

VI

SHAKESPEARE AND ELIZABETHAN DRAMA

[By SIDNEY LEE]

THERE has been considerable activity in Shakespearian research and criticism during the period under review. Most of the results deserve careful consideration, though few of them are likely to command unqualified assent. A suspense of judgement seems desirable in regard to some recent notable deductions from the punctuation of the early editions of Shakespeare's work, and a new and elaborate theory of Shakespeare's versification would appear to rest on questionable foundations.

Of pre-Shakespearian drama *Gammer Gurton's Needle*¹ has been included in the attractive series of 'Percy reprints' which Mr. Basil Blackwell, of Oxford, recently inaugurated under the editorship of Mr. Brett-Smith with the issue of Thomas Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller*. In agreement with the principle of this series, Mr. Brett-Smith reproduces with strict accuracy the text of the original edition of this boisterous domestic farce which appeared in 1575. Only three copies of the first edition seem to be now known and the present editor naturally follows the copy in the Bodleian. Mr. Brett-Smith is sparing of annotation, but in a few notes at the end of the book he briefly solves the main difficulties which the average reader will find in the language of the piece. The editorial Introduction and 'Bibliographical Note' supply much pertinent information. Mr. Brett-Smith accepts Dr. Henry Bradley's identification of the author with William

¹ *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, by Mr. S., Mr. of Art, edited by H. F. B. Brett-Smith. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1920. Sm. 8vo. xv+88 pp. 4s. 6d. (Percy Reprints, No. 2.)

Stevenson, Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, which relieves John Still, Bishop of Rochester, of a traditional claim on which critics long insisted without justification. Although the play has figured in many dramatic collections, it has not hitherto been separately accessible in so attractive a form.

The wisdom of the Editor in retaining the punctuation of the original issue may well be questioned. Whatever view may be held of Mr. Percy Simpson's theory of Shakespearian punctuation, Mr. Brett-Smith assumes an untenable position when he credits authors and printers of so early a date as 1575 with fidelity to Mr. Simpson's principles. The paucity of 'stops' in books of the third quarter of the sixteenth century and the disproportionate favour which the comma enjoys among them give no support to the notion that the punctuation was governed by any well-defined principle, whether rhetorical or syntactical. 'Stops' were a rather late typographical innovation everywhere, and English printers were slow in making any systematic use of them. Thomas Colwell, who first printed *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, did not include among his type either the semicolon or the exclamation-mark. It is characteristic of his unprincipled practice that the twenty lines which form the prologue of the play are destitute, in defiance alike of syntax and rhetoric, of all internal punctuation save ten commas quite promiscuously distributed.

On the tragedy of *Arden of Feversham*, an early piece of work which has found its way into the Shakespeare 'Apocrypha', Mr. Lionel Cust has contributed an interesting and valuable paper to the *Archaeologia Cantiana* (vol. xxxiv; reprinted separately, 38 pp.). Mr. Cust carefully analyses the story of Thomas Arden's murder, which forms the plot of the lurid play, and shows how the dramatist introduces local characters and episodes which are not to be found in Holinshed's *Chronicle*. Holinshed's record is usually reckoned to be the sole source of the plot. Mr. Cust suggests that the playwright's local detail may possibly come from an earlier and a fuller local version of the story which the *Chronicle* abbreviated. From some new pieces of external evidence Mr. Cust infers that Marlowe and

Shakespeare both had a hand in the composition. Therein he comes into unconscious conflict with Mr. Dugdale Sykes, who, on internal evidence alone (in the work noticed below), assigns the authorship to Thomas Kyd. Mr. Cust is on surer ground in his elaborate archaeological research into the history of Thomas Arden and of his native town of Faversham. In an appendix to his paper Mr. Cust prints a deed preserved at Rockingham Castle, wherein Arden on the 3rd August, 1545 (some five years before his murder) transferred a messuage and other property at Faversham (formerly belonging to the far-famed Cluniac Abbey there) to a friend and neighbour, Thomas Dunkin, who was mayor of the town in 1546. The document bears the autograph signature of Thomas Arden, who was himself mayor—three years later.

Mr. Dugdale Sykes has subjected to minute scrutiny the text of seven plays of high interest in the history of Elizabethan drama, of all of which the authorship has been theme of controversy.² Only two of the plays, *Henry VIII* and *Pericles*, have been admitted to the Shakespearian canon, but in three of the plays, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, *Arden of Feversham*, and *A Yorkshire Tragedy*, some few occasional signs of Shakespeare's handiwork have been detected by critics of more or less authority. The remaining two plays with which Mr. Sykes deals, *The Troublesome Reign of King John* and *King Leir*, are pieces of humble merit which were in existence before Shakespeare treated their themes. In the case of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Henry VIII*, the greater part of both pieces has been assigned by numerous responsible critics to Fletcher. In the case of the rest, great divergence of view has long persisted and still persists in the matter of their authorship.

Mr. Sykes, relying exclusively on a meticulous study of the

² *Sidelights on Shakespeare*. Being studies of *The Two Noble Kinsmen—Henry VIII—Arden of Feversham—A Yorkshire Tragedy—The Troublesome Reign of King John—King Leir—Pericles Prince of Tyre*. By H. Dugdale Sykes. The Shakespeare Head Press, Stratford-upon-Avon, 1919. xiv + 208 pp.

internal evidence of style, diction, imagery, metre, or rhythm claims to solve all the questions at issue.

Mr. Sykes's conclusions may be stated briefly. He denies to Shakespeare any share in either *Henry VIII* or *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, dividing the whole responsibility for both these plays between Fletcher and Massinger. *Arden of Feversham* he assigns solely to Thomas Kyd; *A Yorkshire Tragedy* to George Wilkins; *The Troublesome Reign of King John* and *King Leir*, both to George Peele. In the greater part of *Pericles* Mr. Sykes discerns the hand of George Wilkins, though he allows Shakespeare responsibility for the greater part of the last three Acts. Herein Mr. Sykes adopts conclusions which have already been generally accepted. His main difference with previous inquirers in regard to *Pericles* affects the relation between the play and the novel which George Wilkins avowedly fashioned out of the same story. It has hitherto been believed on what seemed externally to be sound testimony that the novel was based on the play. Mr. Sykes contends from a close comparison of the two works that the play was founded on the novel which he claims to have been written first.

Mr. Sykes deduces all his conclusions from accumulated citations of turns of phrase, imagery, metre, or grammatical construction, which he finds common to the plays under examination of doubtful authorship and to other plays of known and unquestioned pens. For example, the old play of *King Leir*, according to Mr. Sykes's citations, offers frequent parallel with verbal or metrical features which figure in Peele's authentic work. Mr. Sykes's parallels are often striking, though not all are quite distinctive. Yet, when every consideration is paid Mr. Sykes's industry and sagacity, it remains clear that absolute certitude can only be reached by a gargantuan method of exhaustion which should lay all authors of the period under contribution to the argument. One must make quite sure that Peele is the only contemporary dramatist characteristics of whose style can be regularly paralleled in the play of *King Leir*. Mr. Robertson, adopting Mr. Sykes's mode of investigation, comes to a different conclusion on the very question at issue. Mr. Robertson deems the style of *King Leir* to resemble that of Robert Greene more

closely than that of Peele. There are obvious obstacles in the pursuit to the bitter end of any method of exhaustion. The results reached by the way will always be open to substantial doubt. At the same time, it should be acknowledged that Mr. Sykes's guesses at truth are usually qualified by caution, and future research will be rash in leaving his labours out of account.

Since the completion of his *Sidelights on Shakespeare*, Mr. Sykes has continued his line of investigations in other directions. From a long series of parallelisms of diction, he has adduced evidence tending to show that *The Taming of A Shrew*, *The Famous Victories of Henry V*, the Additions to Marlowe's *Faustus* (in the quartos of 1604-1616) are all from the pen of Samuel Rowley.³ Only a single extant play, *When You See Me You Know Me* (c. 1604), has hitherto been assigned to Rowley. But Mr. Sykes pursues his argument with ingenious industry and offers food for thought.

Fresh study of Shakespeare's sources has produced several conjectures of value. A paper by Miss Cornelia C. Coulter on 'The Plautine tradition in Shakespeare' in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* for January 1920 (vol. xix, pp. 66-83) may profitably be compared with a paper by Mr. R. S. Forsythe, of North Western University, entitled 'A Plautine Source of *Merry Wives of Windsor*' (reprinted from *Modern Philology*, Dec. 1920, 41 pp.). Mr. Forsythe ingeniously discovers in Plautus's little known comedy of *Casina* plausible parallels with the plot of *The Merry Wives*.

In 'The wager in *Cymbeline*' (*Modern Language Association of America Publications*, December 1920), Mr. William Witherle Lawrence analyses in the light of mediaeval social convention and of literary tradition, the 'chief episode of the main plot, the wager between Leonatus Posthumus and Iachimo as to the chastity of

³ *The Authorship of 'The Taming of A Shrew', 'The Famous Victories of Henry V', and the Additions to Marlowe's 'Faustus', by H. Dugdale Sykes. London: For the Shakespeare Association, Chatto & Windus, 1920. Cr. 8vo. 1s. 6d. net.*

Imogen'. Mr. Lawrence shows how Boccaccio's treatment of the theme, which was clearly accessible to Shakespeare, has numerous analogues in earlier mediaeval romances and in the popular poetry of wellnigh all Europe up to the sixteenth century. Posthumus' action is shown to harmonize in the main with the standards of mediaeval chivalry, which survived in much Elizabethan popular literature. The episode might therefore have presented itself to Shakespeare's public as a reasonable pivot of the main plot. Mr. Lawrence offers, in addition, some sensible strictures on Shakespeare's handling of the story in the later portions of his play.

Professor Herford develops with knowledge and insight Hazlitt's familiar view that Shakespeare keeps in his survey of humanity to the highway of life and avoids its by-ways. In the address which he delivered last year to the English Association⁴ in his capacity of president, Professor Herford seeks to illustrate from Shakespeare's 'treatment of Love and Marriage' what he calls somewhat obscurely his 'normality'. Professor Herford argues that the Shakespearian world is mainly characterized by 'an unmistakable joy in healthy living', which eschews what is pathological or eccentric or fantastic. The anomalies of passion which attracted the dramatist's later contemporaries Fletcher and Webster, for example failed, according to Professor Herford, to interest Shakespeare. In the immature comedies of early date he often treats love slightly and superficially. But in the ripeness of his powers 'his *norm* of love (writes Professor Herford) is a passion, kindling heart, brain, and senses alike in natural and happy proportions; ardent but not sensual, tender but not sentimental, pure but not ascetic, moral but not puritanic, joyous but not frivolous, mirthful and witty, but not cynical.' It is clearly impossible to bring within this comprehensive definition the phases of the amorous sentiment which are developed in plays like *Troilus and Cressida* or *Measure for Measure*. But Professor Herford claims, with some force, that it was a specific dramatic purpose, and no spirit of revolt against 'normality'

⁴ *The Normality of Shakespeare*, by C. H. Herford. The English Association. Large 8vo. 15 pp. 1s. (Pamphlet No. 47.)

on the dramatist's part which occasionally led him to introduce alike into mature comedy and mature tragedy some examples of abnormal passion. In comedy one finds here and there parodies of the normal passion which strikingly accentuate the general dramatic effect. In tragedy Shakespeare at times lays stress on the 'lawless violence' of passion. But Professor Herford concludes that his departures from the 'norm' are proof neither of pathological morbidity nor of cruel cynicism. Professor Herford's development of Hazlitt's point of view is novel and may seem to err on the side of over-elaboration or over-emphasis. But there can be no doubt that his conception of Shakespeare's 'norm of love' is sound.

Mr. Horace Howard Furness, Jr., has added *King John* to the plays already included in the New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare⁵ which his illustrious father inaugurated with *Romeo and Juliet* half a century ago. Towards the close of the elder Horace Howard Furness's life (he died in 1912), his son (of the same name) resolved in an admirable spirit of filial piety to continue the great series. Mr. Furness, Jr., has already issued on his father's exhaustive plan editions of *Richard III* and *Julius Caesar*, and now he has placed Shakespearian scholars under the further obligation of editing *King John* with even greater wealth of *apparatus criticus* than that to which his father accustomed students. The younger editor lays a special stress on the theatrical history of the play, and he supplies a select catalogue of revivals of *King John* both in England and America down to recent years, which will stir many pleasant memories in the minds of elderly playgoers. A section of Mr. Furness's Appendix on 'Actors' Interpretations' gives perhaps undue space to Beerbohm Tree's impersonation of the title-rôle, but the section is a serviceable feature which will be welcome to the growing school of critics who insist on judging Shakespeare as above all else a practical worker for the stage. Mr. Furness reprints

⁵ A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. *The Life and Death of King John*. Edited by Horace Howard Furness, Jr., A.B., Litt.D. Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1919. xiii + 728 pp. 25s.

with much critical commentary the old piece, *The Troublesome Raigne*, on which Shakespeare founded his drama, and he also treats the later adaptations of the play with a fullness which satisfies the most meticulous standards of research into stage history. Nowhere can be found so complete an account of the controversy which Colley Cibber provoked when he converted Shakespeare's *King John* into his degenerate *Papal Tyranny* of 1744. The satiric protest against Cibber's vandalism—'A Letter to Colley Cibber, Esq., on his transformation of *King John*' (1745)—is given by Mr. Furness at length, and makes amusing and instructive reading. Mr. Furness's profuse and encyclopaedic method of exegesis may, in the view of the general reader, err on the side of excess, but no Shakespeare scholar can cherish any sentiment save one of gratitude for the industrious and self-denying zeal with which he is carrying forward to completion his father's ambitious enterprise.

Mr. Robertson continues his scholarly analysis of Shakespeare's work which he inaugurated as long ago as 1905 with his *Did Shakespeare write 'Andronicus'?* and carried on in his *Shakespeare and Chapman* (1917) and his *Problem of 'The Merry Wives of Windsor'* published with the Shakespeare Association three years ago. Mr. Robertson's main aim, like that of Mr. Dugdale Sykes, is to separate, by the evidence of turns of expression and rhythm which seem to him to lack the true ring, the dramatist's genuine handiwork from that of occasional coadjutors in certain plays ordinarily associated with his name.

In the volume before us he submits the play of *Hamlet*⁶ to a close textual scrutiny on his accepted lines. Not that Mr. Robertson questions Shakespeare's responsibility for the authentic text of the most popular of his tragedies. But working with industrious care over the familiar fact of Shakespeare's indebtedness for his plot to a lost piece by another hand, Mr. Robertson seeks to measure the additions and reconstructions which Shakespeare engrafted on his predecessor's effort and to estimate justly the new conception or development of character which

⁶ *The Problem of 'Hamlet'*, by the Rt. Hon. J. M. Robertson. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1919. 90 pp. 5s.

Shakespeare deduced from previously available material. Mr. Robertson's book claims to be a scientific study in evolution. He questions the soundness of the critical method which overlooks Shakespeare's adoption from others' work of the dominant features of Hamlet's experience. He thinks the better way is to recognize the historic circumstance that Shakespeare, having deliberately borrowed his theme, set himself the practical task of impregnating it with a sustained and triumphant psychological significance. The old play suggested to Shakespeare a problem of human character which he judged himself to be capable of solving to better dramatic effect than had yet been reached. Mr. Robertson's familiarity with the massive German speculation respecting Hamlet's character enables him to contrast very thoroughly the results of the intuitional method of criticism with the historic method, and to enter a powerful plea for the superiority of the latter method over the former.

In his *Study of Shakespeare's Versification*⁷ Mr. Bayfield develops exhaustively the original theory of English prosody, the general lines of which he has already indicated in his *Measures of the Poets*. His main conclusion is that Shakespeare resembles other English poets in basing his metrical systems on a trochaic and on no iambic foundation. He admits that 'the measure to which our blank verse is written consists of five metrical units commonly called "feet"', but he declines to recognize in these 'metrical units' the iambic character which has hitherto been assigned them.

In working out his theory Mr. Bayfield invites his readers to accept a good many assumptions which present rather arbitrary features. On the threshold he formulates the premiss that 'the five (trochaic) feet are counted from the first stress, the initial unstressed syllable or syllables (for there may be two) being merely an *anacrusis* or "upbeat"' of no metrical significance. It

⁷ *Study of Shakespeare's Versification, with an inquiry into the trustworthiness of the Early Texts. An examination of the 1616 folio of Ben Jonson's Works and appendices, including a revised text of Antony and Cleopatra*, by M. A. Bayfield, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1920. xii + 521 pp. 16s. net.

is a bold step to exclude from the scansion of a line one or two unstressed initial syllables. Yet even if we grant this condition, Mr. Bayfield's scheme of scansion is involved in strange inconsistencies. On his own showing the trochaic principle does not apply to Shakespeare's verse with any regularity unless we give the epithet 'trochaic' a meaning which it has not hitherto borne. To take an example: the ten-syllable line,

To sleep; perchance to dream; ay, there's the rub

seems to earlier prosodists to conform at all points to iambic rule. Mr. Bayfield insists, however, on its trochaic structure. He treats the initial unstressed syllable 'to' as an extra-metrical or metrically superfluous 'upbeat'. Then scanning the next eight syllables as four regular trochees, he leaves the concluding monosyllable 'rub' in the air, declaring it to be a complete foot in itself owing to 'the prolongation of the stress'. It is as difficult to realize a monosyllabic trochee as a single-pointed pair of compasses.

But Mr. Bayfield makes almost heavier calls on our credulity. Shakespeare's alleged trochaic feet are, according to his prosodic scheme, by no means invariably of the normal dissyllabic kind. It is not only that they may be monosyllabic; they may also be trisyllabic; nay, indeed, their syllables may on occasion number four or five. In the line

Mumbling of wicked charms, conjuring the moon

Mr. Bayfield finds five trochaic feet, of which only one ('wicked') is dissyllabic; two ('charms' and 'moon') are monosyllabic; a fourth foot ('mumbling of') is trisyllabic, while a fifth foot ('conjuring the') is quadrisyllable.

On feet of more than two syllables Mr. Bayfield bestows a peculiar technical term, viz. 'resolved'. The introduction into a foot of more than two syllables he calls 'a breaking up' or 'resolution' of the stressed syllable, and he claims to prove that 'Shakespeare had a decided and even a remarkable affection for resolved rhythms'.

Mr. Bayfield's metrical system finds little support in the text of the first folio, and a very limited support in the text of

the authentic quartos. Although he dedicates his volume to Mr. A. W. Pollard, he shows scant respect for Mr. Pollard's textual conclusions. With an assurance, which it is not easy for his readers to appreciate, Mr. Bayfield denies significance or authenticity to any of the abbreviations—to't, do't, thinkst, betroth'd, and the like—which repeatedly figure in the early texts. He fills out all traditional vowel elisions, urging the circular argument that his mode of scansion with its 'resolved' trochees fails to operate if any syllable be slurred. Some abbreviations to which Mr. Bayfield takes exception may be due to typographical accident and may (as he urges) be impossible of articulation, but many others are clearly justified on impregnable phonetic grounds. It is difficult to take seriously a plea which at one fell swoop deprives of prosodic significance all the signs of vowel-elisions in Elizabethan print.

Mr. Bayfield supports his novel theories with an imposing wealth of organized illustration which makes one reluctant to reject the whole of them hastily, but wellnigh all his methods of inquiry, and most of his results provoke scepticism on a first survey. The irregularities which unquestionably characterize much of Shakespeare's prosody may or may not be reducible to a definite series of laws, but it is hardly possible to credit the dramatist with deliberately cultivating a ragtime jerkiness of scansion such as that which emerges from the practical application of Mr. Bayfield's revolutionary system.

Mr. Alfred W. Pollard has published at the Cambridge University Press a revised edition, with a new introduction, of his interesting and ingenious *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates*.⁸ The work, which skilfully enlists bibliographical research in the service of textual criticism, formed originally a course of lectures delivered by Mr. Pollard before the University of Cambridge in his capacity of Sanders Reader in Bibliography. The present edition, to which the new introduction lends fresh

⁸ *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and the problems of the Transmission of his Text*, by Alfred W. Pollard, Sanders Reader in Bibliography, 1915. Second Edition, revised with an introduction. Cambridge University Press, 1920. Sm. 8vo. xxviii + 110 pp. 7s. 6d.

importance, inaugurates a new series of bibliographical criticisms entitled 'Shakespeare Problems'. Of this series, Mr. Pollard and Mr. Dover Wilson are joint editors, and they promise *inter alia* varied illustration of the attractive theorem that some of the earliest printed texts of Shakespeare's plays, alike in quarto and in folio, 'may have been set up from Shakespeare's autograph manuscript'.

Every scholar will welcome Mr. Pollard's insistence on the textual value of the early copies. But his detailed argument embodies much plausible speculation where one yearns for categorical evidence. Mr. Pollard argues with much spirit and conviction that apart from four or five quartos which clearly answer the First Folio editors' description of 'stolne and surreptitious' issues, the plays were generally printed for the first time from 'prompt-copies', and that such copies were in the author's handwriting. In spite of some fragmentary corroborations from which it seems hazardous to generalize, there is an obvious difficulty in reconciling Mr. Pollard's conclusions with the unchanging practice and conditions of play-house management which exposes the dramatist's autographs to grave risks of early mutilation and makes scribes' transcripts serve as 'prompt copies'.

Nor is Mr. Pollard's plea substantially strengthened by the added stress which he lays in his new introduction on the method of punctuation which he assigns to his 'authentic' texts. Adopting the view of the late George Wyndham and of Mr. Percy Simpson, that the Elizabethan system of punctuation was mainly 'rhythmical', 'elocutionary', or 'rhetorical', rather than 'grammatical' or 'syntactical', Mr. Pollard claims that the 'authentic' texts preserve in their pointing 'evidence of how Shakespeare meant some of his great speeches to be delivered'. Commas, colons, semicolons, brackets, are not infrequently found in these texts in places which the modern system of punctuation disallows. The unexpected appearance of these marks are attributed by Mr. Pollard to the author's deliberate endeavour in his manuscript to guide the actor's elocution. An occasional example seems to lend this bold inference support. But the whole of the 'elocutionary' theory of Elizabethan punctuation

clearly stands at present on a most precarious footing. Mr. William Poel and other actors and professional producers of Elizabethan plays deny the 'elocutionary' value of many of Mr. Pollard's alleged instances of Shakespeare's 'elocutionary' punctuation. In such an inquiry nothing can be safely deduced from a restricted scrutiny. A wider textual field must be laid under contribution than has yet been essayed, and equal weight must be allowed negative evidence and positive evidence. There is good reason to believe that an exhaustive analysis would yield a larger number of so-called 'rhetorical' or 'elocutionary' marks of punctuation which obviously set the accent on the wrong word than of those which obviously set the accent on the right word. An even more serious difficulty, which Mr. Pollard frankly admits, is the paucity of punctuation-marks (as compared with modern practice) which is the prevailing characteristic of the original editions of Elizabethan and Jacobean plays. Sound texts are, as a rule, so scantily punctuated as to confute the inference that authors, press-correctors, or type-setters regarded it as part of their functions to give the reader, let alone the actor, an uniform or consistent guidance in matters of punctuation. Occasionally scenes, or passages from scenes, are somewhat liberally punctuated, more liberally than is now the custom, and it is from these exceptional instances that examples in support of the 'elocutionary' theory have been drawn. It is doubtful if in the case of any play the whole of the text can be said to be methodically punctuated in a way that can be justly called either 'syntactical' or 'rhetorical'. Had Shakespeare or any other dramatic author of his epoch undertaken to coach his actors in their elocution by dint of a peculiar method of punctuation in his manuscript, it is barely credible that so few signs of such a method should have survived in good printed texts.

The occasional appearance of those superfluous marks of punctuation to which, in conflict with the opinion of elocutionary experts of the acting profession, Mr. Pollard and others have assigned a special elocutionary value, may be reasonably attributed to the idiosyncrasies of press-correctors or type-setters rather than to the conscious and consistent design of dramatists. Thomas Heywood in a familiar passage in his *Apology for Actors* of 1612

warned the student of elocution, 'with judgment to observe his commas, colons, and full poynts; his parentheses, his breathing-spaces and distinctions'. But Heywood gives no hint that these aids to 'elocutionary' interretation were provided by the author.

'Let your own discretion be your tutor' is Hamlet's elocutionary advice to the players. Such an injunction suggests the relation commonly subsisting through the ages between dramatist and actor. The actor, without the author's assistance, usually forms his own scheme of stress-notation, which he pencils out for himself on his copy of his 'part'.

An Elizabethan dramatist of the experience of Ben Jonson has left on record a fairly complete view of the purpose and practice of punctuation in Shakespeare's day. Jonson recognizes no elocutionary or rhetorical principle of punctuation as distinguished from the ordinarily accepted syntactical or grammatical principle. Jonson's *English Grammar made . . . out of his Observation of the English Language now spoken and in use*, closes with a chapter on what he calls 'The Distinction of Sentences'. In this chapter Jonson supplies a series of rules for the employment of all known marks of punctuation, which he christens somewhat fantastically 'Distinctions', i.e. separating signs or symbols. In a preliminary paragraph he explains the origin of these 'Distinctions' thus:

'For, whereas our breath is by nature so short, that we cannot continue without a stay to speak long together; it was thought necessary as well as for the speaker's ease, as for the plainer deliverance of the things spoken, to invent this means, whereby men pausing a pretty while, the whole speech might never the worse be understood.'

According to Jonson's detailed definitions—comma, semicolon, brackets, period, as well as notes of interrogation and admiration or exclamation—served in his time precisely the purposes which they serve to-day. No other purposes are entertained by 'Scholar Ben'. All stops were designed to meet common conditions of human speech and to make a sentence convey its meaning rapidly to the ear and eye alike. Jonson, who was as well acquainted with the technique of the drama and the customs of the stage as any

contemporary, knew nothing of 'rhetorical' or 'elocutionary' mode of Elizabethan or Jacobean punctuation, which should convey to actors the dramatist's conceptions of emphasis.

Mr. Teignmouth Shore's endeavour to tell the story anew of Shakespeare's Life⁹ is unjustified either by original research or grace of exposition. The author is moved by 'a desire to study Shakespeare and his work with as free a mind as possible; to get away from the demi-god view of him and to see him as a man'. Mr. Teignmouth Shore generously acknowledges indebtedness to the work of the present writer, but draws many original inferences which hardly seem likely to win approval. The notion that some of Shakespeare's sonnets were addressed to his wife is one of his many random shots.

A volume called *Contemporaries of Shakespeare*¹⁰ collects some fragmentary contributions which Swinburne prepared for a spacious 'Palace of Elizabethan Criticism', a design of the poet's youth which was uncompleted in his old age. One hundred and ten of the volume's 308 pages provide a reprint of Swinburne's monograph on George Chapman which originally appeared in a separate volume in 1875 and has not been reprinted since. It is an erudite and sound piece of criticism which well deserves to be made accessible to the present generation of students. Other of the collected essays which appeared originally in magazines treat of the earlier plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, of Massinger, Day, Davenport, Brome, and Shirley, and illustrate Swinburne's knowledge of and enthusiasm for the miscellaneous dramatic work of the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, King James I, and King Charles I. The only hitherto unpublished piece is the opening essay, entitled 'Christopher Marlowe in relation to Greene Peele and Lodge'. Here Swinburne protests with characteristic warmth against the habit of undiscerning critics

⁹ *Shakespeare's Self*, by W. Teignmouth Shore. London: Philip Allan & Co., 1920. 8vo. 186 pp. 5s.

¹⁰ *Contemporaries of Shakespeare*, by Algernon Charles Swinburne. Edited by Edmund Gosse, C.B., and Thomas J. Wise. London: William Heinemann, 1919. xii + 308 pp. 7s. 6d. net.

68 SHAKESPEARE AND ELIZABETHAN DRAMA

to bracket Marlowe's name with that of writers so clearly his inferiors as Peele and Greene. Marlowe, Swinburne reminds us, 'differs from such little people as Peele and Greene . . . as an eagle differs from frogs or tadpoles'. One might as well, he adds, put Tennyson in the same poetic category as Charles Mackay and Haynes Bayley.

An interesting supplement to the well-known collection of allusions to Shakespeare and his work between the years 1591 and 1700 is due to the research of Mr. George Thorn-Drury, K.C., who has long devoted his leisure to an intensive study of seventeenth-century literature. Mr. Thorn-Drury, who modestly withholds his name from the publication, has brought together in pamphlet-form¹¹ eighty fresh allusions to Shakespeare, ranging in date from 1611 to 1700. All have escaped the notice of C. M. Ingleby, Miss Toulmin Smith, Dr. Furnivall, and Mr. John Munro, the successive editors of the '*Shakespeare Allusion Book*', which was originally published more than forty years ago. Mr. Thorn-Drury's citations attests the familiar uses to which the rank and file of seventeenth-century authors put Shakespeare's name.

The so-called Shakespeare 'Problem' continues to provoke wild efforts at solution. M. Jacques Boulenger has reprinted in pamphlet form from the *Revue de Paris* of 1st February, 1919, an article describing the perplexing grounds on which Professor Abel Lefranc, of the Collège de France, identified the author of Shakespeare's plays with William Stanley, sixth Earl of Derby.¹² The Professor's curious fancies filled the two spacious volumes, entitled *Sous le Masque de William Shakespeare*. In his brief tract his loyal expositor, M. Boulenger, leaves as he finds it the tangled skein of his master's misapprehensions. He adds a chapter entitled 'Réponse à des Objections'. There he seeks to confute M. Léon Daudet, M. André Beaunier, and the Comtesse de

¹¹ *Some Seventeenth-century Allusions to Shakespeare and his Works not hitherto collected*. P. J. and A. E. Dobell, 77 Charing Cross Road, London, W.C., 1920. 8vo. iv+48 pp. 3s.

¹² Jacques Boulenger, *L'Affaire Shakespeare*. Paris: Librairie Édouard Champion, 5 Quai Malaquais, 1919. 75 pp.

Chambrun, who protested against Professor Lefranc's heresies in various French periodicals soon after his book was published. M. Boulenger appears to be no match for his adversaries. 'L'Affaire Lefranc', with which the present writer dealt at length in the *Quarterly Review* ('More Doubts about Shakespeare', July 1919), serves to illustrate the fatal lure which freakish speculation occasionally has for scholars capable of sound research in different fields of study where they are thoroughly at home. To the category of futility in which M. Lefranc's book can alone find a place, also belongs an endeavour from an English pen to identify the author of the plays with Edward de Vere, seventeenth Earl of Oxford.¹³ This nobleman failed to disillusion his credulous champion by inconsiderately dying as early as 1604.

Sir George Greenwood has continued his sceptical study of the Shakespearian tradition in two further booklets, entitled respectively *Shakespeare's Handwriting*¹⁴ and *Shakespeare's Law*.¹⁵

[BY FREDERICK S. BOAS]

In connexion with Mr. J. M. Robertson's *The Problem of 'Hamlet'*, discussed above,¹⁶ brief mention may be made of a monograph by the Scandinavian scholar Mr. V. Østerberg, *Studier over Hamlet-Teksterne*.¹⁷ Only Part I has as yet been published; when the second Part appears, it is to be hoped that an English translation of the whole essay will be issued. Meanwhile some of the main conclusions arrived at by Mr. Østerberg in his study of the history of the *Hamlet* text have been noted by Mr. J. Dover Wilson in a careful analysis in *The Modern*

¹³ *Shakespeare Identified—Edward de Vere, the seventeenth Earl of Oxford*, by J. Thomas Looney. London: Cecil Palmer, W.C. 1. 1920. 551 pp. 21s. net.

¹⁴ *Shakespeare's Handwriting*, by Sir George Greenwood. London: J. Lane, 1920. Sm. 8vo. 36 pp. 2s.

¹⁵ *Shakespeare's Law*, by Sir George Greenwood. London: Cecil Palmer, 1920. Sm. 8vo. 48 pp. 2s. 6d.

¹⁶ pp. 60-1.

¹⁷ *Studier over Hamlet-Teksterne*. I. Af V. Østerberg, Copenhagen. Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1920. 74 pp.