INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

esp

THE AUTHORSHIP OF TITUS ANDRONICUS

BY

KEITH OSWALD BIRKIN

THESIS SUBMITTED

TO

THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

AS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

APRIL 1939

PREFACE.

Among the many plays ascribed to the greatest of England's dramatists, William Shakespeare, are some, the authorship of which is uncertain. These include Titus Andronicus, Pericles, Prince of Tyre, The Two Noble Kinsmen, Locrine, Sir John Oldcastle, Part I, The Life and Death of Thomas Lord Cromwell, The London Prodigal, The Puritan, A Yorkshire Tragedy, Arden of Feversham, The Reign of King Edward III, George-A-Greene, Fair Em, Mucedorus, The Birth of Merlin, and The Merry Devil of Edmonton.

It is the intention of the writer of this treatise to establish, as well as possible, the authorship of the play, Titus Andronicus.

In introduction, a brief biography will be given because of the relationship that exists between the life and work of Shakespeare.

The treatment proper will include a study of the historical, the social, the literary, and the factual evidence.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

Although the exact date of the birth of William Shakespeare is not definitely known, it is generally accepted that he was born on April 23rd, 1564, in the beautiful and tranquil little town of Stratford-on-Avon in the "Heart of England."[1] It was in a house on Henley Street that he first saw the light of day, and it was on April 26th that he was baptized, according tothe entry which reads: "1564, April 26 Gulielmus filius Johannes Shakspere." Upon this is based the assumption that the great dramatist's natal day is April 23rd, because it is thought that two or three days would elapse between the day of birth and the baptism.

John Shakespeare, father of William, was, in turn, the son of Richard, a farmer. He became a prosperous citizen of the little town, and was, at different times, a glove-maker, a tanner of white leather, a wool-merchant, and a dealer in certain farm products, especially grain and malt. He also acted in the capacity of middleman seller of the produce brought to him by the farmers in the district about Stratford. During his lifetime he held several offices in the community. In 1557 he was the official ale-taster and burgess. In the years 1558 and 1559 he was constable. He was affeeror in 1559 and again in 1561. During the years 1561 and 1562 he was chamberlain or treasurer, and in 1565 he was alderman. These were followed in 1568 by the office of High Bailiff or Mayor and finally by that of Chief Alderman in 1571. Thus we see

1. Term used by Michael Drayton.

that William's father took an active part in the life of Stratford. He was a man of some affluence, too, because by 1556 he owned two houses -- one on Greenhill Street, which was, no doubt, a speculation, and one on Henley Street. The latter became known as the Wool Shop, and forms the eastern half of the Shakespeare House of to-day.

In 1557 John Shakespeare took in marriage Mary Arden, the youngest daughter and principal heiress of Robert Arden, Richard Shakespeare's landlord. The Ardens lived at Wilmecote, three miles from Stratford, and were a family of substance. Of this union eight children, of whom William was the third, were born.

William, as a boy, was an attractive lad, and is described by Professor J. Q. Adams as having auburn hair, large hazel eyes, ruddy cheeks, a high forehead, and a gentle disposition. Although it is not known for fact, it is likely that he attended the Stratford grammar school, which was reorganized, in 1553, as the King's New School of Stratford-upon-Avon. There he probably received free tuition because his father was a town offical. At that school the young William doubtless studied Lyly's Latin Grammar and gained a fair knowledge of Virgil, Ovid, Horace, Terence, Plautus, Seneca, Cicero, and Sallust. From his works it is evident that he knew the Geneva version of the Bible, learned at his mother's knee, and that, during his early years, he acquired some French and some Italian. Ben Jonson, almost a contemporary of Shakespeare, admired the great dramatist's genius, but allowed him "small

Latin and less Greek." His first school-masters were Walter Roche, B. A., and then Simon Hunt, B. A., both of Oxford. These were followed in turn by Thomas Jenkins and John Cotton, both Oxonians. Shakespeare's school-day, we can be safe in assuming, was a long one, because it was the custom in those days to attend school from six in the morning until six in the evening, with only occasional slight intermissions. To add to this book-learning preparation for his play-writing, it seems reasonable to assume that he was present at Kenilworth in 1575 when Leicester entertained Queen Elizabeth with shows performed by his company of actors.

As a result of financial difficulties, which befell John Shakespeare, beginning in 1577 and continuing for some years after, most of his own and of his wife's property was lost. William, too, felt the resultant economizing because he was withdrawn from school that he might help. To what he turned his hand is not known definitely, but it is suggested that he entered the glove trade, or became a butcher's apprentice, a school-master, or a lawyer's clerk. In November, 1582, when only eighteen years of age, he married Anne Hathaway, who was his senior by eight years. To them were born three children, Suzanna and the twins, Hammet and Judith.

About 1586 Shakespeare left Stratford for London and, although it is only conjecture, it is said that he eked out an existence by holding horses in front of the London theatres. Whether this be true or not we can assume that before long he was offered employment inside the playhouse. There his ability

brought him promotion to the rank of actor and it was as such that his earliest reputation was made. Although his dramatic work soon overshadowed his histrionic efforts, he occupied a position of prominence in the actors' profession almost until his death in 1616.

Shakespeare's work as a dramatist can be divided into three periods; namely, apprenticeship, experimentation, and maturity. When the first period actually began we do not know because we are not certain of when he started to write, but we can assign 1591 as the approximate closing date. During this period Shakespeare, as a young actor, wrote anonymously, but he chose patriotic themes since he realized that in those days near the Armada patriotism would unite a mixed audience. He therefore turned to the chronicles and produced scenes from national history. To this period are assigned, among other works, the revision of the three parts of King Henry VI, The Tragic History of King John, and The Taming of the Shrew.

In the second period we find Shakespeare writing plays in imitation of others. Love's Labours Lost is a carefully worked imitation of Lyly, and Marlowe's influence can be detected in The Life and Death of King Richard III. Among others of this period he wrote The Comedy of Errors, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, and The Life and Death of King Richard II, in the last of which we find him turning back to the chronicle play.

In the period classed as that of maturity we find Shakespeare on his own feet, as it were, and in his writing there

is evidence of an independence of handling of plots. One of his first products of this period is The Merchant of Venice, which is close to being a tragedy. He then returns to the historical in the trilogy made up of the two parts of King Henry IV and King Henry V. Along with the epic character in these is an undercurrent of broad English humour. Falstaff a real character, appears first in the First Part of King Henry IV, and later, supposedly at Queen Elizabeth's demand to see Falstaff again, in The Merry Wives of Windsor. In A Midsummer Night's Dream, also written during this period of maturity, Shakespeare returns to the court, and in this delicately treated play he elevated English folk-lore to a much higher plane and associated its heroes and heroines with mythological characters. Romantic plays, dealing with love and far-off lands, flowed fromthe mature pen of Shakespeare in As You Like It and in Troilus and Cressida. A series of very heavy tragedies, Julius Caesar, Antony and Cleopatra, Macbeth, Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, and King Lear, also occupied the attentions of the great playwright during this period, and then we find him returning to a state of serenity in the comedies, The Tempest and The Winter's Tale.

Shakespeare, it is generally thought, gave up dramatic composition in 1611 and spent the concluding years of his life mainly at Stratford. In that year he settled permanently at New Place, which was the largest house in the town and had been purchased by him in 1597. It is likely, too, that he disposed of his shares in the Globe and Blackfriars theatres

about that time because he owned none at his death. During his retirement he took an active part in all the social and civic affairs of his birthplace. In the spring of 1616, according to the vicar, John Ward, Shakespeare entertained his two friends, Michael Drayton and Ben Jonson, at New Place. On that occasion, it seems, he "drank too hard," for he died on the anniversary of the day of his birth, April 23, at the age of fifty-two, of a fever thus contracted.

A SYNOPSIS OF TITUS ANDRONICUS.

Before entering into the discussion of authorship of the play an abstract would not be amiss. To that end let us proceed.

In Act I, Titus Andronicus, a noble and a general of Imperial Rome, returns to his native city after conducting a successful campaign against the Gauls. At the time of his return there is a dispute about the succession to the throne. Titus Andronicus is the choice of some but he uses his influence in favour of Saturninus, the eldest son of the deceased emperor. Futher, he promises Lavinia, his daughter, to Saturninus, but the new emperor's younger brother, Bassianus, forcefully carries her off. Titus is angered by one of his sons who helped Bassianus in his treachery and kills this son, Mutius. This evidence of his loyalty is not sufficiently convincing and Saturninus plans Titus' downfall. Tamora, a Gothic queen, whom Titus had captured and brought to Rome, is liberated by Saturninus and becomes his empress in place of Lavinia. Because Titus offers Tamora's first-born son as a sacrifice to his dead sons, she hates him and naturally encourages Saturninus in his plans against Titus Andronicus.

Act II tells us how Aaron, a Moor, whom Tamora loves, causes considerable havoc. He manages to meet Tamora during a hunt which has been planned by Titus to amuse the new emperor. At Aaron's instigation Tamora's two sons murder Bassianus and ravish Lavinia. So that she cannot reveal who treated her in such a cruel fashion, they tear out her tongue and cut off her hands. Suspicion for these dastardly acts are directed against

two sons of Titus by Aaron.

In Act III, these two sons of Titus are condemned to death, but Aaron informs Titus that they will not be executed if he will cut off his hand and send it to Saturninus. Titus has Aaron do this for him and gives it to Aaron to deliver to the emperor. A messenger returns the dismembered hand to Titus and, at the same time brings the heads of the two sons. Titus swears to wreak vengeance on the perpetrators of such cowardly acts, and, to help in this, Lucius, his one remaining son, goes to Gaul to raise an army.

By holding a staff in her teeth and guiding it by her stumps, Lavinia, in the fourth Act, writes the names of her ravishers in the sand. Titus then pretends insanity and sends strange messages to them. Tamora gives birth to a blackamoor child and thus shows how intimate she had been with Aaron. Aaron takes the child and flees from the city. Lucius returns with his army and Tamora indicates that she will meet him at his father's house.

Aaron and his child are found, in Act V, by some of the Goths, who takethem to Lucius. When Lucius promises to spare the life of the child, Aaron tells of his plots against the Andronici. Tamora, accompanied by her sons, goes, disguised, to Titus' house to arrange a conference. Titus continues in his guise of one bereft of sanity and, when Tamora leaves, he kills her sons and bakes them in a pie to be served at the meeting. As soon as the guests are seated Titus kills Lavinia and when questioned by Saturninus he tells of her ravishment by Tamora's sons. Then Titus kills Tamora.

Saturninus retaliates by killing Titus, and Lucius kills Saturninus. After Lucius has told the Roman people of the wrongs suffered by his family, they proclaim him emperor. In conclusion Aaron is sentenced to be set breast-deep in the earth and left there until he dies.

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE.

In 1600 a quarto edition of Titus Andronicus was published and bore the following title-page:

"The most lamenta-|ble Romaine Tragedie of Titus | Andronicus. | As it hath sundry times been playde by the | Right Honourable the Earle of Pembrooke, the | Earl of Darbie, the Earle of Sussex, and the | Lorde Chamberlaine theyr | Seruants. At London, | Printed by I. R. for Edward White | and are to bee solde at his shoppe, at the little | North doore of Paules, at the signe of | the Gun. 1600." This is referred to as Quarto I, because it is the earliest edition known.

Eleven years later, in 1611, another quarto, based on the former, was printed. The title-page of this reads:

"The most lamen- | table Tragedie | of Titus Andronicus. | As it hath sundry | times beene plaide by the Kings Maiesties Seruants. | London, | Printed for Edward White, and are to be solde | at his shoppe, nere the little North dore of | Pauls, at the signe of the Gun. 1611."

In the First Folio, printed in 1623, Titus Andronicus appears between the two plays, Coriolanus and Romeo and Juliet. It was rather carelessly reproduced from a copy of the Second Quarto with some additions. In this version, Scene ii of Act III, which was not in the quartos, makes its appearance.

As to date of composition we cannot be sure, but Gerard Langbaine, in his Account of the English Dramatick Poets, 1611, writes that a quarto edition of Titus Andronicus was printed as early as 1594, but, unfortunately, no copy has been discovered. Langbaine further states that the 1594 version was

acted by the Earls of Derby, Pembroke, and Essex, their Servants. This evidence should lead us to believe that Langbaine had seen such an edition, and his account is confirmed by an entry of February 6, 1593, in the Stationers' Registers. This entry reads: "John Danter. A booke entitled a noble Roman Historye of Tytus Andronicus." Accompanying this is the following: "Entered also unto him, by warrant from Mr. Woodcock, the ballad thereof." It is likely that the ballad was the one printed by Percy in his Reliques of Ancient English Poetry. For purposes of comparison with the play we shall include the ballad, which is as follows:

Titus Andronicus's Complaint.

"You noble minds, and famous martiall wights,
That in defence of native country fights,
Give eare to me, that ten yeares fought for Rome,
Yet reapt disgrace at my returning home.

In Rome I lived in fame full threescore yeeres,
My name beloved was of all my peeres;
Full five and twenty valiant sonnes I had,
Whose forwarde vertues made their father glad.

For when Rome's foes their warlike forces bent,
Against them stille my sonnes and I were sent;
Against the Goths full ten yeeres weary warre
We spent, receiving many a bloudy scarre.

Just two and twenty of my sonnes were slain
Before we did return to Rome againe;
Of five and twenty sonnes I brought but three
Alive, the stately towers of Rome to see.

When wars were done, I conquest home did bring,
And did present my prisoners to the king,
The queene of Goths, her sons, and eke a Moore,
Which did such murders, like was nere before.

The emperour did make this queene his wife,
Which bred in Rome debate and deadlie strife;
The Moore, with her two sonnes, did growe soe proud,
That none like them in Rome might bee allowd.

The Moore so pleas'd this new-made empress' eie,
That she consented to him secretlye
For to abuse her husband's marriage-bed,
And so in time a blackamore she bred.

Then she, whose thoughts to murder were inclinde,
Consented with the Moor of bloody minde
Against myselfe, my kin, and all my friendes,
In cruell sort to bring them to their endes.

Soe when in age I thought to live in peace,
Both care and griefe began then to increase:
Amongst my sonnes I had one daughter bright
Which joy'd and pleased best my aged sight;

My deare Lavinia was betrothed then
To Caesar's sonne, a young and noble man:
Who in a hunting, by the emperour's wife
And her two sonnes, bereaved was of life.

He, being slain, was cast in cruel wise
Into a darksome den from light of skies:
The cruel Moore did come that way as then
With my three sonnes, who fell into the den.

The Moore then fetched the emperour with speed
For to accuse them of the murderous deed;
And when my sonnes within the den were found,
In wrongfull prison they were cast and bound.

But nowe behold! what wounded most my mind,
The empresse's two sonnes of savage kind
My daughter ravished without remorse,
And took away her honour, quite perforce.

When they had tasted of soe sweet a flowre,
Fearing this sweete should shortly turn to sowre,
They cutt her tongue, whereby she could not tell
How that dishonoure unto her befell.

Then both her hands they basely cutt off quite,
Whereby their wickednesse she could not write,
Nor with her needle on her sampler sowe
The bloudye workers of her direfull woe.

My brother Marcus found her in the wood,
Staining the grassie ground with purple bloud,
That trickled from her stumpes and bloudlesse armes:
Noe tongue at all she had to tell her harmes.

But when I saw her in that woefull case,
With tears of bloud I wet mine aged face:
For my Lavinia I lamented more
Then for my two and twenty sonnes before.

When as I sawe she could not write nor speake,
With grief mine aged heart began to breake;
We spread an heape of sand upon the ground,
Whereby those bloudy tyrants out we found.

For with a staffe, without the helpe of hand,
She writt these wordes upon the plat of sand:-
'The lustfull sonnes of the proud emperesse
Are doers of this hateful wickednesse.'

I tore the milk-white hairs from off mine head,
I curst the houre wherein I first was bred;
I wisht this hand, that fought for countrie's fame,
In cradle rockt had first been stroken lame.

The Moore, delighting still in villainy,
Did say, to sett my sonnes from prison free,
I should unto the king my right hand give,
And then my three imprisoned sonnes should live.

The Moore I caus'd to strike it off with speede,
Whereat I grieved not to see it bleed,
But for my sonnes would willingly impart,
And for their ransome send my bleeding heart.

But as my life did linger thus in paine,
They sent to me my bootless hand againe,
And therewithal the heades of my three sonnes,
Which filled my dying heart with fresher moanes.

Then past reliefe I upp and downe did goe,
And with my tears writ in the dust my woe:
I shot my arrowes towards heaven hie,
And for revenge to hell did often crye.

The empresse then, thinking that I was mad,
Like furies she and both her sonnes were clad,
(She nam'd Revenge, and Rape and Murder they,)
To undermine and heare what I would say.

I fed their foolish veines[1] a certaine space,
Untill my friendes did find a secret place,
Where both her sonnes unto a post were bound,
And just revenge in cruell sort was found.

I cut their throates, my daughter held the pan
Betwixt her stumpes, wherein the bloud it ran:
And then I ground their bones to powder small,
And made a paste for pyes straight therewithall.

Then with their fleshe I made two mighty pyes,
And at a banquet, served in stately wise,
Before the empresse set this loathsome meat,
So of her sonnes own flesh she well did eat.

Myselfe bereav'd my daughter then of life,
The empresse then I slewe with bloudy knife,
And stabb'd the emperour immediatelie,
And then myself: even soe did Titus die.

Then this revenge against the Moore was found,
Alive they sette him halfe into the ground,
Whereas he stood untill such time he starv'd.
And soe God send all murderers may be serv'd."

Although the plots of the ballad and of the tragedy are much alike there are dissimilarities in detail. In both, Titus Andronicus returns to Rome from a successful campaign against the Goths and brings with him Tamora, a captured queen of Gaul. In the ballad no mention is made of the dispute about the succession to the throne of Rome, or to the reason for Tamora's hatred of Titus, but in both we read of Tamora's infidelity and the subsequent birth of a blackamoor child. The ballad and the tragedy both record the ravishment of Lavinia and the placing of the blame on sons of Titus. Continuing in similar vein both tell us how, at Aaron's suggestion, Titus cuts off his hand that his sons be saved, but to no avail; and how Lavinia makes known who her ravishers were. Even to the end similarities can be traced. Titus feigns insanity, kills Tamora's two sons, bakes them in a pie

1. Veines - humours.

which he serves to Tamora and others, and then kills Tamora. In both, Aaron is buried breast-deep in the sand to starve to death. But facts that appear in the tragedy alone are those that relate Aaron's flight from Rome with his child and his capture by some Goths of the army raised by Lucius to help his father, Titus, the death of Lavinia at the hands of her father, and, finally, in the tragedy and not in the ballad, Saturninus kills Titus, Lucius kills Saturninus, and Lucius is chosen by the people of Rome to be their emperor.

Percy is of the opinion that the ballad preceded the tragedy because of the several particulars in which they differ. He reasons that a simple ballad-writer would be less likely to alter a story than an inventive tragedian. The terms of the entry in the Stationers' Registers would seem to prove that the ballad existed before the play because it is assigned by a previous publisher to John Danter, by whom the "booke" or play was entered. In opposition to Percy's testimony there is unquestionable evidence that the tragedy was popular as an acted play before 1593, the year in which the ballad was registered. This evidence appears in the Induction to Ben Jonson's Bartholomew Fair, first produced in 1614. Jonson says, in part, that anyone that will swear that Jeronimo or Andronicus are the best plays yet shall pass unexcepted as a person of constant judgment that has stood still for five-and-twenty or thirty years. It is known for a fact that Kyd's Jeronimo belongs to the earliest period of regular drama as it was acted by 'the Lord Strange's men' in

1591. Twenty-five years earlier would place the date at 1589; thirty years would take it back to 1584 or thereabouts. Percy comments on this in his Reliques of Ancient Poetry. He thinks that there is reason to believe that this play was improved by Shakespeare with a few fine touches of his pen rather than originally written by him. Percy follows on by saying that the style of Titus Andronicus is less figurative than that of other plays of Shakespeare, and adds that the mention of it in the Induction to Bartholomew Fair places its composition at a time when Shakespeare was but twenty-five years of age, an age earlier than any known writing of his took place.

To enable us to comment on this, let us examine some of the external evidence that has a definite bearing upon the authorship of Titus Andronicus. Among those who credit Shakespeare with this play is Francis Meres, a contemporary, and probably a friend, of Shakespeare. Meres was, no doubt, intimately acquainted with the literary history of that time because he wrote, not in the later period of Shakespeare's life, but as early as 1598. He compares, for tragedy, the excellence of Shakespeare among the English, with Seneca among the Latins, and mentions as excellent examples of Shakespeare's ability at tragedy his, Richard II, Richard III, Henry IV, King John, Titus Andronicus, and Romeo and Juliet. With this evidence from a contemporary it seems that we can refute Percy's argument. Had Titus Andronicus not been written by the great dramatist, Meres, who was well acquainted with literature of the time, would not have attributed it to Shakespeare.

Further proof that can be classed as historical evidence is the fact that Titus Andronicus is printed in the first folio edition of the poet's collected works. This was published in 1623, within seven years after Shakespeare's death, by his intimate friends and "fellows," and the play, as printed in this edition, contains an entire scene not found in either of the previous quarto editions that have come down to us. The first folio does not contain any other play about which there is any doubt of authorship; so it seems logical to accept the words of Shakespeare's fellow-actors, Heminge and Condell, men of character and experience, as definite proof that Shakespeare was the author of Titus Andronicus.

Against this evidence which favours Shakespeare as the author of Titus Andronicus there is only one fact opposed, and that is that Shakespeare's name does not appear on the title-page of either quarto edition, although both editions indicate that the play was acted by the company to which Shakespeare belonged. True as this is, we can only present in rebuttal the fact that Shakespeare's name did not appear on the first editions of The Life and Death of King Richard II, The Life and Death of King Richard III, First Part of King Henry IV, the first three editions of Romeo and Juliet, or the first edition of King Henry V. These omissions tend to leave the testimony of Heminge and Condell unimpeached.

Almost a century after Meres' time a writer, Malone by name, presented evidence that shakes to some extent, Meres' indirect assertion that Shakespeare was the sole author of

Titus Andronicus. His claim is based on Edward Ravenscroft's somewhat idle tradition that Shakespeare wrote a few lines in the play or gave some assistance to the author in revising it, or, in some way, helped him to present it on the stage. Ravenscroft wrote, in his preface to an alteration of this play published in 1687, to the effect that from some anciently conversant with the stage he had decided that Shakespeare had not written it originally, but had only given some master-touches to one or two of the principal characters. Malone also quotes Langbaine, but not fully. He forgets to mention that Langbaine first noticed an edition of Titus Andronicus, now lost, printed in 1594. He adds that it was revived and altered, about the time of the Popish Plot, by Ravenscroft. When Langbaine wrote his Account of the English Dramatick Poets, in 1691, Ravenscroft was a living author. In an introduction to an account of the plays, claimed by Ravenscroft as his own, Langbaine, in the work just mentioned, says, with freedom such as we seldom find except in anonymous criticism, "Though he would be thought to imitate the silk-worm, that spins its own web from its bowels; yet I shall make him appear like the leech, that lives upon the blood of men." Langbaine also quotes some of the remarks on plagiaries by Shadwell, who insinuates that Ravenscroft invented the story that Shakespeare only gave some master-touches to Titus Andronicus to exalt his own merit in having altered it. The play was revived about 1678, but was not printed until 1687. In the preface Ravenscroft boasts that it is a greater theft to rob

the dead of their praise than to rob the living of their money. Langbaine shows that Ravenscroft's practice does not coincide with his preaching. He suppressed the original prologue, but Langbaine sarcastically offers to furnish the part of the prologue, which he has lost, and, if he desire it, send the whole:

'To-day the poet does not fear your rage,
Shakespear, by him reviv'd, now treads the stage:
Under his sacred laurels he sits down,
Safe from the blast of my critic's frown.
Like other poets, he'll not proudly scorn
To own that he but winnow'd Shakespear's corn;
So far he was from robbing him of's treasure,
That he did add his own to make full measure.'

If the subject, which Malone tries to treat lightly, was worth the production of evidence, he was bound to have given us all this. Therefore, the tradition of Ravenscroft, will not outweigh Meres' testimony.

When the historical evidence is summed up, the facts that place Shakespeare as the author of Titus Andronicus are in excess of those to the contrary. That Shakespeare's name does not appear on the title-page of either quarto edition means very little when it is known that it did not appear on first editions of several plays about which there is no doubt of authorship. The inclusion of Titus Andronicus in the first folio edition of 1623, published by Shakespeare's friends and fellow-actors, Heminge and Condell, proves almost conclusively

that Shakespeare wrote the play under discussion. The actual date of writing is not known, but different facts seem to place it some time during the period of his career which we have called the period of apprenticeship, or during the following one, that of experimentation. When he was serving, as it were, his apprenticeship, or when he was experimenting with his pen, it is generally accepted, and logically so, that he wrote anonymously. Gerard Langbaine claims that a quarto edition appeared as early as 1594, and that it was acted by the Earls of Derby, Pembroke, and Essex, their servants. It is just possible that Langbaine erred in the name Essex, which could quite easily have been written for Sussex. The entry of a play, Titus Andronicus, in the Stationers' Registers on Februauy 6, 1593, and a ballad thereof, helps as evidence. The similarity in plot of the ballad and tragedy reveals a popularity that the story must have enjoyed at the time, and Shakespeare, we are told on good authority, gave the audiences what they wanted. In the matter of date, Jonson's Induction to Bartholomew Fair places the time of composition somewhere between 1584 and 1589. That would be during the period of apprenticeship as has been mentioned. Percy gives Shakespeare credit for only a few fine touches. He refers to Jonson's Induction, too, saying that it places the time of writing at the twenty-five year mark of the great writer's life. An age, says Percy, earlier than any known writing of his took place. These facts seem rather contradictory. Percy does not think that Shakespeare had written anything at that time, and still

gives him credit for a few fine touches. Further testimony to refute the arguments of those who think that Titus Andronicus was not written by Shakespeare comes from Francis Meres, a contemporary and friend of the great playwright. As has already been mentioned, Meres wrote in 1598 while Shakespeare still lived. He compares Shakespeare and Seneca as tragedians, and lists Titus Andronicus among some of Shakespeare's excellent tragedies. Thus we feel justified in saying that Shakespeare wrote Titus Andronicus.

SOCIAL EVIDENCE.

Social evidence that might help us in establishing the authorship of Titus Andronicus would necessarily include an account of Shakespeare's life in his Stratford environment, which would tend to influence his writing, especially early in his career, an account of the London of his time, and a description of the audiences that frequented the theatres in those days. To what extent his social surroundings affected his writing must be conjectural, but to enable us to surmise let us look briefly at his early life, his London, and his audiences.

During the years of his boyhood it is thought that he would attend the Grammar School at Stratford. There the instruction received would be almost wholly classical with Latin predominating because Greek was not taught very extensively in the provinces and there are no traces of its having been included in the course at the Stratford school until later. It seems evident from his writing that the system of education pursued was thorough. This is substantiated by the scenes in Love's Labours Lost where Holofernes appears and in Merry Wives of Windsor where Sir Hugh Evans examines his pupil in the early pages of the Accidence. Some writers have found it difficult to account for Shakespeare's marvellous fund of information when the amount of his school training is considered, but his had been a sound education and he had profited by it as only Shakespeare could. In the boy keen faculty and receptive capacity combined and he must have amassed vast stores of information to be used later.

His schooldays are thought to have lasted from 1571 to 1577, when, at thirteen years of age, because of his father's commercial difficulties, he was removed from school and put to work of some kind. There is little known of what Shakespeare did during the years from 1577 to 1582, but they must have been years of mental growth and further acquisition of knowledge. In 1582 he married Anne Hathaway and, within the next three years, three children were born to them. From 1586 to 1592 his life is again hidden by mists of obscurity, but many are the occupations suggested for him. Whatever he did his mind would be actively storing up information to be used later.

Turning now to Shakespeare's London we find that, although it was not an important centre of the drama during the Middle ages when York, Chester, and Coventry were the homes of the great religious plays, throughout the period known so well as the Elizabethan era, dramatic interests centred in the great metropolis. Travelling companies of actors had headquarters in London and journeyed far and wide from there into the provinces.

When Shakespeare first went to London it was in many ways a mediaeval town, bounded by a wall and the River Thames, guarded by the Tower, and administered to spiritually by many churches, of which St. Paul's Cathedral was most important. The shops and residences were meagre and were huddled together on both sides of very narrow streets. In sharp contrast to these stood the large private dwellings, great palaces, and stately castles set in spacious grounds along the river.

From the plays performed in Elizabeth's London we are

able to glean something of the daily life of the Londoners. Affairs of court occupied a very important place as did insurrections, conspiracies, and palace intrigues. The nobility and the common people in the nation at large were widely separated because there was, as yet, no prosperous middle class, but in London a middle class had already risen to affluence and influence. Listed among members of this middle class were bankers, promoters, great merchants, prosperous traders, manufactures, lawyers, and hundreds of gentlemen, who were younger sons of the nobility and country gentry. The last named came from all parts of England and resided for some time in the Inns of Court. They possessed leisure and culture and were as influential as university groups would be. They took an active part in dramatic performances, performing plays or masques before the queen, and it seems that they were among the most active patrons of thepublic playhouses.

Most of the inhabitants of London were, during Elizabeth's reign, just emerging from the filth, disease, and slavery which were characteristic of the Middle Ages even in a city of such wealth as London. The people, for the most part, were unclean, ill-fed, and poorly housed, but there was constant improvement. According to our standards the city was most unsanitary; sewers were open and the stench in the markets and along Fleet Ditch drew many complaints. In spite of this, the Thames was still unpolluted, being famous for its pure water and its swarms of fish. There was, however, an inadequacy of water supply until Sir Hugh Middleton relieved the situation in 1614 with the New

River System. Public benefactors made possible the erection of many splendid new buildings, among which were some hospitals, but there was little attention paid, scientifically, to the prevention or cure of disease. The plague continued and carried away many of the inhabitants. It is, therefore, easy to realize that the span of life then was much shorter than it is now. Elizabeth was the first of England's rulers to reach the allotted three score and ten years, and, for most, the chances of living to that age were indeed very small. Nevertheless, after the Spanish Armada, the nation enjoyed peace and the population increased rapidly.

The drama flourished during a time of great commercial prosperity. Life in many ways, was becoming more comfortable; houses were improved, windows were coming into common use, and ordinary necessities were within reach of all. Luxury increased. Men of wealth and scholars journeyed on the continent and returned with new tastes, new vices, and new fashions. Forks and toothpicks were introduced. Smoking very quickly became a widespread habit, and the general use of coaches brought forth protests of extravagance and danger such as we hear to-day about motor cars.

It was certainly a time when wealth increased and great fortunes were made. It was a time of extravagance, luxury, and idleness. Puritanism appeared as a reaction to all this, and it and the corrupt society were satirized in the drama. The newly rich, the new knights who could buy their honour, also were given attention by the dramatists. If there had

been no commercial prosperity, there would have, very likely, been no Puritans, and, certainly, very few theatres, because they are luxuries, dependent for their survival upon people who have an excess of time and money. But, in Tudor England, the theatre did not depend entirely upon the wealthy for patronage; there were many idlers in London who could afford a holiday.

The average citizen was not without a good deal of recreation. He lived out-of-doors as much as possible and spent his holidaysbeyond the walls, where he indulged in playing, running, jumping, archery, and military drill. Cock-fights and bull and bear baiting also drew large crowds. These recreations took place in the fields to the north of the city and across the river to the south, and it was in such places, long used by amusement seekers, that the theatres were located when they were forced outside of the city limits.

From the first the city authorities opposed very vigorously the erection of theatres and the acting of plays, but the players were always assured some court protection because they were to have some place to practise the plays which were to be presented before the queen. The corporation, after a long struggle, was forced to content itself with keeping the public playhouses out of the city and with preventing Sunday performances. No doubt, the opposition was, in part, based on moral and religious grounds, and in larger part on social reasons — the danger of rioting, fire, and the spread of the plague.

The theatre of Shakespeare's time was a democratic

institution, and the public seem to have enjoyed the plays presented. In a city of 200,000 people, the population London then boasted, six theatres were often presenting drama at one time, summer and winter. The regular drama enjoyed a popularity like that enjoyed by the movies of to-day. And this London theatre-going public was made up of a very diversified and appealing set of individuals. They are made known to us through the men and women of the plays, and what a wide variety of human nature is represented! We must not believe that the London average was equal to that of the thousand characters of Shakespeare's plays, but we can be safe in assuming that he drew his thousand from the pageant the city afforded. The dramatis personae of Elizabethan drama has a still larger and more varied population, but it is the dramatic reflection of Elizabethan London's inhabitants.

The audience, which must have influenced the play-writing greatly, was a motley one in Shakespeare's day. Men and boys filled the pit. In the galleries there was a fairly large number of women, some of whom were not too respectable. A few gentlemen from the Inns of Court were in the boxes, and in the lord's box, or, sitting on the stage, was a group of extravagantly dressed men of fashion. Even in those days people went about through the crowd selling their wares, not peanuts, chocolate bars, and chewing gum, but more likely nuts and fruit. The gentlemen were smoking, and the people in the pit were, no doubt, exchanging rude jokes with the painted ladies in the lower gallery. Shakespeare has left us

little criticism, or compliment, of his audience as did many of his contemporaries such as Jonson and Massinger. As a result it must be from the writings of these that we gather something of its likes and dislikes.

The Elizabethan theatre was popular with the London populace, and its audience was drawn from all classes of London life. Admission to the pit, where there was only standing room, was a penny. For an additional penny or two a seat on a bench in the galleries could be secured. Still more was charged for seats in the 'rooms' or boxes off the galleries, or for stools on the stage. Whether these prices were higher or lower, in comparison, than the prices of admission to-day it is difficult to say, but it is likely that the penny for the pit meant less to the apprentices, merchanics, and mercantile employees than twenty-five cents does to-day. The shilling paid by the members of the middle class would correspond to approximately two dollars at present. All in all, the cost of theatrical entertainment was about the same in the days of Shakespeare as it is now.

The attendance at the theatre then was much larger than one would expect unless it be kept in mind that the playhouse was new. That, of course, was in its favour. We are told that for twenty years after the opening of the first professional playhouses many Londoners were theatre-mad. This large attendance is still more difficult to understand when one realizes that the arrangements for the comfort of the spectators were meagre. A result of this was that the spectators were often very disorderly.

There is some reason to believe that playbills, posted about town, announced a play, and the title was posted or announced on the stage. No lists of actors were included on these bills, and there were no ushers, tickets, or programmes. Usually there was only one door, and there the admission fee was dropped into a box, which was always under the careful scrutiny of the money-taker. The additional sums required for admittance to the galleries and boxes were taken at the entrances thereto. The beginning of a performance, which usually took place at three o'clock, was announced by trumpets sounded three times. The third sounding was the signal for the speaker of the prologue to appear. Up to this time the audience had been amusing itself in different ways, by eating, drinking, smoking, and playing cards, and, strange to relate, often continued these throughout the play. Picking pockets was common practice, but if the culprit, or culprits, were caught they were tied to a post on the stage. The plays usually lasted two hours; some lasted three. Of the audience, the moving, jostling groundlings were in the majority, and, after standing for an hour or so they must have become restless, and, no doubt, their appetites would be blunted for anything except low comedy or rapid, sensational action. Thus, it is only natural to expect disorders to break out, and they often did.

Of the tastes of these audiences much can be said. They showed a liking for unusual spectacles and brutal physical suffering. They enjoyed battles, murders, processions, fire-

works, ghosts, and insanity. They derived much delight in seeing conquered monarchs draw Tamburlaine about in his chariot. To see Richard III with ghosts surrounding him, or to see him fighting many Richmonds on the battlefield pleased them. Horrid stories of rape and revenge gave them enjoyment, and they were fond of seeing a person's eyes gouged out, someone's tongue torn out by the roots, or a child's brains dashed out. A dance of madmen, a chamber of horrors, or a burning town proved interesting to them. To be thrilled is what they wanted; they demanded physical activity and emotional excess. Comedy must abound in beatings and tragedy in deaths to appeal to them. Villainy was not to be expressed merely by plots and poisons, but rather in terms of rape, unchastity, and mutilation. Cruelty and brutality were more in evidence in those days of massacre and public burning of heretics than they are to-day. At least men were more openly cruel and more bestial in their expression of passion. The audiences went to the theatres expecting some senation or physical horror, but they did not go for those alone; real blood and torture were to be seen daily at the bear baiting and public executions which were still quite common.

The audiences in the early days of the theatre were mostly masculine; there were few women and no young girls. Shakespeare, it is thought, never played before an audience made up largely of women unless at court. Before long however, the citizens' wives began to patronize the play, and the female proportion of the audiences increased considerably with the advent of private theatres. The presence of women in the audience would

lead us to assume that there was some refinement there. Few public entertainments offered as little brutality as the theatres. Museums, libraries, and concerts did not exist then; the rivals of the theatre were cock-fights, acrobatic exhibitions, puppet shows, and bull and bear baiting. These could be had for a penny by those who wanted less literary and more brutal entertainment. But those who desired something that satisfied the imagination could find it only at the theatre, which supplied the desire for story so lacking because of the absence of newspapers and magazines.

At that time there was much comment about the difference between the groundlings and the more judicious spectators, but we must not place too much credence in that. The nobles, who made up the latter group, were not much superior in tastes to the groundlings although their criticism or approval would be incentives to literary ambition. It is suggested, too, that the young lords of Elizabeth's court were not distinguished by taste and learning and probably enjoyed the obscene jokes and bad puns as much as did the apprentices.

The audiences of Shakespeare's day were illiterate if compared with the audiences of to-day. Many probably could not read and certainly only a few read much. That, of course, was due to the lack of educational opportunities and the scarcity of reading material. Their cultural background, in most cases, was scanty, but the theatre became a means of education. This was most evident in the English history that the drama taught its patrons. National patriotism which culminated in the defeat

of the Armada resulted in the publication of many chronicles. The popular patriotism made it possible for the dramatist to use this historical material, and, for the fifteen years between the Armada and Elizabeth's death, many plays based on events of the English Chronicles appeared. Some appealed merely to the national pride, but others gave a searching interpretation of historical persons and events. Thus the public was quickly supplied with much information on the course of English history. So much so was this the case that Shakespeare could begin such a play as The Life and Death of King Richard II in the middle of the reign and not have to bother with what went before. This familiarity with the history of their country became a cultural assest of the London crowd. With the death of Queen Elizabeth in 1603 these chronicle plays based on English history ceased, but the way had been prepared for Chapman's plays on French affairs, Jonson's Roman tragedies, and especially Shakespeare's plays from Plutarch. Only with audiences trained to enjoy historical plays would it have been possible to make Roman history popular.

The absence of reading matter in the form of newspapers, magazines, and novels was an advantage to the Elizabethan dramatist. He was not limited by the general information of his audience, with the possible exception of the field of law. In that field the public seemed well versed and, as a result, the law court became as popular as the battlefield. Therefore the dramatists cultivated the scanty cultural background of the audiences at every opportunity. Although the multitude was

ignorant about most things, it was, nevertheless, able to interest itself in new information, and it did. The audiences, both groundlings and lords, were used to the spoken word and soon became adept in following blank verse. Though not well read, they were familiar with sermons. They preferred listening to reading and they were quick to respond to oratory and repartee. Sonorous declamation and witty slang appealed to them. Their delight in style was oral but none the less keen. They enjoyed hearing new words, new phrases, and classical allusions, that they did not understand, such as the clown's misapplied words, Tamburlaine's ranting audacities, or his sweetly flowing enumeration of strange proper names from Persepolis to Mexico. The Stygian vocabulary of the revenge tragedies or the stylistic redundances and burlesques of such as Love's Labours Lost were enjoyed. They were trained to listen to a speech. They were at home with ancient puns and familiar metaphors, but quick were they to detect a conceit new to them or a figure steeped in adventure. Language was changing rapidly at that time, and the audiences were keen in detecting novelty in the spoken word even if they were careless about the rules of writing. The theatre-goers responded readily to verse, heard clearly the fall of the accent, the regular march of the measure, and their hearts beat with the throb of the decasyllables. Delighted, too, were they with music and sentiment. The people, however, went to the theatre not so much for information, sensational spectacle, or recitation, as for story. From the stage they heard stories of all sorts, strange and new. Stories of Greece

and Rome, of Italian novelists, of English history, and of London of their own time were made real and vivid for a public that was just beginning to read. The stage took the place of the novel, the short story, the drama, the newspaper, and the moving picture show of our day.

The London audiences in Shakespeare's time wanted variety; they liked action as well as incident, and they showed a preference for mixed emotions. If distress moved them to tears, they expected immediate relief in laughter. Although horror was a source of enjoyment to them they wanted it tempered with fun. And as tragedy increased in gruesomeness, the greater became their need for relieving jigs. Stories that took them in fancy to strange lands, into the past, or related for them brave deeds proved of interest to them; as did stories of the shoemakers, clothiers, and grocers of London. Beyond such joys, which can be classed as natural and universal, few were the rules they set. To meet with their approval a story must have some order — a beginning and an end. The characters must be introduced and finally disposed of by being buried or married. Serials were enjoyed, but the story must end to their satisfaction with everything definitely explained, settled, and finished. Both true stories and those that were fictitious appealed to them. They were not romanticists or idealists and did not insist upon a happy ending or the triumph of virtue. The early audiences merely had an insatiable appetite for stories.

Story to them meant persons as well as plot. The Elizabethan

audiences always showed keen interest in human nature and in its dramatic representation. The Elizabethan period was one of individualism, a time when man, as an individual, was, through his own efforts, moving forward and at the same time working out his salvation. This movement was more evident than ever before in England. The individual was endeavouring to escape from that class of society into which he had been born, or from the trade which he had entered as an apprentice, or from the faith to which he had become accustomed because of early associations. No longer was he merely a cog of a wheel, an article of society, or a member of a particular class, party or sect. He frequented the theatres that he might hear and see heroic acts, trials, successes, and defeats of individuals like himself. Along with him he took an adolescent curiosity about human nature -- a dreaming of his own future. The young men who wanted to hear stories and see visions of what they might do or become were the ones who crowded the theatres. The tastes of these young people revealed themselves in their interest in experience, their curiosity about the ways of men, and their liking for incongruous emotions. To us mixed metaphors seem improper, and the close proximity of farce and pathos, grossness and innocence, are indecent, but not so to the Elizabethan. We demand that the exposition be convincing, but the Elizabethan wanted a story that aroused his imagination. As time goes on and people become more solemn and scientific Shakespeare's romantic comedies may be rejected as they were early in the eighteenth century.

Although there is no doubt that they are fantastic, quite lacking in morality, and contain a good deal of nonsense, the audiences in Shakespeare's time enjoyed them because the members of those groups possessed a mixture of impatience and responsiveness, a willingness to let one's imagination go, and an eagerness to have it spurred. There never will be another such age when the public will attend the theatres without much previous schooling or experience and discover there for the first time the whole world in stories.

Since we have accepted Shakespeare as the author of Titus Andronicus from our examination of the historical evidence and have placed it among his early works because of the same findings, let us attempt to use the social evidence to substantiate this premise. Considering, first of all, the circumstances of Shakespeare's boyhood, youth, and early manhood in this attempt to prove his authorship of Titus Andronicus, we must constantly keep in mind the fact that his was a thorough and sound education, and he was a boy of keen faculty, and unusual perceptive capacity, but at the age of thirteen he was thrust into what would be, for a person of his temperament, uncongenial employment. This was followed in turn by his presence in the strange whirl of the so-called great world of London, where he was forced to contend for long years with unfavourable circumstances, with nature, with himself, and with God. In a man who rose to such heights of dramatic production there must have been, early in life, urges to write, and with such urges suppressed because of his surroundings he must have spent much time in the deepest

contemplation. Such a rich nature as Shakespeare's, in such circumstances, must have wanted to explain the riddle of the human being and the surrounding world, but it would not have been disclosed to him while still a young man. Does it seem reasonable to expect him to wait until such a time before he attempted to dramatize? That would be expecting the super-human. Only through early errors, for which he most certainly made up later, could he reach the truth.

In his early poems an elegiac tone, which allows us to imagine very deep passions in the youthful Shakespeare, is found. It should not be considered an error to think that this single tone would not long remain sufficient for him. Soon he would want to speak aloud from that stage 'which signifies the world'[1] what the world seemed to him, a youth, who was not yet able to penetrate that seeming. In Titus Andronicus the the poet had nothing less in mind than to give us a grand Doomsday-drama, for such the world seemed to him. What was possible to him as a man in King Lear he could not have accomplished as a youth. He pictures for us a torn-to-pieces world, about which Fate wanders like a bloodthirsty lion or a refined and cruel tiger tearing the good and evil of mankind and stamping out every vestige of joy.

Let us, now, imagine the young Shakespeare entering the London of his time. As has been intimated, he had had, no doubt, aspirations to write poetry and plays when a very young man, and with his background of education he would have something

1. Term used by Schiller.

on which to build. He came from the sturdy yeoman class which fitted in admirably between the high and the low. He had lived his early life in the beautiful and quiet part of England, Warwickshire. He arrived in London, therefore, with a vast fund of knowledge, and, no doubt, experience, and an open mind. The London he entered was still a mediaeval town where affairs of court, insurrections, conspiracies, and palace intrigues were common. Shakespeare was quick to realize what the very mixed audiences would want, and he tried to please them. Would it not be likely then that in his early efforts he would reproduce to some extent what he saw around him? In Titus Andronicus he very early mentions difficulties at court in the matter of deciding a successor to the deceased emperor. Conspiracies and palace intrigues are evident in the plotting of Saturninus to bring about Titus' downfall. Tamora joins in these. What better example of an intrigue can be imagined than that of Aaron and Tamora? And does not Lucius raise an army of Goths and lead them in an insurrection? The author of Titus Andronicus produced everyday happenings in a different setting.

We are told, too, that the people of London at that time were just emerging from the filth, disease, and slavery of the middle ages, and they were, for the most part, unclean, ill-fed, and poorly housed. Only a man of such keen perception would have written, early in his career, a play as low in aesthetic quality as Titus Andronicus because he must have realized that it would not be wise to present to such people something too far above their tastes. Affairs of court were meant to attract

the courtiers while the crudity that he portrayed was intended to appeal to the groundlings. Shakespeare, throughout his career, was able, in the same play, to satisfy both high and low, and this is done admirably in Titus Andronicus. It seems logical, therefore, to suppose that he would attempt that in one of his early efforts.

Shakespeare arrived in London during a time of great commercial prosperity and its attendant extravagance, luxury, idleness, and corruption. In Titus Andronicus the actions of corrupt society are reflected in the actions of Aaron and Tamora and of Tamora's two sons. Thus is that corrupt society satirized by one who observed this—Shakespeare.

It must not be thought that the average citizen of that time had no other form of recreation besides the theatre. Such was not the case because, in the fields to the north and across the Thames to the south, holidays were spent in playing, running, jumping, military drill, cockfights, and bull and bear baiting. To attract audiences from these, plays that appealed to all must be presented. The groundlings, who were required to stand throughout the entire performance, must be kept interested, or their consequent actions would be liable to upset everything. The plays of some of Shakespeare's contemporaries failed because they did not appeal sufficiently to the audience. Titus Andronicus, however, we found in our examination of the historical evidence, enjoyed a long popularity as have Shakespeare's later plays, about which there is no doubt of authorship. The connection seems evident. Shakespeare must have written Titus

Andronicus. Furthermore, when the theatre was just beginning to take its place among Elizabethan amusements, a play written by a man, who with his other plays held his audiences, would naturally be less finished and more likely to contain incidents that would appeal to the groundlings. In that way he would hope to retain their interest for later performances. After standing for an hour or so only rapid and sensational action would appeal to their somewhat blunted appetites, and since Shakespeare became the greatest of dramatists he must have forseen what would appeal to such people.

In the matter of the tastes of the Elizabethan audiences we are told that they derived much pleasure from unusual spectacles, brutal physical suffering, battles, murders, processions, ghosts, and insanity. How well are these portrayed in Titus Andronicus? And it seems that only by him who became the master of drama could such have been written. Early in the play unusual spectacle is seen in the dispute about a successor to the throne, and throughout the play one unusual incident follows another very closely. Bassianus carries off Lavinia. Tamora, a captive queen, becomes empress. Tamora's sons murder Bassianus. Titus is inveigled into cutting off his hand. Tamora gives birth to a blackamoor child. Titus bakes Tamora's sons in a pie. Titus kills Lavinia and then Tamora. Saturninus kills Titus. Lucius kills Saturninus. And the unusual incidents are climaxed by Aaron being set breast-deep in the sand to die of starvation.

Brutal physical suffering is mentioned throughout. What

could be more brutal than the treatment Lavinia received at the hands of Tamora's sons, or the cutting off of Titus' hand? Murder follows murder. The play opens with a procession, and numerous others take place before the play closes. And for insanity, what better examples could there be than the actions of Titus toward the end, especially when he bakes Tamora's sons in a pie?

If horrid stories of rape and revenge gave them enjoyment, Lavinia's ravishment must have fully satisfied their demands, and revenge was certainly exemplified in the last act. If it was to their liking to see someone's tongue torn out, this was satisfied by the treatment meted out to Lavinia by Demetrius and Chiron. The audiences demanded that they be thrilled and, with their tastes in mind, a reading of Titus Andronicus will reveal that this demand was filled to excess. Comedy to appeal to them had to abound in beatings, and tragedy in death. Titus Andronicus, then, is a tragedy in the full sense of the word. Villainy must be expressed not merely by plots and poisons but in terms of rape, incest, and mutilation. So it is in Titus Andronicus. If this play seems cruel and brutal to us we must keep in mind that cruelty and brutality were more in evidence in those days of massacres and public burnings of heretics than to-day.

Then, too, the audiences were mostly masculine and men were more bestial and more openly cruel than they are now. Furthermore, other entertainments were brutal and if the theatre was to vie successfully with cockfights and bull and bear baiting its performances must include some brutality.

The cultural background of the patrons of the theatre in its

early days was scanty indeed, but they soon evinced an interest in stories of Greece and Rome. A budding dramatist would, therefore, use any story available to satisfy this interest, and such a story was Titus Andronicus.

The London audiences also wanted variety, and this they were given in Titus Andronicus. They enjoyed stories of strange lands, past times, and heroic deeds. It has been quite definitely proven that the play being discussed is not based on fact and, therefore, falls into the first group mentioned.

Thus it seems that the author of Titus Andronicus has fulfilled all the requirements set by an Elizabethan audience. One who could so early in the development of the theatre satisfy so well the demands made by its patrons must have reached the heights of success during his career. Shakespeare so outshines his contemporaries and all other dramatists that it seems justifiable on the strength of these bits of social evidence to place Titus Andronicus among the plays written by Shakespeare.

A survey of all the social evidence reveals to us a young man, who as a boy was admitted to the halls of learning, but because of circumstances, over which he had no control, was forced into uncongenial employment. Against the fetters of this he must have strained. Life to him, in consequence, would seem sordid and gloomy and when he attempted to satisfy the urge to write he would most likely reveal in his writings what the world seemed to him. Would that not be an outlet to his feelings? Titus Andronicus seems to be just such an outlet. Then, in reference to the state of early English drama and the circumstances

in which he was placed with reference to his audiences, our findings seem to corroborate the testimony presented as historical evidence and make it possible for us to name Shakespeare the author of the rather painful tragedy, Titus Andronicus.

LITERARY EVIDENCE.

To make it possible to examine literary evidence that might be used to defend Shakespeare's authorship of Titus Andronicus, the literary style and the dramatic art of the great dramatist must be considered in some detail, and evidences of that style and that art then sought in the play being discussed.

Shakespeare is acclaimed by all the world's genius. He appeared in the world of literature at the most opportune time in human history for a great genius of drama to pour out his verse. He was favoured more than any by circumstances of time and place. His age was rife with dramatic elements; it abounded in character and passion; and it was an age of change from an old society to a new. Yet did it contain the peculiarities of both. At that time human nature had just been stirred to its depths and the strongest of its passions laid bare. Society had not reached that calm uniformity which has brought about a weakened sympathy for strongly expressed passion.

Shakespeare was thoroughly acquainted with the classical unities of action, time, and place. In The Tempest they are strictly observed for the period of time during which the events of the play are represented as occurring is slightly more than that required for the stage performance -- about four hours, according to Prospero and Ariel. In The Comedy of Errors, too, are the unities observed by the universal poet. The scene, in this play, is confined to Ephesus, and the dramatic action takes place in one day, ending about five p. m. On the other hand, in The Winter's Tale, the master has utterly disregarded the unities

in the actual sense, but he has, nevertheless, shaped the widely varied elements of the play into "the unity of breathing life," which is the only unity worthy of consideration in Art.

Because of the wider range of modern drama, the system of time and place that suited the narrower range of ancient drama, was not suited to it, and Shakespeare, who because of his genius rose above arbitrary law and authority, devised a time-system of his own. This he used in most of his plays. Briefly, it is a system of time-perspective; a long period appears as a short period, and a short period, as a long.

Another feature of Shakespeare's dramatic art which adds to what may be called the dramatic perspective, or what makes up the still background of what is to be dramatized, is the narrated element of the plays; that is, all that is told or described by characters instead of being represented in scene or action. Although this element is to be found in the dramatic literature of all time, no one has used it with such skill as Shakespeare did. For example, in The Merchant of Venice, when Shylock finds out that Jessica has run off with a Christian and taken with her two bags of ducats and some valuable jewels, in anger and despair, he walks about the streets of Venice, trailed by jeering boys. Had this been scenically represented instead of being described by Salanio in a few lines it would weaken the appearance of the money-lender when he meets Salanio and Salarino. Then, too, if this had been dramatically presented, too great would have been the indignity heaped upon the leading character of the play before the time was ripe for such. Actually, poor

Shylock is treated badly enough.

Contrast was also used very skilfully by Shakespeare as a means of effective expression. In his plays he brings together the high and the low, the great and the little, the noble and the base, the sad and the merry. To bring together such widely separated material is quite easy, but when it is to be governed by a great idea then it is the work of the master, who lives, it seems, in all and for all.

In the way in which one speech depends on and develops from one that precedes it, Shakespeare excels. It shows how complete is the identification of the poet and his scenes and how great is his skill in filling up little intervals with side-dialogues. In Shakespeare each reply and the answer thereto appears as the rebound of the previous speech.

Let us now examine briefly Shakespeare's verse. When he began to write, blank verse had not been sufficiently developed to make it adaptable to use in the highest of dramatic work. It evolved, in its earliest form, out of the rhyming pentameter couplet. Rhyme gives emphasis to the end of a verse and checks the smooth flow of one verse into another. As a result, in rhymed verse the thought is more or less confined. It is sectioned off, as it were, by the metre, and pause-emphasis and pause-melody are thus more impeded than in free blank verse. In Lord Surrey's translation of the second and fourth books of Virgil's Aeneid, which was fashioned upon rhyming verse, there is very little melody resulting from variety of pause. The fact is that it is often difficult to distinguish Surrey's blank verse

from prose. The reader is made too conscious of the metrical bonds within which the thought is confined throughout. In material which is suited to expression in blank verse, thought and feeling are equally weighted one against the other, although the former is generally more predominant. Such material, as a result, would be restrained by the cyclic movement which, in the case of material wherein feeling is superior in influence to thought, would not be restraint at all, but it would be the natural movement that this material would endeavour to find for itself. Thought moves toward an undeviating course; that is, toward straightforward speech. Feeling, on the other hand, must rotate, as it were, upon an axis that is itself. When the feeling is strong it is unreasonable to do so. An examination of a few lines of Surrey's blank verse, written about 1540, shows that the thought is narrowly restricted within the limits of the metre. It seems to the reader a mere succession of verses, or a list of verses that do not run together to form a system. A pause occurs at the end of each verse and these verses are little more than couplets without their rhymes. Decidedly lacking is the sweep and elasticity of the blank verse of fifty or sixty years later.

The earliest English drama of any kind written in blank verse is The Tragedy of Gorboduc, known also as Ferrex and Porrex. The first three acts of this were written by Thomas Sackville, first Lord Buckhurst, a little more than twenty years after Surrey's Translation of Virgil. Its smoothness and its variety of pause shows considerable improvement over Surrey's, but

generally the thought is bound by the metre. The speeches are long and give the impression that they were prepared in advance by the different speakers. As a result the dialogue is not very dramatic. But the movement of the verses is freer than Surrey's and the verses themselves have more continuity and more spirit.

It was felt, apparently, by the several writers of early blank verse that a substitute for the closing of verses by rhyme was necessary. As a result the use of rhyme was discontinued more and more until people became quite accustomed to its absence. In its place a freer and more melodious progression of verse developed, and the strong word or syllable at the end of the line was desired less.

Continuing in our tracing of the development of blank verse we come to Marlowe's, and in his we find a great improvement over all that had been produced previously. It is true that the thought therein is more or less restricted to metrical limits but there is much more freedom and grace of movement within those limits. Each verse is more melodiously joined to the others and the progress of the verse, as a result, appeals to the ear more than does the close. Such verses seem to follow one another more smoothly than do those that have less melodious movement and more strongly marked endings. In Marlowe's earliest play, Tamburlaine the Great, there is much bombast, rant, and brag, but the splendid vigour of the verse that is evident, here and there, throughout the play makes up, in part, for these. In Edward II, his best play, Marlowe displays more self-control, and the occasional verse is quite equal to that written by Shakespeare during his period

of experimentation. Even when freest, Marlowe's thought, however, seldom breaks the bounds of metre. In consequence, the dramatic possibilities of blank verse cannot be judged from its use in his plays. Nevertheless, within those bounds, Marlowe's thought has much ease and grace of movement. It has been suggested, and on good authority, that in the tragedy Tamburlane the Great Marlowe established blank verse as the popular metre of English drama. He not only drove the rhymed couplet from the stage by substituting the blank verse of his contemporaries, but he also created a new metre by the melody, variety, and force which he poured into the iambic, and he left models of versification, the pomp and gorgeousness of which only Shakespeare and Milton have surpassed. The ten-syllabled heroic line, which was divided into five feet of alternate short and long, Marlowe found monotonous and monosyllabic, but the changes he introduced into it left it decidedly varied in form and structure. Sometimes in his line there was an extra syllable; sometimes it was deficient by a syllable. And the unexpected emphases and changes in beat for which Marlowe is responsible made the heroic line much richer than it had been before he set to work to remould it. When he turned his attention to it he found no sequence or attempt at periods; one line followed another with uninteresting regularity, and all were made in the same mould. In his verse, form does not dominate over thought; rather it is grouped according to sense, and it obeys an internal law of melody. His metre was not fixed and unaltered but was widely varied in its modulations, and these in turn were dependent for their beauty

upon their perfect adaptation to the flow of his ideas. Thus was Marlowe able to produce the double effect of variety and unity, to retain the fixed march of the metre he had chosen, and, at the same time, by clever changes in the pauses, speed, and grouping of syllables, he was able to make each measure very effective. In skilful hands, blank versebecame widely varied. In some ways, it was similar to music, which requires regular time and rhythm; but, by use of phrase, it brings about a higher kind of melody which rises above the common and dull beat of time. Many writers of blank verse, like Marlowe's predecessors, who lacked creative ability and power of harmonious inflection, produce monotonous successions of iambic lines in which poetic expression is sacrificed that the mechanical side of their art be more nearly perfect. To them metre is nothing more than a framework instead of the organic body of a vital thought, and for these very faults of tameness and monotony, which have been incorrectly termed the regularity of numbers, they have been praised by critics of questionable reputation. Thus it was that Jonson severely censured the sublimest and most audacious of Milton's essays in versification.

It can be said that Shakespeare raised his future dramatic discourses upon the ground, the tune, or the plain song of the best form of Marlowe's verse. Some suggest that Shakespeare's metre developed freely as it appealed to the ear and that it owed very little except its generic form to his predecessors and contemporaries. In any case, he first of all perfected the plain song before he raised any descants upon it, and he learned

to move freely and gracefully within the bounds of five measures. But Shakespeare's development as an artist did not proceed from form to spirit. It is plain to be seen, however, that his verse did develop in certain directions. The change in form which gradually took place throughout his career, exclusive of certain conventionalities, was not brought about through the influence of the foreign hand, but developed more from within. In some of his earliest plays it is evident that sentiment is predominant over the dramatic, but it must be admitted that the verse of these plays, which are more or less conscious imitations of the works of his predecessors and contemporaries, and which conform to the traditional demands of the theatre, is just as organic as the verse of his latest plays, in so far as the spirit that shapes it is concerned. Because the man, Shakespeare, in the period of his career designated the period of maturity, had grown spiritually, intellectually, and morally, had grown in self-knowledge and in world-wisdom, had decided the proportions by which the moral elements of the world are balanced, and, above all, had reached the heights of dramatic ability, the language-shaping, of the plays written during that period, differs greatly from that of the plays produced early in his life as a playwright. This difference is not so much the difference one would expect to find between the work of an apprentice and the work of a master, though it has been indicated that Shakespeare, like all mortals, served an apprenticeship, as it is the difference between "genius in the bud and genius in full bloom."[1] As a result, the student of Shakespeare's verse must

1. Introduction to Shakespeare, Hiram Corson, P. [illegible]

not reason after the theory of evolution, as it is often understood to-day, but he must reason in the opposite direction --- from pre-existent spirit to form.

Stated generally, it can be said that the development of Shakespeare's verse is from the recitative to the spontaneous. In conformity with this development, his verse at first moves submissively within the limits of metre, gaining melody and grace gradually until the greatest freedom of movement possible within those metrical limits is reached, and realizes the fullest dramatic power of which it is capable. Then it gradually breaks the bonds of metre more and more until, in the latest plays, The Winter's Tale, Cymbeline, and The Tempest, it is frequently little more than rhythmical prose in which an unbroken pentameter measure is not returned to often enough to be considered a standard. Although many writers of blank verse have not done it, it should be clearly understood that however skilfully the pause may be varied, variety ceases to be such when the deviation from the standard pentameter measure is so continuous that it is no longer, even subconsciously, in the feelings.

That poetry, written in blank verse, may be musical, it must exhibit all the variations possible in a ten-syllable line. Nowhere between the first syllable and the last is there a place at which the poet should not pause occasionally, and that place of pause must be continually moved. Such variety in the place of the pause, however, will not bring pause-melody, but rather metrical chaos, unless the return to an unbroken pentameter measure is made sufficiently often to establish it as a standard.

In Shakespeare it is thought that the most frequent Caesura is at the end of the third foot, that is, generally after the sixth syllable, though it may at times be after the seventh or even the eighth foot.

Returning to the development of Shakespeare's verse, it can be stated again that it proceeds from the recitative to the spontaneous. This was due, no doubt, to the fact that when the drama was first ushered in, during the reign of Elizabeth, the elocution of the stage was most likely more or less recitative in style and at the same time inflated. This can be inferred from an examination of the versification that precedes Shakespeare's.

At the same time that Shakespeare's blank verse was identified by its recitative form there were numerous rhymes, but these slowly decreased in number as the verse moved toward the spontaneous form. During the recitative period, the poet often permitted sentiment to dominate the thought because his mood was more poetic than dramatic. In consequence, he had the tune, the plain song, more in his feelings. Generally, the metre of the plain song is characterized by a strong word or syllable in the fifth foot, and it is upon this that the voice can and must press. Rhyme forces this marking of the metre under certain emotional conditions.

There are in Love's Labours Lost, about eleven hundred rhyming verses; about nine hundred in A Midsummer Night's Dream; about five hunfred in Romeo and Juliet; and over five hundred in The Life and Death of King Richard II. In that part of Shakespeare's career that intervenes between the decidedly recitative

and the decidedly spontaneous periods rhymes gradually decreased in number, and during his latest period of work they were used very sparingly and only for a special purpose such as the rounding-off of a scene. Only about one hundred rhyming verses appear in Cymbeline, in Coriolanus and in Antony and Cleopatra about forty; in The Tempest, only two; and in The Winter's Tale there are none, except those in the chorus introducing the fourth act, and about Shakespeare's authorship of this chorus there is much doubt.

It is possible that the proportion of rhyming to blank vers verses might indicate whether a play was written during the recitative or the spontaneous period, but rhyme is only one of a number of phenomena which must be considered in an effort to determine approximately where a play belongs in the chronological order. This is equally true of all other tests without exception.

In considering two early plays written by Shakespeare, it is not possible to decide which was written first even if one does contain one hundred or two hundred, or even three hundred rhymes more or less than the other, the whole number of verses i in each being taken into account. Shakespeare, it is true, made use of the conventional forms of language but he never slavishly subjected his mind and feelings to them. The use of more rhymes or of fewer rhymes in one early play than another depended upon the pitch of the poetic or dramatic key in which he wrote it. Anyone who reads A Midsummer Night's Dream must necessarily feel that rhyme is an inseparable addition to the speeches of the

chief characters of this drama, if it can be considered an addition when it is so organic an element of the language-shaping. At times the feeling is better expressed by double rhyme:

"The will of man is by his reason sway'd;
And reason says you are the worthier maid.
Things growing are not ripe until their season:
So I, being young, till now not ripe to reason;" [1.]

In one case, repetition of the same rhyme through a number of consecutive verses shows the rebounding pitch of the speaker's feelings or spirits:

"Be kind and courteous to this gentleman;
Hop in his walks and gambol in his eyes;
Feed him with apricocks and dewberries;
With purple grapes, green figs and mulberries;
The honey bags steal from the humble-bees,
And for night-tapers crop their waxen thighs,
And light them at the fiery glow-worm's eyes,
To have my love to bed and to arise;
And pluck the wings from painted butterflies
To fan the moonbeams from his sleeping eyes --
Nod to him, elves, and do him courtesies." [2.]

If Shakespeare, early in his career, had merely adopted rhyme, and then used it just because he liked it, there would

1. A Midsummer Night's Dream, Act II, Sc. ii, 111 - 114.
2. Ibid., Act III, Sc. i, 167 - 177.

be no use in trying to employ it in estimating the pitch of a play. But as it is used in A Midsummer Night's Dream, it is felt to be very necessary to the poetic pitch of a play. There is no reason to boubt that the poet wrote plays on a lower poetic key before he wrote A Midsummer Night's Dream, and, because he had a more dramatic purpose, he used fewer rhymes. In fact, we are quite certain that he did write such plays; and to suppose that he could not have written a more dramatic play at the time he composed A Midsummer Night's Dream would be folly.

As Shakespeare uses it, rhyme, by itself, is more or less a chronological test except in deciding whether a play be an early or a late one.

There is, however, a relationship between the place of a pause or a break in a verse and the current of the feeling. Ordinarily the comma-pause makes very little difference in the movement of a verse, but when a sentence closes within a verse, and with a complete foot, the break is more pronounced than it is when the sentence closes with the light syllable of an iamb. In such a case as the latter, the feeling of the current of the verse is somewhat sustained, but there is a close in the thought, as the following verses from Romeo and Juliet show:

> O, where is Romeo? Saw you him to day? [1.]
> Well, in that hit you miss: she'll not be hit
> With Cupid's arrow; she hath Dian's wit. [2.]
> A man, young lady; lady, such a man [3.]

1. Romeo and Juliet, Act I, Sc.i, 99.
2. Ibid., Act I, Sc.i, 191 & 192. 3. Ibid., Act I, Sc.iii, 57.

You are a lover; borrow Cupid's wings,[1.]
She is the Fairies' midwife; and she comes[2.]
And sleeps again. This is that very Mab[3.]

If this be the case, it would be expected that the pauses or breaks would be more frequent after the light syllables in the more smoothly flowing of Shakespeare's verse that belongs to the recitative form; and so Corson found them to be in a number of plays examined by him. Then, too, the verse-sense of the poet, at the time of writing, determines, more or less, the place of the pause. When this verse-sense is strong, the pauses after the light syllable of an iamb will be more numerous, and when his verse-sense is weaker, the pauses after complete feet will increase in numbers.

The recitative form of verse becomes freest in King John, The Life and Death of Richard II, the two parts of King Henry IV, and King Henry V, which were written between 1596 and 1599. In these plays, too, recitative verse becomes most vigorous and sweeping, and reaches its fullest dramatic possibilities. The best blank verse in these plays stands in marked contrast to that of such of Shakespeare's earliest plays as Love's Labours Lost.

Shakespeare's blank verse in its recitative form; that is, the form in which the orbit of the thought is determined to a considerable extent by the normal pentameter measure of the verse, reached its climax of freedom of movement and bounding

1. Romeo and Juliet, Act I, Sc.iv, 17.
2. Ibid., Act I, Sc.iv, 56. 3. Ibid., Act I, Sc.iv, 88.

vigour in Act IV, Scene i, of the First Part of King Henry IV when Hotapur says, in alluding to the King:

"Where is his son,
The nimble-footed madcap Prince of Wales,
And his comrades, that daff'd the world aside,
And bid it pass?" [1]

and in Sir Richard Vernon's reply:

"All furnish'd, all in arms;
All plumed like estridges that with the wind
Bate it like eagles having lately bathed;
Glittering in golden coats like images;
As full of spirit as the month of May,
And gorgeous as the sun at midsummer,
Wanton as youthful goats, wild as young bulls.
I saw young Harry, with his beaver on,
His cuisses on his thighs, gallantly arm'd,
Rise from the ground like feathered Mercury,
And vault it with such ease into his seat,
As if an angel dropp'd down from the clouds,
To turn and wind a fiery Pegasus,
And witch the world with noble horsemanship." [2]

When such vigorous and bouyant metrical movement was reached, the greatest dramatic capabilities of this form of blank verse had been reached by the poet. For the freest movement of his dramatic thought in the fullest maturity, however, he left the

1. First Part of King Henry IV, Act IV, Sc.i, 94 - 97.
2. Ibid., Act IV, Sc.i, 97 - 110.

recitative form, and passed into that named by Corson the spontaneous. The outstanding characteristics of this form of verse are:

1. The metre is, to some extent, sunk
   (a) Through the weakness of the word receiving the fifth ictus of the verse.
   (b) By a looser melodious fusion of the verse, and by a more arbitrary use of pauses and breaks.
2. Extra end-syllables appear more frequently as the recitative form of verse is departed from more and more.

As Shakespeare advances in his dramatic art the movement of thought controls the metre of his blank verse much more. In the more markedly recitative style, the firmest resting place for the voice is the accented word or syllable of the fifth foot; in the spontaneous style, this word or syllable is very often the lightest on which the voice can press, and sometimes a proclitic particle, on which the voice cannot press at all, but must move to the next verse, occupies this place in the verse.

Thus the normal metre is sometimes lost to the feelings, and all that is felt is the foot rhythm of the language. Such atonic or proclitic words as a, are, and, as, but, if, nor, or, of, for, the, to, which, withare often used in The Winter's Tale at the ends of verses. For example:

> A lip of much contempt, speeds from me, and [1.]
> Turn then my freshest reputation to [2.]

1. The Winter's Tale, Act I, Sc.ii, 370.
2. Ibid., Act I, Sc.ii, 416.

When feeling or sentiment is in the ascendancy over the dramatic, its power to unify is shown in a closer and more melodious fusion of the verse. The pauses and breaks comply more with the standard measure of the verse, or, in other words, the way in which the pauses or breaks occur does not cause the standard to be sunk in the varied measures. But in the speech uttered by Imogen in Cymbeline, Act III, Scene ii, lines 50 - 70, when she learns that her husband is at Milford-Haven, and expresses an eagerness to go to him, the melody fusion of the verses is diminished, and the verse measure which is considered the standard gives way to varied measures. The speech is as follows:

"O, for a horse with wings! Hear'st thou, Pisanio?
He is at Milford-Haven: read, and tell me
How far 'tis thither. If one of mean affairs
May plod it in a week, why may not I
Glide thither in a day? then, true Pisanio, --
Who long'st, like me, to see thy lord; who long'st,-
O, let me bate,-but not like me-yet long'st,
But in a fainter kind:- O, not like me;
For mine's beyond beyond-say, and speak thick,-
Love's counsellor should fill the bores of hearing,
To the smothering of the sense-how far it is
To this same blessed Milford: and by the way
Tell me how Wales was made so happy as
To inherit such an haven: but, first of all,
How we may steal from hence, and for the gap
That we shall make in time, from our hence-going

And our return to excuse: but first, how get hence.
Why should excuse be born or ere begot?
We'll talk of that hereafter. Prithee, speak,
How many score of miles may we well ride
'Twixt hour and hour?"

As Fletcher used them, extra end-syllables are not much more than a mere peculiarity of style, that is, they are not very organic -- The movement of the thought or feeling is not responsible for their occurrence. For that reason and because Fletcher used them excessively, the possibilities of double endings in drama can not be realized from his verse. But with Shakespeare, extra end-syllables were more than just an adoption. Still it is desirable to decide, if possible, how organic and how conventional they are. It must be remembered that Shakespeare used what was conventional in other things than language forms. The fact is that he used to good advantage all the literary conventions of that era, but his genius was so forceful that he was able to instill new spirit into the conventional forms and thus make the conventional organic. Under his influence graceful spontaneity emerges out of the formal. Of all authors, he is freest from mannerisms, and in that we have one of the important reasons why he cannot be successfully imitated. Nowhere in his diction can be found that something upon which imitators usually pounce -- the organic characteristic of his language-shaping.

As in his use of rhyme, so in his use of extra syllables, Shakespeare employs them when the feeling of the drama reaches

out for them, and the extra end-syllables are not found only in verse of the spontaneous form, but they appear also quite frequently in the better verse of the recitative form. In Hamlet's first soliloquy, Act I, Scene ii, lines 129 -158, which begins "Oh, that this too too solid flesh would melt," additional light syllables appear at the end of, and within the verses, and they produce an organic effect. The rebound of the speaker's impulsive feeling is expressed by them. In the soliloquy, beginning "To be or not to be", a reflectiveness of tone is given to the language by their use. Corson expresses the belief that the speeches of some of Shakespeare's characters must have been heard by him apart from the thoughts they expressed, and he shaped them according to the sound that was in his mind. Often, too, verses having extra end-syllables are effectively mingled with verses which end normally on accented syllables. Gloster's soliloquy, which opens The Life and Death of King Richard III, is a good example of this. After a succession of smooth verses the extra end-syllable produces an agreeable effect when it appears, as in the fourth verse:

"Now is the winter of our discontent
Made glorious summer by this sun of York:
And all the clouds that lour'd upon our house
In the deep bosom of the ocean buried."

Then, in the four verses that follow (28-31), an alternation of normal and extra end-syllable proves effective:

"And therefore, since I cannot prove a lover,
To entertain these fair well-spoken days,

I am determined to prove a villain
And hate the idle pleasures of these days."

The more or less organic end-syllable of Shakespeare gives liveliness to his verse, but the extra end-syllable of Fletcher is usually the product of an uninteresting language habit.

Now let us examine briefly the distinctive use Shakespeare made of verse and prose.

It is said that no writer has shown the power, which Shakespeare has exhibited, of arranging words effectively, of increasing the vitality of language to the limit, and of introducing into that language all the variety of organic form which might be demanded by any of the attitudes of the mind and the sensibilities. Corson uses the term organic in describing the form because, although Shakespeare did choose, early in his career, as the general course of his language, forms used by his predecessors and contemporaries, the power of his mind and feelings to mould these forms slowly made them more and more organic. In other words, these forms became closely linked with the thought and emotion expressed. Shakespeare was the first to use blank verse, rhyming verse, and prose organically in dramatic composition. All are harmoniously united by him, and often within the limits of a short scene. It is not known whether he ever decided definitely the actual duties each of these modes of language-shaping was to perform, but he must have felt, to a nicety, the use of each. He moves from blank verse to rhyme, from rhyme to prose, then back again to blank verse without the reader actually noticing the change, or, if

he does notice it, he takes it for granted as the natural thing to do. It is often difficult to decide the plan and the spirit of the different stages of his writing during the various periods of his career, but it is quite easy to obsérve the two outstanding divisions of language-shaping, prose and verse, in all the plays. In the first place, those characters that are more or less subordinate, or those that do not move in the higher realms of thought and feeling, usually speak in straightforward prose. This is truer of the later plays because Shakespeare's appreciation of the peculiar domains of verse and prose developed gradually just as other characteristics of his dramatic art, such as humour, developed. Sometimes, leading characters speak in prose when the situation does not call for any idealization of language. Hamlet uses verse in speaking to his mother, to his very close friend Horatio, to his father's ghost, and in his soliloquies; but he uses very easy prose when he speaks to Polonius, the old chancellor, whom he dislikes, when he speaks to the courtiers and to the players, and in the scene with the grave-diggers. In the last scene, however, when he thinks of the great Roman, he speaks in rhymed verse:

"Imperious Caesar, dead and turn'd to clay,
Might stop a hole to keep the wind away:
O, that the earth which kept the world in awe,
Should patch a wall t'expel the winter's flaw!"[1]

Prose, of course, is spoken by such a character as Falstaff. Although his actual self is backed by great and various possi-

1. Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, Act V, Sc.i, 235-238.

bilities, sensual indulgence always dominates his higher faculties. Just as with all sensualists, his mind never reaches a height above regard of self; it never attains that elevation of thought and feeling that requires, for expression, a language both rhymthical and metrical in form.

In Act I, Scene iii, of The Merchant of Venice is found an interesting example of the change from prose to verse. Business-like prose is used during the conduct of negotiations between Bassanio and Shylock for a loan of three thousand ducats for three months, the repayment of which is guaranteed by Antonio. This prose is quite matter-of-fact except in Shylock's reply to Bassanio's invitation to dine with him and Antonio. This rather bitter speech precedes Antonio's entrance and is the transition-point of the language-shaping. Shylock bears Antonio many grudges for real or imaginary wrongs, and, when Antonio appears, Shylock's feelings, which have become unduly intensified, find expression in verse, the beat of which is high.

One of the most striking examples of Shakespeare's changes in language-shaping to suit the varied pitch of thought and feeling is shown in the third scene of the first act of Othello, The Moor of Venice. In this particular scene the Moor, who has been accused by Brabantio of using love-potions and witchcraft to win Desdemona, defends himself before the Duke and Senators of Venice, and tells them how he courted the young lady. In his address to the Senators the language he uses is very dignified but not arrogant. A more than usual correspondence of the rhythmical ictus with the logical emphasis gives weight to

the movement of the verse. Such double-endings as "masters", "daughter", "offending", and "magic" give decisiveness to the tone, and the breaks in verse come at the ends of complete feet. When Othello tells of his courtship the verse drops some of its stateliness, and his speech takes on a characteristic of frankness which is particularly suited to the movement of the verse. When Desdemona enters at the conclusion of the story she is questioned by her father:

"Do you perceive in all this noble company
Where most you owe obedience?"

Her answer to this is given in blank verse which is as staightforward as prose and which is raised above prose just enough to show respect for her father. Their close relationship would not permit of a more elevated form of language. And the first part of Brabantio's reply, in which he drops the case, closely approaches prose. There is an ease of movement in the old man's expression of submission.

It is not easy to draw a line between the fields of prose and verse, but it can best be done through a consideration of Shakespeare's works. He chose verse as the general medium of his language, and, consequently, often uses it where prose would have been better. His verse frequently trespasses into the field of prose, but it can never be said that his prose trespasses into the field of verse.

To help us in examining the literary evidence a brief discussion of the Latin and Anglo-Saxon elements and the monosyllabic vocabulary would be in order. Numerous writer's, well

qualified for the task, have ably defined the peculiar domains of the Latin and the Anglo-Saxon elements of the English language. We are told that both are equally indispensable. Pathos, especially in homely situations or in connection with domestic affections, is best expressed in Saxon words. Lyrical emotion of all kinds, which, to warrant the name lyrical, must be in a general state of agitation, is also best expressed by the Saxon element of the language. These uses can be explained by the fact that the Saxon is the primitive element, or, in other words, the basis and not the superstructure. It, therefore, includes all the ideas relevant to the heart of man and to the simple situations of life. Latin, it is true, does often supply us with words that express corresponding ideas, but the Saxon or monosyllabic part is given preference because it is the language of the nursery, where there is no use for long words. Thus it is an advantage to have a language mixed as ours is. Generally speaking, Saxon will predominate when the feeling of a poem is of that kind, which uses the ideas without attempting to extend them, but, when the feeling of a poem moves by and through the ideas, Latin will be the controlling influence.

Shakespeare's instincts in the use of words were so almost infallible that the key, in which a particular play or a special speech was pitched, is indicated quite reliably by the vocabulary. Troilus and Cressida, considered the most intellectual of Shakespeare's plays, has a decidedly Latin vocabulary.

The Anglo-Saxon element of the English language is mostly

monosyllabic; and the monosyllabic word occupies an important place in Shakespeare's diction. For that reason it must be considered in a study of his language-shaping as it is organically connected with thought and feeling.

Deep feeling, it will be found, is usually expressed through monosyllabic words; not only because such words are mostly Anglo-Saxon, and thus more closely related to feeling than thought, but also because they produce a more staccato effect than do disyllabic and trisyllabic words. They serve better the natural movement of speech animated by passion. This is exemplified in Juliet's speech to the Friar, three lines of which are:

"Or bid me go into a new-made grave,
And hide me with a dead man in his shroud;
Things that to hear them told, have made me tremble;" [1.]

The extra end-syllable of the third line adds to the effect. The following speeches also show the force of the monosyllable:

"Montague ..... Hold me not, let me go.
Lady M. Thou shalt not stir one foot to seek a foe.", [2.]

as does also Juliet's mother when she answers Juliet's entreaty to delay her marriage with Paris:

"Talk not to me, for I'll not speak a word:
Do as thou wilt, for I have done with thee." [3.]

King Lear, of all Shakespeare's plays, is the homliest in its pathos. In it are many striking examples of staccato effects

1. Romeo and Juliet, Act IV, Sc.i, 84-86.
2. Ibid., Act I, Sc.i, 72, 73. 3. Ibid., Act III, Sc.v, 204, 205.

through monosyllables:

"Go tell the duke and's wife I'ld speak with them,
Now, presently, bid them come forth and hear me,
Or at their chamber-door I'll beat the drum
Till it cry sleep to death."[1.]

Only a monosyllabic vocabulary, and that the Saxon vocabulary of every-day life, would be effective in expressing such homely pathos as that of King Lear.

Other evidences of Shakespeare's able use of monosyllabic words are to be found in other of his plays. Besides the uses already enumerated, he uses them to advantage in conveying an impression of close confidence, abruptness of strong feeling, or passionate grief.

The more violent feelings of anger, hate, detestation, and scorn are found to attract to themselves the monosyllabic words of the language, and, at the same time, express themselves on the abrupt vowels of words. The gentler feelings of love, admiration, and of the beautiful, on the other hand, express themselves on the prolongable vowels.

Examples of special effect secured by emphasis on abrupt vowels are numerous in the tragedies and histories of Shakespeare. In The Life and Death of King Richard III Gloster's speeches are excellent examples:

"Gloster (in anger). What! threat you me with telling of the King?
Tell him, and spare not: look what I have said
I will avouch in presence of the King;"[2.]

1. King Lear, Act II, Sc.iv, 112-115.
2. The Life and Death of King Richard III, Act I, Sc.iii, 110-112.

Good examples occur, also, in the quarrel scene between Brutus and Cassius, in Julius Caesar, Act Iv, Scene iii.

With these characteristics of Shakespeare's literary style and dramatic art in mind, let us examine Titus Andronicus.

Shakespeare has shown in his writing that he was familiar with the classical unities of action, time, and place, although he did not always adhere to them slavishly. The first of these is the only absolute dramatic-art principle; the others originated in the constitution of the Greek drama. According to Aristotle, the time of action must not exceed one revolution of the sun, and the beginning and end of the action must be within the scope of a single view. Taken word for word, the first suggests twenty-four hours, the second, a rather limited view. It has been mentioned that these have been observed in The Tempest and in The Comedy of Errors, but not in The Winter's Tale. If by one revolution of the sun is meant only twenty-four hours, then Titus Andronicus does not comply; but if we interpret it to mean a year, then Titus Andronicus does comply. In The Comedy of Errors, the scene is confined to Ephesus; in Titus Andronicus, to Rome and the immediate vicinity. It seems that there is a marked similarity in the treatment of place and a partial similarity in the treatment of time. The writer, therefore, feels justified in counting these as further proof of Shakespeare's authorship of Titus Andronicus. Too, as in The Winter's Tale, where "the unity of breathing life" is all-important, so is it all-important in Titus Andronicus. The author of the two would appear to be one and the same person, and, since Shakespeare's

authorship of The Winter's Tale is undisputed, it is justifiable to accept Titus Andronicus as one of his works.

Because the system of time and place that was suited to the narrower range of the ancient drama was not suited to the wider range of modern drama, Shakespeare worked out his own dramatic time-system -- a system of time-perspective in which a long period appears as a short period, and a short period, as a long. This is quite evident in Titus Andronicus. The conqueror's return to Rome, the discussion of the imperial succession, the difficulties of Lavinia's betrothal, the rapid climb of Tamora to the position of Saturninus' empress, and the formulation of plans for the downfall of Titus take place, actually, in a short space of time, but that time in the play appears to be a long period. Likewise, the meeting of Tamora and Aaron during the hunt, the murder of Bassianus, the ravishment of Lavinia, and the directing of suspicion for the murder of Bassianus against two sons of Titus are made to appear to occupy a long period of time. But the period of pregnancy of Tamora is passed over quickly. Only the inventor of the system of time-perspective could use it to such advantage.

In an examination of the narrated element of this play; that is, all that is told or described by characters instead of being scenically or dramatically represented, we are able to find as worthy examples as the one in The Merchant of Venice, mentioned earlier. Lucius tells of the sacrifice of Alarbus; it is not represented scenically or dramatically. The intimate relations of Aaron and Tamora are merely suggested. In like

manner are treated the ravishment of Lavinia, the execution of the two sons of Titus, and Tamora's delivery of a blackamoor child. It has been definitely established that Shakespeare used this element more effectively than any other writer, and, although Titus Andronicus is one of his earliest plays, evidence of his skill is apparent.

Contrast of high and low, great and little, noble and base, sad and merry were used to good advantage by Shakespeare. In Titus Andronicus Shakespeare shows his supremacy in this field by bringing all together and subjecting them to the dominancy of the idea that right will triumph. He also makes them subservient to the profound feeling that there is some good in everything. As has been stated elsewhere, it is easy enough to bring together such diverse material, but only the master can make a great idea and a profound feeling dominant. The high and the low are brought together in Titus and the clowns; the great and the little, in Titus and the boy Lucius; the noble and the base, in Lavinia and Tamora; and the sad and the merry, in the sadness of Bassianus and Lavinia which follows very closely the new-found happiness in their love. Sadness does outweigh happiness, it is true, but only Shakespeare could use all these diverse elements and keep the idea of right against wrong and the feeling of some good in everything predominant.

Shakespeare surpasses all other dramatists in the way in which one speech depends on or is evolved out of a preceding speech. He fills little intervals with side-dialogue. Each reply or rejoinder in his plays seems to be the rebound of the

previous speech. In Titus Andronicus Saturninus addresses the patricians in his own behalf in the opening speech of the play. Bassianus' speech, before the people, certainly follows that of Saturninus regarding the choice of an emperor. Marcus' speech is dependent upon these two, but he pleads for Titus. At this point Saturninus' aside, "How fair the tribune speaks to calm my thoughts!"[1] is most apropos. These should suffice to show that the hand of Shakespeare worked in this. Anywhere throughout this play it is evident that one speech evolves out of, or is dependent upon, the preceding one, and almost anywhere can side-dialogues like that of Saturninus be found filling up little intervals. Tamora's "O cruel, irreligious piety!"[2] and the dialogue between her two sons fill the gap between the departure of Lucius to see about the sacrifice of Alarbus, son of Tamora, and his (Lucius') return to report to his father, Titus. How clever is the reply of Lavina,

"I say, no;
I have been broad awake two hours and more."[3]

to Bassianus' query of whether it was too early for new-married ladies!

Now we turn to a consideration of Shakespeare's verse form in so far as it applies to Titus Andronicus. It is said that Shakespeare first learned to make his verse move freely and with grace within the limits of five feet. This is plainly seen in any part of Titus Andronicus, although it is marked somewhat as

1. Titus Andronicus, Act I, Sc.i, Line 46.
2. Ibid., Act I, Sc.i, 130-141. 3. Ibid., Act II, Sc.ii, 12-16.

the work of an apprentice when compared with later works of his maturity. We are told also that Shakespeare's verse developed from the recitative to the spontaneous. At first it moves obediently within the limits of metre; it gradually gains in melody, until it is slightly more than rhythmical prose. Titus Andronicus has been placed by other evidence among Shakespeare's earlier works, and, therefore, must needs be classed as recitative. This is proven further when we examine the regularity with which the verse of Titus Andronicus moves within the pentameter line. Together, these two pieces of evidence help to prove that Shakespeare wrote Titus Andronicus.

It is thought that, in Shakespeare's plays, the Caesura occurs most frequently at the end of the third foot; that is, after the sixth syllable. If Titus Andronicus is examined with this in mind it is found that Caesurae at the end of the third foot are frequent. Thus it seems logical to assume that Titus Andronicus was written by Shakespeare. Some of these, picked at random from the play, are:

Saturninus. "Thanks, sweet Lavinia.--Romans, let us go."[1.]

Titus. "What, villain boy!
Barr'st me, my way in Rome?"[2.]

Lucius. "But, soft! methinks I do digress too much,
Citing my worthless praise."[3.]

To be musical, poetry must show all the variations possible. Brief pause must be made any place between the first

1. Titus Andronicus, Act I, Sc.i, Line 273.
2. Ibid., Act I, Sc.i 290, 291. 3. Ibid., Act V, Sc.iii, 116, 117.

and the last syllable, and the place must be continually shifted. To avoid metrical chaos, however, the unbroken pentameter measure must be returned to often enough for it to be considered the standard. When one considers how early in the dramatic career of Shakespeare Titus Andronicus is supposed to have been written, one is impressed by the variety shown.

Much has been written about rhyme in Shakespeare's plays. By the number of rhyming verses it can be decided, with some accuracy, as to whether a certain play belongs to the early period of composition or to the late. Rhymes gradually diminish in number as the verse progresses from the recitative form toward the spontaneous. Yet it is quite certain that Shakespeare, with a more dramatic purpose, wrote a number of plays, with fewer rhymes and on a lower poetic key, before he wrote such as Love's Labours Lost, with its eleven hundred rhyming verses, and A Midsummer Night's Dream, with its nine hundred. It has been fairly definitely established that Titus Andronicus preceded these two plays, and, since it has in the neighbourhood of fifty rhyming verses, it might be placed in this group of fewer rhymes and lower key.

From an examination of a number of Shakespeare's plays that can be said to contain the more smoothly flowing verses of the recitative form, it has been found that the pauses or breaks come more frequently after the light syllables. Titus Andronicus, chronologically, belongs to the recitative period, and although it cannot be said emphatically that in this play, such pauses or breaks occur more frequently after the light

syllables, still it can be said that they do appear frequently after the light syllables, and thus portend the smoother verse of the later poems of this period. A few examples follow:

Bassianus. "Ay, noble Titus; and resolv'd withal
To do myself this reason and this right."[1.]

Saturninus. "What madam! be dishonour'd openly,
And basely put it up without revenge?"[2.]

Lavinia. "O, let me teach thee! for my father's sake,
That gave thee life, when well he might have slain thee,
Be not obdurate, open thy deaf ears."[3.]

It has been found that the firmest resting place for the voice, in the plays that are more markedly recitative in style, is the accented syllable or word of the fifth foot; while, in the plays belonging to the period of the spontaneous style, this syllable or word is often a proclitic on which the voice cannot place stress but must move on to the next verse. We have placed Titus Andronicus among those plays written by Shakespeare during the recitative period, and, since few, if any, verses of this play terminate with a proclitic particle, this can be cited as further evidence that Titus Andronicus is one of Shakespeare's early plays.

Extra end-syllables in Shakespeare are used to good advantage, and, although they are sometimes conventional, they are mostly organic in his verse. They are not confined to his spontaneous form of verse, however, but often occur in the

1. Titus Andronicus, Act I, Sc.i, 278, 279.
2. Ibid., Act I, Sc.i, 432, 433. 3. Ibid., Act II, Sc.iii, 158-160.

recitative as well. As in Hamlet's first soliloquy where the extra end-syllables express the impulsiveness of the speaker's feeling, so do they in different speeches in Titus Andronicus, such as in Lavinia's denunciation of Tamora:

"No grace? no womanhood? Ah, beastly creature!" [1.]

Just as an agreeable effect results when an extra end-syllable crops out after a succession of smooth verses in Gloster's soliloquy, so in Aaron's speech to Demetrius and Chiron when he is exhorting them to the dastardly ravishment of Lavinia:

"For shame, be friends, and join for that you jar:
'Tis policy and stratagem must do
That you affect; and so must you resolve,
That what you cannot as you would achieve,
You must perforce accomplish as you may.
Take this of me, Lucrece was not more chaste
Than this Lavinia, Bassianus' love." [2.]

Too as in Gloster's soliloquy in Richard III where verses with extra end-syllables mingle effectively with regular verses, so do they in the words of the boy Lucius:

"O, grandsire, grandsire, even with all my heart
Would I were dead, so you did live again!
O Lord I cannot speak to him for weeping!
My tears will choke me if I ope my mouth." [3.]

Thus we find traces of Shakespeare's able use of extra end-syllables in Titus Andronicus. More proof, it seems, that

1.Titus Andronicus, Act II, Sc.iii, 182.
2. Ibid., Act II, Sc.i, 104-108. 3. Ibid., Act V, Sc.iii, 172-175.

Shakespeare wrote this play.

Shakespeare was the first to intermingle blank verse, rhyming verse, and prose in dramatic composition. It would be practicable then to examine Titus Andronicus with this in mind, and attempt to find evidences of Shakespeare's handiwork therein in this connection. It has been definitely established that Shakespeare in his writing passes from blank verse to rhyme, from rhyme to prose, and back again to blank verse without having the reader feel conscious of such changes. Although very little prose appears in Titus Andronicus, some is spoken by the clowns in Act IV, and blank verse is interspersed through it. There is no rhymed verse intermingled, it is true, but this play is characterized by a deficiency of rhyme. As in works known to have been written by Shakespeare, so too, in Titus Andronicus, such characters as the clowns, that are not active in the higher movements of thought and feeling, speak in straightforward prose. Leading persons speak in prose when the situation does not demand idealized language. Both Titus and Marcus use prose in speaking to the clowns just as Hamlet does when he speaks to the despised Polonius.

Evidences of early Shakespearian language-shaping that is adapted to the pitch of thought and feeling, though hardly comparable with those in Othello, are to be found throughout Titus Andronicus. At the beginning of the play Saturninus, Bassianus, Marcus, and Titus all address the patricians solemnly and with dignity. Double endings such as "followers", "indignity", "approach", "undertook", and "ancestors" give

these speeches a decisive tone. Again has proof been found that Shakespeare wrote Titus Andronicus.

Lastly, in applying what has been decided generally about Shakespeare's style to Titus Andronicus, we come to his use of Anglo-Saxon and Latin in his plays. Shakespeare used Anglo-Saxon which is largely monosyllabic to express deep feeling. Are not Tamora's words to Titus when he is about to offer her eldest son as a sacrifice;

"And if thy sons were ever dear to thee,
O, think my son to be as dear to me!" [1.]

and Lavinia's when she beseeches Tamora not to let her sons ravish her:

"O Tamora, be call'd a gentle queen,
And with thine own hands kill me in this place!
For 'tis not life that I have begg'd so long;
Poor I was slain when Bassianus died." [2.]

good examples of this? Shakespeare used monosyllabic words, also, to convey an impression of close confidence, abruptness of strong feeling, and passionate grief. One example of each of these should suffice as further evidence that Shakespeare wrote this play. The words of Titus to Lavinia when he tells her how he intends to avenge the wrong done her are an example of close confidence:

"Come, come, Lavinia; look thy foes are bound.--
Sirs, stop their mouths, let them not speak to me,

1. Titus Andronicus, Act I, Sc.i, 107-108.
2. Ibid., Act II, Sc.iii, 168-171.

But let them hear what fearful words they utter.--"[1]

What better example of the abruptness of strong feeling can be found than Lavinia's words when she hears what Tamora and her two sons plan for her:

"'Tis true; the raven doth not hatch a lark." ?[2]

And the power of monosyllables to express passionate grief is shown by the words of young Lucius when he is called to the side of his dead grandsire, Titus:

"Would I were dead, so you did live again."[3]

The presence of Latin words in the vocabulary of Titus Andronicus will serve to assist us in establishing Shakespeare's authorship of the play, especially in their use in more intellectual passages and in the general tone of the play. In Act I, Scene i, Marcus uses Latin words in an intellectual dissertation:

"And welcome, nephews, from successful wars,
You that survive, and you that sleep in fame!
Fair lords, your fortunes are alike in all,
That in your country's service drew your swords;
But safer triumph is this funeral pomp,
That hath aspir'd to Solon's happiness
And triumphs over chance in honour's bed.--"[4]

Saturninus also makes use of Latin words in:

"Why, lords, what wrongs are these! was ever seen
An emperor in Rome thus overborne,

1. Titus Andronicus, Act V, Sc.ii, 167-169.
2. Ibid., Act IV, Sc.iii, 149. 3. Ibid., Act V, Sc.iii, 173.
4. Ibid., Act I, Sc.i, 172-178.

Troubled, confronted thus, and, for the extent
Of equal justice, us'd in such contempt?
However these disturbers of our peace
Buzz in people's ears, there nought hath pass'd,
But even with law, against the wilful sons
Of old Andronicus."[1.]

It can be said, generally, about the entire play that the setting is fictitiously Roman, and so for the most part, Latin words predominate. Then, too, the feeling of this poem moves by and through the ideas, and, consequently, Latin is the controlling influence.

In these respects, Titus Andronicus is characteristically Shakespearian.

Included also in literary evidence, passages that bear marked Shakespearian characteristics should be cited.

Bassianus' words, "Romans, friends, followers,"[2.] are echoed by Mark Antony in Julius Caesar in his "Friends, Romans, countrymen ..."[3.]

Demetrius, in talking about Lavinia, says:

"She is a woman, therefore may be woo'd;
She is a woman, therefore may be won;"[4.]

Gloster in Richard III speaks in similar vein about Lady Anne:

"Was ever woman in this humour woo'd?
Was ever woman in this humour won?"[5.]

1. Titus Andronicus, Act IV, Sc.iv, 1-9. 2. Ibid., Act I Sc.i,9.
3. Julius Caesar, Act III, Sc.ii, 75.
4. Titus Andronicus, Act II, Sc.i, 82, 83.
5. Richard III, Act I, Sc.ii, 228, 229.

Also in Henry VI, Part I does the Earl of Suffolk in speaking about Margaret:

"Fain would I woo her, yet I dare not speak:
I'll call for pen and ink, and write my mind:" [1.]

Titus Andronicus, after his victorious return to Rome, speaks as follows:

"Hail, Rome, victorious in thy mourning weeds!
Lo, as the bark that hath discharg'd her fraught
Returns with precious lading to the bay
From whence at first she weigh'd her anchorage,
Cometh Andronicus, bound with laurel boughs,
To re-salute his country with his tears,
Tears of true joy for his return to Rome.--" [2.]

Tamora in beseeching that her son be spared says:

"Wilt thou draw near the nature of the gods?
Draw near them then in being merciful;
Sweet mercy is nobility's true badge." [3.]

These two speeches are similar in some respects to the famous mercy speech of Portia in The Merchant of Venice beginning: [4.]

"The quality of mercy is not strained;"

Other passages bear marked Shakespearian characteristics. The concluding line of Demetrius' words to his mother and his surviving brother:

"To quit the bloody wrongs upon her foes." [5.]

1. I Henry VI, Act V, Sc.i, 78,79.
2. Titus Andronicus, Act I, Sc.i, 70-76. 3. Ibid., Act I, Sc.i, (117-119.
4. The Merchant of Venice, Act IV, Sc.i, 183.
5. Titus Andronicus, Act I, Sc.i, 141.

is one of these, as is also the first line of Lucius' report to his father after feeding Alarbus to the sacrificial flames:

"See, lord and father, how we have performed
Our Roman rites;"[1.]

In the opening words of Titus, in Act II, Scene ii, the work of Shakespeare seems apparent:

"The hunt is up, the morn is bright and gray,
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,
And rouse the prince and ring a hunter's peal,
That all the court may echo with the noise."[2.]

Tamora's words to Aaron, in Act II, Scene iii, are worthy of Shakespeare when she says:

"My lovely Aaron, wherefore look'st thou sad,
When everything doth make a gleeful boast?
The birds chant melody on every bush,
The snake likes rolled in the cheerful sun,
The green leaves quiver with the cooling wind
And make a chequer'd shadow on the ground:"[3.]

Marcus, in describing Lavinia after her ravishment by Chiron and Demetrius, uses words with a Shakespearian touch:

"O, that delightful engine of her thoughts,
That blabb'd them with such pleasing eloquence,
Is torn from forth that pretty hollow cage

1. Titus Andronicus, Act I, Sc.i, 142. 2.Ibid., Act II, Sc.i,1,6.
3. Ibid., Act II, Sc.iii, 10-15.

Where, like a sweet melodious bird, it sung
Such varied notes, enchanting every ear!" [1.]

In the same act and scene Titus gives us further evidence that Shakespeare wrote this play when he says:

"It was my deer, and he that wounded her
Hath hurt me more than had he kill'd me dead;
For now I stand as one upon a rock
Environ'd with a wilderness of sea,
Who marks the waxing tide grow wave by wave,
Expecting ever when some envious surge
Will in his brinish bowels swallow him." [2.]

Again Tamora speaks words that seem to be conceived by Shakespeare in:

"King, be thy thoughts imperious, like thy name.
Is the sun dimm'd, that gnats do fly in it?
The eagle suffers little birds to sing,
And is not careful what they mean thereby,
Knowing that with the shadow of his wings
He can at pleasure stint their melody;" [3.]

Similarly the following words of Titus seem to be by the master:

"I am not mad; I know thee well enough.
Witness this wretched stump, witness these crimson lines;
Witness these trenches made by grief and care;
Witness the tiring day and heavy night;
Witness all sorrow, that I know thee well

1. Titus Andronicus, Act III, Sc.i, 82-86.
2. Ibid., Act III, Sc.i, 91-97. 3. Ibid., Act IV, Sc.iv, 81-86.

For our proud empress, mighty Tamora.
Is not thy coming for my other hand?"[1.]

In conclusion another passage of Shakespearian merit is that uttered by Lucius to his son:

"Many a time he danc'd thee on his knee,
Sung thee to sleep, his loving breast thy pillow;
Many a matter hath he told to thee,
Meet and agreeing with thine infancy:
In that respect, then, like a loving child,
Shed yet some small drops from thy tender spring,
Because kind nature doth require it so;
Friends should associate friends in grief and woe."[2.]

Other passages there are throughout the play that show evidence of Shakespeare's hand, but the foregoing seem to be sufficiently representative, and can be taken to prove that Shakespeare wrote Titus Andronicus.

Thus in every part of the literary evidence examined there have been found sufficient facts to warrant our placing of Titus Andronicus among Shakespeare's plays.

1. Titus Andronicus, Act V, Scene ii, 28-34.
2. Titus Andronicus, Act V, Scene iii, 160-168.

FACTUAL EVIDENCE.

We turn now to our discussion of the factual evidence. This will take the form of an examination of the opinions of leading Shakespearian scholars regarding the authorship of Titus Andronicus. To examine, in detail, all opinions on this matter seems unnecessary, but representative findings must be considered.

Since we have, to our satisfaction, established Shakespeare as the author of Titus Andronicus through our study of the historical, the social, and the literary evidence, let us see how this premise is substantiated by Charles Knight.

This able student of Shakespeare tells us that it is difficult to accept Hallam's opinion that "in criticism of all kinds we must acquire a dogged habit of resisting testimony, when res ipsa per se vociferatur to the contrary."[1.] Knight goes on to say that the res ipsa may be looked upon through very different media by different minds, and testimony that is clear and free from bias must be received and cannot be doggedly resisted. Hallam's decision, that by common consent Titus Andronicus is denied to be Shakespeare's, is countered by Knight's assertion that there is a school of thought that places Titus Andronicus as a Shakespearian product in every sense. The German critics, he goes on to say, reject the opinion of those English critics that refuse Shakespeare any part in writing this play, and follows by saying that the subject, therefore, is worthy of much consideration.

Knight then presents his external evidence, and in doing

1. Literature of Europe, vol.ii, page 385.

so constantly refers to the state of early English drama, the probable tendencies of the poet's own mind when he produced his first dramas, the position in which he found himself in respect to his audiences, the struggle which he must have had in trying to reconcile the practical and the ideal, the popular and the true, and, finally, the process which Shakespeare must have employed in reaching superiority over his contemporaries. One can easily say that the versification of Titus Andronicus is much inferior to that of A Midsummer Night's Dream. Titus can be shown to rave and denounce without moving terror or pity, and Lear to tear up the whole heart and lay bare all the hidden springs of thought and passion that elevate madness into sublimity. This, Knight says, is not just criticism. First, we must trace relation, not likeness; and if likeness is found in a "single trick or line" it may be added to the evidence of relation. Relation, too, continues Knight, may be established even out of dissimilarity. The progress of the great intellects of the world, traced through doubts, fears, throes, and plunges of genius, shows that excellence in art is attained by contest and purification. To prove this point, Knight quotes from Franz Horn who, in part, says that a mediocre nature finds itself easily,but the richest and most powerful poetic nature that the world has ever seen could not do that. This rich nature would naturally, through the expression of error in song, find what quickens the truth. Horn goes on to say that the elegiac tone of his juvenile poems reveals deep passions. This was not enough for him. He very soon wanted to tell what

the world seemed to him. There are errors. it is true, but the man who could write Lear could not have written it as a youth. He gave in Titus Andronicus what the world seemed to him at the time. More could be written, at this point, from Horn's treatment of Titus Andronicus, but it is sufficient to say that Horn considered Shakespeare to be the author of the play in every sense of the word. He does not give any credence to the thought that Shakespeare might have written a part or helped the author to revise it.

Knight also makes reference to Malone who was of the opinion just stated. Malone based this upon Ravenscroft's idle tradition. Boswell was of the same opinion. In dealing with such beliefs, Knight discusses drama briefly. He says that drama is of the highest poetical art, because a play "which fully realizes the objects of a scenic exhibition requires a nicer combination of excellences, and involves higher difficulties, than belong to any other species of poetry."[1.] If the qualities of invention, power of language, and versification be equal in two men, and one devote himself to dramatic poetry, the other to narrative poetry, the former is more likely to fail than the latter. Dialogue, and especially the imagery, of a dramatic poet are secondary to the invention of the plot, the management of the action, and the conception of the characters. Language is merely the drapery of the beings that the dramatic poet's imagination has created. They must be placed by the poet in the various relations which they must maintain

1. The Pictorial Edition of the Works of Shakespere. Edited by Charles Knight. The Second Edition, Revised. Doubtful Plays. Page 50

through a long and often complicated action. The poet must see the whole action vividly, as it would appear to an audience, and the pantomime must be acted over and over in his mind, before the actors are given voice. When this is done and the contradictions removed, the obscurities cleared, the interest prolonged, and the catastrophe matured, the design is complete. One of the reasons for Shakespeare's superiority over his contemporaries, to continue with Knight, is his power of combination by which the action of his drama is constantly sustained. In the works of his contemporaries, with few exceptions, the action flags or breaks down into description, or is carried off by imagery. Knight names Christopher Marlowe and Philip Massinger as the best of Shakespeare's contemporaries, and he says that they do what Shakespeare never does -- speak from the mouths of the puppets. When this happens, characterization is lost and action is forgotten. Shakespeare, according to Knight, was not a line-maker, and, therefore, it is absurd to think that Shakespeare added here and there to Titus Andronicus. The passages, that Malone thought were Shakespeare's and marked with inverted commas, could not have been written except by the man who conceived the action and the characterization. To substantiate this, Knight discusses the character of Tamora. He thinks that Tamora is the presiding genius of the piece. Strong passions, ready wit, perfect self-possession, and a sort of oriental imagination place her apart from ordinary women. It is from her lips that much of the poetical language of the play comes. Some examples are:

"The birds chant melody on every bush;
The snake lies rolled in the cheerful sun;
The green leaves quiver with the cooling wind,
And make a chequer'd shadow on the ground:
Under their sweet shade, Aaron, let us sit,
And-whilst the babbling echo mocks the hounds,
Replying shrilly to the well-turn'd horns,
As if a double hunt were heard at once,--
Let us sit down."[1.]

"A barren detested vale, you see, it is:
The trees, though summer, yet forlorn and lean,
O'ercome with moss and baleful misseltoe.
Here never shines the sun; here nothing breeds,
Unless the nightly owl, or fatal raven.
And, when they show'd me this abhorred pit,
They told me, here, at dead time of the night,
A thousand fiends, a thousand hissing snakes,
Ten thousand swelling toads, as many urchins,
Would make such fearful and confused cries,
As any mortal body, hearing it,
Should straight fall mad, or else die suddenly."[2.]

"King, be thy thoughts imperious like thy name.
Is the sun dimm'd,that gnats do fly in it?
The eagle suffers little birds to sing,
And is not careful what they mean thereby;

1. Titus Andronicus, Act II, Scene iii, 12-20.
2. Titus Andronicus, Act II, Scene iii, 93-104.

Knowing that, with the shadow of his wing,
He can at pleasure stint their melody."[1.]

"Know thou, sad man, I am not Tamora;
She is thy enemy, and I thy friend:
I am Revenge; sent from the infernal kingdom,
To ease the gnawing vulture of thy mind,
By working wreakful vengeance on thy foes.
Come down, and welcome me to this world's light."[2.]

Malone marked the first two of these as additions made by Shakespeare. Knight claims that, had he used Malone's theory, he would have marked the others and more, too, of the lines spoken by Tamora. Furthermore, Knight holds that the lines could not have been produced, according to Malone's theory, even by Shakespeare. Poetry, and especially dramatic poetry, cannot be regarded as a bit of joiner's work. The lines quoted are not to be listed amongst Shakespeare's highest, but they could not have been produced except under the full swing of his dramatic power. Continuing, Knight states that it would be equally just to say that the well-defined traits of character, which stand out from the physical horror of the play, were superadded by Shakespeare to the work of a less able man. Aaron, the Moor, is a villain or a fiend, and is to be detested, but Shakespeare makes him human when he shows his affection for his child in these words:

"Come on, you thick-lipp'd slave, I'll bear you hence;

1. Titus Andronicus, Act IV, Scene iv, 81-86.
2. Titus Andronicus, Act V, Scene ii, 28-33.

For it is you that puts us to our shifts:
I'll make you feed on berries, and on roots,
And feed on curds and whey, and suck the goat,
And cabin in a cave; and bring you up
To be a warrior and command a camp."[1.]

Knight asks if Shakespeare could have added these lines in mending another man's work, and adds that such a system would do for an article but not for a play. He further wants to know if Shakespeare put these lines:

"Come hither, boy; come, come and learn of us
To melt in showers: Thy grandsire lov'd thee well:
Many a time he danc'd thee on his knee,
Sung thee to sleep, his loving breast thy pillow;
Many a matter hath he told to thee,
Meet and agreeing with thine infancy;
In that respect then, like a loving child,
Shed yet some small drops from thy tender spring,
Because kind nature doth require it so."[2.]

into the mouth of Lucius, when he calls his son to weep over the body of Titus. Knight tells us that Malone did not mark these at all, and suggests that they are too simple to be included in his poetical gems. Knight continues that they are full to overflowing of those deep thoughts of human love which the great poet of the affections has sent into so many loving hearts. Knight informs us that Malone marks with commas the

1. Titus Andronicus, Act IV, Scene iii, 175-180.
2. Ibid., Act V, Scene iii, 160-168.

address to the tribunes at the beginning of the third act. The lines are lofty and rhetorical; a poet who had undertaken to add set speeches to another man's characters might have added these. But Malone does not mark one line which has no rhetoric in it and does not look like poetry. The old man has given his hand to the treacherous Aaron to save his sons' lives, but the messinger brings him the heads of his sons. Marcus and Lucius burst into passion. Titus, for some time, does not speak, and when he does, speaks only one line:

"When will this fearful slumber have an end?"[1.]

Knight doubts that such a line was made to order. He says that the poet who wrote that line conceived the whole situation.

From this point Knight continues with a dissertation on the evidence of Shakespearian versification in Titus Andronicus. He discards Malone's theory on the matter as a fallacy, and, although it does, like Henry VI, want the

"Linked sweetness long drawn out"[2.]

of later plays, Knight says that so, too, do The Two Gentlemen of Verona and The Comedy of Errors. In part, he goes on to say that after the first scene of Titus Andronicus, in which the author sets out with the stately pace of his time, we are carried away, by the power of the language, the variety of the pause, and the freedom with which trochees are used at the ends of lines, to forget that the versification is not altogether upon the best Shakespearian model. The instrument is there, but the performer has not fully realized its scope and power.

1. Titus Andronicus, Act III, Scene i, 253.
2. L'Allegro, John Milton, 140.

Knight refers again to Horn, and this time mentions Horn's remark on the language of Titus Andronicus. According to this Shakespearian scholar we first of all recognize with praise the almost never-wearying power of the language. Shakespeare does not resort to feeble Ohs! and Ahs! as do many of the French and German tragedians, who have their princes and princesses satisfy themselves to silence with Helas! Oh Ciel! O Schicksal! and similar cheap outcries. Shakespeare, for every degree of pain, knew how to give the right tone and the right colour. In the bloody sea of this drama, in which men scarcely keep themselves afloat, this, without doubt, in Horn's estimation, must have been difficult. Knight continues that other old English dramatists had the same power as the author of Titus Andronicus of grappling with words befitting situations, but their besetting sin was the constant use of "huffing, braggart, puft" language, which Shakespeare did not use in dramas, which all agree to call his, and of which there is a very sparing portion in Titus Andronicus. There was, at every turn, a temptation to use such language, but when Titus kills Mutius, the young man's brother says:

"My lord, you are unjust."[1.]

And when Marcus encounters his mutilated niece there is much poetry but no raving. Then in his crowning agony Titus utters:

"Why, I have not another tear to shed."[2.]

Next, Knight deals with the assumption that Shakespeare has given us no other tragedy constructed upon the principle

1. Titus Andronicus, Act I, Sc.i, 203. 2.Ibid., Act III, Sc.i, 267.

of Titus Andronicus. He says that we cannot be sure of this because we do not know what the first Hamlet was. When the quarto of 1603 is compared with the finished play, we are able to study the growth of Shakespeare's command of language, his dramatic skill, the higher qualities of his intellect, his profound philosophy, and his wonderful penetration of what is most hidden and obscure in men's characters and motives. In the sketch of 1603 all the action of the perfect Hamlet is to be found, but the profundity of the character is absent. There is little of the thoughtful philosophy or of the morbid feelings of Hamlet. Knight, however, suggests that we imagine an earlier sketch in which that wonderful creation of Hamlet's character may have been still more unformed and in which the poet may have simply proposed to exhibit in the young man a desire for revenge combined with irresolution or even madness. Knight suggests that if we make a common dramatic character the tragedy becomes a tragedy of blood. It does not offend us now, softened and almost hidden in the atmosphere of poetry and philosophy that surrounds it. If we look at it merely with reference to the action and to the materials of which it is made, we find a ghost described, a ghost appearing, a play within a play, and that a play of murder, Polonius killed, the ghost again, Ophelia mad and self-destroyed, the struggle between Hamlet and Laertes at the grave, the queen poisoned, Laertes killed with a poisoned sword, the king killed by Hamlet, and, finally, Hamlet's death. No wonder Fortinbras exclaims:

"This quarry cries on havoc."[1.]

Knight concludes his evidence by referring to another early Shakespearian tragedy, Romeo and Juliet. He mentions the belief that there was an earlier sketch of it than the one published in 1597. It may be said, according to Knight, of the delicious poetry that it makes the charnel-house "a feasting presence full of light." He suggests, on the other hand, that we imagine a Romeo and Juliet conceived in the immaturity of the young Shakespeare's power -- a tale of love but surrounded with horror. There is enough for the excitement of an uninstructed audience: the contest between the houses, Mercutio killed, Tybalt killed, the apparent death of Juliet, Paris killed in the church-yard, Romeo swallowing poison, Juliet stabbing herself. The marvel is that the surpassing power of the poet should make us forget that Romeo and Juliet can present such an aspect. All the changes, which we know Shakespeare made in Hamlet and in Romeo and Juliet, were to work out the peculiar theory of his mature judgment -- that the terrible should be held, as it were, in solution by the beautiful, so as to produce a tragic consistent with pleasurable emotion.

By the foregoing evidence Knight leaves no doubt about Shakespeare's authorship of Titus Andronicus.

Let us now examine briefly Verplanck's treatment of Titus Andronicus in regard to its author.

This Shakespearian scholar begins by saying that a great majority of English Shakespearian editors, commentators, and critics, including some of the highest names in literature, have agreed in rejecting this bloody and repulsive tragedy as

wholly unworthy of Shakespeare and therefore, erroneously ascribed to him. Yet the external evidence of his authorship, which is the same as that presented previously as Historical Evidence, and will not be outlined again, according to Verplanck, is exceedingly strong, and, although thrown aside by a host of critics without any plausible attempt to explain how the error arose and why it prevailed so generally and so long, cannot be disposed of so easily. The argument rests almost entirely upon the apparent inferiority of this play of accumulated physical horrors to the alleged author's other tragedies, and its difference from their style and versification, so great as to be judged incompatible with their proceeding from the same author. Verplanck offers his opinion that it is unphilosophical and in contradiction to the experience of literary history, to reject all external evidence as being incompetent to oppose the internal indications of taste, talent, and style. To uphold this opinion Verplanck refers to Sir Walter Scott's last novel which shows no want of learning and of labour. It, claims Verplanck, would be ejected from his works on account of its fatal inferiority to all his other prose and verse, had his biographers chosen, from any reason of delicacy, to veil from us the melancholy cause of its inferiority, in the broken spirits and flagging intellect of its admirable author.

Verplanck continues in this vein by adding that it is possible to enumerate several of Dryden's works which would hardly stand this test of authenticity; but it will be enough to mention his deplorable and detestable tragedy of Amboyna,

written in the meridian of his faculties, yet as bloody and revolting as Titus Andronicus, and far more gross, and this without any redeeming touch of genius or feeling.

This rule, Verplanck suggests, should be sparingly applied more especially to the juvenile efforts of men of genius. He refers to Jonson's mention of Titus Andronicus in his Induction to Bartholomew Fair which places the writing of Titus Andronicus at the time when Shakespeare was scarcely twenty-one years of age, if not still a minor. He goes on then to mention Hours of Idleness by George Gordon, Lord Byron, published when the author was but twenty. Lord Byron's education and precocious acquaintance with the world had given him far greater advantages for early literary exploit than Shakespeare could have possibly enjoyed; yet, claims Verplanck, it is no exaggeration of the merits of Titus Andronicus to say that, with all its defects, it approximates more to its author's after excellence than the commonplace mediocrity of Byron's juvenile efforts to any of his works by which his subsequent fame was won. Swift's poor Pindaric Odes, written after he had attained manhood, might be denied to be his for the same or similar reasons, as differing in every respect, of degree and kind, from the talent and taste he afterwards exhibited -- as too extravagant and absurd to have been written by the author of the transparent prose, strong sense, and sarcastic wit of Gulliver; and equally incompatible with the mind of the inventor of that agreeable variety of English verse, in its lightest, easiest, simplest dress

"which he was born to introduce;

Refined it first, and showed its use."

Verplanck goes on to say that critics have vied with one another in loading this play with epithets of contempt. He, himself, feels that, as compared with the higher products of dramatic poetry, it has little to recommend it. But in itself, and for its times, it was very far from giving the indication of an unpoetical or undramatic mind. Verplanck offers as proof of this that it was long a popular favourite on the stage. It is full of defects, but these are precisely such as a youthful aspirant, in an age of authorship, would be most likely to exhibit -- such as the subjection to the taste of the day, good or bad, and the absence of that dramatic truth and reality which some experience of human passion, and observation of life and manners, can alone give the power to produce.

Verplanck continues with his examination of Titus Andronicus. He terms it a tragedy of coarse horror, but he says that it was in the fashion and taste of the times, and, accordingly, stands in the same relation to the other popular dramas of the age that the juvenile attempts of Swift and Byron do to the poetry of their day which had excited their ambition. But it differs from their early writings in this, that while they fall very much below their models, this tragedy is at least equal to the once admired tragedies of Peele and Kyd, and if inferior in degree and power, yet not of an inferior class to the scenes of Marlowe and Green, the models of dramatic art and genius of their times. Theatrical audiences had not yet been taught to be thrilled "with grateful terror" without the presence of physical

suffering; and the author of Titus Andronicus made them, in Macbeth's phrase, "sup full with horrors." He gave them stage effect and interest such as they liked, stately declamation, with some passages of truer feeling, and others of pleasing imagery. It is not in human nature that a boy author should be able to develop and portray the emotions and passions of Lear and Iago. It was much that he could raise them dimly before "his mind's eye", and give some imperfect outline and foreshadowing of them in Aaron and Andronicus. He who could do all this in youth and inexperience, might, when he had found his own strength, do much more. The boy author of Titus Andronicus, in Verplanck's opinion, might well have written King Lear twenty years later.

Continuing, Verplanck explains that the rather scant resemblance of diction and versification of Titus Andronicus to after works may also be ascribed to the same cause. We do not need the experience or authority of Dryden to prove that the mastery of "the numbers of his mother tongue" is one of the gifts which "nature never gives the young."

The young poet, born in an age and country having a cultivated poetic literature, good or bad, must, until he has formed his own ear by practice, and thus too by practice made his language take the impress and colour of his own mind, echo and repeat the tune of his instructors. This may be observed in Shakespeare's earlier comedies; and, to Verplanck's ear, many lines and passages of Titus Andronicus, such as the speech of Tamora in Act II, Scene ii, beginning "The birds chant melodies

in every bush", and in the same scene the lines from the same person beginning "A barren detested vale you see it is," recall the rhythm and taste of much of the poetry of The Two Gentlemen of Verona. The matchless freedom of dramatic dialogue and emotion, and of lyrical movement -- the grand organ swell of contemplative harmony, were all to be afterwards acquired by repeated trial and continued practice. The versification and melody of Titus Andronicus are nearer to those of Shakespeare's two or three earlier comedies, thinks Verplanck, than those are to the solemn harmony of Prospero's majestic morality.

Verplanck continues by saying that he cannot find, in Titus Andronicus, any proof of the scholar-like familiarity with Greek and Roman literature that Steevens asserts it to contain, and, therefore, to be as much above Shakespeare's reach in learning as beneath him in genius. This lauded scholarship does not go beyond such slight schoolboy familiarity with the more popular Latin poets read in schools, and with its mythology, and some hackneyed scraps of quotation such as the poet has often shown elsewhere. The neglect of all accuracy of history, and of its costumes, the confusion of ancient Rome with modern and Christian habits, are more analogous to Shakespeare's own irregular acquirements than to the manner of a regularly trained scholar. To add proof to his findings Verplanck quotes Hallam as saying of the undisputed Roman tragedies that it is evident that Roman character and Roman manners are not exhibited in them with the precision of a scholar. If this be true of the historical dramas composed in the fullness of the

poet's knowledge and talent, Verplanck thinks that the same sort of defects will be found in Titus Andronicus and carried to greater excess. The story is put together without any historical basis or any congruity with any period of Roman history. The Tribune of the people is represented as an efficient popular magistrate, while there is an elective yet despotic emperor. The personages are pagans appealing to Apollo, Pallas, Juno, or Mercury, while at the beginning of the play we find a wedding conducted according to the Catholic ritual with "priest and holy water,"[1] and tapers that "burn so bright,"[2] and at the end an allusion to a Christian funeral, with burial and "mourning weeds"[3] and "mournful bell."[4]

For all these reasons Verplanck is so far from rejecting this play as spurious that he regards it as a valuable and curious evidence of its author's -- Shakespeare's --intellectual progress.

Further examination of the findings of pro-Shakespearian scholars seems unnecessary, but in justice to those who, in their opinions, thought Shakespeare had nothing to do with Titus Andronicus, and those who thought that he merely added to the play, we should examine the words of some that are representative of these two groups.

The judgment of the first of these groups is given by Johnson who says, in part, that all the editors and critics agree in supposing this play to be spurious. He adds that he

1.Titus Andronicus, Act I, Sc.i, 323. 2.Ibid., Act I, Sc.i,324.
3. Ibid., Act V, Sc.iii, 96. 4. Ibid., Act V, Sc.iii, 97.

sees no reason for differing from them because the colour of the style is wholly different from that of other plays, and he goes on to say that there is, in the play, an attempt at regular versification and artificial closes, not always inelegant, yet seldom pleasing. He thinks the barbarity of the scenes and the general massacre which are exhibited can scarcely be conceived tolerable to any audience, yet we are told by Jonson that they were not only borne but praised. That Shakespeare wrote any part of it, though Theobald declares it incontestable, Johnson sees no reason for believing. The treatment of Knight and the treatment of Verplanck refute quite definitely what Johnson has to say.

Hallam who also believes that Shakespeare had nothing to do with Titus Andronicus says that the play is, by common consent, denied to be in any sense a production of Shakespeare. Very few passages, in fact, Hallam thinks not one, resemble Shakespeare's manner. Knight again has disposed of this opinion very ably.

To this second group, also, belongs Dowden. He says that, regardless of the strong external evidence of Meres and of Heminge and Condell, it is difficult to admit Titus Andronicus to the period of Shakespeare's tentative dramatic efforts. He says that this tragedy belongs to the pre-Shakespearian school of bloody dramas, and, if any portion of it be from Shakespeare's hand, it merely shows that there was a period of Shakespeare's authorship when he yielded to the popular influences of the day and hour. Dowden feels that other early writings of

Shakespeare will not let him believe that Shakespeare himself entered with passion or energy into the literary movement which the Spanish Tragedy of Kyd may be taken to represent. Continuing, Dowden thinks that the supposed sturm and drang period of Shakespeare's artistic career exists only in the imagination of his German critics. Dowden is of the opinion that the early years of Shakespeare's authorship were years of bright and tender play of fancy and of feeling. If an epoch of storm and stress arrived at any period, it was when Shakespeare's genius had reached its full maturity and Lear was a product of that period. But, if the storm and stress were prolonged and urgent, Shakespeare possessed sufficient power of endurance, and had obtained sufficient grasp of the strong sure roots of life to save him from being borne away into the chaos or in any direction across the borders of the ordered realm of art. Upon the whole, concludes Dowden, Titus Andronicus may be disregarded. Again, however, it can be said that the evidence so far examined favouring Shakespeare's authorship of Titus Andronicus is sufficiently strong to cast this testimony of Dowden's aside with the other of the anti-Shakespearian school.

In the second group, already represented in this treatise by Ravenscroft and Malone whose evidence in both cases has been blasted by that of Knight and Verplanck, is a man by the name of Stokes. He tells us that Meres' mention of Shakespeare in connection with Titus Andronicus places the subject of authorship beyond doubt, but he feels that the classical allusions

and the peculiar words compel us to adopt Ravenscroft's tradition that it is only an old play revised by Shakespeare. He is not able to tell us in what year the revision took place, but adds that it must have been before 1598, when Meres mentions it. The members of this group do not, like the others, disregard Mere's evidence, but they are strongly entrenched in their belief that Shakespeare merely added to Titus Andronicus. Knight's treatment of the theory that is given credence by such scholars has been written at length elsewhere so that it seems unnecessary to again enunciate it. Suffice it to say that it does not seem possible that superimposed speeches and passages can be detected in Titus Andronicus. It is the work of one man, William Shakespeare.

Thus the factual evidence establishes more firmly our findings that Titus Andronicus was written by Shakespeare.

CONCLUSION.

The conclusion can be stated briefly. William Shakespeare wrote Titus Andronicus. No further reiteration of evidence is necessary; the findings point conclusively to Shakespeare's authorship and are held together by the three-fold cord of testimony -- Langbaine's word for it that it was acted and printed in 1594; Mere's mention of it in 1598; and its inclusion in the first folio of 1623 by Heminge and Condell.

Bibliography.

A History of English Literature
Edited by John Buchan
With an Introduction by
Sir Henry Newbolt.

A History of English Literature
By Emile Legouis and Louis Cazamian.

An Introduction to The Study of Shakespeare
By Hiram Corson, LL.D.

Chambers's Cyclopaedia of English Literature
New Edition by David Patrick, LL.D. and
J. Liddell Geddie, M.A.

Characters of Shakespeare's Plays
Lectures on The English Poets
By William Hazlitt.

How To Study Shakespeare (Series I, II, III, IV)
By William H. Fleming.

Introduction to Shakespeare's Tragedies
Short Studies in English Literature No. XII.

On Reading Shakespeare
By Logan Pearsall Smith.

Pictorial Edition of The Works of Shakspere
Edited by Charles Knight.

Shakespeare's Life and Work
By Sidney Lee.

Shakespeare's Theatre
By Ashley H. Thorndike, Ph.D., L.H.D.

Shakespeare's Tragedy of Titus Andronicus
Edited, with Notes, by William J. Rolfe, Litt.D.

Shakespeare Truth and Tradition
By John Semple Smart, M.A., D.Litt.

Bibliography (cont'd.)

Shakespearian Tragedy - Lectures on Hamlet,
Othello, King Lear, Macbeth
By A. C. Bradley.

Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art
By Edward Dowden, LL.D.

The Approach to Shakespeare. The "Teaching of English"Series
General Editor - Sir Henry Newbolt.
With an Introduction by Mrs. Andrew Lang.

The Cambridge History of English Literature
Edited by Sir A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller.

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare
Comprising His Plays and Poems also
The History of His Life, His Will and
An Introduction to Each Play
To Which are added
An Index to The Characters and An Authentic Glossary
Illustrated with original designs by T. M. Matterson
Engraved by Alexander Anderson.
World Syndicate Company, Inc.
New York, Cleveland.

The Complete Works of William Shakespeare
Introduction by Temple Scott
With Copious Notes and Comments
By Henry Norman Hudson, M.A.,
Israel Gollancz, M.A., C. H. Herford, Litt.D.,
and Numerous Other Eminent
Shakespearian Authorities.
Hearst's International Library Co. Publishers
New York.

The Shakespeare Apocrypha
Edited by C. F. Tucker Brooke, B.Litt.

What is Shakespeare?
An Introduction to The Great Plays
By L. A. Sherman.