.*

of Humanism. He thinks that the dramatists spoke respectfully of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, but that they spoke, "neither like Catholics nor like Protestants, but like persons who are wavering between the two systems, or who have made a system for themselves out of parts selected from both. They seem to hold some of the Romish rites and doctrines in high respect, and the partiality of Shakespeare for friars is well known, and yet the author of 'King John' and of 'Henry VIII.' was surely no friend to papal supremacy." We shall endeavour presently to solve this seeming contradiction in a different and, as we think, a more correct way. Besides, as already said, Shakespeare does not by any means stand alone in this respect, indeed the whole cycle of the Elizabethan poets occupied a more or less similar position towards positive religion, on the one hand, and towards Humanism on the other. From Greene's "Groat's Worth of Wit," we learn that Marlowe was considered a wicked infidel, and that Greene himself did not deserve much higher praise till he lay on his death-bed and was converted.[1] Bacon and Raleigh were deists, Sydney patronized Giordano Bruno, who was burnt as a heretic. Beaumont and Fletcher make the same "free use" of the Bible that has been so much found fault with in Shakespeare. All the others were little better, at least in the eyes of the utterly penitent Greene. Ben Jonson was the only one who—according to Gifford—to a certain extent differed from the rest in their general want of faith; but his case cannot be said to form a very laudable exception, for Jonson turned Catholic and then again joined the Protestant Church. If Ben Jonson's religious sentiments had really been what Gifford describes them to have been, it is an insignificant fact that Jonson, in his elegy on Shakespeare, makes no allusion whatever to Shakespeare's religious feelings, for Jonson would assuredly not have omitted to do so, if any praise could have been attached to the point in question.

By the side of this external and certainly somewhat weak evidence, opposing the idea of Shakespeare's strict orthodoxy, we have further indications that carry more weight and must the less be left unnoticed, as some critics have viewed them from a different point of view and interpreted them in an

[1] "*Wonder not (for with thee will I first begin) thou famous gracer of tragedians, that Greene, who hath said with thee, like the fool in his heart, there is no God, should now give glory to his greatness.*"

entirely opposite sense. For when we bear in mind that the poet's family evidently entertained strictly orthodox views—of a Puritanical colouring—there can be no doubt that the differences which arose between the poet and his family on this account, are distinctly perceptible in the inscription on the tombstone of his daughter Susanna :—

> Witty above her sexe, but that's not all,
> Wise to salvation was good Mistris Hall;
> Something of Shakespere was in that, but this
> Wholy of Him with whom she's now in blisse.[1]

Accordingly, in the wit and wisdom that distinguished her above her sex, Mrs. Hall resembled her father, whereas her religious piety she owed exclusively to God. The case is in no way strange; Mrs. Shakespeare and Mrs. Hall merely followed the general tendency of their sex, the necessity and desire of all women, by showing an interest and liking for ecclesiastical concerns; while Shakespeare, as the man, probably found no satisfaction in them. That the opening lines of Shakespeare's will—which was not even drawn up by him—cannot be regarded as opposing this supposition, has already been pointed out by Ulrici[2] among others. These opening lines of the will—where the testator expresses the hope that through the only merits of Jesus Christ, his Saviour, he may be made partaker of life everlasting—are nothing but the standing phrase for the beginning of a Protestant will in those days, and do not, in the slightest degree, prove anything as regards the testator's religious sentiments; prove only that he was a Protestant in so far as the justification by faith alone (*sola fide*) is one of the most important and distinguishing dogmas of the Protestant Church.

This leads us to the well-known endeavours that have been made to declare Shakespeare to have been an orthodox Roman Catholic; but from what has been said above, it is clear how any such attempts have to be judged. To enter into a detailed examination or refutation of these endeavours would be absolutely useless, considering the circles from which these attempts have emanated; for in spite of the admirable analysis of the question by M. Bernays[3] and others, which ought to have

[1] See Hunter, *New Illustrations*, i. 105 ff.; Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 270.
[2] *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art*, i. p. 237.
[3] *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, i. 220 ff.

settled the matter once and for ever, Dr. August Reichensperger and Dr. A. Hager have again entered the lists to challenge anyone who would dispute the right of the one true Church to claim Shakespeare as one of its flock. Both Reichensperger and Hager maintain Shakespeare to have been a Crypto-Roman Catholic, what Hager was himself for a time—according to his own confession—although a Protestant clergyman.[1] It is useless repeating the old arguments, and again and again pointing out that Davies' well-known remark of Shakespeare having "died a Papist," is of no value whatever; that the supposed will of John Shakespeare, found under the roof of Shakespeare's birthplace in 1770, is nothing but a gross piece of forgery;[2] and that, even granting its genuineness, it could prove nothing respecting the poet, and only of the father's opinions. It needs but a minimum of critical acumen to see the question in its proper light. Whether Shakespeare's father was a recusant or not, whether or not the oath of allegiance to the Queen—as head of the Church—which was required of him as an alderman and bailiff was compatible with his supposed Crypto-Roman Catholicism, may be left wholly out of the question; this much is certain, that Shakespeare, according to the clearest and most irrefutable historical evidence, belonged to the Protestant Church. To quote a striking passage from Ulrici,[3] "Shakespeare was baptized[4] [and buried] in the Protestant church of Stratford; he, no doubt, attended the grammar school of the town and received there his first religious instruction in the Protestant faith. The licence for his marriage (after the banns had been proclaimed but once)

[1] Reichensperger, *William Shakespeare, insbesondere sein Verhältniss zum Mittelalter und zur Gegenwart*, Münster, 1872; Hager, *Die Grösse Shakespeare's*, Freiburg in Breisgau, 1873. See also F. A. Rio, *Shakespeare*, Paris, 1864; *Was Shakespeare a Catholic?* (by Simpson) in *The Rambler* (a Catholic periodical), 1854, No. 7; *Was Shakespeare a Roman Catholic?* in the *Edinburgh Review*, No. ccli. Jan. 1866. Even Chateaubriand (*Essai sur la litt. angl.*, i. 195) maintained that *Shakspere, s'il était quelque chose était catholique*, &c.

[2] See Drake, *Shakespeare and his Times*, i. 8 ff. With regard to Davies' remark, see above, p. 104 (note).

[3] *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art*, i. p. 235.

[4] The fact of Shakespeare having been baptized in a Protestant church furnishes conclusive evidence as regards the poet's father; would he have had his children baptized as Protestants if he had himself been a member of the Catholic Church?

was obtained from a Protestant bishop, and accordingly the ceremony was performed in a Protestant church. What reason is there then for supposing him to have been a Catholic?" Let us for a moment suppose the question reversed, and that we possessed documentary evidence of the poet having been baptized and buried in a Catholic church, of the banns of his marriage having been proclaimed and the marriage itself having been celebrated according to the rites of the Romish Church, and of his children having been baptized as Catholics, —what would the Catholics say were a Protestant commentator to venture, in face of such facts, to declare Shakespeare to have been a Protestant? The Catholics, it is true, raise the objection that, owing to the religious despotism which prevailed, the adherents of the Catholic Church had no alternative but outwardly to affect the Protestant doctrines: to be married and to have their children baptized according to the rites of the new Church, and hence that no certain conclusion respecting their religious confession can be inferred from these circumstances; in fact, that all were forcibly driven to become Crypto-Catholics. However, if we turn to the Church history of the Elizabethan period, this idea is proved to be absolutely incorrect; and, indeed, it is obvious that it was not so much compulsion as indifference towards their own Church, that induced the Catholics to show an interest in affairs connected with the Protestant Church. We hear of priests who in public made use of the Protestant Liturgy, and then read mass in private houses; we hear of Catholics who on one and the same day "partook of the Table of our Lord and of the table of devils," *i.e.*, of the Blessed Eucharist and of the Calvinistic Supper;[1] nay, we often hear of priests who administered the Sacrament either according to the Catholic or according to the Protestant rite, as happened to be wished, and who had provided themselves with the necessary means for performing the service in either way. Is this religious compulsion or indifference? Another Catholic Church historian[2] reports: "Deferebantur filii catholicorum ad baptisteria hæreticorum, ac inter illorum manus matrimonia con-

[1] These words sufficiently prove that the above passage is taken from a Catholic source, viz., from Edward Rishton's *Continuation of the "History,"* ed. by David Lewis (Lond. 1877), p. 267. See, Fred. Geo. Lee, *The Church under Queen Elizabeth* (Lond. 1880), i. 110 ff.

[2] Ribadeneira, *de Schismate*, p. 53, apud Hallam, i. 162 note.

trahebant. Atque hæc omnia sine omni scrupulo fiebant, facta propter catholicorum sacerdotum ignorantiam, qui talia vel licere credebant, vel timore quodam præpediti dissimulabant." But the Catholic clergy, who followed the doctrines of their Church with greater sincerity, were able to attend to the decrees of their Church, respecting baptisms and marriages, without any great difficulty, although it would seem that the Catholic form of worship was not allowed to be held in public places. "Migratory priests of the old rite came round occasionally to aid and minister to trusted families; many of them are married if not by seminaries and Jesuits, by old Mass priests and by the words of the Mass Book; their children are not christened in the churches, neither do their wives go there to return thanks for deliverance." [1] From this incontrovertible historical evidence, it is absolutely certain that there could be no reason why Shakespeare should have found himself compelled to be married according to the Protestant rites, or to have had his children baptized as Protestants, but that he acted of his own free will in this respect.[2]

Although almost superfluous, we may here refer to one point in this connection that has hitherto been overlooked. From the notes of his medical work, kept by Dr. Hall, Shakespeare's son-in-law, it is unmistakably clear that Dr. Hall was a decided and strictly orthodox Protestant. Not only is his ability and popularity as a physician distinctly evident from the remark in the second Preface to his "Select Observations," published after his death, where it is said, "Nay, such as hated him for his Religion, often made use of him;" but Dr. Hall himself never omits in his Journal stating when the patient was a Catholic.[3] In 1632, after having recovered from a dangerous illness, Dr. Hall wrote a thanksgiving for his recovery in a truly Protestant spirit;[4] indeed he never

[1] This is reported by Dr. William James—Dean, afterwards Bishop of Durham—to Lord Burghley (apud Lee, *The Church under Queen Elizabeth*, ii. 277).

[2] See the account given by Froude in his *History of England*, &c., *Reign of Elizabeth* (Lond. 1870), v. 306.

[3] For instance: "*Mrs. Peerse of Anson, Roman Catholicke* (p. 28); *Browne, a Romish priest. The Catholick was cured* (p. 41); *Mrs. Richardson, Roman Catholick*" (p. 167). We shall have to speak more fully of Dr. Hall's *Select Observations* in our next chapter.

[4] In Halliwell's *An Historical Account of New Place*, London, 1864.

failed, in cases where the cure had been difficult, to give the credit to God. And are we to believe that so resolute an anti-Catholic would have connected himself with a Catholic family by marrying Shakespeare's daughter, if the father had been an adherent of Rome?

If—as would appear from the works of Roman Catholic commentators—Roman Catholicism is unable to arrive at a clear understanding of Shakespeare's plays, all the less could Catholicism have produced them. A Catholic by name, it is possible enough Shakespeare may have been; but a Catholic in deed or in character, never! That would be an inward impossibility. Could a Catholic have written "King John" or "Henry VIII."?"[1] Would it have been possible for a Catholic to have declared that in Elizabeth's reign God should be truly known? Of all the Catholic commentators on Shakespeare, Dr. Flir alone is free from prejudice (although a clergyman), and he alone has recognized—in contrast to the latest Ultramontane enthusiasts—that Shakespeare cannot have belonged to the Catholic faith. Catholicism in its logical consequences is an institution that exhibits the greatest possible one-sidedness, not to say narrowness, of the human mind, and Shakespeare's was not only a many-sided mind, but one that embraced every point of view. His, the freest and most independent of minds, could not possibly have tolerated the mental restraint or limitation such as the Catholic Church casts upon its followers, and which in fact it must cast upon them for the sake of its own preservation. Nay, the Catholic Church in its narrow-mindedness, its police-like supervision, intolerance, and love of persecution must have been positively repulsive to Shakespeare, and, indeed, the very same reasons kept him aloof from Protestant Churchism and from Puritanism in particular.[2] Between the Papists on the one hand, and the Puritans on the other, Shakespeare may be said to have been what Goethe calls "*das Welt-kind in der Mitte;*"[3] Puritanism was, in fact, even further removed from ideal Humanism and genuine humanity than Papacy; and not having in its favour either the reverence of age or the imposing organi-

[1] See Lord Campbell, *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements*, p. 63: "In 'King John' (iii. 1), the true ancient doctrine of 'the supremacy of the crown' is laid down with great spirit and force."

[2] Dr. Flir, *Briefe über Shakespeare's Hamlet*, p. 118.

[3] The line occurs in a poem of Goethe's called *Diné*.

zation of the Roman Catholic Church it could scarcely fail to be an object of ridicule to dramatists and to Shakespeare as well.[1] Puritanism was no less a form of mental slavery than Roman Catholicism; in this respect it was the element of Romanism that had been transferred into Protestantism. The dramatists perfectly recognized the fact that the Puritans were the grave-diggers of merry Old England, and had every reason to exclaim with Sir Toby Belch against the Malvolios: "Dost thou think that because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale?" The dramatists can scarcely be blamed when, like Sir Andrew Ague-cheek, they too were inclined to cudgel the Puritans pretty soundly without any "exquisite reason;" and when—to speak in Maria's words[2]—it was said of them, "The devil a puritan that he is, or anything constantly, but a time-pleaser; an affectioned ass that cons state without book and utters it by great swarths; the best persuaded of himself, so crammed, as he thinks, with excellencies, that it is his grounds of faith that all that look on him love him." Puritanism was not only so bitter-tongued that it sipped gall from every flower in place of honey, but it degenerated into hypocrisy and pharisaism. The Puritans who made a profession of their religious piety presented so many laughable and weak points that they could not fail to

[1] Compare *The Puritan, or The Widow of Watling-Street*, a play ascribed to Shakespeare—Beaumont and Fletcher, *Women Pleased*, act iv—"*The rascally yea-forsooth knave*" in *The Second Part of King Henry IV.* i. 2, is undoubtedly meant to represent a Puritan, precisely as in the passage in *The Puritan*, v. 4: "*Where is Truly la, Indeed la, he that will not swear, but lie; he that will not steal but rob*," &c.—See also, *All's Well*, i. 3, 97 ff.: "*Though honesty be no puritan, yet it will do no hurt.*"—In *Eastward Ho!* ii. 1 (The Works of Geo. Chapman: Plays, ed. by R. H. Shepherd, 1874, p. 460 a), it is said: "*Your only smooth skin to make fine vellum, is your Puritan's skin; they be the smoothest and slickest knaves in a country.*"—The lines "*To my loving Friend and Fellow Thomas Heywood*," by Richard Perkins, prefixed to Heywood's *Apology for Actors* (ed. Collier, p. 10), give the following indirect description of a Puritan:—

> Give me a play, that no distaste can breed.
> Prove thou a spider, and from flowers suck gall;
> I'le like a bee, take honey from a weed;
> For I was never puritannicall.
>
> I love no publicke soothers, private scorners,
> That raile 'gainst letchery, yet love a harlot:
> When I drinke, 'tis a sight, and not in corners!
> I am no open saint, and secret varlet.

[2] *Twelfth Night*, ii. 3.

provoke ridicule and contempt; Catholicism could be passed over in silence, but Puritanism forced the dramatists to take notice of it; it everywhere pushed itself into the foreground, and made itself conspicuous by its foolishness; in "The Winter's Tale," iv. 3, it is said there is "but one puritan amongst them, and he sings psalms to hornpipes." Sir Andrew's words (in "Twelfth Night," iii. 2), "I had as lief be a Brownist as a politician,"[1] may probably be taken as Shakespeare's personal opinion, for his whole nature must have revolted against Puritanical principles; yet even the Puritans are treated with gentleness and toleration. This is distinctly obvious when we consider the uncouth way which Ben Jonson (in "The Alchymist" and "Bartholomew Fair") attacks the religious sect, a tendency which was progressing with dangerous rapidity. Sir Andrew's remark that he had no "exquisite reason, but good reason enough" for chastising the Puritans, Knight thinks contains a secret thrust at the hostile feelings with which the ignorant mass of the public regarded the Puritans—also without any "exquisite reason." Knight considers that the words are spoken in a spirit of the utmost toleration, which refuses to see anyone persecuted on account of his opinions. And, indeed, here—as everywhere else—Shakespeare exhibits the purest Humanism; it is to him a precept, and regulates his dealings towards those whose opinions differ from his own, even when he may have found it impossible to agree or to sympathize with them in his heart.

On account of his "King John" it has been admitted by Macaulay and others[2] that Shakespeare cannot have belonged to the Romish Church, and yet, as we have seen, the poet is said to exhibit an unmistakable liking for some of its doctrines, institutions, and customs. Macaulay, in the essay referred to, says: "In 'Hamlet' the Ghost complains of having died without extreme unction, and, in defiance of the

[1] The Brownists—who answered to the Independents or Congregationalists of our day—were not recognized by the moderate Puritans. The founder of the sect, Robert Brown, carried on his mischievous work principally between the years 1580 and 1590; in 1592, however, the fanatical sect received its death-blow; six of the leaders died on the scaffold, and fifty-six members of the community were cast into prison. See Masson, *Life of Milton*, ii. 534-538.

[2] Macaulay, *Lord Burleigh and his Times;* Thornbury, *Shakespeare's England*, i. 212, ii. 64 ff.

article which condemns the doctrine of purgatory, declares that he is doomed

> To fast in fires
> Till the foul crimes done in my days of nature
> Are burnt and purged away."

These lines, as Macaulay fears, would have called forth a tremendous storm in the theatre at any time during the reign of Charles the Second. They were, he goes on to say, clearly not written by a zealous Protestant or for zealous Protestants.[1] Thornbury completes the list of these supposed symptoms of Shakespeare's having favoured Catholicism; but this cannot have caused him much trouble. "Shakespeare," says Thornbury, "draws his priests generous as pious, self-denying and sincere; his Protestant ministers foolish, knavish, servile. On the one side are Evans, Martext, and Holofernes; on the other, Friar Patrick, the simulated monk in 'Measure for Measure,' the holy father in 'All's Well that Ends Well,' and Friar Lorenzo in 'Romeo and Juliet.'" Thornbury goes on to say that "the monk's abuses he hardly touches on, whereas he ridicules the Puritans; Portia is made 'to kneel and pray by holy crosses,' Iago terms baptism the seal and symbol of redeemed sin, and in 'A Midsummer Night's Dream' the poet speaks of nuns as 'thrice blessed,' but less earthly happy than 'the rose distilled.'"[2] These passages are carelessly quoted and arranged, without proper consideration, in a one-sided manner, and with a definite purpose. But even in so far as the facts are correct in themselves, they by no means furnish the inferences which Thornbury wishes to draw from them; and indeed, when correctly understood, they in no way show any personal predilection on the poet's part towards

[1] Dr. Flir, *l.c.*, gives a better interpretation of this point than Macaulay. "If," he says (on p. 116), "Shakespeare's feeling towards the English Church had been only in the slightest degree unorthodox, he would never have ventured to take any such liberty, and much less have himself acted the part of the Ghost." According to the popular belief—which in this case coincides with the doctrines of the Romish Church—the Ghost could not have returned either from hell or from heaven, he could only return to earth from purgatory. "Shakespeare's drama," says Flir, "required a Ghost of this sort from purgatory, and the poet obeyed the demands of his art."

[2] Every reader of Shakespeare knows that in the passage from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* there is no talk about nuns. The words on baptism Thornbury does not quote as Iago's, but makes Othello himself utter them, thus: "*The seal and symbol of redeemed love*," whereas in Shakespeare they are: "*All seals and symbols of redeemed sin*."

Catholicism. They simply seem to characterize the persons into whose mouths the remarks are put, as well as the time and the locality which form the scene where the drama in question is played; in short, the words are, as it were, a part of the setting of the play, and nothing can justify their being interpreted as the expression of universally recognized truths, or as the personal convictions of the poet. Shakespeare is here no less objective than he is elsewhere; at the same time, however, he could not fail to see that Catholicism possessed an element of romanticism, not to say picturesqueness, which Protestantism lacked, and which was extremely useful for poetic treatment. It was this romantic element which interested our German Romantic writers in Catholicism, and, in fact, induced some of them to join the Romish Church. Shakespeare, however, employed the rites and customs of the Catholic Church only as a poetical apparatus, in the same way as he did the popular superstitions which he has made use of so extensively. If we are to draw inferences regarding Shakespeare's religious opinions from his having introduced into his dramas Roman Catholic customs—where these merely form a part in the characterization or ornamentation of his works—then we may as well conclude from Schiller's "Maria Stuart" and his "Geister-seher" that Schiller too was a Catholic, that he too—to use Thornbury's expression—had "a yearning fondness" for Roman Catholicism.

As regards the clergy themselves, Shakespeare has here also, in every case, recognized and described the man in the priest, Catholics as well as Protestants. The hierarchy—Protestants no less than Catholics—naturally considers this a want of reverence and religious feeling, for, according to it, the priest should be regarded only as the priest, never as the man; the priest's vestments, it thinks, should conceal the man, and the priestly character is ineffaceable. Shakespeare, on the other hand, knows that the cowl does not make the monk. In "Henry VIII." (iii. 1) it is said,—

> They should be good men; their affairs as righteous;
> But all hoods make not monks."

And, in "Measure for Measure" (v. 1), Lucio quotes the proverb in its original form: "*Cucullus non facit monachum.*"[1]

[1] See Whetstone, *Promos and Cassandra*, iii. 6 (*Shakespeare's Library*, 2nd ed. pt. ii. vol. ii. 239): "A holie Hoode makes not a Frier devoute."

That the Catholic clergy should have appeared to the poet surrounded with more poetic halo than the Protestant clergy is quite natural; and in this Shakespeare again only gives us the objective reflex of the reality. Shakespeare's day—in an ecclesiastical respect—was above all things a period of transition, in which the old forms necessarily appeared doubly, or even trebly, more poetic than the undeveloped new forms. The Protestant clergy had not yet become a definite, venerable, and esteemed order. It is characteristic of their position that Elizabeth, although she tolerated the marriage of priests, did not sanction or even recognize the new institution. The offensive words which she addressed to the wife of Archbishop Parker, after enjoying their hospitality at Lambeth Palace, almost surpass belief. Her words were: "Madam I may not call you, and Mistress I am loth to call you; however, I thank you for your good cheer."[1] It should be added that married ladies in Elizabeth's day were addressed as "Madam," unmarried ladies as "Mistress." The objection to the marriage of priests was, it is true, connected with the circumstance that the Protestant clergy, owing to their low social position and their small amount of culture, had to choose wives from the lower strata of society.[2] The only one who spoke in favour of marriage for the Protestant clergy was Bishop Joseph Hall (1574-1656). Up to the time of James's accession to the throne the children of such marriages were considered illegitimate. Towards the end of the seventeenth century even, according to Macaulay's admirable account, the Protestant clergy played such a pitiable part, that it is not to be wondered at that the dramatists made use of the lower clergy only for comic parts, and were unable to surround them with any poetic halo. With but rare exceptions, the Protestant clergy did not take part in the political affairs of the nation as their Catholic predecessors had done for ages past, nor had they, as yet, adopted the work of the lower Catholic clergy as curers of souls and good Samaritans. Where they principally and most effectually made their influence felt upon the nation, was by their activity as teachers and educators; and, in perfect accordance with this, Shakespeare introduces the Welsh parson Evans, Sir Nathaniel, and Holofernes, as teachers. How far any Stratford model may have hovered before his imagination has

[1] Green, *A Short History of the English People*, 1875, p. 371.
[2] See Harrison, ed. Furnivall, p. 22 note, and p. 26 note.

nothing to do with the case. And he has described the Catholic clergy—from the cardinal to the barefooted friar—with the same knowledge and understanding of the subject. It was not his fondness for the subject, but that the subject of his dramas required him to introduce a pretty extensive gallery of such figures. In a Church which is a political power as well, it cannot fail that the prelates become ambitious, intriguing political personalities, wholly ignorant of the simplicity of heart and the sincere childlike piety exhibited by the serving friars and monks. Such, for instance, are Cardinal Pandulf in "King John," the Legate Campeius and Cardinal Wolsey in "Henry VIII.," the Bishop of Carlisle and the Abbot of Westminster in "Richard II.," &c. The Abbot of Westminster is a conspirator who proposes to get Bolingbroke out of the way by murdering him, and, before openly declaring his purpose, takes the sacrament to bury his "intents." The Bishop of Carlisle, on the other hand, is as faithful and upright as he is fearless and zealous, in his support of the kingdom by the grace of God. From Lancaster's speech to the Archbishop of York in the Second Part of "Henry IV." (iv. 2), it would appear as if Shakespeare disapproved of the interference of the high ecclesiastics with state affairs, especially when political concerns had to be decided on a field of battle. The vocation and position of the clergy is there laid down in unmistakable words. The lower Catholic clergy described by Shakespeare, and by the other dramatists, are represented as benevolent, humble, unselfish, and helpful. We have an example of this class in the oftenmentioned Friar Lorenzo, who recommends philosophy, and not so much religion, as a means of comfort (iii. 3) :—

> I'll give thee armour to keep off that word;
> Adversity's sweet milk, philosophy,
> To comfort thee, though thou art banished.

The poet, however, also knows of monks of a different calibre. He does not conceal the fact that King John was poisoned by a monk, although the monk does not appear on the stage; and on the occasion of Ophelia's interment we are introduced to an uncharitable priest who, in brooding over the dogmas and rites of his Church, has forgotten the meaning of humanity and mercy. Laertes' rebuke to this "churlish priest" is a chastisement of ecclesiasticism by humanism.

Shakespeare's nature was so harmonious that it is difficult

to believe that his position towards the State could have been anything else but absolutely in accordance with his position towards the Church and positive religion; in both cases we find him exhibiting the same grand objectivity, which stands as far above the different forms of state as above the different forms of faith. In taking single passages and remarks from Shakespeare's works, we can as little arrive at a general conclusion on this point as with regard to Shakespeare's religious opinions. All Shakespeare's dramatic characters speak of the various forms of government and the different estates, &c., perfectly in accordance with their own individuality, and we have no right, for instance, to assume the political views of Richard II. or of Richard III. to be the poet's own personal views; for he had no other alternative than to give expression in his histories, to the political opinions peculiar to the day and to the persons represented, and which he found in the works from which he drew his material. It is well known how closely, in this respect, Shakespeare follows Holinshed in his Histories and North's Plutarch in his Roman plays. Shakespeare was, no doubt, anything but a politician himself —"I had as lief be a Brownist as a politician." He was as far from having thought out a political system for himself as he had planned a religious system, yet he must certainly have been aware that the State is an indispensable and unavoidable means for leading both the human community and the human individual forward on the path to culture and morality, and that the right use of every form of government accomplishes this, although, of course, every form of government is liable to deteriorate. In so far, probably, monarchy and republic —from a theoretical point of view—may have been the same to him; all he demanded was that the foundations of all human existence—order and law, uprightness and faithfulness, justice and mercy—should be allowed to exert their influence; for, in his opinion, they are the pillars of the State and the Church, inasmuch as they are the basis of every moral community. Beyond these he placed weight only in one other ethical and political factor, that is, in the division and arrangement of the various grades and classes of society, which he thinks ought not to be overstepped either arrogantly or with criminal intention. He does not like to see a peasant tread on the courtier's heel,[1] and terms reverence, which makes

[1] *Hamlet*, v. 1.

distinction of place between high and low, "that angel of the world."[1] This can astonish us the less, as the only form of government Shakespeare knew by experience was the monarchical form, which had worked itself out of feudalism, and was controlled more by public opinion than by parliament; hence from childhood he had been accustomed to the distinction of grades in society. In his opinion everyone ought to act in his own sphere as best he can for the good of the whole community, without venturing to grasp at things above or below him; in this way alone, the poet thinks, can the community be prosperous as a whole. This is most fully and completely brought forward in the famous speech of Ulysses in "Troilus and Cressida" (i. 3). In connection with this it would seem that the poet considered the things that existed as justified by reason of their very existence. This reminds one of Hegel's proposition, that the actual is the rational form; and in this Shakespeare again shows a resemblance to Walter Scott, who resembled him in so many other respects. However, the distinction of classes Shakespeare by no means considers an exclusively monarchical institution; he makes the same demand of the republican form of government, as is proved by the opening scene in "Coriolanus." The fable there related by Menenius Agrippa, of the various members of the body rebelling against the belly, expresses this eloquently enough. And yet here again the reverse of the case has no less its justification in Shakespeare; he attacks and condemns all prejudices respecting class, and considers rank and birth far inferior to virtue and nobility of soul. This is most distinctly taught in "All's Well that Ends Well;" and the admonitory words addressed to the young Count Rousillon (ii. 3), who despises Helena on account of the lowness of her social position, would need to be placed as *pendants* by the side of the speeches of Ulysses and Menenius Agrippa. Such objectivity is all the more confounding, as the admonitory words against class prejudice are not by any means the harangue of a democrat and revolutionist, but are spoken by a royal personage. Any form of government that is not based upon the above-mentioned foundations of all political and social life, the poet denounces and attacks with ridicule as delightful as it is withering. He introduces us to

[1] *Cymbeline*, iv. 2, 207.

two forms of this description: to the ochlocracy of Jack Cade (in the Second Part of "Henry VI."), and the Utopian state of nature in "The Tempest," which is an imitation of Montaigne's idea; both forms are so admirably described that they will ever be models of their kind. W. König[1] very justly points out that Shakespeare seems to express his own opinion of these two abortions, where "the rabblement" is characterized by Jack Cade's words, "But then are we in order when we are most out of order," and where the Utopian state is despatched with Alonzo's words, "Thou dost talk nothing to me." Shakespeare denounces ochlocracy as well as the socialistic, natural state, because both speak disparagingly of culture. Jack Cade causes the Clerk of Chatham to be executed merely "because he can write, read, and cast accompt," and Lord Say because he erected schools, printing establishments, and paper-mills. The natural state advocated by Gonzalo is altogether wanting in moral foundation: he will have nothing to do with work, or property, or marriage.

Endeavours have not been wanting to represent Shakespeare as having been a good royalist and a herald of the so-called Teutonic Christian form of government; but these endeavours are precisely of the same character as those which maintain the poet to have been a strictly orthodox Christian, no matter whether Protestant or Catholic. It is no doubt true that Shakespeare has given the monarchical form of government an extremely high position, and has repeatedly praised it in enthusiastic terms as the sublime and sanctified climax of all social order; still it must not be overlooked that this praise falls from the lips of kings themselves—or, at all events, from the lips of those in their immediate surroundings—and it is not to be expected that they should have thought or spoken disparagingly of such a subject. It will be sufficient to point to the remarks of Claudio (in "Hamlet," iv. 5) and to the speeches of Richard II. (iii. 2 and 3). But besides this, the Biblical and very poetical idea that the King rules as the Anointed of the Lord, as the representative of God on earth, corresponds absolutely with the ideas entertained in Shakespeare's day; and "His Sacred Majesty" James I. was so imbued with this idea that he would scarcely

[1] *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, vii. 194.

allow himself to be regarded as mortal. The same idea the poet found in Holinshed, where, for example, the Archbishop of Canterbury expresses the same opinion on the occasion of King John's coronation; in fact, the idea was part and parcel of the general current of thought of Shakespeare's day, so that even on this account it is difficult to determine how far the idea may have concealed the poet's own personal convictions. Benno Tschischwitz, in whom Shakespeare's supposed royalism has probably found its most staunch supporter, goes so far as to make the poet's feeling of reverence a principle, and has endeavoured, from the Lancastrian tetralogy, to point out that this principle of reverence, and the poet's attachment to it, forms the substance of Shakespeare's political opinions.[1] Tschischwitz arrives at these two positions, he says, first from the fact that in the Lancastrian tetralogy we find Shakespeare's fundamental political views expressed "with the full vigour of a developed and well-founded system," and secondly, because it is evident that Shakespeare considers popular absolutism the ideal form of government. With neither of these two views are we able to agree. Indeed, in our opinion it would rather seem that Shakespeare entertained no greater respect for regal robes than for the robes of priests, and that the poet might very well have supplemented his remark about the hood not making the monk, by saying that neither do purple robes make a king. The cowl and the ermine are beautiful and venerable symbols, but the appearance must not belie the reality; and here again, as in every other case, the poet lays the main stress upon the man whom the regal mantle envelops. He makes his Henry V. state this very clearly (in iv. 1), where he says to John Bates, "I think the king is but a man, as I am: the violet smells to him as it doth to me; the element shows to him as it doth to me; all his senses have but human conditions; his ceremonies laid by, in his nakedness he appears but a man; and though his affections are higher mounted than ours, yet when they stoop, they stoop with the like wing."[2] These words at the same time remind us of Shylock's famous apostrophe ("Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not

[1] *Shakespeare's Staat und Königthum nachgewiesen an der Lancaster-Tetralogie*, by B. Tschischwitz, 1868.

[2] See also Henry's monologue in the same scene: *Upon the King! Let us our lives*, &c., *lay on the King!*

a Jew hands?" &c.), and show very distinctly, when thus placed side by side, that Shakespeare recognized the rightful claims of the man in the king as well as in the Jew, in the highest as well as the lowest. Shakespeare knows that there are royal criminals, and has depicted them as such in Claudius and Richard III. He knows that royalty has important duties to perform, and he judges kings according to their ability and their endeavour to discharge these duties—and their fate, too, is made dependent upon this. The supreme freedom with which Shakespeare has not only delineated a series of the most different royal personages, but also genuine Roman republicans, makes it impossible to believe that he was an admirer of royalty *quand même*—in fact, that he can have been attached to any special political system. To what a climax an exaggerated form of royalism and absolutism may be carried is shown by an appalling example in "King Lear." Lear himself, in his clear moments—but unfortunately too late—recognizes the fact that in a very great measure his absolute power, and the grovelling devotion and flattery of his subjects, are the cause of his misfortunes, as, in fact, they are the cause of his downfall. Without exaggeration, it may be said that Lear is the personification of Absolutism which has lost its reason, Cæsarism gone mad, and in him it is shown that absolute power carried to excess, leads to mental aberration as a final consequence. We have here Goethe's warning about "the limitation of the human mind" in the grandest and most overwhelming form. "They flattered me like a dog," says Lear (iv. 6). "They say 'Ay' and 'No' to everything that I said!—'Ay' and 'No,' too, was no good divinity. When the rain came to wet me once, and the wind to make me chatter; when the thunder would not peace at my bidding; there I found 'em, there I smelt 'em out. Go to, they are not men o' their words; they told me I was everything; 'tis a lie, I am not ague-proof." If anywhere, the poet seems himself here to be speaking through the mouths of his dramatic personages.

But the poet shows his detestation of insolence and arrogance, not only in crowned heads, but also in the king's officials; he chastises them for this at every opportunity, and even Hamlet does not omit to mention "the insolence of office" as one of the greatest plagues of life. The poet, in "Measure for Measure," iv. 2, says that:—

> Could great men thunder
> As Jove himself does, Jove would ne'er be quiet,
> For every pelting petty officer
> Would use his heaven for thunder;
> Nothing but thunder!

And when among the lower officials conceit of office and unseemly behaviour are coupled with ignorance and stupidity, the combination is made the target of the poet's most delightful, but, at the same time, of his keenest sarcasm. Shallow, Silence, Dogberry, Verges and others, are extremely comical characters, but between the lines it is unmistakably evident what the poet's own opinion is of these caricatures of officialism. Absolutism, when carried to excess by rulers or leaders of men, ends in madness, but when carried to excess by subordinates results in absurdity. In various quarters Shakespeare has, indeed, been found fault with for the manner he has drawn these characters—for having, in fact, represented the burgher class at a disadvantage, and everywhere favoured the aristocracy. His townsfolk, it has been said, are simpletons and the heroes of Eastcheap; his country-folk, mere fools dressed as clowns; in this respect Scott—whose creations are equally numerous—is said to show an incomparably greater degree of justice. The truth, however, is that the progress of our political and social development has conferred upon the burgher class an infinitely higher position and significance than it possessed in Shakespeare's time. In his day, the lower orders had not yet succeeded in obtaining equal consideration or educational advantages; the aristocracy still formed the centre of the political, social, intellectual, and in many ways also of the literary life of the nation, whereas the burgher class in reality—and hence also in Shakespeare's dramas—occupied mostly a subordinate position. Any ambitious spirits among the burgher class (and of these there was indeed no dearth) found themselves obliged to attach themselves, in some way, to the aristocracy—who represented the *élite* of intellect as well as of birth—and had thus, as it were, to be taken in tow. Shakespeare, however, did not fail to exhibit his all-embracing sense of justice even towards the burgher class, so far as he found it worthy of esteem and honour; this is proved by "The Merry Wives of Windsor," which presents a picture of healthy and sterling burgher life; we here find representatives of the burgher classes who are neither simpletons nor fools, and who are at least on a

par with the amusing artisans in "A Midsummer Night's Dream," or with those in "Coriolanus." In the romantic comedies, in fact, we must not expect to find serious representatives of the burgher class; as little can we expect to find a place allotted to them in the Histories, for these dramas refer to days prior to Shakespeare's own, and hence represent an even inferior degree of development among the burgher class than was met with in Shakespeare's day. And, finally, the great tragedies move in ages and in spheres where there can be no question at all of a burgher class, in the present sense of the word.

With regard to one point in Shakespeare's character critics are happily entirely of one mind—that is, with regard to his enthusiastic love of his country, and he has given expression to this sentiment, not only in several immortal apostrophes,[1] but it is found shedding its animating and brilliant influence over all his poetry. His joyous pride of England resounds like a flourish of trumpets from every one of his dramas, and it may be said that no poet in the world surpasses him in fervent and sincere patriotism.[2] And yet he is anything but a "John Bull" *pur et simple*, and his dramatic characters are by no means, as Goethe[3] has said, "mere incarnate Englishmen." Shakespeare also allows other nationalities to assert their rights and peculiarities; prejudice and unjust one-sidedness are as far from him in this direction as everywhere else. He knows no national hatred, not even against Spain, which, as the chief representative of the Roman Catholic world, continually assumed a hostile attitude towards his native land—an attitude which brought war to its threshold, and even threatened his country with complete destruction during the very years when Shakespeare was at an age most susceptible of receiving deep and lifelong impressions. It is true that in Don Armado,[4]

[1] Take, for instance, John of Gaunt's speech in *Richard II.* and the closing lines of *King John.*

[2] The only one point which I cannot make tally with this feeling of patriotism in Shakespeare, is that Cymbeline, after a hard-won and glorious victory, declares himself ready for the sake of peace to pay tribute to Rome as before.

[3] *Shakespeare und kein Ende.*

[4] And may not Don Armado be an intentional allusion to the Armada? The type of the Spanish braggadocio is in fact unmistakable. Herzberg (in the Schlegel-Tieck translation of Shakespeare, vii. 262) conjectures—not without probability—that one or other of the prisoners-of-war from the

in "Love's Labour's Lost," the poet has presented an extremely lifelike portrait of a specific Spanish braggart, but the sparkling wit which is provoked by this portrait exhibits neither bitterness nor sarcasm, so that it cannot offend the countrymen either of the second, or, more strictly speaking, of the first Don Quixote.[1] Shakespeare is sarcastic—but not unjust—only towards the French, whose national character he perfectly understood; their vain, hollow, and unreliable nature was perfectly recognized by him, but he is ready to acknowledge that they are excellent horsemen,[2] and remarkable for the tastefulness of their attire.[3] The contrast between the French and English national character Shakespeare has described more particularly in the camp-scenes in "Henry V." In his account of the dishonest ways of the French, which—as is said in "Henry VIII." (i. 3)—threaten to affect the English, the poet has followed Holinshed, it is true, but the two braggarts and swaggerers are altogether his own creation; they are admirably drawn characters, Frenchmen to the backbone, and so true to nature, that even in our day, after the lapse of centuries, they are absolutely correct even in the smallest features. Monsieur Lavache, Countess Rousillon's clown, in "All's Well that Ends Well," is a Frenchman from top to toe, and a "loose fellow." It will be sufficient to mention, in addition, Monsieur Veroles in "Pericles" (iv. 2). The contrast between the reasonable, serious, and sterling national character of the English is everywhere distinctly perceptible in Shakespeare. Who cannot see the Frenchman bodily before him, when Richard III.—certainly no good example of the English character—maintains (i. 3):—

> Because I cannot flatter and speak fair,
> Smile in men's faces, smooth, deceive and cog,
> Duck with French nods and apish courtesy,
> I must be held a rancorous enemy.

Who can help siding with Portia when she says of her French admirer, Monsieur Le Bon: "God made him, and therefore let him pass for a man." Only in one case does Shakespeare

Armada may have served Shakespeare as a model for the character of the Spaniard. May not the Spanish admiral, Don Pedro Valdes, whom Drake took prisoner, have been the man? See above, p. 132.

[1] The first quarto of *Love's Labour's Lost* belongs to the year 1598, whereas *Don Quixote* appeared first in 1606.

[2] *Hamlet*, iv. 7, 82 ff.

[3] *Hamlet*, i. 3, 73 ff.

—according to our modern ideas—seem to have gone too far and to have been unjust, viz., in his delineation of Joan of Arc's character; but in this he has closely followed his authority, whether we assume it to have been Hall or Holinshed. La Pucelle's character was, up to the seventeenth century, a closed book even to her own countrymen, and has only in recent days by documentary evidence been revealed to us in its full purity and beauty. But even though this want of a correct knowledge of the case were not an unquestionable excuse for the poet, still his error vanishes, and appears as nothing, when compared with the filth which Voltaire—her own countryman—has cast upon the character of La Pucelle. And even though Voltaire's wit were a hundred times more poignant, it would never clear him of this wrong.

As regards the Italians, Shakespeare has, it is true, in "The Merchant of Venice" and in "Othello," and elsewhere, succeeded in giving a reflex of the local colouring of Italy with marvellous skill and fidelity, in the same way as he has, in "The Taming of the Shrew" and elsewhere, made use—after his own fashion—of figures from Italian comedy, but we look in vain for any special delineation of the specific Italian character. The Italians introduced in his plays are by no means distinct Italians to the same extent as Parolles, Dr. Caius, and others are distinct Frenchmen. The reason of this may be found in the circumstance that the Italian national character does not present such striking traits to the eyes of a stranger as in the case of the French or even the Spanish character. Shakespeare—even though he may have visited Italy—must, therefore, have been less struck with the Italian people and with their national peculiarities, and hence was less tempted to make use of them for dramatic representation. Nevertheless, he praises Italy as the land of refined and fashionable life;[1] while, on the other hand, like his contemporaries, he too, is very well aware that it is also the land of cunning and of treachery, and more especially of poisonings.[2] Iachimo is described as a false and deceitful Italian, and himself speaks of his "Italian brain;" Posthumus (v. 5, 210) calls him the "Italian fiend." In "The Taming of the Shrew" (ii. 1, 405), Gremio calls old Vincentio "an old Italian fox."

[1] For instance, in *King Richard II.*, ii. 1, 21 ff.
[2] See *Cymbeline*, iii. 2, 4, and iii. 4, 15.

Of Germans Shakespeare had but little occasion to speak. In "The Merchant of Venice" and in "Othello" he alludes to their love of drink, but has finally to admit that the English were their masters in the art; and, as is well known, the Danes and Dutch are referred to as their equals in this.[1] Drunkenness and immoderate eating were a general custom in those days, throughout northern and central Europe, and accordingly the Germans need not be specially found fault with in this respect; indeed they may be the more readily reconciled to the accusation as, in the opposite scales, we have the noble testimony (uttered by the landlord of the Garter Inn, in "The Merry Wives," iv. 5), that "Germans are honest men!"

And now to summarize. In making *objectivity* the basis of our inquiry into Shakespeare's character—and in his case objectivity, as is universally admitted, reaches its climax—we obtain a foundation upon which an incomparably safer estimate of the poet's character can be based than upon an examination of a number of quotations from his works, and, as a logical sequence, we also obtain a view of his relation to positive religion as well as to the State. Shakespeare stood above the dogmatic and confessional idea of religion, as well as above all political theories; the very fact that the clergy have arrived at such different, nay, opposite conclusions regarding Shakespeare's religious sentiments from an examination of his works, may be considered a proof of their inadequacy and inaccuracy. It is scarcely likely that there will ever be unanimity on this point among Shakespearean commentators, for nothing is more obstinate than religious belief. All the more pleasant it is to know that, with but few exceptions, there is more unanimity among critics with regard to the sublime and unchanging ethical principles which so largely pervade Shakespeare's works—that no other poet can surpass him in this. Hence the praise which has, for this reason, been lavished upon the poet from the most varied quarters may unhesitatingly be acknowledged as perfectly justified. Short-sighted commentators have, it is true, been affrighted at the ribaldries and obscenities which—in accordance with the custom, or rather the bad custom of the day—occupy a conspicuous part in the dialogues of the poet's dramatic characters, and frequently

[1] See p. 146.

serve the poet with an opportunity for a display of his brilliant wit. But, objectionable as these may be to the feelings of propriety in our age, two things we must bear in mind: in the first place, they are a characteristic peculiarity of his day, and not a feature peculiar to Shakespeare; in the second place, for this very reason they are in him the mere shell, not the kernel. Those who are unable to see through this shell, had therefore better not take up Shakespeare's works, or use some family edition of the poet's works. We are here reminded of a simile which Alcibiades makes use of, in Plato's Symposium, of his teacher Socrates, viz., that he resembled one of the Sileni, whose outward forms conceal the divine image. This divine image in Shakespeare's poetry is altogether independent of every form of ecclesiastical belief, of every political party, of every kind of nationality, and of every period of time; in imperishable brilliancy it throws its light upon all future ages. That the æsthetic and ethical greatness of Shakespeare, charms and captivates the followers of every religious creed, and of every political body, without exception, seems, in fact, an important corroboration of our conception of his character. But Shakespeare not only proclaims that virtue is beauty;[1] from all we know of his life, and can infer, he honestly and conscientiously endeavoured to live up to his own ideal, and, to the best of his powers, to realize his own ideal of humanity in himself—unlike those ungracious pastors of whom Ophelia says that they show a steep and thorny path to heaven, while they themselves wander on the flowery path of pleasure. Of this we have testimony in his extraordinary love of truth, which certainly cannot have been less conspicuous in his life than in his poetry. Shakespeare was assuredly one of the truest and most genuine of human beings; truthfulness, in its deepest and most ideal significance, was a fundamental trait in his nature, and if there is any one virtue to which he gives unmistakable precedence, it is to truthfulness. His resemblance to Walter Scott in this point also must not pass unnoticed. Nothing arouses Shakespeare's wrath like hypocrisy, untruthfulness, want of sincerity, affectation, falsehood and deception, and crooked ways. How his spirit is aroused, for instance, at women wearing false hair and using paint; these things are an abomination to him.[2] And while he almost loses sight

[1] In *Twelfth Night*, iii. 4.
[2] *Hamlet*, i. 3; *King John*, conclusion.

of his objectivity in describing false characters—who fall victims to their own deceitfulness and hypocrisy, as in the case of Osric—so conversely, notwithstanding all his objectivity, he shows unmistakable signs of delight in sterling, genuine characters who discountenance a false semblance, as, for instance, in the case of his Henry V., and of Portia, a girl thoroughly after his own heart. To be true to oneself the poet considers the highest ideal, the best safeguard against aberration of mind, and as the surest path towards moral progress. Polonius says: "To thine own self be true and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man." Nay, this being true to oneself is even made a duty of the country itself; and, according to Sonnet 123, fidelity and truth act as a safeguard against the scythe of time. Hence we may all the more unhesitatingly regard sincerity and natural truthfulness to be the main feature in Shakespeare's poetry, at least in his dramatic poetry, for he has himself unequivocally termed these the aim and final goal of art. Accordingly, if it is everywhere Shakespeare's endeavour in poetry and art to develop and to represent the truest and noblest form of humanity, can we believe that his life belied his art? We have not the smallest internal or external evidence for any such supposition; in fact, all the existing indications point to the reverse, viz., that the poet's life was in perfect harmony with the fundamental principles and the character of his poetry. And yet, assuredly, Shakespeare was no more entirely faultless in his life and work than any other human being, more especially in the storm and stress period of his youth; unquestionably the passions which he has described in such an unapproachable and masterly way must have rankled in his own breast; yet he has never endeavoured to appear better than he was, and everything points to the fact that he succeeded in freeing himself from the fetters of his passions, and by an ennobling system of purification rose above the temptations of sensuality. We can therefore fully and cordially agree with Gervinus when he praises Shakespeare as one of the most admirable and most trustworthy guides through life; assuredly he who follows Shakespeare with a correct appreciation will neither stumble nor go astray. But it is not to the individual only to whom Shakespeare may be a guide through life, he is also the guiding star to humanity. And if man is to be judged by the fruit of his work, then

scarcely any other writer can be put by the side of Shakespeare; for he has now, for more than 300 years, scattered golden seeds over the widest field that ever poet has commanded, nay, it may be said, over the whole realm of humanity, and the harvest of this work keeps coming in, in fuller quantities, from decade to decade. There is scarcely any other poet whose works, in so great a measure, have passed over into the intellectual as well as the ethical life of humanity, or exercised so enduring an influence upon it, as Shakespeare's. Just as the waters of a mighty stream are perceptible far off in their course after joining the mighty ocean, so the spirit of Shakespeare—to a greater extent than that of any other man—still shows a distinct existence in the mighty ocean of human life.

Chapter VIII.

RETIREMENT TO STRATFORD, AND DEATH.

IN speaking of Shakespeare's retirement to Stratford, we must guard against the error of regarding it as a complete withdrawal from public life; his retirement was merely a comparative one—merely, as it were, an alteration of the central point of gravity. For even though we did not possess any undoubted proofs of the fact, it would surely be no unwarrantable supposition to assume that Shakespeare made repeated journeys from Stratford to London, and that he resided there from time to time, in the same way that, as a younger man, he had travelled from London to Stratford for a longer or shorter stay. The object of Shakespeare's removal to Stratford was clearly the result of his wish to withdraw entirely from the stage and to lead the life of a gentleman; this it would have been impossible for him to do in London. Not only was the low social position of an actor's life objectionable to him, but, like Sir Walter Scott, Shakespeare may very possibly have had his doubts whether a literary life was compatible with the life of a gentleman; Scott, at all events, did his best to conceal the fact that he was an author, and withdrew to Abbotsford as often as he could, to lead the life of a country gentleman. The date of Shakespeare's retirement to Stratford is as little certain, nay, even less certain than the date upon which he quitted his native town as a young man, and the combinations and conjectures made with regard to it are scarcely able to bridge over this gap in our knowledge. After the beginning of the seventeenth century, if not earlier, Shakespeare, although still residing in London at the time, regarded Stratford as his home and as the place in which he ultimately intended to reside. This is obvious, not only from his continued acquisition of property in Stratford, but more evident still from the deeds of conveyance of May, 1602, July, 1605, and March, 1612-13, in which he is called "Wil-

liam Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon, gentleman."[1] On the occasion of the purchase of the land from the Combes (in May, 1602), the business was, indeed, transacted for him—as already stated—by his brother Gilbert, very probably because the poet himself happened to be in London at the time. It is possible also that Gilbert, who seems to have been an intelligent and practical man, assisted his brother in the management of his other property.[2] When the Getley estate was purchased (on 28th September, 1602), Shakespeare was again absent, as is clear from the conditions made in the deed of conveyance.[3] During the following year Shakespeare, for a time at least, seems to have again resided in London, for in that year he took part in a performance of B. Jonson's "Sejanus." And the fact of Shakespeare having in 1604 employed an attorney in the legal proceedings he instituted against Philip Rogers, would likewise seem to indicate the poet's absence from Stratford at the time; on the other hand, the unusually important transaction concerning the purchase of the tithes (on 24th July, 1605) could not well have been concluded unless the purchaser had himself been present in Stratford.[4] In a survey of the manor of Rowington, Shakespeare is, indeed, termed the proprietor of the house in Walker Street or Dead Lane purchased from Walter Getley, still the space left in the document for the signature of the proprietor is not filled in, and for this reason it has been concluded that the poet must have been absent from Stratford at the time. But while we know of these cases of absence, we also know that in 1608 Shakespeare was living in Stratford, temporarily at all events, for on the 16th of October of that year he stood godfather to one William Walker, to whom in his will he bequeaths 20*s.* in gold. It is probable also that on the 9th of September of the same year he attended the funeral of his mother, and that on the 21st of February, 1607-8, he was present at the christening of his first grandchild, Elizabeth Hall.

[1] See above, p. 186.

[2] To judge from the facsimile of Gilbert's signature given in Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 282, his handwriting is not only that of a well-educated person, but also shows a certain amount of grace.

[3] The words of the document are: "*Et sic remanet in manibus dominæ manerii prædicti* (viz. Rowington Manor) *quousque prædictus Willielmus Shakespare ven. ad capiend. præmissa prædicta.*" See Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 201 f.

[4] See Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 210-216.

In order to obtain a graphic picture of the home which the poet established for himself in his native town, the result of years of active work and trouble, we shall be obliged, in the first place, again carefully to examine the already mentioned purchases, in doing which a plan of Stratford and its environs would be most useful.[1] The original and central point round which all the other purchases may to a certain extent be said to have clustered, was the dwelling-house called New Place, which we shall speak of more fully presently. The acquisition of New Place was in all likelihood an advantageous, or at least a convenient investment. Shakespeare was, however, too practical a man not to have known that a dwelling-house of such stately proportions would require to be supplied with farm produce, and that farm produce would make it necessary to possess land as well; for on his father's as well as on his mother's side the poet was descended from families who had owned land and been engaged with farm-work. In May, 1602, accordingly, we find Shakespeare purchasing 107 acres[2] of arable land in the parish of Old Stratford from "William Combe, of Warwick, esquier," and from "John Coombe of Olde Stratford, gentleman," for the sum of £320, which according to our present money value represents somewhere about £1,600. The deed of conveyance, which is reprinted in Halliwell's "Life of Shakespeare," was "sealed and delivered to Gilbert Shakespere to the use of the within named William Shakespere in the presence of Anthony Nasshe, William Sheldon, Humfrey Maynwaringe, Rychard Mason, and Jhon Nashe."[3] And this purchase led to legal proceedings in 1611, and it would seem that Shakespeare on this latter occasion, in addition to securing his 107 acres, bought other twenty acres of pasture land.[4]

The property known as Getley's cottage—which Shake-

[1] Compare above, p. 45, note 3.

[2] *Four yards*, as is stated in the endorsement, the term *yard* being the customary measure used in Warwickshire. See Malone's *Shakspeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. 518.

[3] The importance of this document, which was once in the possession of the well-known antiquary Mr. Wheler, is increased by the endorsement on the indenture ("Combe to Shackspeare of the 4 yard land in Stratford fielde"). The name Shackspeare so closely resembles the poet's handwriting, that Halliwell, in his *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 283, says that he decidedly takes it to be the autograph of Shakespeare or of one of the family—taking for granted, of course, that this is not again a fabrication.

[4] Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 230.

speare had purchased for him on the 28th of September of this same year by an attorney named Thomas Tibbottes—was, as already stated, situated in Walker Street (now called Chapel Lane), opposite to his house New Place, and by the side of the Guild Chapel;[1] according to Halliwell, this cottage was in existence only a few years ago. Shortly before the publication of his "Life of Shakespeare," it was pulled down, and a modern building erected in its place. The house sold to Shakespeare by Getley was a mere labourer's cottage with a frontage of 34 feet, and the poet in all probability intended it for his gardener's abode. For Shakespeare would assuredly have required the services of a gardener or workman of some kind to attend to the large garden attached to his house, as well as for other outdoor work; and there could have been no more convenient abode for such a servant than Getley's cottage, for it was both within sight and call of Shakespeare's own residence. Had no such arrangement been necessary, it would be difficult to understand what Shakespeare's object could have been in purchasing the cottage. Moreover, this cottage had attached to it a small garden of about a quarter of an acre, and paid an annual rental of 2*s.* 6*d.*

New Place,[2] the house in which Shakespeare spent the last years of his life, and in which he died, had originally been built by the same Sir Hugh Clopton to whom Stratford was indebted for its beautiful bridge over the Avon, and the restoration of the Guild Chapel.[3] He settled in London, became Lord Mayor of that city in 1492, and died in 1496. The wealth he had acquired in London, Sir Hugh could the more readily devote to the town of his birth, as—according to Stow, and the monument erected to his memory in the Guild Chapel in Stratford—he had never married, and there was no one to inherit his property. Shakespeare as a boy must unquestionably have heard the story of Sir Hugh who went to London, made his fortune there, and yet never forgot his native town—precisely as Shakespeare did himself. And

[1] A plan of the locality is given in Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 165, and a picture of the house on p. 201.

[2] Wheler, *History of New Place*, ed. by Halliwell; J. C. M. Bellew, *Shakespeare's Home at New Place, Stratford-upon-Avon*, London, 1863; J. O. Halliwell, *An Historical Account of New Place, the last Residence of Shakespeare*, London, 1864, fol.; *Outlines*, ii. 101.

[3] See above, p. 44.

even though this similarity in their lives could scarcely have been a reason for Shakespeare's choosing Clopton's house for his Tusculum, still, when making the purchase, the remembrance of his distinguished fellow-citizen must certainly have been in his thoughts, for, according to Leland, Clopton is said to have died at New Place. This statement, however, is a mistake, for it is well known from Stow's "Chronicle" that Sir Hugh died in London, and was interred in St. Margaret's Church, Lothbury. Leland, who visited Stratford in 1540, describes New Place as "an elegant house built of brick and timber."[1] This elegant house, when bought by Shakespeare from William Underhill,[2] was in a state of disrepair, it is true—this accounts for the comparatively low price the poet gave for it—and Shakespeare found himself obliged forthwith to put it into order. Very probably this was done in 1598, for in the accounts of the Corporation of that year is an entry that 10*d.* was paid to "Mr. Shakspere for on lod of ston;" this was no doubt building material from the old house. At all events, there is no other way of explaining this curious entry. According to Theobald (1733), who based his report upon communications made to him by the Sir Hugh Clopton whom he knew, it was Shakespeare who gave the house the name of New Place; this statement has, however, proved to be erroneous, as the name New Place is met with in documents belonging to a date anterior to Shakespeare. Bellew,[3] among others, quotes a record in which it is stated: "Willielmus Underhill generosus tenet libere quandam domum vocatem the Newe Place cum Pertinentiis per annum xij^{d} sectam curie." The picture published in 1790 of New Place as it was in 1599, from a drawing of John Jordan, is of no value whatever, and was probably the manufacture of the same Stratford poet who furnished Ireland with his notorious information.[4] The same

[1] According to Knight, *William Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 501, it is Dugdale who says: "On the north side of this chapel was a fair house built of brick and timber by the said Hugh, wherein he lived in his later days, and died."

[2] Wm. Underhill probably sold the house because he was ill and felt his end drawing near; he died at the beginning of July of that same year, and was buried on the 13th of July.

[3] *Shakespeare's Home at New Place*, p. 95 ff.

[4] See *Original Collections on Shakespeare and Stratford-upon-Avon, by J. Jordan, selected from the Original MSS. written about* 1780, ed. by J. O.

may be said of the illustration in Ireland's "Picturesque Views on the Avon," 1795. In fact, no picture is known to exist of New Place as it was at the time when it belonged to Shakespeare and his descendants; a picture does, however, exist of the house as subsequently rebuilt by the Clopton family, who regained possession of it at a later date. On the other hand, there exists a second document of equal interest, from the year when the house was rebuilt. In the winter of 1597-8 so great was the dearth of corn in Stratford that it was feared riots might ensue; and, in order to divert the people's thoughts from the dread of a famine, the Corporation, on February 4th, caused a list to be drawn up of all the grain and malt stored up in the town. In this list William Shakespeare of Chapel Street Ward (in which New Place was situated) is mentioned as in possession of ten quarters. This entry applies too exactly to the poet for it to be likely that it could have referred to anyone else of the name of Shakespeare. Only two of the inhabitants of the same ward are mentioned as holding a larger quantity; one is entered as holding seventeen and a half quarters, the other eleven quarters. It should be remembered that Shakespeare did not at that date possess any land in Stratford—unless it was what had belonged to his parents—and his stock of grain, accordingly, could not have been the produce of his own land. Besides this, the document proves that Shakespeare's family must have been residing at New Place at the time, even though he may not have been there himself, for his stock of grain could not otherwise have been valued or entered on the list. According to Halliwell, who discusses this point very fully, it seems very probable that Shakespeare did not occupy his new residence till between the 9th of September, 1609, and the 21st of June, 1611, and that it had previously been inhabited by his cousin Thomas Greene; still we do not possess the faintest clue as to whether Shakespeare's family (*i.e.* his wife and two daughters, and after June 5th, 1607, only the younger daughter and her mother) shared the great house with Thomas Greene, or what the arrangement may have been.

New Place, where Shakespeare's life, as it were, returned to the point from which it had started, was situated at the

Halliwell, London, 1864 (10 copies).—*Original Letters from E. Malone to John Jordan the Poet*, ed. by J. O. Halliwell, London, 1864 (10 copies).

corner of Chapel Street and Chapel Lane,[1] the opposite corner being occupied by the Guild Chapel, which still exists almost exactly as it was then. The bells of this chapel had transported the boy Shakespeare in days past, into a dreamland from which the fully developed man in the evening of his life was now returning, and the melodious sound of the chapel bells may perhaps have aroused in him the same sentiments which similar evening bells at a later date aroused in the mind of Thomas Moore. At the further end of the Guild Chapel—as stated in a previous chapter—stands the School in which the boy Shakespeare once learned his "*hig, hag, hog.*" The house adjoining New Place in Chapel Street was the property of Anthony Nash, the father of the husband of Shakespeare's grand-daughter; he had inherited it, and bequeathed it (under date of 25th August, 1642) to his widow, to whom it belonged up to the time of her death. Nash's house was considerably smaller than New Place. In the house next to Nash's—hence two doors from Shakespeare's—lived Julian Shaw (1571-1629), one of the witnesses of the poet's will, and who in the old records is described sometimes as "yeoman," sometimes as "gentleman," or as "Mr. Julian Shaw."[2] Although smaller than New Place, Shaw's house (a picture of which is given in Halliwell's "Life of Shakespeare") must nevertheless have been a house of goodly appearance, for the occupier had to contribute 6*s.* annually to the church rate, while New Place was assessed at 8*s.*

It is easy to believe that Shakespeare not only made the house in which he proposed to spend his "*otium cum dignitate*" as comfortable as possible, but that he took pleasure in laying out the two gardens attached to it. We can scarcely be wrong, in accordance with our judgment of Shakespeare's character, in assuming that these gardens—which extended down to the Avon—were by no means the least important among the reasons that led him to purchase the property; and probably the Stratford of his day could not boast of any larger or finer garden.[3] The only drawback which Shakespeare may have felt was that the larger of his two gardens

[1] Previously called Walker Street or Dead Lane.

[2] *Outlines*, ii. 91-100 (*Shakespeare's Neighbours*).

[3] From Bacon's essay *Of Gardens* and elsewhere, we learn that the art of gardening and the cultivation of flowers was a favourite pursuit in England during the Elizabethan period. See Harrison, ed. Furnivall,

lay apart from the house and its garden, and was connected with the latter only by a narrow strip of ground; that, in fact, along the one side of Chapel Lane two small properties intervened between his house and the larger garden. Shakespeare, no doubt, meant eventually to have purchased these two small houses and the land attached to them, and thus made his whole estate a continuous piece of land.[1] The smaller garden was very likely a pleasure garden, with beds of flowers, whereas the larger one—which was almost three-quarters of an acre, and is invariably referred to as the "orchard," was probably devoted to the cultivation of fruit-trees and other vegetable produce; the supposition that it was put to some such use would, at any rate, correspond with what is known of Shakespeare's character as a practical man of business. His having purchased these gardens confirms all we have said in a preceding chapter of the poet's love of nature and of his intimate knowledge of the various branches of gardening, which is so fully exhibited in all his writings. It is known that Walter Scott did not consider it derogatory to assist in the work done on his estate. Shakespeare may have had leisure in Stratford to watch the growth of the flowers and shrubs which he had himself sown or planted, and while doing so may have thought of the garden he described in his "Richard II." In Stratford he could cultivate the different kinds of apples for which his native county was so famous; here in the shade of his own trees he could enjoy the humming of his bees, and give himself up to day-dreams in the twilight of evening.[2] Those fond of making speculations may even venture to ask whether Shakespeare may not have made use of his garden for taking part in the endeavour (which is known to have been made in 1609) to introduce the cultivation of silk into Stratford. It had been found that the soil there was specially favourable for the growth of mulberry trees, and in 1609 a quantity of these trees were planted, and—

p. xiii. f.; John Parkinson, *Paradisus Terrestris, or A Choice Garden*, &c., London, 1629. Bacon declares a garden to be "the purest of human pleasures and the greatest refreshment to the spirits of man," and the poet Shakespeare is scarcely likely to have differed from the philosopher Bacon on this point.

[1] Compare the plan in Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 165, and the subsequent note on p. 330; also *Outlines*, ii. 141-145 (*The Chapel Lane*).

[2] See *Shakespeare in Domestic Life* in the *British Quarterly Review*, No. 89, January, 1867.

according to a generally accepted tradition in Stratford—Shakespeare planted a mulberry tree in his garden with his own hands; of this famous tree we shall presently have to speak again.[1]

In March, 1613, Shakespeare was again in London, and purchased there a tenement in Blackfriars.[2] But whether the poet was in London in June of that year, and present at the burning of the Globe Theatre while his "Henry VIII." was being performed, is not known; as little is it known whether or not he suffered any loss personally by the fire, although it seems more than probable that some of his dramas, in manuscript, must have been lost on that occasion.[3] During this same year the poet's brother Richard died, in Stratford, and this no doubt caused Shakespeare some grief; but during the following year further troubles came upon him, which may have caused him even greater anxiety. On the 9th of July, 1614, Stratford was visited by a terrible conflagration. In less than two hours, fifty-four houses, together with a number of barns and stables and all their valuable contents, were burnt to the ground, and the town suffered a loss of over £8,000—according to our present standard, of at least £40,000. Most of the houses and cottages in Stratford in those days had thatched roofs, which were a means of spreading any fire that occurred. Thatched roofs had, indeed, some time previously been forbidden in the case of new houses; still, owing to the poverty of most of the inhabitants of the town, the authorities had difficulty in enforcing the prohibition.[4] This circumstance perfectly accounts for the fact that the fire, owing to being driven by a violent wind, raged in several parts of the town simultaneously, and that fears were entertained that the whole town would be completely destroyed. New Place fortunately escaped, and, in fact, Shakespeare does not appear to have in any way suffered from this calamity. But we may unquestionably assume that the poet did all in his power to alleviate the distress which the fire caused, and that he contributed to the funds raised to rebuild the town, even though there is no record of these facts.

The winter of this same year Shakespeare again spent in London, as we know from Greene's letters of the 16th of Novem-

[1] See Knight, *William Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 490.
[2] See above, p. 184.
[3] See above, p. 4.
[4] Halliwell, *New Place*, p. 210 ff.

ber and the 23rd of December, 1614, so that the poet's presence in the metropolis on these two days at least, is a matter beyond a doubt.[1] It is to this absence of Shakespeare from his home, that Halliwell assigns the visit of a Puritan preacher to New Place, which is recorded in the Chamberlain's accounts of that year; and this seems highly probable. From the record we learn that—according to the praiseworthy old custom—the itinerant preacher was presented by the town with a quart of sack and a quart of red wine by way of welcome. The curious entry is given in the following words: "For one quart of sack and on quart of clarett wine geven to a preacher at the New Place, xx*d*." Halliwell thinks that the Halls may have been living at New Place at the time, and that Shakespeare's family may even at that date have given signs of their interest in ecclesiastical concerns, *i.e.* of the Puritanical tendency which characterized the poet's descendants to the last. Hunter, too, in his "New Illustrations," has a very interesting and suggestive chapter on this tendency in the poet's family. It is not at all impossible that Shakespeare's descendants in this respect, stood to him in much the same relation as Byron's relatives did to him. It is possible that Shakespeare was looked upon as the "black sheep" of the family; not, indeed, on account of his immorality, but because of his want of religion, which they considered sinfulness. It is possible, too, that for this reason they destroyed, or bestowed no care upon the papers he left. In the case of Susanna Hall, the religious tendency is expressly mentioned on her tombstone, and we have proofs of Dr. Hall's religious sentiments in the notes he kept of his medical work, and also in his journals. But even as regards Shakespeare's wife, it is by no means unlikely that as she advanced in years she became a zealous and strict churchwoman; the inscription on her tombstone, at all events, leaves nothing to be desired in the way of religiousness, and any such tendency would only be in keeping with the passionate sensuality which she had exhibited in early life. According to Dowden[2] she endea-

[1] The possibility of Shakespeare's having seen Milton as a boy, is connected with this sojourn of the poet's in London. Milton, as we know, was a marvellous child, and wrote poetry at a very early age, and the proud father may on this occasion have endeavoured to introduce his boy to Shakespeare. See Bellew, *Shakespeare's Home at New Place*, p. 264.

[2] *Shakspere*, p. 20.

voured to find in "religion a satisfaction which her marriage had not afforded." It is very obvious, therefore, that mother and children would be likely to make use of the absence of the irreligious head of the family in order that their friendly intercourse with the Puritan preacher might be enjoyed without interruption. And, for our own part, we can see no difficulty in supposing that, even during Shakespeare's presence at home, a Puritan preacher may have been entertained as a guest at New Place. Shakespeare's spirit of tolerance and kindliness would assuredly not have entirely excluded this class from his sympathy, especially if the preacher in question was a man of culture, and not one of the very vehement zealots. Besides, if Halliwell's supposition should be correct, that Dr. Hall was residing in his father-in-law's house at the time, the preacher might very well have been his guest, and Shakespeare could have made no objection to this. But whatever the true state of the case may have been, it is an unquestionable fact that Puritanism was greatly on the increase in Stratford as well as in England generally; this is proved even by the fact that theatrical representations were repeatedly forbidden by the civic authorities. As early as December 17th, 1602, the Corporation of the town determined that in future no play or interlude should be performed in the Guildhall, and that any bailiff, alderman, or citizen who should take upon himself to grant any such permission should be fined 10*s.* for disregarding the prohibition. Still, this prohibition does not seem to have been very effectual, for in 1612 the fine of 10*s.* was increased to the extraordinary amount of £10; and in 1622 the King's Players even received 6*s.* as a compensation for not being allowed to give a dramatic performance.[1] In Stratford, therefore, and in the very presence of Shakespeare, the most distinguished of its citizens and the greatest dramatist of all ages, the drama and the theatre were, so to say, proscribed and outlawed,—a very remarkable fact, certainly. The necessity of renewing the prohibition does, it is true, seem to indicate that the citizens were not all disposed to regard dramatic performances with hostility, and that the Puritans formed only a small, although influential party; but, in any case, the suppression of the

[1] Malone's *Shakspeare*, by Boswell (1821), ii. 153; Dyce, *Works of Shakespeare* (3rd ed.), i. 116; Kenny, *Life and Genius of Shakespeare*, p. 58.

drama at the time of its highest perfection by the fanatical zeal of Puritanism could not fail to have painfully affected Shakespeare, and he must have had anxious forebodings of the future. Can it have been in any way the result of this Puritanical spirit prevailing in Stratford, that Shakespeare—as far as is known—never held any municipal appointment, and that, in this respect, his retirement from public life may be said to have been completed? Among the Corporation, where Puritanism led the way, there can assuredly have been no place for Shakespeare. That he was nevertheless not only upon good terms with his fellow-citizens, but enjoyed their esteem and affection, and that he had the welfare of the town at heart, in spite of not holding any civic office, we know more especially from the part he took in the matter relating to certain proposed enclosures of common lands, at Welcombe near Stratford.

Since the beginning of the sixteenth century the nobility and gentry of the kingdom had shown an increasing disposition to do away with the mediæval system of common lands, and to enclose land for the grazing of cattle, and parks for preserving game.[1] The injurious effects of such proceedings upon the country at large Holinshed[2] mentions, by stating that it interfered with tillage, and hence that the peasant class, from which the naval and military forces principally drew recruits, was becoming seriously diminished; that villages and even towns were being ruined, and also that the prices of meat, wool, and cloth were rising, for, as there was no competition, the owners of parks and pastures could regulate prices as they chose.[3] In order to put an end to this mischievous state of affairs, Henry VIII., as early as 1521, ordered that all fences and railings enclosing land, should at once be taken down, and that the decayed cottages be put into repair and restored to the husbandmen. The expectations which the nation entertained of these wholesome ordinances were, however, frustrated, for the landlords contrived by dishonest means to retain the lands which they had enclosed; bribes were given to Cardinal Wolsey, and with the aid of

[1] Compare Erwin Nasse, *Ueber die mittelalterliche Feldgemeinschaft und die Einhegungen des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts in England* (Bonn, 1869), p. 56 f.

[2] *Chronicle*, 1586, iii. 862.

[3] Compare Sir Thomas More, *Utopia*, ed. Arber, p. 41.

large sums of money they also succeeded in closing the eyes of the law. In this way not only did the existing enclosures remain undisturbed, but even a number of other enclosures were made. It can readily be imagined, therefore, that a proposal made in 1614 by William Combe, Arthur Mainwaring, and William Replingham, to enclose the "common fields" at Welcombe, put the Stratford people into a great and lasting state of excitement. For the enclosing of these common fields would not only have turned arable land into pasture ground, but it would have led to an alteration of boundaries and a change of tenure and ownership, and moreover the value of the tithes possessed by Shakespeare—and it seems by Thomas Greene also—would have been greatly diminished. Accordingly, Shakespeare, his cousin Greene, and the town—as the ultimate inheritor of the tithes—opposed the enclosing of the fields. Shakespeare, the practical man of business, to make use of Dr. Ingleby's words, "seems to have temporized with both parties, when he might have treated with both, like an elector selling his vote to the highest bidder." He at all events claimed full compensation; and with this object, on the 28th of October, 1614, an agreement was made by him and his cousin Greene with Replingham, according to which the latter undertook to indemnify both Shakespeare and Greene, as well as their heirs and assignees, for any loss which—in the judgment of four disinterested persons—might have occurred to them "by reason of anie inclosure intended by the said William Replingham." Shakespeare stated to J. Greene (a brother of Thomas Greene ?) "that he was unable to bear the enclosing of Welcombe."[1] This, however, was by no means the end of the matter; the Corporation of Stratford considered it their duty towards their fellow-citizens—who had become greatly impoverished by the great fire of the previous summer—to do all in their power to resist the dreaded enclosures. And Shakespeare on this occasion again, no doubt, acted not only as the highly-esteemed and influential man, but he may in all probability have been requested to watch and protect the interests of the town as well as his own. The inferiority of the actor's social status, which Shakespeare laments in his Sonnets, proved accordingly,

[1] This remark Halliwell discovered among the town archives of Stratford. See Halliwell, *The Last Days of Wm. Shakespeare* (1863), p. 13 f.

in his own case, no obstacle to his being asked to attend to this important business matter—at any rate, the obstacle was overcome. If any authenticated fact relating to Shakespeare's life throws an unusually favourable and bright light upon the poet's social position, it is unquestionably his connection with these proceedings. The town clerk, Thomas Greene, who discharged the duties of a solicitor for the Corporation and was a counsellor of the Middle Temple, was sent to London on this business; and on November 17th, 1614, he reported to the Corporation that "My Cosen Shakspeare comyng yesterday to towne I went to see him howe he did, he told me that they assured him they ment to inclose no further then to Gospell Bushe and so upp straight (leavying out part of the dyngles to the ffield) to the gate in Clopton hedge, and take in Salisburyes peece: and that they meane in Aprill to servey the Land, and then to gyve satisfaccion and not before; and he and Mr. Hall say they think there will be nothyng done at all." The assurance here given by Shakespeare and his son-in-law that no enclosures were likely to be made—that, in fact, the persons concerned had abandoned their proposal—does not, however, appear to have altogether satisfied the Corporation; for on the 23rd of December the Town Council held a meeting to discuss the question, and letters were despatched to Mr. Mainwaring and to Mr. Shakespeare in London, "with almost all the company's hands to either." Greene, who kept a memorandum of all the proceedings, adds that he sent his cousin Shakespeare (he seems not a little proud of the cousinship) "coppyes of all our acts," and also "a note of the inconvenyences wold happen in the inclosure." A petition on the subject was also addressed to the Privy Council. How the matter was finally settled does not seem certain; in 1618—hence after Shakespeare's death—an order was issued not only forbidding the enclosure, but commanding William Combe, who was High Sheriff of the county at the time, to desist in some work connected with enclosures which had already been begun.[1] If we may trust Wheler's report,[2] the fields in question remained unenclosed till 1774.

In the same year during which Shakespeare took part in the proceedings against the proposed enclosure of the Wel-

[1] Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 19.
[2] *Guide to Stratford*, pp. 22-25.

combe fields, his name occurs in the will of John Combe, who died on the 10th of July, 1614,[1] and who leaves him a legacy of £5. From this will of John Combe we learn that the testator possessed an estate in the parish of Hampton Lucy called Parson's Close, which became subsequently known as Shakespeare's Close; whether, and in what sense this name has any connection with the poet, there is not the smallest evidence to show, as in so many other points relating to the poet's life.

But it is not sufficient for our purpose merely to mention John Combe's will; we must look a little more closely at his life, for his name is perhaps the one most frequently mentioned among the friends Shakespeare had in Stratford. John Combe held an office under the Earl of Warwick as the collector of the rents of the manor of Stratford, and is said to have received in this capacity an annual salary of 53*s.* 4*d.* Such officers are never looked upon with much favour, and John Combe does not seem to have been popular in Stratford, where he had a residence in the so-called College.[2] From his holding this appointment in the Earl's service, it seems obvious that he must have had other financial matters to attend to for him, and this appears to have caused him to be regarded somewhat in the light of a "usurer"—this was the name given in Shakespeare's day to anyone who lent out money on interest; and in fact Combe was looked upon as a veritable oppressor of the poor. That Combe accumulated a considerable fortune is evident from his will, but Halliwell, to whom we owe the discovery of the will, maintains that this very will fully acquits John Combe of the popular slander that has descended on his name, inasmuch as we have there proof that he bequeathed large sums to the poor. However, Halliwell omits to consider the possibility that if the testator had really been what tradition makes him out, the legacies in question may have been made to appease an evil conscience. But whatever the true state of the case may have been, John Combe must undoubtedly have possessed good qualities of mind and heart, for according to all reports he

[1] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 235 f. It is possible that Combe's death was in some way connected with the great fire which occurred the previous day.

[2] A picture of the College is given by Halliwell in his *Life of Shakespeare;* see pp. 232 and 234.

was upon intimate and friendly terms with Shakespeare. Not only may they have had many a pleasant hour's chat in each other's houses—at the College and at New Place—but tradition relates that they used to meet regularly every evening at a tavern in Chapel Street, opposite New Place, where a "shovel board" was long exhibited as having been used by the poet. Halliwell[1] and Knight,[2] however, both maintain that although the house in question existed in Shakespeare's day, it did not become a tavern till between 1645 and 1665, and that it perhaps received the name of The Falcon in connection with the poet's coat-armour. According to another tradition,[3] these meetings were held at The Bear in Bridge Street, where Shakespeare and his friends were in the habit of spending their evenings. This legend even tells some of the anecdotes and witticisms wherewith the poet amused his friends and himself. If we may trust badly authenticated reports, it was one of Shakespeare's favourite diversions to write serious, but generally satirical epitaphs for his friends.[4] And he is even said, while residing in London, to have extemporized one for himself while sitting in some tavern with Ben Jonson.[5] In like manner, according to Dugdale, Shakespeare is also said to have written two epitaphs for Sir Thomas Stanley, a son of the Earl of Derby, who died in 1600, and who was buried in Tong Church, in Shropshire; one of these epitaphs is said to have been placed on the east side, the other on the west side of Stanley's tombstone. However, the latter, more especially, seems as much unlike a production of Shakespeare as could possibly be. These epitaphs were first collected by Dugdale, and not till the year 1664, hence almost fifty years after the poet's death, so we cannot be going far wrong in rejecting his authority on this point. Another epitaph met with in a MS. collection of poems, probably from the time of Charles I., is said to have been written for a certain Elias James of Stratford; a third or fourth satirical epitaph is said to have been coined for the Thomas Combe to whom the poet bequeathed his sword. Still, the most famous epitaph ascribed to Shakespeare's pen are the cutting lines addressed to John Combe that have been handed

[1] *New Place*, p. 88. [2] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 199.
[3] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 242.
[4] Ibid., pp. 231-243; Drake, *l.c.*, ii. 604 f.
[5] Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, p. 277.

down to us by no less important authorities than Rowe and Aubrey. Rowe's account is: "It happened that in a pleasant conversation amongst their common friends, Mr. Combe told Shakspeare in a laughing manner that he intended to write his epitaph, if he happened to outlive him; and since he could not know what might be said of him when he was dead, he desired it might be done immediately; upon which Shakspeare gave him these four lines:"

> Ten in the hundred lies here ingrav'd;
> 'Tis hundred to ten his soul is not sav'd:
> If any man ask, who lies in this tomb?
> Oh! ho! quoth the Devil, 'tis my John-a-Combe.

"But the sharpness of the satire is said to have stung the man so severely, that he never forgave it." The trustworthiness of the story is opposed by the already mentioned circumstance that Combe left Shakespeare a legacy of £5, and certainly only as a token of his special affection. No such objection can be raised against the version of the story as given by Aubrey, for according to him Shakespeare did not write the lines till after Combe's death; and, indeed, the lines are even somewhat less bitter as given by him. Aubrey's version of the story is: "One time as he was at the Tavern, at Stratford super Avon, one Combes, an old rich Usurer, was to be buryed, he makes there this extemporary Epitaph:—

> Ten in the Hundred the Devill allowes,
> But Combe will have twelve, he sweares and he vowes:
> If any one asks who lies in this Tombe,
> 'Hoh!' quoth the Devill, ''tis my John a Combe.'" [1]

In the latter case, accordingly, the usurer's soul is not said to be doomed to eternal perdition, but this form of the epitaph cannot otherwise be said to exhibit any much greater amount of consideration on the poet's part. Shakespeare's "gentleness" is too often alluded to by his contemporaries, and constitutes too essential a trait in the idea we are justified in forming of his character, for us to ascribe so crude and so little witty a jest to him, whether addressed to a living friend, or written after the friend's death. For in ascribing the lines to Shakespeare, we should at the same time have to admit that they were written at a period of the poet's life

[1] Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 384.

when neither the thoughtlessness nor hastiness of youth could be accepted as an excuse for him. We should, in fact, be doing Shakespeare a wrong, for Rowe expressly states that the poet had made numerous friends in and around Stratford by "his pleasant wit and good nature." And, as Halliwell[1] has pointed out, this same epigram, under slightly varied forms, is met with both in MS. as well as printed collections from the seventeenth century, and is met with in print as early as between 1608 and 1614.[2] Nothing is more easy to imagine than that in the course of time the epigram should, intentionally or unintentionally, become attributed to Shakespeare; in fact, it would seem as if this anecdote were one of those likely to attach itself to the personality of a great man, as barnacles to a ship. A manuscript in the British Museum[3] does, indeed, give an account of three officers—a captain, lieutenant, and an ensign—who made a pleasant tour through several counties, and among other places visited Stratford, where, in the church, they noticed the following tombstones: "A monument for the Earl of Totness, and his lady, still living. The monument of Sir Hugh Clopton. A neat monument of that famous English poet, Mr. Wm. Shakespeare, who was born here; and one of an old gentleman, a batchelor, Mr. Combe, upon whose name the said poet did merrily fann up some witty and facetious verses, which time would not give us leave to sacke up." This report carries us back pretty close to Combe's as well as to Shakespeare's death, for it is dated just twenty years after Combe's death, and thus seems to furnish a clue for the existence of some humorous lines on John Combe from the poet's pen. However, Hunter[4] very correctly remarks that the expressions *fan* and *sacke up* employed by the officers are but little applicable to the traditional lines, but seem rather to suggest a play upon the word *combe* with its double meaning; this would be incomparably more in keeping with Shakespeare's acknowledged predilection for a play upon words. But the account given by the officers in no way settles the question as to the identity of the

[1] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 232.

[2] Malone (Malone's *Shakspeare*, by Boswell, ii. 496), Knight (*William Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 488 f.), and Dyce (*The Works of Shakespeare*, 3rd ed., i. 108), all agree with Halliwell in rejecting the anecdote. With regard to "*Ten in the Hundred*," see above, p. 182.

[3] *Lansdowne MSS.* No. 213.

[4] *Illustrations*, i. 88.

epitaph. And lastly, with regard to the usury of which John Combe is accused, it is strange, certainly, that in his will he orders money to be put out at interest, but one thing that redounds to his honour is, that this is done purely from benevolent motives. He bequeaths, namely, £100 for the benefit of fifteen poor or young tradesmen, all of whom are to receive 20 nobles a-piece for a term of three years, all of them paying yearly, during the said three years, the sum of 3*s.* 4*d.* (hence 2½ per cent. interest) in aid of the poor in Stratford. This is philanthropic enough. Shakespeare may possibly have had other business transactions with John Combe previous to the purchase of the fields from him, and also with Thomas Combe; it can scarcely be doubted that after his retirement in Stratford the poet employed his leisure in superintending and increasing his movable as well as his immovable possessions, in so far as he did not—to use Rowe's words—give himself up entirely "to ease, retirement, and the conversation of friends." His repeated journeys to London also appear to have been mainly undertaken with a view to business, although they may partly have been made in connection with the theatre. The supposition that Shakespeare wrote several of his dramas after retiring to Stratford, or even—as is reported in the Diary of the Rev. John Ward—that he was in a measure obliged to supply the stage with two plays every year in return for a handsome salary, is absolutely unfounded and improbable.[1] Dramatic poetry was in those days much too intimately and

[1] Upon this supposed fact Ward founds another statement which does but little credit to his critical judgment, viz., that Shakespeare's annual expenditure in Stratford after his retirement from public life amounted to £1,000—according to our present value, therefore, from between £4,000 to £5,000. This is a palpable mistake, and, in fact, an utterly impossible piece of exaggeration. According to the general opinion, which Malone (Malone's *Shakspeare*, by Boswell, 1821, ii. 517 f.) traces back to Gildon, Shakespeare's annual income amounted to about £300, a sum which in *The Merry Wives* is spoken of as a pretty considerable fortune. Anne Page says of Master Slender:—

O, what a world of vile ill-favour'd faults
Looks handsome in three hundred pounds a year.

Malone even considers this sum too high, and reckons the total receipts from Shakespeare's different properties at some £200 annually. The poet is, indeed, said to have drawn a similar amount from the theatre as long as he was connected with it. See Dyce, *The Works of Shakespeare* (3rd ed.), i. 106 f.; Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 327.

inseparably connected with the art of acting to be produced so entirely apart from the stage, and least of all by a poet who had himself been an actor. There is no doubt that Shakespeare gave up writing dramas when he withdrew from the stage, although a few exceptions may be granted; and if his withdrawal from the stage, as seems probable, took place about 1605, still he would nevertheless have spent twenty years of his life as an actor and a dramatist, for his first youthful efforts can scarcely be assigned to a later date than 1585.

We are approaching the end, but one more joyful event in the family has first to be recorded—the marriage of Shakespeare's second daughter Judith, which was celebrated at New Place on the 10th of February, 1615-16; the elder daughter Susanna had married on the 5th of June, 1607, Dr. John Hall, a medical man, of whom we shall presently have to speak more fully. Judith had reached the age of thirty-two at the time of her marriage—a strange circumstance that can in no way be accounted for; the elder sister had married at twenty-five. Judith must have been what is called a good match, although what she was likely to inherit from her father would not be equal to what her elder sister possessed. Can she have been ill-favoured? This is not very likely, as her parents were in all probability persons of good looks and appearance, the father more especially. Can she have been a "quarrelsome Kate?" There is, however, not the smallest reason for any such accusation being laid to her account. Can she have been difficult to please, and had she rejected other suitors? In this case, however, she is not likely to have accepted Thomas Quiney either, for he does not seem to have been of good family or a wealthy man. Thomas Quiney—a son of the same Richard Quiney who on the 25th of October, 1598, had applied to Shakespeare by letter for a loan of £30—was "a vintner" by trade, and in a small town like Stratford this cannot have been a very lucrative business, unless, indeed, he supplied the cellars of the gentry of the neighbourhood—the Lucies, Rainsfords, and others. According to Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps,[1] "there was some reason for accelerating the nuptials, for they were married without a licence, an irregularity for which a few weeks afterwards they were fined and threatened with excommunication by the

[1] *Outlines*, ii. 234.

ecclesiastical court at Worcester." I am unable to find out Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps' source for this statement. In the church register Thomas Quiney is on several occasions termed a "gentleman;" for instance, at the entry of the birth of his first child on the 23rd of November, 1616, and the Quiney family possessed a coat-of-arms.[1] We know also from his brother-in-law, Dr. Hall, that he was by no means wanting in culture,[2] and to judge from the flourishes round his neatly-written signature, he must have been, as Knight says, "a great master of caligraphy." But the most remarkable point in the case is that Thomas Quiney was four years younger than his bride, having been born on the 26th of February, 1588-89.[3] It has been remarked in connection with this fact that the disparity in the ages of William Shakespeare and his wife cannot possibly have affected the poet's conjugal happiness, otherwise the parents would never have consented to Judith's following their example, and that Judith herself would have been forewarned by having witnessed the unhappiness of her own parents. In opposition to this, it may be observed that—as a well-known fact—young people rarely take the experience of those older than themselves. And even though the parents may not have been satisfied with their daughter's choice, they could have done but little to prevent the marriage; in England children are much more independent in these matters than in Germany. It must also be admitted that the disparity of age between Judith and her lover, was both less dangerous and strange at her age than it had been in the case of her parents. Still, according to Halliwell-Phillipps,[4] it would seem that Judith's marriage was by no means a happy one; her husband seems finally to have removed to London, and died there. As a means of judging of the degree of Judith's education, it must be remarked that she did not subscribe her name to the contract of marriage, but made use of her mark, whereas her elder sister Susanna signed her name, not only legibly, but in a good and characteristic style of writing. Judith may perhaps have been able

[1] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 31, 178. With regard to the Quiney family, compare also Hunter's *Illustrations*, i. 91-93.

[2] See above, p. 378.

[3] The statement which Drake, *Shakespeare and his Times*, ii. 609, makes about the reverse having been the case is probably the result of a mistake.—Susanna was eight years younger than her husband, Dr. Hall.

[4] *Outlines*, i. 248 f.

to write, but in so inferior a manner that she preferred making her mark.[1] The clergyman who officiated at the ceremony, and whose sad duty it was a few weeks later to read the burial service at the father's funeral, is said to have been one Rogers by name.[2]

Shakespeare's death followed so closely upon his daughter's wedding that we cannot summarily dismiss the idea that there may have been some connection between the two events. The only report we possess as to the cause of the death is from an entry made in the Diary of the Rev. John Ward, of Stratford,[3] from the year 1663: "Shakespear, Drayton, and Ben Jhonson," he says, "had a merry meeting, and itt seems drank too hard, for Shakespear died of a feavour there contracted."[4] This entry has called forth not only a great

[1] See the facsimile of her handwriting at the end of another document in Halliwell, p. 109. See also the *Athenæum*, 1869, i. 660. Susanna's signature in Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 296, and in Halliwell's *New Place*, p. 130 (from the year 1647). Milton's eldest daughter likewise was unable to write, and the second daughter, it seems, only moderately well. See *Milton's Poetical Works*, ed. Masson (1874), i. 64 f.

[2] According to Bellew, *Shakespeare's Home at New Place*, p. 269 f.

[3] *Diary of the Rev. John Ward, M.A.*, arranged by Charles Severn, M.D. (London, 1839), p. 183 f. Ward settled in Stratford towards the beginning of 1662, either shortly before or shortly after Judith Quiney's death. He alludes to her in the following words: "*A letter to my brother, to see Mrs. Queeny, to send for Tom Smith for the acknowledgment.*" The meaning of these words is unexplained, and it cannot even be denied that it is doubtful whether the Mrs. Queeny alluded to refers to Judith Shakespeare. Ward's *Diary* was written in Stratford between the 14th of February, 1661-62, and the 25th of April, 1663. See Kenny, *Life and Genius of Shakespeare*, p. 63, and Appendix, Note 6; Ingleby, *Centurie of Prayse*, p. 327.

[4] An extremely offensive version of this note of Ward's has appeared of late years. In the *Passages from the English Note Books of N. Hawthorne* (i. 143), it is stated that Roger Kemble (the father of John and Charles Kemble and of Mrs. Siddons) had discovered in Stratford, after careful investigations, that "Shakespeare attended a certain revel at Stratford, and indulging too much in the conviviality of the occasion, he tumbled into a ditch on his way home and died there." The publisher of this altogether unfounded piece of scandal must be placed in an unenviable position, by the side of his country-woman Mrs. Beecher Stowe.—Compare *Notes and Queries*, January 21, 1872, p. 52. A piece of gossip agreeing pretty closely with the above is mentioned by Bellew, *Shakespeare's Home at New Place*, p. 114; according to it Shakespeare died while in drink! Bellew was told this by a clergyman!!—I regret to have to state that Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps joins Hawthorne and this clergyman, in believing the story; in his readiness to believe all traditions he has not been able to reject even this utterly unfounded piece of scandal, although, by putting it in a somewhat humorous

many sceptical doubts, but even disapprobation, not to say moral indignation, and yet in all probability the report is correct, that is to say, when rightly understood. That Shakespeare did die of fever, and most probably of typhus fever, Halliwell[1] has established almost beyond the possibility of a doubt, and has at the same time pointed out how the poet is likely to have contracted the fever. Stratford was, in those days, anything but a healthy place, as we have learned already. Its situation, to begin with, is low and damp; of drainage or any other sanitary arrangements there was then no question whatever, and the frequent inundations of the Avon no doubt contributed not a little to the general unhealthiness of the town. In fact, Stratford was a very hotbed for fevers of the worst kind. Dirt and filth filled the streets, and, up to the second half of the eighteenth century, there occur, with only one longer interval, a succession of warnings and fines on the part of the municipal authorities concerning the cleansing of the streets, and of these Halliwell has published a goodly series. The interval alluded to (from 1605 to 1646) is explained by the fact that the documents relating to this period are missing. Even Garrick, the great actor, notwithstanding the hospitable and honourable reception he met with in Stratford on the occasion of the Shakespeare Jubilee in 1769, declared the place to be "the most dirty, unseemly, ill-pav'd, wretched-looking town in all Britain.[2] Chapel Lane, in particular, one end of which skirted Shakespeare's house and the longest side of his garden, was an ill-kept by-street. It contained only a few dwelling-houses, and consisted mainly of cattle-sheds, thatched barns, and mud walls, while along the middle of the road ran an open drain. A civic record from the year 1553 contains an order from the magistrate: "Item, that every tenaunt in Chapell Lane or Ded Lane do scour and keep cleane their gutteres or dyches in the same lane befor thassencyon day and so from thensfurthe from tyme to tyme to kepe the same in payn of every offender to forfet for every deffalt iii*s.* iv*d.* (considering the money-value of the time, a pretty heavy fine!) and that every tenaunt do ryd the soyelles

form, he endeavours to make the actual fact appear less unpleasant; in his *Outlines*, i. 243, he says the poet "had taken more wine than was conducive to pedestrian accuracy."

[1] *New Place*, p. 28 f.

[2] *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 285.

in the stretes of logges and blokes ther lyenge and beynge to the noysaunce of the Kinges leage people by the same day in lyke peyne." William Clopton, the proprietor of New Place at the time, was fined in 1558 "for not keeping clean the gutter along the Chapell in Chappell Lane." As a result of this state of things, Stratford was visited at almost regular intervals by fevers and epidemics. The Guild Chapel was erected expressly as "a chapell of ease for the seperacion of the sicke persons from the hole in tyme of plague." We have repeatedly in the course of our narrative had to mention visitations of this kind that followed the great plague of 1565, when Shakespeare was one year old. And after the poet's death, we hear that his grand-daughter, Dr. Hall's child, suffered from fever in 1625, and that in 1632 Dr. Hall himself, indeed the whole town of Stratford, suffered more or less. Dr. Hall, in his "Select Observations," reports: "I fell into a deadly burning fever, which then raged very much, killing almost all that it did infect." The art of medicine had not yet come to understand the nature of fevers, especially of typhus fever, and knew of no remedies or preventives.

Accordingly the report handed down to us by the Rev. John Ward seems in so far quite worthy of belief. And even his statement of the drinking-bout can be explained in the most natural way. Drayton and Ben Jonson must undoubtedly have gone to Stratford for Judith's wedding. For Drayton was not only a Warwickshire man, but, as we know from his "Polyolbion," he was upon intimate terms with the Rainsford family in Clifford (a village about one mile from Stratford), and generally spent the summer months there.[1] It can, therefore, scarcely be doubted that Drayton made frequent visits to New Place from Clifford, the more so as he was a patient of Dr. Hall's. It may, in fact, also be assumed

1 *Near of dear Clifford's seat, the place of health and sport,*
Which many a time have been the Muse's quiet port.

Compare also Drayton's *Letters to Drummond of Hawthornden*, in *Drummond's Works* (Edin., 1711, fol.); Hunter's *Illustrations*, i. 84.—In the *Elegy* addressed to his friend Henry Reynolds (1627) Drayton pays his tribute to Shakespeare's memory. The praise he bestows upon him is somewhat lukewarm certainly; the lines are:—

Shakespeare, thou hadst as smooth a Comicke vaine,
Fitting the socke, and in thy natural braine
As strong conception, and as Cleere a rage,
As any one that trafiqu'd with the stage.

that Shakespeare was personally acquainted with Sir Henry Rainsford, whom Aubrey describes as "a learned gentleman." Ben Jonson's presence at Judith's marriage will likewise seem quite intelligible when we bear in mind that, according to a generally-accepted tradition, Shakespeare had stood godfather to one of Jonson's children. Now, if the three poets met on the joyful occasion of Judith's wedding, they are more than likely to have indulged in a little too much drink; and may not the bridegroom, being a vintner, have delighted in setting before them his choicest wines and in filling up their glasses? Where Ben Jonson was one of the party, there is sure to have been a goodly amount of tippling, for "drink is one of the elements in which he liveth," says Drummond of him. No doubt the three poets had a high time of it, and we may safely picture to ourselves the table well supplied with sack, Rhine wine, and caviare—not for the guests generally, but for the select few. And in the centre, doubtless, stood "the broad silver and gilt bowl" which figures in Shakespeare's will and is very appropriately bequeathed to Judith, the vintner's wife. Over their wine, the three friends would recall to each other's remembrance scenes from the past; they would recall their jovial evenings at The Boar's Head and The Mermaid; old jests would be revived; old friends as well as new friends would be remembered; a number of good-healths would be drunk, and their glasses would be made to ring—"for auld lang syne, my dear!" Who would grudge them their enthusiasm over such memories? Who could honestly find fault with them for it, or be the first to cast a stone at them? To our mind, at all events, the remembrance of Shakespeare will not be one whit the less dear and sacred, even though at his daughter's wedding he may have been carried away by his enthusiasm and have partaken somewhat too much of the good things provided.[1] But this joyful festivity had a mournful sequel. Very possibly Shakespeare caught a chill; at all events, the unusual excitement aggravated the latent mischief which had been caused by the unhealthy atmosphere and the miasmas of Stratford, and unmistakable signs of illness soon became apparent. The injurious effect produced by decayed

[1] The above was written before I had read Bellew's account, which I find agrees entirely with my view. See Bellew, *Shakespeare's Home at New Place*, p. 266 f., and also Severn, *Diary of the Rev. John Ward* (Lond., 1839), pp. 60-70.

or decaying animal and vegetable substances upon the human frame, was still a sealed book in Shakespeare's day. Hence it was most natural that people generally—and the medical attendant, *i.e.* Dr. Hall, probably also—did not ascribe the fever to its real cause, but to some insignificant secondary cause; and accordingly it is quite intelligible also that Ward made an entry in his Diary to the effect that Shakespeare had contracted a fever as a result of hard drinking, and that he died of it—Ward was, however, careful enough to add the words, "itt seems." Several commentators have endeavoured to prove that Shakespeare's illness was not a long one; that his death was somewhat sudden; that it followed almost directly upon the convivial meeting, and that, accordingly, it had no connection with Judith's wedding. In favour of this opinion, it is stated that Shakespeare, in his will, asserts that he is "in perfect health and memory;" however, this is merely the standing legal phrase, which is simply meant to express that the testator is capable of making a deposition. Hence no value can be attached to this statement; whereas, Shakespeare's unsteady signature to his will, obviously shows that he must have been suffering or ill when he signed his name. His memory, also, does not appear to have been exactly "perfect;" this seems proved partly by the many corrections and interlineations, and partly also by the circumstance that Shakespeare clearly could not recollect the first name of his nephew Thomas Hart, and hence left a blank space for it. If Shakespeare had not been ill, he would probably not have made his will at the time, for having a strong constitution he, no doubt, expected to live to a greater age than he did. It is possible, also, that the news of the death of his brother-in-law, William Hart (who was buried on April 17th), may have aggravated his own illness.

The question whether, according to the general supposition, Shakespeare's death occurred on the 23rd of April, that is, on the anniversary of his birth, has been discussed in our first chapter. And with regard to the remark made by Drake[1] and others, that the day of Shakespeare's death was the day on which Cervantes died, we have already given its proper interpretation, by pointing to the variations in regard to dates. Cervantes certainly did die on the 23rd of April, 1616, but on

[1] Drake, *Shakspeare and His Times*, ii. 611.

the 23rd of April according to the Gregorian Calendar; he died on a Saturday, Shakespeare on a Tuesday. In Spain, namely, the Gregorian Calender had already been adopted, whereas in England the Julian Calendar was still in use in Shakespeare's day, and the Gregorian Calendar was not introduced till 1752.[1] Shakespeare, accordingly, outlived the great Spanish poet by ten days.[2]

Shakespeare's mortal remains were buried on the 25th of April in the chancel of Holy Trinity Church, Stratford.[3] That the day of his funeral was one of deep sorrow, not only to his family, but to the whole town of Stratford, can scarcely be disputed, even by the most inveterate opponents of every species of hypothesis, and who value nothing but dry documentary facts. Not only must the genial, cheerful, and kindly man ("gentle Willie") assuredly have been on the best terms with all his fellow-townsmen, and without an enemy, but they must have been aware of the fact that he was one of the most eminent poets of his day and an honour to his native town—even though they may not have been able to recognize the full extent of his poetic greatness and the immortality of his genius. What impression Shakespeare's premature death created in London, and whether it called forth any sign of public sympathy and grief there, we have unfortunately not the smallest evidence to show. In fact, this is a case that throws the fullest light upon the importance of the means of communication in our day, and upon the change which these have brought about in all our social relations. In our day the telegraph would have carried the melancholy tidings to every part of the globe; all the newspapers would have reported the news within a deep edge of black; deputations from London and other towns would have hastened to Stratford to follow the remains of the renowned poet to their last resting-place, unless indeed, arrangements had been made to remove the body to London at public expense, to have it interred in Westminster Abbey; the ships in every port of the kingdom

[1] See *The Athenæum*, 1864, i. 440, i. 475.

[2] The difference amounted to as much as this. See Bond's *Handy Book of Rules and Tables for Verifying Dates* (London, 1866), p. 27; *Notes and Queries*, Feb. 14, 1874, p. 133 f.

[3] *Shakespeare's Funeral*, in Blackwood's Magazine, No. DCXC., April, 1873. According to *Outlines*, i. 244, the chancel in those days was "the legal and customary burial-place of the owners of the tithes" and even their relatives were sometimes admitted to it.

(as happened at Walter Scott's death) would have had their flags at half-mast—in brief, the whole nation would have taken part in the funeral, and in mourning the loss of the great poet, whereas, owing to the circumstances of the time, the funeral service and signs of mourning were confined to the small town of Stratford. In all probability the earth had closed over his grave before the melancholy news reached London, which had been the scene of his fame and renown. The remains of the greatest dramatist the world has ever produced, were not followed to the grave by the representative men in science and art, nor by any of the leading public men—in fact, not by any of the eminent men of the day; only simple burgesses, artisans, and peasants attended his funeral. From all that can be inferred, perhaps no other eminent poet—with the exception of Schiller—was ever consigned to his last resting-place in so unpretentious a manner; and so little in keeping with his actual greatness. And yet no one can be blamed for this; under the existing circumstances it could not have been otherwise.

On the flat stone which is placed over the poet's grave are inscribed the well-known words:—

> Good frend, for Jesus' sake forbeare,
> To digg the dust enclosed heare:
> Bleste be the man that spares thes stones,
> And curst be he that moves my bones.[1]

Dowdall, who in 1693 made inquiries of the old parish clerk, says he was told that Shakespeare wrote these lines himself shortly before his death; and upon this evidence most commentators have hitherto ascribed the lines to Shakespeare, although Dugdale[2] gives the lines without in any way referring them to Shakespeare. De Quincey, however, with more critical acumen, maintains that this doggerel which is attributed to Shakespeare is "equally below his intellect no less than his scholarship," and Knight,[3] who agrees with De Quincey, believes that during the period that elapsed between the poet's death and the setting-up of the monument, a stone was temporarily placed over the grave. The object of the inscription was thus obviously to secure Shakespeare's

[1] Compare R. Hendrie, *Shakespeare's Tombstone*, in *The Athenæum*, July 9, 1881, p. 49; J. Tom Burgess, *Shakespeare's Monument and Gravestone*, in *The Athenæum*, Nov. 3, 1883, p. 568 f.

[2] *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, p. 1656.

[3] *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 535.

remains from being thrown into the charnel-house[1] beside the church, in accordance with the custom of the day. Schiller's remains were in our own day cast into the so-called *Kassen-gewölbe.* It is possible that Shakespeare may have expressed some wish on the subject; still he would certainly never have clothed it in the above absurd form of verse. What seems most probable is, that the poet's relatives got some local poet to write the lines, and had them engraved on the stone. They would naturally be interested in the poet's remains being left undisturbed, as they must have wished to be buried beside him; and this, in fact, was ultimately the case.[2]

Immediately by the side of the grave, on the northern wall of the church, the poet's relatives erected to his memory the well-known monument with a bust of him, a monument that has as often been discussed, as it has been copied. Below the bust—which we shall have to speak of more fully presently—are two inscriptions:—

Iudicio Pylium, genio Socratem, arte Maronem,
Terra tegit populus maeret, Olympus habet.

Stay, passenger, why goest thov by so fast?
Read, if thov canst, whom envious Death hath plast,
Within this monvment, Shakspeare; with whome
Quick natvre dide: whose name doth deck this tombe
Far more than cost: sith all that he has writt,
Leaves living art bvt page to serve his witt.
Obiit Año Do^{i} 1616
Aetatis 53, die 23 Ap.[3]

The English lines may possibly have been written by Ben Jonson—or it may be by Drayton; the Latin distich, however, with its metrical blunder in the name of Socrates, cannot possibly be attributed to Jonson, who so prided himself on his classical learning.[4] It may perhaps have been written by Dr.

[1] Views of this charnel-house, the outside as well as the interior, are given by Halliwell in his *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 278 and 287.

[2] According to Dowdall's somewhat doubtful statement, Mrs. Shakespeare and her daughters are said to have urgently wished to be buried by the side of the husband and father.—Dyce, *The Works of Shakespeare* (3rd ed.), i. 125.

[3] A supposed epitaph of Dr. Donne's on Shakespeare (given in Mr. and Mrs. Cowden Clarke's *Life of Shakespeare* prefixed to their edition of his works) does not refer to Shakespeare, but to the Marchioness of Hamilton (who died in 1625). *Notes and Queries*, Feb. 5, 1870, p. 148.

[4] Some commentators consider *Socratem* to be a mistake for *Sophoclem.*

Hall, who as we know wrote Latin pretty fluently, although not without making occasional blunders.

What we should most earnestly have wished to be able to do, namely, to picture the interior of the house of mourning, and to know something of the feelings of those who were left, this again is wholly denied to us; it is only of such concerns as are of the smallest value in themselves—the mere outward arrangements and circumstances after the poet's death—that we have any kind of report. Our principal source of information is Shakespeare's will, which was opened on the 22nd of June, and proved by Dr. Hall; unfortunately, however, this will has given rise to so many doubts which have not received any satisfactory solution, that, in many respects, the will may be said to have increased the obscurity, in place of throwing light upon matters—in fact, the will seems likely ever to remain an insolvable enigma.[1] The will is dated the 25th of March, 1616; but the word "Martii" has been substituted for "Januarii," which makes it seem highly probable that the document had been drawn up or prepared as early as January. This conjecture is confirmed by the fact that Judith is mentioned only by her maiden name—whereas her sister is spoken of as Susanna Hall—and that Judith's marriage is in every case alluded to only as a possible occurrence, not as having actually taken place: ("provided that yf such husbond as she shall att thend of the saied three yeares be marryed unto, or at anie [tyme] after"). Everything obliges one to assume that Shakespeare must have been ailing as early as January, and therefore drew up a will; but that, as his health again improved, he delayed having it finally prepared. Then came Judith's wedding, when Shakespeare's health gave further signs of failing, and as the dangerous character of his illness now became very apparent and the worst fears were entertained, the

An exactly opposite case is met with in *The Playhouse Pocket Companion* of 1779, where in the very first line the word Sophocles is erroneously given in place of Socrates. See Ingleby, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*, p. 125.

[1] The original is preserved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury (in London), where it is guarded like a sacred relic, so much so that Halliwell in his *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 274, complains that "the public are not permitted to collate copies with the original." The most reliable copy, naturally, is the photo-lithographic facsimile in Staunton's *Memorials of Shakespeare. Outlines*, ii. 169-172. John Cordy Jeaffreson (*The Athenæum*, April 29 and May 27, 1882) assumes that the will is a draft drawn up in Shakespeare's own hand; in all other points his views agree with mine.

original draft of the will was fetched and hurriedly filled in, only the most necessary alterations being made owing to the urgency of the case. The invalid, however, seems to have unexpectedly rallied and to have lived a few weeks longer. This would also explain the much-disputed interlineations and erasures, as well as the poet's unsteady signature. No essential alteration had become necessary with regard to the bequest to Judith, except that "in discharge of her marriage porcion" she was to receive £100, and as the words quoted are a subsequent alteration, this obviously serves to corroborate our view of the case. But again, in opposition to this view, it would seem that on the first mention of Judith's name in the original, the words were "unto my sonne and Daughter Judyth," and that the words "sonne and" had been struck out. Can it be that Shakespeare expected a different son-in-law, and that he did not approve of Judith's choice? At all events, the poet took good precaution that the bequest to his daughter should only benefit her and her children (should she have any). The provision made for her certainly agrees with the whole spirit and tenour of the will, which may be said to have been drawn up with a view to founding a family on the principle of entail. In addition to the above-mentioned bequest of £100, she is, accordingly, to receive £50, as soon as she has surrendered her claim to any property of her father's—that is not specially assigned to her by the will—in favour of her elder sister Susanna and her heirs. And besides this she or her children were to receive, three years after the date of the will, other £150, which were meanwhile to be invested for her at ten per cent. interest. With regard to her marriage portion also—which was to be paid to her one year after the death of the testator—it was likewise to be put out on interest for as long a time as it remained unpaid to her.[1] Judith's future husband was to have no control over the £150, unless he gave Judith and her children security to the same amount in landed property. If Judith should die within three years without leaving children, one hundred of the £150 was to be made over to the testator's grand-daughter Elizabeth Hall (in the will she is regularly called his *niece*), while the remaining £50 were to be applied to the use of Shakespeare's sister Joan, and on her death to be

[1] See above, p. 182.

divided equally among her children. This same sister Joan was to receive in addition £20, together with the testator's wearing apparel, and also the permission to occupy, during her natural life, the house belonging to the testator which she was living in at the time, for the nominal rent of 12*d.* per annum; this was very likely one of the two houses that had belonged to his parents in Henley Street. Joan's three sons William, Thomas, and Michael were to receive legacies of £5 each. The whole of the poet's immovable property—houses, gardens, lands, &c., more especially New Place, the two houses in Henley Street, his London house in Blackfriars near The Wardrobe, together with all the smaller possessions in the way of barns, stables, &c.—were bequeathed to his elder daughter, and were to pass on to her male heirs according to a carefully specified order of primogeniture. If Susanna should not leave any male heirs, then the male heirs of her daughter Elizabeth were to inherit the property; and should Elizabeth die without male heirs, then Judith's male descendants were to be the inheritors, according to the order of primogeniture. If, finally, Judith should not have any male heirs, then the property was to pass on to "the right heirs of me the said William Shakespeare for ever." And all the rest of his "Chattel, Leases, Plate, Jewels, and houshold stuff whatsoever,"[1] after his debts and legacies were paid and the funeral expenses discharged, were bequeathed to the testator's son-in-law Dr. Hall, in conjunction with his wife Susanna, both of whom were, at the same time, appointed his executors. The poet's only grand-daughter Elizabeth Hall—then eight years old—was to receive all his silver plate with the exception of the "broad silver and gilt bowl," which, as already stated, was bequeathed to Judith. Thereupon follows the much-discussed interlineation where Shakespeare bequeaths

[1] See *Shakespeare's Goods and Chattels*, in *The Athen.*, April 9, 1864, p. 509; April 16, 1864, p. 545; Feb. 3, 1872, p. 146; Feb. 17, 1872, p. 210. The whole of this movable property with the exception of Shakespeare's supposed seal-ring (see Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 298 and 334,) has vanished entirely; even Lady Barnard's will makes no mention of any such heirlooms, and Betterton too (who went to Stratford fifty years after Shakespeare's death with a view to make inquiries about the poet) says nothing about any such articles, nor did he bring anything of the kind back with him. The only existing thing known to have been Shakespeare's property—that is, if we may trust Sir Fred. Madden, the famous palæographical critic—is the copy of Florio's *Montaigne* that contains the poet's autograph. It is more difficult to believe in the genuineness of the "gloves," which will be spoken of presently.

to his widow his "second best bed with its furniture," which we shall have to speak of more in detail presently. £10 was left for the benefit of the Stratford poor; Mr. Thomas Combe is to receive Shakespeare's sword; Thomas Russel, Esq., £5; Francis Collins, Gentleman, in Warwick, £13 6*s.* 8*d.* (=20 nobles), and Shakespeare's godson William Walker 20*s.* in gold. Hamlet [Hamnet] Sadler (the original draft of the will gave the name Mr. Richard Tyler the elder), William Raynolds, Anthony Nashe,[1] John Nash, and the testator's "fellows," John Heminge, Richard Burbage, and Henry Condell, are to receive each 26*s.* 8*d.* to buy themselves rings. As "overseers" of his will Shakespeare appoints (in addition to his executors) Thomas Russel, Esq., and Francis Collins, gent., and those who signed their names as witnesses "to the publishing" of the will are: Francis Collins, Julius Shawe, John Robinson, Hamnet Sadler, Robert Whattcott.[2]

The interlineation relating to the second-best bed has naturally been used as a handle for determining the relation in which Shakespeare stood to his wife; it has from the outset been considered a proof that his marriage was an unfortunate one, or, at least, that it was not a happy one, and Malone more especially regarded it in this light. However, Knight, and other commentators after him, have maintained that this bequest is no proof whatever of the poet's supposed unhappiness in his marriage, but that, on the contrary, it throws a somewhat favourable light upon the nature of their conjugal relation. Knight points out[3] that Shakespeare's widow was "unquestionably provided for by the natural operation of the law of England;" the poet's "estates, with the exception of a copyhold tenement, expressly mentioned in his will, were *freehold; his wife was therefore entitled to dower.*" Knight

[1] "Anthony Nashe," says Neil, *Critical Biography*, p. 76, "was factor for Sir John Hubande, and a co-holder of an interest in the tithes of Stratford with Shakespeare and Combe. To his son, Shakespeare's grand-daughter Elizabeth Hall was married. John Nashe was his brother."—Of Russell, Collins, Raynolds, and Whattcott absolutely nothing is known; probably they were the poet's nearest neighbours, possibly even servants of Shakespeare's who had been hurriedly called in as it was thought the poet's last hour had come.

[2] Compare the signatures in Staunton's *Memorials* and in Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 278.

[3] First in his Postscript to *Twelfth Night*, and then in his *Biography*, p. 530.

thinks, accordingly, that Shakespeare's widow would be comfortably, if not amply provided for, for life, without any further provision by the testator.[1] It is unquestionably certain that this statement is correct, but as unquestionably certain that no Shakespeare-commentator ever imagined that "the second-best bed" was bequeathed to the wife by way of providing for her for life—it being the only provision made for her. There can be no question that the poet left her "the second-best bed" as a sign of his affection and remembrance, in addition to the dower to which she was legally entitled; but it seems to have occurred to him only as an afterthought to leave her some sign of his affection. This is the actual state of the case, and it is difficult to interpret it in any other way than as a proof that Shakespeare's affection for his wife had died out, or that he had become indifferent to her—not to speak of anything worse. Malone's words,[2] "he had forgot his wife," do not assuredly maintain too much. Halliwell,[3] who considers Shakespeare's marriage to have been a happy one, refuses to find any proof of an estrangement between them in this bequest of "the second-best bed." He points out that—to judge from several wills from the same period—the bequest of a bed (one of the most valuable articles of household furniture in those days) "was the usual mode of expressing a mark of great affection." Nor have we any wish to dispute this point, but if Shakespeare had re-

[1] This view is shared by Kenny in his *Life and Genius of Shakespeare*, p. 66.

[2] Malone's *Shakspeare*, by Boswell, 1821, ii. 607.

[3] As early as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries—when feather-beds were articles of luxury—such beds are mentioned in aristocratic families as legacies. In the cases quoted by Halliwell, however, it is never the "second-best bed," but either the best bed or some favourite bed, or one standing in some definite position that is mentioned. However, John Combe (see Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 237) certainly does bequeath his second-best "gown" to his brother George, while Margaret Reynolds is to receive the best one. In his *Outlines*, i. 240, Halliwell-Phillipps points out that it is very singular that Shakespeare does not bequeath to his wife, as was customary, "a life interest either in their own residence at New Place or in its furniture," especially as this would have been quite consistent with the other provisions of the will. Halliwell-Phillipps goes on to say that this omission of Shakespeare's might or must be regarded as a sign of the estrangement between the husband and wife, but in order to avoid the difficulty of believing this, he straightway brings forward an altogether unfounded hypothesis that Mrs. Shakespeare was mentally afflicted in some way that precluded all hope of recovery.

garded the matter in this light he would have bequeathed to his wife the best bed, and not the "second-best bed," for surely no one could have had a better claim to it—and then, too, the bequest would not have been entered as a mere afterthought. Owing to the fact of the bequest being an interlineation, we cannot but regard it as showing a want of kindly affection on the testator's part, the more so as we find our conviction—that the marriage was an unhappy one, and that Shakespeare was also not upon good terms with his wife's relatives—confirmed by the remarkable fact that the Hathaway family are nowhere alluded to in the will. In what a different manner Shakespeare's father-in-law, Richard Hathaway, in his will refers to his wife! He makes her his sole executrix, whereas Shakespeare's wife is not mentioned in any way as to take part in seeing that his wishes were carried into effect. Richard Hathaway bequeaths to his wife all his movable and immovable possessions (*i.e.* after his debts, legacies, and funeral expenses have been settled), and with regard to the beds in particular he leaves the following order: "Item, my will is that all the seelings in my hall howse, with twoe wyned beddes in my parlor, shall contynewe and stand unremoved duringe thee naturall liffe or widowhode of Jone my wyffe, and the naturial lief of Bartholomewe my sonne, and John my sonne, and the longest lyver of theme."[1] The affectionate esteem and tender solicitude that is here expressed—as well as in the wills of Dr. Hall and Augustine Philips, among others, towards their widows—forms an unmistakable contrast to Shakespeare's will, where his wife is referred to only in the interlineation where he bequeaths to her "his second-best bed with its furniture." And that the Hathaway family are nowhere alluded to in the will, is also an important point seems to be proved by the fact that Thomas Nash (the husband of Shakespeare's grand-daughter, Elizabeth Hall) in his will remembers the Hathaways no less than the Quineys, and that in Lady Barnard's will they even occupy a prominent position. Very likely the misunderstandings between the two families had meanwhile ceased to exist. May not the Hathaways have aroused the poet's displeasure by making all sorts of demands upon him? May he not have done for them what he thought sufficient, and been unwilling to do more? If the "Mr. W. H., the onlie begetter of these ensuing sonnets," had really

[1] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 292.

been his brother-in-law William Hathaway, and if Shakespeare had allowed him to keep what money came in from the publication of the Sonnets, this would be an important item in favour of the hypothesis.

No less striking and mysterious is the fact that Shakespeare did not leave any legacy or remembrance to any one of the poets or writers of his day. His three "fellows," Heminge, Burbage, and Condell, are the only members of the large and brilliant circle in London—where he had worked for close upon a quarter of a century—for whom he has a kindly remembrance on quitting the scenes of his life on earth. And yet that circle in London had not only been the means of establishing his own renown, but the renown of the English drama for all ages to come. Not even does Ben Jonson receive the specified 26*s.* 8*d.* to buy himself a ring. Gilchrist[1] protests against Malone's[2] idea that Shakespeare "marked his disregard for the calumniator of his fame, by not leaving him any memorial by his will." And, indeed, this would appear to be asserting a little too much.[3] Still, Jonson had shortly before Shakespeare's death been his guest in Stratford; there is at least no reason to doubt this. Jonson may, certainly, have gone to Stratford uninvited, and Shakespeare may not have seen his way to refuse his visit. But even Drayton received nothing. Jonson's son likewise, to whom Shakespeare is said to have stood godfather, was not remembered with the gift usually presented to a godchild; in fact, only one godchild receives a memento, and it cannot be supposed that Shakespeare had stood godfather to only this one child, or that all his godchildren, with one exception, died before him. The tradition of Shakespeare's having acted as godfather to B. Jonson's son is not, indeed, altogether to be trusted; may not the story perhaps have been the outcome of the joke anent the "latten spoons?" or had Jonson's son really died before his supposed godfather? At any rate, nothing further is known of Jonson's children.

It has also been considered a puzzling point in Shakespeare's will that no mention whatever is made to the shares which Shakespeare probably had in the Globe Theatre. For although he may not have been one of the proprietors of the

[1] *An Examination*, &c., p. 16. [2] *Shakespeare's Works*, ii. 293
[3] See above, p. 159, note.

theatre, he may nevertheless have possessed stage property of some sort or another; for, according to Halliwell's documentary evidence, the wardrobes and other appurtenances belonged to the actors. However, this supposed stage property Shakespeare no doubt disposed of when he retired to Stratford, both because he could no longer attend to it properly at such a distance, and because he may have considered it too uncertain an investment of capital. This supposition would perfectly explain there being no allusion to any such property in the poet's will. Indeed, it would seem that, with the exception of his house in Blackfriars, he had withdrawn all his property from London and gathered it together in his native town of Stratford. The legacies mentioned in the poet's will amount to the considerable sum of £373 13*s.* 4*d.*, which sum he can scarcely have possessed in ready money, but as the legacies did not require to be paid till one year after the testator's death, they could have been settled gradually out of the current receipts, more especially from the produce of the tithes. It is worthy of notice, finally, that no reference is made in Shakespeare's will to any books or manuscripts, such as, for instance, is met with in Dr. Hall's will. The manuscripts of Shakespeare's dramas were, indeed, the property of the Globe Theatre, and the poet does not appear to have troubled himself in any way about the quarto editions of his plays. Nor was it the custom of the day to carry on a literary correspondence, much less was there any thought of preserving letters.

It will be well for us to inquire somewhat more closely into the circumstances of Shakespeare's family, and see what ultimately became of them. In the first place, as regards his widow, she survived him seven years, and died on the 6th of August, 1623. William Harness, the well-known schoolfellow of Lord Byron, and less well known as an editor of Shakespeare's works, ventures upon the supposition that Anne Shakespeare married again after her husband's death.[1] Harness bases his hypothesis upon an entry in the Stratford Church register, where her burial is entered in the following manner:—

1623, August 8. { Mrs. Shakespeare.
Anna Uxor Richardi James. }

Harness thinks it strange that two persons should have been

[1] *Shakespeare Society's Papers*, ii. 107 f.

buried in Stratford on one and the same day; and the strangeness is increased by the fact that both should be women, and being women, that both should have been named Anne. In no other case in the Stratford Church register are two burials thus bracketed together; the only form met with being that the date is repeated, and, indeed, this occurs even on the very page where Anne Shakespeare's burial is entered. Harness infers from the names being thus bracketed together that the entry does not refer to two persons, but to one and the same person—in other words, that Shakespeare's widow married one Richard James after her first husband's death. He thinks that the name Mrs. Shakespeare was added in the register because she was best known by that name. Harness believes his supposition supported by the fact of the name not having been entered in Latin; under ordinary circumstances the entry would have been made thus: *Anna Vidua Gulielmi Shakespeare*, which would correspond exactly with the *Anna Uxor Richardi James*. However, notwithstanding these statements of Harness, which are correct enough in themselves, his hypothesis is highly improbable. Mrs. Shakespeare, at the time of her husband's death, had already reached the sixty-first year of her age. It cannot, of course, be denied that even widows of this age receive offers of marriage, but they are generally married for their money, and this can scarcely have been an attraction in Mrs. Shakespeare's case, for, with nothing beyond her jointure and "the second-best bed," she cannot have been a very good match; for her jointure, naturally, would cease at her death, and there would be nothing to pass on to the husband. How can Harness make it tally with his hypothesis that on the tombstone of the poet's wife we have the name Mrs. Shakespeare and not Mrs. James? Lastly, if Harness considers the extreme accuracy of the church register to be a safe foundation for his inferences, how is it that in this book—which he maintains is kept with extreme care—there is no entry of the supposed second marriage? This is a circumstance which Harness ought obviously to have explained, in place of passing it over in silence. In fact, his hypothesis is highly improbable from whatever point we view it. Shakespeare's widow, in all likelihood, lived in New Place, and had no thought of ever marrying again; indeed, as already intimated, it would seem that she had become very pious. This change in Mrs. Shakespeare's character seems to be intimated

by the inscription on her tombstone, which perhaps the equally pious daughter Susanna induced her husband to draw up. No other inference as to her character can surely be drawn from the following inscription:—

Here lyeth interred the Body of Anne, wife of William Shakespeare, who departed this Life the 6th Day of August 1623 being of the age of 67 yeares.

Ubera tu mater, tu lac, vitamque dedisti:
  Væ mihi, pro tanto munere, saxa dabo.
Quam mallem, amoveat lapidem bonus angelus ore,
  Exeat [ut] Christi corpus, imago tua;
Sed nil vota valent; venias, cito, Christe, resurget,
  Clausa licet tumulo, mater et astra petet.

In pointing to the possibility that these lines were penned by Dr. Hall, we do so without the slightest intention of rousing any prejudice either for or against him. Dr. John Hall was a perfectly honourable and upright man, an experienced and careful physician, and much sought after—in fact, a man of whom his father-in-law might well have been proud.[1] He was born in 1575 (where?), had settled in Stratford towards the beginning of the seventeenth century, and, as already reported, had married Shakespeare's elder daughter Susanna on the 5th of June, 1607. James Cooke states that Dr. Hall had travelled abroad, and had become so well acquainted with the French language that some of his "Select Observations" are made in that language. His practice extended beyond the borders of Warwickshire, and included some of the highest families; among others, he attended the Earl and Countess of Northampton at Ludlow Castle. After his father-in-law's death (as we learn from the Stratford archives), Dr. Hall resided at New Place, but it seems that he and his wife lived there even during the poet's lifetime;[2] in 1618 he paid 8*s.* church rate—only one other house in Stratford paid a larger sum, and only one other an equal amount—the average sum being 3*s.* In 1625 Dr. Hall sold

[1] *Shakespeare's Son-in-Law*, by C. Elliot Browne, in *Fraser's Magazine*, No. lii., April, 1874; F. J. Furnivall, *Shakspere's Son-in-Law, Dr. John Hall*, in *The Academy*, June 3, 1876, p. 537. Furnivall, who assigns *Pericles* to the year 1607-8, believes that Lord Cerimon is an idealized portrait of Dr. Hall; and more especially thinks the passage in iii. 2, "'Tis known, I ever Have studied physic," &c., an allusion to Dr. Hall. This opinion is, however, not likely to find much support.

[2] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 332, also p. 299 f.

"his share in the tithe lease" which he had inherited from his father-in-law; and upon the accession of Charles I., in 1631, he declined the honour of knighthood, and is recorded to have had to pay £10 in consequence.[1] The honorary civic appointments to which he was elected on several occasions he also declined; on the other hand, we hear of a dispute he had with the Corporation, on which occasion his friend, the Vicar Wilson, took his part; the dispute in question was about the pew in the church which was reserved for the owners of New Place, and with which Dr. Hall does not appear to have been satisfied. The matter seems finally to have been satisfactorily settled, for Dr. Hall is shortly afterwards reported to have erected a new and artistically-carved pulpit in the Stratford Church (perhaps in return for, or in acknowledgment of, the satisfactory settlement of the dispute with the Corporation). Dr. Hall is further said to have rendered the town great services by his care and attention to the sick poor. He died on the 25th of November, 1635, apparently from some infectious disease, for he was buried on the following day in the church, by the side of his father and mother-in-law. The inscription on his tombstone is:—

Heere lyeth the body of John Hall, Gent.: Hee marr: Svsanna the daughter and coheire of Will. Shakespeare, Gent. Hee deceased Novbr. 25, A° 1635, aged 60.[2]

Hallius hic situs est, medica celeberrimus arte;
  Expectans regni gaudia læta Dei;
Dignus erat meritis, qui Nestora vinceret annis;
  In terris omnis, sed rapit æqua dies,
Ne tumulo quid desit, adest fidissima coniux,
  Et vitæ comitem nunc quoque mortis habet.

The last couplet shows that the Latin portion of the inscription was not added till after the death of his wife in 1649. Death must, in fact, have overtaken Dr. Hall suddenly, for there was no time for him to make a regular will; only on the day of his death was he able to dictate to his son-in-law Nash, a so-called "nuncupative will"—clearly *in articulo mortis*—and in the presence of a single witness, one Simon Trapp, a clergyman; in this will he divides his movable and immovable possessions (including his house in London and

[1] Halliwell, *New Place*, p. 95.
[2] The words *and coheire* are an interlineation.

one in Acton) equally between his wife and his daughter.[1] The several bequests are of no interest to us here, with the exception of the last clause, which refers to the testator's books and manuscripts: "Item, concerning my study of books, I leave them, said he, to you, my son Nash, to dispose of them as you see good. As for my manuscripts, I would have given them to Mr. Boles, if he had been here; but for as much as he is not here present, you may, son Nash, burn them, or do with them what you please." It is probable that this Mr. Boles, of whom we otherwise know absolutely nothing, was a medical man, and that the manuscripts were chiefly papers on medical subjects; else why should not the testator have left them to his son-in-law Nash with the books? As a matter of fact, after Dr. Hall's death the books and manuscripts remained in the possession of his widow until they came to light in the following way. One Dr. James Cooke of Warwick, a physician who had an extensive practice there of some years' standing, was during the Civil War appointed medical attendant to some of the regiments stationed at Stratford Bridge, and one day while talking to an assistant their conversation turned to the books and papers left by Dr. Hall. The story had, however, better be given in Cooke's own words: "Being in my Art, an Attendant to parts of some regiments to keep the pass at the bridge of Stratford-upon-Avon, there being then with me a Mate allyed to the Gentleman that writ the following Observations in Latin, he invited me to the house of Mrs. Hall, wife to the deceased, to see the books left by Mr. Hall. After a view of them, she told me she had some books left, by one that professed Physick, with her Husband, for some mony. I told her, if I liked them, I would give her the mony again; she brought them forth, amongst which there was this with another of the Authors, both intended for the Presse. I being acquainted with Mr. Hall's hand, told her that one or two of them were her husband's, and shewed them her; she denyed, I affirmed, till I perceived she begun to be offended. At last I returned her the mony. After some time of tryall of what had been observed, I resolved to put it to suffer according to perceived intentions, to which end I sent it to London, which after viewed by an able Doctor, he returned

[1] See the will in Halliwell's *New Place*, p. 106; also *Outlines*, ii. p. 61.

answer, that it might be usefull, but the Latin was so abbreviated or false, that it would require the like pains as to write a new one."

In the first place, we cannot fail to notice the light which this story throws upon Susanna Hall's character and the degree of her culture. According to this account, she could not read her husband's handwriting; reading and writing, therefore, were weak points in her, as well as in her sister Judith, notwithstanding that she was "witty above her sex," and able to sign her own name in an unusually good hand. She seems to have had but small appreciation for these accomplishments, and although she lived amid the best circumstances, she did not value the books or papers her husband left, or preserve them with any feeling of reverence, except with a view as to what they might be sold for. From this we can infer what interest she is likely to have taken in the printed or manuscript papers left by her father. It is extremely to be regretted that James Cooke did not make use of his opportunity and inquire what Shakespeare may have left in the way of books and papers; he might, at least, have obtained some direct information from the daughter and published it for the benefit of posterity. It would seem that Cooke's own literary accomplishments were of no very high order, for not only was he unable to judge of the value of Hall's manuscripts himself—and evidently possessed no knowledge of Latin—but he was also obliged, as he himself admits, to have some of the French passages translated to him.[1]

These manuscript notes of Dr. Hall, which James Cooke had thus obtained, were published under the title of "Select Observations on English Bodies," &c.,[2] a report of some 183 cases of illness.[3] To the utmost regret of all interested in

[1] See above, p. 378.

[2] The somewhat elaborate title in full is: *Select Observations on English Bodies: or Cures both Empericall and Historicall, performed vpon very eminent Persons in desperate Diseases. First, written in Latine by Mr. John Hall, Physician, living at Stratford-upon-Avon, in Warwickshire, where he was very famous, as also in the Counties adjacent, as appeares by these Observations drawn out of severall hundreds of his, as choyest. Now put into English for common benefit by James Cooke, Practitioner in Physick and Chirurgery.* London, Printed for John Sherley, at the Golden Pelican, in Little Britain, 1657. In the year 1679 James Cooke published a second edition, and in 1683 a third with a new title, both of which are adorned with a portrait of himself. The portrait of Dr. Hall would have been of more interest to posterity.

[3] Dr. Hall's manuscript *Medical Case Book* was acquired by the British

Shakespeare's life, these "Select Observations" do not[1] tain one word about the poet's last illness, or of his death the fact, begin with the year 1617. And yet it cannot but be supposed that Dr. Hall, the poet's son-in-law, must have been his medical attendant. Did Dr. Hall really not begin his medical notes till after Shakespeare's death, or did the editor omit those previous to 1617 as uninteresting from a medical point of view? Whatever the case may have been, the book is nevertheless not without its value to us here, for not only does it give us information about Dr. Hall's position as a physician, but also about his personal character and about the illnesses from which he and his family suffered. With regard to the first point, the editor says in his Preface that Dr. Hall had the good fortune "to lead the way to that practice almost generally used by the most knowing, of mixing scorbutics in most remedies: It was then, and I know for some time after thought so strange, that it was cast as a reproach upon him by those most famous in the profession." In proof of Dr. Hall's ability as a medical man, it is stated that even the Catholics, who "hated him for his religion, often made use of him," and Dr. Hall himself never omits stating when his patients were Catholics. There are three cases of illness which Dr. Hall describes as having occurred in his own family; the first of these refers to his daughter Elizabeth, his report being that: "At the close of the year 1624, Elizabeth Hall, my only daughter, was vexed with tortura oris, or the convulsion of the mouth. . . . . At the same time it appears that she suffered from inflammation of the eyes. She was cured by Jan. 5, 1624-1625; but in the beginning of April she went to London, and returning homewards the 22nd of the said moneth, she took cold, and fell into the said distemper on the contrary side of the face; before it was on the left side, now on the right, and although she was grievously afflicted with it, yet, by the blessing of God, she was cured in sixteen dayes.—In the same year, May the 24, she was afflicted with an erratick fever; sometimes she was hot, by the sweating, again cold, all in the space of half an hour, and thus she was vexed oft in a day." As regards this journey of Elizabeth Hall to London, it is to be

Museum in 1869. See *The Athenæum*, June 12, 1869, p. 798.—The Latin manuscript (or is it the same?) is in Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps' possession. See Halliwell's *New Place*, p. 107.

regretted that the father does not mention whether she travelled alone or who accompanied her. The second case of illness in his family, reported in 1631, refers to Mrs. Hall, who was attacked by "scurvy; on Feb. 9, 1630-1631, the tenth day takeing cold, she had againe miserable paine in her joynts, so that she could not lye in her bed, in so much as when any helped her, she cryed out miserably." During the following year ("about the 57 year of my age"), Dr. Hall himself was very much troubled with hæmorrhoids. He was also "often afflicted with a light delirium," to cure which "then was a pidgeon cut open alive and applyed to my feet, to draw down the vapours," a barbarous remedy formerly used instead of the more efficient modern poultice.[1] Mrs. Hall was so uneasy about him that she sent for two physicians, who prescribed an electuary, "of which I swallowed the quantity of a nutmeg twice a day," and he was shortly afterwards cured.[2]

Mrs. Hall survived her husband fourteen years and her son-in-law by two years. According to Halliwell-Phillipps,[3] in 1613 a malicious piece of gossip was in circulation at Stratford which connected Mrs. Hall's name with that of one Ralph Smith, and the rumour being traced to one Lane, Mrs. Hall summoned him to appear before the Ecclesiastical Court to atone for the offence. Neither the defendant nor his proctor ventured to appear before the Court, and Mrs. Hall's character was vindicated by a sentence of excommunication being passed upon Lane on the 27th of July. There are a few other incidents from the days of Mrs. Hall's widowhood which we must not omit to notice in giving these meagre outlines of her life. At the time of the great fire which devastated Stratford in 1640, Mrs. Hall contributed £1 for the relief of the sufferers (on the 10th of March, 1640-41); on the other hand, her son-in-law Thomas Nash, Esq., is mentioned in a list "of such persons within the Burrough of Stratford-upon-Avon who by way of loane have sent in money and plate to the King and Parliament," and Nash's contribu-

[1] The *poultice* was however already known, at least in Ben Jonson's *Volpone* (1607), iii. 1, *Lady Politick* says: "Shall I, sir, make you a poultice?" Compare, however, Webster's *Duchess of Malfi*, ii. 1, and Pepys' *Diary*, Jan. 21, 1667-8 ("they did lay pigeons to his feet").

[2] See Halliwell's *New Place*, p. 93 f.

[3] *Outlines*, i. 225.

tion, which was paid in at Warwick, amounting to £100, is by far the largest contribution sent from Stratford for the purpose. This loan to the King and Parliament brings us to the days of the outbreak of the Civil War, the horrors of which affected even the quiet little country town of Stratford and Shakespeare's family; the latter, however, are said during this time to have had a great honour conferred upon them as well. The family were staunch Royalists, it seems; and this, in the year 1640, when a loan was asked for the King and Parliament together, would be quite compatible with their strictly Puritanical inclinations. Tradition goes so far even as to say that, three years later, Queen Henrietta Maria, on her triumphal march from Newark to Oxford, passed through Stratford, and resided at New Place for a time. This report would suggest the question why the Queen did not choose for her temporary residence, one of the lordly mansions in the neighbourhood, such as Charlecote or Clopton; still, if she preferred or was obliged to reside in the town itself, then New Place would certainly have been the roomiest, best-appointed, and most convenient residence, for her, and accordingly the daughter of the poet Shakespeare—who "so did take Eliza and our James"—entertained the Queen at her father's hearth. It is possible, also, that New Place was, in a certain measure, chosen as the royal residence by way of punishing the inhabitants for their sympathy with the Puritans, for Queen Henrietta Maria did not come alone, but at the head of an armed force of 2,000 infantry, 1,000 cavalry, about a hundred waggons, and a train of artillery. To the poor little town of Stratford such a host of visitors could assuredly not have been welcome, whether it took the King's part or not. And it is very possible, also, that amid the tumult that accompanied the inroad of this military host, manuscripts and other mementos of Shakespeare's life may have got destroyed. It was on this occasion that Queen Henrietta Maria met Prince Rupert at the head of another body of troops, and, according to Theobald's account, she remained in Stratford for three weeks. Halliwell has, however, reduced these three weeks to three days—from the 11th to the 13th of July, 1643—and points out that on the 14th the Queen made her entry into Oxford accompanied by the King.[1]

[1] See Halliwell, *New Place*, p. 115 f., who publishes the civic accounts relating to the expenses of this royal visit.

In 1645, Mrs. Hall saw her native town again visited by the scourge (no doubt typhus fever) that had so repeatedly devastated the place, and on this occasion probably was the result of the military inroad. In 1649, Mrs. Hall died at the age of sixty-six years and a few weeks, and was buried by the side of her husband and parents. On her tombstone is the following inscription:—

Heere lyeth the body of Svsanna, wife to John Hall, Gent: the daughter of William Shakespeare, Gent. Shee deceased the 11th of Jvly, A° 1649, aged 66.

Witty above her sexe, but that's not all,
Wise to Salvation was good Mistris Hall:
Something of Shakespeare was in that, but this
Wholy of him of whom she's now in blisse.

Then, Passenger, ha'st ne're a teare
To weepe with her that wept with all?
That wept, yet set herself to chere
Them up with comforts cordiall.
Her love shall live, her mercy spread,
When thou hast ne're a teare to shed.[1]

Mrs. Hall's only daughter Elizabeth (baptized on the 21st of February, 1607-8) was married on the 22nd of April, 1626, to Thomas Nash, a son of Anthony Nash (baptized on the 20th of June, 1593), and died childless on the 4th of April, 1647, after having been married twenty-one years. Thomas Nash, too, is buried in Stratford Church beside the Shakespeare family, and his tombstone bears the following inscription:—

Heere resteth the body of Thomas Nash, esquier. He mar. Elizabeth, the daug: of Iohn Hall, gentleman. He died Aprill 4, A. 1647, aged 53.

Fata manent omnes, hunc non virtute carentem
Vt neque divitiis, abstulit atra dies;
Abstulit; at referet lux ultima; siste viator,
Si peritura paras, per male parta peris.

On the 5th of June, 1649, hence only a few weeks previous to the death of Mrs. Hall, or, according to Halliwell,[2] on the 5th of June, 1648, her daughter Elizabeth, the widow of Thomas

[1] These lines were obliterated many years ago to make room for an inscription in memory of someone else. However, the Rev. William Harness (whom we have already referred to) had the tombstones of Dr. Hall and Thomas Nash (with the inscription preserved by Dugdale) restored, for which welcome service and his liberality he received a vote of thanks from the (First) Shakespeare Society.

[2] See Halliwell's *New Place*, p. 133, and his *Outlines*, ii. 325.

Nash, married John Barnard of Abington, Northamptonshire, who was born in 1605. The wedding took place in the village of Billesley, four miles from Stratford, and Elizabeth followed her second husband to his estate of Abington. John Barnard, who was knighted by Charles II. on the 25th of November, 1661, led the life of a country gentleman, and there is nothing specially to report of him, except that he was a widower without children when he married Mrs. Nash, his first wife having died in 1642.[1] Lady Barnard, or Dame Elizabeth Barnard as she is usually styled in the old records, or Madam Elizabeth Barnard, according to the church register, died at Abington (childless in her second marriage also), and was buried in the church there on the 17th of February, 1669-70. Her husband died four years afterwards, without having made a will, and was carried to his last resting-place in the same church on the 5th of March, 1673-74.

With Elizabeth Barnard, Shakespeare's family became extinct, as the Quineys had died out previously. Judith Quiney had had three sons, who, however, all died before her; their names were (1) Shakespeare Quiney, baptized on the 23rd of November, 1616, buried on the 8th of May, 1617; (2) Richard Quiney, baptized on the 9th of February, 1617-18, died 1638-39; (3) Thomas Quiney, born in January, 1620, died 1638-39.[2] Judith herself was interred on the 9th of February, 1661-62; her grave is not by the side of the other members of her family, as she had no claim to a grave in the chancel. Her tombstone has not been preserved, and indeed it is not known where she was buried. Can this be an indication of the position in which she stood towards the other members of the family? However, such circumstances are too misleading for any inference to be drawn from them. For Hamnet Shakespeare's grave is likewise not to be found among the family tombs, and it is not known where he was buried. In order not to omit Shakespeare's sisters, it must be stated that his sister Joan Hart was the only one who survived him (as we know from the poet's will). She died in 1646, and is the only member of the family with descendants in our present century, but—as already mentioned on pp. 27

[1] See Hunter's *Illustrations*, i. 103 f.; Wheler, *History and Antiquities of Stratford-upon-Avon*, p. 134.

[2] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 31.

and 30—not the smallest reflection of the poet's renown or wealth has fallen upon them.

Thus vanished the dream which Shakespeare had made the main object of his life; and the careful depositions in his will, which he had imagined would affect generations to come, became null and void in less than one lifetime. Shakespeare, like Walter Scott, had looked for immortality in his worldly possessions; both committed the error of regarding their works merely as a means towards an outward object; neither of them had ever fully recognized the truth expressed in the beautiful words:—

Vivitur ingenio, cætera mortis erunt,

and yet it was just in their case that this truth had manifested itself most strikingly.

After Judith's three sons had died, and she herself had attained the age of fifty-four, Mr. and Mrs. Hall very justly considered the clauses in Shakespeare's will referring to the Quiney family as ineffectual, and on the 27th of May, 1639, made a new settlement with regard to the family property, the details of which have, however, no interest for us here. A few years later (on the 25th of August, 1642), Thomas Nash in his will bequeathed New Place—where he was residing—together with all its belongings, to his cousin Edward Nash, as though it had been his unconditional property; this deposition, however, seems to have given rise to legal proceedings, and not to have been carried into effect, as the Hathaway family, more especially, seem to have made claims upon it. Susanna Hall and Elizabeth Nash accordingly made a new settlement in 1649, in conjunction with "William Hathaway of Weston-upon-Avon in the county of Gloucester, yeoman, and Thomas Hathaway of Stratford-upon-Avon aforesaid, joyner," who were expressly entitled to establish their supposed claims to the property ("entre sur diseisin in le post"). But even this decree did not finally settle the matter, and the poet's estates continued to be the subject of trouble and dispute to his descendants, till Lady Barnard, in her last will, on the 29th of January, 1669—when probably seriously ill—made a request that, after the death of her husband, her surviving trustee or his heirs will sell New Place with its belongings to the highest bidder, and that the first offer of it be made to Edward Nash. The money realized by the sale was to be employed as legacies, and the five daughters

of her kinsman Thomas Hathaway are mentioned as legatees, first the unmarried daughters Judith, Rosa, Elizabeth, and Susanna, who it would seem were still children, and then Joan, married to Edward Kent, to whose son Edward considerable sums are bequeathed. The fact that Thomas Hathaway's daughters—with the single exception of Rosa—bear the same names as Shakespeare's own daughters and grand-daughter, and that the name Anne is avoided, may probably also be regarded as significant and indicative of the family circumstances. Lady Barnard leaves legacies also to the brothers Thomas and George Hart, sons of her kinsman Thomas Hart, and to other unknown relatives. If we compare the prominent position occupied by the Hathaway family in this will, with their utter neglect in Shakespeare's own will, and if we take Thomas Nash's will as—to a certain extent—an intermediate stage between the two, it is unmistakably evident that the Hathaway family gradually gained favour with their relatives, and this leads to many a speculation. Can it be that the Hathaways—as already intimated—were greedy or grasping, and contrived by insinuating ways or by lamenting over their own needy circumstances, to induce their wealthy connections to relieve their poverty? Or may they not have had well-founded claims to consideration? May not New Place have been purchased with Anne's money as well as with Shakespeare's own? That Anne's father was a "substantial yeoman" we know. Had this been the case, her relatives would have been quite justified in disputing Shakespeare's will. At all events, from an examination of the settlements in these different wills, it seems tolerably certain that Shakespeare was not upon friendly terms with his wife's family, and it is only natural to suppose that this state of affairs must have reacted upon their own married life, unless, indeed, the constrained relation between the husband and wife had been the original cause of the estrangement between the families.[1]

In accordance with the settlements in Lady Barnard's will, after her husband's death in 1675 New Place was sold to Sir Edward Walker, Knight, Garter Principal King-at-Arms. We are not told why Edward Nash did not make use of his right to the first offer of purchase; perhaps the price was too high, for the sum obtained for it was no less than £1,060, *i.e.*

[1] All of the wills and documents in question are published in Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 299-325.

exactly £1,000 more than had been given for it in 1597. This extraordinary rise in the price in the comparatively short time of eighty years is, however, in no way to be ascribed simply to the depreciation in the value of money that had taken place in the interim, but was mainly owing to the fact that the purchase included the 107 acres of arable land[1] which Shakespeare had acquired from the Combes for £320. Besides, the house itself, which in 1597 was in complete disrepair, was now in perfect order. Curiously enough, shortly afterwards New Place again passed into the possession of the Clopton family, by whom it had originally been built, and in 1702 Sir John Clopton had the house pulled down and completely rebuilt. Hence the first house built by Sir Hugh Clopton, as well as the one owned by Shakespeare, existed but little over a hundred years, and the third edifice was destined to last only a little over fifty years. This third house, of which we have authentic pictures,[2] no doubt differed greatly in its architectural style from the one Shakespeare had inhabited; it was evidently built of red brick in the Dutch style which prevailed in England during the reigns of William III., Anne, and George I., whereas Shakespeare's house was in all likelihood a gabled house in the early English style of architecture.

In 1756 New Place became the property of Francis Gastrell, who has won for himself the name of being a second Herostratus. Gastrell was a son of the Bishop of Chester (1662-1725), and had a living at Frodsham in his father's diocese. Notwithstanding his being a clergyman, he was a man of an extremely passionate and vindictive disposition, and his wife is said to have even surpassed him in this respect. Mrs. Gastrell was a daughter of Sir Thomas Ashton, a landed proprietor in Cheshire, and, like her unmarried sister Mistress Elizabeth Ashton, was a friend of Dr. Johnson's and one of his correspondents. The last proprietor of New Place, Sir Hugh Clopton (a descendant and namesake of the Sir Hugh Clopton who originally built the house), had always considered it a pleasure to show Shakespeare's house and garden to

[1] In the indenture the measurement given is: 4 *yarde lande of errable lande.*

[2] See Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 166. According to Knight, *William Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 503, no picture of the place previous to 1757 is genuine.

strangers, and hospitably entertained his visitors (Garrick among others in 1744) under Shakespeare's mulberry tree. Francis Gastrell, on the other hand, was irritated beyond measure by the number of travellers who came to see the poet's house, and made no attempt to conceal the annoyance he felt. The mulberry tree which Shakespeare is said to have planted was the first thing that fell a sacrifice to his ill-temper; in all probability it was cut down as early as 1756 or 1758.[1] Both Knight and Halliwell have endeavoured to exonerate this act of Gastrell's.[2] Knight feels convinced that Gastrell had no intention to insult Shakespeare's memory, as he knew next to nothing of Shakespeare; his one idea was that he had a right to do with his own property as he chose—that idea of the exclusive right to one's own possessions peculiar to most Englishmen, especially to ignorant Englishmen. Halliwell thinks that the tree may have been in a state of decay, as it must have been at least 150 years old, and that a mulberry tree could scarcely be expected to attain a greater age in England;[3] or that, owing to its great size, it may have darkened both the garden and the house, and caused dampness as well. This supposition, however, does not seem very likely, for the tree stood in the so-called orchard, and hence—to judge from the plan which Halliwell himself gives—it can scarcely have cast its shadow as far as the house, and probably could deprive the Great Garden only of a small portion of air and light. Be this as it may, the Stratford people, who had probably previously been annoyed with Gastrell's behaviour, considered the destruction of the revered mulberry tree a species

[1] Compare *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1760, p. 308; *Shakespeare's Wainscot Chair and his Mulberry Tree*, in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, June, 1791; *Shakespeare's Mulberry Tree*, in *The Athenæum*, February 23, 1867, p. 256; *Shakespeare's Mulberry Tree*, in Halliwell's *Illustrations*, pp. 65-70, also in his *Outlines*, i. 379-384. Offshoots of the tree that was cut down are said still to exist in Stratford—at least the persons to whom they belong are convinced of their genuineness.

[2] Knight, *William Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 502; Halliwell, *New Place*, p. 220 f. Compare also *The Correspondence of E. Malone with the Rev. J. Davenport, Vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon*, London, 1864, 4to. (ed. by Halliwell, 10 copies).

[3] Tradition says that Milton planted several mulberry trees in the vicarage garden at Stowmarket, of which place his tutor Dr. Young was the vicar; one of these trees still exists, and bears plentiful fruit every year. If this tradition could be relied upon, mulberry trees might be supposed to attain a greater age than Halliwell assumes—at all events in exceptional cases. See *Notes and Queries*, June 13, 1874, p. 465.

of sacrilege, and assumed such a hostile attitude towards him that he had eventually to quit Stratford for good. But, not satisfied with having thus driven him from the town, the people vowed that no one bearing his name should ever be tolerated in Stratford. All this naturally only increased Gastrell's passionate and vindictive spirit, especially as he considered the Corporation of Stratford unjust in their refusal to allow him to purchase and pull down some barns and stables which he wished to acquire in order to extend his orchard. In addition to this, Gastrell was required to pay his contribution to the poor rate, although he did not inhabit his house in Stratford; this made him finally resolve to be quit of the annoyance altogether, and hence he had New Place completely pulled down and the building material sold.[1] Gastrell died in Lichfield, where he had taken up his abode; his widow in 1775 sold the dilapidated property in Stratford to one William Hunt of that town. In judging of Gastrell's unparalleled behaviour, it is only fair to bear in mind, as regards New Place, that the house he caused to be pulled down was not the one left by Shakespeare, but the house which had been rebuilt by Sir John Clopton; this has been proved beyond a doubt by recent investigations and excavations.

Most of the wood of the mulberry tree, which was disposed of as firewood, was bought by Thomas Sharp of Stratford, a clock and watchmaker (sometimes called a silversmith), who soon discovered that the wood could be turned to better account.[2] He made boxes, medallions, and a variety of other small articles out of the wood, and found plenty of purchasers for the things thus manufactured. The great demand for these articles ultimately led to deception being practised, and Sharp himself was some years afterwards accused of having used other wood in the manufacture of the things. When

[1] It was for similar reasons that Mrs. Gastrell, at a later date, had a house belonging to her at Stow Hill, near Lichfield, pulled down in order "that the poor should derive no benefit from that house again." See *Malone's Letter to Davenport* (May, 1788); Wheler, *History of Stratford*, p. 138; Bellew, p. 292 f.

[2] This experience was again made use of in Stratford not very long ago; when the beautiful old elms that stood in the churchyard by the porch of Holy Trinity Church were cut down in 1871, the wood was forthwith offered for the manufacture of mementos. See *The Athenæum*, Feb. 11, 1871, p. 162.

Garrick in May, 1769, was made an honorary burgess of Stratford, the document conferring the privilege—bestowed on the 11th October, 1768—was presented to him in a carved casket made of the wood of Shakespeare's mulberry tree, specially manufactured for the purpose in Birmingham, for the sum of £55.[1] In September of the same year the Corporation of Stratford presented Garrick with a medallion of Shakespeare, carved on a piece of the famous mulberry tree, richly set in gold; also with a wand made of the same wood. On the occasion of the Stratford Jubilee (September, 1769) Garrick wore this medallion, and in the engraving by Vandergucht, Garrick is represented with both of these relics. A goblet or cup is also mentioned as having been made out of the mulberry tree, and Garrick is said to have held it in his hand at the Jubilee festival, when he sang his famous song, "Shakespeare's Mulberry Tree."[2]

[1] For a detailed description of this casket, see Wheler, *History and Antiquities of Stratford-upon-Avon*, p. 165. The casket, as well as Garrick's correspondence in connection with it, the medallion and a ring containing a miniature portrait of Shakespeare, were bequeathed to the British Museum in April, 1864, by Mr. George Daniel. See *The Times*, April 11, 1864; Sidney Beisly, *Shakespeare's Garden*, Introd. xix. f.

[2] The verse referred to is:—

Behold this fair goblet, 'twas carv'd from the tree
Which, O my sweet Shakspeare, was planted by thee;
As a relic I kiss it, and bow at the shrine,
What comes from thy hand must be ever divine!
All shall yield to the mulberry-tree,
Bend to thee,
Blest mulberry:
Matchless was he
Who planted thee;
And thou, like him, immortal be!

See the detailed account of the Stratford Shakespeare Jubilee (together with all the speeches and poems) in Wheler, *l.c.*, pp. 164-209. The mulberry-cup, after Garrick's death, was sold at an auction to a Mr. J. Johnson for 121 guineas, and is at present in the possession of a Mr. William Fraser. *Notes and Queries*, 6th Series, vol. xii., 1885, p. 327 f. and p. 355 f.; Boswell, *Account of Shakespeare's Jubilee at Stratford-upon-Avon*, and *Another Account*, both in *The Gentleman's and London Magazine*, Oct. 1769.—"At the Stratford Jubilee in 1769, a pair of Shakespeare's gloves was presented to Garrick. These gloves Garrick valued more than his other Shakespeare relics; and Mrs. Garrick by her will bequeathed them to Mrs. Siddons. She in her turn left them to her daughter, Mrs. Combe; and she again left them to Mrs. Kemble. Mrs. Kemble has lately presented these gloves to Mr. H. H. Furness, of Philadelphia, the able editor of the well-known new Variorum Edition of Shakspere." *The Academy*, 1874, i. 200.

Halliwell, however, makes no mention of this cup. The medallion Garrick had inserted into a chair which, under the name of Shakespeare's chair, was for some years an object of interest at Garrick's villa at Hampton, and was afterwards purchased by Lady Burdett Coutts for £300.[1] That the Jubilee festival should have still further encouraged the sale of relics is a matter of course. As late as 1806, when the Prince of Wales of the time passed through Stratford, the Corporation presented him with a casket carved out of the wood of the mulberry tree. The trade has not yet quite died out, although it is no longer possible to distinguish between what may be genuine and what is not. Another relic of a peculiar kind must be referred to, if only because it bears testimony to the fact that the enthusiastic veneration in which Shakespeare is held is by no means an artificial product of recent times, or even the outcome of mere speculation. Namely, when the mulberry-tree was cut down, a lady of the name of Wren gathered some of the fruit of it and preserved the juice. This juice was bequeathed from generation to generation as a precious relic; in the course of years it dried up, with the exception of a few drops which are now preserved in Stratford in a phial hermetically sealed.[2]

Fortunately for the town of Stratford the changes it has experienced were less violent than those experienced by the poet's residence. Not long after Shakespeare's death, it is true, brilliant and indeed extravagant projects were formed in connection with Stratford, which projects, however, were carried out only to a very small extent, and proved of mere temporary value. A fantastic speculator of the name of Andrew Yarranton brought forward so plausible a scheme for making the river Avon navigable from its confluence with the Severn at Tewkesbury up to Stratford, that the plan was actually carried out by one Sandys of Flatbury. By this means Stratford was brought into direct communication by water with Bristol, and acquired the appearance of a small

[1] Shakespeare's courting chair, which is said to have originally come from Anne Hathaway's cottage in Shottery. See Knight, *Wm. Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 265. Another (not genuine) Shakespeare chair was purchased in 1790 by the Countess Czartoryska for twenty guineas in the poet's birthplace; of course it was immediately replaced by another chair. See Wheler, *An Historical Account*, ed. by Halliwell, p. 18 f.; Burnet, *View of the Present State of Poland*, p. 257.

[2] Halliwell, *New Place*, p. 225.

maritime town. However, with the gradual improvement of the country roads and the construction of canals, this water-highway, which had never been supported by any sufficient commercial transactions, had to be given up; and at a later day the construction of railroads led commerce and industries into entirely new channels. But Yarranton had even more magnificent schemes in his mind, which he felt convinced could not fail to confer upon the small town of Stratford a renown that would be wellnigh miraculous. In his work, entitled "England's Improvement," which was published in 1677, he points out, namely, that the position of Stratford was specially adapted for the establishment of a linen manufactory upon a large scale, for immense granaries for the laying up of corn, and for breweries of mum! These latter were to exceed everything of the kind that had yet existed in England, and in fact this enthusiast declared that as much mum would be made there as was made in Brunswick, and the granaries would be the occasion of getting away the mum trade from Brunswick altogether. A new city, he said, would arise like magic, and cover at least thirty acres of land. Yarranton's work contains a plan of Stratford, which he christens New Brunswick. This would-be "improver" of Stratford seems to have known nothing of Shakespeare; at all events, the poet's name is not once mentioned in his philanthropic work.[1] Stratford—perhaps to its own good fortune—has never seen the realization of these fantastic projects for its improvement, but has modestly and quietly joined in the general progress of the country; its fate has been much the same as the other small provincial towns that did not possess the natural conditions for any important development as a centre for mercantile or industrial work—still, it has made undeniable progress in this respect also. Camden might, even in our day, still describe it as an "*emporiolum non inelegans*," although, fortunately, it is no longer visited by such terrible scourges as are reported in its earlier history, and its magistrates are also no longer called upon to fine the inhabitants for allowing dunghills to accumulate in the streets. The interest in and the fame of the little town is centred entirely in the renown of its great son; the town would be as wholly unknown to the world as any other small remote place were it not that it is Shakespeare's birthplace, and were it not that countless pilgrims—both reverent and irreverent—wander towards

[1] Hunter's *Illustrations*, i. 81-83.

this shrine from every part of the world. In Shakespeare's honour Stratford has not only held a Jubilee festival in 1769, which was arranged by Garrick, but in 1864 celebrated the 300th anniversary of the poet's birth, and on both occasions the town occupied a conspicuous position and attracted the interest of all the civilized world. But of course these festivals did not exercise any lasting influence upon the welfare or further development of the town itself.

The garden and land that had been attached to Shakespeare's house had become split up into several small estates, and during the early half of the present century seemed about to lose every vestige of its former appearance as the poet's property, when Mr. Halliwell made an appeal in "The Times" of October 15th, 1861, that a sum of money be collected to purchase the whole piece of land and to preserve it as public property. With the money thus collected Mr. Halliwell (on February 8th and March 21st, 1862), after carefully fixing the old boundary, purchased the land (including Nash's house) for the sum of £3,200, and handed it over to the Corporation of Stratford. One portion of the original garden —upon which a so-called "theatre" had been erected in 1830—could not be acquired at the time, as the proprietors asked £1,100 for it. This theatre was not an actual theatre,[1] but was sometimes used as a hall for public lectures, sometimes as a police court or county court in the morning and for Ethiopean serenaders, conjurors, and travelling wonders at night.[2] Notwithstanding the various uses to which this theatre was put, the income derived from it was so small that—as a last resource—it was about to be converted into a Dissenting chapel, when Halliwell (in March, 1872) stepped in as the purchaser, and added this theatre to the other property he had already acquired,[3] and we believe the ground has been converted into a public garden. The house in which Shakespeare was born has also been purchased for the town, and has been carefully restored; in it has been established a small Shakespeare Museum, which likewise mainly owes its existence to Halliwell's efforts. A Shakespeare Library, which was started at Birmingham on the occasion of the 300th anni-

[1] Stratford now possesses a very artistic theatre, due to the patriotic generosity of Mr. Charles E. Flower. See *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, xv. 156-163.

[2] See Bellew, *Shakespeare's Home at New Place*, p. 310.

[3] See *The Athenæum*, April 6, 1872, p. 434. The last play performed in this theatre was *Hamlet*, see *Notes and Queries*, April 26, 1884, p. 336.

versary of the poet's birth, was unfortunately completely destroyed by fire in January, 1879; but on June 1st, 1882, a new Shakespeare Library was again started, and has since then received numerous contributions.

We have now brought the story of Shakespeare's life to a point where the last traces, so to say, of his physical life are lost sight of. His intellectual life, on the other hand, *i.e.* his life as continued in his works, still exists; indeed, it seems rather to increase than to lose in inward strength and outward vigour, and exercises its influence in every one of the different countries of the civilized world—a fact that cannot be maintained of any other poet the world has ever seen. How immensely Shakespeare, in this respect, surpasses all the other poets of the Latin races, the French and Spanish dramatists, the Italian and Portuguese epic poets! One main reason of this is that Shakespeare's works are written in English, a language which—owing to a marvellous concatenation of outward and inward causes—has come to enjoy a wider diffusion than any other language. But Shakespeare has found his way into regions even beyond the range of the English tongue, and has found a home among the Teutonic nations, and, indeed, the Latin and Slavonic nations have been unable to resist his influence. If Ben Jonson could say of Shakespeare that every theatre in all Europe ought to do him homage, these words may now without exaggeration be applied to the whole world. The story of Shakespeare's life, therefore, requires to be continued, and this sequel will, in extent, in trustworthiness and far-reaching significance, surpass all that has yet been written of his actual life; this sequel might be called Shakespeare After His Death. Of this second part of the poet's life, however, only the first beginnings have as yet been attempted, and these again have been principally the work of Germany;[1] England, the poet's own country, is

[1] Among these are *Hamlet in France* (in my *Essays on Shakespeare*, pp. 193-253); *Hamlet in Spanien*, Caroline Michaelis in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, x. 311-354; *Shakespeare in Griechenland*, Wagner (ibid., xii. 33-56); *Hamlet in Schweden*, Bolin (ibid., xiv. 23-86); *Shakespeare in Island*, Gering (ibid., xiv. 330-335); *Zur Shakespeare-Literatur Schwedens*, Bolin (ibid., xv. 73-128); *Shakespeare in Ungarn*, Greguss (in Hunfalvy, *Literarische Berichte aus Ungarn*, Bd. iii. Heft. 4); the various contributions towards a statistical account of the performance of Shakespeare's dramas in Germany (in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*); *Tara, or Shakespeare in Bengal*, Harold Littledale (in *Macmillan's Magazine*, May, 1880), &c.

not to the front in this work, and it would almost seem as if in England Shakespeare's works were less intimately connected with the theatre, with literature and criticism generally, than they are in Germany—that, in fact, there is less evidence of the poet's influence in England than in Germany. But before it is possible to form any reliable idea of Shakespeare's far-reaching influence on the literatures of the world, on the intellectual development of civilized man, an immense variety of material will first have to be collected, sifted, and worked out. To accomplish this it will not only be necessary to have a complete bibliography on the subject, but more especially an historical and statistical account of the drama, together with an account of all the critical and æsthetic works relating to Shakespeare; and of such works there exist as yet none whatever among the Latin and Slavonic nations. Only when these gaps in our knowledge have been satisfactorily filled, only when Shakespeare's intellectual influence can be viewed in systematic connection and in every direction, then only will it become perfectly evident that his own words, in "Cymbeline" (i. 6 [7]), and in "Henry VIII." (v. 5), can with absolute justice be applied to himself:—

> Half all men's hearts are his . . . .
> He sits 'mongst men like a descended god:
> He hath a kind of honour sets him off,
> More than a mortal seeming.—

> Wherever the bright sun of heaven shall shine,
> His honour and the greatness of his name
> Shall be, and make new nations: he shall flourish,
> And, like a mountain cedar, reach his branches
> To all the plains about him: our children's children
> Shall see this, and bless heaven.

Appendix I.

ON THE ORTHOGRAPHY OF SHAKESPEARE'S NAME.

AT first sight nothing seems simpler or more natural than that Shakespeare's name should be spelt as he himself spelt it, for assuredly a person is himself the best authority as to how his name ought to be spelt and pronounced. However, it is by no means certain how Shakespeare wrote his name. The six autographs of the poet that have the best claim to being regarded as genuine, and which moreover are the only signs we possess of his handwriting, are the following: (1) his signature to the indenture relating to the property in Blackfriars purchased from Henry Walker, and dated the 10th of March, 1612-13; (2) his signature to the mortgage deed relating to the same purchase, dated the 11th of March, 1612-13; (3) the three signatures on the three sheets that form his will, dated the 25th of March, 1615-16; and, finally, the autograph in Florio's translation of Montaigne's "Essays" (the folio edition of 1603), for which no definite date can be given.[1] Facsimiles of all these signatures have repeatedly been published since Steevens' (1788) and Malone's "Inquiry" (1796); of the indenture and of the poet's will we have complete photo-lithographic reproductions

[1] With regard to other supposed autographs of Shakespeare, see also *The Athenæum*, October 1, 1864, p. 432; January 28, 1865, p. 126; April 13, 1867, p. 488; July 24, 1869, p. 120; July 31, 1869, p. 152; August 7, 1869, p. 176; May 6, 1871, p. 546. Compare also (as regards the pronunciation of the name, by Al. Ellis) *The Athenæum* of August 17, 1872, p. 207; Fennel's *Shakespeare Repository*, p. 4; R. Gr. White, *The Works of Shakespeare*, i. cxxiii. f.; Knight, *William Shakspere; a Biography*, p. 538 f.; *Notes and Queries*, July 1, 1871, p. 1 f.; Dr. Ingleby, *Shakespeare. The Man and the Book*, London, 1877, pp. i.-ii.

in Staunton's "Memorials of Shakespeare." The indenture of March 10th was purchased by the City of London in 1841 for £145, and has since been preserved in the Guildhall Library. The mortgage deed was discovered in 1768, came into Garrick's possession, was lent to Steevens, and was missing after 1796. It came to light again, however, and was purchased at an auction on the 14th of June, 1858, by the British Museum for £315.[1] The genuineness of the sixth autograph (in the British Museum) is accepted on the authority of the eminent palæographer Sir Frederic Madden,[2] whereas Halliwell-Phillipps has declared himself doubtful about it, and his doubts are not without good foundation. Yet, of all the signatures it is the most legible, and beyond all doubt gives the spelling "Shakspere." The second and third signatures in the will have evidently been written with a tremulous hand, and the second syllable is very difficult to decipher—if, indeed, it can be deciphered at all. Madden, nevertheless, traces these two signatures also back to the form "Shakspere," and it is difficult to avoid agreeing with him, the more so as Malone and Boaden had previously come to the same conclusion, although both men made use of the form "Shakspeare" themselves notwithstanding. Boaden[3] says, "If there be truth in sight, the poet himself inserted no *a* in the second syllable of his name." Other Shakespearean scholars, more especially Chalmers, Drake, and Halliwell-Phillipps, on the other hand, are of the opinion that the poet did not adhere to any uniform method, sometimes spelling his name "Shakspere," sometimes "Shakspeare;" in fact, Mr. John Cordy Jeaffreson[4] even maintains that two different forms are recognizable in the signatures to the will, namely,

[1] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 248; *The Times*, June 15, 1858; Kenny, *The Life and Genius of Shakespeare*, p. 46 f.; Fennel, *Shakespeare Repository*, p. 18 f.

[2] *Observations on an Autograph of Shakspere and the Orthography of his Name*, by Sir Frederic Madden, London, 1838. J. C. M. Bellew (*Shakespeare's Home at New Place*, p. 241 f.) discovered that "upon *the edges* of the leaves is printed with pen and ink the name of A. Hales," which he refers to Anthony Hales, a brother of John Hales (see above, p. 367). A sister of these two brothers—as Bellew subsequently points out—was married to one Combe, so that, if all these details are correct, this remarkable book might be traced back to Stratford.

[3] James Boaden, *An Inquiry into the Authenticity of the Various Portraits of Shakspeare* (London, 1824), p. 62.

[4] *The Athenæum*, April 29 and May 27, 1882.

"Shakspere" and "Shackespeare." Halliwell and Drake—the latter, it is true, without having examined the originals—are convinced that the second and third signature in the will unquestionably spells "Shakspeare." One point is never disputed, namely, that the autographs invariably make the first syllable a short one, *i.e.* no *e* is inserted after the *k*. It would, however, in no way be remarkable if the poet had not always spelt his name in the same manner, for similar carelessnesses in the spelling of names have been pointed out in the case of many of his contemporaries. His own son-in-law signed himself Hawle and Hall, Henslowe sometimes subscribed himself Heglowe, Sir Walter Raleigh in the year 1581 signed his name Rauley, and five years later Ralegh, and Edward Alleyn made use of the forms Aleyn, Alleyn, Allen, and Allin.[1] Names, in fact, had not yet acquired any definite orthographical form, and were treated most arbitrarily. Well known are the variations between Sidney and Sydney, Spenser and Spencer, Kid and Kyd, Middleton and Midleton, Dryden, Dreyden, Driden, and Dreydon, &c. The name Marlow is met with in ten different forms, Throckmorton in sixteen, Gascoigne in nineteen, Percy in twenty-three, Cholmondeley in twenty-five, Percival in twenty-nine, and Bruce in thirty-three different forms.[2] And yet the name of Shakespeare is the one which exhibits the greatest variety of spellings, no less than fifty-five different forms having been counted; indeed, Mr. George Wise has drawn up a chart in which 4,000 possible ways of spelling the name are given.[3] In the records of the Corporation of Stratford the name of John Shakespeare, the poet's father, occurs 166 times, and in the following fourteen different forms:—

1. Shackesper	4 times.	5. Shakespere	13 times.
2. Shackespere	3 ,,	6. Shaksper	1 ,,
3. Shacksper	4 ,,	7. Shakspere	5 ,,
4. Shackspere	2 ,,	8. Shakspeyr	17 ,,

[1] Halliwell, *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 278-283.

[2] George R. French, *Shakspeareana Genealogica* (London and Cambridge, 1869), p. 347 f.; *The Works of Christopher Marlowe*, ed. Dyce (1862), p. xi. note.

[3] *The Autograph of William Shakespeare, with Facsimiles of his Signature as appended to various Legal Documents; together with* 4,000 *Ways of Spelling the Name according to English Orthography*, Philadelphia, 1869, by George Wise.

9. Shakysper	4 times.		12. Shaxper	8 times.	
10. Shakyspere	9 „		13. Shaxpere	18 „	
11. Shaxpeare	69 „		14. Shaxspeare	9 „	[1]

In the Stratford Register of Births and Burials there likewise occur different spellings, all with the first syllable short; by far the most frequent is "Shakspere." In agreement with this, the document where Fulk Sandells and John Richardson, on the 28th of November, 1582, become security for Shakespeare (to relieve the poet of the necessity of having the banns of his marriage called thrice), the name—in the two cases where it occurs—is written "Shagspere." In addition to the forms given above, the following spellings are met with: Schakespeire (1460); Shakespeyre (1464); Chacsper (1476); Shaxespere (1545); Shakispere; Shackspire (1589); Sheakspeare (1600); Shakespeere (1602); Shexpere (1604); Shaxberd (also as the poet's name in the books of the Stationers' Company); Shakespear (1605), and others.

An attempt to bring this confusion into something like systematic order has been made by the distinguished grammarian Professor Koch.[2] He has as it were examined the name under the microscope of historical grammar, and endeavoured to explain the laws by which its pronunciation and orthography must have gradually developed. "If," he says, "the name existed in Anglo-Saxon its form would have been Scac-spëre or Sceac-spëre; in New Anglo-Saxon it would be Shac-spere or Shak-spere; in Old and Middle English we should have to expect Shak-sper or Shax-per; this gradual disappearance of the last syllable does not, however, seem to have been completed, probably because it was supported by the living *spere*, and therefore retained the lengthened pronunciation, or perhaps because the French pronunciation not merely lengthened the forms *er* and *ere*, but lengthened the terminations generally." Koch considers that the poet's signature varies (between the Shakspere in Montaigne's "Essays" and the Shakspeare or Shackspeare in the will), and adopts the form "Shakspere" for the poet, because he considers it the correct Middle-English spelling. He thinks the form "Shakspeare" is "the transition form which, by the insertion of the

[1] C. Matthews in A. Wivell, *An Inquiry into the History, Authenticity, and Characteristics of the Shakspeare Portraits* (London, 1827), p. 224 f.

[2] In the *Jahrbuch für Romanische und Englische Literatur*, 1865, vol. vi. part iii. pp. 322-326.

a, is intended to emphasize the *e* as the e sound." The forms where the first syllable is long Koch accounts for as having arisen from the poetical application of the name, and finds them tending towards a certain end. This is, however, contradicted by their occurrence in documents of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, at a time when the name had not yet become a familiar one with the poets. Further, in the three earliest records where the name is met with (from the years 1278, 1357, and 1375) it is written "Shakespere."[1] Koch does not give the spelling in the original editions of the poet's works correctly, in so far as—to use his own expression—he does so with a certain "tendency," in fact, for the sake of his theory he makes the exception the rule; the original editions, he says, give the form Shakspeare ("King Lear," 1608), more commonly, however, Shakespeare. Surnames, are, however, obstinate things to deal with, and do not readily submit to the laws of historical grammar. There are, it is true, three groups distinguishable amid the numerous varieties; in the first place, the pure appellative form, with two long syllables (Shakespeare); secondly, the group with the shortened first syllable (Shakspeare, Shakspere); and thirdly, the shortening of both syllables—never quite completed—(Shaksper, &c.). Which form is actually the oldest can scarcely be determined with any degree of certainty; the age of the appellative form, however, seems to be indicated by the family name of Pope Hadrian IV. (who died in 1159), namely, Breakspeare or Breakspear, which is the pure appellative form with two long syllables; the name is at least always spelt thus, whether in perfect accordance with the old records we cannot undertake to say.[2]

From the records of the Stratford Corporation and the church registers, it appears that in Stratford the first syllable of the name was generally, if not always, pronounced short, for the form with the first syllable short is by far the most frequently met with. But the question assumes a very different aspect if we consult the original editions of Shakespeare's plays. In all the quartos the name is spelt "Shakespeare," with the exception of the quartos of "King Lear" of 1608 and of "The Two Noble Kinsmen" of 1634, where in

[1] French, *Shakspeareana Genealogica*, *l.c.*

[2] See p. 9. Appellative surnames from Shakespeare's day we had occasion to refer to on pp. 30 and 117 (Breechgirdle and Brooksbank).

both cases the name is "Shakspeare." In the editions of "Venus and Adonis" (1593), and of "Lucrece" (1594), published under the poet's superintendence, the name likewise is spelt "Shakespeare," and so it is also in the first edition of the Sonnets (1609), and in all the folio editions. Heminge and Condell, the editors of the first folio, must be considered competent authorities on this point. It frequently happens that a hyphen separates the two syllables, whereby the length of the first is even further emphasized. Again, in the "Commendatory Verses," and in all other cases where the poet is mentioned by contemporary writers, his name is invariably spelt "Shakespeare." Halliwell refers his readers to Milton's famous lines:—

> What need my Shakespeare, for his honour'd bones, &c.,

and is shocked at the mere thought that the name there could be read with a short first syllable. In like manner, all the witticisms to which the name gave rise presuppose the emphasis on the first syllable. Greene's jest, that Shakespeare considered himself "the onlie Shake-scene in a country;" Thomas Bancroft's epigram:—

> Thou hast so used thy pen, or shook thy speare,
> That poets startle;

Ben Jonson's famous line:—

> In each of which he seems to shake a lance;[1]

and Spenser's allusion to Shakespeare in the lines already referred to:—

> Whose muse full of high thought's invention
> Doth, like himself, heroically sound,

would otherwise completely lose their point. Still, it is not only the early editions of his works that give the form "Shakespeare," it is also met with in the London records. In the document relating to the grant of the coat-armour in 1596,[2]

[1] Compare *Histrio-Mastix*, act ii. 272 f. (Simpson, *The School of Shakspere*, ii. 39 (see ibid., ii. 3), where Troilus to Cressida:—

> *Thy knight his valiant elbow wears,*
> *That when he shakes his furious speare*
> *The foe in shivering fearful sort*
> *May lay him down in death to snort.*

[2] Given in Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare.*

the name is invariably spelt "Shakespeare;" in that of 1599 it is spelt "Shakespere;" in the licence granted by King James, dated May 17-19, 1603, the name is again "Shakespeare;" and in the already-mentioned indenture dated the 11th March, 1612-13, the name is likewise spelt "Shakespeare."

These facts prove with tolerable certainty that in London, and especially in literary and well-educated circles, the name was spelt and pronounced differently to what it was in Stratford, *i.e.* with the first syllable long, and that to shorten it was a provincialism—Boaden calls it "a Stratford barbarism"—an opinion which, among others, is shared by Disraeli in his "Curiosities of Literature" and by Halliwell,[1] both of whom have discussed the subject. But, as we have seen, even the Stratfordians themselves were not altogether unacquainted with the more refined pronunciation of the name, particularly in cases where a more careful language was required. In one of the most carefully-written Stratford documents—"a fine levied on the purchase of New Place by Shakespeare in 1597"[2]—the name occurs five times, and on every occasion is with great distinctness spelt "Shakespeare." The same spelling is met with in the other documents relating to the purchase of New Place. On the family tombstones in the Stratford church the name is also "Shakespeare;" only in the inscription below the bust of the poet have we the form "Shakspeare," and on Susanna's tombstone we have "Shakespere," the first syllable long, but no *a* in the second. In like manner the poet's brother Gilbert signed himself "Shakespere."[3] These cases are all of unquestionable weight, and the most eminent English editors of the poet's works—Dyce, Halliwell, Collier, and others—have accordingly adopted the form "Shakespeare;" and even Sir Frederic Madden allows the justice of its claim. The First English Shakespeare Society and the German Society as well, have adopted the form "Shakespeare," whereas the New English Society make use of the form "Shakspere"; all three societies do not, of course, require their members to alter their personal conviction as regards the spelling of the poet's name, nor do they

[1] *An Introduction to Shakespeare's Midsummer Night's Dream*, pp. 88-94.
[2] A facsimile of this document is given in Halliwell's *Historical Account of New Place*, p. 17.
[3] See Halliwell's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 282.

insist upon their members adopting any one special form of the name.

It would seem, therefore, that as regards the pronunciation and spelling of his name, the poet himself differed from the more educated persons of his day, inasmuch as he was more inclined to adopt the Stratford provincialism. There are two ways—very different, it is true—of accounting for this circumstance, and we shall here give preference to the one which corresponds best with the idea we have formed of the poet's character. It may be thought that Shakespeare did not waste much thought upon such a trifling matter as the orthography of names, and that with the indifference of genius he made use of the form that came most readily to his pen, and that this as a rule was the provincial form to which he had from early youth been accustomed. In direct opposition to this interpretation, however, it may be assumed that the poet *did* attach some importance to the spelling of his name, and that he intentionally made use of the form not generally in vogue. Proper names with the appellative form and meaning have never been considered pleasing, or at least aristocratic; and hence persons bearing names of this kind have always endeavoured by means of slight orthographical alterations to convert them into genuine surnames, and thus at the same time make them more aristocratic in appearance. In this way the name Shepherd has been converted into Sheppard, Young into Yonge, Collier into Collyer, Cook into Cooke, White into Whyte, Green into Greene, Smith into Smyth or Smythe, and numerous other instances. Poets especially have very frequently indulged in these fancies. William Davenant changed his name into D'Avenant after having been knighted, and exposed himself to the ridicule of his contemporaries on account of this aristocratic whim. Bishop Percy's name (the editor of the "Reliques") was in reality Piercy, but, in accordance with a genealogy drawn up by himself, he wished to prove himself of royal descent and a scion of the famous house of Percy; his wife's name also, in the inscription on her tombstone, he had changed from Gutteridge to Goodriche.[1] Charlotte Brontë (Currer Bell) signed herself Brontï, whereas on her own tombstone and those of the other members of the family the name is given in its generally recognized form.

[1] See *The Athenæum*, Nov. 16, 1867, p. 651.

There was less occasion for an alteration in her name than in the other cases, as it was a good-sounding name, in fact, it is thought to be an abbreviation of the Irish Bronterre.[1] Lord Byron, too, as is well known, altered the pronunciation of his name from the customary and usual form by invariably pronouncing it as a word of one syllable with the *y* short. It seems not at all unlikely that Shakespeare may have acted somewhat in a similar way as regards his name, and have endeavoured to give it a more uncommon appearance; that he was not altogether free from aristocratic inclinations is proved by the repeated application for a grant of arms. He may very possibly have been induced to alter the pronunciation of his name on account of the jokes played with it, and which may at times have annoyed him; in the provincial shortening of the first syllable he may have found a welcome handle for freeing the name of its appellative meaning. On this supposition, therefore, the form "Shakspere" would offer the greater degree of inward probability for the poet's own way of spelling his name, as it differed most from the appellative form customary in his day. The noun "spear" occurs eight times in Shakespeare's plays, and is invariably spelt "speare" in the first folio. The spelling "Shakspere" therefore differs in two points from the appellative form, "Shakspeare" only in one.

Be this as it may, the conclusion arrived at is that there are only two forms to choose between: "Shakspere" and "Shakespeare." The first is the provincial form, and possibly the form used by the poet, no matter at what date or for what reason he adopted it; still, it should not be forgotten that on the title-page of the two works which were published under his own supervision we find the name "Shakespeare." The second form of the name is the one generally adopted by the poet's more enlightened contemporaries, and is moreover the one upon which we can depend with incomparably greater certainty than in the case of the other. The decision, therefore, cannot be difficult.

[1] Harriet Martineau, *Biographical Sketches*, 2nd ed. (London, 1869), p. 360.

Appendix II.

THE PORTRAITS OF SHAKESPEARE.

THE features of Shakespeare's face are so well known that they can be recognized at once, however inartistic or different the portraits may be. And yet his portraits present greater differences than are met with in any other case; for, apart from the usual differences—due to the change of expression which varies with age, and due also to the conception formed by the artist—in Shakespeare's case the differences are the result of a peculiar circumstance. The fact is, there does not exist any absolutely authentic portrait of him of any artistic value—any portrait that might serve as an authentic original for subsequent copies—and hence in most of the later portraits of the poet artists have made too free use of their imaginations. This may, at first sight, appear a somewhat unwarranted or exaggerated statement; it might be asked—Have we not got Shakespeare's bust on his monument at Stratford? Have we not got the engraving on the title-page of the first folio? Have we not got the famous and often-copied Chandos portrait, not to speak of the numerous other likenesses of the poet? True, we do possess all these portraits, and every admirer of Shakespeare must esteem it a blessing that time has hitherto dealt sparingly with these precious mementos; for deep in the human heart is implanted a desire to behold great and renowned men, face to face if possible, and if not, to have their likenesses to be able to contemplate their features, in order, as it were, to have a direct reflex of their mind and heart. For not only do we in beholding the countenance obtain a better understanding of their life and work, but we feel at the same time drawn closer to them, and, so to say, brought directly within the circle of their personal acquaintance. What admirer of Shakespeare, accordingly, does not derive pleasure from a faithful and good portrait of the poet? And may it not perhaps be cruel to disturb the pleasure thus enjoyed? Truth, however, is the *magis amica*, and her existence cannot be ignored. Shakespeare's portraits have

repeatedly been the subject of learned and artistic inquiries, and a glance at the result of these inquiries will justify the verdict that not one of these portraits can claim to combine the two merits of being unquestionably genuine and, at the same time, an artistic work; indeed, it would almost seem as if the one merit appeared in the same proportion as the other disappeared.[1]

Let us begin with the Stratford bust, which, as we know from the eulogy on Shakespeare by Leonard Digges, must have been erected before 1623 (probably even before 1622), and which, therefore, offers a safe starting point.[2] This monument, with the bust, proves that the first thought of Shakespeare's relatives after his death was to erect—it may be said—a grand tombstone to his memory, one worthy of the

[1] The principal materials for the subject is contained in the following four works (all illustrated) :—1. James Boaden, *An Inquiry into the Authenticity of Various Pictures and Prints which from the Decease of the Poet have been offered to the Public as Portraits of Shakspeare*, Lond., 1824. 2. Abraham Wivell, *Historical Account of all the Portraits of Shakespeare*, &c., Lond., 1827. A large supplement to this work appeared during the same year. 3. J. Hain Friswell, *Life Portraits of William Shakspeare*, &c., Lond., 1864. 4. J. Parker Norris, *The Portraits of Shakespeare*, Philadelphia, 1885. A very complete, not to say too complete a work, and handsomely got-up.—The best of these works is unquestionably that by Boaden, even as regards the illustrations; his work paved the way for the others. Wivell quotes largely from Boaden, but as a rule his book is bad in style, unmethodical, uncritical, and, in fact, accomplishes nothing. Hain Friswell's chief merit is the elegant appearance presented by his book; he is frequently careless, and cannot in any way be compared to Boaden as regards thoroughness and critical judgment.

[2] The lines of Leonard Digges are :—

Shakespeare, at length thy pious fellows give
The world thy works; thy works, by which outlive
Thy tomb thy name must: when that stone is rent,
And time dissolves thy Stratford monument,
Here we alive shall view thee still: this book,
When brass and marble fade, shall make thee look
Fresh to all ages.

Compare *Remarks on the Monumental Bust of Shakspeare, at Stratford-upon-Avon*, by John Britton, Lond., 1816 (privately printed); Abraham Wivell, *An Historical Account of the Monumental Bust of William Shakespeare*, &c., Lond., 1827; *Shakespeare's Bust at Stratford-upon-Avon*, by the Rev. Wm. Harness, in *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, ii. 9 f.; Gabriel Harrison, *The Stratford Bust of Wm. Shakespeare, and a Critical Enquiry into its Authenticity and Artistic Merits, illustrated with two Photographic Views, Front, and Profile*, Brooklyn, 1865, 4to., p. 13 (worthless, as the two photographs were not taken from the original, but from a plaster-cast; the "*Critical Enquiry*" is of very little value).

renowned poet and of the esteem in which he was held by his fellow-citizens. Yet what means could the family adopt for carrying out their wishes? The small and poor little town of Stratford could not boast of any sculptor capable of undertaking any such work. England altogether was very far behindhand in every species of artistic work, and even London possessed no English artists of any eminence. We find that in London painting and sculpture were almost exclusively in the hands of foreigners, and more especially of the Dutch. Among these Dutchmen was one Gerard Johnson (in Dutch Jansen), whose chief occupation was the manufacture of tombstones; these were objects of much greater importance in those days than they are now, as people are no longer buried in churches.[1] Gerard Johnson was a native of Amsterdam and twenty-six years of age when he settled in London—it is not known exactly when. He is expressly termed a "tombmaker," and employed in his workshop "four journeymen, two apprentices, and one Englishman" (!!). What was more natural, therefore, than that Shakespeare's relatives—represented, doubtless, by his own son-in-law—should have applied to this industrious manufacturer, who probably enjoyed the reputation of being a proficient member of his craft. Gerard Johnson had already a connection in Stratford, for it was he who, in 1614, made the tombstone of John Combe, Shakespeare's friend. Combe's monument, which represents a recumbent figure carved in stone, had to be erected within one year of his death, in accordance with the instructions of his will. It seems reasonable to assume that Johnson may have personally superintended the placing of this monument in the church, and that on this occasion he may have made Shakespeare's personal acquaintance. Or, if this is considered unlikely, Johnson may, at all events, have met Shakespeare in London on some previous occasion, at the theatre or elsewhere. If we imagine ourselves in Dr. Hall's position, nothing seems more likely under the circumstances than that he should have written to G. Johnson and have requested him to come

[1] We know that the monuments erected to the memory of Shakespeare and of Combe were made by Gerard Johnson, from *Dugdale's Life, Diary, and Correspondence*, by Wm. Hamper (Lond., 1827), p. 99. Halliwell conjectures—with a view to making the dates correspond better—that Shakespeare's monument may have been made by a son of Gerard Johnson. See Dyce, *The Works of Shakespeare* (3rd ed.), i. 120.

to Stratford, with as little delay as possible, to undertake the work.[1] The sculptor's presence must have been indispensable for various reasons; in the first place, the plan and cost of the monument would have to be discussed with the relatives, and this could of course be settled more speedily and definitely by word of mouth; in the second place, the sculptor would necessarily have had to examine the inner wall of the church and to take requisite measurements for the monument; and, lastly, he would if possible have endeavoured to obtain a plaster cast of the head of the deceased poet to assist him in making the bust. It was a common custom of the day to take a mask, or what the sculptors call a "flying mould," of deceased persons; such casts were required for tombstones, but chiefly for constructing the wax figures which—when eminent persons were buried—were exhibited in place of the corpse. Above St. Erasmus' Chapel, in Westminster Abbey, there is a collection of wax figures of this kind, which were for long known by the name of "the Play of the Dead Volks." That the Stratford bust was made from a mask of this kind has long—from internal reasons—been the conviction of eminent English sculptors and connoisseurs in art. The chief representatives of the hypothesis are Sir Francis Chantrey and James Boaden; the Mr. Bullock also, who in 1814 had a cast made of the bust, was of the same opinion.[2] It is very

[1] Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, in his *Outlines*, i. 258, assumes (without giving his authority) that Dr. Hall went to London some weeks after Shakespeare's death, and made arrangements about the monument with G. Johnson, whose place of business was near the western door of St. Saviour's Church, within a few minutes' walk of the Globe Theatre. If this was really the case, then my hypothesis that Johnson may have known Shakespeare by sight, at all events, is unquestionably confirmed.

[2] This is the only occasion upon which a cast has been taken of the bust, and it was done secretly at night, no doubt in order not to excite the jealous anxiety of the Stratfordians. The cast was subsequently destroyed, so that the copies soon became scarce. Hence James de Ville had another cast taken of one of these, and multiplied.—Wivell, *l.c.*, p. 137 note. The drawing given by Boaden is made from one of Bullock's copies, but unfortunately has somewhat the look as if viewed from below. The best known engravings of the bust are those by G. Vertue (with the head in the position of the Chandos portrait, says Wivell, p. 62), by Thomson (in profile, 1820), by W. Finden (1820), by W. T. Fry, by J. S. Agar (after Wivell's drawing), and by T. A. Dean (also after Wivell, 1827). Most pleasing is the mezzotint by Wm. Ward (1816), "from a Painting by Thomas Phillips after a Cast by Bullock." It is only Wivell (p. 140) who thinks that the bust was not made from a death-mask, as otherwise it would look more

likely that Dr. Hall, as a medical man, was sufficiently well acquainted with the method to make a cast of his father-in-law's head himself; but he may very possibly have engaged some competent person from the neighbouring town of Warwick to attend to the matter.

The question whether a cast was ever taken of Shakespeare's head is all the more interesting as this cast is said to have been recently discovered in Germany. The owner of this supposed relic is Dr. Becker of Darmstadt, who was private secretary of the late Princess Alice of Hesse; the way it came into his possession was briefly as follows:—At the sale of a valuable collection of curiosities and objects of art belonging to Count and Canon Franz of Kesselstadt—who died in 1841, and with whom the family became extinct—an antiquary in Mayence, one S. Jourdan, purchased a small picture, painted in oil on parchment, representing a man dead lying on a bed. This little picture, bearing the date 1637, was said to have been in the possession of the Kesselstadt family for more than 100 years, and to have been specially treasured by them owing to a tradition which spoke of its representing Shakespeare on his deathbed. Jourdan sold the little picture in 1846 to the Court-painter Ludwig Becker,[1] who, judging by some technicalities, maintained that the picture had not been painted from nature, but from a cast. He thereupon began to make inquiries about a mask of this kind, and was encouraged in his pursuit by hearing that some such article had existed among the Kesselstadt collections. Finally, after two years' search, he discovered the mask in a broker's shop in Mayence "amongst rags and articles of the meanest description," somewhat damaged, but on the whole in a tolerably good condition. A number of documents are given in proof of the genuineness of the transaction, but unfortunately the most important item seems to have been overlooked, viz., the credentials of the broker in Mayence (whose name is not even given) that the mask had been obtained by him at the sale of Kesselstadt's collections; hence the genuine-

natural. With regard to Chantrey, see *The Illustrated London News*, April 25, 1863, p. 466.

[1] This Ludwig Becker, who died in Australia in 1861, was a brother of the present owner of the picture. See *The Stratford Bust and Kesselstadt Mask of Shakespeare*, in *Notes and Queries*, March 19th, 1864; Herm. Grimm, *Ueber Künstler und Kunstwerke* (Berlin, 1867), ii. 209-215 (with illustrations).

ness of the cast may still be questioned. Some such trustworthy evidence was all the more indispensable as there had been an interval of seven years between the time of Count Kesselstadt's death and the purchase of the mask by L. Becker. The genuineness of the mask is said to be attested by the fact that "the back of it bears the inscription: + *A° Dm̄* 1616, written in the style of the seventeenth century;" however, this inscription may be a forgery like many others of a similar kind. The very fact that Mr. Becker was for years in eager search for the mask arouses the suspicion that some skilful modeller may have determined to satisfy Mr. Becker's eager wish and do himself a good turn at the same time. At all events, the possibility of the cast being a fabrication can as little be denied as the possibility of its being genuine; still the Rhinelanders themselves seem more disposed to accept the former alternative. However, a third supposition may be mooted, viz., that the mask is genuine in so far that it was taken of some person after death, but that person was not Shakespeare, and hence that the inscription alone is a fabrication. In examining the photographs of the mask published by Hermann Grimm,[1] we find it to be an undoubtedly remarkable head, and that upon the whole it exhibits the same characteristic peculiarities met with in the best accredited likenesses of Shakespeare: the distinctly oval face, the high bald forehead, the long upper lip, the large eyes, and the high arched eyebrows. The different form of the beard is accounted for (we do not know whether rightly) by the necessary manipulation of the artist in making the cast, and the colour of the hairs left sticking in the plaster are said to correspond in colour both with the Stratford bust and the authentic likenesses of the poet. But notwithstanding all this, the likeness between the mask and the bust and the portraits regarded as genuine is by no means as striking as, for instance, in the case of Napoleon's mask and his portraits; the resemblance in the present case has, as it were, to be obtained by a process of comparing and considering, and this, in our opinion, does not say much in favour of the genuineness of the mask.

This mask from Count Kesselstadt's collection was offered for sale to the British Museum, and it is said the authorities would have purchased it had there been the smallest evidence to show that any member of the Kesselstadt family had been

[1] *Ueber Künstler und Kunstwerke*, vol. ii.

in London attached to any embassy or otherwise, and thus come into the possession of the mask in question. Mere possibilities are of no value whatever, and hence in examining the authenticated portraits of Shakespeare it seems wisest to leave this death-mask out of the question; in any case, it cannot be taken into account as a means for judging the other likenesses of the poet. Hermann Grimm, and more recently again Hermann Schaaffhausen, have, it is true, spoken enthusiastically in favour of the genuineness of this cast; still their treatises do not by any means fully settle the doubts entertained regarding it, and indeed Schaaffhausen's article contains facts which place the spuriousness of this death-mask beyond a doubt.[1] Among other things he relates the following: according to the unanimous assertions of Herr Weismüller, majordomus to Count Franz of Kesselstadt, who died in 1841, of his Secretary Schmit, and of the administrator of the Kesselstadt property, Zell in Treves, no such mask ever existed among the collections of the Kesselstadt family. Their collections of curiosities and objects of art, which had formerly been preserved in Treves, according to the Librarian Schömann, are said to have been sold privately some years previously, and the articles sold by auction in Mayence are said never to have belonged to the Kesselstadt collections, but were a special collection of Count Franz of Kesselstadt, who was, moreover, not the last of the family. Schaaffhausen calls Becker "the finder of the mask," whereas Fr. Schneider, Prebendary of the Cathedral at Mayence, states, "without, however, any unfavourable judgment to be inferred from his remark," that Becker "employed a good deal of his time in copying, modelling, and in making casts, and that he was as apt at the work as he was fond of it." Can it be necessary to say much more than this![2]

But to return to the Stratford bust. If Johnson, as is probable, worked from a death-mask, and if he had been personally acquainted with Shakespeare, it seems natural to suppose that the bust must have been a faithful and satisfac-

[1] Schaaffhausen, *Ueber die Todtenmaske Shakespeare's*, in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, x. 26-49. Compare John S. Hart, *The Shakespeare Death-Mask* (*Illustrated*), in *Scribner's Monthly* (New York), July, 1874.

[2] Towards the beginning of 1879 a supposed portrait of Shakespeare suddenly cropped up in Australia; perhaps this was again a labour of love of Becker's. See *The Academy*, Sept. 17, 1881.

tory likeness of the poet. And this it would certainly have been had Johnson been a true artist. His work, however, is unfortunately of such an inferior kind, that Boaden—who is both calm and clear in his judgment—thinks it by no means too good for the work of a Stratford sculptor. There is but one opinion on this point. Johnson has represented the poet in the act of writing and in his gayest mood; the left hand is resting on a cushion, holding a sheet of paper; the right hand holds a pen. It would seem as if Shakespeare has been depicted at the moment when happy over the composition of some scene with Falstaff; the mouth, contrary to the strict rules of art, is open, as if about to laugh. This conception, and the unusual circumstance that the figure is coloured, appears somewhat inappropriate for a tombstone, and indeed has a disturbing effect. In truth, the bust is very inferior to the noble and beautiful conception which many an ardent admirer of the poet doubtless formed of it before visiting Stratford. The fulness of the face (a double-chin is even seen) does not strike one as surprising, in so far as this is quite in keeping with the idea to be formed of Shakespeare's appearance during the later years of his life. There is no want of animation and spirit in the expression of the face, and the look of good-nature and great kindliness is unmistakable as in every one of the other portraits. Yet the sculptor has not succeeded in giving his work any appearance of a finished form, or in investing it with any touch of the ideal. The modelling, too, leaves much to be desired. The eyes are specially faulty, but the artist could not have obtained much help in this from the death-mask, if any such existed. Fairholt, who shows some knowledge of art, says that the eyes are not only badly done, but incorrect; that they are mere elliptical openings without any of those delicate curves that ought to have been expressed; that the glands in the corners of the eyes are not indicated at all, and the arched and upraised eyebrows—also met with in the other portraits—are hard and ungraceful in the bust. The shortness of the nose also (the feature is longer in the pictures), and the disproportionate length of the upper lip in consequence, has a somewhat strange appearance. The distance between the lip and nose measures one inch and a quarter, while the whole face only measures eight inches and three-quarters in length. It is said that Walter Scott—who, as is well known, had the same peculiarity of face—on one occasion,

when looking at a copy of Shakespeare's bust, maintained that the length of the upper lip was exaggerated, whereupon his companion jocosely reminded him of his own upper lip, and when measured it proved to be a quarter of an inch longer still. However this may be, the supposition of English connoisseurs is that the shortness of the nose resulted from an accident which occurred while the sculptor was at work upon the bust, and the supposition is one that deserves careful consideration. An accident of the kind is all the more likely to have occurred as the bust is cut out of a soft stone. Another explanation, and one also worthy of notice, is given by George Scharf, who endeavours to show that the bust was constructed with the idea that it was intended to be looked up to, and that the shortness of the nose is remarkable only when the bust is brought to a level with the spectator, whereas when looked at from below and at a little distance the shortness is scarcely perceptible.[1] To put it in other words, the sculptor is supposed to have made a miscalculation, and to have purposely shortened the nose, as the bust was to be placed in an elevated position. And as regards the material of which the bust is made, it can only be assumed that Johnson was not able to do fine work in marble, otherwise marble would have been selected for the bust as well as for the two pillars of the monument; a marble bust would certainly have been more in accordance with the wishes of his family, for their idea seemed to be specially directed to erecting a splendid monument. Soft stone was indeed almost invariably employed for monumental figures in those days, and it is possible that, in the present case, soft stone was used, as the bust was to be "painted over in imitation of nature," and the soft material may have been better adapted for this purpose.[2]

To colour busts was by no means an uncommon proceeding in Shakespeare's day, and, in the case of the Stratford bust, the hands and face were made a flesh colour, the eyes a light hazel, the hair and beard auburn; the doublet or coat was scarlet, and partially covered by a loose black gown or tabard without sleeves. This, it has been supposed, was the dress worn by the King's Players. The upper side of the cushion

[1] *On the Principal Portraits of Shakespeare* by George Scharf, London, printed by Spottiswoode and Co., 1864, p. 5.

[2] Compare *Shakespeare's Bust at Stratford-upon-Avon*, in *The Shakespeare Society's Papers*, i. 74.

was green, the under side crimson, and the tassels gilt. In 1749 the monument was repaired and recoloured, but in 1793, at Malone's instigation, the colouring was done away with altogether. He caused the bust to be painted over with one or more coats of white paint, and hence completely destroyed its original character, and doubtless also some of the finer details in the workmanship were permanently injured. Malone has had to endure well-merited ridicule for this proceeding of his; however, in 1861, the traditional original colouring was restored with the utmost care.[1]

Accordingly, the Stratford bust leaves our desire for an artistic representation of Shakespeare wholly unsatisfied, not that we have any reason to doubt the likeness, but that, very far from being an artistic work, it is evidently only the work of some skilful stonemason.

The portrait which ranks next in genuineness unfortunately affords even less satisfaction. This is the engraving by Martin Droeshout (also a Dutchman), which Heminge and Condell placed on the title-page of the Folio edition of Shakespeare's works. We have Ben Jonson's eloquent testimony that this picture was an excellent likeness; in his well-known lines To the Reader, prefixed to this first Folio edition, he says:—

This figure, that thou here seest put,
It was for gentle Shakespeare cut;
Wherein the Graver had a strife
With Nature, to out-do the life:
O, could he but have drawn his wit
As well in brass, as he hath hit
His face, the Print would then surpass
All, that was ever writ in brass.
But, since he cannot, Reader, look
Not on his Picture, but his Book.

[1] The following verse is to be found in the Visitor's Book at Stratford:—

Stranger, to whom this monument is shown,
Invoke the poet's curses on Malone,
Whose meddling zeal his barbarous taste betrays
And daubs his tombstone as he marr'd his plays.

Boaden—who is otherwise so rational—is the only one who tries to defend Malone's proceeding; but it must be remembered that he knew the bust only with its coating of white paint.—With regard to other supposed alterations and subsequent treatment with the bust, see *The Athenæum*, Oct. 21,

This praise undoubtedly sounds exaggerated. Is it possible that B. Jonson can have written the lines before he saw the engraving finished, in the same way as, in our day, theatrical critics at times write reports of performances they have not witnessed? Or may Jonson not have had personal reasons for praising the excellence of the likeness in such extravagant terms? It will be shown immediately why this last supposition is by no means improbable. That the likeness—which agrees with the bust in all essential features—may have been good we do not mean to dispute, but we have all the more to say against its artistic conception and as a finished work of art. It is clearly the puerile and in many respects ill-drawn work of an amateur who possessed merely a knack for catching likenesses.[1] Englishmen themselves have termed it "an abominable libel on humanity." The expression of the face is altogether wanting in intelligence, and all the features are represented with hardness and coarseness of touch, more especially the characteristic peculiarity of the upper lip, which is met with in all of the portraits. The forehead is so exaggerated and so badly shaped that it almost resembles that of a person suffering from water on the brain. These defects in the drawing are increased by the equally hard and spiritless work of the engraver.[2] Engravings were, as a rule, much better in those days; we have even better engravings by Droeshout himself, as, for instance, the portrait of Chapman prefixed to his translation of the Iliad.[3] Whatever Scharf[4] may say to the contrary, Boaden has made it appear tolerably certain that Shakespeare is here represented as some theatrical character, and, indeed, in all probability as Old Knowell in Jonson's "Every Man in His

1865, p. 542, and Oct. 28, 1865, p. 578; Dyce, *The Works of Shakespeare* (3rd ed.), i. 121, Note 49; Wheler, *History and Antiquities of Stratford-upon-Avon*, p. 73 f.; Ingleby, in *Notes and Queries*, March 1, 1884, p. 165; *Outlines*, i. 257 f.

[1] A. Wivell, *Historical Account of all the Portraits of Shakespeare*, p. 58, infers from Jonson's lines, that Droeshout was the original artist, as well as the engraver.

[2] The title-pages of all the four folio editions are furnished with the same print, and, naturally, a number of abominable reprints has been the result.

[3] See Hain Friswell, *Life Portraits of Shakspeare*, p. 40.

[4] Scharf, *l.c.*, will not admit that the Droeshout engraving is a portrait in costume; he says the same dress is met with in numerous other portraits of the time, for instance, in those of James I., Richard Sackville, and Sir Philip Sidney; that, in fact, it was the dress of the upper classes in the Elizabethan age. He further thinks that the hair is decidedly not a wig.

Humour."[1] It might almost seem as if Shakespeare had been here depicted as the actor, indeed, by way of an intentional and direct contrast to the portrait which existed of him as a literary man in the monument at Stratford. What makes it evident that Droeshout's print is a portrait in costume is the peculiarity of the dress, which, however, cannot be said to belong to any definite historical period. Then the hair, which in the other portraits is curly, is here perfectly straight, and, indeed, has every appearance of being a wig, and the moustache is combed upwards; this is done clearly with the intention of altering the expression of the face, and, as already stated,[2] seems to have been very successful. It is quite in keeping with the self-sufficiency of Jonson—who attached great importance to anything that concerned himself—to find him specially pleased with a portrait of Shakespeare representing him as a character from one of his plays, and we have no doubt that Jonson was the happy owner of the picture. He may even have drawn it himself, or it may have been the work of Richard Burbage, who is said occasionally to have occupied himself with painting; at all events, it was doubtless the production of some actor, for the portrait has every appearance of having been drawn during some theatrical performance, and without Shakespeare's knowledge.[3] Heminge and Condell, being actors themselves, may have found this portrait the one easiest to obtain, and Jonson doubtless felt much flattered in being asked for the loan of his picture for the engraving. This supposition, at any rate, would account for Jonson's extravagant praise of the likeness. Lord Southampton—who, as will be shown immediately, is supposed to have possessed an excellent portrait of Shakespeare in oil—does not appear to have been upon good terms with the two editors of the Folio, so that they could not very well have applied to him for a copy, or did not succeed in obtaining it. This is inferred from the fact that the editors did not dedicate the Folio edition to Lord Southampton, but to the Earls of Pembroke and Montgomery. It is also possible that Lord Southampton was abroad at the time, for he died at Bergen-op-Zoom on the 10th of November, 1624. It is strange, however, that the editors did not give a print of the so-called Chandos portrait, which is said to have been in the possession of their fellow-actor Joseph Taylor; this is a cir-

[1] See above, p. 238. [2] See above, p. 239. [3] See above, p. 250.

cumstance that has hitherto not been sufficiently considered, and yet is one calculated to raise some misgivings about the history of the picture. That Droeshout's engraving must have been considesed an excellent likeness by the poet's friends and contemporaries, is proved by the fact that it was reproduced in a smaller form upon the title-page of Shakespeare's poems published in 1640, but the dress is somewhat different, owing to the addition of a mantle and the want of the embroidery; besides, the head is surrounded by a halo and the left hand holds a branch of laurel. Still the head—although looking in an exactly opposite direction—is unmistakably that known as by Droeshout. In accordance, therefore, with all that has been stated, our verdict on the Droeshout print is precisely the same as that given of the bust at Stratford, viz., that there is every reason to believe that it resembled the poet, but that it is even more defective in that artistic finish which alone makes a likeness a good portrait. The engraving and the bust agree in all essential particulars, in so far as these are not affected by the different conception of the artist and the differences in their style of work, except that the bust exhibits a somewhat round head, whereas Droeshout's engraving is the likeness of a man with a distinctly long face. And yet these two portraits are, in fact, the only authentic likenesses by which we can judge the other pictures that are held to be portraits of Shakespeare.

Is it to be supposed, then, the reader may ask, that Shakespeare never had his portrait painted? We have good portraits (by Honthorst and Jansen) of almost all the poets of his day—of B. Jonson, of Beaumont and Fletcher, of Spenser, &c.—why not of Shakespeare? This is a question that has, of course, been explained in a variety of ways. Those commentators who have endeavoured to maintain that Shakespeare belonged to the pariah class of common actors have assumed that, owing to his social position, it would never have occurred to him to have his portrait painted. But, apart from the fact that social position has less to do with the matter than a well-stocked purse (there is no reason why even a butcher might not have his portrait painted in oil for his family), this objection proves to be altogether wrong upon an impartial examination of the circumstances, and is, indeed, contradicted by the already mentioned fact, that persons who were not the social equals of poets and players, were nevertheless considered distinguished enough to

be honoured with having their portraits painted. However, an explanation of a very different kind forces itself upon us, viz., that Shakespeare himself had no desire to have his portrait painted. Shakespeare, who did nothing whatever towards preserving his works for posterity, is scarcely likely to have had sufficient appreciation of his own importance to have had his portrait painted for posterity. In this respect, as is well known, Shakespeare was the very opposite of Ben Jonson. In fact, we have had repeated occasion to point out that no poet has ever kept his personality so completely in the background as Shakespeare. He was too much impressed by the vanity of all mundane affairs to regard himself as anything more than an atom in the infinity of space. The atom comes into existence, it glitters in the sunlight, it delights and refreshes the rest of creation, and then vanishes. Who can retain hold of it, or make it assume an imperishable form? Froude[1] says, "Men truly eminent think too meanly of themselves or their work to care much to be personally remembered." If Shakespeare, although entertaining similar sentiments, ever sat to a painter, he can have done so only in compliance with the request of friends who thought differently. And it is not likely that there was any want of requests of this kind.

To some such procedure it is generally thought we owe the two oil-paintings which, amid a large number of other portraits, appear to have the best, if not the exclusive claim to be considered authentic likenesses. These are the so-called Chandos portrait and the portrait by Cornelius Jansen; the first-mentioned may probably have been painted at the request of his fellow-actors, the latter at Lord Southampton's desire. The Chandos portrait, which is perhaps the best-known likeness of Shakespeare (in Germany more especially), ranks first in value and importance because of its having the longest pedigree of any, and although this is by no means attested by documentary evidence, still in England great value is attached to its history. The story as generally told is that the painting was originally the property of the actor Joseph Taylor (who played Hamlet in 1596), and is said to have been painted by Joseph Taylor's brother John, or by Richard Burbage. This last supposition, although accepted by Boaden as beyond a

[1] In his *Bunyan*, p. 173.

doubt, is difficult to believe, in so far as the painting is obviously not the work of a dilettante, but the work of a professional artist, and, indeed, in all likelihood not the work of an English artist. Joseph Taylor bequeathed the picture to Sir William Davenant, who, as already stated, considered himself an illegitimate son of Shakespeare's. After Davenant's death it was bought by Betterton the actor, upon whose decease it was purchased for 40 guineas by Mr. Robert Keck of the Temple, from whom it was inherited by Mr. Nicholls of Southgate, Middlesex. The latter's only daughter married the Marquis of Caernarvon, afterwards Duke of Chandos, from whom the picture takes its name. After his death the portrait passed into the possession of his daughter Anna Eliza, Duchess of Buckingham. In September, 1848, when the Duke of Buckingham's pictures were sold, the Earl of Ellesmere purchased the Shakespeare portrait for 355 guineas, and in 1856 presented it to the National Portrait Gallery, where it is now preserved. The picture, which is painted on canvas, is 22 inches in height and 18 inches in breadth, and has unfortunately suffered from the ravages of time, and even more from having been injudiciously cleaned and restored.[1] Sir Joshua Reynolds was convinced that the painting was the unfinished work of some artist. The painting has become very dark in colour, and has been so often touched up that even in Malone's day it was sarcastically said to be "an old friend with a new face." Yet Malone greatly admired it, and declared it to be the only authentic likeness. However, not much value can be attached to Malone's artistic judgment when we remember his absurd treatment of the Stratford bust. Steevens, on the other hand, declared himself wholly opposed to the Chandos portrait as a likeness of the poet; this, probably, he did mainly out of spite towards Malone. He ridiculed it in every possible way, and is, indeed, sus-

[1] The Chandos portrait is probably the one that has most frequently been reproduced. The most valuable prints are, the one by Vandergucht (1709, prefixed to Rowe's edition of the poet's works); that by Vertue (1719); by Duchange (1733, after a drawing of Arland's); by Houbraken (1747, is considered the best); by T. A. Dean (1823, after a drawing by Ozias Humphrey, which is considered the most faithful one); and the mezzotint of the English Shakespeare Society, by Samuel Cousins. See Henry Rumsey Forster, *A Few Remarks on the Chandos Portrait of Shakespeare*, and a *Letter* upon the same by H. Rodd. London, 1842 (privately printed).

pected of having had the so-called Felton head painted in order to eclipse the Chandos portrait. This so-called Felton head which Steevens gave out as a genuine portrait of Shakespeare, was obviously painted from the Droeshout print, and is of a later origin; however, it is no longer taken into consideration in the discussion of the authenticated likenesses.[1]

The condition of the Chandos portrait accounts for the fact that the copies made of it by various artists differ extremely; still they all agree in so far as they show that the portrait itself differs in important points both from the Stratford bust and from the Droeshout engraving. Indeed, it is only as regards the high forehead—the lines of which, however, are very differently curved—and the large eyes that look leftwards, that it shows any resemblance to them at all. It does not show any breadth or massiveness in the lower part of the face, the chin is more pointed than broad, and the face is thin as a whole, whereas in all of the other likenesses it exhibits more or less fulness.[2] The whole style of the head—as English critics unanimously maintain—is un-English, and presents a distinctly Southern, almost Jewish type of face. The poet is depicted with a profusion of curly hair, of a much darker colour than that of the bust or engraving, with red-edged eyes, a nose wholly different from the bust and print, a sen-

[1] Wivell, in his *Historical Account of all the Portraits of Shakespeare*, p. 30, not only takes the Felton head under his protection to shield it from Boaden's annihilating criticism, but even declares it to be the only genuine portrait of Shakespeare and as the original of the Droeshout print. The latter supposition is unlikely, if only because the Felton head is well drawn, and according to Wivell's own showing is a masterly work. Droeshout could not possibly have made so coarse a copy of it, even though Shakespeare's had been the first portrait he had engraved in England, as some suppose it to have been. The two portraits need only be placed side by side to show the impossibility of any such supposition. On the back of the piece of wood on which the Felton head is painted is the name Gul. Shakspeare, the date 1597, and the monogram R. B. (according to another reading, R. N.), and these letters Wivell refers to R. Burbage, whom accordingly he unhesitatingly assumes to have been the artist! Burbage, as already said, can only have been an amateur, and the writing on the back of the picture is even said to be very suspicious owing to the style of the letters.

[2] After repeatedly and carefully examining the original and the various copies, we cannot avoid the impression that the picture represents a man with a naturally weak chest, and that in this respect it is an utter contrast to the Stratford bust and the Droeshout portrait; the somewhat sunken cheeks, the prominent cheekbones, the large hollow eyes, and the distended nostrils, clearly suggest this.

suous mouth, dark beard, and the ears tricked out with earrings. With regard to the earrings, it is known that Shakespeare's patrons, Southampton, Pembroke, and Montgomery, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Charles I. at a later period, did not disdain to wear these foppish decorations.[1] In order to account for the points in the Chandos portrait which, on the one hand, show a striking divergence from, and again a striking resemblance to the other likenesses, some critics have taken refuge in the bold and altogether unfounded hypothesis that Shakespeare was represented in the character of Shylock. Now there is not the smallest evidence to show that Shakespeare ever played the part of Shylock, and in the present case we have certainly no portrait in any special dress or character to deal with. Dr. Waagen very determinately declares the portrait not only to be a likeness of Shakespeare, but also the work of an English artist; his opinion, however, has not by any means been generally accepted by English connoisseurs—Englishmen have, in fact, pronounced Waagen's criticism to be somewhat superficial. George Scharf, the secretary of the National Portrait Gallery, who has expressed himself eloquently in favour of the genuineness of the Chandos portrait, supports Dr. Waagen's criticism on both points, and assumes the artist to have been a stepbrother of Lord Bacon's, Sir Nathaniel Bacon, some of whose paintings are to be found in English collections. In direct opposition to these views, Halliwell maintains that the Chandos portrait does not exhibit a trace of Shakespeare's character, as we are justified in imagining him to have been. Halliwell thinks it more likely the portrait of some Dutchman, which indulgent but overcredulous critics have persuaded the world into believing to be a portrait of Shakespeare.[2] All things considered, two points seem very evident—that the picture does not represent an Englishman, nor does it appear to be the work of an English artist. And even though it may be a genuine portrait of Shakespeare, in no case can it have been a good likeness. And, after all, it must be admitted that it is a mere matter of

[1] Harrison's *Description of England*, ed. Furnivall, p. 170; Stubbes, *Anatomie of Abuses*, ed. Furnivall (for the New Shakspere Society, 1877), p. 70; the latter says: "because this is not so much frequented amongst Women as Men, I will say no more thereof," &c.

[2] Halliwell, *A New Boke about Shakespeare and Stratford-upon-Avon*, London, 1850 (for private circulation), p. 65.

faith whether this enigmatical portrait is to be considered genuine or not.

Very much the same may be said of the oil-painting said to represent Shakespeare by Cornelius Jansen, again a Dutchman. Unlike the Chandos portrait, however, it has less external evidence in its favour, although it seems to possess a greater degree of internal probability.[1] It was unknown till the latter end of the last century, at which time it was in the possession of a Mr. Charles Jennens, of Gopsal, in Leicestershire. After his death in 1773 it remained for a time in the possession of the family, but was then entirely lost sight of till 1809, when it was purchased by the Duke of Hamilton, who bequeathed it to his daughter, the Duchess of Somerset, in whose collection, or rather in that of her husband, it still exists. According to other accounts, it is said never to have been in Gopsal, but to have been the property of Prince Rupert, who left it to his natural daughter. This much is certain, that the pedigree of the picture, almost every detail of which is based upon mere tradition, cannot be depended upon in this case any more than in any other. Some critics even refuse to believe that the portrait was painted by Cornelius Jansen. According to the general supposition, which is founded on a statement of Walpole,[2] Jansen did not come over to England till 1618, whereas the portrait bears the date "1610 Aet. 46" in the left upper corner. Boaden, who is one of the chief defenders of the Jansen portrait, points out, however, that Malone possessed a picture of Jansen's dated 1611, and that his birthplace was not Amsterdam but London, where he was born somewhere about 1580. It is probable that his parents fled to England after the capture of Antwerp by the Spaniards.[3] The only details known of Jansen's life

[1] Harting, *The Ornithology of Shakespeare*, p. xii. f.

[2] Horace Walpole's *Anecdotes of Painting*, ed. by the Rev. James Dallaway (London, 1826), ii. 9 f. According to Walpole, Jansen lived in Blackfriars, and among others painted portraits of Lady Southampton, B. Jonson, John Fletcher, and of the Lucy family of Charlecote, hence moved in Shakespeare's own circle.

[3] J. Hain Friswell, in his *Life Portraits of William Shakspeare*, is specially inaccurate in his quotations from Boaden's work on this point, and charges Boaden with absolutely false assertions—for instance, that he makes Jansen out to have lived to be 101 years of age. And Friswell then vehemently launches out against these false statements of his own making, and, as a matter of course, does not give the picture itself due consideration.

are the following:—He married in 1622, had a son also named Cornelius, who was bred to his father's profession, and who painted among others the portrait of the Duke of Monmouth. Jansen returned to Holland, and died at Amsterdam in 1665 (hence about eighty-five years of age). He was the most famous portrait-painter of his day in London, till his star paled before that of Van Dyck; many of his works are met with among English collections of pictures. Lord Southampton commissioned him to paint the portrait of his eldest daughter Elizabeth, who married Lord Spenser, and this has led to the supposition that Lord Southampton may have induced his friend and *protégé* William Shakespeare to have his portrait painted by the same artist. Jansen in 1618 painted the portrait of Milton, who was then a boy of ten years old.[1]

Jansen's portrait of Shakespeare so closely resembles the Droeshout print,[2] that it might easily be suspected of having been painted from the engraving—as in the case of the Felton head—or that after Shakespeare's death Jansen had painted the portrait from the engraving as well as from his own recollection of the poet. English art-critics are all unanimous in thinking that the portrait is painted in Jansen's well-known style; he was an excellent colourist, and proves himself this also in the present case. What Walpole remarked as characteristic of Jansen's portraits, viz., "a lively tranquillity," is also a peculiarity of the portrait in question. On comparing the Chandos portrait, the Felton head, the Droeshout engraving, &c., we are forcibly struck by the thought that Jansen's picture, in an artistic respect, greatly surpasses all the other Shakespeare portraits in ideal conception. It is—as Englishmen themselves have maintained—the portrait above all others which most distinctly embodies our idea of the poet. Not any one of the other portraits shows us Shakespeare in his own peculiar greatness; not any one of the others allows us to look so fully into the depths of his nature. Thoughtful earnest-

[1] With regard to Jansen's portrait of Milton, see *Notes and Queries*, January 15, 1870, p. 65; *Milton's Poetical Works* (1874), ed. Masson, i. 71; Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, i. 50, 277. According to Masson, in 1618 Jansen was a young artist who had come over to London from Amsterdam, but he does not give his authority for this statement.

[2] Only with regard to the beard does it show more resemblance to the bust, for of beard there is none in the Droeshout print; Shakespeare probably allowed his beard to grow only when he had retired from the stage.

ness and a tinge of melancholy are expressed in the face, and in this the Jansen portrait is a perfect contrast to the almost jovial-looking bust. In the Jansen portrait we have the poet as he was when he had overcome all the inward and outward struggles of his life, when he had become reconciled with himself and the world. It is this expression of purification and reconciliation, after previous battlings, that attracts us to the portrait, and, as it were, rivets us with magnetic force.[1]

This attraction is, indeed, partly owing to the fact that Jansen's picture excels all its competitors in having been most admirably reproduced; we refer to the mezzotint by Turner in Boaden.[2] The mezzotint style seems to be specially well adapted for Shakespeare's likeness, as no other seems capable of reproducing the delicate curve of the forehead. And the excellent copy of the Chandos portrait, made for the English Shakespeare Society, was also done in mezzotint. But even more attractive and remarkable than Turner's mezzotint is the admirable copy of the Jansen portrait in the so-called Gothic House in Wörlitz. It is at present marked No. 1,280, and A. von Rode[3] gives the following account of it: "Shakespeare, a gift from one of his descendants to Count L. F. Franz of Anhalt-Dessau, on the occasion of his sojourn in England." Count (afterwards Duke) Franz's journey to England took place during 1763-4, when, as is well known, there was no descendant of the poet's living; the family, as we have already stated, had died out 100 years previously. The unknown donor of the picture could accordingly only have been a descendant, real or fictitious, of some lateral branch of the family, of whom, however, nothing whatever is known. This much is, however, certain, that the Count brought the picture from England. The Jansen portrait had only shortly before

[1] On a scroll above the head of the figure are the words, *Ut Magus*, which are said to refer to a passage in Horace (Epist. i. 2, 208-213), and might certainly be aptly and appropriately applied to Shakespeare and his poetry. Wivell, *l.c.*, p. 243, declares that although he carefully examined the original painting he was unable to discover the words referred to; however, they exist in Earlom's engraving, which was made in 1770 from the original, and they are also in Turner's mezzotint of 1824.

[2] The photograph of it in Hain Friswell's book and the engraving in Wivell's give but a faint idea of the beauty of the mezzotint. In how far the copies are faithfully executed it is impossible to judge without having examined the original.

[3] *Das Gothische Haus zu Wörlitz*, &c., Dessau, 1818, p. 47.

made its appearance, and must at once have aroused interest and been considered a genuine portrait, otherwise the would-be descendant of Shakespeare would never have had it copied for himself, and neither the Count nor his companion Von Erdmannsdorf, both of whom were connoisseurs of art, would have attached any value to it. The original portrait by Jansen is painted on wood, according to the artist's usual custom, whereas the copy at Wörlitz is painted on canvas; it is seventy-four centimetres high and sixty-one in breadth. The agreement between the latter and Turner's mezzotint leaves nothing to be desired. The almond-shaped eyes remind one of the Stratford bust; but in all other respects, especially as regards the nose and the high and rather hard lines of the eyebrows, it shows a distinct resemblance to the Droeshout engraving. On examining the dark background of the picture an oval outline is seen; in fact, it would seem as if the original had been oval in form, a circumstance not implied in any previous account of the picture. No name of any artist is to be found, nor is there any sign of a date or of the scroll with the words, *Ut Magus;* the back of the canvas cannot be examined, as it has been lined with a sheet of linen. At any rate, this copy —which, as far as we know, is unsurpassed by any other in Germany—deserves more attention and consideration than it has hitherto received.

As our readers must perceive, all our knowledge on the subject of Shakespeare's portraits is based almost entirely upon hypotheses and combinations. It is only with regard to the Stratford bust and the Droeshout print that we may be said to stand upon *terra firma*, and it is not difficult to say to which of these two we give the preference. For, in spite of all that may be said against it, the bust unquestionably deserves to rank first, and its defects should be treated leniently and with a feeling of reverence; in England, too, its merits are becoming more and more recognized as the most trustworthy, faithful, and, on the whole, not unpleasant portrait of the poet.

Those who are unable to accept any such combinations will find the positive result of our examination of the Shakespeare portraits meagre enough, and will no doubt feel disposed to cast them among those "groundless fancies" which Shakespeare and his works have so frequently called forth. Still, in order to be able fully to appreciate the work accomplished,

the negative result must also be taken into consideration. Before Boaden first threw light upon the myriad of Shakespeare portraits, an incredible amount of ignorance and confusion prevailed, particularly as fabrications and deceptions had been widely spread in this direction as well. In addition to W. Ireland, of notorious memory, there was, more particularly, a German restorer of pictures in London, one W. F. Zincke by name, who was very active in this line of business. One of his crudest fabrications was a portrait of Shakespeare on a pair of bellows which Zincke had repaired, and the picture was palmed off upon Talma as a genuine portrait of the poet. Talma purchased it for 1,000 francs, and is said to have refused as many pounds sterling for it.[1] When, ultimately, Talma was undeceived, he conducted himself "like a philosopher and a gentleman;" this, at least, is the report given of him by the friend who undertook the unpleasant task. At the sale of Talma's possessions, after his death, the bellows nevertheless fetched the sum of 3,100 francs, and it is said the bellows were even brought back to England by some dealer in curiosities to be sold.[2] Whether this speculation proved successful has not been stated; very possibly a worthy successor to Pope presented himself, Pope's ignorance in matters connected with art being such that he allowed a portrait of James I. to be palmed off upon him as Shakespeare's likeness. There is nowadays, at all events, no dearth of signposts and signals of warning to make such mistakes next to an impossibility; everything that is spurious and worthless has been cast aside, and this much, at least, has been accomplished, that the question can now apply only to the few portraits—the *Imagines Principes*, as it were—which we have briefly described to our readers.

[1] Ainger, *Charles Lamb*, London, 1882, p. 127 f.

[2] Wivell, *Historical Account of all the Portraits of Shakespeare*, pp. 197-205; Wivell, *A Supplement*, &c., p. 21. Compare *Shakespeariana. Catalogue of all the Books, Pamphlets, &c., relating to Shakespeare*, London, 1827 (printed for John Wilson). A detailed account of the bellows picture, pp. xxi.-xxiv.

INDEX.

"ALARUM for London," R. Simpson on, 301.
Actor, the first with an assumed name, 262.
—— Shakespeare as an, 235; also 30, 35, 114, 123, 125, 137, 161, 173, 194, 235, 239, 413, 481.
Actors, 173; conflicts of, with the Lord Mayor and authorities, 222; rise of professional, *ib.*; Shakespeare's fellow actors upon the stage, 246, *et sq.*; and supernumeraries, 223. *See* also Stage, Theatres, Players, etc.
Addenbrooke and Horneby, Shakespeare's suit against, 184.
Admiral's, Lord, Players, 223. *See* also Players, etc.
Alleyn, Edward, 58, 173, 183, 225; as an actor, 249; his company of players, 145, 247.
—— Mrs., her letter brought to light by Collier a forgery, 247.
"All's Well that Ends Well," 336; Klein on, 304.
Ambition, Shakespeare's, 428.
Amusements in London in Shakespeare's time, 128. *See* also Theatre, etc.
Ancestors, Shakespeare's, 9, 11. *See* also under Shakespeare.
Anderson, Hugh, on "Venus and Adonis," 313.
Angler, Shakespeare an, 395.
"Antony and Cleopatra," 354; also 127, and in the foot-notes.
"Antwerp, The Siege of." *See* "A Larum for London."
Apollo tavern, 148.
Apothecaries' Hall, 212.
Apothecary, Shakespeare an, 84.
"Arden of Feversham," 363.
Arden family, the, 11, 188; the Earl of Leicester and, 111.
—— Mary, Shakespeare's mother, 11, 13, 41.
—— Robert, 11, 187; his will, 11.
Aristocratic bias, Shakespeare's alleged, 186.
Arms, coat of, Shakespeare's, 11, 13, 185, 427.
Arts, the fine, Shakespeare's knowledge of, 411, et. sq.
Asbies, or Ashbies, estate, 91, 180; mortgaged to Edmund Lambert, 68; suit in Chancery concerning it, 69. *See* also Lambert.
"As You Like It," 335; also 36, 374, 380, 408; Shakespeare as Adam in, 30, 239.
Atheist, Shakespeare not an, 440. *See* also under Religion, etc.
Aubrey, his account of Shakespeare, 5, 23, 147, 237, 496.
Autograph, Shakespeare's, 9, 185, 482, 509, 539; that in Florio's "Montaigne," 511. *See* also Handwriting, MSS., etc.
Avon, the, 99; Garrick's poem on, 47; Yarranton's scheme for making it navigable, 533. *See* also under Stratford, Warwickshire, etc.

Ayrer, Shakespeare's acquaintance with, in Germany, 125.

Bacon, Delia, and her theory of Lord Bacon's authorship of Shakespeare's plays, 270; her wish to be buried in Shakespeare's grave, *ib.;* her death, 270.
Bacon, Lord, and Shakespeare, 386, 387, 388, 440, 455; the Bacon theory of the authorship of Shakespeare's plays, 270.
Bacon, Sir Nathaniel, portrait of Shakespeare attributed to him, 564.
Bale, Bishop, his works, 207, 208.
Bankside, theatres at, 213, 228.
Barber surgeons, 148.
Barbers' shops, 128.
Barksted, Wm., actor, 268.
Barnard, Lady, Shakespeare's granddaughter, 5, 33, 526, 528; her will, 511, 514.
Barnfield, Richard, and "The Passionate Pilgrim," 319.
Barnstorff on the "Sonnets," 327.
Bartholomew Fair, 128.
Bear tavern, Stratford, 495.
Beaumont and Fletcher, 111, 138, 259; their works, 258, 263; and the "Two Noble Kinsmen," 300.
Becker, Dr., and Ludwig Becker, and the Kesselstadt cast of Shakespeare's head, 552.
Beds, bequests of, and that of Shakespeare's "second best" to his wife, 512, 513.
Beeston, Christopher, actor, 268.
Bellew, Rev. J. C. M., his account of New Place, 484, 501, 535, 540; his account of Shakespeare's death, 504.
Benfield, Robert, actor, 240, 263.
Betterton, and Shakespeare, 5, 104, 123, 511; portrait of Shakespeare attributed to him, 562.
Bible, The, Shakespeare's knowledge of, 42, 385, 439. *See* also Religion, etc.
Bibliography of Shakespeare, 537; of the quartos and folios, 277, *et sq.* *See* also under Works, Quartos, Folios, etc., and the footnotes on every page.
Bidford, "Drunken," and its Shakespeare legend, 98.
Birch, J. W., on Shakespeare's Religion, 440.
Birth-date of Shakespeare, 29, 31; should be May 3 now, in consequence of the prevalence of the Gregorian calendar, 33. *See* also under Shakespeare, birth.
Birth-dates in family Bibles, 32.
Birth-place, the, Stratford, 26; bought for the town, 535.
"Birth of Merlin," 363.
Bishopsgate, Shakespeare a resident there, 182.
Black Friars, house of the, etc., 212.
Blackfriars, Shakespeare's property there, 240, 511, 539.
Blackfriars Theatre, 212, 217, 222, *et. sq.;* also 165, 172, 184, 235, 240, 488.
Blades, Mr. William, his attempt to show that Shakespeare was a printer, 190.
Blood, circulation of, Shakespeare's knowledge of, 399.
Boaden, James, on Shakespeare's portraits, etc., 549, 565.
Boar's Head, East Cheap, 147, 149.
Bodenstedt, Von, on the "Sonnets," 327.
Bodley, Sir T., his library, exclusion of dramatic poetry from it, 275.
Bohemia, Shakespeare and, 407.
Bowdler, the Rev. Mr., his work upon Shakespeare, 440; Bp. Wordsworth's refutation of it, 441.
Bowling-alleys, 128.
Boys of the Chapel Royal, etc. *See* Children.
Brown, C. A., on Shakespeare, 80, 327.
Brown, Henry, on the "Sonnets," 327.
Brownists, The, 462.
Bruno, Giordano, Shakespeare and, 304, 381.
Bryan, George, actor, 255.
Burbage, Cuthbert, 225, 240, 262.
—— James, 118, 211.

Burbage, William, 240.
—— Mrs. Winifred, 240, 250. *See* also Robinson, Mrs.
—— Richard, actor and manager, 247; and Shakespeare, 59, 118, 124, 145, 171, 173, 211, 234, 235, 240, 262, 512; in his dressing room, 248; as a painter, 250, 559, 561, 563; his theatres, 182.
Bust of Shakespeare at Stratford, 549.
Butcher, the statements that John Shakespeare was a butcher and his son a butcher's apprentice, 22, 70.
Butts, Dr., 148.

Camden, Wm., and Shakespeare's arms, 188; on Shakespeare's "forty-eight plays," 297.
Campbell, Lord, on "Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements," 87.
Capell on the "Sonnets," 34.
Carlyle on Shakespeare, 271.
Carriers, etc., in London, 117, 168.
"Castell of Courtesie," its allusion to "W. S.," 115.
Catholic faith, the, Shakespeare's grandfather and, 13; Shakespeare's supposed preference for it, 449.
Catholicism, in Elizabeth's time, 454.
Catholics and Protestants, between the two Shakespeare took refuge in Humanism, 449, 454, 460.
Cervantes, the date of his death, not the date of Shakespeare's death, 505.
Chairs said to have belonged to Shakespeare, 533.
Chalmers, George, on the "Sonnets," 327.
Chamberlain, the Lord, and the Players, 240; his company of Players, 223, 234, 247.
Chancery suit of Shakespeare's father, 69, 180.
Chandos, Lord, his company, 259.
—— portrait of Shakespeare, 559; also 250, 263.
Chantry, Sir F., on the Shakespeare bust, 551.
Chapel Royal children players, 259, 260. *See* also Children.
Chapman, Geo., 138.
Character and character drawing, the connexion between, 430.
Charlecote Park and the Lucys, 99.
Charles I., his Queen at New Place, 524.
Chasles, Philarète, on the "Sonnets," 324.
Chester Plays, the, 200.
—— Robert, his "Love's Martyr," etc., 319.
Chettle, Henry, and Shakespeare, 138, 237, 343, 424; he the possible original of Falstaff, 151.
Children players, companies of, rise of, 218. *See* also Chapel Royal, children of, etc.
Christian, Shakespeare as a, 416, 440, 443, 453. *See* also under Religion, etc.
Church, the, Shakespeare and the, 439, 446. *See* also under Christian, Catholic, etc.
Cibber's (or Shiel's) "Lives of the Poets," 123.
Clarke, Mr. and Mrs. Cowden, their edition of Shakespeare, 508.
Classes, distinction of, Shakespeare on, 468.
Classics, Shakespeare and the, 366. *See* also Latin, Greek, etc.
Clergy, the, marriage of, temp. Eliz., 465; Shakespeare on, 464. *See* also Church, etc.
Clifford, John Shakespeare of, 91; Drayton at, 503.
Clopton Bridge, Stratford, 44.
Clopton family, the, of Stratford, 44.
—— Sir Hugh, 483, 529.
—— Sir John, rebuilds New Place, 529.
—— William, 26.
Clowns, stage, their "jigs," etc., 233; their parts, 253.
Coaches, etc., in Shakespeare's time, 123.
Cockpit (or Phœnix) Theatre, 213.
Coleridge, Hartley, on Shakespeare, 186, 428.
Coleridge, S. T., on "The London

Prodigal," 360; on Shakespeare, 437.
Collier, J. P., the doubtful and forged documents, etc., put forth by him, 6, 119, 144, 172, 198, 247, 249, 292.
Collins, Francis, 512.
Colonization in Elizabeth's reign, 132.
Combe, John-a-, 44, 550; the epitaph on, 495.
—— Thomas, 183.
—— William, 44.
Combes, the, 180, 482, 494.
Comedy, rise of, 208.
—— English, "the perfection of," ("Twelfth Night"), 337.
"Comedy of Errors, The," 331, also 171, 402.
Commentators and editors of Shakespeare. *See* under their names, as Halliwell-Phillipps, Knight, Malone, Dyce, etc., etc., and the footnotes on nearly every page.
Commons' enclosure, Shakespeare's opposition to, at Stratford, 491.
Commonwealth, the suppression of theatres during, 3.
"Conde Lucanor," Don Juan Manuel's, 336.
Condell, Henry, actor, 255; also 145, 177, 252, 285, 512.
—— Mrs., 240.
Constable's "Venus and Adonis," 315.
Cooke, Dr. James, and the Shakespeare family papers, etc., 520, 521.
"Coriolanus," 347.
Corney, Bolton, on "the Assumed Birthday of Shakespeare," 32.
Corpus Christi Plays, 200.
Costume, stage, Inigo Jones' designs for, 143.
Court robes at the theatre, 227.
Coventry Plays, 201, 204; the Corpus Christi plays perhaps witnessed by Shakespeare, 51, 53.
Cowley, Richard, actor, 256.
"Cradle of Security, The," an old play, 61.
Crabtree, Shakespeare's, at Bidford, 97.
"Cromwell, Lord," 360, 363.
Cundall, Henry. *See* Condell.
Cunningham, Peter, unreliable documents put forth by him, 6, 194, 243, 252; his "Revels' Accounts," 252.
Curtain Theatre, Shoreditch, 211.
"Cymbeline," 355.

Dancing and Music, temp. Eliz., 411.
Daniel, P. A., his edit. "Romeus and Juliet," 350.
Daniel, Samuel, and Shakespeare, 120, 123, 140, 329, 339, 433; as Master of the Revels, 219.
Davenant, John, his will, 170.
—— Mrs., and Shakespeare, 170.
—— Sir William, and Shakespeare, 5, 195, 220, 546, 562; as Shakespeare's "godson," 170.
Davies, John, and Shakespeare, 237, 327; on actors, 224.
Death, Shakespeare's pictures of, 401.
—— mask of Shakespeare, the, 551.
Dedications, 175, 177, 322.
Deeds, documents, etc., Shakespearian, 539, *et sq.* *See* also MSS., etc.
Deer-stealing, Shakespeare's alleged, 80, 92, 99.
Dekker, Thos, 138; his "Satiro-Mastix," 159.
Delius, Prof., his view of the "Sonnets," 428; on "Timon of Athens," 351.
Dennis, John, on Shakespeare, 366; on the "Merry Wives," 331.
De Quincey on Shakespeare, 80, 271.
Derby's, Lord, company of actors, 223.
Descendants, Shakespeare's, 5. *See* also under their names, and under Shakespeare, his family.
Despair, utterances of, in Shakespeare's works, 451.
Dethick, Sir Wm., King-at-Arms, 187.
"Digby Mysteries," the, 202.
Digges, Leonard, on Shakespeare, 549.
Dogs, Shakespeare's love of, 394.

Donne, Dr., his supposed epitaph on Shakespeare, 508.
Don Quixote, did Shakespeare read it? 384, 474. *See* also Cervantes.
Dorset, Earl of, his company of players, 223.
"Double Falsehood, The," 363.
Doubtful and spurious plays, 359; Tieck on, 299. *See* also under "Pericles," "Henry VI.," "Titus Andronicus," "Two Noble Kinsmen," etc.
Dowdall, on Shakespeare's grave, etc., 508.
Dowland, John, 140, 144, 412.
Dowden, Prof. C., on the "Sonnets," 329.
Drake, on the plays of Shakespeare's youth, 64; on "Troilus and Cressida," 347.
Drake, Sir F., 132.
Drama, English, rise and development of, 198; Puritan objections to, 214; of the Restoration, 4; Rümelin on, 198. *See* also Theatre, etc.
Dramatists, before Shakespeare, 210; portraits of those of Shakespeare's days, 560; their plays curtailed in acting, 233; payment for their plays, 227; their religion, 454; their works excluded from the Bodleian Library, 275. *See* also under their several names, and under Drama, etc.
Drayton, Michael, and Shakespeare, 120, 140, 508, 515; and the "Sonnets," 327; his visits to Shakespeare at Stratford, 503.
Drinking, in Shakespeare's time, 146.
Droeshout, Martin, and his portrait of Shakespeare, 557; also 234, 238, 250.
Drummond of Hawthornden, and Ben Jonson, 154.
Dryden, John, on Shakespeare and Fletcher, 432.
Duke, John, actor, 268.
Dutch, German, and English drinking, 147.
Dyce, Rev. Alexr. on Shakespeare, 80.
Earrings, Shakespeare's (?), 564; men's earrings in Shakespeare's time, 564.
East India Company, 132.
Ecclestone, Wm., actor, 262.
Editions, early, of Shakespeare's works. *See* under their names; also under Quarto, Folio, etc.; corrupt and pirated copies of the plays, 344, 356.
Editors and Commentators. *See* under their names, and for additional references see the foot-notes throughout.
"Edward III.," 363.
Egerton, Sir Thomas, 245.
Egerton papers, the doubtful, 245.
Elizabeth, Queen, and Shakespeare, 127, 132, 331, 425; his performances before her, 191, 217, 235, 245; the Queen and "Richard II." 243; and the "Sonnets," 327; knowledge of languages in her time, 376; London in her time, 127; Protestants and Catholics in her reign, 454; the story of Shakespeare and the Queen's glove, 191; her visit to Harefield, 245; her visit to Warwick, 168; Shakespeare's views on her death, 190.
Ellesmere, Lord, 247. *See* also Egerton, Sir Thos.
England, Shakespeare's "joyous pride of," 473.
"England, Merry," the Puritans the grave-diggers of, 412, 461.
English, Shakespeare's, 56.
Engravings of portraits of Shakespeare, 551, 562, 567.
Epitaphs, ascribed to Shakespeare, 495; on Shakespeare's tomb, etc., 507.
Essex, Earl of, and Shakespeare, 138, 177, 334, 340; his execution, 190.
"Every Man in His Humour," Shakespeare an actor in, 160, 238.

Facsimile reprints of Shakespeare's works, 339, 352.
"Fair Em," 363.
Falstaff, 151; Guizot on, 109.

"Falstaff, The Amours of Sir John," 1702, 331.
Falcon tavern, Stratford, 148, 495.
Farmer, Dr. R., "On the Learning of Shakespeare," 365, 375.
Felton portrait of Shakespeare, 563.
Fennell's "Shakespeare Repository," 115.
"Ferrex and Porrex," 63, 208.
Field, H., 119.
—— Nat., actor, 260.
—— Richard, 119, 121, 311.
—— Bp. Theo., 260.
Fielde, Henry, tanner, 93.
Finsbury Fields, the theatres near, 211.
Fleay, Rev. F. G., on Shakespeare, 114, 188; his metrical test, 307; on "Pericles," 356; his word test, 348; on "Timon of Athens," 350.
Flecknoe's account of Burbage, 248.
Fletcher, John, 138. *See* also Beaumont.
Flir, Dr., (a Catholic) on Shakespeare's undoubted Protestantism, 460.
Florio, John, and Shakespeare, 143, 378; his translation of Montaigne with Shakespeare's autograph, 511, 539; and Holofernes, 37, 145.
Flower, Mr. C. E., rebuilds the Theatre at Stratford, 535.
Flowers, etc., Shakespeare's knowledge of, 327,
Folio edition of Shakespeare, the first, 284; also 56, 110, 118, 243, 250, 252, 255, 557; the second folio, 291; the third folio, 4, 291, 297; the fourth folio, *ib*: the Perkins folio, 6.
Ford, John, 138.
Foreigners, Shakespeare's drawings of, 130.
Forgeries, Shakespeare, 6, 172, 194, 235, 247, 457, 482, 484, 569.
Forman, Dr. Simon, 337, 339, 355.
Forster, H. R., on the Chandos Portrait, 562.
Fortune Theatre, 213.
French, the, Shakespeare's pictures of, 474.
—— Shakespeare's knowledge of, 375: translations from the, in Shakespeare's time, 383.
—— and English drama contrasted, 210.
French, G. R., his "Shakspeareana Genealogica," 541.
Friswell, Jas. Hain, his book upon Shakespeare's portraits, etc., 549, 565.
Friendship and love in the "Sonnets," 431; in the plays, 433.
Froude, Mr. J. A., on Shakespeare, 198.
Fulbroke Park, Sir T. Lucy's, 99.
Fuller on Shakespeare and Jonson, 150.
Fulman, Rev. W., his "Notes," 104.
Furness, Mr. H. H., 532.
Furnivall, Dr. F. J., 167, 168; on the chronology of the plays, 306; his edition of "The Digby Mysteries," 202; his and other facsimiles of the Quartos, 281; his edition of Harrison's England, (Holinshed), 127, 186, 402; his account of Dr. John Hall, Shakespeare's son-in-law, 518; his "Leopold Shakspere," 306; his view as to "Pericles," *ibid.*; on "Richard II.," 339.

Gabriel, actor, 268.
Game Laws in Shakespeare's time, 101.
"Gammer Gurton's Needle," 63.
Garden, Shakespeare's, at New Place, 487, 530; it is bought and presented to the town of Stratford, 535.
Garrick at Stratford, 532; his account of Stratford, 502; his poem on the Avon, 47; his song on the mulberry-tree, 532.
Gastrell, Francis, destroys Shakespeare's mulberry-tree, 529, 530; pulls down New Place, 531.
Geography, Shakespeare's blunders in, 406.

German study and views of Shakespeare, 285, 306, 443, 536.
—— wines in England, temp. Eliz., 148.
Germans, Shakespeare on the, 476.
Germany, Shakespeare in, 124.
Gervinus on Shakespeare, 80, 151, 437, 450, 478; on "Venus and Adonis."
"Gesta Romanorum," the, Shakespeare and, 42.
Getley estate, the, 481.
Gifford, W., on Shakespeare and Ben Jonson, 153, 440.
Gilchrist, O., on Shakespeare and Ben Jonson, 153.
Gildemeister, his view of the "Sonnets," 428.
Gildon, on Shakespeare's learning, 366.
Globe Theatre, 228; also 165, 172, 175, 212, 213, 217, 337, 346; burnt down, 1613, 4; proprietors of, 24; Shakespeare's share in, 240, 515.
Glover, Shakespeare's father as a, 19.
Gloves, Shakespeare's, 511, 532.
Gloucester, old plays there, 60.
Gloucestershire dialect and Shakespeare's English, 56.
Goethe, on Shakespeare, 2, 271, 364, 399, 421, 449, 453.
Goffe, Robert. *See* Goughe.
"Gorboduc," 208.
Goughe, Robert, actor, 264.
Grand-daughter, Shakespeare's described as his niece, 510. *See* Hall, Elizabeth.
Gravitation, laws of, and Shakespeare, 391.
Greek, Shakespeare's knowledge of, 368, *et sq.*
—— authors in English in Shakespeare's time, 373.
Greene, actor, 124.
Greene, Robert, and Shakespeare, 85, 100, 115, 137, 141, 142, 210, 338, 343, 424, 455.
Greene, Thos, 168, 485, 493.
Grillparzer on the poetic faculty, 273.
Grimm, Hermann, on the Shakespeare mask, 553, 554.
"Groundlings," at the theatre, 230.
Guilds, plays of the, 201.
Guizot, on Falstaff, 109.

Hales, Anthony, 540.
—— John, on Shakespeare's learning, 366.
—— Mr. J. W., on Shakespeare's Greek names, 370.
Hall and Holinshed, Shakespeare's historians, 406.
Hall, Dr. John, Shakespeare's son-in-law, 518; also 405, 459, 509, 514; his MSS. and family papers 520, 521; his will, 522. *See* also Hall, Mrs. Susan.
—— Elizabeth, Shakespeare's grand-daughter, 168, 481, 510, 522, 525. *See* also Nash, Mrs.
—— Mrs. Susan, Shakespeare's daughter, 489, 499, 511, 521, 527.
Halliwell, or Holywell, Shoreditch, theatres there, 211, 256.
Halliwell-Phillipps, Mr. J. O., his "Life" of and other works on Shakespeare referred to, 1, 6, 80, 172, 486, 513, 528; also see the notes generally; his efforts which resulted in the purchase of the Shakespeare lands for the public, 535; his facsimile reprints, 280; his account of New Place, 484; his "intolerable" custom of printing tens of copies only "for friends," 132, 280, 339, 484; on Shakespeare's relations with his wife, 513; on "Twelfth Night," 337; his account of Shakespeare's death, 501.
"Hamlet," 352; also 115, 148, 189, 219, 227, 234, 236, 263, 382, 446, 462; played on board East India ships in 1607, 245.
Hampton Lucy, Stratford, 99; Shakespeare's Close there, 494.
Handwriting, Shakespeare's, 363. *See* also Autograph, and MSS.
Hanseatic merchants, their Hall at the Steelyard, 148.
Harness, Rev. W., on Shakespeare's

wife, 516, 549; his restorations at Stratford, 525.
Harrison, Gen. and the death of the actor Dick Robinson, 265.
Harrison's "Description of England," (Holinshed), Dr. Furnivall's edition, 127, 167, 168.
Hart, Joan = Shakespeare, Joan, Shakespeare's sister (which also see), 526.
—— Michael, 511.
—— Thomas, 505, 511.
—— William, 505, 511; and "W, H," 326.
—— family, the, 27. *See* also Descendants, Shakespeare's.
Harvey and Shakespeare and the circulation of the blood, 399.
Hathaway, Anne, Shakespeare's wife, 72, 115. *See* also under Shakespeare, marriage, etc.
—— Richard, 72, 73, 165, 514.
—— Richard, the younger, 75.
—— Wm., 75, 324.
Hathaways, the, 528: their cottage, 75, 533.
Hawthorne, Nathaniel, and the Baconian theory, 270-1; and the story of Shakespeare's death, 501.
Heminge, John, actor, 250; also, 73, 118, 124, 145, 177, 184, 194, 240, 285, 512.
Heminge, Richard, 250.
—— Wm., 251.
Hemynge family, the, 165.
"Henry IV," 339, 341.
"Henry V." 340; also 37, 228, 348, 442.
"Henry VI," 468.
"Henry VIII," 346, 426, 460.
Henrietta Maria, Queen, at New Place, 524.
Henslowe, 225; his Diary, 351, 361; his players, 145, 247.
Herbert, Sir Henry, Master of the Revels, 257.
Hertzberg on "Titus Andronicus," 349; on "Troilus and Cressida," 347.
Heywood, John, 206.
—— Thomas, and Shakespeare, 318.
Hickson, S., on Fletcher and Shakespeare, 300.
Higden, Ralph, his Chester plays, 202.
Histories, Shakespeare's, 51, 64, 406. Also under their names.
"Histrio-Mastix," Peele, and Marston's, (?) 544.
"Histrio-Mastix," Prynne's, 221.
Holbein, 148, 417.
Holder, Mr. H. W., 79.
Holinshed's "Chronicle," Shakespeare and, 42, 406, 425, 467. *See* also Harrison.
Holland, Shakespeare in, 124.
Honthorst, painter, 560.
Hope Theatre, 213, 215.
Horneby and Addenbrooke, Shakespeare's suit against, 184.
Horse-holder, Shakespeare as, the stories of, 122.
House, the Birthplace, and other Shakespeare houses, 26. *See* also Birthplace.
Household effects of Shakespeare's grandfather, 15.
Huband, Ralph, 183.
Hughes, Wm. and the "Sonnets," 326.
Hugo, F. V., on the "Sonnets," 327.
Human Nature, Shakespeare's conception of, 423, *et sq.*
Humanism, Shakespeare's, 375, 449, 453, 460.
Hume, David, his view of Shakespeare, 443.
Humfrey, or Humfrey Jeaffes, actor, 268.
Hunsden, Lord Chamberlain, 223.
Hunt, Thomas, 37.
—— Wm., 531.
Hunting, Shakespeare's knowledge of, 107, 394.

Immortality, Shakespeare's views as to, 447, 452.
Ingleby, C. M., his "Centurie of Praise," and other works on Shakespeare, 3, and the notes generally; on the Collier controversy, 6; on the "Sonnets," 321.

Ingon Meadow, John Shakespeare's house at, 26.
Inn-yards, plays in, 222.
Inns, 168; hostesses of, 170.
Interludes, 206, 234.
Ireland, Samuel, 98.
—— W. H., his Shakespeare forgeries, 6, 176, 484, 569.
Italian, Shakespeare's knowledge of, 382. *See* also Languages, modern, etc.
—— poetry influencing Shakespeare's work, 135.
Italians, Shakespeare's pictures of, 475.
Italy, did Shakespeare visit? 124, 419.
—— drama of, its influence in England, 208.

James I. and Shakespeare, 193, 195, 425, 440; and "Macbeth," 196, 352.
James, Richard, supposed second husband of Mrs. Shakespeare, 517.
Jansen, painter, 560; his portraits of Shakespeare, etc., 561, 565, 567.
Jealousy, Shakespeare's view of, 171.
Jenkins, Thomas, 37.
"Jigs," of the clowns, etc., 233, 254.
Joan of Arc, Shakespeare and, 475.
"Johannes Factotum" = Shakespeare, 115.
Johnson, Gerard, his bust of Shakespeare at Stratford, 550.
Jones, Inigo, and Shakespeare, 143.
—— Thos., of Tarbick, 104, 239.
Jonson, Ben., 156; relations with Shakespeare, 4, 141, 149, 174, 176, 192, 212, 285, 367, 378, 407, 424, 425, 434, 440, 455, 508; allusions to Shakespeare in his works, 160; and Shakespeare's portrait, 557, 559; quarrels with Shakespeare, 152; Shakespeare a player in his "Sejanus," 481; his visits to Shakespeare at Stratford, 503; the alleged last "drinking bout," 515.
Jordan, John, 105, 484.
Jubilee, Shakespeare, at Stratford, 1769, 532.
"Julius Cæsar," 351.

Karpf, on the "Sonnets," 327.
Keltic words in Shakespeare, 37.
Kemble, Roger, his account of Shakespeare's death, 501.
Kemp, Will, actor, 224, 235, 253, 255.
Kenilworth fêtes, 248; Shakespeare perhaps saw Queen Elizabeth at them, 54.
Kenny, T., his view of the "Sonnets," 429, 436; his estimate of Shakespeare's character, *ib.*
Kesselstadt cast of Shakespeare's head, the, 552.
"King John," 338; also 460, 462, and foot-notes.
"King Lear," 353; also 402, 471, and the foot-notes.
King's-evil, "touching" for, 196.
Klein on "All's Well that Ends Well," 304.
Knight, Charles, on Shakespeare, 2, 80, 100, 126, 169, and as referred to in the foot-notes; on Shakespeare's marriage, 72; on the "Sonnets," 327.
Knowell, Old, Shakespeare as, 238.
Knowle, Shakespeare there, 10.
Knowledge of Shakespeare, 386. *See* also Learning of, etc.
Koch, Prof., on the spelling of Shakespeare's name, 542.
König, W., on Shakespeare and Rabelais, and Giordano Bruno, etc., 304, 416.
Kurz, Hermann, on Shakespeare, 2, 178.
Kyd, Thomas, 137, 210.

Lamb, Charles, on Shakespeare, 442.
Lambert, Edmund, 68, 69.
—— John, his lawsuit with Shakespeare's father, 91, 167, 180.

Lancastrian method of teaching, origin of, 40.
Languages, English knowledge of, in Elizabeth's time, 375; modern, Shakespeare's knowledge of, *ib.*
Latin authors Englished in Shakespeare's time, 372; Shakespeare's knowledge of Latin, 368, *et. sq.*
Lawyer, or lawyer's clerk, was Shakespeare a? 85, 179, 184.
Learning, unproductive, Shakespeare's hatred of, 193.
—— of Shakespeare, the, 365, *et sq.*
Leicester, opposition to play-acting there, 1566-86, 58.
—— the Earl of, and the Ardens, 111; his company of players, 118, 125, 223, 248; and Shakespeare, 125.
Lessing on Shakespeare, 271, 453.
Lewin, John. *See* Lowin.
Lilly, John, 137, 209, 210.
—— William, his Latin Grammar, 39.
Line-end test of Shakespeare's text, 307.
Literary life, Shakespeare and, 480; literary work, temp. Eliz. and James I., 134.
"Locrine," 362.
Lodge, Thomas, and Shakespeare, 137, 315.
London, early maps of, 129, 213; foreigners in, temp. Eliz., 129; Lord Mayor and the actors, conflicts between, 222; in Shakespeare's time, 126, 146; Shakespeare's arrival in, 116; tavern life in, etc., 146; the theatres, 207, 211.
"London Prodigal, The," 359.
Love and friendship in the "Sonnets," 431.
"Lover's Complaint, The," 75, 329.
"Love's Labour's Lost," 333; also 36, 37, 319.
"Love's Martyr," Chester's. *See* "Phœnix and Turtle."
Lowin, John, actor, 240, 257.
"Lucrece," 316; also 119, 136, 175, 296, 312.
Lucy, Lady, 106.
—— Sir Thomas, and Shakespeare, 92, 93, 99, 115; his arms, 108; as Justice Shallow, 102, 108; Shakespeare's verses on him, 105.
—— Sir T., the yr., 378.
Luddington, 79.

"Macbeth," 351; also 196, 366, 426, 447, and foot-notes.
Madness, Shakespeare's delineations of, 400.
Maginn, Dr., on Farmer's essay on the Learning of Shakespeare, 365.
"Majesty's (Her and His) Servants," (the Players), 234.
Makart, Hans, his paintings, 314.
Malone, on Shakespeare, 6, 100, 104, 305; on Shakespeare's portraits, 562; he has the Stratford bust painted over, 557.
Manningham, John, 245.
Manuscripts, Shakespeare's, 295, 363, 516, 520, 521, 524. *See* also Autograph.
Marini's "Adone" and "Venus and Adonis," 136.
Marlowe, Christopher, and Shakespeare, 137, 210, 343, 455.
Marriage and "troth-plight" in Shakespeare's time, 77.
Marston, John, 138, 141, 301.
"Martin Marprelate" and the controversy raised by it, 207, 218.
Mask, death, of Shakespeare. *See* Death-mask.
Massey, Mr. Gerald, on the "Sonnets," 176, 323, 327.
"Master-mistress," the, of the "Sonnets," 433.
"Measure for Measure," 331; also 267, 446, and foot-notes.
Medical knowledge of Shakespeare, the 84, 399, etc.
—— schools in Shakespeare's day, 401.
Melancholy, Shakespeare's delineations of, 404.
"Merchant of Venice, The," 125, 334; also 446, and the notes.
Meres, Francis, on Shakespeare, 298; on the "Sonnets," 323.

Mermaid Club, the, 138, 147, 151, 292.
"Merry Devil of Edmonton, The," 363.
"Merry Old England," ended by the Puritans, 220.
"Merry Wives of Windsor, The," 330; also 37, 56, 107, 109, 112, 171, 382.
Metrical tests of the text, 307.
"Midsummer Night's Dream," 333; also 115, 178, 292.
Milton and Shakespeare, 292, 440, 489.
Miracle Plays, etc., 198.
Mitre tavern, the, 148.
Money lending, Shakespeare's, 182.
Montaigne, his influence upon Shakespeare, 454, 469, 511, 539.
Montgomery, Earl of, his patronage of Shakespeare, 177, 285, 559, 564.
Monument, Shakespeare's, at Stratford, 549.
Moralities and early plays, 62-65, 203, 218.
"More, Sir Thomas," R. Simpson on, 363.
Morris Dancing, 253.
MSS., Shakespeare's. *See* Manuscripts.
"Mucedorus," 363.
"Much Ado About Nothing," 267, 332.
Mulberry-tree, Shakespeare's, 531; Garrick's song on, 532.
Munday, Anthony, 138.
Music, Shakespeare and, 411; music and dancing in his time, *ib.*
Mysteries and Miracle Plays, 198.
Myths and superstitions, popular, in Shakespeare, 392.

Name, Shakespeare's, its spelling, 8, 188, 539.
Nash, Anthony, 486, 512, 525.
—— Edward, 528.
—— John, 512.
Nash, Thomas, dramatist, 85, 115, 141, 341, 343, 370, 424.
—— Thomas, husband of Shakespeare's grand-daughter, 514, 519, 523, 525, 528.
Nature, Shakespeare's knowledge of, 390.
Neil, Samuel, on Shakespeare, 80, 167; on the "Sonnets," 324.
Neumann, Prof., on Ophelia, 405.
New Place, Shakespeare's house, 165, 175, 180, 482, 527; in the time of the Civil War, 524; changes hands, 528; re-built, 529; pulled down by Gastrell, 531.
Newington Butts Theatre, 213, 234.
Nicholson, Dr. Brinsley, on the rhyme test, 308.
Niece, Shakespeare's, = his grand-daughter (Elizabeth Hall), 510.
Nonesuch House, 418.
Norris, J. P., on the Portraits of Shakespeare, 549.
Norton and Sackville, their "Gorboduc," 208.
Noverint = attorney's clerk, 86.

Objectivity, Shakespeare's extreme, 445, *et sq.*
"Oldcastle, Sir John," 360.
Oldys, on Shakespeare, 170.
Ophelia, 148; Prof. Neumann on, 405.
Orchestra, theatre, in Shakespeare's time, 230, 232.
Ostler, Wm., actor, 259.
"Othello," 125, 244, 354. *See* also under jealousy.
Oxford, Shakespeare at, 170.

Page, name in Stratford, 38.
Painter's "Palace of Pleasure," Shakespeare and, 42.
Painting, Shakespeare's knowledge of, 416.
Paper-making, German, in England in Elizabeth's time, 285.
Paris Garden, Southwark, 128.
"Passionate Pilgrim, The," 318, 427.
Patriotism, Shakespeare's, 473.
Peele, George, 137, 210.
Pembroke, Earl of, and Shakespeare,

177, 240, 285, 559, 564; and the "Sonnets," 321; his company of players, 223.
People, the common, Shakespeare and, 468.
"Pericles," 355; also 96, 164, 363; Dr. Furnivall on, 518.
Perkins Folio, the, and Mr. J. P. Collier, 6, 292. *See* also Folios.
Phillips, Augustine, actor, 252, 514.
Phillipps, Sir Thos., his Shakespeare discoveries, 165.
"Phœnix and the Turtle, The," 319.
Phœnix Theatre, 213.
Pickpockets caught at the theatre, 215.
Plague in Stratford at the time of Shakespeare's birth, 33. *See* also Stratford.
"Play of the Dead Volks," the, at Westminster Abbey, 551.
Playbills, 231.
Players, companies of, Alleyn's, 145; the Lord Chamberlain's, 145, 178, 193, 217; Children players, *see* Children; Henslowe's, 145; the King's, 193; their costume, 556; noblemen's companies, 59, 223. (*See* also under Leicester, Earl of; Admiral's, Lord; Worcester, Earl of, etc.); the Queen's, 59, 217, when called "Her Majesty's Servants," 234; the Players and the Master of the Revels, 257; and the theatre shareholders, disputes between, 240.
Playhouse Yard, Blackfriars, 212, 217.
Playhouses, 123, 129. *See* also Theatres, etc.
Plays, early, moralities, etc., 62-65; also 437; the Chester plays, 200; Corpus Christi, plays at Coventry, etc., 53, 200; Guild plays at York, etc., *ib.* plays in inn-yards, 222; plays succeeding the miracle plays and moralities, 205; plays in Stratford, etc., in Shakespeare's time, 57. *See* also Mysteries, Miracle Plays, etc.
Plays, Shakespeare's, the author's material for his works, sources of plots, etc., 302-5; chronological order of the plays, 305; the doubtful and spurious plays, 293, 297, 299, (*see* also Doubtful Plays); the plays curtailed in the acting, 233; those played in the author's lifetime, 243, 348, 355; the first prints of, 276; the Roman plays, 374; plays supposed to have been written after Shakespeare's retirement, 498; *see* also under separate heads, and under Histories, etc.
Plutarch, Shakespeare's (North's), 406, 467.
Poems, attributed to Shakespeare, 363; Shakespeare's: *see* under "Sonnets," "Venus and Adonis," etc.
Poetic faculty, Goethe and others on the, 271-73.
Politics, Shakespeare's, 193, 428, 467.
Pope, Thomas, actor, 254.
Portraits of Shakespeare, 548, *et sq.* *See* also Chandos, Droeshout, etc.
Printer, Shakespeare a, 86, 120, 398.
Printing House Square, site of the Blackfriars Theatre, 212.
Prologues, 232.
Property, Shakespeare's, 240, 481. *See* also under Stratford, etc.
Protestants and Catholics, Shakespeare between, 449, 454.
Prynne, his "Histrio-Mastix," 1633, attacking the players, 214, 221, 285.
Publishers, early, of Shakespeare's works, 276, 281, 285, 311, 316, 319.
Pulpit and stage in the Reformation period, 207.
"Puritan, The, or the Widow of Watling Street," 361, 461.
Puritanism, effects of, 3, 47; and Shakespeare, 3, 453, 456, 460; in Stratford, 490; suppression of theatres, etc., 3, 214, 220, 265. *See* also under Protestant, etc.
Quartos, of Shakespeare's plays, 277; also 280, 295, 311, 358, and under the separately named plays.

Queeny, Mrs. (? Quiney), 501.
Quin, the actor, on Shakespeare, 443.
Quiney, Adrian, 18, 25, 116.
—— Mrs. = Judith Shakespeare, 499, 504, 526.
—— Richard, 168, 181.
—— Thos., 499.

Rabelais, Shakespeare and, 304, 380.
Ramsford, Sir Henry, 504.
Raleigh, Sir Walter, 132.
"Ralph Roister Doister," 208.
Reardon, J. P., on "Venus and Adonis," 315.
Red Bull Theatre, 213.
Reformation, effects of, in England, 130, 453; effect of upon the English drama, 207; and Humanism, *ib.*
Relics, Shakespeare, 511, 531, 532, 533.
Religion, Shakespeare and, 439, *et sq.*
Restoration, the, the Drama at, 4; re-opening of the theatres at, 220; women first on the stage then, 218.
"Revels' Accounts," Cunningham's, unreliable, 194, 243.
Revels, The Master of the, 219, 223, 257.
Reverence, Shakespeare's inculcation of, 467.
Reynolds, Humfred, 18.
Rhyme tests of Shakespeare's text, 308.
Ribaldries in Shakespeare, 476.
Rice, John, actor, 266.
"Richard II.," 245, 338; and Queen Elizabeth, and Essex's rebellion, 243.
"Richard III.," 344, 447.
Richardson, John, 72, 74.
Roberts, Nicholas ap, 23.
Robinson, John, 512.
—— Mrs. Winifred, (formerly Burbage), 240, 265.
—— Richard, actor, 264.
Rodd, Thos., on the folios, 288.
Rogers, Philip, Shakespeare's suit against, 179, 183, 481.
Roman plays, the, 374.
Roman Catholic. *See* Catholic.
"Romeo and Juliet," 349.
Rose Theatre, 213.
Rowe, Nicholas, on Shakespeare, 5, 104, 124; on Ben Jonson, 153.
Rowley, Wm., 138.
Royalist, Shakespeare as a, 193, 469.
Rümelin, his attack on Shakespeare and the Drama, 198, 214, 273, 406, 407.
Russel, Thomas, 512.

Sachs, Hans, and Shakespeare, 125.
Sadler, Hamlet, 113, 116, 512.
—— John, 116.
—— Judith, 113.
St. Dunstan's Club, Ben Jonson's, 150,
St. Paul's, 128.
—— School, boy-actors of, 218.
Sandells, Fulk, 72, 74.
"Satiro-Mastix," Dekker's, 159, 163.
Scharf, Mr. George, on Shakespeare's portraits, 556.
Schiller, on Shakespeare, 423, 453.
Schlegel, on Shakespeare's medical knowledge, 400.
School, a, and school books in Shakespeare's time, 39.
Schoolmaster, Shakespeare a (?), 84.
Scotland, Shakespeare's alleged visit to, 126.
Scott, Sir Walter, his picture of Shakespeare in "Kenilworth," 34; Scott and Shakespeare, a parallel, 273, 394, 401, 428, 438, 444, 477, 480, 527, 555.
Sculpture, Shakespeare's allusions to, 416.
Sea, Shakespeare and the, 398.
"Sejanus," Jonson's, Shakespeare's share in it, 157, 195, 481.
Seneca, Shakespeare and the English, 96, 208, 374.
Shake-scene = Shakespeare, 142.
Shakespeare, Anne, the poet's sister, 30.
—— Anne, the poet's wife, 516; her supposed second marriage, *ib.* *See* also under Hathaway, Anne, and Shakespeare, marriage, etc.

Shakespeare, Edmund, the poet's brother, 31, 239.
—— Gilbert, the poet's brother, 29, 30, 481, 482.
—— Hamlet (or Hamnet), the poet's son, 112, 166, 180, 526.
—— Joan, the poet's two sisters so named, 29, 30, 510. *See* also Hart, Mrs.
—— John, the poet's father, 11; his occupation and position in Stratford, 16, 18, 24, 30, 90; becomes alderman, 24; forfeits that office, 90; his later life difficulties, 67, 89; his coat of arms, 186; his chancery suit, 167, 181; his religion, 457; his will a forgery, *ib.*
—— John, of Clifford, 91.
—— John, the shoemaker, 29, 91.
—— Judith, the poet's daughter, 112, 166; her marriage, 499, 503. *See* also Mrs. Quiney.
—— Margaret, the poet's sister, 29.
—— Mary (Mary Arden), the poet's mother, 481. *See* also Arden.
—— Richard, the poet's brother, 31.
—— Susanna, the poet's daughter, 73, 456. *See* also Hall, Mrs.
—— William, chief events in his life.—Birth and baptism, 29-33; boy and school life, 35-42, 67, 84; earliest writings, 309, 315, 499; marriage and relations with his wife, 8, 70, 72, 79, 80, 94, 164, 332, 433, 489, 512; removal to London, 102, 113, 164; career in London and at the theatres, 116, *et sq.;* alleged travels abroad, 124; retirement, 194, 309, 480; opposition to commons-enclosure in Stratford, 491; illness and death, 501, 502, 509. Other particulars; the doubts as to the facts of his life, 1, 489; his ancestors, 5, 9, 187; his good looks, 17, 34, 163; his portraits, 234, 548 (*see* also Portraits); education, 365; character, 5, 423, *et sq.*; alleged love intrigues, 171; his religion, 439 (*see* also Religion); his family and descendants, 28, 29, 166, 456, 489, 516 (*see* also the several names); his contemporaries and associates in London, 2, 116, 136 (*see* also their several names); his success in life and wealth, 172, 179, 240 (*see* also Property); the date and story of his death, 501-505; his grave and monument, 506 (*see* also Bust, etc.); his will, 173, 456, 505, 509, 527; as an actor (*see* Actor); as a man of business, 179, 436; the spelling of his name, 8, 188, 539; his two souls, 97; his conception of human nature, 423; his working life, 351; his work, 297 (*see* also Works, etc.); after his death—work to be done, 536; what Germany has done and is doing, *ib.* *See* also many separate headings, as Actor, Autograph, Birth-place, Crab-tree, Gloves, House, etc., etc., etc.
Shakespeare, others so named in Stratford, 28.
Shakespeare Hall, Knowle, 10.
Shakespeare Library, Birmingham, 535.
Shakespeare Society, 61, 71, 187.
Shakspere Society, New, 307, 348.
Shakespeare's Close at Hampton Lucy, 494.
Shallow, Justice, Sir Thos. Lucy, and, 102, 108.
Shancks, John, actor, 240, 265.
Sharp, Archbishop, and Shakespeare, 442.
—— Thomas, and the mulberry-tree, 531.
Shaw, Julian, 486, 512.
Shawe, Ralph, "woll-dryver," 93.
Shops, London, 127,
Shoreditch, actors in, 250, 256, 262; theatres there, 211.
Short-hand, and the earliest prints of Shakespeare's plays, 277, 278.
Shottery, Stratford, 74.
Shylock, 130.
Sidney, Sir P., 136; his funeral, 131.
Simpson, Richard, on Shakespeare, 88, 331, 457; his "School of Shakspere," 219, 301, 544; his word test, 348.

Sincklow, or Sincklo, actor, 267.
Sly, William, actor, 255, 256.
Smith, Miss L. Toulmin, her account of the "York Plays," 201, 202.
Smith, W. H., and the Baconian theory, 270.
Smithfield, 128.
Smoking, Shakespeare's silence on, 128.
Soldier, was Shakespeare a? 29, 34, 125.
Somnambulism, Shakespeare's picture of, 404.
Southampton, Earl of, and Shakespeare, 96, 133, 145, 564; his alleged gift to the poet of £1,000, 174, 182; his imprisonment, 190; supposed letters of his, 175, 247; and Elizabeth Vernon, 327; and Shakespeare's portrait, 559, 561; and the "Sonnets," 176, 321.
Southwark, 128; Shakespeare in, 183.
Sonnet-poetry, 431.
Sonnets of Shakespeare's time and since, 327.
"Sonnets," Shakespeare's, 320, 424; also, 34, 67, 75, 80, 88, 95, 136, 162, 167, 176, 190, 224, 319, 328, 427, 428.
Spalding, Prof. W., on "The Two Noble Kinsmen."
Spanish Armada, the, Shakespeare and, 131; the Catholics and, *ib.*
Spanish language in England, temp. Eliz., 383.
Spanish, translations from the, in Shakespeare's time, 384.
Spedding on "Henry VIII.," 307.
Spelling, of Shakespeare's name, 8, 539 *et sq.;* careless spelling of the time, 541.
Spenser and Shakespeare, 120, 136, 138, 427.
Spielmann and his paper-mills at Dartford, 285.
Sportsman, Shakespeare as a, 392. *See* also Hunting, etc.
Spurious plays. *See* Doubtful.
Stage, early English, accounts of, 198; stage and pulpit in the Reformation period, 207; temp. Eliz. and James I., 134; Shakespeare's retirement from the, 480, 498. *See* also Drama, Players, Theatre, etc.
Stationer's entries, Registers 305.
Staunton, Howard, his "Memorials of Shakespeare," 540.
Steelyard, the, 417; drinking at, 147.
Steevens, his biography of Shakespeare, 1; on the portraits, 562.
Stevens, Henry, on the folios, 288.
Sturley, Abraham, 181, 182.
Stratford-upon-Avon, 1-115, 480-537; Chapel of the Guild there, 44; the church, 29, 44, 506; environs, 99, 167; fevers in Stratford, 502, 525; the fire there, 1614, 4, 448; Grammar School, 35, 44, 85, 486; inns of, 60; and the Lucy's, 106; Stratford men with Shakespeare in London, 118; the plague at Stratford, 33; plays, etc. there, 57; Puritanism in, plays prohibited, 1612, 490; the "decay" of Stratford, 90; the parish register there, records missing, 29, 67; the Shakespeare Jubilee of 1769, 532; the tercentenary celebration of 1864, 535; the theatres, old and new, 535; Shakespeare's father and his family at Stratford, 1-115; the poet's boyhood there, 42; Camden's account of the town, 43; Shakespeare's flight from, 114, 116; his return, 196, 309, 480, 498; his journeys from the town to London, 166, 167, 169; his property in the town, 175, 180, 184, 511; he purchases the tithes of the town, 183; his death, grave, monument, etc. there, 505-537; purchase of the Shakespeare lands for the public, 535; Yarranton's improvements in the town, 533. *See* also Avon, Warwickshire, etc.
Supernumeraries and actors, 223.
Superstitions, popular, alluded to by Shakespeare, 392.

Surnames, appelative, 543, 546; variations in spelling them, 541.
Surrey, Earl of, 136.
Sussex, Earl of, his company of actors, 223.
Swan Theatre, Bankside, 213.

Talbot in "Henry VI.," 344.
Talma, the, portrait of Shakespeare, 569.
"Taming of the Shrew, The," 125, 336; also 39, 56, 97, 230.
Tarleton, Richard, actor, 212, 224, 233, 248.
Tavern life in Shakespeare's time, 146, 148, 168. *See* also Apollo, Mitre, etc.
Taylor, John, portrait of Shakespeare attributed to him, 561.
Taylor, Joseph, actor, 258; also 240, 263, 559, 561.
"Tempest, The," 329; also 133, 189, 468.
Temple, Middle, performance of "Twelfth Night" there, 245.
Text, the, of Shakespeare, 7, 299, 307, 308, 343, 348, 358. *See* also under Folios, Quartos, Metrical tests, etc.
Thames, the, 127, 130.
Theatre, the, in England, 198, *et sq.*; the classical and the national, 208, 213, *See* also Drama, etc.
—— The, Shoreditch, 211.
Theatres, earliest in London, 207, 211; charges and expenses of, 241; costumes of, 227; internal arrangements, 215, 226, 230; prices of admission, etc., 215; private theatres, 216; theatres at the Restoration, 220; Royal patronage, 193; scenic arrangements, etc., 226; suppression of during the Commonwealth, 3. *See* also under Blackfriars Theatre, Globe Theatre, Players, etc.
Thornbury, Walter, on Shakespeare's religion, 463.
Tieck, on Shakespeare, 97; on the doubtful plays, 299; on "King John," 338.
"*Times, The*," 212.
Timmin, Mr. Samuel, his facsimile quartos, 352.
"Timon of Athens," 189, 350.
"Titus Andronicus," 348; also 66, 96, 362.
Tobacconists' shops, 128.
Tooley, Nicholas, actor, 261.
"Towneley Mysteries, The," 202.
Tragedies, the, 189.
Tragedy, the first English, 208.
Travelling, temp. Eliz., 168.
"Troilus and Cressida," 138, 346.
"Troth-plight" and marriage in Shakespeare's time, 77.
Tschischwitz, Baron, on Shakespeare's royalism, 470.
"Twelfth Night," 337, 403; at the Temple, 245.
Twins, Shakespeare's, 332.
"Two Gentlemen of Verona," 330.
"Two Noble Kinsmen, The," 300, 543.

Udall, Nicholas, 208.
Ulrici, on Shakespeare, 80, 306; on "Pericles," 356.
Underhill, Wm. 484.
Underwood, John, actor, 261.
Upton, John, on Shakespeare's learning, 366.
Usury in Shakespeare's time, 182.

Vautrollier, printer, 120, 311.
Venice, was Shakespeare ever in? 125.
"Venus and Adonis," 311; also 75, 96, 119, 136, 175, 178, 296.
Vernon, Elizabeth, and Lord Southampton, 327.
Voltaire, on Shakespeare, 443.

"W. H." of the "Sonnets," 176, 321, 325, 438, 514.
"W. S." in Yates' "Castell of Courtesie," 115.
Wakefield, early plays at, 201.
Walker, Sir Edward, buys New Place, 528.
—— Henry, 184, 539.
—— Wm., 481, 512.
Ward, Rev. John, and his Diary, 498, 501, 504.

Warner, Wm. 120.
Warwick, Queen Elizabeth's visit to, 168.
—— Earl of, his company of actors, 223.
—— Castle and the Earls, 49.
Warwickshire and Shakespeare, 48.
Warwickshire men in London with Shakespeare, 118, 120, 122.
Wax figures at Westminster Abbey, 551.
Webster, John, 138.
Welcome Fields, Stratford, the attempt to enclose, and Shakespeare's opposition to it, 491.
Welshmen in Stratford at Shakespeare's time, 37.
Westminster, player children of, 218.
—— Abbey, wax figures there, 551.
Whattcott, Robert, 512.
Wheler, R. B., his "Account of the Birthplace," etc., 26, 27.
White, R. Grant, on Shakespeare, 80.
Whitefriars Theatre, 213.
Whitehall, theatricals at, 217, 246, 331.
Whittington, Thos., his will, 164.
"Widow of Watling Street, The." *See* "Puritan."
Wilkinson. *See* Tooley, Nicholas.
"Will, my Lord of Leicester's jesting player," 125.
Willis, R., his account of the old play "The Cradle of Security," 60; his account of a school (at Gloucester) in Shakespeare's time, 39.
Wilson, John, actor and singer, 267.
"Winter's Tale, The," 41, 171, 337.
Wise, G., on Shakespeare, 80; on Shakespeare's autograph, etc., 541.
Wivell, Abraham, on Shakespeare's portraits, etc., 549, 563.
Women first on the stage, 218.
Wood, A. À., on Shakespeare, 166, 170.
Woodstock, 169.
Wool dealer, Shakespeare's father as a, 19, 22.
Worcester, Earl of, Shakespeare and, 54; his company of players, 58, 59, 223.
Word tests of the text, 348.
Words used by Shakespeare, 389.
Wordsworth, Bp., his defence of Shakespeare against Bowdler, 441.
Works, Shakespeare's, 270, *et. sq.* *See* also under Plays, etc., and the titles of the several works; earliest prints of, 276, etc: *see* also Quartos, Folios, etc., bibliography, 277, *et. sq.* *See* also Shakespeare's Conception of Human Nature.
Wörlitz copy of the Jansen portrait, the, 567.
Wyat, Sir Thomas, 136.

Yarranton, Andrew, his projects for improving Stratford, 533.
Yates, James, his "Castell of Courtesie," 115.
Yeomanry, in Shakespeare's time, 21.
York, early plays at, 201.
"Yorkshire Tragedy, A," 361.

Zincke's bellows portrait of Shakespeare, 569.

CHISWICK PRESS:—C. WHITTINGHAM AND CO., TOOKS COURT, CHANCERY LANE.

PR
2897
E613

Elze, Karl
William Shakespeare

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY