the Cambridge editors it differs from the Quarto for the worse in forty-seven places, yet according to the same critics differs for the better in twenty places. "We feel," says Dr. Garnett, "that *Hamlet* expresses more of Shakespeare's inner mind than any other of his works, and is the most likely of any to have been subjected to close revision." Among other things, as the same writer points out, "one trifling circumstance indicates revision; the alteration of *twelve* years, given in the First Quarto as the period for which Yorick's skull had been interred, to twenty-three, upon Shakespeare's remarking that he had made Hamlet a man of thirty"!

Whether, then, the Folio *Hamlet* is really to be looked upon as an abridgment for the stage, or whether, in spite of the omission of certain "purple patches," it is to be regarded as the result of the author's final revision, and therefore as "absolute in its numbers as he conceived it,"[1] may, as it seems to me, still be considered a question open to argument. But the point is that the play was "recast" and "revised"; and not only this, but many other plays. Thus *Romeo and Juliet* was "re-written"; *King Henry the Fifth* "is hardly less than transformed"; *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, in the original version of which "there was not," says Mr. Swinburne, "a note of poetry from end to end," is re-written till it becomes "the bright light interlude of fairyland child's play, which might not unfittingly have found place even within the moon-charmed circle of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*." Other plays were treated in similar fashion, and, says Mr. Swinburne, "there is not one of his contemporaries whom we can reasonably imagine capable of the patience and self-respect which induced Shakespeare to re-write the triumphantly popular parts of Romeo, of Falstaff, and of Hamlet, with

[1] This expression, as Judge Webb points out, is Pliny's "liber numeris omnibus absolutus"—a quite Jonsonian adaptation. And see Petronius Arbiter quoted at p. 486 n.

an eye to the literary perfection and performance of work which, in its first outlines, had won the crowning suffrage of immediate and spectacular applause."

In the light of all this patient revision and re-writing, the absurdity of the manuscripts without "a blot" stands very clearly revealed. But how does it square with the theory that Shakespeare sold his plays to the company once for all, and preserved no manuscripts? Are we to suppose that he was called in from time to time to revise his plays at the theatre? But this would only be required, as Mr. Lee suggests, in case of the "revival" of a piece, and such a theory is absolutely at variance with Mr. Swinburne's judgment that the successive revisions were made not for the stage, but for the study—not for present profit, but for posterity. Here again we have an interesting and edifying instance of contradictory beliefs among our Stratfordian instructors.[1]

[1] "If," writes Judge Webb, "it was Shakspere who recast *Hamlet*, who re-wrote *Romeo and Juliet*, who renovated and transformed *Henry the Fifth*, who enriched and ennobled the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, who tempered and enriched *The Taming of the Shrew*, and who with consummate skill touched up the three plays which form the Trilogy of *Henry the Sixth*; if it was the Player who, to increase their value for the study, deliberately impaired their fitness for the stage; if, in fine, it was the Player who was resolved to make them worthy of himself and of his future students; if all this be admitted, the inevitable question rises, Why did the Player fail to publish what he had so laboriously prepared for publication? He was in the full possession of his powers. In his retirement he had ample leisure. He had no reason for concealment or disguise. If he was indifferent to fame, admittedly he was not indifferent to money," etc. Mr. Lee's answer would be, as I gather, the Player did not publish because he had sold all his rights to the company. But then we are confronted with two difficulties. First, all this revision could only have been done, from time to time, at the theatre, as Shakspere was called upon to revise pieces for revival; and, secondly, we must reject the belief, so forcibly upheld by Mr. Swinburne, that the author revised for the study. If, on the other hand, we adopt the reasonable belief that Shakespeare worked on his own manuscripts, at his own times, and in his own chamber—that he had some appreciation of his own greatness, and wrote for posterity as well as for his own generation—then does it become increasingly hard to believe that the Player who died without book or manuscript of any sort (whether poem or drama) was the Shakespeare of immortality.

But, however this may be, surely it will now be conceded that it is reasonable to hold that Shakespeare was *not* indifferent to the fate of his works; that he did *not* write for "gain" only and not for "glory"; that he revised his plays again and again, not simply for the stage, but for the student; that he recognised, among other things, the greatness of his own *Hamlet*, and laboured "to make it worthy of himself and future students"—in a word that he was not a monstrous exception to all the known rules of human nature, but that, immortal genius as he was, he recognised that his works were worthy of immortality. But if this eminently reasonable view be accepted, then does it become ever increasingly difficult to identify this Shakespeare with the Player who retired to Stratford about 1611, leaving some twenty plays, and among them some of his very finest, unpublished, and, apparently, taking no interest in their fate.

Let us consider the strange case of *King Richard III.* This play was first published anonymously in 1597. "In the following year a second edition appeared, ascribed on the title-page to 'William Shake-speare.' Then followed a third edition in 1602; a fourth in 1605; a fifth in 1612; and a sixth in 1622. The changes made in these successive editions were not important; but when the Folio appeared in 1623 some very marked improvements had been effected in the text. Mr. Richard Grant White says that these additions and corrections are 'undeniable evidence that the copy in question had been subjected to carefullest revision at the hands (it seems to me beyond a doubt) of Shakespeare himself, by which it gained much smoothness and correctness and lost no strength. In minute beauties of rhythm, in choice of epithets, and in the avoidance of bald repetition, the play was greatly improved by this revision,' and was 'evidently from the perfecting hand of the author in the maturity of his powers.'"[1]

this is very important. an account of the dates.

note this

[1] I have taken this extract from Mr. Edwin Reed's *Francis Bacon our Shakespeare*, p. 117.

To the same effect write the Cambridge editors: "Passages which in the Quarto are complete and consecutive are amplified in the Folio, the expanded text being quite in the manner of Shakespeare. The Folio, too, contains passages not in the quartos, which, though not necessary to the sense, yet harmonise so well, in sense and tone, with the context, that we can have no hesitation in attributing them to the author himself."

The question, then, arises, when was all this revising done—when were these new passages supplied "by the author himself"? The Stratfordian answer must be that all this work was done by Shakespeare, from time to time, before the spring of 1616, and probably before 1611, when, according to Mr. Lee, he "permanently settled at New Place."[1] But what had he to work upon, since, after selling his play to the company, he did not preserve his manuscript? Well, of course, there was always the "prompt-copy" at the theatre, so we are driven to suppose that he worked upon this, and thus, through Messrs. Heminge and Condell, this revised theatrical manuscript of *Richard III* (e.g.) came into the possession of the publishers of the Folio, having been inaccessible to Mathew Lawe, of St. Paul's Churchyard, who reissued this play in 1605, 1612, and 1622.

But here we are confronted with a rather curious fact. It appears that there were twelve printer's errors peculiar to the Quarto of 1622, and these all reappear in the Folio version of 1623. It follows from this that the editors of the Folio, instead of working on a manuscript, worked on the Quarto of 1622, and somehow omitted to correct the printer's errors of that Quarto. Is not the natural conclusion that "some person unknown" took the Quarto of 1622, revised it, added the new passages, and thus put it into the form in which it appeared in 1623? If so Mr. Reed has warrant for his assertion that "the changes in the

[1] As to "Shakespeare revising Shakespeare" at New Place, see p. 194 n.

play, comprising one hundred and ninety-three new lines and nearly two thousand retouched, were made by the author himself in 1622–3," some seven years after Shakspere's death!

this is the point.

The case of *Othello* is very remarkable. This great tragedy was not printed in any form during the lifetime of Shakspere, but six years after his death, viz. in 1622, it was published by Thomas Walkley. In 1623 a new version appeared in the Folio, not only with 160 new lines, but also with numerous and important emendations!

important—

The second and third parts of *Henry VI* were published in 1594 and 1595 under the titles, respectively, of "The First part of the Contention betwixt the two famous houses of Yorke and Lancaster," etc., and "The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of York, and the death of good King Henrie the Sixt," etc. Second editions of both appeared in 1600; and in 1619, three years after Shakspere's death, a third edition was published of the two plays together—"The Whole Contention betweene the two Famous Houses, Lancaster and Yorke etc. . . . Divided into two Parts and newly corrected and enlarged. Written by *William Shakespeare*, Gent." In the Folio of 1623 these same plays "appear under new titles, and the Second part now contained 1578 new lines and is otherwise much altered."[1]

note this

The Merry Wives of Windsor was issued in 1602, and was reprinted in 1619, three years after Shakspere's death. In the Folio of 1623 the play appears as a new and greatly enlarged version, with the number of lines increased from 1620 to 2701, the Folio version thus becoming nearly twice as long as that of the Quarto; and there are numerous emendations introduced. The case of *Richard II* equally deserves careful consideration. "This great play was first published anonymously in 1597. A second

[1] Bompas, *Problem of the Shakespeare Plays*, p. 100. As to the Trilogy of *Henry VI*, see chap. v.

edition, substantially a reprint, but with the name of 'William Shake-speare' as author on the title-page, followed in 1598; a third, with the famous deposition scene added to it, in 1608; and a fourth in 1615." (Edwin Reed, *Francis Bacon our Shakespeare*, p. 106.) The next appearance of the play was in the Folio of 1623. Now it is clear that the editor of the Folio based his version on the Fourth Quarto (1615). As Dr. Furnivall writes: "There is no doubt on this point; the quarto errors which have crept into the Folio text, and which prove its connection with the quarto version, are clearly traceable to quarto four as their immediate source." But nevertheless the Folio version, though based on this Quarto text, and repeating these errors which were peculiar to it, does not simply follow it, but contains many additions and improvements. The natural and reasonable supposition, surely, is that these were made subsequently to 1615. If so, by whom? William Shakspere had retired to Stratford in 1611 at the latest, and probably before that date. In 1611, says Mr. Lee (p. 208), he had abandoned dramatic composition. He died in April, 1616. The Stratfordian editors are driven to assume hypothetical MSS. which somehow had not been made use of in the four previous editions throughout.

There are many other instances of the revision and rewriting of the Shakespearean dramas, some of which appear in the Folio as practically new compositions. When was it done, and by whom? The orthodox hypothesis that it was done by Shakspere, from time to time, for the theatre, the manuscripts being left with the company or (in the case of not a few of the "transcripts") having found their way into the hands of "private owners," from whom they were purchased by the publishers of the Folio, seems, when closely examined, not a credible one. Is it not a more natural solution that "Shakespeare" himself revised his works for publication, and that some part,

at any rate, of this revision was done after 1616 and before 1623?

One more observation upon Mr. Lee's theory as to the sources from which the Folio was compiled. According to this hypothesis Shakspere had made over all right in his manuscripts to "the acting company to which he attached himself." It was, then, the company, and not Messrs. Heminge and Condell, who owned the manuscripts, viz. the limited number of "prompt-copies" that remained "in the repertory of the theatre" in 1623. One would have expected, therefore, that the Folio volume would have been, as Judge Webb says, "accredited by the proprietors of the theatres with which Shakspere was connected." But such was not the case. The two players, who were put forward as the nominal editors, were not even managers. They were "doubtless," as Cuthbert Burbage described them, "deserving men," but they seem to have been quite insignificant personages. It has already been remarked that although, in the Jonsonian Preface "to the great variety of Readers," words are put into their mouths which seem to imply that they "received" the manuscripts from Shakespeare himself, yet both in this Preface and the Epistle dedicatory they tell us that they have "collected" the plays. But of this we may be sure, viz. that neither the proprietors of the theatre nor the owners of the transcripts "in private hands" would have parted with the documents in their possession without being paid for them. As Judge Webb reminds us: "When the collected edition of the Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher was published in 1647, the Stationer in his address to the Reader says:—

"'Twere vain to mention the chargeableness of this work; for those who owned the manuscripts too well knew their value to make a cheap estimate of any of these pieces.'"[1]

We may be sure that the owners of the Shakespeare

[1] We are told that the dramatist Shirley contributed this "address to the Reader."

manuscripts "well knew their value" also. Who, then, found the money to purchase them? According to Mr. Lee, the "syndicate" of printers and publishers who brought out the volume, at the head of whom stood William Jaggard, the printer, who "as the piratical publisher of *The Passionate Pilgrim* had long known the commercial value of Shakespeare's work."[1] Thus, then, finally disappear poor Heminge and Condell, with the unblotted manuscripts showing the easiness with which Shakespeare knocked off such "trifles" (so the Epistle dedicatory styles the plays) as *Hamlet* and *Macbeth!* Of this faith it may, surely, be now said (*pace* Mr. Willis, K.C.) "nec pueri credunt, nisi qui nondum aere lavantur." It is pretty clear that if the editors of the Folio had, indeed, any blotless manuscripts before them, they must have been, as Mr. R. L. Stevenson suggests, "fair copies," and, if such they had, it would be interesting to know who supplied them. But for how much mythology has that statement of the manuscript without a blot been responsible!

On the other hand, if we accept Mr. Lee's theory of the syndicate, and the threefold source from which the Folio was compiled, we must accept the proposition that Shakespeare "wrote for the stage and not for the study," in direct contradiction to Mr. Swinburne's assertion that the poet revised his works "for the closet" and not for the stage—and not only in contradiction to Mr. Swinburne, as it seems to me, but also to reason and common sense, for we must shut our eyes to the evidence afforded by these constant, careful, and minute revisions, and we must accept that belief, "of all vulgar errors the most wanton, the most wilful, and the most resolutely tenacious of life," that "he wrote 'for gain, not glory,'" and thought no more of his dramatic works after he had been duly paid for them.

There is, of course, another hypothesis. It is that

[1] Lee's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 250.

Shakespeare did not die in 1616; that Shakspere's second-best bedstead "was not Shakespeare's bedstead"; that "Shakespeare" had been adopted as a *nom de plume*[1] by a man of that transcendent genius, universal culture, world-wide philosophy, and unapproached dramatic powers which Shakespeare's works prove to have been among the attributes of their creator; a man moving in Court circles, among the highest of his day (as assuredly Shakespeare must have moved), who, for reasons not difficult to conceive, wished to conceal his identity. This hypothesis, which it is the fashion to ascribe to the morbid imagination of wild fanaticism, seems to me, I confess, an extremely reasonable one, far more so, in fact, than the faith, beset on every side with countless difficulties and mutually destructive theories, which, surrendering its reason to the high priests of the established and endowed literary church, is content to accept these immortal works as, one may almost say, the *Parerga* of a provincial player, thrown off with ease, "as an eagle may moult a feather or a fool may break a jest."

Supposing that there was such an author as I have suggested, he may well have conceived the idea of publishing a collected edition of the plays which had been written under the name of Shakespeare, and being himself busy with other matters, he may have entrusted the business to some "literary man," to some "good pen," who was at the time doing work for him; and why not to the man who wrote the commendatory verses, the "Lines to the Reader" (opposite to the engraving), and, as seems certain, the Preface "to the great variety of Readers"? It was necessary, of course, to come to an arrangement with the book-

or "he had"?— what of "Titus Andronicus"?

[1] I prefer this old expression to the now more fashionable "pseudonym." *Nom de plume* means a name adopted to write under, and not for other purposes; whereas a "pseudonym" may be employed as a general *alias*, and still seems to many to bear with it some lurking suggestion of false pretence. Whether or not the French ever use, or used, the expression *nom de plume* seems to me quite immaterial.

sellers who owned most of the "copies" of the plays already entered in the Stationers' Registry; nor would theatrical manuscripts, such as "prompt-copies," giving the dramas in the forms which they had assumed in the process of evolution on the stage and adaptation to its requirements, have been neglected by any sensible editor. In the case of at least sixteen of the plays there were the already printed quartos to work upon. In other cases, if the author had been careless about keeping copies of his manuscripts, these would have to be collected from the theatre or from private persons (possibly "grand possessors") by purchase or otherwise. Then there were the twenty plays which had not as yet seen the light in printed form. These, "so many as not formerly entered to other men," would have now to be entered,[1] and the book would, of course, have to be published by a member, or members, of the Stationers' Company. If only the manuscripts of these sixteen plays, including the *Tempest* (the poet's last drama in which the magician announced his intention to break his staff, and to drown his book), had been preserved to us, possibly they might have thrown a flood of light upon the circumstances in which the work was produced.

But however this may have been, one thing is now certain, viz. that the statement to which the two players put their signatures is discredited. "Clearly they wished to suggest," says Mr. Lee, "that the printers worked exclusively from Shakespeare's undefiled autograph," and clearly this was not the fact. Moreover, as the Cambridge editors write, "as the 'setters forth' are thus convicted of a 'suggestio falsi' in one point, it is not improbable that they may have been guilty of the like in another." Meantime those who have waxed so indignant at the idea of accusing the worthy players, or good "old Ben," of being guilty of "telling a lie" may surely calm themselves.

[1] They were entered to Blount and Isaac Jaggard on November 8th, 1623, as above mentioned.

A lie, as Dr. Johnson has told us, is "a criminal falsehood," i.e. an unjustifiable falsehood; but though truth must certainly be the general rule of conduct, there are, as everybody knows, many falsehoods that are justifiable, some that it is actually a duty to tell. Sir Walter Scott, we are told, thought it perfectly justifiable for a writer who wished to preserve his anonymity, to deny, when questioned, the authorship of a work, since the interrogator had no right to put such a question to him. One need not doubt that those who republished the plays which had been issued under the *nom de plume* of "Shakespeare" or "Shake-speare" thought themselves perfectly justified in so doing. As to the players, they merely acquiesced in their signatures being affixed to the preface written by the "literary man" according to the usual custom.

That the name "Shakespeare" had been used as a convenient pseudonym is a mere matter of fact. Plays, and poems too, had been published in that name which nobody now considers to have been written by the author of *Hamlet*, and seven of these, viz. *Pericles*, *The London Prodigal*, *The History of Thomas Lord Cromwell*, *Sir John Oldcastle*, *The Puritan Widow*, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, and *The Tragedy of Locrine*, were actually included among Shakespeare's works by the editors of the 1664 Folio, in spite of the fact that the 1623 volume professed to be a collection of "The works of William Shakespeare, containing *all* his Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, truely set forth according to their first original." Of these plays *Pericles*, as Judge Webb says (p. 82 n.), "had been published in quarto in 1609, and 1611, and 1619, and it had been published as by Shakespeare. Its omission in the [First] Folio, therefore, must have been a deliberate act, and not a default occasioned by any difficulty in finding or obtaining the original of the play." The name of Shakespeare appeared in full on the title-pages of *The Life of Oldcastle* in 1600, of *The London Prodigal* in 1605, and of *The York-*

And what of the inclusion of "Titus A." and of the Trilogy?

shire Tragedy; while plays like *Locrine, Thomas Lord Cromwell,* and *The Puritan Widow* appeared under the initials "W. S."

A word now as to the printers of the Shakespeare plays previously to 1623. Mr. Lee tells us (p. 247) that "only two of Shakespeare's works—his narrative poems *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*—were published with his sanction and co-operation," and of the sixteen pre-existent "quarto" plays he tells us (p. 254) that they were "surreptitiously and imperfectly printed," and as to William Jaggard, Mr. Lee describes him as "a well-known pirate publisher." These statements, says Mr. Bompas (p. 101), seem at least exaggerated. For "James Roberts, who printed the quartos of *The Merchant of Venice, Midsummer Night's Dream,* and the *Hamlet* of 1604, enjoyed for nearly twenty years the privilege, under license from the Stationers' Company, of printing the playbills, a privilege he could scarcely have retained had he habitually pirated plays against the will of the author and players, and in defiance of the rules of the Stationers' Company." I do not think, however, that there is much force in this. All that the Stationers' Company was concerned with was to see that nothing was published without their licence, and this J. Roberts was careful to obtain. There is nothing to show that he acted in defiance of the rules of the company.[1] As to the Jaggards, Mr. Bompas writes: "The Jaggard family, John, William, Isaac, and E. Jaggard, were among the chief printers of London. William Jaggard was appointed in 1611 printer to the City of London; and in 1613 the Jaggards bought James Roberts' business. They also published four editions of Bacon's *Essays* in 1606, 1612, 1613, and 1624. William Aspley and John Smethwick

[1] The 1600 Quarto of *The Merchant of Venice* was duly registered on July 22nd, 1598, with the *proviso* "that it be not printed by the said James Roberts or any other whatsoever without licence first had from the Right Honorable the Lord Chamberlain." See chapter X on "Sixteenth-Century Copyright."

had each published two of the Shakespeare quartos.[1] It is not likely that Ben Jonson would select as publishers or printers of the Shakespeare Folio men notorious for having pirated the plays." This argument, however, supposes that the author of the plays had really objected to the publication of these quartos: which seems very doubtful indeed.

Meantime we may just note in passing, and for what it is worth, that the noble Lords, to whom this Folio of 1623 was dedicated, were both friends of Bacon; that the Jaggards, the printers, had published four editions of Bacon's *Essays;* that Jonson, who was so closely concerned in the publication of the Folio, had become Bacon's friend and literary assistant, and one of the "good pens," as Archbishop Tenison tells us, who aided him in translating his works into Latin; and that in 1621 Jonson was staying with Bacon at Gorhambury and wrote a sonnet in praise of his sixtieth birthday. But, no doubt, that way madness lies!

Of the engraving by Martin Droeshout and the lines by Jonson and others prefixed to the Folio volume I have spoken elsewhere.

[1] Both William Aspley and John Smethwick were members of the syndicate whose names figure on the Folio colophon.

CHAPTER X

SIXTEENTH-CENTURY COPYRIGHT

IT is very necessary to consider the law of copyright in Elizabethan times. It is sometimes said that there was no such law in the sixteenth century. Thus Mr. Lee writes (p. 45 n.): "In the absence of any law of copyright, publishers often defied the wishes of the owner of manuscripts." And in his Preface to the Folio Facsimile he expands this as follows: "The theatrical manager viewed the publication of plays as injurious to his interests, and until a play had wholly exhausted its popularity on the stage he deprecated its appearance in print. But however indifferent the Elizabethan dramatist was to the reading public, and however pronounced were the manager's objections to the publication of plays, there developed among playgoers and others at the close of the sixteenth century a wish to peruse, in private, dramas that had achieved success in the theatre. Publishers quickly sought to gratify this desire for their own ends. *In the absence of any statutory prohibition they freely enjoyed the right of publishing any manuscript, whatever might be the channel through which it reached their hands, provided that they purchased a licence for its publication of the Stationers' Company.*[1] At times failure on the part of an author to keep his manuscripts in safe custody, at times the venality of an amanuensis, rendered manuscript

[1] But, as we shall presently see (p. 304), no person was allowed to print "any book or anything for sale or traffic" unless he was himself a member of the Stationers' Company.

literature accessible to the publisher without the author's personal intervention. In such circumstances it was not the publisher's habit to consult an author about the publication of his work, and in the case of plays it was the rule rather than the exception for the manuscript to reach the publishers through other hands than those of the dramatist. The publisher was, moreover, wont to ignore the claim to ownership in a play that was set up by the theatrical manager who had bought it of the writer."[1]

It will be seen therefore, that, according to Mr. Lee, if a publisher, in Shakespearean times, got hold of a manuscript which had been stolen from the custody of the author—say if he bought it from a thief, or from a "venal amanuensis"—there was no law to restrain him from publishing it for his own profit, in spite of the protests of the author, so long as he obtained the necessary licence from the Stationers' Company.

I hope, and I will endeavour to show, that this is not an accurate statement of the law of England in the times referred to.

It will be observed that though Mr. Lee in the first of the above extracts speaks of "the absence of any law of copyright," in the second extract he limits this general statement by speaking of "the absence of any statutory prohibition"; and he assumes that if there were no such statutory prohibition there was no law to prevent the publisher from acting in the unscrupulous manner supposed. Mr. Lee does not seem to have considered whether such iniquitous proceedings would have been allowed by the common law of England. Yet it has been held over and over again in our courts that an author has a right at common law to prevent the publication by another of his manuscript without his permission. "The term 'copyright,'" as Baron Parke said in the case of *Jefferys* v. *Boosey* (4 H.L.C. 920), "may be understood in two different senses.

[1] Preface to First Folio Facsimile, p. xi. The italics are mine.

The author of a literary composition, which he commits to paper belonging to himself, has an undoubted right at common law to the piece of paper on which his composition is written, and to the copies which he chooses to make of it for himself and others. If he lends a copy to another his right is not gone; if he sends it to another under an implied undertaking that he is not to part with it, or publish it, he has a right to enforce that undertaking. The other sense of that word is the exclusive right of multiplying copies; the right of preventing all others from copying, by printing or otherwise, a literary work which the author has published. This must be carefully distinguished from the other sense of the word."

As to copyright in the first sense of the word, the law is thus stated in Mr. Copinger's well-known work on the subject (Third Edition, p. 7): "Every man has the right *at common law* to the first publication of his own manuscript; it cannot without his consent be even seized by his creditors as property. He has, in fact, supreme control over his own productions, and may either exclude others from their enjoyment or may dispose of them as he pleases. He may limit the number of persons to whom they shall be imparted and impose such restrictions as he pleases upon their use."

In the celebrated case of *Millar* v. *Taylor* (4 Burrows 2303), which was decided in the time of Lord Mansfield, the law on this point was thus stated by Mr. Justice Yates.[1] "Most certainly the sole proprietor of any copy may determine whether he will print it or not. If any person takes it to the press without his consent, he is certainly a trespasser; though he came by it by legal means, as by loan or devolution; for he transgresses the bounds of his trust, and therefore is a trespasser. . . . Ideas are free,

[1] This learned judge dissented from the judgment of the majority of the court on certain other points, but the judges were unanimous on the point of the common-law right of an author to the first printing of his manuscript.

but while the author confines them to his study, they are like birds in a cage, which none but he can have a right to let fly; for till he thinks proper to emancipate them, they are under his own dominion."

This, therefore, being part of the common law, had, according to these learned judges, always been the law of the land. But, it may be objected, it is one thing for judges in the time of Lord Mansfield and afterwards to lay it down that such, in their opinion, must always have been the law of England, and another thing to prove that that law was recognised, and could have been enforced, in Star Chamber times. At first sight there seems to be much force in the objection, for I do not know that any records can be produced showing that authors in those old days had successfully appealed to the courts in vindication of their common-law right to prevent the unauthorised publication of their works; but, nevertheless, I think we may confidently assert that English law would never have sanctioned a proceeding so entirely iniquitous as that in which, according to Mr. Lee, it quietly acquiesced, viz. that a publisher might, without let or hindrance, publish a stolen manuscript if only he had obtained the licence of the Stationers' Company for such publication. The judgments in *Millar* v. *Taylor* are direct authority to the effect that our law never tolerated any such inequitable proceedings,[1]

[1] As to the Star Chamber, which claimed a penal jurisdiction in all matters relating to printing and publishing, Mr. Justice Willes, giving judgment in *Millar* v. *Taylor*, says, "No case of a prosecution in the Star Chamber for printing without licence or against letters patent, or pirating another man's copy, or any other disorderly printing has been found. *Most of the judicial proceedings of the Star Chamber are lost or destroyed.*" (We know, however, that unlicensed printing was severely punished.) It is understood that the judgment delivered by this learned judge was really the judgment of Lord Mansfield. As to the *civil* jurisdiction of the Court of Star Chamber, it seems to have been confined to certain admiralty and testamentary matters, suits between corporations, or between foreigners, or British subjects and foreigners, and "sometimes between men of great power and interest, which could not be tried with fairness by the common law." (Hallam, *Const. History*, Vol. III, chap. VIII.) Hudson, who practised in the Court at the

and show that the right in question was recognised as a common-law right in the early part of the seventeenth century. Thus, Mr. Justice Willes (p. 2314), after referring to Milton's *Areopagitica*, or "Speech for the liberty of unlicensed printing" (1644),[1] and pointing out that Milton there speaks of "the just retaining of each man his several copy, which God forbid should be gainsaid," draws attention to the Statute 14 Car. II, 33 (1662), which prohibits printing without the consent of the *owner*, upon pain of forfeiting the book and 6s. 8d. for each copy, half to the king and half to the *owner*, to be sued for by the owner in six months. "The Act," says the learned judge, "*supposes an ownership at common law*, and the right itself is particularly recognised in the latter part of the third section of the Act where the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of the Universities are forbid to meddle with any book or books the right of printing whereof doth solely and properly belong to any particular person or persons. The sole property of the owner is here acknowledged in express words as a common-law right, and the legislature who passed that Act could never have entertained the most distant idea that the productions of the brain were not a subject matter of property. To support an action on this Statute *ownership* must be proved, or the plaintiff could not recover, because the action is to be brought by the *owner*, who is to have a moiety of the penalty. The

beginning of the seventeenth century, and was its historian and apologist, writes as to *civil causes*: "I know men will wonder that I should offer them to be subject to this Court"; but he shows that some, nevertheless, fell within its jurisdiction, such as those mentioned by Hallam, and a few others. (See *Collectanea Juridica*, Vol. II.) Further light on the Star Chamber may be obtained from Mr. J. S. Burn's work (1870), *Reports of Cases in the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission*, printed for the Camden Society, and edited by Dr. S. Rawson Gardiner; and *Select Cases before the King's Council in the Star Chamber*, 1477–1509, edited for the Selden Society by I. S. Leadam, 1903.

[1] Milton, it will be remembered, had been attacked by the Stationers' Company for publishing pamphlets without a licence.

various provisions of this Act effectually prevented piracies WITHOUT [*sic*] actions at law or bills in equity by owners" —i.e. the Act provided a new and convenient remedy for the author whose copyright had been infringed, but, of course, left intact the existing remedies for the breach of this *common-law right*, viz. by action at law, or by filing a Bill in Equity; and the statute is itself an indisputable proof that such remedies were before that date open to an aggrieved author. But quite independently of such excellent authority, it would have been impossible to conceive that our law would have refused to provide a remedy for the violation of so elementary a right.

At the same time it may well have been that, in practice, it was found difficult and troublesome for an author to enforce such a right. The offending publisher would, of course, be a member of the powerful Stationers' Company, and the poor author might constantly find that it was better to "take it lying down" than endeavour to obtain justice by litigation.

Let us now consider copyright in the second sense of the word, viz. "the exclusive right of multiplying copies; the right of preventing all others from copying, by printing or otherwise, a literary work which the author has published." This right had its origin in these sixteenth-century days, when "copy" became the technical term for the right to produce copies, i.e. the copyright. Under the circumstances of the time, however, the right became lodged not in the author, but in the publisher of a literary work. Copyright, in fact, had its origin, not in any enlightened desire to protect authors, but in the desire of "authority," as represented by the sovereign, and especially by the Star Chamber, to prohibit the publication of all works not especially licensed for that purpose. One of the means by which this was accomplished was by granting a monopoly to the Stationers' Company. From the time of its foundation, that Company had kept a

register at their hall in which the members were required to enter the titles of all books and other works printed by them. At first this was done under a private ordinance of the Company, which, of course, affected its members only; but in 1556 the Company was incorporated by a Charter of Philip and Mary, under which, and under a decree of the Star Chamber of the same year, no person was allowed to print "any book or anything for sale or traffic" unless he was a member of the Stationers' Company.[1] In 1559 this Charter was confirmed by Elizabeth, and under her Injunctions of the same year it was provided that every book was to be licensed by Her Majesty, or by six of the Privy Council, or perused and licensed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishop of London, the Chancellors of both Universities, the Bishop being Ordinary (i.e. Ecclesiastical Judge as well), and the Archdeacon also of the place where such should be printed, or by two of them, the Ordinary of the place to be always one; and the names of the allowing Commissioners were to be added at the end of the work for a testimony of the allowance thereof. "Pamphlets, Plays, and ballads" were to be so licensed by any three of the Commissioners as appointed in the City of London to hear and determine causes ecclesiastical tending to the execution of the Statutes of Uniformity.

By a decree of the Star Chamber, dated June 23, 1586, it was ordered that "no person shall imprint or cause to be imprinted or suffer by any means to his knowledge his press, letters [=type], or other instruments to be occupied in printing of any book work copy matter or thing whatsoever except the same book, etc., hath been heretofore allowed or hereafter shall be allowed before the printing thereof, according to the order appointed by the Queen's

[1] Ninety-seven persons named, with Master and Warden, were incorporated as a society of the art of a stationer, and no person in England was to practise the art of printing unless one of the Society.

Majesty's Injunctions, and been first seen and perused by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London for the time being, or any one of them," exceptions being allowed for the Queen's Printer and the Books of the Common Law. No printing presses were to be permitted except in London and the two Universities.[1]

Under the system so established an author would, as it seems, sell his manuscript "out and out" to a member of the Stationers' Company, who, having duly obtained a licence to print the work, and having entered the title on the register of the Company, would thenceforth be the owner of the "copy," or copyright. Assignments of such a right had also to be effected by entry on the register. An author might, of course, sell his manuscript to another individual not a member of the Company (to a theatrical manager, for example), and the purchaser might subsequently assign his right to a "stationer" for publication. Thus the copyright in the second sense of the word always became vested in a "stationer."[2]

From all this it would seem (1) that an author could restrain any person from publishing his manuscript, or

[1] See Arber's transcripts of entries in the Stationers' Register, Vol. I, p. 13; Vol. II, p. 807. All these royal proclamations and decrees of the Star Chamber were, I take it, of very doubtful legality, but they regulated procedure in the matter of printing and publishing till the abolition of the Star Chamber by 16 Car. I, c. 10. It may be noticed that Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Bacon's old tutor, who licensed *Venus and Adonis* for publication, "aggravated the rigour of preceding times" by his hostility to free printing. It was at his instigation that the Star Chamber published these ordinances for the regulation of the Press. (Hallam, *Const. Hist.*, Vol. I, chap. v.)

[2] The preamble to the by-laws of the Company, made August 17, 1681, runs as follows: "Whereas several members of the Company have great part of their estates in *copies*, and by ancient usage of this Company, where any book is *duly entered in the register book of this Company*, such person, to whom such entry is made, is and always hath been reputed and taken to be *proprietor* of such book or copy, and ought to have the sole printing thereof; which privilege and interest is now of late often violated and abused; it is therefore ordained," etc. See the above-cited case of *Millar* v. *Taylor* as to this.

could bring an action against him for so doing, so long as he had not disposed of his right to it; and (2) that the publisher could prevent any other publisher from issuing the work. At the same time it is clear that the law was frequently violated (indeed, the by-laws of the Stationers' Company above referred to assert as much with regard to the violation by one member of the Company of the rights of another in his "copy"), whether because of the difficulty of enforcing it, or through the supineness of authors; and that in consequence authors were frequently defrauded by surreptitious copies of their works being issued by "piratical" publishers. Moreover, when the author had disposed of his work to a printer, the latter might, as it seems, do what he liked with it in the way of alteration, addition, omission, etc., without being liable to be called to account by the writer. Altogether it was not a very happy time for authors. Nevertheless, it seems tolerably clear that if Shakespeare acquiesced in the unauthorised publication of any of his manuscripts, the right to which he had not disposed of, whether of dramas or of other works (the Sonnets e.g.), it was not because there was, as Mr. Lee asserts, no law of copyright at all to which he might have appealed. On the contrary, we must conclude that for some reason or other he preferred to put up with the injustice done to him rather than to appeal to the law for protection. I do not think "old Ben" would have "taken it lying down" in this way. We do not hear of *him* gazing with equanimity on "stalls laden with unwarranted and corrupt versions of his works," as, according to Mr. Lee, was the fact in Shakespeare's case. It seems that the "piratical publishers" were less anxious to put forward "surreptitious copies" of *his* dramas and poems, and I do not think it was merely because he was less popular with the public. Shakespeare, however, raised no protest even when very inferior works by other writers were published in his name. Good, easy-going man![1]

[1] See *ante*, p. 279, and note.

CHAPTER XI

SHAKESPEARE ALLUSIONS AND ILLUSIONS

WE are frequently told that the best answer to sceptics in the matter of the Stratfordian authorship is to be found in the wealth of contemporaneous allusion to Shakespeare, and we are referred to Dr. Ingleby's *Centurie of Prayse* and Furnivall's *Three Hundred Fresh Allusions to Shakspere.* Well, we turn to those two volumes, and we find collected every possible allusion to Shakespeare, real or imaginary, within the dates indicated, which the industry of man has been able to bring to light from carefully ransacked records; but of evidence in support of the proposition to be proved it appears to me that there is little or none.

What is it we should expect to find in contemporary records? We should expect to find allusions to dramatic and poetical works published under the name of "Shakespeare"; we should expect to find Shakespeare spoken of as a poet and a dramatist; we should expect, further, to find some few allusions to Shakespeare or Shakspere the Player. And these, of course, we do find; but these are not the object of our quest. What we require is evidence to establish the identity of the player with the poet and dramatist; to prove that the player was the author of the *Plays* and *Poems*. *That* is the proposition to be established, and *that* the allusions fail, as it appears to me, to prove. At any rate, they do not disprove the theory that the true authorship was hidden under a pseudonym.

Let us, however, examine some of these allusions to Shakespeare, real or supposed. I will take first the one that is so constantly quoted by editors, and biographers, and commentators, as showing that as early as the year 1592 Shakspere was known as one who had given proof of "facetious grace in writing, that approves his art." I refer, of course, to the well-known passage in Chettle's preface to the *Kind-Hart's Dreame*. Now as to this supposed allusion I have two propositions to make. First, that it is, demonstrably, not an allusion to Shakspere (or Shakespeare) at all; and, secondly, that to cite it, as is constantly done, in such a manner that the reader is led to suppose that Shakspere's name actually appears on the face of the document, and that there is no doubt whatever about the matter, is simply to disregard the claims of common honesty.

But in order to deal satisfactorily with Chettle I must first examine Greene's equally well-known utterance in his *Groatsworth of Wit*. This work was probably first published in 1592, having been entered at Stationers' Hall on the 20th of September in that year, but the earliest known edition bears date 1596.[1] It is thus addressed: "To those Gentlemen his Quondam acquaintance, that spend their wits in making Plaies, R. G. wisheth a better exercise, and wisdome to prevent his extremities." Now there are three playwrights (or, as Chettle subsequently calls them, "play-makers") addressed, who are identified by Fleay (following Collier) as Marlowe, Peele, and Lodge,[2] the principal playwrights of the time. "Base-

[1] Robert Greene died on September 3rd, 1592.

[2] Some have supposed that Marlowe, Peele, and Nash are meant, but it seems impossible that Nash can be referred to, for Chettle when he makes his apology for publishing Greene's book says: "I protest it was all Greene's, not mine nor Master Nashes, as some unjustly have affirmed"; and he writes, he says, "as well to purge Master Nashe of that he did not, as to justifie what I did." If Nash was himself addressed by Greene he would hardly have been suspected of being the author of Greene's book. (See also Fleay's *Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 110, 260.)

minded men al three of you," writes Greene, "if by my miserie ye be not warned; for unto none of you, like me, sought those burres to cleave; those puppits, I meane, that speake from our mouths, those anticks garnisht in our colours. Is it not strange that I, to whom they al have beene beholding, is it not like that you to whome they all have beene beholding, shall, were ye in that case that I am now, be both at once of them forsaken? Yes, trust them not; for 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 own conceit the onely Shake-scene in a countrie. O that I might intreate your rare wits to be imployed in more profitable courses, and let those apes imitate your past excellence, and never more acquaint them with your admired inventions. I know the best husband of you all will never prove an usurer, and the kindest of them all will never prove a kinde nurse; yet, whilst you may, seeke you better maisters, for it is pittie men of such rare wits should be subject to the pleasures of such rude groomes."

The line "O tiger's heart wrapp'd in a woman's hide" occurs in the old quarto play of the *True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York, and the Death of Good King Henry the Sixth*, being the second part of the *Contention of the Two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster*, and reappears in *Henry VI*, Part 1, Act I, Scene 4. It is commonly assumed that in "Shake-scene" we have an allusion to Shakespeare, but if so it seems clear that it is as an actor rather than as an author that he is attacked.[1] All

[1] Greene, writing in 1590, gives us an imaginary interview between Tully and Roscius, in which the orator thus addresses the actor: "Why, Roscius, art thou proud with Æsop's crow, being pranked with the glory of others' feathers? Of thyself thou canst say nothing. . . . What sentence thou utterest on the stage flows from the censure of our wits," etc. This clearly explains the meaning of the "crow beautified with our feathers." Nash, in

note

Greene's invective is launched at the players, of whom he speaks with great bitterness. They are the burrs that cleave to the writers, the puppets that speak from the mouths of others; "anticks garnisht" in the colours provided for them by others. They are "apes" and "rude grooms." Why Greene should have been so particularly bitter against the players, and why he should have thought it necessary so seriously to warn his fellow playwrights against them, we do not know. Possibly it was only because they were well paid, whereas the dramatic author who supplied them received a miserable pittance for his work; because as the writer of *The Return from Parnassus* puts it,

> With mouthing words that better wits have framed,
> They purchase lands, and now Esquires are namde.[1]

Possibly he had some further and more personal reasons for his spleen. Anyhow, it is obvious that he is not attacking the players generally as *authors*. He does not accuse them of passing off other men's work as their own. What he says is, that they are beholden to him and other dramatic authors for the words which they speak, and so reap a rich harvest from the wits of others, yet that in his trouble he is forsaken of them, though in prosperity they stuck to him like

his preface to Greene's *Menaphon*, writes, "Sundry other sweet gentlemen I do know, that we [*sic*] have vaunted their pens in private devices, and tricked up a company of taffaty fools with their feathers," etc.; upon which Richard Simpson's comment is: "Notice this; it proves that when Greene, three years later, called Shakespeare 'an upstart crow, beautified with our feathers,' he need not have meant anything more than that he was an actor, who had gained his reputation by speaking the verses that the poet had written for him." (See *The School of Shakspere*, Vol. II, pp. 359, 368.)

[1] Better it is 'mongst fiddlers to be chiefe
Than at a plaier's trencher beg relief.
But ist not strange these mimick apes should prize
Unhappy schollers at a hireling rate?"
The Return from Parnassus, Act V, Scene 1.
For the reading "namde," instead of the usually received "made," see Mr. Macray's Edition.

"burrs," and such also is likely to be the fate of his fellow playwrights. But among the players he specially singles out Shakspere (if, indeed, Shakspere is meant), as being not only, as they all were, "garnisht in our colours," and "beautified with our feathers," but also "an upstart crow," and one who was "in his own conceit the only Shake-scene in a country." So far there is nothing which necessarily implies that he accuses the player of holding himself out as a writer also, but the words "supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blank verse as the best of you," do seem to have that implication. To bombast appears to have meant originally to stuff out with cotton wool; as in "they bombast their doublets."[1] Had the word stood alone it might, perhaps, have meant, as applied to a player, to rant, or to "gag," which in theatrical slang means to add words of one's own to those of the author; for "Bombastes" is not a turgid writer, but a speaker of inflated and thrasonic language, a man of "mouthing words." Moreover, *Shake-scene* suggests the ranting actor, as in *The Puritaine* (1607), where Pye-boord says: "Have you never seene a stalking-stamping Player, that will raise a tempest with his toung, and thunder with his heels?"[2] But the player here is accused of supposing himself to be "as well able to bombast out a blank verse as the best of you," viz. the playwrights whom Greene is addressing, which certainly looks as if he meant to suggest that this

[1] Bulwer (1650) cited in the *New English Dictionary*. In Scott's *Abbot* we read: "My stomach has no room for it, it is too well bombasted out with straw and buckram." Greene, by the way, speaks of the players as "these buckram gentlemen." Dr. Ingleby quotes a passage from Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* where the author complains that "in tricking up themselves men go beyond women . . . more like Players, Butterflies, Baboones, Apes, Antickes, than men."

[2] Cited by Dr. Ingleby, who also compares Jonson's lines:—

"to hear thy Buskin tread,
And shake a Stage."

Shake-scene supposed himself able to compose, as well as to "mouth" verses.[1]

Now, as I have already said, there seems to be some reason for supposing that the *Contention* was written by Greene himself in conjunction with Marlowe, and therefore it has been suggested that Greene is alluding to the new edition of the *True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York*, which had been written by Player Shakspere according to the orthodox view, but by somebody else under the pseudonym of Shakespeare according to the heretical view. According to this theory, Shakespeare, as the "upstart crow," seems to be one of those alluded to by "R. B. Gent" in *Greene's Funeralls*, 1594, where he writes :—

> Greene, is the pleasing object of an eie ;
> Greene, pleasde the eies of all that lookt uppon him ;
> Greene, is the ground of everie Painter's die ;
> Greene, gave the ground, to all that wrote upon him.
> Nay more, the men that so eclipst his fame
> *Purloynde his Plumes*, can they deny the same?

This, at any rate, affords a very good explanation of Greene's wrath against Shakespeare. But is it certain that by "Shake-scene" Greene intended Shakspere? It is usually so assumed because the parodied line occurs in *Henry VI*, Part 3, which was published in the Folio of 1623, under the name of Shakespeare. But *The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke* was published anonymously (1595), and, as I have elsewhere endeavoured to show, it was not written by Shakespeare. This seems to detract not a little from the force of the argument of those who think that there is here an allusion to Shakspere. At any rate, it is only a surmise, but, even assuming its validity,

[1] Thus in Dekker's *Satiro-Mastix* Sir Rees ap Vaughan calls upon Horace (Jonson) to "sweare not to bombast out a new Play with the olde lynings of Jestes, stolen from the Temple Revels," and Nash, in his introduction to Greene's *Menaphon* (1589), writes of those "who, mounted on the stage of arrogance, think to outbrave better pens with the swelling bombast of bragging blank verse."

the utmost that we should be entitled to say is that Greene here accuses Player Shakspere of putting forward, as his own, some work, or perhaps some parts of a work, for which he was really indebted to another. Anyhow, Greene refers to this "Shake-scene" as being an impostor, an upstart crow beautified with the feathers which he has stolen from the dramatic writers ("our feathers"); a "Poet ape," to borrow Jonson's expression; a "Johannes factotum," who could do a little bit of everything, and withal self-conceited, and so far from being, as Shakspere is so often represented, an easy-going, genial, boon companion, that he is fitly described as hiding a tiger's heart under a player's hide! This is indeed strange, but such is poor Greene's celebrated death-bed supposed allusion to Player Shakspere in 1592, that is, before "Shakespeare" had published "the first heir" of his "invention." When it is closely examined I do not think it is of very much assistance to the biographer, more especially as it cannot be said with certainty that it is an allusion to Shakspere at all.[1]

But now we are in a position to deal with Chettle's equally famous allusion. Chettle, who had apparently published Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit*, subsequently issued a book called the *Kind-Hart's Dreame*, which was entered at Stationers' Hall on December 8th, 1592. In the Preface to this work are the following words: "About three months since died Mr. Robert Greene, leaving many papers in sundry booksellers' hands, among others his 'Groatsworth of Wit,' in which a letter, *written to divers play makers, is offensively by one or two of them taken*;[2] and

[1] It must be remembered that in 1592, when the *Groatsworth of Wit* was written, the name "Shake-speare" (with or without the hyphen) was unknown to literature, nor did it appear on any play till 1598. The *True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York* was not published till 1595, and then anonymously, as above mentioned. The first and second parts of the *Contention between the Two Famous Houses* were published together as *The Whole Contention*, "written by William Shakespeare, Gent," in 1619. As to these plays see chap. v.

[2] My italics.

because on the dead they cannot be avenged, they wilfully forge in their conceites a living author, and after tossing it two and fro, no remedy but it must light on me. How I have all the time of my conversing in printing hindred the bitter inveying against schollers, it hath been very well knowne, and how in that I dealt I can sufficiently proove. With neither of them that take offence was I acquainted, and with one of them I care not if I never be. The other, whome at that time, I did not so much spare as since I wish I had, for that, as I have moderated the heate of living writers, and might have usde my owne discretion, especially in such a case, the author dead,—that I did not I am as sory as if the originall fault had beene my fault, because myselfe have seene his demeanour no lesse civil, than he excelent in the qualitie 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."

It is absolutely clear from this that Greene's address to the three playwrights had been taken offensively by two of them. "With neither of them that take offence was I acquainted," says Chettle, "and with one of them I care not if I never be." He then goes on to speak of "the other, whom at that time I did not so much spare as since I wish I had." This "other" may be either one of the two who took offence, whose acquaintance Chettle made subsequently, or it may mean the third of the play-makers, who seems not to have taken the matter offensively. Chettle wishes he had spared this one by cutting offensive matter out of Greene's book (as he might easily have done, the author being dead), which implies that this one had, at any rate, some cause for offence. But whoever this "other" was, it is clear that he was one of the three "play-makers," and could not possibly have been "Shakespeare," who was not one of those addressed by Greene, not being one of "those Gentlemen, his Quondam acquaintance, that spend

their wits in making Plaies." In fact, when the thing is looked into, there seems to be no pretence at all for saying that Chettle here makes an allusion to "Shakespeare."

Mr. Fleay saw this plainly enough. In his *Life of Shakespeare* (p. 119) he writes as follows: "The line 'O tiger's heart wrapt in a woman's hide' occurs in *Richard, Duke of York* (commonly but injudiciously referred to as the *True Tragedy*), a play written for Pembroke's men, probably in 1590, on which *Henry VI* was founded. It is almost certainly by Marlowe, the best of the three whom Greene addresses. In December Chettle issued his *Kind-heart's Dream*, in which he apologises for the offence given to Marlowe in the *Groatsworth of Wit*, '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 which approves his art.' To Peele he makes no apology, nor indeed was any required. Shakespeare was not one of those who took offence; they are expressly stated to have been two of the three authors addressed by Greene, the third (Lodge) not being in England."

Whether Mr. Fleay was right in identifying Marlowe with the playwright to whom Chettle makes his apology may, perhaps, be doubtful, for Chettle, as I conceive, deals separately with Marlowe in the following passage: "For the first, whose learning I reverence, and, at the perusing of Greene's booke, stroke out what then in conscience I thought he in some displeasure writ; or, had it been true, yet to publish it was intolerable; him I would wish to use me no worse than I deserve." But however this may be Mr. Fleay is clearly right in saying that there is no reference to Shakespeare.

Mr. Castle's legal mind has also appreciated that fact.

"Chettle's meaning is clear," he writes.[1] "The letter of Greene was addressed to three play-writers, said to be Marlowe, Lodge, and Peele. Two of these complain. One of those complaining he does not know nor care to know; the other he is sorry for, as he is of very excellent demeanour, etc. These two I consider must be Lodge and Peele, for of the first, Marlowe, he speaks separately." Then, after citing the passage which I have just quoted from Chettle, he proceeds: "This is also clear. Marlowe was the Nestor of the rising literary world—the giant whom they all respected. Chettle simply submits himself to his judgment, but deals with the other as pointed out. Yet Malone twisted this apology of Chettle's to one of the two play-makers to whom the letter was written, and who had taken offence, as an apology to Shakespeare. It is difficult to see how the language could be so understood, even by one of his most ardent admirers. The letter was not addressed to Shakespeare; he was not one of the play-writers; he was a pretender in Greene's eyes; and as far as one can see he was severely left alone by Chettle. Of course it is immaterial whether Chettle apologised to him, or to Peele, or Lodge.[2] But it is material to see whether a whole succession of writers, Malone, Steevens, Dyce, Collier, Halliwell, Knight, and a host of minor authors, are so blinded by their admiration for Shakespeare, that they cannot read a simple document correctly, or are such simple followers of Malone that they have adopted his mistakes and made no inquiry for themselves."[3]

We see, then, that a careful examination of the document under consideration renders it quite clear that

[1] *Shakespeare, Bacon, Jonson, and Greene*, by E. T. Castle, Q.C. (now K.C.), 1897.

[2] I do not agree in this. It is by no means immaterial.

[3] Mr. W. L. Courtney has been led into this same error in his article on "Christopher Marlowe." *Fortnightly Review*, September, 1905. So too Monsieur Jusserand (*Stratford Town Shakespeare*, Vol. X, p. 300). This pestilent perversion is as infectious as the plague.

Chettle makes no allusion to Shakespeare; and we see that this has been pointed out by such a distinguished Shakespearean as Mr. Fleay, and that a King's Counsel, accustomed to pronounce on the construction and interpretation of documents, has expressed himself very decidedly to the same effect; notwithstanding which we find that the modern biographers and critics, Mr. Sidney Lee, Messrs. Garnett and Gosse, and Mr. Churton Collins, not only persist in this error, not only ignore all that Mr. Castle and Mr. Fleay have said on the subject, but actually so write as to convey to the mind of the ordinary reader that Chettle makes mention of Shakespeare by name in the Preface to his work, and that, consequently, the supposed allusion is not a matter of inference and argument, but a fact patent on the document itself! The usual way of doing this is by quietly slipping in Shakespeare's name in a bracket, without any admonition to the reader that his name is not mentioned by Chettle at all.

Thus Mr. Sidney Lee writes (p. 53): "In December, 1592, Greene's publisher, Henry Chettle, prefixed an apology for Greene's attack on the young actor to his *Kind-Hartes Dreame*, a tract reflecting on phases of contemporary social life. 'I am as sorry,' Chettle wrote, 'as if the originall fault had beene my fault, because myselfe have seene his [i.e. Shakespeare's] demeanour no lesse civill than he [is][1] excelent in the qualitie he professes," etc. etc.[2] Messrs. Garnett and Gosse adopt

[1] The brackets are, of course, in the original. Mr. Lee also writes (p. 224): "At the opening of Shakespeare's career Chettle wrote of his 'civil demeanour,'" etc.

[2] The commentators, quietly appropriating this as an allusion to Shakspere, explain "quality" here as a reference to the actor's profession. But the word is used of any profession or occupation. Thus in *Every Man Out of His Humour*, Act IV, Scene 2, Shift says: "I have now reconciled myself to other courses, and profess a living out of my other qualities." And in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (Act IV, Scene 1) the word is used of an outlaw's occupation, Valentine being addressed by one of the band as "a man of such perfection as we do in our quality much want." Again, Thomas

exactly the same very convenient expedient,[1] and Mr. D. H. Lambert, in his *Cartæ Shakespeareanæ* (p. 3), follows suit by calmly annotating Chettle's words, "the other whom at that time I did not so much spare," etc., with a brief "i.e. Shakespeare"! Mr. Churton Collins (*Studies in Shakespeare*, p. 108) writes: "What is certain is, as we know from Greene and Chettle, that he (i.e. Shakspere) was writing plays before 1593."[2]

A more dishonest method of writing biography than this can hardly be imagined. I think I have made it quite clear that Chettle makes no reference to Shakespeare; but even if this could be disputed, surely it is the duty of every honest writer to inform the reader that the supposed Shakespearean allusion is only a matter of argument and hypothesis, and that there is high authority for denying its existence! To insert Shakespeare's name in

Heywood, in a letter to his bookseller, Nicholas Okes, prefixed to his treatise, "An Apology for Actors" (1612), uses the word with reference to a printer. "The infinite faults escaped in my book of Britain's Troy, by the negligence of the printer, as the misquotations, etc. . . . when I would have taken a particular account of the errata, the printer answered me, he would not publish his own disworkmanship, but rather let his own fault lie upon the neck of the author, and being fearful that others of his quality had been of the same nature and condition," etc. etc. Greene uses the word "faculty" of the actor's profession. See Simpson's *School of Shakespere*, Vol. II, p. 366 *et seq.* Of course "quality" might be used of that profession also, as of others. Mr. Henry Davey, more honest than most Shakespearean biographers, states that "Chettle's apology does not name Shakespeare," but absurdly adds that it "sufficiently indicates him by the word *qualitie* applied commonly to his profession." This writer further states, on the authority of Greene and Chettle, that "Shakespeare was in 1592 already known as a successful dramatist, besides being an actor, and personally esteemed by some of the higher classes"! Well! well! well! (*Stratford Town Shakespeare*, Vol. X, p. 276.)

[1] See their *English Literature*, Vol. II, p. 205.

[2] Mr. J. M. Robertson is both too honest a critic, and too good a reasoner, to be any party to this dishonest distortion of the facts. "This is quite unwarranted," he comments on Mr. Collins's above-quoted assertion. "Neither Greene nor Chettle ever named Shakespeare or any of his plays." It is true that Mr. Robertson thinks "we are fully entitled to infer from the 'Shake-scene' passage in Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit* that he (Shakespeare) had had a hand in plays before 1593; but certainly not that he had written

parenthesis, or note, so as to make it appear that the allusion is patent on the face of the document, appears to me a course of procedure closely akin to that of those who attempt to gain credit by false pretences. Then we have Mr. Collins, who presumably has read Mr. Castle's book (since he dismisses it with the epithet he so much loves to apply to those who do not share his own opinions),[1] suppressing all reference to that learned writer's criticism of those who are "so blinded by their admiration of Shakespeare that they cannot read a simple document correctly," and calmly telling his readers that it is "certain" from what Chettle has said (coupled with Greene's reference to the "upstart crow") that Shakspere was writing plays before 1593! I have already discussed Mr. Collins's idea of "certainty" with reference to *Titus Andronicus*. We now have the measure of his idea of fair play. It is quite characteristic that this writer should accuse others of "misrepresentations" and "impudent fictions." But why, we are fain to ask, do Shakespearean biographers think themselves entitled to ignore all the ordinary canons of criticism, and to adopt methods which, were the lives of other men concerned, would be characterised as simply dishonest?

I now come to an almost equally famous, and, this time, an undoubted allusion to Shakespeare. I refer to the often-quoted words which the author of the old play, *The Return from Parnassus*, has put into the mouth of the player Kempe. These words are constantly cited as

one," on which point Mr. Robertson opines that Shakespeare's own declaration as to the "first heir of his invention" is surely final. But, after all, that "Shake-scene" had really reference to Shakespeare is only an assumption. Judge Stotsenburg disputes the hypothesis, and suggests that the reference is to Anthony Munday, but it must, I think, be confessed that his reasoning is by no means convincing. See *An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title*, chap. XII., and Mr. Robertson's *Did Shakespeare write "Titus Andronicus"?*, p. 22. Mr. Collins repeats his inexcusable misrepresentation as to Chettle at p. 137 of his *Studies in Shakespeare*.

[1] "Absurd" (p. 211), "palpably absurd" (p. 213), and so forth.

bearing testimony to the unquestioned pre-eminence of Shakespeare as a dramatist in the year 1601. Thus Professor Arber, in the introduction to his edition of the play, tells us that it is a comedy which "publicly testifies on the stage, in the characters of Richard Burbage and William Kempe (fellow-actors to William Shakespeare, and deservedly general favourites), to his confessed supremacy at that date not only over all University dramatists, but also over all the London professional playwrights, Ben Jonson himself included."

I propose to show that this is an entire misconception, and that the passage has no such significance as claimed for it. But before examining this and other passages, it will be well to devote a few lines to a consideration of the work in question.

The Return from Parnassus, of which Professor Arber published a reprint, is the third play of a trilogy consisting of *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, *The Return from Parnassus, Part 1*, and *The Return from Parnassus, Part 2, or The Scourge of Simony*. The three plays have been excellently edited by the Rev. W. D. Macray.[1] In the earlier-printed texts of the third play (that edited by Professor Arber) many passages were rendered unintelligible by errors of the press. These, however, were, for the most part, cleared up by readings gained from a manuscript which came into the possession of Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps. "The new readings," writes Mr. Macray, "show how fair a field is really open to conjecture in the attempted correction of old texts for which no MS. authority exists, and justify much of the conjectural criticism which is applied to Shakespearean difficulties. They prove also the critical acumen and ingenuity of Edm. Malone, since several of the corrections are found to correspond with emendations noted by him, as apparently

[1] *Parnassus. Three Elizabethan Comedies, 1597–1601.* Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1886.

his own guesses, in the margins of one of his printed copies."[1]

The plays, which are by an unknown author, but which contain some remarkable coincidences with Bishop Hall's *Satires* (first printed in 1597), are said to have been acted by the students of St. John's College, Cambridge, the first in December, 1597, the third in January, 1602,[2] and the second at some intermediate Christmastide.

Let us now examine the passage in the third play referred to by Professor Arber, and so constantly quoted by Shakespearean biographers. In the third scene of Act IV the players Burbage and Kempe are brought on to the stage, and while waiting for the scholars, whom they are to instruct in the art of acting, they thus hold converse:—

Burbage. Now *Will Kempe*, if we can intertaine these schollers at a low rate, it will be well, they have often times a good conceite in a part.

Kempe. It's true indeede, honest *Dick*, but the slaves are somewhat proud, and besides, it is a good sport in a part, to see them never speake in their walke but at the end of the stage, just as though in walking with a fellow we should never speake but at a stile, a gate, or a ditch, where a man can go no further.[3] I was once at a Comedie in Cambridge, and there I saw a parasite make faces and mouths of all sorts in this fashion.

Burbage. A little teaching will mend these faults, and it may be besides they will be able to pen a part.

Kempe. Few of the university pen[4] plaies well; they smell too

[1] Preface to *Parnassus*, p. ix.

[2] See Arber's Introduction. The Professor thinks the representation was "rather in the first six days of January, 1602, than in the last six of December, 1601," but Gullio's observation (Act III, Scene 1), "I cal'd thee out for new year's day approacheth," seems to be an argument in favour of December, 1601.

[3] This is rather curious. The modern amateur is generally prone to the opposite fault, namely, to be always walking about the stage while he is speaking.

[4] Mr. Macray, adopting apparently the reading from the Halliwell-Phillipps MS., prints "Few of the University (men) pen plaies well." This speech of Kempe's is the one usually quoted without context.

much of that writer *Ovid* and that writer *Metamorphosis*,[1] and talke too much of *Proserpina* and *Juppiter*. Why here's our fellow *Shakespeare* puts them all downe, aye and *Ben Jonson* too. O that *Ben 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.

Burbage. It's a shrewd fellow indeed: I wonder these schollers stay so long, they appointed to be here presently that we might try them: oh, here they come.

It is strange indeed that this passage has been quoted in all seriousness as though it were the writer's testimony to the "confessed supremacy," as Professor Arber says, "of England's superlative poet," whereas it is obvious on the face of it that it is sarcastic, the fact being that the players are held up to ridicule, before a cultivated audience of Cambridge scholars and students, as ignorant, half-educated vulgarians, "rude grooms," as Greene called them, who know so little about classical authors that they think there was a writer called *Metamorphosis*, as well as a writer called *Ovid!* It is surely needless to point out that a University dramatist, writing for a University audience, did not intend to be taken seriously when he made player Kempe say, "few of the University [men] pen plaies well"![2] But I do not think it has ever been pointed out how absurd is this criticism of Will Kempe's,

[1] Mr. Castle makes a curious mistake here. He quotes the passage as though it ran, "and that writer's *Metamorphosis*." Quoting possibly at second hand he does not seem to have perceived that the players are being held up to ridicule. (*Shakespeare, Bacon, Jonson, and Greene*, p. 191.) Possibly he was misled by Gifford, who in a note to his Memoirs of Ben Jonson makes the same mistake. (See the *Works of Ben Jonson*, by W. Gifford, edited by Colonel Cunningham, p. lxii.)

[2] In just the same way the writer makes Gullio, the pretentious fool, in the first play, after quoting some of his own silly "extempore" lines, say, "a dull Universitie's head would have bene a month about thus muche"! (Act IV, Scene 1). The fact is, of course, that nearly all the best dramatists of the time were University men. Marlowe, Greene, and Nash were Cambridge men; Lyly, Lodge, and Peele were at Oxford. Jonson, indeed, does not appear to have been at either University as a student (see note *infra*, p. 323), but he got the best he could out of the best school of the time, and was Camden's special protégé.

if it is to be taken as a eulogium of Shakespeare. For what, according to Kempe, is the objection to the University pens? That they "smell too much of that writer *Ovid*, and that writer *Metamorphosis*, and talk too much of *Proserpina* and *Juppiter*." But this criticism if it applies to anybody applies in an eminent degree to Shakespeare himself. Who so saturated with Ovid, the *Metamorphoses* especially, as Shakespeare? Who talks, all out of season, of Proserpina and Jupiter, if not the writer who makes his "Queen of Curds and cream," brought up in a Bohemian grange, as Judge Webb says, parade her knowledge of the Greek Mythology by exclaiming,

> O, Proserpina,
> For the flowers now which frighted thou let'st fall
> From Dis's waggon?[1]

But was he taken to be so?

It seems pretty obvious, in fact, that the passage, so far from being intended to be taken in its literal sense, conveyed to the audience the very opposite meaning. Ben Jonson, though not, as it seems, a student at either Oxford or Cambridge, held an honorary degree at each University, and seems to have been particularly connected with St. John's College, Cambridge.[2] I take it that all this about Jonson's being "a pestilent fellow" is ironical. It is extremely unlikely that the University writer intended to exalt Shakespeare at the expense of Jonson. Who is it that speaks? Will Kempe, the clown and morris-dancer. In the first play, *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* (Act V), Dromo comes on to the stage "drawing a clowne in with a

[1] *A Winter's Tale*, Act IV, Scene 4.

[2] Fuller says that he was "statutably admitted" there, whereas Aubrey says he went to Trinity College; and, as Gifford pointed out, "if Jonson had been on the foundation at Westminster, and went regularly to Cambridge, this must have been the college": but it seems clear that both Fuller and Aubrey were mistaken. Jonson's M.A. degree at both Universities was due, as he told Drummond, "to their favour, not to his studie" (i.e. it was spontaneously conferred, and not solicited). Jonson, it seems, was never a student at either Oxford or Cambridge. See further on this point at p. 108 *supra*.

rope," and accosts him thus: "Why, what an ass art thou! dost thou not knowe a playe cannot be without a clowne? Clownes have bene thrust into playes by head and shoulders ever since Kempe could make a scurvey face"; and in the scene of the third play now under consideration, when the students come on (after Burbage's "Oh, here they come"), Studioso exclaims, "Welcome Mr. *Kempe* from dancing the morrice over the Alpes"; indeed, if any one wants to form an idea of what sort of a player this Will Kempe was, he has only to turn to Mr. Sidney Lee's illustrated *Life of Shakespeare* (p. 40), where he will see a picture of this "clowne" dancing a jig, while a youth plays a drum with one hand and a fife with the other. The University man, no doubt, chuckled when he was made to talk of "our fellow Shakespeare"—"a shrewd fellow indeed," as Burbage adds—as having made the scholarly Ben Jonson bewray his credit. Ben, in his *Poetaster*, did indeed bring up Horace giving the poets a pill (Horace being Jonson himself), but what is meant by Shakespeare having given him a purge, etc., nobody has ever been able to explain.[1] Well may Mr. Mullinger remark (*University of Cambridge*, p. 524 n.) that the notices in the third play seem "to convey the notion that Shakespeare is the favourite of the rude half-educated strolling players, as distinguished from the refined geniuses of the University"! Yet this is the passage which is so constantly paraded as being indubitable, contemporaneous testimony to the supremacy of Shakespeare!

Since writing as above I have lighted on the following in Gifford's *Memoir of Ben Jonson*. Commenting on this passage in the *Return from Parnassus* Gifford writes: "In the recent edition of Beaumont and Fletcher it is referred to 'as a proof of Jonson's enmity' [i.e. to Shakespeare], and called 'that strong passage.' When will this folly end? But true, it is a *strong* passage, a very *strong* one—

[1] See p. 326 n.

but against whom? Frankly I speak it, against Shakespeare, who, if Will Kempe be worthy of credit, wantonly interfered in a contest with which he had no concern. . . . Now I am on the subject of this old play, I will just venture to inform those egregious critics that the heroes of it are laughing both at Will Kempe and Shakespeare. Of Shakespeare's plays they neither know nor say anything; when they have to mention him in their own character they speak merely of his *Lucrece* and his *Venus and Adonis*. Yet Shakespeare had then written several of his best pieces, and Jonson not one of his. . . . We shall now, I suppose, hear little more of Will Kempe, who was probably brought on the stage in a fool's cap, to make mirth for the University wits, and who is dismissed, together with his associate, in a most contemptuous manner, as '*a mere leaden spout*,'" etc. Unfortunately, the Shakespeariolaters, instead of taking a hint from Gifford, have continued blindly to quote Will Kempe as a serious witness to Shakespeare's "confessed supremacy." In another place Gifford remarks, truly enough, "Kempe is brought forward as the type of ignorance, in this old drama." Yet the critics have wasted much time in the endeavour to identify the supposed "purge," which, according to Will Kempe, Shakespeare gave to Jonson, "that made him bewray his credit"! (See *Gifford's Jonson*, by Colonel Cunningham, pp. lxii, n., and cxcviii, n.). If the dates would allow it, I should be inclined to think that in Shakespeare's supposed purge there was an allusion to Dekker's *Satiro-Mastix*, where there are many references to pills and purges to be administered to Jonson, and in which Jonson is made to "bewray his credit"—("beray" or "bewray" is specially used of the action of an aperient; see the *Parnassus* plays *passim*)—and is finally crowned with nettles instead of laurel. The *Satiro-Mastix* was published in 1602, but before that it had been, as the title-page tells us, "presented publicly" by the Lord Chamber-

lain's servants, and "privately by the children of Paules," so that it must have been known to the public a considerable time before publication. It is usually supposed that Shakspere took a part in it—some say that of William Rufus—and in that sense "our fellow Shakespeare" may have taken part in administering the purge.[1]

But there are other allusions to Shakespeare in this Trilogy which we may now examine.

In the first of the three plays we are introduced to Gullio, the fool of the piece, "the arrant braggart, the empty pretender to knowledge, and the avowed libertine," as Mr. Macray correctly describes him. "Now, gentlemen, you may laugh if you will for here comes a gull," says Ingenioso, as this Gullio comes upon the stage. This idiot, who never opens his mouth but to utter absurdities, tells the poor scholar Ingenioso that he proposes to bestow some verses, "a diamonde of invention," upon his mistress; "therefore," says he, "sithens I am employed in some weightie affayres of the courte, I will have thee, Ingenioso, to make them, and when thou hast done I will peruse, pollish, and correct them." Ingenioso asks, "What veine would it please you to have them in?" Whereupon Gullio replies, "Not in a vaine veine (prettie i' faith!): make me them in two or three divers veines, in Chaucer's, Gower's, Spencer's, and Mr. Shakespeare's. Marry, I think I shall entertaine those verses which run like these:—

> Even as the sun with purple coloured face
> Had tane his laste leave of the weeping morne, etc.

[1] The suggestion that *Troilus and Cressida* was the "purge" seems to me a futile one. That dismal play, which, as Mr. Israel Gollancz says, "has been well described as 'a Comedy without genuine laughter, a Tragedy without pathos,'" was more likely to act as an opiate than as a purge, even if we could suppose that Jonson is meant to be satirised as Thersites, which seems to me altogether improbable. Moreover, although Thersites is represented as the chartered railer, and held up to scorn as base and cowardly, he is not punished as is the victim in *Satiro-Mastix*. The play has some immortal

O sweet Mr. Shakespeare! I'le have his picture in my study at the Courte."

The lines are, of course, from *Venus and Adonis*, which this oaf is very fond of quoting. It is noticeable that while he speaks of Chaucer, Gower, and Spenser without any prefix, it is always "*Mr.* Shakespeare" with him. Thus, further on, he says: "Let this duncified worlde esteeme of Spencer and Chaucer; I'le worshipp sweet Mr. Shakespeare, and to honoure him will lay his *Venus and Adonis* under my pillowe." Which appears to make "Mr. Shakespeare" not a little ridiculous.

To be eulogised by this fool is, of course, the reverse of recommendation. Gullio, in fact, shows only that *Venus and Adonis* was the favourite poem of that class which this fatuous character, this pretentious, affected, and ridiculous man of fashion, this soi-distant Don Juan, "this habberdasher of lyes, this bracchidochio, this ladyemonger," as Ingenioso styles him, so well represents.[1]

In the second play we have yet another allusion to Shakespeare. Ingenioso reads to Judicio the names of a number of poets that he may pass judgment upon them. After discussing Spenser, Constable, Lodge, Daniell, Watson, Drayton, Davis, Marston, Marlowe, and Jonson, Ingenioso propounds the name of William Shakespeare; upon whom Judicio gives his "censure" thus:—

> Who loves not *Adons* love, or *Lucrece* rape?
> His sweeter verse contaynes hart throbbing line,
> Could but a graver subject him content,
> Without loves foolish lazy languishment.

lines (one of them concerning the "touch of nature" which "makes the whole world kin," constantly misquoted, or rather misapplied), but one can hardly conceive any audience sitting it out. As to the question of its authorship see p. 357 *et seq.*

[1] We may remember that the *Venus and Adonis* of "sweet Mr. Shakespeare" was satirised (by Markham as we are told) in *The Dumb Knight* as a lascivious poem. (Fleay's *Life*, p. 78.)

Not surely much of a testimony to the supremacy of the great poet![1]

The supposition, therefore, that any of the allusions in this trilogy prove the pre-eminence of Shakespeare as a poet, in the opinion of literary men of the time, seems, when closely examined, to be quite unfounded. As to Professor Arber's idea that Player Kempe's observations may be taken as showing the "confessed supremacy" of the immortal bard at that date, "not only over all University dramatists, but also over all the London Professional playwrights, Ben Jonson himself included," it seems clear that the very opposite inference is to be drawn, so far, at least, as the opinion of the Cambridge University students is concerned. The opinion of the University is evidently the very opposite to the opinion of Will Kempe, and to the opinion of the fool Gullio. In fact, the only thing of real importance in these allusions is this, that the Cambridge dramatist makes Kemp and Burbage speak of "our fellow Shakespeare" as an author. But when we remember the feud which always existed between the scholars and the players in those times, and appreciate the fact that the scholar playwright is satirising the players, we shall, I think, see that the significance to be attached to this utterance is, after all, not very great. It is quite consistent with the theory that Shakespeare was a mask name. The whole scene is evidently a burlesque in which

[1] When Ingenioso propounds the name of *Benjamin Johnson*, Judicio exclaims "the wittiest fellow of a bricklayer in England." Ingenioso, however, who in other cases leaves Judicio to pronounce judgment, calls Jonson "a mere empyric, one that getts what he hath by observation, and makes onely nature privy to what he indites, so slow an inventor that he were better betake himself to his old trade of bricklaying . . . as confident now in making a booke, as he was in times past in laying a brick." This must surely be meant for nothing more than chaff at Ben's expense. It could hardly be intended for serious dispraise to say of a poet that he founded his writing on observation and on *nature*, but it is curious to observe that the characteristic of being indebted solely to *nature*, which is usually attributed to Shakespeare ("next nature only helped him," etc.), is here ascribed to Jonson. "This is not altogether the critic's creed," as Gifford says (p. cxcviii).

the poor players are held up to ridicule for their ignorance generally, and for their distorted notions as to "Shakespeare" and Jonson in particular. Moreover, the fact that Kempe urges as objections to "the University pen" those very things which might particularly be urged as objections to Shakespeare, viz. his Ovidian thoughts and utterances, and his uncalled-for classical allusions, seems to show that Master Kempe, as conceived by the playwright of St. John's College, had no very clear idea of what he was talking about.[1]

The feelings of the poor University scholar towards the successful player may be gathered from the passage some lines of which I have already quoted, and which it may be well now to set forth entire :—

> Better it is mongst fidlers to be chiefe
> Than at a plaiers trencher beg reliefe.
> But ist not strange these mimick apes should prize
> Unhappy schollers at a hireling rate?
> Vile world, that lifts them up to hye degree
> And treades us down in groveling misery.
> England affordes those glorious vagabonds,
> That carried earst their fardels on their backes,
> Coursers to ride on through the gazing streets,
> Sooping it in their glaring satten sutes,
> And pages to attend their masterships.
> With mouthing words that better wits have framed
> They purchase lands, and now Esquires are namde.[2]

The complaint that these "mimic apes" prize the "unhappy schollers at a hireling rate" refers to Burbage's remark, made just previously to Kempe, "if we can inter-

[1] "I will venture to affirm," says Gifford (p. cxv, n.), "that more of the *heathen mythology* may be found in a single scene, nay in a single speech of Shakespeare, Fletcher, Massinger, and Shirley, than in the whole of Jonson's thirteen comedies. Nothing is so remarkable as his rigid exclusion of the deities of Greece and Rome." (*Cynthia's Revels* is, of course, exceptional.)

[2] This is the reading adopted by Mr. Macray from the Halliwell-Phillipps' MS. The old printed version reads "made" (*Return from Parnassus*, Part 2, Act V, Scene 1).

taine these schollers at a low rate it will be well, they have often times a good conceite in a part." The shrewd players were apparently speculating on the possibility of getting some poor scholars to join their company, for the inferior parts, at very low rates. As to "they purchase lands, and now Esquires are namde," here is, very probably, an allusion to Player Shakspere, who had bought lands at Stratford before this date (the contract for the purchase of New Place was in 1597), and whose father had got his grant of arms in 1599. "Be merry, my lads," says Kempe to the scholars, "you have happened upon the most excellent vocation in the world for money; they come North and South to bring it to our playhouse; and for honours, who of more report than Dick Burbage and Will Kempe? He is not counted a gentleman that knows not Dick Burbage and Will Kempe. There's not a country wench that can dance Sellengers Round but can talke of Dick Burbage and Will Kempe."

Subsequently Philomusus asks:—

> And must the basest trade yeeld us reliefe?
> Must we be practis'd to those leaden spouts,
> That nought doe vent but what they do receive?

It is clear that, in the estimation of this "University pen," the player's trade was an extremely contemptible one.

Such are some typical cases of those "allusions" which are so confidently appealed to by Mr. Lee as conclusive evidence that Player Shakspere wrote the *Plays* and *Poems* of Shakespeare. One of them I have shown not to be an allusion at all, the others, as I think the unprejudiced will admit, have little or no evidentiary value as regards the question at issue, for they are quite consistent with the theory that Shake-speare was in reality a pseudonym. And what of the rest? Mr. Lee is, as we have seen, very contemptuous of those ignorant persons who conceive

that he has built his edifice not on "the impregnable rock" of evidence, as he fondly imagines, but on the shifting sands of prejudice and imagination. I am not impressed by Mr. Lee's assertion that those who differ from him are incompetent to form a just estimate of the value of evidence. I do not know anything in Mr. Lee's life or writings which would lead me to suppose that he is himself endowed with that faculty. His Shakespearean polemics always bring to mind the saying of the old Greek philosopher, *πολυμαθίη νόον οὐ διδάσκει—πολυμαθίη* in this case standing for study of Elizabethan literature. But let us hear what that distinguished Shakespearean, Mr. Fleay, who certainly cannot be charged with want of knowledge, learning, or industry, has to say on this subject. Speaking of the "allusions" which have been "collected, and well collected, in Dr. Ingleby's *Century of Praise*," he says: "They consist almost entirely of slight references to his (Shakespeare's) published works, and have no bearing of importance on his career. Nor, indeed, have we any extended material of any kind to aid us in this investigation; *one source of information, which is abundant for most of his contemporaries, being in his case entirely absent. Neither as addressed to him by others, nor by him to others, do any commendatory verses exist in connection with any of his or other men's works published in his lifetime,—a notable fact, in whatever way it may be explained.*[1] Nor can he be traced in any personal contact beyond a very limited circle, although *the fanciful might-have-beens*[1] so largely indulged in by his biographers might at first lead us to an opposite conclusion!"

The medley of further allusions so laboriously collected and published by Dr. Furnivall certainly carry the matter no further; that is to say, they are of little or no value on the question of authorship. But there has been recently published (in fact, since I commenced to write this

[1] My italics.

chapter) a book called *The Praise of Shakespeare*, compiled by Mr. C. E. Hughes, and with a preface by Mr. Sidney Lee. Now here, at any rate, one may expect to find among the allusions of the "First Period" (from 1596 to 1693) the very best of the proofs for which we seek. "The whole of the sceptical argument," says Mr. Lee in his preface, "ignored alike the results of recent Shakespearean research and the elementary truths of Elizabethan literary history. . . . The conjecture that Shakespeare lived and died unhonoured rests on no foundation of fact. The converse alone is true. Shakespeare's eminence was fully acknowledged by his contemporaries and their acknowledgments have long been familiar to scholars."

This seems to me mere *σκιαμαχία*—or I should, perhaps, rather say *ignoratio elenchi*. But first as to the fact. Though the learned Dr. Ingleby, whom even Mr. Lee would, I imagine, scarcely venture to include among the ignorant, makes perhaps too broad an assertion when he says (*Forespeech*, p. 11) that "the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of that age," it is, I think, indisputable that Mr. Lee speaks but the language of exaggeration when he says that "Shakespeare's eminence was fully acknowledged by his contemporaries." The "allusions" are far from giving support to so sweeping an assertion. That there *was*, however, contemporaneous testimony to Shakespeare's eminence is not denied. There is, that is to say, some testimony by contemporaries to the fact that there was a poet of pre-eminent genius who wrote under the name of Shakespeare. It would have been strange indeed if it were not so. The really remarkable thing is that there is not much more of it. It is admitted that poems and plays of transcendent excellence were published under the name of Shakespeare during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. It would indeed have been phenomenal if no contemporaneous voice had been raised to give them praise, and

very true.

to us it does seem strange that, although such voices there were, yet so few and far between were they, and so many and so important were the voices that kept silence on this theme, that Dr. Ingleby is almost justified in his statement that "the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of that age."[1] The fact is, of course, that as was once said of Mr. Gladstone, great men are like great mountains, and we require to be at a very considerable distance from them before we can adequately appreciate their grandeur. The result is that the real appreciation of Shakespeare's transcendent genius is a plant of comparatively modern growth. The point, however, to which I wish to direct attention, is that the contemporary eulogies of the poet, although they afford proof that there were some cultured critics of that day of sufficient taste and acumen to recognise, or partly recognise, his excellence, afford no proof that the author who published under the name of Shakespeare was in reality Shakspere the Stratford player. The most that can be said is that there is, *a priori*, a presumption to that effect, but it is certainly very far from being what is known to lawyers as an irrebuttable presumption.

Let us take a modern instance. Suppose that the true identity of George Eliot had never been revealed. Suppose also that there had been living at the time of the publication of Miss Evans's works a smart young man, say a foreign-office clerk, or a second-rate actor if you will, who bore the name of George Eliot. Suppose, further,

[1] As Dr. Ingleby points out, Thomas Lodge's *Wits Miserie and the World's Madness* was issued as late as 1596, but "among the 'divine wits' named we do not find the name of Shakespeare. Similarly in 1598 was published Edward Guilpin's collection of satires called *Skialethia;* the sixth of which contains the names of Chaucer, Gower, Daniel, Markham, Drayton, and Sidney, but not that of Shakespeare." He might have added that Dr. Peter Heylyn, of Magdalen College, Oxford, wrote a celebrated *Description of the World*, published in 1621, but in his list of famous English dramatic poets he does *not* include the name of Shakespeare!

that a question were raised as to the authorship of these works. It is very obvious that any amount of contemporaneous eulogy of the writer "George Eliot" would not afford a tittle of evidence in favour of the contention that the foreign-office clerk or actor of that name was, in truth, the author, even although some persons had during his lifetime credited him with the authorship.

I am aware of the dangers of analogy, and I am equally aware that the two cases are not altogether "on all fours," as the lawyers would say, and therefore I merely give this hypothetical case as being, under due limitations, a fair illustration of my meaning, as against those who appear to think that all praise, if not all notices, of Shakespeare afford proof of the Stratfordian authorship.

Revenons à nos moutons. Let us come back to the "allusions." Mr. Hughes leads off with the well-known extracts from Francis Meres's *Palladis Tamia*, or Wits' Treasury, published in 1598. Meres expresses the opinion that "the sweet witty soul of Ovid lives in mellifluous and honey-tongued Shakespeare, witness his *Venus and Adonis*, his *Lucrece*, his sugred Sonnets among his private friends." Here we have, again, the "Sweet Mr. Shakespeare" of Gullio, Shakespeare of the Poems—the *Venus and Adonis* especially—all sugar and honey, and, as the truth was, saturated with Ovid.[1]

Meres also says that "the Muses would speak with Shakespeare's fine-filed phrase" if they would speak English. Here we note "*fine-filed* phrase" as showing that Meres, at any rate, was not so foolish as to imagine that Shakespeare threw off his poetry *currente calamo* without effort, or that he "never blotted out a line"; and,

[1] Compare with this:—

> Sweet honey dropping Daniell doth wage
> War with the proudest big Italian
> That melts his heart in sugred sonneting.
>
> *The Return from Parnassus*, I, 2, 241.

comparing Jonson's reference to "his well-turned and *true-filed* lines," we see that both these critics recognised the fact that Shakespeare used both file and polish, or in other words, rewrote, recast, corrected, and revised. Then, again, Meres says that "As Plautus and Seneca are accounted the best for Comedy and Tragedy among the Latines, so Shakespeare among the English is the most excellent in both kinds for the stage"; and he then gives us a valuable list, evidently not intended to be exhaustive, of some of the Shakespearean plays then extant. These "allusions" are very interesting, but how they negative the hypothesis that "Shakespeare" was a *nom de plume* is not apparent. There is nothing whatever to show that Meres had any personal acquaintance with the author.

Then follows Richard Barnfield (1598), who again speaks of Shakespeare as "honey-flowing," and says that his *Venus* and *Lucrece* have placed his name "in Fame's immortal book." Next comes John Weaver (1599), and once more we hear of "honey-tongued Shakespeare," admired for his "rose-cheeked Adonis," and "Fire-hot Venus," and "chaste Lucretia." Weever, however, does mention

> Romeo, Richard,[1] more whose names I know not,

and speaks of "their sugared tongues."

John Davies, of Hereford (1610), is rather more to the point, for he writes lines to "our English Terence, Mr. Will Shake-speare,"[2] and, addressing him as "Good Will," says that "according to some if he had not played some kingly parts in sport," he might have been "a companion for a king," and "been a king *among the meaner sort*," hardly the sort of language which we should expect to be addressed to the immortal bard! He adds that Will sows

[1] In the original this seems to have been written "Romea-Richard." (See Ingleby, p. 16.)

[2] Why does Mr. Hughes omit the hyphen? (See Ingleby, p. 94.)

while others reap. The note in Ingleby, by L. Toulmin Smith, is as follows: "It seems likely that these lines refer to the fact that Shakspere was a player, a profession that was then despised and accounted mean." Indeed, John Davies seems to have the player in his mind rather than the poet. Did he, perchance, mentally separate the two?[1]

Next comes Thomas Freeman (1614, only two years before Shakspere's death), who writes "To Master W. Shakespeare," and says that for him

> Who loves chaste life, there's *Lucrece* for a teacher;
> Who list[2] read lust there's *Venus and Adonis;*

but goes on to say:—

> Besides in plays thy wit winds like Meander.

Hence we jump at once to William Basse (1622), six years after Shakspere's death, which reminds us that although at Jonson's death there was a competition among his brother poets for the writing of his elegy, the results being gathered together in *Jonsonus Virbius*, as a wreath to be laid upon his tomb, yet, for some unexplained reason, Shakspere had to lie six years in his grave, "without the meed of one melodious tear," till this unknown Basse published his cryptic lines, with which, as with Jonson's own verses prefixed to the 1623 Folio, I have elsewhere dealt at some length.[3]

This brings us to the unknown author of the inscription on the Stratford monument, and the verses of Hugh Holland and Leonard Digges, which, together with Jonson's, appear on the opening pages of the First Folio. I notice,

[1] "Thou hadst been a companion for a *King* (*sic*)
And beene a King among the meaner sort"?
I suspect an allusion to a name, or some esoteric meaning which, at the present day, we cannot understand.

[2] Why does Mr. Hughes print "but" instead of "list"?

[3] See chap. XVI. p. 472 *et seq.*, and *ante*, p. 201.

however, that the compiler has omitted Digges's lines which were prefixed to the 1640 edition of Shakespeare's poems, and which it seems he had written with the view to their publication in the 1623 volume. But it is a pity not to put all one's witnesses in the box, so I will myself call Leonard Digges, and the reader shall judge of the value of his evidence.

He leads off with the assertion that "Poets are born not made," and appeals to Shakespeare as a signal example of the truth of that proposition. Thus he at once challenges Jonson's

> For a good poet's made as well as born ;
> And such wert thou.

According to Digges, Shakespeare had no art at all, or, as he absurdly expresses it, he had

> Art without art unparaleld as yet ;

here, again, coming into conflict with Jonson's

> Thy *art*,
> My gentle Shakespeare, must enjoy a part.

No wonder that Jonson should have excluded these lines from the Folio, as we may reasonably presume he did.

Now let the reader hearken to this estimate of Shakespeare as conceived by Digges :—

> Next Nature only helpt him, for look thorow
> This whole Book, thou shalt find he doth not borrow
> One phrase from Greekes, nor Latines imitate,
> Nor once from vulgar languages translate,
> Nor Plagiari-like from others glean,
> Nor begs he from each witty friend a scene
> To piece his acts with, all that he doth write
> Is pure his owne, plot, language exquisite.

Absurdity could hardly go further than this. It is as if one should praise Swift for the chasteness of his language,

the delicacy of his thought, the sweetness of his temper, and his obvious desire to avoid giving offence to anybody! It is, in fact, to praise Shakespeare for exactly those qualities which in Shakespeare's case were conspicuous by their absence, and shows that this Digges was either writing with his tongue in his cheek, or had no conception of what he was talking about. Yet this ridiculous writer is often cited as though his upside-down comments had some evidentiary value on the question of the Shakespearean authorship!

Few of the "Shakespeare allusions" are better known than the words of Thomas Fuller, (1643–62), whom I have already quoted to the effect that Shakespeare was "an eminent instance of the truth of that rule, *Poeta nascitur non fit;* one is not *made* but *born* a poet." For "his learning was very little," and if alive, he would confess himself to be "never any scholar." Then follows this often-quoted passage: "Many were the *wit-combates* betwixt him and Ben 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. Shakespear, 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 has been frequently quoted by ardent Shakespeareans, "with just enough of learning to misquote," as if the words stood, not "I behold," but "I beheld," so as to give the impression that the writer was himself present at these supposed "wit-combates"; but inasmuch as "worthy old Fuller" was not born till 1608 he was only eight years old when Shakspere died. It is plain, therefore, that he beheld these imaginary conflicts "in his mind's eye" only.[1]

[1] Fuller seems to have known but little of Shakespeare, for alluding to the "warlike sound of his surname" he says that from it "some may conjecture him of a military extraction."

Let us now turn to an undoubted allusion to Shakspere the player, made by one whose family had been long associated with him, and who must have known him well. In 1635 Cuthbert Burbage, son of James, and brother of Richard the famous actor, addressed a petition, on behalf of himself "and Winifred his brother's wife, and William his son," to the Earl of Pembroke, the survivor of the "Incomparable Pair" to whom the Folio was dedicated, and then Lord Chamberlain. I do not find the petition in Ingleby's *Century of Praise* or in the lately published *Praise of Shakespeare*, but it is given *in extenso* by the industrious Halliwell-Phillipps (I. 291). Cuthbert Burbage recites that his father "was the first builder of playhouses, and was himself in his younger years a player," that he built his first playhouse on leased land, and had a lawsuit with his landlord, "and by his death the like troubles fell on us his sons; we then bethought us of altering from thence, and at like expense built the Globe . . . and to ourselves we joined *those deserving men*, Shakspere, Hemmings, Condall, Phillips and others, partners in the profits of that they call the House," of which the petitioners were lessees. He adds that when he and his brother took possession of the Blackfriars (which his father had "purchased at extreme rates") they "placed men players, which were Hemmings, Condall, Shakspere, etc.," as successors to the children of the Chapel. It does indeed seem strange, as Judge Webb remarks, that the proprietor of the playhouses which had been made famous by the production of the Shakespearean plays, should in 1635—twelve years after the publication of the great Folio—describe their reputed author to the survivor of the Incomparable Pair as merely a "man-player" and a "deserving man"! Why did he not remind the Lord Chamberlain that this "deserving man" was the author of all these famous dramas? Was it because he was aware that the Earl of Pembroke "knew better than that"?

Note

Again, we may ask why it is that Henslowe, the proprietor of the Rose, who kept a diary (1592–1603) in which he recorded his dealings with all the leading playwrights of the day, never once mentions the name of Shakspere as being one of them, or indeed at all.[1]

Let me here give one other instance of the "negative pregnant." John Manningham, Barrister-at-law, of the Middle Temple, and of Bradbourne, Kent, a well-educated and cultured man, makes an entry in his diary under date February 2nd, 1601. "At our feast we had a play called Twelve Night, or What you Will, much like the Comedy of Errors, or Menechmi in Plautus, but most like and near to that in Italian called *Inganni*. A good practice in it to make the steward believe his lady widow was in love with him, by counterfeiting a letter as from his lady, in general terms, telling him what she liked best in him, and prescribing his gesture in smiling, his apparel, etc., and then, when he came to practise, making him believe they took him to be mad." Upon March 13 of the same year he makes another entry as follows: "Upon a time when Burbidge played Richard Third there was a citizen gone so far in liking with him, that before she went from the play she appointed him to come that night unto her by the name of Richard the Third. Shakespear overhearing their conclusion went before, was entertained, and at his game ere Burbidge came. Then message being brought that Richard the Third was at the door, Shakespeare caused return to be made that William the Conqueror was before Richard the Third. Shakespeare's name William."

Now if Shakspere the player was known to the world as the author of the plays of Shakespeare, it does seem

[1] Yet, says Mr. Lee, "The Rose Theatre was *doubtless* the earliest scene of Shakespeare's pronounced successes alike as actor and dramatist." If this were so, Henslowe's silence would be trebly inexplicable. But "doubtless" with Mr. Lee is generally used to introduce a proposition unsupported by evidence and peculiarly doubtful. I deal with "the silence of Philip Henslowe" at some length in chap. XII.

extremely remarkable that John Manningham, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-law, should have made that curious addendum to his scandalous story, "Shakespeare's name William," instead of saying "the brilliant author of that Twelfth Night play which so much amused me at our feast a few weeks ago"! But Manningham, it seems, had no suspicion of the identity of Shakespeare the author and Shakspere the merry player, who played this not very edifying trick on his fellow actor.[1]

I will conclude with two contemporary allusions to Shakespeare which are not a little interesting.

In Camden's *Remains*, 1614, at p. 44, we read: "Whatsoever grace any other language carrieth in verse or prose, in tropes or metaphors, in echoes and agnominations, they may all bee lively and exactly represented in ours. Will you have Platoes veine? reade Sir Thomas Smith. The Ionicke? Sir Thomas Moore. Ciceroes? Ascham. Varro? Chaucer. Demosthenes? Sir John Cheeke, who in his treatise to the Rebels hath comprised all the figures of rhetorik. Will you read Virgil? Take the Earle of Surrey. Catullus? Shakespeare and Barlowe's fragment. Ovid? Daniell. Lucan? Spencer. Martiall? Sir John Davies and others. Will you have all in all for prose and verse? Take the miracle of our age, Sir Philip Sidney."

The authorities at the British Museum inform us[2] that the above is an extract from "*The Excellencies of the English Tongue*, by R[ichard] C[arew], Esq., an essay written about

[1] When Phillips the actor died in 1605, he left a bequest "To my fellow William Shakespeare a thirty shillings piece in gold," using no words to distinguish him from other fellow players. Apart from the players' preface to the Folio, which I have dealt with elsewhere, there is never any recognition of him by his "fellows" as a poet and dramatist. He is just the "man player," the "deserving man." Mr. D. H. Lambert, in his *Shakespeare Documents*, prints the first but discreetly omits the second of the above entries in Manningham's Diary.

[2] On a written card exhibited at the recent exhibition of Shakespeare books, etc.

the beginning of the seventeenth century, and communicated to Camden, who printed it in 1614." Camden, at any rate, accepted it, and made himself responsible for it. But what is the meaning of "Shakespeare and Barlowe's fragment"? It is presumed that Barlowe is merely a *lapsus calami* for Marlowe. But are we to understand that Shakespere and Marlowe collaborated in this "fragment"? Or is the meaning merely that Catullus may be found "exactly represented" in the poems of Shakespeare (*Venus and Adonis*, e.g.), and in a fragment by Marlowe (possibly *Hero and Leander*)?[1]

My last quotation is from an old work called "*Polimanteia*, or the meanes lawfull and unlawfull to judge of the fall of a Common-wealth against the frivolous and foolish coniectures of this age. Whereunto is added a letter from England to her three daughters, Cambridge, Oxford, Innes of Court, and to all the rest of her inhabitants. Printed by John Legate, Printer of the Universitie of Cambridge, 1595. Dedicated to the Rt. Honble Robert Devorax, Earle of Essex and Ewe; signed 'W.C.'," which is generally interpreted Wm. Clark or Clerke, though some have ascribed the work to William Camden. In the letter to the Universities and the Inns of Court (see page numbered R 2 and following) the author is alluding to writers of the University school, such as Spenser and Daniell, and he has this marginal note to the passage: "All praiseworthy Lucrecia, Sweet Shak-speare. Eloquent Gaveston, Wanton Adonis, Watson's heyre."

[1] "E. W. S." (*Shakespeare-Bacon*, p. 5) writes: "That Shakespeare passed for a scholar is also attested (as Halliwell-Phillipps has somewhere observed) by a passage in *Camden's Remaines* which intimates that Marlowe was helped by Shakespeare (necessarily before June, 1593) to render Catullus into English." An examination of the words above quoted will, however, show, as I think, that the passage does not bear this meaning. It is very curious to observe how Marlowe and Shakespeare selected the same passages of Ovid for translation or paraphrase. The *Hero and Leander*, by the way, would be more suggestive of this poet than of Catullus.

"Gaveston" is, I presume, an allusion to Marlowe's *Edward II.*[1] As to "Watson's heyre," Mr. Sidney Lee (*Dictionary of National Biography*) thinks that the writer (whom he assumes to be William Clerke) means to refer to Shakespeare as the poetical heir to Thomas Watson (*circ.* 1557–92). This seems *very* doubtful. But whatever may be the meaning of the expression it is clear that "W. C." couples Shakespeare with Marlowe and Watson, both University men, and conceives of him as being himself a member of one of the Universities, and, presumably, of one of the Inns of Court also. This is not a little significant, especially when we remember that the book was published in 1595, only a few months after the *Lucrece* of "Sweet Shak-speare."[2]

[1] Or, perhaps, to Drayton's "Legend of Piers Gaveston."

[2] I have examined both the works cited at the British Museum. They are frequently very incorrectly quoted. I may here add that in *The Times* of December 27th, 1905, two columns are taken up by an article by Mr. Sidney Lee headed "A Discovery about Shakespeare." Among the documents preserved at Belvoir Castle is an account of the household expenses of Francis, sixth Earl of Rutland, wherein has been found an entry showing that in March, 1613, the sum of forty-four shillings was paid to "Mr. Shakespeare" (how the name is spelled in the original entry I do not know) for work "about my Lorde's impreso," and a like sum to his fellow player Richard Burbage (who was, as everybody knows, a painter as well as an actor) "for paynting and making it." An "impreso," or, more correctly, "impresa," was, we are told, "a hieroglyphical or pictorial design (in miniature) which suggested some markedly characteristic quality or experience of the person for whom it was devised, while three or four words of slightly epigrammatic flavour were appended," as a motto, "to drive the application home." Shakspere is designated as "Mr." because he had, "with great difficulty," as Mr. Lee says, and by not a few false pretences, as he might have added, obtained a coat-of-arms from the Heralds' College, but both he and Burbage received the same remuneration. This, it is to be noted, was in 1613, when Shakspere, as Mr. Lee tells us, had "retired from the great work of his life." Not much here to show that he was recognised as the "great dramatist" and immortal poet! Incidentally Mr. Lee mentions that the fifth Earl of Rutland married Sir Philip Sidney's daughter, Elizabeth, who "in her father's spirit assiduously cultivated the society of men of letters. She bought and read their books and welcomed them to her table." Ben Jonson "was often her guest, and with him and with the poet and dramatist, Francis Beaumont, she regularly corresponded." Strange, is it not, that there should be no corre-

spondence between this cultured lady and the great poet and dramatist, "Mr. Shakspere," who was employed (for the reward of forty-four shillings) "about my Lorde's impreso" at Belvoir Castle! Why did *he* never correspond with the patrons of literature and art in his time? "It may well be," says Mr. Lee, "that documents which are yet to be discovered will set Shakespeare also among the poets who shared the hospitality of Sidney's daughter at Belvoir"! A consummation devoutly to be wished certainly; but such documents are always "to be" and never "are" discovered. What is shown is that Shakspere and Dick Burbage are employed for a not excessive remuneration to do some fanciful work for the Earl of Rutland, and are duly paid for it; and no doubt they went home rejoicing. Somehow I cannot think that "Shakespeare" would have made any charge for work of this kind!

On the whole this record, so far from showing that William Shakspere of Stratford was the admired poet and successful dramatist, whose society was cultivated by the great personages of his day, appears to me to tell strongly on the other side. And now let us see how it is made use of by the fertile imagination of the Stratfordians. I read in the *Westminster Gazette* (November 30th, 1906), under the heading "Shakespeare at Belvoir," the following words: "As to Shakespeare having been *frequently* at Belvoir, *that seems certain beyond doubt* [my italics]. The Rutland Earls were related to Lord Southampton as well as to the Penshurst Sidneys, and had Ben Jonson for one of their literary 'tame cats.'" Not much evidence so far, but mark what follows. "Among the Belvoir papers, dated March 31, 1613, is the entry of a sum paid to Mr. Shakespeare and Mr. Burbage for preparing my lord's 'impreso,' in other words, an emblematical design with an appropriate motto illustrating some great quality or greater deed." We know, therefore, that Ben Jonson was a "tame cat" at Belvoir. About Shakspere we have a single line of a steward's account of household expenses, showing that three years before his death, and at a time when, if he was the great poet, he would have been at the zenith of his fame, he is paid forty-four shillings for this trivial fancy-work. Therefore, it is "certain beyond doubt" that he was "frequently at Belvoir," and "doubtless," as an honoured guest; perhaps, like Ben Jonson, as a "tame cat"! Thus is "Shakespearean" biography concocted!

Again, there has recently been published a new volume of *Hatfield Manuscripts*, to which *The Tribune*, of December 18th, 1906, has devoted two "leaderettes." Here we read as follows: "Shakespeareans will turn at once in the new volume of *Hatfield Manuscripts* to the documents which have to do with Shakespeare's generous and sympathetic patron Henry Wriothesley Earl of Southampton. . . . Southampton was one of those fine spirits who was privileged to break the bonds of the eternal commonplace, and could realise that, as Scott has phrased it in *Kenilworth*, it was not the playwright paying homage to the peer but the immortal conceding a conventional tribute to the mortal. In the *Hatfield Manuscripts* we find Southampton writing after the failure of Essex's plot in tender strain but philosophic spirit to his young wife, Elizabeth Vernon. An especial interest attaches to this ill-fated venture, because there is very little doubt that it was the ruin attending it, which involved some of his closest friends, that induced the

melancholy and tragic mood so conspicuous in the penultimate stage of Shakespeare's development." With greatly excited interest we turn to the volume. Here, at least, we shall find some allusion by Southampton, in one of his numerous letters, to the great dramatist whose "generous and sympathetic patron" he had been! Here, at least, that "fine spirit" who could realise that he was but a mortal receiving conventional tributes from an immortal has left some testimony, some few words, expressive of the profound homage which he yielded to the great poet who was not of an age but for all time! Alas! It is the same old story; the same hope deferred that maketh the heart sick. Of Shakespeare not one single word. All this of "the generous and sympathetic patron"; all this of Shakespeare's "melancholy and tragic mood," induced by the ruin attending the failure of Essex's plot, belongs not to the realms of fact, but to the visionary regions of imagination and conjecture.

CHAPTER XII

THE SILENCE OF PHILIP HENSLOWE

LET us now put together some important facts which are well worthy of consideration.

In the first place it is clear that Francis Meres's allusions to Shakespeare[1] do nothing whatever to support the idea that the Stratford player was the author of the plays and poems alluded to. There is nothing at all to show that Meres, native of Lincolnshire, graduate of Cambridge, and Divine, had any personal knowledge of Shakespeare. He knew that plays and poems were published under that name, and that some sonnets purporting to be "Shake-speare's" were being privately circulated, but on the question "Who was Shakespeare?" he throws no light. Drayton he seems to have known, for of him he says *quem toties honoris et amoris causa nomino*, where *amoris* would seem to imply personal affection; but as to Shakespeare there is no such implication. Meres gives lists of all the famous literary men of the time and compares them with the ancients. He refers to Shakespeare as "the most excellent" both for tragedy and comedy, and as to his *Venus and Adonis*, his *Lucrece*, and his "sugred sonnets among his private friends," he says that "the sweet wittie soule of Ovid lives in mellifluous and hony-tongued Shakespeare." He says, further, that "the Muses would speak with Shakespeare's *fine-filed phrase*, if they could speake English," an expression which is in agreement with Jonson's mention of the

[1] *Ante*, p. 334.

poet's "well turnéd and true-filéd lines." But Meres is certainly not to be trusted absolutely, for he names *Titus Andronicus* as a play of Shakespeare's, which we can say with "certainty," *pace* Mr. Collins, that it is not, though no doubt it had been ascribed to "Shakespeare," notwithstanding the fact that the 1594 Quarto had, like the subsequent editions, been published anonymously.[1]

Secondly, we see that the Folio *canon* is not to be implicitly relied upon, for this, too, includes the non-Shakespearean *Titus*, as well as the three parts of *Henry VI*, of which we may surely affirm that Part 1 is certainly not Shakespearean, and that it is exceedingly difficult to say how much, if any, of the second and third parts is the work of Shakespeare.

Thirdly, let us take careful note of the number of plays which were published as by Shakespeare, though admitted to be none of his, and that, too, in the lifetime of Shakspere. There were, for example, (1) *Locrine*, published in 1595, with a title-page setting forth that it had been "overseene and corrected by *W. S.*" (2) *Sir John Oldcastle*, which first appeared in 1600, with a title-page which informed the reader that it was by "William Shakespeare." (3) *The London Prodigal*, published in 1605, under Shakespeare's name. (4) *The Puritan or the Widow of Watling Street*, given to the public in 1607 as written by "*W. S.*" (5) *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, published in 1608 in the name of Shakespeare. (6) *Pericles*, published in 1609 as "by William Shakespeare." (7) *Thomas, Lord Cromwell*, published in 1613 as by "*W. S.*"

Now whatever were the laws of copyright,[2] Shakspere, if he were the man who wrote under the name of Shakespeare, might at least have raised some protest against works of this sort being thus fraudulently palmed off upon

[1] Meres is not always accurate. For instance, he seems to have confused Edward Ferrers who wrote for the stage (d. 1564) with George Ferrers who wrote six of the historical poems in the *Mirror for Magistrates* (d. 1579).

[2] As to which see chap. x.

the public under his name. It seems clear, however, that he stood by and said nothing, for not only is there no grain of evidence that he took action of any kind, but the pseudo-authorship still stood uncontradicted in 1664 when the Third Folio was issued including these seven plays among the works of Shakespeare. Nay, there have been found critics, so late as the beginning of the nineteenth century, to maintain stoutly that some of these works were, in fact, by Shakespeare. Thus Schlegel, speaking of *Sir John Oldcastle*, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, and *Thomas, Lord Cromwell*, says, "The three last pieces are not only unquestionably Shakespeare's but, in my opinion, they deserve to be classed among his best and maturest works!" How this renowned critic could have arrived at such a conclusion I find it extremely difficult to conceive; but he had not before him the evidence since made available by the discovery of Henslowe's *Diary*, which would have opened his eyes to the danger of using such adverbs as "unquestionably" in such cases.[1] Anyhow, nobody at the present day ascribes these seven plays to Shakespeare, although many critics insist that Shakespearean work is to be found in *Pericles*, which is at this day commonly included among "the works of Shakespeare," although omitted by the editor of the First Folio.

In this connection we must note also that in 1599 W. Jaggard published *The Passionate Pilgrim* as "By W. Shakespeare," though, as he must have very well known, very few of the pieces which it contained were by Shakespeare. In 1612 another edition was issued augmented

[1] Henslowe's *Diary* (as to which see p. 352) has the entry: "This 16th October '99 [i.e. 1599] Receved by me Thomas Downton of Phillip Henslow to pay Mr. Monday, Mr. Drayton, and Mr. Wilson and Hathway for the first prte of the lyfe of Sir John Ouldcasstell and in earnest of the second pte, for the use of the company ten pownd. I say receved." It thus appears that Anthony Monday, Michael Drayton, Robert Wilson, and Richard Hathaway were the real authors of this "Shakespearean" play, to which, as it appears by a later entry, Thomas Dekker made additions in 1602.

by the addition of some poems by Thomas Heywood, viz. two love epistles, the first from Paris to Helen, the second Helen's answer to Paris. In the postscript to his *Apology for Actors*, 1612, Heywood, referring to his book called *Troia Britannica*, published in 1609,[1] says, "Here, likewise, I must necessarily insert a manifest injury done me in that work, by taking the two epistles of Paris to Helen, and Helen to Paris, and printing them in a less volume under the name of another, which may put the world in opinion I might steal them from him, and he, to do himself right, hath since published them in his own name; but as I must acknowledge my lines not worthy his patronage under whom he hath published them, so the author, I know, was much offended with Mr. Jaggard that (altogether unknown to him) presumed to make so bold with his name."

Here we observe that Heywood does nothing to identify "the author" with the player. He is somebody of whom Heywood speaks in very deferential terms. "The author," says Heywood, "I know was much offended"; but nevertheless, "the author" does not seem to have raised any protest as Heywood did, whereby Mr. W. Jaggard was constrained to cancel the first title-page, and substitute a second, omitting Shakespeare's name. Had not Heywood thus interfered, we may conclude that, as in the case of the spurious plays and of the Sonnets, no action would have been taken, and *The Passionate Pilgrim* would have continued to be issued with "W. Shakespeare" on the title-page. Yet no reason can be suggested why the player (if he were the author) should not have interfered by protest or otherwise. If "Shakespeare" was some other personage, in an altogether different walk of life—a courtier, for instance, holding or aspiring to high office in the state—he might have thought it expedient in this, as

[1] In this volume Heywood had already published the two translations from Ovid, which Jaggard printed as Shakespeare's in 1612.

in other cases, to say nothing. There are times when silence is golden.

There is yet another play which was published as by Shakespeare in the life of Shakspere, and which must on no account be omitted from our survey. I refer to *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, printed anonymously in 1591, but as "written by W. Sh." in the second edition, in 1611, and as "written by W. Shakespeare" in 1622, the year before the publication of the First Folio.

After Shakspere's death several plays were published as by him, which very possibly passed as Shakespeare's long before that date. Thus, Humphrey Moseley, the publisher, in 1653, entered on the Stationers' Register two pieces which he represented to be by Shakespeare in whole or in part, viz. *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* and the *History of Cardenio*, a share of which was assigned to Fletcher. Earlier still, viz. in 1634, the play of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* was attributed on the title-page to Fletcher and Shakespeare,[1] and, as is well known, in the library of Charles II was a volume containing *Mucedorus*, *The Merry Devil of Edmonton*, and *Fair Em*, purporting to be by Shakespeare.

We need not, however, delay over these later publications. More than enough has been said to show that not only was the name of "Shakespeare" very frequently made use of as a popular name under which publishers might appeal to the public, and under which many works were published as Shakespeare's in which he had no part, but also that the publishers were aware that they might so use it without let or hindrance, in the knowledge that "Shakespeare" was prepared to "take it lying down."

[1] The title-page states that it is "by the memorable worthies of their time, Mr. John Fletcher and Mr. William Shakespeare gentlemen." Mr. Lee thinks that "frequent signs of Shakespeare's workmanship are unmistakable" (p. 211). Charles Lamb, Coleridge, and Dyce assigned a substantial portion of the play to Shakespeare. Shelley, however, wrote: "I do not believe Shakspere wrote a word of it"; and Hazlitt was of the same opinion.

And now, fourthly, let us return to the Folio of 1623. It stands admitted that a very large part of that volume consists of work that is not "Shakespeare's" at all. I have already dealt with *Titus* and *Henry VI*, but there are many other plays in that very doubtful "canon," which, by universal admission, contain much non-Shakespearean composition.

Such plays are *The Taming of the Shrew*, of which much is admittedly non-Shakespearean, if indeed any part of it can be confidently ascribed to the master; *Troilus and Cressida*, in which all critics recognise the work of at least two hands; *Timon of Athens*, of which Mr. Gollancz writes: "It is now generally agreed that *Timon* contains a good deal of non-Shakespearean alloy"; and *Henry VIII*, a large part of which we are told is by Fletcher. But this is by no means an exhaustive list, for modern critics tell us that there is non-Shakespearean work in *King John*, *Richard III*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and some other plays.[1] In fact, it is quite astonishing how much of "Shakespeare" turns out to be non-Shakespearean! This is a characteristic of the plays which has to be seriously considered.

note this.

There has recently been published in the United States a work entitled, *An Impartial Study of the Shakespeare Title*, by John H. Stotsenburg. The author, Judge Stotsenburg, has done well in calling special attention, first, to the system of collaboration in the writing of plays which so generally prevailed in Shakespearean times, and

[1] Mr. Bertram Dobell claims to have proved that George Wilkins "collaborated with Shakespeare, not only in *Timon of Athens* and *Pericles* (which has been previously suspected, though never proved), but also in *Macbeth*." That the work of another and inferior hand appears in parts of the latter play is generally admitted. The distinguished Clarendon Press Editors, Messrs. W. G. Clark and Aldis Wright, came to the conclusion that these portions were interpolated "after Shakespeare's death, or at least after he had withdrawn from all connection with the theatre," and that "the interpolator was, not improbably, Thomas Middleton," whose play of *The Witch* contains many resemblances to *Macbeth*.

secondly to the importance of the entries to be found in Henslowe's Journal. Let us take Henslowe first.

Philip Henslowe was in partnership with Edward Alleyn the famous actor (who had married Henslowe's stepdaughter) in considerable theatrical speculations, and they appear to have been joint proprietors of several theatres, including the Rose, which he erected on the Bankside; and this partnership continued till his death in 1616, in which year William Shakspere also was removed from life's fitful fever.

His so-called *Diary*, a large folio manuscript volume, containing valuable information concerning theatrical affairs from 1591 to 1609, was discovered by Malone at Dulwich College (founded by Alleyn) about the year 1790. It was reprinted by the Shakespeare Society in 1845, with a preface by J. Payne Collier. "Henslowe," says Collier, "wrote a bad hand, adopted any orthography that suited his notions of the sound of words, especially of proper names (necessarily of most frequent occurrence), and he kept his book, as respects dates in particular, in the most disorderly, negligent and confused manner. . . . He generally used his own pen, but in some places the hand of a scribe or clerk is visible; and here and there the dramatists and actors themselves (whom he employed) wrote the item in which they were concerned, for the sake perhaps of saving the old manager trouble; thus in various parts of the manuscript we meet with the handwriting, not merely the signatures, of Drayton, Chapman, Dekker, Chettle, Porter, Wilson, Hathaway, Day, S. Rowley, Haughton, Rankins, and Wadeson." Mr. Furness, who quotes this passage in the appendix to his new Variorum *Hamlet* (Vol II), justly adds: "Where the names of nearly all the dramatic poets of the age are to be frequently found, we might certainly count on finding that of Shakespeare, but the shadow in which Shakespeare's early life was spent envelops him here too, and his name, as Collier

says, is not met with in any part of the manuscript." very strange.
And again: "Recollecting that the names of nearly all the other play-poets of the time occur, we cannot but wonder that that of Shaksper is not met with in any part of the manuscript. The notices of Ben Jonson, Dekker, Chettle, Marston, Wilson, Drayton, Monday, Heywood, Middleton, Porter, Hathaway, Rankins, Webster, Day, Rowley, Haughton, etc., are frequent, because they were all writers for Henslowe's theatre, but we must wait at all events for the discovery of some other similar record, before we can produce corresponding memoranda regarding Shaksper and his productions."

Now here is another most remarkable phenomenon. Here is a manuscript book, dating from 1591 to 1609, which embraces the period of Shakespeare's greatest activity; and in it we find mention of practically all the dramatic writers of that day with any claims to distinction—men whom Henslowe had employed to write plays for his theatre; yet nowhere is the name of Shakespeare to be found among them, or, indeed, at all. Yet if Shakspere the player had been a dramatist, surely Henslowe would have employed him also, like the others, for reward in that behalf! It is strange indeed, on the hypothesis of his being a successful playwright, as well as an actor, that the old manager should not so much as mention his name in all this large manuscript volume! Nevertheless it is quietly assumed by the Stratfordian editors that Shakspere commenced his career as a dramatist by writing plays for this very Henslowe who so completely ignores his existence. Thus we have an entry in the *Diary:* "R'd at titus and ondronicus the 23 of Jenewary (1593) iii^{ll} viij^{s}," i.e. three pounds eight shillings; which means that this sum represented the theatre receipts for the first presentation of the tragedy which Henslowe marks as new.[1] Now

[1] Henslowe placed *ne* in the outer margin to denote "new," according to his custom. *Diary*, as edited by Collier, p. 33. We must remember that a quarto edition of *Titus* appeared in 1594.

100

mark the Stratfordian argument! *Titus Andronicus* is included in the Folio, therefore it was written by Shakespeare, who is identical with Shakspere the actor. From this, says Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps (Vol. I, p. 97), "*it appears that Shakespeare up to this period had written all his dramas for Henslowe, and that they were acted under the sanction of that manager by the various companies performing from 1592 to 1594 at the Rose Theatre and Newington Butts.*[1] The acting copies of *Titus Andronicus* and the three parts of *Henry VI* must, *of course*,[1] have been afterwards transferred by Henslowe to the Lord Chamberlain's company"! In similar strain writes Mr. Lee, "The Rose Theatre was *doubtless*[1] the earliest scene of Shakespeare's pronounced successes alike as actor and dramatist"!

This is indeed a delightful specimen of Stratfordian reasoning. If Shakspere had really commenced his dramatic career (at a time when money was certainly an object to him) by writing plays for Henslowe, it would be all the more extraordinary—indeed incredible—that the old manager should have made no mention of him in his *Diary*. That Henslowe made no mention of "Shakespeare" in connection with *Titus* or *Henry VI* is, however, not unnatural if, as I believe, these were not Shakespearean plays. But why did he not mention Shakespeare as the writer of other plays? I think the answer is simple enough. Neither Shakspere nor "Shakespeare" ever wrote for Henslowe![2] But "Shakespeare" was writing plays between 1591 and 1609? Certainly; but he did not write to anybody's order, nor, in my opinion, did he write "in collaboration" with anybody. Of this a word later. At present it is sufficient to remark that he was above Henslowe's "sky-line," and therefore this illiterate old manager had no reason to make mention of him.

Note.

[1] My italics.

[2] Shakspere's early connection seems to have been with the Burbages. James Burbage, father of the actor, built the *Theatre* in 1576. His sons built the *Globe* in 1599.

Let us examine some other entries made by Henslowe. On page 34 of the *Diary* we have, "Re'd at King Leare the 6 of Aprell 1593 xxxviij s.," showing that a play of *King Lear* was acted on April 6th, 1593. By an entry on page 26 it appears that a play of *Henry V* was acted for the first time on May 14, 1592. "This," writes Collier, "is the piece to which Nash alluded in his *Pierce Penniless*,[1] published in 1592; and *The Famous Victories of Henry V* was entered at Stationers' Hall to be printed in 1594."

Again, at page 36 we have this entry as to *The Taming of a Shrew*: "11 of June 1594 R'd at the tamynge of a Shrowe ix s." Upon this Judge Stotsenburg asks, "But who wrote *The Taming of a Shrew* printed in 1594, and who wrote the *Titus Andronicus*, *Henry the Sixth*, or *King Lear*, referred to in the Diary?" And he continues: "Neither Collier nor any of the Shaksper commentators make any claim to their authorship in behalf of William Shaksper. Since these plays have the same names as those included in the Folio of 1623 the presumption is that they are the same plays until the contrary is shown. Of course it may be shown either that those in the Folio are entirely different, except in name, or that these plays were revised, improved, and dressed by some one whom they called Shakespeare." Well, if these and other old plays mentioned by Henslowe, and similar in name to those included in the Folio, were Shakespearean dramas, that fact would indeed be strong evidence against the *Shaksperian* authorship,[2] but my own conviction is that the

[1] "What a glorious thing it is to have Henry the Fifth represented on the stage, leading the French King prisoner," etc. It is sometimes assumed that Nash's allusion is to the old play, printed by Thomas Creede in 1598, whence Shakespeare took the young prince, Ned, Gadshill, the old tavern in East-cheap, and some other ideas for his drama, of course "transmuting dross into gold." But Collier concludes that "our old stage was in possession of three dramas founded upon the events of the reign of Henry V, viz. that described by Nash, 'The Famous Victories' first printed in 1598, and Shakespeare's historical play.

[2] See chap. XVI.

hypothesis suggested in the last sentence of the above quotation is the true one. These plays were "revised, improved, and dressed by some one whom they called Shakespeare."[1]

As to the manner in which plays were written in Shakespearean times, I take the following from the appendix to the "New Variorum" *Hamlet* already referred to: "The rapidity with which plays must have been written at that time is most remarkable, and is testified beyond dispute by later portions of Henslowe's manuscript, where, among other charges, he registers the sums paid, the dates of payment, and the authors who receive the money. Nothing was more common than for dramatists to unite their abilities and resources, and when a piece on any account was to be brought out with peculiar despatch, three, four, five, and perhaps even six, poets engaged themselves on different portions of it. Evidence of this dramatic combination will be found of such frequent occurrence that it is vain here to point out particular pages where it is to be met with."[2]

Judge Stotsenburg draws attention to many instances of this collaboration, of which evidence is to be found in Henslowe's *Diary*. One interesting example is seen in the following extract (p. 221): "Lent unto the companye,

[1] In Note B to chap. v. I have discussed Professor Courthope's theory that the whole of *The Contention of the Two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster*, the trilogy of *Henry VI*, *The Taming of a Shrew*, *Titus Andronicus*, and *The Troublesome Reign of King John* were the work of Shakespeare, and I have pointed out that if this be indeed the fact, Henslowe's silence becomes more extraordinary than ever, for he makes mention of *Titus*, *Henry VI*, and *The Taming of a Shrew* in his *Diary*, but says never a word of Shakespeare, though he names practically all the other dramatists of his day.

[2] Yet Professor Courthope writes (Vol IV, p. 462): "I venture to say that no dispassionate reader can peruse *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy* without perceiving that—even admitting a practice of co-operation between dramatists at so early a date, of which, so far as I am aware, there is no proof whatever—these plays are the work of a single mind." Henslowe's *Diary* affords abundant "proof" of the practice in question between the years 1590 and 1610.

the 22 of May 1602, to geve unto Antoney Monday and Mikell Drayton, Webester, Mydelton, and the Rest, in earnest of a Booke called Sesers Falle, the some of five pounds." Here Collier's note is: "Malone passed over this important entry without notice; it shows that in May, 1602, four poets, who are named, viz. Monday, Drayton, Webster, and Middleton, and some others not named, were engaged in writing a play upon the subject of the fall of Cæsar." Judge Stotsenburg believes that this was the original of the play of *Julius Cæsar*, which appears in the Folio, and contends that it was for the most part written by Michael Drayton, who was nicknamed by Sir John Davies the "poet Decius," on account, as this writer thinks, of the mistake he made in writing "Decius" Brutus, instead of "Decimus." But I must refer the reader to Judge Stotsenburg's work if he wishes to consider the ingenious arguments put forward for Drayton's authorship, or part-authorship, of this Shakespearean play. Anyhow, the play to which Henslowe refers "had noble parents. Anthony Monday, 'our best plotter' (according to Meres), Thomas Middleton, and John Webster, three poets and dramatists of the first rank, were Drayton's coadjutors."[1]

The case of *Troilus and Cressida* is also interesting. This curious drama seems to have been inserted in the

[1] Mr. Lee says, in his life of Webster (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*), that Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar* had been successfully produced a year before *Cæsar's Fall* was "accepted by Henslowe from the joint pens of Webster, Drayton, Middleton, Munday, and 'the rest,'" viz. on May 22nd, 1602; and he suggests that Henslowe got these playwrights to produce their play in rivalry with that of the great poet whose name Henslowe never mentions. This seems to me an extremely improbable hypothesis, and there really is no sufficient evidence to show that *Julius Cæsar* was produced (successfully or otherwise) in 1601, for Weever's lines in the *Mirror of Martyrs* are by no means conclusive. Collier contended for 1603 as the date of production. The play was first published in the Folio of 1623. Henslowe's *Diary* shows that a *Tragedy of Cæsar and Pompey* was produced as early as 1594. I must not be taken as subscribing to Judge Stotsenburg's hypothesis, but these entries certainly provide abundant food for meditation.

Folio at the last moment. It is not mentioned in the table of contents. It was at first proposed to make it follow *Romeo and Juliet*, and the first three pages were actually numbered so as to follow that play, but *Timon of Athens* was subsequently put in its place, and a neutral position was assigned to it between the Histories and the Comedies, though it is styled a "Tragedie." As it stands, *Troilus* is unpaged, except in its second and third pages, which bear the numbers 79 and 80. The last page of *Romeo and Juliet* should bear the number 77, and the first of *Troilus* would thus be 78. But the Folio editor had, evidently, no little doubt about the latter play.

What light does Henslowe throw on the subject? On page 147 of Collier's edition of his *Diary* appears the note: "Lent unto Thomas Downton, to lende unto Mr. Dickers and Harey Cheattell in earneste of their boocke called Troyeles and Creassedaye the some of 3 pounds Aprell 7 day 1599." Following this entry is another: "Lent unto Harey Cheattell and Mr. Dickers in pte of payment of ther boocke called Troyelles and Cresseda the 16 of Aprell 1599 xx s."

In Judge Stotsenburg's opinion, "these remarkable entries not only refute the Shakespearean claim to the authorship of *Troilus and Cressida*, but the collaboration of two men in its composition tallies exactly with the opinion of the leading commentators that one part of the play of *Troilus and Cressida* is altogether different in style and method from the other part. Even the careless reader of the play of *Troilus and Cressida* will notice the difference in the style and composition of parts of the play, naturally evidencing that it was the work of more than one writer." Again, in a subsequent chapter, "The first fact to which I will call the reader's attention, as attested by reliable evidence, is that the play of *Troilus and Cressida* was originally written by Thomas Dekker and Henry Chettle. My authority for this statement of