An Image of Shakespeare

An Image of Shakespeare

by Frank Mathew

Jonathan Cape
Eleven Gower Street, London

First published 1922

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner, *Frome and London*

PREFACE

Ψυχῆς εἰμὶ Πλάτωνος ἀποπταμένης ἐς Ὄλυμπον
Εἰκών, σῶμα δὲ γῆ γηγενές Ἄτθις ἔχει.

WE shall never understand Shakespeare unless we can learn the history of his Poems and Plays. Lisideius in Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* says that "he conceived a Play ought to be a just and lively image of human nature, representing its passions and humours, and the changes of fortune to which it is subject, for the delight and instruction of mankind." This was Hamlet's view when he said that the purpose of Playing was "to hold, as it were, the Mirror up to Nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image." We must see the mirror correctly if we want to discern a just and lively image of Shakespeare.

We have been misled by our deference to the opinion of foreigners. The German students, for instance, who have tried to explain him to his countrymen were forced to rely on such hints as could be found by research, because they knew little of the nature of Englishmen. Without underrating the debt we owe to the industry of some of the German students, such as Gervinus, we should remember that no rational Englishman would try to interpret Molière to the French. If our notion of Shakespeare is foreign it is sure to be wrong.

The fact that a Play was printed or mentioned or performed on the Stage in a particular year cannot prove that it had not been written before, and the metrical tests may be only signs of revision. The only important clue is the fact that there is a difference between juvenile and elderly work. If we knew nothing about Giovanni Boccaccio we could be sure that he wrote his *Fiammetta* before most of his *Rime*, and his *Questione d'Amore* before his *Decameron*. Three of Shakespeare's Narrative Poems and some of his Plays survive as he wrote them when he was young, and we

can be sure that his other juvenile work resembled them in manner and mood. We ought to be able to recognize the change in his manner better than students reading Plays in a language which is foreign to them, and we ought to see the change in his mood better than any foreigner can.

Our acquaintance with his private affairs is dangerous unless it is coupled with an intimate knowledge of his different times, and this is also required because he mirrored the days in which he was living. Mr. Bradley, for instance, writes in his *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*: "When we study the history of the times in which the Elizabethan dramas were composed, when we examine the portraits of famous men, or read such a book as the *Autobiography of Lord Herbert of Cherbury*, we realize that the violent actions and passions which the dramatist depicted were like the things he saw." This intimate knowledge is out of the reach of the most industrious foreigner—even Gervinus, though he wrote "So wie die Zeit, so war der Dichter selbst," exhibited a natural ignorance. No rational Englishman would try to explain Luther's times to the Germans.

While the history of the Plays is confused Shakespeare's image in them must be distorted, and if we have a wrong notion of him they also would be misunderstood. It ought to be possible to discover the right Order of his Poems and Plays. The Order commonly accepted to-day, with some variations, is founded on chance hints and metrical tests, and many students have recognized that it cannot be right. Mr. Saintsbury, for instance, writes in his *History of English Prosody:* "I ought to say, that it seems to me pretty certain that some (and perhaps many) of the Plays represent very different stages and were, in all probability, begun, suspended and finished with more or less rewriting, sometimes at long intervals." And he writes in the *Cambridge History of Literature* about *The Merchant of Venice*: "To the present writer it has been for many years a moral certainty that these different parts are of different dates, and that a similar difference prevails much more largely in Shakespeare's work than is commonly thought"; and about *Measure for Measure*, "it was certainly, or almost certainly, performed in 1604, and it has been customary to accept that year as the approxi-

mate date of its composition. To the present writer this appears very improbable, and he would select *Measure for Measure* as the strongest instance of the suggested earliness, in a more or less complete form, of many more Plays than are contained in Meres' list." All modern students have recognized that several Plays, for instance *Romeo and Juliet* and *Troilus and Cressida*, show signs of revision. And Sir Walter Raleigh writes in his *Shakespeare*: "There is good reason to think that many of his Comedies are recasts of his own earlier versions now lost to us. . . . When the Theatre came to its maturity, complete five-act Plays, with two plots and everything handsome about them, were required to fill the afternoon. The earlier and slighter Plays and Interludes were then enlarged and adapted to the new demands."

The right Order should show when Plays were first written and when they were revised. This method would solve many problems about the dates of the Plays: for instance, *Cymbeline* might be ranked with the earliest, as Coleridge suggested in his *Classification Attempted* of 1819, and also with the last in accordance with the metrical tests and Simon Forman's mention of it and the place given to it by Heminge and Condell in the Folio of 1623.

It may be that the First Folio Order would help us to discover the right one. Even Mr. Saintsbury writes of "the notoriously haphazard Order," and even Sir Walter Raleigh writes: "In the Folio Shakespeare's work is divided into three kinds—Comedy, History and Tragedy. The Classification of the Plays under these headings is artificial and misleading. *Cymbeline* appears among the Tragedies; while *Measure for Measure*, a play much more tragic in temper, is numbered with the Comedies. *Richard the Second* is a History: *Julius Cæsar* is a Tragedy." But these instances were chosen unluckily, for *Cymbeline* was planned as a Tragedy (as is shown by its title, the *Tragedy of Cymbeline*), and it is not a Comedy now but a Tragi-comedy ending in impossible happiness, and *Measure for Measure* was a Comedy first, though it became Tragi-comical when its meaning was darkened in an older revision, and *Richard the Second* is ranked with the Histories because, like all the other Plays in that class,

it is an English Chronicle History or a Scene in the Pageant of the Annals of England.

If Heminge and Condell had printed a fourth class, Tragi-comedies, it could have included *Cymbeline* and *Measure for Measure* and many other Plays. They may have remembered how Philip Sidney condemned "the mongrel Tragi-comedy" in his *Apology for Poesy*, or they may have perceived how difficult it would be to discriminate, since many Comedies became Tragi-comical when they were revised and some of the Tragedies, *Hamlet* and *King Lear* and *Othello*, for instance, had a Comical vein. And they may have disliked the recent Italianate Tragi-comical fashion. Their three classes echoed the Licence granted to them in 1603 "freely to use and exercise the art and faculty of playing Comedies, Tragedies, Histories, Interludes, Morals, Pastorals, Stage-Plays, and such other like as they have already studied," and these were the three classes named first by Polonius when he spoke of "the best actors in the World, either for Tragedy, Comedy, History." Since they did not use the fourth class their division was a natural one. They must have known all the facts and they may have preferred to set the Plays rightly when there was nothing to be gained by inventing an irrational Order.

Heminge and Condell printed the Comedies thus—*The Tempest*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Measure for Measure*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *As You Like It*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *All's Well that Ends Well*, *Twelfth Night*, and *The Winter's Tale*. Next they printed the English Chronicle Histories according to the dates of the Reigns. Last they printed the Tragedies, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Coriolanus*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Timon of Athens*, *Julius Cæsar*, *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Othello*, *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Cymbeline*.

Francis Meres wrote in *Palladis Tamia*, printed in 1598: "As Plautus and Seneca are accounted the best for Comedy and Tragedy among the Latins, so Shakespeare among the English is the most excellent in both kinds for the Stage, for Comedy witness his *Gentlemen of Verona*, his *Errors*, his

Love's Labour's Lost, his *Love's Labour's Won*, his *Midsummer Night's Dream* and his *Merchant of Venice*: for Tragedy his *Richard the Second*, *Richard the Third*, *Henry the Fourth*, *King John*, *Titus Andronicus* and his *Romeo and Juliet*." Meres only professed to cite some Plays as examples, and he set them all in the First Folio Order except *Love's Labour's Won*, which may have been the first form of *All's Well that Ends Well*, and *King John*, which may have been the last of the four Histories selected by him and classed with the two Tragedies *Titus Andronicus* and *Romeo and Juliet*. This would be a curious coincidence if the Folio Order was a haphazard one. In that case it would also be a curious coincidence that Heminge and Condell printed the Tragedies, except the two first and *Timon of Athens*, in an Order close to the one commonly accepted to-day. Since *Troilus and Cressida* appears to be founded on two juvenile Plays and *Timon of Athens* is an unfinished revision of an earlier one, the main ground for rejecting this part of their Order is the fact that *Coriolanus* is printed early in it, and this would be explained if they knew that Shakespeare had written a form of *Coriolanus* when he was young. Since they printed the Chronicle Histories in the historical order (which was the natural thing to do because they were Scenes in an Historical Pageant), the modern Order mainly differs from theirs about the dates of the Comedies. And Coleridge came near the Folio Order when after putting *Love's Labour's Lost* in the earliest epoch in his *Classification Attempted* of 1819, he said: "In this same epoch I should place the *Comedy of Errors*. . . . I add *All's Well that Ends Well*, originally intended as the counterpart of *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Taming of the Shrew*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Much Ado About Nothing*."

It may be that Heminge and Condell had a definite rule. Perhaps when they thought that a Play had been little changed in revision except in its manner, which may have seemed of small importance to them because they were Players and concerned with the story, they put it according to its original date and when one had been altered in its structure they ranked it according to the date of the change. For instance, they may have printed *The Tempest* first because it was founded on a juvenile Comedy and appeared the same Play to

them (since the story survived in spite of an elderly revision which changed it to a wise Tragi-comedy), while they printed *The Winter's Tale* and *Cymbeline* later because the young stories had been altered in them.

Of course, the right Order ought to differ from theirs in combining the three divisions which were intended to put Plays of the same nature together; but perhaps it ought to recognize theirs as a proof that some form of each Play was written first or revised at the time denoted by it and ought to reconcile theirs and Meres' corroboration of it with the Order suggested by the stray hints and by the metrical tests.

The right Order of Shakespeare's Poems and Plays would show us an image of him as he was altered by a natural growth and it would help us to value the stories about his private affairs, if they interest us at all, for if we listen to gossip about some one we know, we test it according to our knowledge of him.

This Order may yet be ascertained by some English or American student. And this is the right time for that task. Though more details may be found, the long labours of Mr. Halliwell-Phillips and of Sir Sidney Lee, for instance, have gathered many things which were hidden from Gervinus and Coleridge, and the England which Shakespeare knew is passing away. Those of us who are elderly can remember a time when there were many remote villages where people were living in a wholesome placidity, only concerned with their immediate affairs, reading little or nothing or unable to read, spending every night of their lives in the same little houses centuries old, never desiring to go anywhere else, ripening like their apples and falling when their time was complete. In that ancient tranquillity we were able to find Chaucer's England or Shakespeare's; but our children will look for those quiet places in vain. And many other things which survive from England's old days are vanishing with the calm of those villages. I propose to begin this task by making suggestions which students more learned may correct or reject.

(1915–1920.)

CONTENTS

THE PLAYS OF YOUTH

I

SHAKESPEARE wrote the buoyant Prose of his time with a rhythm of his own easily recognized in such sentences as "the tears live in an onion that should water this sorrow," or "I learn in this letter that Don Pedro of Aragon comes this night to Messina," or "Why, thou wert better in thy grave than to answer with thy uncovered body this extremity of the skies." His Prose was gay when he was young and stately when he began to be old. We can discern from it not only the order of his Writings, but also blunders still popular in all the Editions as, for instance, when we read in *Twelfth Night* that Sir Toby squeaked out his catches "without any mitigation or remorse of voice," the rhythm proves that Shakespeare wrote "without any remorse or mitigation of voice."

A great deal of the Prose of his time was controlled by the fashion which is commonly called Euphuism though it was admired at the Court before Lyly wrote *Euphues*. Queen Elizabeth was always an Euphuist. When she was eleven she wrote in Italian to Katharine Parr a letter beginning "Inimical Fortune, envious of all good, and ever-revolving human affairs have deprived me for a whole year of your illustrious presence." This was a Spanish fashion set at Queen Katharine of Aragon's Court and after her time when, for instance, the second Lord Berners translated Antonio de Guevara's *Dial of Princes* (*Reloj de Principes*) in 1534 as the *Golden Book of Marcus Aurelius*.

John Lyly wrote *Euphues, the Anatomy of Wit*, "hatched in the hard winter in 1578," when he was aged about twenty-five. He seems to have meant it to be a picture of some one, perhaps Edward de Vere, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford, to whom he dedicated *Euphues and His England* in 1580. Lord Oxford, who was then about twenty-eight and had returned from his travels in Italy in 1576, was a poet and a patron of writers. Euphues meant well-formed and hence well-intentioned and eloquent and witty,

and the *Anatomy of Wit* began thus, "There dwelt in Athens a young gentleman of great patrimony, and of so comely a personage, that it was doubted whether he were more bound to Nature for the lineaments of his person, or to Fortune for the increase of his possessions. . . . This young Gallant of more wit than wealth, and yet of more wealth than wisdom, seeing himself inferior to none in pleasant conceits, though himself superior to all his honest conditions, insomuch that he thought himself so apt to all things that he gave himself almost to nothing but practising of those things which are incident to these sharp wits, fine phrases, smooth quips, merry taunts, jesting without mean and abusing mirth without measure." This young Gallant's letters are in the mode of the day, as can be seen, for instance, if we compare them with the correspondence between Edmund Spenser and his "singular friend," Gabriel Harvey, who wrote, "Young Euphues but hatched the eggs that his elder friends laid."

Lyly imitated Guevara, particularly in the chapter called *Euphues and Atheos*; but he echoed the Court fashion in these two little books instead of inventing it. Hazlitt wrote of him in his *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*, "It is singular that the style of this author, which is extremely sweet and flowing, should have been the butt of ridicule to his contemporaries, particularly Drayton." The vices and virtues of Euphuism are much more distinct in Sidney's *Arcadia*, which was finished in 1581, and since Drayton, for instance, admired Sidney's style we can guess that Lyly's was ridiculed by personal enemies.

This fashion of beautiful speech was based on the theory that words should be used harmoniously in Prose as in Verse and set out of their natural order if the melody of a sentence required it. The national English Prose is sane and straightforward, neither spangled with adjectives nor twisted to fascinate. But this temperate Prose only became national when the English were sobered. There was a young mood in Queen Elizabeth's time, and this foreign fashion suited the fantastic and buoyant life of those days. The men who followed it could have cited King Duarte of Portugal's rules in *O Leal Conselheiro*, "que se screvam cousas de boa sustancia, claramente pera se bem poder entender, e fremoso, o mais

que elle poder, e curtamente quanto for necessario." Though some of them overlooked his advice that Prose should be clear and brief as well as charming, this fashion enriched our language with many beautiful pages which will be studied if anyone should seek to revive the lost art of musical English. And though Shakespeare lived to renounce his early extravagance he was always an Euphuist.

Shakespeare followed another fashion in writing Plays in Blank Verse. Rhyme had been employed for the Stage because it had assisted the Players to remember the words and because the Drama had sprung from the old chants or recitations of Minstrels. Blank Verse was adopted instead and, like the old rhymes, it was mainly employed as Metrical Prose. Shakespeare did not imagine that when Holinshed's words, "after the death of Pharamond," were changed into—

After defunction of King Pharamond

this alteration had turned Prose into Poetry, but he saw that the use of this metre allowed him to write Poetry without the jar caused by an alteration of form. Besides, Blank Verse added dignity to the long recitations which were retained from the Traditional Stage. This dignity led to the use of ordinary Prose in some Plays which were not meant to be dignified: Gascoigne, for instance, wrote a Tragedy in Verse and a Comedy in usual Prose. And Shakespeare often kept this distinction, writing recitations or dignified passages in Blank Verse and turning to the usual Prose to mark a change in his tone.

It has been stated that Henry Howard, who was called Earl of Surrey by courtesy, was the first to write English Blank Verse; but this is improbable. The first Italian Carnival Comedies seem to have been written in Prose; but about 1519 Ariosto invented or used his Verso Sdrucciolo as a compromise between Prose and Verse, probably based on the Latin trimeter iambic, and the later Italian Comedies were either in Prose or in Versi Sciolti, Blank Verse. It may be that Blank Verse was employed by the Traditional Stage of England soon after it was the fashion in Italy or earlier, for it was merely Chaucer's favourite metre delivered from the shackles of rhyme.

Shakespeare seems to have learnt the first music of his verses from Chaucer, though he imitated Spenser and Marlowe and others besides when he was beginning to write. His first two Narrative Poems are imitations of Chaucer, as well as of Ovid, and his third, *A Lover's Complaint*, resembles, for instance, Chaucer's *Complaint of the Black Knight*, but this may have been due to an imitation of Spenser's *Ruins of Time*. A day came when he could surpass all his masters, except Christopher Marlowe, writing his Blank Verse with a music which was his individual voice. But that day was slow in coming. The difference between his mature and immature Verse and between his mature and immature Prose is patent to any reader who happens to have an ear for such things. This difference (which is not a mere matter of metrical tests, such as whether he used a redundant syllable as Ariosto had done in his Verso Sdrucciolo, but a radical alteration) remains the best clue to the order in which he wrote parts of most of his Plays.

If he had not rewritten his Plays even a foreigner could hardly help seeing that many of them had been written in Youth; but he rewrote or retouched nearly all of them, turning to some of them again and again, and the result is that in many of them his immature work remains blended with the work of maturity.

Some students have argued that when immature work is visible in one of the Plays, as, for instance, in *Macbeth* or in *Timon of Athens*, we should ascribe it all to somebody else. Even Mr. Masefield has written of *Timon of Athens* in his *William Shakespeare*: "*Timon of Athens* is a Play of mixed authorship. Shakespeare's share in it is large and unmistakable; but much of it was written by an unknown Poet of whom we can decipher this, that he was a man of genius, a skilled writer for the Stage, and of a marked personality. It cannot now be known how the collaboration was arranged. Either the unknown collaborated with Shakespeare, or the unknown wrote the Play and Shakespeare revised it." It does not seem probable that Shakespeare would have stooped to collaborate with anyone else in the days when he wrote the masterly part of *Timon of Athens*. We have either to think that he collaborated with somebody else in a great

many Plays, or that he wrote the immature work when he was young.

It seems to me that one man wrote the immature work in all Shakespeare's Comedies, except *The Taming of the Shrew* and perhaps *Pericles*, and in all his Tragedies. The Plays in the English Chronicle Pageant printed as Histories by Heminge and Condell are apart from the rest, and there are many voices in them. He used stories and Plays written by others when he was writing his Comedies and Tragedies also, but he did this in a different way, transmuting them and making them his.

We know that *Venus and Adonis* was printed in 1593 and the *Ravishment* or *Rape of Lucrece* and *Titus Andronicus* in the following year. It is probable that the two Narrative Poems and the Melodramatic one had all been revised before they were printed, and we do not know when they were first written. In the year before *Venus and Adonis* was printed Robert Greene wrote in *A Groat'sworth of Wit*: "There is an upstart crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his *Tiger's heart wrapt in a Player's hide* supposes he is as well able to bombast out a Blank Verse as the best of you; and being an absolute *Johannes fac totum*, is in his own conceit the only Shake-scene in a country." This seems to prove that Shakespeare had begun as a Player and that when he was aged about twenty-six he had earned success and dislike by writing Plays of different kinds.

Sir Sidney Lee writes in his *Life of William Shakespeare*: "There is no external evidence to prove that any piece in which Shakespeare had a hand was produced before 1592. . . . But his first essays have been, with confidence, allotted to 1591." Instead of supposing that *A Groat'sworth of Wit* complained of such a recent beginning, I take it to be evidence that Shakespeare had written Plays for several years, for it would have been extraordinary if he had earned such success in one year while he also worked as a Player. Besides, the few Plays which Sir Sidney Lee doubtfully assigns to the year 1591 could not have made anyone claim to be the only Shake-scene in England. And, instead of concluding that Shakespeare during most of his life recurred to the work of some unknown and immature Dramatist, I suggest that he

used or rewrote many of his own early Plays or Interludes written before 1592.

In those times the Players were still ranked with the Jugglers. For instance, Sir Walter Cope wrote to Lord Cranborne in January, 1604–1605, "Sir, I have sent and been all this morning hunting for Players, Jugglers and such kind creatures, but find them hard to find; wherefore leaving notes for them to seek me, Burbage is come." The Jugglers seem to have been Mountebanks and Reciters and Singers like the Spanish Juglares whose name may have come from Joculator, perhaps through the French versions Jogleor and Jongleur. They seem to have been masters of some tricks of illusion in Chaucer's time, for he wrote in *The Squire's Tale*,

> It is rather like
> An apparence made by some Magic,
> As jugglours playen at the festes great;

and in *The Franklin's Tale*,

> For I am sure that there be Sciences,
> By which men make diverse apparences,
> Like to the subtile Juggelours when they play,
> For oft at Festes have I heard it say
> That juggelours within an halle large,
> Have made incomen water and a barge
> And in the halle rowen up and down:
> Sometime hath seemed come a grim leoun,
> Sometime a castle all of lime and stone,
> And when they would it vanished anon:
> Thus seemed it to every man's sight.

Chaucer's account would be sufficient to prove that there was an old Stage-craft apart from the Church Pageants and Miracle and Morality Plays if there was any reason to doubt that the Common Players provided an immemorial amusement. The Strolling Players, who went from house to house to perform at revels and banquets, would not have been welcomed if all their Plays had been pious. King Richard the Second and King Edward the Second, who both employed Players, would not have been pleased if all the Plays had been

sermons. The Religious Drama of England must have been separate from the Secular one which was only meant to amuse.

The Secular Drama of England sprang from the songs and recitations of Minstrels who were succeeded by Strolling Players performing short Chronicle Plays which led to the longer Chronicle Histories. Mr. Tucker Brooke says in his *Tudor Drama*: "Coeval with the beginnings and earliest development of the regular Stage under Religious auspices, there had existed an entirely popular species of quasi-dramatic entertainment, much less definite in form and less rich in evolutionary possibilities, but even more firmly ingrained in the life of the Nation and deep-rooted in hoariest antiquity. . . . Most commonly it dealt with the celebration of heroic qualities and lauded individual prowess." These Heroic Plays seem to have been the chief stock-in-trade of the Players. For instance, Thomas Nashe wrote of the Plays in *Pierce Penniless*, printed in 1592, "First, for the subject of them for the most part it is borrowed out of our English Chronicles." These Plays were England's national Chronicles, preserving the memory of former events, not as they were recorded in the seclusion of Cloisters but as they had been understood by the men who bore the brunt of the fighting. In them, as the Prince said in *King Richard the Third*, the History of England survived as it was—

reported
Successively from Age to Age.

And in them such mythical Heroes as Sir Bevis of Hampton or Guy of Warwick were shown with the legendary pictures of Kings. These Chronicle Histories dealt with current affairs as well as with the deeds of the Past; for instance, it is recorded that King Henry the Eighth, disguised as a gentleman, watched some Common Players acting a Comedy in which he was shown killing the Monks, and also that after his death and before he was buried a Play depicting the Comical Tragedy of his Reign was performed by Lord Oxford's Players at Southwark.

The Religious Drama of England sprang from the Ritual of the Catholic Church. The Church Pageants and Miracles

were Catholic sermons, and because they were Catholic they were abolished in the Protestant days. (I use the terms Catholic and Protestant here and elsewhere in the sense in which they were commonly understood in those times.) For instance, the York Cycle was forbidden to show the Coronation of the Virgin in 1548, and was changed further in 1568 and 1572 and suppressed with the Coventry Cycle in 1580, though twenty years later there was a last attempt to revive the Chester Plays—which had been called the Popish Plays of Chester in 1575. The Catholic Church was hostile to the Secular Drama, as it is still, for no Priest is allowed to see a Play in a Theatre. Cardinal Manning, for instance, while condemning the Stage, wrote: "The mind of the Church is sufficiently shown in the fact that *histriones* were held to be *in statu reprobatorum* and deprived of Christian burial." And though some of the Strolling Players performed humorous Morals as Interludes because they were popular, they repaid that hostility, particularly in King Henry the Eighth's time and Queen Mary's. The Secular Stage rose into favour when the Religious Stage was suppressed.

This separation set the English Drama apart from the Drama of Spain which sprang from the Spanish Mystery Plays, such as *El Misterio de los Reyes Majos*, and resembled them at first in its Autos. And its national growth sundered it from the Drama of Italy which began when Ariosto revived the old Roman Comedies in the mood of the Carnival. It might have resembled the Drama of France if this had sprung from the Pièces Farcies acted by Les Clercs de la Basoche or Les Enfants sans Souci in rivalry with the Miracle Plays shown, for instance, by Les Confrères de la Passion; but the French dramatists copied Italian and Spanish and Portuguese and Classical models instead of retaining the character of their Secular Stage.

In Queen Elizabeth's time the Players were still ranked with the Minstrels, and even their longer Plays were still linked with music and dancing. Her Statutes of 1571 and 1596 required all Fencers, Bear-Wardens, Common Players of Interludes and Minstrels wandering abroad to procure patrons if they wished to avoid being prosecuted as Vagabonds. Paul Hentzner, or Hentznerius, wrote in his *Travels in England*,

written in German in 1598, "Without the city are some theatres where English Actors represent almost every day Comedies and Tragedies to very numerous audiences. These are concluded with music and a variety of dances." And even in 1632 Donald Lupton wrote in *London and the Country Carbonadoed*, "Most commonly when the Play is done, you shall have a jig or dance of all treads; they mean to put their legs to it as well as their tongues."

We do not know when the Players built their first theatres. In 1578 Thomas White, preaching at Paul's Cross, said: "Look but upon the common Plays in London and see the multitude that flocketh to them and followeth them. Behold the sumptuous theatre-houses, a continual monument of London's prodigality and folly." In the same year John Stockwood said at Paul's Cross: "If you resort to the Theatre, the Curtain and other places of Plays in the City, you shall see the Lord's Day have those places, with many others that I cannot reckon, so full as possible as they can throng," and he spoke of "eight ordinary places" in the City of London. These eight ordinary places may have been the courtyards of Inns or they may have been booths. The sumptuous theatre-houses denounced by White may have been the Theatre and Curtain, the wooden booths built at Shoreditch outside the Walls of London in 1576; but these two sermons prove that the Players had many other resorts.

London was then a huddled old town, defended still by its ancient Walls except on the river-side. About a hundred and fifty thousand people lived there, and the length of the original Walls was little more than two miles; the narrow streets were so packed that few rode in them and nobody drove, and the Thames was still the highway of traffic. This gave the Players a reason for building booths in the fields when they became popular enough to attract the citizens there. Besides, they wished to avoid the Corporation's hostility, which was explained, for instance, in 1597 when the Lord Mayor and the Aldermen of London demanded the final suppression of Stage-Plays, "as well at the Theatre, Curtain and Bankside as in other places about the City," because "they corrupted the young by their exhibition of vices and lascivious devices," and because they were frequented

by " the base or refuse sort of people, or such young gentlemen as have small regard of credit or of conscience," and were " the ordinary places for vagrant persons, masterless men, thieves, contrivers of Treason and other idle and dangerous persons to meet together."

The Suburbs outside the Walls or across the River were then known as the haunts of cut-throats and thieves, as they were when Ben Jonson in *Poetaster* (which was first acted in 1601) made Historicus say, " All the sinners in the Suburbs come to applaud our actions daily," and the Players had resorted to them long before this. For instance, we know that Lord Oxford's Company was acting in Southwark in 1547. The lawless Suburbs were congenial to them because they were " vagrant persons," and only exempted from the Laws against Rogues and Vagabonds when they were controlled by a responsible patron. Robert Willis wrote in *Mount Tabor*, printed in 1639: " In the City of Gloucester the manner is (as I think it is in other like Corporations) that when Players of Interludes come to the town they first attend the Mayor to inform him what nobleman's servants they are, and so to get licence for their public playing." In Shakespeare's time they were still Strolling Players during part of the year, going from house to house or town to town in the country, and even when they were acting in their booths in the Suburbs they still kept the old customs of the open-air Stage.

Even the Globe, which was built on the Bankside at Southwark in the fields near the Bear Garden in 1599, was roofless though the back of the stage was protected by a pent-house of thatch. The stage there was a wide platform jutting into the Pit in front of a house or shed with a balcony. The Plays there began at three o'clock, and though some students have thought that a curtain was used to darken the theatre when darkness was needed, we have no record of this. Since the spectators could understand that a scene had been changed from a seashore to a forest or city they could not have needed darkness when they witnessed events which were supposed to happen at night. We have no record that there was any attempt to copy old or foreign costumes. Thomas Platter of Basle, whose narrative of his visit to London in 1599 was printed in 1899, wrote in German: " The Players wear the

most costly and beautiful dresses, for it is the custom in England that when noblemen or knights die, they leave their finest clothes to their servants, who, since it would not be fitting for them to wear such splendid garments, sell them soon afterwards to the Players for a small sum."

Paul Hentzner wrote in his *Travels in England*: "At these spectacles and everywhere else the English are constantly smoking the Nicotian weed which in America is called tobacco. . . . At their theatres, fruits, such as apples, pears and nuts, according to the season, are carried out to be sold as well as ale and wine." The men and boys in the Pit were apt to be turbulent, as is recorded in *Julius Cæsar*, "If the tag-rag people did not clap him and hiss him, according as he pleased and displeased them, as they use to do the Players in the theatres, I am no true man"; and in *King Henry the Eighth*, "These are the youths that thunder at the Playhouse and fight for bitten apples."

We have no reason to think that the Common Players altered the nature of their old entertainment when they built their new booths in 1576. The Classical or Italianate Plays, written, for instance, by Gascoigne or by Lyly, were not intended for them but were acted by students or the boys of the Choirs, such as the Children of Paul's, for courtiers or others who had some education. These Plays were literary and meant to be printed, but most of those acted at Shoreditch or Southwark provided amusement for people who were mainly illiterate, and few of them were intended to be studied in books. Even in 1604 John Marston complained in the Preface to *Malcontent* that "Scenes invented merely to be spoken should be enforcibly published to be read."

Most of the Players came from the lowest ranks. Even James Burbage, who built the Theatre and was the chief of Leicester's Players, began life as a carpenter, and Lord Strange's Company was formed first in 1589 from men who had served him as tumblers or acrobats when they were boys. When Shakespeare was young no woman was allowed to adopt the disreputable life of the Stage. Thomas Coryat in his *Crudities*, printed in 1611, wrote that in Venice he saw women act, "a thing that I never saw before, though I have heard that it hath sometimes been used in London"; but it

may be that all Shakespeare's feminine Characters were entrusted to men or boys in his time. And if we can trust the Corporation of London no respectable women went to the theatres.

Though between 1580 and 1590 dramatists of some education, such as George Peele, Robert Greene, Thomas Kyd, Anthony Munday and Christopher Marlowe, began to write for the Players, some of them imitating foreign examples or the Plays written for the courtiers and students, the Theatre and Curtain exhibited fencing and wrestling and dancing combined with Interludes still. William Lambarde wrote in his *Perambulation of Kent*, printed in 1576 and 1596, of men who went "to Paris Garden, the Bell-Savage or Theatre to behold Bear-baiting, Enterludes or Fence-play." Interludes seem to have been Plays written to be acted between other entertainments or after a feast or during a revel. Short Plays were required for all such occasions as when Theseus said in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*,

> Say, what abridgment have you for the evening?
> What Masque? what Music? How shall we beguile
> The lazy time if not with some delight?

For instance, it is recorded that Henry Medwall's lost Interlude, *The Finding of Truth*, which was acted before King Henry the Eighth at Richmond in 1514, was condemned for its length, "it was so long it was not liked: The Fool's part was the best, but the King departed before the end to his chamber." Abridgments seem to have been Plays which were shortened to be acted as Interludes.

The Players were often described as Players of Interludes, as for instance, in Queen Elizabeth's two Licensing Statutes, and they acted them still after her time, as was shown when King James granted his Licence to Shakespeare's associates in 1603. Ben Jonson wrote when he dedicated *Volpone* to the two Universities (perhaps about 1616, though that Play was first acted in 1605), "the increase of which lust in liberty, together with the present trade of the Stage, in all their misc'line Enterludes, what learned or liberal soul doth not already abhor? . . . But my special aim being to put a

snaffle in their mouths that cry out, 'We never punish Vice in our Enterludes.'"

The Licence of 1603 shows that the Interludes were distinguished from Morals and Stage-Plays. Mr. Pollard in his *Fifteenth-Century Prose and Verse* cites a lawsuit which in 1530 showed that the Interludes were acted in Winter and the Stage-Plays in Summer. This may mean that the Stage-Plays were longer and acted out of doors on a stage while the Interludes were acted without one indoors in any town-hall or room. We know that some of the later Morals and Morality Plays were acted as Interludes and were called by that name. But, as Mr. Tucker Brooke says in his *Tudor Drama*, the term Interlude came more and more to be employed in the Tudor period "as the gradual disappearance of the Religious element rendered the expression 'Moral Play' increasingly a misnomer." They seem to have been of similar length but distinguished by the fact that the Morals were intended to edify. The Players of Interludes mentioned in the Licensing Statutes with Bear-Wardens and other Vagabonds could not have restricted themselves to edifying performances, and we can infer that the men described by Sir Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of Leicester, as "his servants, Players of Interludes," in 1559, did not attempt to entertain him with piety.

In Queen Elizabeth's time the Interludes may have been mainly Comedies, as would have been natural when they were associated with revels. For instance, the Treasurer's Accounts show that Shakespeare and Burbage and Kemp were paid for "two several Interludes or Comedies" acted at Greenwich Palace in 1594. But we have no reason to think that the Strolling Players of Interludes only performed Comical Plays, for many Heroic Plays and Chronicle Histories must have been Tragical. And we know that "an Interlude concerning King John" was acted for Cranmer in 1538.

The Secular Drama seems to have grown from songs or chants, recitations, dialogues, short Plays of the nature of Interludes, and Chronicle Pageants or Histories. And the Religious Drama seems to have grown under the influence of the dramatic Ritual of the Catholic Church from sermons, dialogues, Miracle or Morality Plays to its last form the Pageants or Cycles shown first by the Church and later by

Guilds which were Religious in origin and mainly concerned, like the Guild of the Holy Cross at Stratford-on-Avon, with good works, including the provision of Masses for the living and dead. The Morality Plays seem to have been the Interludes of the Catholic Church.

The Mummers' Plays were Interludes founded on the Religious and the Secular ones and distinguished from these because they travestied them and were performed by the Rustics in their holiday sports. The Masques were the Mummers' Plays of the Court. For instance, Edward Hall in his *Chronicle* wrote of one acted in 1509, "the torchbearers were apparrelled in Crymosin Satin and green like Morescoes, their faces black, and the King brought in a Mummery," and George Cavendish wrote in his *Life of Cardinal Wolsey*, "The banquets were set forth with Masques and Mummeries, in so gorgeous a sort and costly a manner that it was a heaven to behold."

When the change called the Reformation delivered the Secular Drama from its rival and enemy the Drama of Sermons, Plays of all kinds were added to the Chronicle Histories. The Players of Interludes must have employed some foreign stories before (such as, perhaps, the story of Pericles), in the same way as the French Players founded their *Robin et Marion* on the English Robin Hood Plays, and they probably used some familiar Classical themes, such as Cæsar's Fall, and repeated some of the private murders of the day in their Chronicles.

There may have been from the first some remembrance of the Drama of Rome in the Secular Drama as there was in the Morality Plays written by men who knew Latin, the language of the International Church. Four hundred years of Roman civilization in England during which Plays were performed publicly must have left echoes in the minds of the English. Besides, Terence had been greatly admired through all the Middle Ages and Plautus had rivalled him since 1427 and their Plays were still seen as when, according to Holinshed, "there was a goodly Comedy of Plautus played before the King and Queen and the hostages" at Greenwich Palace in 1520. This may help to account for the resemblance between the English and the Roman buffoonery. Still, the influence

of the Drama of Rome, if indeed it survived, must have been very much weaker than it was when the Plays were written by men who were acquainted with Latin.

Most of the new dramatists who began to write for the Common Players about 1580 could read Latin and Italian and Spanish, and these often turned to foreign books for their plots because there were so few English stories in print. These foreign books put them in touch with the World's common stock of stories. Mr. Edward Hutton says in his *Giovanni Boccaccio*, "Certainly to the Contes and Fabliaux of Northern France a third part of the *Decameron* can be traced, much too to Indian and Persian sources and a little to the *Gesta Romanorum*." *El Conde Lucanor*, written by Don Juan Manuel and printed at Seville in 1575, was founded on stories brought to Spain by the Moors and as old as the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*, which were traced by Masondi in his *Golden Meadow* (Nouradj-al-Zehel), written in 944, to Persian and Greek and Indian tales gathered by Caliph Mansour who began his reign about thirty years before Caliph Haroun Al-Raschid. And other Writers, such as Giraldi Cinthio, borrowed tales from *The Arabian Nights' Entertainments*. Some of Boccaccio's stories could be read then in English, for sixteen of those in the *Decameron* were translated in William Paynter's *Palace of Pleasure*, printed in 1566 and 1567, and two others in the *Forest of Fancy*, printed in 1579, and there were many other foreign ones in the *Hundred Merry Tales* which were printed in 1565 and 1588. But most of the stories in the *Decameron* and in *El Conde Lucanor* and Cinthio's *Hecatommithi*, licensed in 1565 and printed in the following year, had not been translated, and this gave them the charm of novelty when they were seen on the Stage.

The Plays founded on such stories as these were only foreign in setting and could have been made English by altering the names and the scenes in the same way as Ben Jonson changed the second edition of *Every Man In His Humour*. Indeed, it would have been hard to make a play foreign when there was no scenery except a thatched shed, and when sign-posts were used instead of programmes to show that the platform should be taken to be a Forest near Rome or the imaginary Coast of Bohemia, and the Players wore

second-hand finery in the fashions of England. So the English Drama remained essentially English in spite of the fact that some foreign plots were added to the old stock-in-trade of the Traditional Stage.

Mr. Moulton says in his *Ancient Classical Drama*: "The English reader will bring his mind into the right focus for appreciating Old Attic Comedy if he imagines a modern Pantomime into which is infused a strong element of the highest literary power." This might be said too of England's national Drama: it resembled the Pantomimes imported to Rome about 21 B.C. by Pylades and Bathyllus or the fabulæ togatæ, of which the younger Seneca wrote in his Eighth Epistle, "Habent enim hæ quoque aliquid severitatis et sunt inter comœdias et tragœdias mediæ." Most of its Tragedies remained Pantomimic or Tragi-comical because they were blended with inappropriate Clownage, as even *Tamburlaine* was when it was first shown on the Stage and as even the Church Pageants (for instance, the Wakefield or Towneley Cycles) had been. And the English Stage remained Pantomimic till it ceased to be national when Ben Jonson and his followers killed its natural growth.

Shakespeare wrote the Plays of his time as well as its Prose and Verse when he began. Mr. George Baker writes in *Representative English Comedies*: "By 1590 the boisterous Romantic Drama, the often inchoate Chronicle History, both frequently accompanied by scenes of would-be comic horseplay, engrossed public attention. The great period of experimentation with both old and crude forms was beginning." I think that Shakespeare began to write for the Stage while he was still a Player on it, some years before 1590 when Interludes were still in demand. And I think that he began with short Plays of the nature or length of Interludes. I infer this from the fact that the separate parts visible in most of his Plays seem to have been of an appropriate length. Besides, it would have been a natural thing for a beginner to do and particularly for one whose chief work was still the trade of a Player. He may have begun with Tragical efforts, as so many other writers have done, in the same way as many actors begin with visions of succeeding as Hamlet though they

may be destined to be known as buffoons. If he began by copying Kyd and then turned to imitate Lyly this would help to explain why only one of his Tragedies survives as he wrote it in his ignorant days, though some of his first Comedies were left little changed.

This Tragedy, *Titus Andronicus*, was printed in 1594 and may have been revised in the manner of his Narrative Poems. It may have been first written in Quatrains like Robert Wilmot's *Tancred and Gesimund*, which was written in Quatrains about 1568 and was published in Blank Verse containing some Quatrains in 1591. This is suggested, for instance, when Andronicus says in the second Scene of the second Act,

> The hunt is up, the morn is bright and grey,
> The fields are fragrant, and the woods are green:
> Uncouple here, and let us make a bay,
> And wake the Emperor and his lovely bride,

for the last line may have ended with Queen and this may have been changed because Shakespeare remembered that the Emperor's wife should be an Empress. Elsewhere in this Play Tamora is often called Empress, but sometimes Queen, as when Andronicus says in the fifth Act—

> In the Emperor's Court
> There is a Queen attended by a Moor.

In any case the manner and mood of the present form seem to show that it was written before the final revision of *Venus and Adonis*.

This charming Play remains lyrical, a Melodramatic Poem. We are reminded that its terrible doings are as innocent as the shadows that chequer the bright Forest of Arden when Tamora says,

> The green leaves quiver with the cooling wind,
> And make a chequered shadow on the ground,
> Under their sweet shade, Aaron, let us sit.

The wicked Moor, Aaron, whose love-making and cruelty may have suggested Othello's, is as pleasantly false as Andronicus

who raves like King Lear and pretends to be more mad than he is, like Hamlet.

Some of the horrors are openly imitated from Ovid's. When Andronicus asks,

> Lucius, what book is that she tosseth so ?

the boy answers,

> Grandsire, 'tis Ovid's Metamorphoses.

Like Ovid's they are meant to afford the pleasure sought by Andronicus when he turned from his afflictions to read—

> Sad stories chanced in the times of old

as by King Richard the Second when he said,

> Come, let us sit upon the ground,
> And tell sad stories of the deaths of Kings.

In this young story of impossible crimes Shakespeare supped full of horrors, as a schoolboy might do, and if anyone condemns him for this there is the answer—

> Grandsire, 'tis Ovid's Metamorphoses.

He pointed to one source of his horrors when he made Andronicus say,

> This is the tragic tale of Philomel,
> And treats of Tereus' treason and his rape,
> And rape, I fear, was root of thine annoy.

This links it with *The Rape of Lucrece* and both are connected with *Cymbeline* when Iachimo says in the second Scene of the second Act of that Play,

> Our Tarquin thus
> Did softly press the rushes ere he wakened
> The chastity he wounded. . . .
> She hath been reading late
> The Tale of Tereus, here the leaf's turned down
> Where Philomel gave up.

Shakespeare could have said of this Play as Horatio did in *Hamlet*,

So shall you hear
Of carnal, bloody and unnatural acts,
Of accidental judgments, casual slaughters,

or with Othello,

On horror's head horrors accumulate.

He tried to increase Ovid's horrors, as when he made Demetrius and Chiron cut off Lavinia's hands and made Andronicus say to them,

For worse than Philomel you used my daughter,
And worse than Progne I will be revenged,

and prepare their heads for Tamora's meal (instead of using a child's flesh as was done in Ovid's version and Gower's in the Fifth Book of *Confessio Amantis*), so that he was able to say when they were sought,

Why, there they are both baked in that pie,
Whereof their mother daintily hath fed.

This last change made his version ridiculous: since the pie could not have been vast enough to hold two men he made Tamora eat two heads without detecting her fare.

It may be that he combined his version of Philomela's calamity and Procne's revenge, using Gower's names for the story, with a plot suggested to him by a similar play, *Lust's Dominion or The Lascivious Queen*. Though *Titus Andronicus* is meant to be Roman and its scenes are in Rome or in a neighbouring forest, the story seems Spanish and may have been based on some old Spanish legend of the days of the Visigoths. It may be that he could have said, as in *Lust's Dominion*,

Now Tragedy, thou minion of the night,
Rhamnusia's pewfellow, to thee I sing.
Upon an harp made of dead Spanish bones.

This may have referred to the fact that the Revenge Tragedies were supposed to be modelled on those ascribed to Lucius Annæus Seneca, who was a native of Cordova. Ben Jonson, for instance, called Seneca "him of Cordova dead"

in the Verses prefixed to the Folio of 1623, and Guilpin wrote in *Skialetheia*, printed in 1598,

> Or if my dispose
> Persuade me to a Play, I'll to the Rose
> Or Curtain, one of Plautus' Comedies
> Or the pathetic Spaniard's Tragedies.

The most prominent Writer of these Plays, Thomas Kyd, may have been one of the shifting companions who, according to Thomas Nashe's Preface to Greene's *Menaphon*, printed in 1589, borrowed from Seneca read by candlelight (that is, with the help of translations). But Kyd owed more to Spain than to Rome. Spain was the Country of Romance in his eyes, as he showed when he used the Danish story of Hamblet in *The Spanish Tragedy*, and his Plays have the Spanish cruelty which seems to have come from the heartless tales of the Moors. When Shakespeare revelled in horrors in *Titus Andronicus*, and perhaps in the first versions of most of his Tragedies, his mind had the young cruelty shown in the immemorial tales of the East and in the Mythology which Ovid preserved.

Heminge and Condell printed two Plays, *Troilus and Cressida* and *Coriolanus*, as Tragedies before *Titus Andronicus*; but both of these seem to have been rewritten by Shakespeare towards the end of his life. They began to print *Troilus and Cressida* between *Romeo and Juliet* and *Julius Cæsar* and then gave that place to *Timon of Athens*. They did not name it in the Table of Contents. If, after they began printing it, they came to believe that it should have been put with the Comedies they saw this too late, for they had printed the Comedies and Histories first. They could not have meant it to be ranked with the Histories since these are all Scenes from the Pageant of the Annals of England. It may be that they decided to put it according to the date of the first form of one of its parts, the finished Story of Hector.

Mr. Saintsbury writes in his *History of English Prosody*: "It is impossible that *Troilus and Cressida*, in part at least, should not be early, and it must be remembered that the fact of Meres not mentioning a play is not final." Sir Sidney Lee

writes: "In matter and manner *Troilus and Cressida* combines characteristic features of its author's early and late performances. His imagery is sometimes as fantastic as in *Romeo and Juliet*, elsewhere his intuition is as penetrating as in *King Lear*. The problem resembles that which is presented by *All's Well that Ends Well* and may be solved by the assumption that the Play was begun by Shakespeare in his early days and was completed in the season of maturity." And many students have recognized three parts in this Play, the stories of Troilus and Hector and Ajax. It may be that Shakespeare wrote one of these parts when he was beginning to write and another, the Story of Troilus, about the time when he wrote *Love's Labour's Lost* and combined these and added the Episode of Thersites and Ajax about 1601 during the War of the Poets (which would explain why Heminge and Condell began printing this Play before *Julius Cæsar*) and revised them about 1609.

Coriolanus is a man's work and echoes the gravity and hardness of Rome. We would be tempted to say that the mind in it is not Shakespeare's, though the manner is his, if we did not find the same mood in *Troilus and Cressida* and *Timon of Athens*. It may be that all these were first written when he was young and revised darkly near the end of his days. This would help to explain the contrast between *Coriolanus* and his other mature tragedies except *Julius Cæsar*. They are aching with sympathy, but this is external and rhetorical work. This Play, like *King Richard the Third* and *Timon of Athens*, is planned in Marlowe's proud way: there is a dominating figure in it and the rest of the Characters have little importance. It may be that instead of reverting to imitate Marlowe after he had surpassed him he copied him here with a beginner's humility.

Coriolanus imitates North's version of Plutarch: it is a close dramatic copy repeating or expanding the speeches. Such a method would have been natural when he was beginning, and if he had written a first form in this manner Heminge and Condell might have thought that this Play should be ranked as an early one. If he had written it first when he was mature, he would have transfigured North's version as he did when he wrote *Antony and Cleopatra*.

Coriolanus is closely linked with *Timon of Athens*. Both are tales of Ingratitude, and Timon of Athens was another Coriolanus who raged in solitude and befriended his country's enemies instead of commanding them. *Timon of Athens* is obviously based on a Play written in Youth, and if he took the story from North's version of Plutarch, which was first printed in 1579, he may also have founded a first form of *Coriolanus* on Plutarch when he was beginning to write. But the structure of *Coriolanus* suggests that he did not write it when he was young enough to write the crude form of *Timon of Athens*, and the place given to it by Heminge and Condell may only mean that he wrote a version of it before he revised *Titus Andronicus*. It may be that he revised *Timon of Athens* about 1600 (when the second Earl of Essex was seen in Timon's place) and began to rewrite it afterwards as the last of his Tragedies. Dryden thought it the last and Mr. Dowden has said that it was their climax. If so, this would explain why Heminge and Condell printed it before *Julius Cæsar*, since the last form of it was only begun.

Julius Cæsar seems composed of two parts, a Play of Ingratitude dealing with Cæsar's fall and a Senecan one showing the revenge of his ghost. It may be that the first of these was first written in a Classical group with the Story of Hector and *Timon of Athens*, and the other among the Plays of Revenge, and these groups may have been linked by *Titus Andronicus*.

We cannot be certain that Shakespeare was the poet described in Kemp's *Nine Days' Wonder*, printed in 1600, "whose first making was the miserable stolen story of Macdoel or Macdobeth or Mac-somewhat." Still, *Macbeth*, as we have it, seems a noble revision of a juvenile Tragedy. It may be that its first form belonged to a group which included the first forms of *Othello*, *King Lear*, *King Richard the Third*, *Hamlet* and *The Merchant of Venice*. Four of these Plays, *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, *King Richard the Third* and the story of Brutus in *Julius Cæsar* exhibit Senecan ghosts seeking revenge. Even if this was an imitation of Seneca instead of Kyd it was Spanish, and all these first forms may have shared the Spanish mood of *Titus Andronicus*.

Shakespeare founded *Macbeth* on Raphael Holinshed's

Chronicles of England and Scotland, printed in 1578 and reprinted with John Hooker's additions in 1586, and he may have used an obsolete Play if it was "a miserable stolen story." The first form may have suggested a similar Play dealing with King Richard the Third which was borrowed from the Traditional Stage. The wicked Moor, Aaron, with the Jewish name, may have suggested the Moor of Venice, who may in his turn have suggested the Jew of Venice, and Andronicus may have suggested King Lear's frenzy and Hamlet's simulation of madness.

All this group of first forms may have resembled *Titus Andronicus* in imitating Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, which may have been written about 1586 and was printed in 1594 like *Titus Andronicus*. Sir Israel Gollancz writes, "*Hamlet* and *The Spanish Tragedy* may well be described as twin dramas," and he adds, "To this same class of drama belongs *Titus Andronicus*, and it is interesting to note that early in his career Shakespeare put his hand to an Hamletian Tragedy." It may be that Shakespeare put his hand to his first version of *Hamlet* when he was young, and this may have been one of the Plays in Nashe's mind when he wrote in his Preface to Greene's *Menaphon*: "Yet English Seneca, read by candlelight, yields many good sentences as 'Blood is a beggar' and so forth, and if you entreat him fair in a frosty morning, he will afford you whole *Hamlets*, I should say Handfuls of Tragical speeches." But this may only refer to the fact that Kyd had used the story of Hamlet which he may have found in the *Historia Danica* by Saxo Grammaticus, printed in 1514, or in Belleforest's *Histoires Tragiques*, printed in 1570. His story differed from the story of Hamlet in making a father revenge a murdered son. Shakespeare may have copied from it the ghost demanding revenge and the use of a Play set in a Tragedy. Sir Sidney Lee writes of *Hamlet*: "Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* anticipates with some skill the leading motive and an important part of the machinery of Shakespeare's Play." It does not seem probable that Kyd would have copied his own *Spanish Tragedy* by writing a Danish one; but anyone setting out to imitate him might have done this. Neither does it seem probable that Shakespeare would have written a twin drama to Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*

in 1601 or later when he had outgrown his young mood and the Spanish fashion was dead.

Mr. Tucker Brooke writes in his *Tudor Drama*: "*The Spanish Tragedy* virtually created a great deal of Elizabethan stage business." The long success of this Play (which was afterwards called *The Second Part of Jeronimo*) proves that madness or distraction of mind was recognized as a Tragical theme or a Tragi-comical one. Hieronimo's distraction of mind seems a source of all Shakespeare's pictures of men crazed or distraught and tottering on the brink of Insanity. Pedro says of Hieronimo,

> O Jaques, know thou that our master's mind
> Is much distract since his Horatio died:
> And now his aged years should sleep in rest,
> His heart in quiet, like a desperate man,
> Grows lunatic and childish for his son:
> Sometimes, as he doth at his table sit,
> He speaks as if Horatio stood by him,

and Hieronimo says to the Painter,

> Art thou not sometime mad?
> Is there no tricks that come before thine eyes?

"Well, sir, then bring me forth, bring me through alley and alley, still with a distracted countenance going along, and let my hair heave up my nightcap. Let the clouds scowl, make the moon dark, the stars extinct, the wind blowing, the bells tolling, the owls shrieking. . . . There you may show a passion. Draw me like old Priam of Troy, crying 'the house is afire, the house is afire' and the torch over my head; make me curse, make me rave, make me cry, make me mad, make me well again, make me curse Hell, invocate, and in the end leave me in a trance and so forth." It seems plain that if Kyd wrote these passages Shakespeare echoed him in *Titus Andronicus* and in *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* and *King Lear*. And it may be that the echoes were much more distinct in the first forms of these Plays. *King Lear*, even as we have it, seems based on *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Titus Andronicus*.

King Lear combined separate stories, as is shown by the

title page of the Quarto of 1608, "Mr. William Shakespeare, his true Chronicle History of the Life and Death of King Lear and his three daughters. With the unfortunate life of Edgar, son and heir to the Earl of Gloucester." The first may have been founded on Holinshed's Chronicles and the second derived from Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*, which may have been current in manuscript before it was printed. Both were tales of Ingratitude; but the horrors in them give them a place in the group linked with *Titus Andronicus*.

Coleridge rejected *Titus Andronicus* because he disliked it, in the same way as he called *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* a sketch in his *Classification* of 1802 and omitted it in his *Classifications* of 1810 and 1819. He said in his *Notes on some other Plays*: "To the objection that Shakespeare wounds the moral sense by the unsubdued, undisguised description of the most hateful atrocity . . . I, omitting *Titus Andronicus* as not genuine, and excepting the scene of Gloster's blinding in *Lear*, answer boldly in the name of Shakespeare, not guilty." But the scene of the blinding proves that Shakespeare could have written the horrors of *Titus Andronicus*. And its survival in *King Lear* seems a sign that this Tragedy is based on two others which were written in Youth.

The Merchant of Venice is another Play which seems linked with *Titus Andronicus*. It seems compounded from two different Plays, a Tragical one of Shylock's Revenge and an Italianate Comedy, The Choice of the Caskets. It may be that in the first of these Shylock was taken from the Traditional Stage to rival the Moor of Venice and was as horrible as Aaron the Moor and resembled Barabas as he was drawn in the Jew of Malta in the immature Scenes which were added to Marlowe's noble beginning.

It may be that after writing these first Tragical Plays Shakespeare turned to two longer Tragedies or fantastic Romances, *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*. *Cymbeline* and *King Lear* are connected by a part of their themes, the tragedy of a father's injustice, and by their place in prehistorical England and their tangled construction. And *Cymbeline* is linked with *Othello* by its tale of a loving husband's deception and jealousy and with *Titus Andronicus*

of the wickedness of a Queen and her son and the atmosphere by a boyish romance. *The Winter's Tale* is connected with *Cymbeline* and *Othello* by a story of jealousy and by the calamities of an innocent lady which also unite it with *King Lear* and with *Titus Andronicus*.

There are three parts in *Cymbeline*, as we have it, Holinshed's tale of Cymbeline and his sons, and the Wager-story told by Boccaccio, and Imogen's fantastic adventure in the Mountains of Wales. The third part may have been added after he had combined the two others in a Romance which had a Tragical ending as its title *The Tragedy of Cymbeline* shows. In this version, I think, Imogen died when Posthumus struck her down at the end; but in the Play, as we have it, she is restored from the grave as Thaisa, Æmilia and Hermione were. These long-suffering ladies all belonged to the type which Chaucer admired when he drew Constance "full of benignity" in *The Man of Law's Tale* and wrote,

> The tale of Melibee
> And of Prudence and her benignity

and drew the patient Griselda in *The Clerk's Tale*. The fierce women like Tamora and the Queen in this Play were also in Chaucer's Tales as when he wrote in *The Man of Law's Tale*,

> Oh Sultaness, root of iniquity,
> Virago thou!

and of Donegild "the King's mother, full of tyranny."

The restoration from the tomb makes this Play Tragi-comical as *King Lear* would have been if Cordelia and the King had survived. If it was a change made by Shakespeare at the end of his work this would explain why Heminge and Condell put *Cymbeline* as the last of the Tragedies. They may have classed it as a Tragedy still because he had not altered the name and because there is no Comedy in it—the drift of the Play remains Tragical and the end is untrue because there has been no preparation for it.

Samuel Johnson wrote in his *General Observations*: "This Play has many just sentiments, some natural dialogues and some pleasing Scenes, but they are obtained at the expense

of much incongruity. To remark the folly of the fiction, the absurdity of the conduct, the confusion of the manners and names of different times and the impossibility of the events in any system of life, were to waste criticism upon unresisting imbecility, upon faults too evident for detection and too gross for aggravation." Johnson had no eyes for the Poetry and glamour of *Cymbeline*, and he did not perceive, as Coleridge did, that these faults are signs of juvenile work. The merits too are equally young, and the Play is planned with a boy's lavishness and random invention.

When Coleridge in his *Classification* of 1819 put *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale* with the earliest Plays he added: "The example of *Titus Andronicus* which as well as *Jeronimo* was most popular in Shakespeare's first Epoch, had led the young dramatist to the lawless mixture of dates and manners." And the fact that *Cymbeline* and *King Lear* are the two Plays which are most akin to *Titus Andronicus* seems a proof that they were first written in Youth.

Cymbeline has the mood of the Mediæval Romances, and this was why Imogen's adventure in Wales, the scene of many of them, resembles a Fairy-tale, as Sir Israel Gollancz has observed when he compared it with the Fairy-tale of Little Snow-White. It is probable that most of the Fairy-tales were early Romances which had dwindled for the amusement of children in the same way as the primitive gods dwindled to Fairies. This Fairy-tale dominates the rest of the Play: if it was omitted *Cymbeline* would closely resemble *Titus Andronicus* and *The Rape of Lucrece*.

The Wager-story was told by Boccaccio with indifferent gaiety. His story "Bernabo da Genova da Ambruoguiolo ingannato perde il suo" begins gaily. Three rich Italian merchants have been feasting in Paris, "avendo una sera fra laltre tutti lietamente cenato, cominciarono di diverse cose ad ragionare"; they talk of their wives and Bernabo praises his and Ambruoguiolo "comincio ad fare le maggior riso del mondo." The same laughter rings in the Italian Novelle which imitated Boccaccio's and in the Queen of Navarre's *Contes et Nouvelles*. Shakespeare remembered it when he was writing his Argument to *The Rape of Lucrece*: "During which siege the principal men of the Army meeting

one evening at the tent of Sextus Tarquinius, the King's son, in their discourses after supper every one commended the virtues of his own wife; among whom Collatinus extolled the incomparable chastity of his wife Lucretia. In that pleasant humour they all posted to Rome, and intending, by their secret and sudden arrival, to make trial of that which every one before had avouched." Still, this pleasant humour has no part in that Poem or in this Play: he had not come to the mood of his Italianate Comedies and the wager which would have been light-hearted in them, and therefore left credible, is unnatural here because it is made by Posthumus as Iachimo says,

Sitting sadly,
Hearing us praise our loves of Italy.

This fault would have left this Play as crudely impossible as *Titus Andronicus* if it had not been redeemed by the glamour of the adventure in Wales. Cloten in this Play might have sinned in *Titus Andronicus* and so might Iachimo, another Iago, but their wickedness is unreal and harmless because the soft light of the Fairy-tale subdues their atrocity. I think that this Fairy-tale was added when Shakespeare borrowed a lighter method from *Pericles*.

There are two Plays in *The Winter's Tale* as we have it. One is a version of the Tragical part of *Cymbeline* with Hermione in Imogen's place and Leontes outdoing Posthumus, and the other, the fourth Act, is a separate Comedy.

The first part is based on Greene's story, *Pandosto* or *The Triumph of Time*, which was printed in 1588 and afterwards called *Dorastus and Faunia*. Greene may have shaped a Play from his story, for his slack mind and wandering manner seem visible in the build of this part. This would help to account for his assertion that Shake-scene was arrayed in his plumes.

As this part was first written Leontes was a caricature of jealousy. When it was revised he remained a boy's picture of a man's jealous rage in the first Acts, but in the fifth he was worthy to be loved by Hermione. The dignity of this Act was worth the audience of Kings and Princes, as the First Gentleman says in it with a different meaning.

The fourth Act is a Pastoral Comedy of the Rustics and knaves of an English countryside fair. It has the sweetness and ripeness of a Midsummer Dream and it shines in this Play like the episode of Marina in *Pericles* and the Interlude of Imogen's wanderings in the story of *Cymbeline*. Autolycus could have wandered with Jaques, singing in the Forest of Arden: he was too wise for the days when Shakespeare was beginning to write and too merry for his mood at the end.

The first three Acts have the mood of a Mediæval Romance and I see in their rawness a proof that they were written first in the days when he was young enough to conceive the first fantastic version of *Cymbeline*. Mr. Saintsbury writes: "There might be some reason for thinking *The Winter's Tale* Shakespeare's first experiment in very free redundance and overlapping combined; perhaps one made very much earlier than is usually thought, and held back. Nor would this lack support in some non-prosodic aspects of the Play."

This Tragi-comedy had, I think, a Tragical ending in its earliest form. The first three Acts are still appropriate to a Tragical ending, but they are made Tragi-comical by the unforeseen radiance of a Midsummer Dream. A first end, which was imitated from Greene's *Pandosto*, seems still shown when Mamilius begins his story and says, "A sad tale is best for Winter." King Richard the Second thought the same when he said,

> In Winter's tedious nights sit by the fire
> With good old folks, and let them tell thee tales
> Of woeful ages long ago betid.

Mr. Seccombe and Mr. Allen write of this Play and *Cymbeline* in their *Age of Shakespeare*: "Both these Plays combine an almost childish romance of plot, an utter disregard of plausibility, with most minute and finished realism in the presentation of individual figures or situations." It seems to me that these contrasts can only be explained by concluding that these Plays were written first when Shakespeare was young and revised when he was mature.

Coleridge in his *Notes on some other Plays of Shakespeare*, written in 1818, said that "*Cymbeline* is a congener with

Pericles," and in his *Classification Attempted* of 1819 put *Pericles* after *Love's Labour's Lost*, which he took to be the earliest Play, and added, "in the same epoch I place *Winter's Tale* and *Cymbeline*, differing from the *Pericles* by the entire rifaciamento of it." In 1802 he had put *Pericles* in Shakespeare's first Epoch among "the transition-works, *Uebergangswerke*, not his, yet of him," and in his *Lectures on Shakespeare and Milton* of 1813 he had spoken of "the Play of *Pericles*, written a century before, which Shakespeare altered." In these opinions he disregarded the fact that Heminge and Condell had omitted this Play.

The Quarto edition of *Pericles* printed in 1609 (or bearing that date), described it as "the late and much admired Play called *Pericles, Prince of Tyre* . . . as it hath been divers and sundry times acted by His Majesty's Servants at the Globe on the Bankside. By William Shakespeare." Since it was a popular Play acted by His Majesty's Servants and was printed as Shakespeare's in four or five Quarto editions before 1623 Heminge and Condell must have been guided by some particular reason when they rejected it. It seems to me that they must have known either that Shakespeare had not written this Play or that he had wished to disclaim it. I think that there are at least three versions to be seen in this Play, an antiquated one and another founded on it and a hasty revision. If only this last version was Shakespeare's they may have rejected *Pericles* for that reason alone, or in that case he may have preferred that it should rest in oblivion because he had founded several other Plays on its Scenes.

Old Gower says in the beginning,

> To sing a song that old was sung,
> From ashes ancient Gower is come,
> Assuming man's infirmities,
> To glad your ears and please your eyes.
> It hath been sung at festivals
> On Ember eves and holy ales,

Soon he breaks into irregular Verse,

This Antioch then Antiochus the Great
Built up, this city, for his chiefest seat,
The fairest in all Syria :
I tell you what mine authors say :
This King unto him took a fere.

In the second Act he declaims,

The good in conversation,
To whom I give my benison,
Is still at Tarsus, where each man
Thinks all is writ he speken can ;
And, to remember what he does,
Builds his statue to make him glorious.

He says after the dumbshow in this Act,

And he, good prince, having all lost,
By waves from coast to coast is tost ;
All perishen of men, of pelf,
Ne aught escapen but himself.

And in the third Act he says,

By many a dern and painful perch
Of Pericles the careful search,
By the four opposing coigns
Which the world together joins,
Is made with all due diligence
That horse and sail and high expense
Can stead the quest.

I do not think that these old-fashioned verses were written in Queen Elizabeth's time. They are like many verses in *Confessio Amantis*, for instance,

Whereas with great devotion
Of holy contemplation
Within his heart he made his shrift . . .
The Vice of Supplantacion,
With many a false collacion,
Which he conspireth all unknow,
Full ofte time hath overthrow
The worship of another man.

If anyone writing in Queen Elizabeth's time could have imitated Gower so closely he would have done it throughout the speeches given to him. I think that these old-fashioned verses survive from a Traditional Play. They probably led Coleridge to think that *Pericles* had been written a century before, and Ben Jonson seems to have considered them old when he wrote in the Prologue to *Volpone*,

> Nor hales he in a gull, old ends reciting,
> To stop gaps in his loose writing,

for this seems to refer to Gower's words

> I do beseech you
> To learn of me, who stand in the gaps to teach you
> The stages of our story.

John Gower may have written his *Confessio Amantis* ten years before he changed his first dedication in 1393. When he began his tale of Appollinus, Prince of Tyre in the Eighth Book he wrote,

> Of a Chronique in days gone,
> The which is cleped Panteon,
> In love's cause I rede thus.

This Chronicle, Godfrey of Viterbo's *Pantheon*, written in the Twelfth Century, borrowed the tale from the Greek Romance, *Apollonius of Tyre*, which may have been written in the First Century and now survives in a Latin version made in the Sixth. Chaucer in *The Man of Law's Tale* called the story—

> As horrible a tale as man may read,

but the horrible beginning was only an episode in a tangled Romance. *Apollonius of Tyre* belonged to the group of Greek Romances which dealt with flights, captures, rescues, storms at sea, pirates and partings, and ended with marriages, as Nicetas Eugenianus wrote of *Charicles and Drusilla*. Mr. Gaselee writes of them in his Appendix on the Greek Novel, printed in the Loeb edition of Longus and Parthenius, "The most significant feature of the Greek novels is their un-Greek character. We can always point to Oriental

elements in their substance, and almost always to Oriental blood in the writers. Sometimes it would almost seem that the accident that they were written in Greek has preserved them to us in their present form rather than in some such shape as that of *The Thousand and One Nights*." And it may be that *Pericles* shared an Oriental descent with *Titus Andronicus*.

The story of *Pericles* is all to be found in Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, though the Prince is called Appollinus there and Thaise is the name of his child. Gower, for instance, tells of the tempest,

> The storm arose, the winds loud
> They blewen many a dreadful blast,
> The welkin was all overcast,
> The dark night the sun hath under,
> There was a great tempest of thunder,

and of the sale to the brothel,

> The master-shipman made him boun
> And goeth him out into the town,
> And proffereth Thaise for to sell.
> One Leonin it heard tell
> Which master of the bordel was.

Some Strolling Player, thinking only of pleasing an illiterate crowd, may have discovered the admirable contrasts of *Pericles* when he heard Gower's story, perceiving how the excitement of shipwreck and the humour of brothels and the triumph of Virtue could be fitly combined. Mr. Saintsbury writes of *Pericles* in his *History of English Prosody*: "It was evidently a derelict in some way. Not merely the extremely *décousu* character of the plot, and the absence of any distinct character-drawing, but the importance and peculiarity of the Chorus show earliness, and so does the Blank Verse, though this is not exactly of the earliest." It may be that *Pericles* was already a derelict when Shakespeare began.

In 1608 George Wilkins published a story called "*The Painful Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre.* Being the true history of the Play of *Pericles*, as it was lately presented

by the worthy and ancient Poet, John Gower." He invited the Reader "to receive this History in the same manner as it was under the habit of ancient Gower, the famous English Poet, by the King's Majesty's Players excellently presented" and he claimed that the Play was "a poor infant of his brain." We know nothing else about Wilkins except that he helped John Day and William Rowley to write *The Travaile of Three English Brothers* which was printed in 1607, and wrote a Play called *The Miseries of an Enforced Marriage* which was printed in the same year. If he wrote *Pericles* he deserved to be ranked with Shakespeare and Marlowe; but nothing else written by him justifies this. It is possible that he revised an old Play or that he helped to write a version of it twenty years before 1608 (since we do not know when he was born); but his other work seems a sufficient proof that the beauty of *Pericles* was out of his reach.

The title of his story suggests that he based it on Laurence Twine's "*Pattern of Painful Adventures* containing the most excellent, pleasant and variable History of the Strange Accidents that befell unto Prince Apollonius, the Lady Lucina his wife and Tharsia his daughter." And that book was first printed thirty-two years before 1608. If the Prologue to Ben Jonson's *Volpone* was spoken when that Play was acted in 1605, its mention of a gull reciting old ends may be a proof that *Pericles* had been seen on the Stage. But we cannot conclude that *Pericles* was old from the fact that Ben Jonson called it "mouldy" when he wrote of

> Some mouldy tale
> Like *Pericles*

in the Verses beginning "Come, Leave the loathed Stage," for he used that word to mean "bawdy," and Owen Feltham agreed with him when he said that some of Ben Jonson's Scenes in *The New Inn*

> Throw a stain
> Through all the unlikely plot, and do displease
> As deep as *Pericles*.

This Play is essentially young, and it is either the source

of many of Shakespeare's Scenes or a repetition of them. If he was acquainted with a version of it when he was young, this would explain, for instance, why in *The Comedy of Errors* the first Scene of the fifth Act, when Ægeon recognizes the Abbess as his lost wife and says,

> If I dream not, thou art Æmilia;
> If thou art she, tell me, where is that son
> That floated with thee on the fatal raft?

closely resembles the third Scene of the fifth Act of *Pericles* when the Prince sees the High Priestess of Diana at Ephesus, and why the brothel-scenes are so much alike in *Pericles* and in *Measure for Measure*, which is openly founded on a juvenile version. Other things which resemble *Pericles*, such as the restoration of wives in *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*, could have been derived from the story, which must have been commonly known like other Greek novels, for instance, the *Æthiopica* of Heliodorus of Emesa, which was taken to Sea by Pantagruel (according to Rabelais) and was remembered by the Duke in *Twelfth Night* when he said,

> Why should I not, had I the heart to do it,
> Like to the Egyptian thief, at point of death
> Kill what I love?

These tales, which may have sprung from the East, had been destined to be *Wonderful Things Beyond Thule*, like the adventures celebrated under that name by Antonius Diogenes. While these other apparent echoes of *Pericles* could have answered the story, they could also have repeated the Play, and this seems more probable.

Many students (for instance, Sir Israel Gollancz) have regarded *Pericles* as closely connected with *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*. *Cymbeline* is linked with it by the mood of Imogen's adventure in Wales, and *The Winter's Tale* is connected with it by the mood of the fourth Act and so is *The Tempest* by the use of the storm and by the grace and the sweetness of those separate Episodes. Also these three Plays, like many others, retain the nature of the immemorial Romances.

One obvious link between *Pericles*, *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale* is the use of the conventional lists of flowers chosen for their colours or names. In the first Scene of the fourth Act of *Pericles* Marina says,

> No, I will rob Tellus of her weed,
> To strew thy green with flowers: the yellows, blues,
> The purple violets, and marigolds,
> Shall, as a carpet, hang upon thy grave,
> While summer-days do last.

In the fourth Scene of the fourth Act of *The Winter's Tale*, Perdita says,

> I would I had some flowers of the Spring that might
> Become your time of day . . .
> daffodils,
> That come before the swallow dares, and take
> The winds of March with beauty; violets dim,
> But sweeter than the lids of Juno's eyes
> Or Cytherea's breath; pale primroses,
> That die unmarried, ere they can behold
> Bright Phœbus in his strength.

And in the second Scene of the fourth Act of *Cymbeline* Arviragus says,

> With fairest flowers,
> While Summer lasts, and I live here, Fidele,
> I'll sweeten thy sad grave: thou shalt not lack
> The flower that's like thy face, pale primrose, nor
> The azured harebell, like thy veins; no, nor
> The leaf of eglantine, whom not to slander,
> Outsweetened not thy breath.

A model for all these had been set, for instance, in Marlowe's *Dido, Queen of Carthage* when Venus said,

> Amongst green brakes I'll lay Ascanius,
> And strew him with sweet-smelling violets,
> Blushing roses, purple hyacinths:
> These milk-white doves shall be his centronels.

The second of these three lists is plainly an imitation of

Marlowe. The third is a revision or a form of the first and it is the only one in Shakespeare's last manner. The repetition in it would be explained if when it was written or revised, as we have it, Shakespeare had not intended to take the credit of *Pericles*.

Dryden recognized the young mood in *Pericles* when (referring to the belief that the Glastonbury Thorn blossomed at Christmas) he wrote in his Prologue to Davenant's *Circe*, printed in 1675,

> Shakespeare's own Muse her *Pericles* first bore,
> The Prince of Tyre was elder than the Moor:
> 'Tis Miracle to see a first good Play;
> All Hawthorns do not bloom on Christmas Day.

It seems certain that Shakespeare could not have written *Pericles* after *Hamlet* or *King Lear* or *Othello*. Still, he might have revised a Play as young as *Titus Andronicus*, founded by him on a much earlier Traditional one and written in imitation of Marlowe, and this would have been the natural conclusion if Heminge and Condell had not rejected this Play. Of course, the fact that it was called his in the Quarto editions proves nothing, for several Plays which were not his (for instance, the *First Part of Sir John Oldcastle*, which was written by Munday and Drayton and others, and apparently printed in 1619, though it bears the date 1600) were ascribed to him with intent to deceive. The later belief that it was his may have been due to the Quartos or to a tradition that he had prepared a form of it for His Majesty's Servants. The Play, as we have it, bears signs of a revision by him after 1603. But I think that Heminge and Condell's rejection can only be explained by concluding that the Play was not his. Though they do not appear to have been equally scrupulous when they printed *King John* and *King Henry the Eighth*, this may have been due to the fact that those Plays were in the Chronicle Pageant which was founded on common property. No one ascribed *Doctor Faustus* to Dekker, or *Jeronimo* to Jonson, though they added some Scenes, and if Heminge and Condell had happened to know that *Pericles* was as old as those Plays and that Shakespeare had only retouched it (perhaps after a revision by Wilkins) they would not have ascribed it to him.