

u.w.

REPORT  
of  
Committee on Thesis

The undersigned, acting as a Committee of  
the Graduate School, have read the accompanying  
thesis submitted by Clara E. Hegg  
for the degree of Master of Arts  
They approve it as a thesis meeting the require-  
ments of the Graduate School of the University of  
Minnesota, and recommend that it be accepted in  
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of Master of Arts.

Harold Craig  
Chairman

E. P. Kull

Richard B. ...

June 3 1917

UNIVERSITY OF  
MINNESOTA  
LIBRARY

REPORT  
of  
COMMITTEE ON EXAMINATION

This is to certify that we the undersigned, as a Committee of the Graduate School, have given Clara E. Hegg final oral examination for the degree of Master of Arts. We recommend that the degree of Master of Arts be conferred upon the candidate.

Minneapolis, Minnesota

June 3 1917

Harold Craig  
Chairman

E. P. Kull

Richard Buxton

Gioel Bothue

13 Dec 7, 1918

THE RELATION OF THE TAMING OF THE SHREW  
AND  
THE TAMING OF A SHREW.

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE  
FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

BY  
CLARA ELLIDA HFGG.

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF HER REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS  
JUNE  
1917.

MOM

H362

1.

The unorthodox view that TTS is the source of TAS.

Among the critics who consider TTS an earlier play than TAS are Creizenach<sup>(1)</sup> and Hickson<sup>(2)</sup> though Creizenach is the only<sup>(3)</sup> one who has written at length on this subject. Though Ten Brink<sup>(4)</sup> and Tolman<sup>(4)</sup> hold peculiar views they would be classed with Creizenach. Since Creizenach alone among the critics has tried to prove his position it will be necessary to give his views at the outset.

In his chapter on "Die gezähmte Widerspenstige" Creizenach<sup>(5)</sup> makes this statement:- Ich halte die gewöhnliche Annahme für unrichtig wonach die Taming of a Shrew nicht ein Plagiat sondern die Vorlage von Shakespeares Lustspiel sein soll. Hinsichtlich ist es allerdings schwer zu entscheiden ob wir in dem anonymen Stück eine unvollkommene Vorstufe oder einen unvollkommenen Ablatsch Shakespeares vor uns haben wenn es auch im ersten Falle befremden musste, dass hier Shakespeares Verfahren dem älteren Drama gegenüber ein ganz anderes wäre, als bei Dramen wie König Johann und König Lear in denen ohne Zweifel frühere Stücke benutzt sind: wir mussten annehmen dass Shakespeare sich viel enger als sonst an seine Vorlage ausgeschlossen und auch auffallend viele Stellen wörtlich übernommen hätte. In den Biancaszenen tritt der Sachverhalt viel deutlicher hervor, hier hält sich Shakespeare viel gen-

(1). Creizenach, Geschichte des neuern Dramas IV. p. 686.

(2). Notes and Queries I. 1850. p. 345.

(3). Jahrbuch XLIII. p. 94.

(4). Tolman, Hamlet and other essays. p.

(5). Geschichte des neuern Dramas IV. p. 694.

auer an das italienische Vorbild, er ist offenbar das Zwischenglied zwischen Ariost und dem Anonymus, dessen Abweichungen an einiger Stellen sich nur dadurch erklären lassen, dasz er liederlich arbeitete, an anderen wiederum dadurch, dasz er durch willkürliche Änderungen sich ein Schein von Originalitet geben wollte."

So far, then, Creizenach has told us 1. that he considers TTS not TAS the original, 2. that it is difficult to distinguish whether we have in the Petruchio- Katherine scenes of TAS an incomplete first attempt or a feeble imitation; 3. that if Shakespeare's play was the later play he kept more closely to the source than he did in plays like King John and King Lear in which he used old plays and in many instances adopted the exact words of the old play TAS; 4. that in the Bianca scenes the fact comes out more plainly for here Shakespeare follows the Italian source more closely and is the connecting link between Ariosto and TAS.

These, then, are his main statements. As proof he gives the following points which he considers inconceivable if TAS were the earlier play:-

1. Aurelius, the son of the Duke of Sestos disguises himself as the son of a rich merchant of Sestos and begs his servant to assume his role as the Duke of Sestos. This disguise is purposeless. Nothing is said about Aurelius fearing he will not be received by Philema's father if he appears in his own role. (6)

2. The disguise of Valeria as Katherine's music teacher is given only for the purpose of the violent scene between the music teacher and the shrew. (7)

---

(6). Geschichte des neuern Dramas IV. p. 695.

(7). Ibid.

3. Later Valeria appears at Aurelius' wedding in the role of his master, the prince of Sestos. This scene in TAS, says Creizenach is not motivated and has as its only purpose to make possible the situation which arises when the father arrives and finds Valeria disguised as his son. (8)

4. In TTS the last test to which Katherine's obedience is put is on the way to Padua where they meet Vincentio. Here the scene furthers the plot as Vincentio learns of the marriage of his son through Petruchio. In TAS only the grotesque jokes are given and these have no significance on the bearing of the plot. (9)

It is Creizenach's theory that the author of TAS, without doubt, an actor of a rival company, wrote the play to compete with TTS and remembering beautiful portions of Marlowe's tragedies he used these on inappropriate occasions. (10) According to Creizenach the taming scene, aside from its coarseness, resembled Shakespeare very closely.

However, TAS has what Creizenach considers a new feature when Ferando brings Katherine food on the point of the dagger. It is only in the scene with Valeria that we get an idea of Katherine's shrewishness and there, says Creizenach, Valeria behaves so contemptibly that Kate is justified. Creizenach assuming TTS the earlier play pronounces TAS more independent than TTS in Katherine's last long speech which closes with the thought that women should lay their hands under their husband's feet. This speech in TAS is actually accompanied by the appropriate gesture which is omitted

---

(8). Ibid.

(9). Ibid.p. 696.

(10).Ibid.

in Shakespeare. Creizenach pronounces the comic parts also more  
 independent in TAS. <sup>(11)</sup>

In a foot-note he refers to Hickson <sup>(12)</sup> who also believes  
 TTS the source of TAS-To support his theory Hickson notes several  
 parallel passages which contain jokes misunderstood in TAS but un-  
 derstood in TTS. Some of these passages are:-

1. Grumio. Thou hast fac'd many things.

Tailor. I have.

Grumio. Face not me: thou hast braved many men brave not me.

I will neither be fac'd or brave. TTS, Act 1V.3, 123.

Sander. Dost thou hear tailor? Thou hast braved many men: brave  
 not me. Thou'st faced many men.

Tailor. Well, sir?

Sander. Face not me. I'll neither be faced nor braved at thy  
 hands, I can tell thee. TAS, Act 1V, 3, 69.

2. Kath. I'll have no bigger than doth fit the time,  
 And gentlewomen wear such caps as these.

Pet. When you are gentle you shall have one too,  
 And not till then. TTS, Act 1V, 3, 69.

Kath. For I will home again to my father's house.

Ferando. I, when you're meeke and gentle, but not before.  
 TAS, Act 111, 3, 47.

3. Grumio. Master if ever I said loose-bodied gown sew me in the  
 skirts of it, and beat me to death with a bottom of  
 brown thread. TTS, Act 1V, 4, 136.

Sander. ----- sew me in a seam. TAS, Act 111, 5, 29

---

(11). Geschichte des neuern Dramas 1V. p. 697.

(12). Ibid., p. 698.

4. Petruchio. Well come, Kate: we will unto your father's  
 Even in those honest mean habiliments,  
 Our purses shall be proud, our garments poor,  
 For 'tis the mind that makes the body rich.  
 TTS. Act 1V, 3, 171.

Ferando. Come, Kate, we now will go see thy father's house.  
 Even in these honest mean habiliments  
 Our purses shall be rich our garments plain  
 To shroud our bodies from the winter's rage.  
 TAS. Act 111, 5, 56.

5. Petruchio. Say that the frown; I'll say she looks as clear  
 As morning roses newly washed with dew.  
 TTS. Act 11. 1, 173.

Ferando. Beauteous and stately as the eye trained bird  
 As glorious as the morning washed with dew.  
 TAS. Act 1V, 1, 36.

Ten Brink maintains that neither play is the source of  
 the other, but that both have their source in an earlier play of  
 Shakespeare's. He, however, gives no proof to support this con-  
 jecture. (13)

Tolman agreeing with Ten Brink goes one step further and  
 tries to identify "Love's Labor Won" of Meres' list with TTS. (14)

To do this he

1. Quotes Craik (15) who in 1857 tried to prove LLW our present TTS  
 and says that (a) the play is full of repetitions of the word  
 "win".

(13). Jahrbuch XLIII, p. 9.

(14). Hamlet and other Essays. 293.

(15). Ibid.



2. Quotes Hertzberg <sup>(16)</sup> who represents the argument that TTS is not in Meres' list by its own name although it is among the most youthful of Shakespeare's productions.
3. "Shakespearian scholars are pretty well agreed that TTS was in existence when Meres' list was written," adds Tolman. <sup>(17)</sup>
4. Metrical evidence is in favor of a date before 1598.
5. The close verbal agreement of TAS and TTS could thus be explained. (a) "The true explanation may well be that in some way another man had previously borrowed the language of Shakespeare and that in 'The Shrew' the dramatist only claims his own." <sup>(18)</sup>
6. The writer of TAS is the borrower. <sup>(19)</sup>

These, then, are the views of those who consider TTS the older play.

---

(16). Ibid., p. 294.

(17). Ibid.

(18). Ibid., p. 296.

(19). Ibid., p. 311.

## 11.

The orthodox view that TAS is the source of TTS.

That TAS has some merit and was not written by a novice who knew nothing of dramatic art is certain. Swinburne, who must be accepted with caution, calls him "of all the Shakespearians incomparably the truest, the richest, the most powerful humorist."<sup>(20)</sup> R. Warwick Bond states the case clearly when he says: "The counter suggestion of Mr. Hickson that The Taming of the Shrew formed the model for A Shrew is one which it is difficult to believe can have commended itself to anybody so much more fully developed and finished is our play, so far does it surpass the other in fluency and naturalness of dialogue, in the handling of the plot, and in small but telling points of characterization; while in diction too, and partly in versification A Shrew represents an earlier stage."

That TTS is superior in literary qualities, style, structure, characterization, I shall now undertake to show.

First of all, I find that there are many structural changes each lending its share to enhance the value of TTS.

1. There is the disguise of Aurelius as the son of a rich merchant of Sestos, a disguise Creizenach<sup>(21)</sup> as well as Schomburg<sup>(22)</sup> pronounces purposeless. Schomburg thinks Aurelius could have gained access to Philema more easily in his own role as a prince. Creizenach tells us, and this is true, that the play

---

(20). Dowden Edition. TTS. p. XV.

(21). See supra.

(22). Eine Studie zu Shakespeares Kunst in Studien zur Englischen Philologie. Vol.20., p. 32.

gives us no hint that he will be rejected if he appears in his own guise. However, we do read that Aurelius puts Philema to the test which, doubtless, is the cause of the disguise.

Aurel. Sweetly resolved, fair Emilia!

But would Philema say as much to me,  
 If I should ask a question, now of thee,  
 What if the Duke of Sestos' only son,  
 Which came with me unto your father's house,  
 Should seek to get Philema's love for me,  
 And make thee duchess of the stately town  
 Wouldst thou not then forsake me for his love? (23)

Philema. Not for Great Neptune, no, nor Jove himself,  
 Will Philema leave Aurelius' love;  
 Could he instill me empress of the world.

Is not this purpose sufficient? The times called for a disguise; Elizabethan literature revels in such artifices. Granted, then, that there is a motive for the disguise of Aurelius, Creizenach's first point for the priority of TTS can be ruled out.

2. We come to the consideration of the excellence of TTS in the manner of these Elizabethan artifices. In this play we find that Lucentio is made of like rank with Bianca, hence rank furnishes no motive for the disguise. In TTS the motive is a much stronger one,- Lucentio becomes a tutor and thus gains access to Bianca. (24)  
 In this motive, TTS follows Gascoigne's Supposes.

---

(23). Act 11, 6, 15. The Taming of A Shrew edited by Boas.  
 For the purpose of comparison he divides the play into acts and scenes. He also modernizes the spelling.

(24). Englished by Gascoigne from Ariosto's Suppositi.

3. Creizenach's next contention <sup>(25)</sup> is that the disguise of Valeria as a music teacher is given only for the purpose of the lively scene between him and the shrew. This is true, though the author <sup>(26)</sup> motivates it when he has Polidor say,

Now sweet Aurelius by this device  
 Shall we have leisure for to court our loves,  
 For whilst that she is learning on the lute  
 Her sisters may have time to steal abroad.

Moreover in TTS the scene comes after the wooing and has, as above stated, no significance except in a farcical way. In TTS, however, its position is changed so that it comes at a crucial moment, - just as Petruchio comesto woo Katherine. Petruchio not only hears of her shrewishness but actually sees evidence of it. This again makes TTS structurally superior to TAS.

4. Creizenach tells us <sup>(27)</sup> that Valeria's second disguise, this time, as the son of the Duke of Sestos is not motivated. This statement is hardly true for in Act.1, 1, 90, TAS we read,-

Aurel. And now be thou the Duke of Sestos' son,  
 Revel and spend as if thou wert myself,  
 For I will court my love in this disguise.

Valeria. How if the duke your father should  
 By some means come to Athens for to see  
 How you do profit in these public schools,  
 And find me clothed thus in this attire,  
 How would he take it then think you my lord?

---

(25). See supra.

(26). Boas TAS 1, 1, 286.

(27). See supra.

This dialog not only prepares us for the disguise at the wedding but also makes possible the exciting situation arising at the unexpected appearance of Aurelius' father. However, the intrigue in TTS adds much to the play. Here Tranio assumes the part of Lucentio in order to head off his rivals, thus Tranio indirectly woos for him. TAS is structurally weak in giving Tranio this double disguise. Since this double disguise is confusing another character should have been added. No such confusion of parts is to be found in TTS, for sufficient unto the play are the disguises thereof.

5. We admit again the truth of Creizenach's statement <sup>(28)</sup> that the author of TTS connects Katherine's last test with the rest of the play so that it furthers the plot. Vincentio thus learns of his son's marriage. The author of TAS gives this scene not only for the purpose of revealing Katherine's submission but also for producing a comic effect. TAS is a farce and as such calls for this humorous element in the training process. TTS, a comedy calls for a scene that carries the plot forward.

6. The plot balance of TAS, like that of Love's Labor Lost, is done away with in TTS. In TAS Alfonso has three daughters for whom are provided three suitors. In TTS Baptista has but two daughters. Katherine, the shrew has but one suitor while Bianca has three, thus producing rivalry. For the consolation of Hortensio a widow is provided in the last act. The movement is thus freer and the action more vital.

7. In the disguise of Lucentio as a tutor and Hortensio as a music teacher great dramatic skill and differentiation of character are shown. As there is no rivalry in TAS no such intrigue is necessary.

---

(28) See supra.

Can we believe the author of TAS would have omitted this scene had he borrowed his plot from TTS? The management of the underplot in TTS is not without instructive suggestions to Creizenach in regard to the priority of TAS.

8. The persons in the underplot of TAS are mere types borrowed from Italian comedy; in TTS they are individualized and become living personalities. This signifies much for the success of the play and marks a stride forward in the art of the drama. TAS gives Ferando one servant, Sander, Aurelius has Valeria, while Polidor is given a boy. In TTS Petruchio is given Grumio and Curtis, while Lucentio is also given an additional servant in the person of Biondello (Polidor's boy). This contributes to contrast of character. Grumio stands in the position of master to Curtis, and Tranio (Valeria), in a similar position to Biondello. Furthermore Biondello has a more vital interest in the action, for it is he who makes the arrangement for Lucentio's marriage.

9. The difference in Katherine's training is so marked as scarcely to call for a comment here.

10. TTS gives a new feature in relating the past history of Petruchio, thereby producing evidence of his fitness for the taming and training of the shrew.

11. In TAS Katherine is shown the shrew more after marriage than before; in TTS she is the shrew before and during the courtship but the change comes gradually from the beginning of the training-Petruchio's belated arrival at his own wedding.

From Tolman I quote the following with no further comments,-

12." The very point of the play is blunted in TAS by representing Kate as already tired of her own shrewishness and partially cured.

13." Katherine's characteristic teasing of Bianca is peculiar to TTS.

14." The wager at the end of the play comes in naturally in TTS; in TAE it has no apparent occasion."<sup>(29)</sup>

So far, then, all of the four points which Creizenach considers inconceivable if TAE were the earlier play have been shown to be not only conceivable but probable as well. In addition an attempt has been made to show that structurally TTS is a most excellent example of the law of evolution and growth. We have thus presented proof par excellence of the priority of TAE.

In addition to these significant structural changes are two which make for structural unity, - the omission of the epilog and the interweaving of plots.

We now turn to the Induction. Almost with one accord critics pronounce the Induction of TTS a true work of art, one in which Shakespeare's genius shows at its best. But when the points in question are the interruptions by the presenters and the conclusion of the Induction into an epilog then there is strange diversity of opinion. The view I maintain is that Shakespeare improved upon the early play in omitting the epilog. Elze,<sup>(30)</sup> Fleay,<sup>(31)</sup> Boas<sup>(32)</sup> and Creizenach<sup>(33)</sup> oppose this view. Creizenach is with those who suspect that the Induction originally had a conclusion now lost. Pope actually printed an epilog in his edition.

(29). Publication Modern Language Association V. "Shakespeare's part in the Taming of the Shrew." In this article Tolman tries to prove TAE the older play and source of TTS. In this he seems successful.

(30). Elze. Cited by Schoenberg in Studien, vol. 80, p. 8.

(31). Fleay. T.N.E. 1874, p. 85.

(32). Boas Introduction to TAE XXXVIII.

(33). Geschichte des neuern Dramas IV, p. 523.

Herford suggests that it is quite possible that a conclusion may have been designed but never added, but that it is equally conceivable that Shakespeare meant " to emphasize Sly's brute insouciance instead of his rude humor." (34) R. Warwick Bond (35) sees a technical reason for the omission of the epilog and for the withdrawal of Sly and his presenters. (36) Neilson suggests the same. The stage directions give Sly and the presenters a place in the balcony which place must be occupied by the pedant when Vincentio appears.

Before coming to a decision in regard to the epilog we must know the purpose of the Elizabethan Inductions. Baskervill tells us that they set before the audience in dramatic form what the author wished understood as preliminary. (37) There was on the one hand merely the prolog in which the author states the purpose or nature of the play, as for example, in "Every Man in his Humor", "Volpone", "The Alchemist", and "Shoemaker's Holiday". On the other hand, there was the dramatic production representing the tone of the play or the attitude of the audience (38) and continued by presenters or chorus, and concluding with an epilog. Examples of these are "Every Man of his Humor", "Cynthia's Revels", "Spanish Tragedy", "Summer's Last Will and Testament", "James IV", and "The Taming of a Shrew". These presenters ( or chorus) and epilog not only distract the attention from the main drama but, as in TAS and Holberg's "Jeppe paa Bjerget", (39) place in the foreground the main character of

(34). Evereley Shakespeare 11, p. 10.

(35). Dowden Shakespeare- TTS. p. 33.

(36). Cambridge Shakespeare, p. 124.

(37). Baskervill - English Elements of Jonson's Comedy, p. 146.

(38). Ibid.

(39). Nor Jeppe vom Berge as Dora Schmitz gives it in her translation of Ulrici. Vol.11, p. 109.



the Induction to the detriment of the rest of the play.

Over and above these is Shakespeare with his Induction in TTS. With due proportion wisely planned, it is more than Jonson's mere prolog, and has none <sup>(40)</sup> of the distracting features of the enveloping action of TAS. Shakespeare's purpose is to arouse our interest. That purpose once gained he drops the Induction.

Again the interweaving of the two plots in TTS so that one is aware of but the shrew plot with its resultant intrigues is quite foreign to TAS. "The way in which the entirely remodelled Bianca side of the plot supports and enhances the taming side and makes with it a dramatic unit is characteristic of the artistry of 'The Shrew' in marked contrast with the split action and contrary interests of a 'Shrew'." <sup>(41)</sup> One feels, in TAS, that Katherine, Philema, and Emilia are all daughters of one father, but on the one hand stands Katherine with her story, on the other, Philema and Emilia with theirs. This is a defect which could scarcely have resulted had the author of TAS had TTS before him. Nor could it have happened if he had but seen TTS acted.

Perhaps there is nothing which shows the superior workmanship of TTS so clearly as the transformation of the characters into vital, consistent and refined human beings. Petruchio, when introduced in the play, may leave an impression of coarseness. Our first glimpse of him is wringing his servant's ear. Throughout the play, however, he is a paradox, so one wonders whether it is humor or anger that he here exhibits. In jest Hortensio offers him the wealthy, beautiful but shrewish Katherine. In a spirit of bravado Petruchio enters into the affair, imperturbable and impatient to begin. The motive in TAS is far cruder, there it is the promise of

(40). Only one instance.

(41). Charlotte Porter- First Folio ed. TTS, Xll.

six thousand crowns. This alone sustains Petruchio. Throughout the play Petruchio shows a finesse of which Ferando is wholly incapable. What telling points of characterization could show the work of the artist better than this? -

'Twas told me you were rough and coy and sullen,  
 And now I find report a very liar;  
 For thou art pleasant, gamesome, passing courteous,  
 But slow in speech, yet sweet as spring-time flowers:  
 Thou canst not frown, thou canst not look askance,  
 Nor bite the lip, as angry wenches will,  
 Nor hast thou pleasure to be cross in talk,  
 But thou with mildness entertain'st thy wooers,  
 With gentle conference, soft and affable.  
 Why does the world report that Kate doth limp?  
 O slanderous world! Kate like the hazel-twig  
 Is straight and slender, and as brown in hue,  
 (42)  
 As hazel nuts and sweeter than the kernels.

This good humor, finessed as it is, Petruchio maintains throughout his courtship and marriage, Ferando, however, comes out boldly in his excuse for his wedding suit and says,-

For when my wife and I are married once (43)  
 She'll pull my costly suit over my ears.

In TTS Petruchio says, very adroitly,- (44)

To me she's married, not unto my clothes.

Petruchio, blusterer that he is, makes no promises he does not keep; Ferando, coarse and repellant delights in that. He promises Katherine to return for his sister's wedding and adds,-

(42). Eversley TTS 11, 1, 245.

(43). Boas TTS 11, 1, 114.

(44) TTS 111, 2, 119.

This is my day; tomorrow thou shalt rule,  
 (45)  
 And I will do whatever thou commands.

Did he do it? Petruchio in a similar circumstance says,-

I will be master of what is mine own:  
 (46)  
 She is my goods and chattel.

That he was her master became evident. Ferando's training is revolting and full of cruelty. Katherine yields only because she has suffered physical torture. Petruchio, on the other hand, shows good humor and abandon as he goes about singing "There is the life that late I led", then without a moment's warning the scolding of the servant begins. He holds "the very mirror up to nature", a most effective object lesson. Withal Petruchio shows himself a gentleman; the result is a reformed and happy Katherine.

Katherine of TAS, coarse and repellent as Petruchio, fails to interest us. Though we see but little of her shrewishness we continually hear of it. TAS gives but one actual exhibition of her shrewishness- in the scene with Valeria. There as Creizenach (47) tells us Valeria conducts himself in so unseemly a manner that Katherine seems justified in becoming angry. Her language, however, is not the language a gentlewoman would use under any provocation. We cannot agree with Schomburg (48) who tells us that she is undeservedly called "shrew" and adds, "-So ist sie gegen ihren Vater ganz gehorsam, erfüllt seinen Wunsch im ersten Auftritt und fugt sich seinem Heiratsplane." She obeys her father, not because she is obedient but because she chooses to do so. She says,-

(45). Ibid. III, 2, 88.

(46). TTS III, 2, 231.

(47). Geschichte IV, p. 697.

(48). Studien zur Englischen Philologie Vol. 20, p. 33

Why father, what do you mean to do with me  
 To give me unto this brainsick man,  
 That in this mood cares not to murder me?  
 But yet I will consent and marry him  
 (49)  
 For I me thinks have lived too long a maid.

Shakespeare's Katherine interests us from the beginning.  
 (50)

Like Adriana she is a shrew from neglect. Her temper and disposition called for the discipline her weak father failed to supply. Moreover, Bianco's attitude irritated Katherine beyond measure."Her silence flouts me and I'll be revenged" supplies the very genesis of Katherine's proud and positive shrewishness." (52) Neglect has soured her, and "she bullies her sister from envy. (53) But once freed from this envy her better qualities appear. What shows this better than Grumio's recital of the ride home!- "How he left her with the horse upon her, how he beat me because her horse stumbled, how she waded through the dirt to pluck him off me, how he swore, how she prayed, that never prayed before. (54) In the wooing scene she is exactly what one expects her to be. When she yields she does so because she has been outgeneraled. A new situation has arisen and we, therefore, see a somewhat new Katherine. In TAS the change comes only because Katherine feels this is her opportunity to escape 'leading apes in Hell.' She is not consistent. But in TTS the Katherine who yields is quite as virile as the shrew of old, she

(49). TTS 1, 1, 166.

(50). Furnivall. Introduction to Leopold Shakespeare XLIV.

(51). TTS 11, 1, 29.

(52). Charlotte Porter in Introduction to First Folio Ed. TTS. p. XII.

(53). Furnivall- Introduction to Leopold Shakespeare XLV.

(54). TTS. 1V, 1, 78.

who has never met her equal now meets her superior general and becomes conscious of the fact.

Is Sly of TAS a consistent character? Does not the lazy drunken tinker accept too readily the assurance that he is a lord? The TAS Sly is assuredly a humorous character, with humor, too apt for a drunken tinker. I question his ability to apply the lesson of the play in his shrewd way. Shakespeare's Sly, old Sly's son of Burtonheath is one of Shakespeare's masterpieces. We are here, as it were, in the presence of a consistent character; to be sure he is somewhat of a wag, a bit racy, but the humor is all his own.

Sander, on the other hand, is more consistent, He" is a thoroughly entertaining specimen of the swaggering, familiar, sharp-tongued but withal good-humored serving-man who enters with gusto into his master's plans for taming his bride." (55) His humor does not, however, in any way further the plot as does Grumio's. Grumio, the saucy servant with his ever-ready wit saves every situation. Even those, and there are many, who hold the position of divided authorship give Shakespeare credit for this remarkable creation.

Of the characters of the underplot of TAS little can be said since they are merestock types. TTS, on the other hand, presents these same characters as living identities.

Bianca, a pampered child from the beginning can never rise above the fault this engendered, otherwise Lucentio would have won the wager. In spite of this, she is extremely interesting. How admirably the author of TTS portrays her coquetry in the wooing scene- so different from the insipid scene in TAS.

Hortensio and Lucentio are doubtless friends because each supplies what the other lacks. Hortensio easily believes, Lucentio

quickly deceives. Lucentio, a born strategist, is surely most cunning and successful in his intrigues. Hortensio, the dupe and weakling forswears Bianco in one breath and boasts the next moment of his intention of marrying the widow. Even here he meets one who leads him by the strings.

Further evidence of the superiority of TTS from the stylistic point of view is to be found in the refinement of situation, the humor, and the diction. It will be noted that, whereas TTS abounds in lines of poetic excellence TAS has no poetry except that borrowed from Marlowe, - and these lines, as Creizenach (56) states, often come in the most inappropriate places.

For convenience + represents diction, li dramatic technique, ∞ humor, and \* refinement of situation or lack of it. For convenience too Hickson's arguments will be set in parallel passages with the mark preceded by 1,2,3,4, or 5 as the case may be.

Is there any better proof of the superior excellence of TTS than in the Induction? Compare the inflated Marlowesque diction of the lord in TAS with the realistic one in TTS.

TAS Act 1,1, 9.

+ Now that the gloomy shadow of the night,  
 Longing to view Orion's drizzling looks  
 Leaps from the Antarctic world into the sky,  
 And dims the welkin with her pitchy breath,  
 And darksome night o'er shades the crystal heavens.  
 Here break we up the hounds and let us bid us home,  
 For they have all deserved it well today.  
 But soft what sleepy fellow is this lies here?  
 Or is he dead? See one what he doth lack.

TTS. Act 1,1, 16.

Lord. Huntsman, I charge thee, tender well my hounds,  
 -1- Brach Merriman, the poor cur, is embossed;  
 And couple Clowder with the deep-mouthed brach.  
 Saw'st thou not, boy, how Silver made it good  
 At the hedge-corner, in the coldest fault?  
 I would not lose the dog for twenty pound.

First Hun. Why, Belman, is as good as he, my lord;  
He cried upon it at the merest loss  
And twice today picked out the dullest scent,  
Trust me, I take him for the better dog.

Lord. Thou art a fool: if Echo were as fleet,  
+ I would esteem him a dozen such.  
But sup them well and look unto them all:  
Tomorrow I intend to hunt again.

First Hunt. I will, my lord

Lord. What's here? one dead, or drunk? See, doth he breathe?

TAS. Ind. 11, 10.

Sly. Tapster, gi's a little small ale. Heigh ho!

Lord. Here's wine my lord, the purest of the grape.

Sly. For which lord?

Lord. For your honour, my lord.

Sly. Who, I? Am I a lord?

\* Jesus, what fine apparel have I got!

Lord. More richer far your honour hath to wear,  
And if it please you I will fetch them straight.

Wil. And if your honour please to ride abroad,  
I'll fetch you lusty steeds more swift of pace  
Than winged Pegasus in all his pride,  
That ran so swiftly o'er the Persian plains.

Tom. And if your honour please to hunt the deer,  
Your hounds stand deady coupled at the door;  
Who in running will o'ertake the roe,  
And make the long-breathed tiger broken-winded.

\* 11 Sly. By the mass, I think I am a lord indeed.

(57)

11 TTS. 11, 1.

Sly. For God's sake, a pot of small ale.

First Serv. Will't please your lordship drink a cup  
of sack?

Sec. Serv. Will't please your honour taste of these  
conserves?

Third Serv. What raiment will your honour wear today?

Sly. I am Christopher Sly; call not me 'honour'  
\* nor 'lordship': I ne'er drank sack in my life;

↳ And if you give me any conserves, give  
me conserves of beef: ne'er ask me what  
raiment I'll wear; for I have no more  
doublets than backs, no more stockings  
than legs, npr no more shoes than  
feet; nay, sometimes more feet than  
shoes, or such shoes as my toes look  
through the leather.

Lord. Heaven cease this idle humour in your honour!  
O, that a mighty man of such descent,  
Of such possessions and so high esteem,  
Shall be infused with so foul a spirit.

Sly. What would you make me mad? Am not I  
Christopher Sly, old Sly's son of Burton-heath,

\* ↳ by birth a peddler, by education a card maker,  
by transmutation a bear-herd, and now by

(57). This passage taken in its entirety shows superior dramatic  
technique.

present profession a tinker? Ask Marion Hackett, the fat ale-wife of Winoot, if she knew me not. If she say I am not fourteen pence on the score for sheer ale, score me up for the lying'st knave in Christendom. What I'm not bestraught; here's-  
Third Serv. O, this it is that makes your lady mourn.

In TAS the Sly is convinced too readily; in TTS he maintains his identity and is loth to believe.

So witty is Sly of TTS fame that these lines from the Induction are almost proverbial.

Compare for a moment the love-scenes of the minor plot. We have, again, in TAS the Marlowesque diction. In TAS there is no conflict, no suspense, in this alone TTS takes a great stride forward.

Pol. Fair Emelia, summer's sun-bright queen,  
Brighter of hue than is the burning clime,  
+ Where Phoebus in his bright equator sits,  
Creating gold and precious minerals.  
What would Emelia do, if I were forced  
To leave fair Athens and to range the world?

Eme. Should thou assay to scale the seat of Jove,  
Mounting the subtle airy regions,  
+ Or be snatched up as erst was Ganymede,  
Love should give wings unto my swift desires,  
And prune my thoughts that I would follow thee,  
Or fall and perish as did Icarus.

Aurel. Sweetly resolved, fair Emelia!  
But would Philema say as much to me,  
If I should ask a question now of thee;  
What if the Duke of Sestos' only son,  
Which came with me unto your father's house,  
Should seek to get Philema's love from me,  
And make thee duchess of that stately town,  
Wouldst thou not then forsake me for his love?

Phile. Not for great Neptune, no, nor Jove himself,  
Will Philema leave Aurelius' love;  
+ Could he instal me empress of the world,  
Or make me queen and guidress of the heavens,  
Yet would I not exchange thy love for his;  
Thy company is poor Philema's heaven,  
And without thee heaven were hell to me.

Eme. And should my love, as erst did Hercules  
Attempt to passthe burning vaults of hell,  
+ I would with piteous looks and pleasing words,  
As once did Orpheus with his harmony,  
And ravishing sound of his melodious harp,  
Entreat grim Pluto and of him obtain,  
That thou mightest go and safe return again.



Phile. And should my love, as erst Leander did,  
 Attempt to swim the boiling Hellespont  
 For Hero's love, no towers of brass should hold  
 But I would follow thee through those raging floods  
 With locks disheveled and my breast all bare;  
 With bended knees upon Abydos' shore  
 I would with smoky sighs and brinish tears,  
 Importune Neptune and the watery gods  
 To send a guard of silver-scaled dolphins  
 With sounding Tritons to be our convoy,  
 And to transport us safe unto the shore;  
 Whilst I would hang about thy lovely neck,  
 Redoubling kiss on kiss upon thy cheeks,  
 And with our pastime still the swelling waves.

Eme. Should Polidor, as great Achilles did,  
 Only employ himself to follow arms,  
 Like to the warlike Amazonian queen  
 Penthesilea, Hector's paramour,  
 Who foiled the bloody Pyrrhus, murderous Greek,  
 I'll thrust myself amongst the thickest throngs,  
 And with my utmost force assist my love.

Phile. Let Aeole storm, be mild and quiet thou;  
 Let Neptune swell, be Aurelius calm and pleased:  
 I care not, I, betide what may betide,  
 Let fates and fortune do the worst they can,  
 I reckon them not; they not discord with me,  
 Whilst that my love and I do well agree.

Aurel. Sweet Philema, beauty's mineral,  
 From whence the sun exhales his glorious shine,  
 And clad the heaven in thy reflected rays!  
 + And now, my liefest love, the time draws nigh,  
 That Hymen mounted in his saffron robe,  
 Must with his torches wait upon thy train,  
 As Helen's brothers on the horned moon.  
 Now, Juno, to thy number shall I add  
 The fairest bride that ever merchant had.

Pol. Come, fair Emelia, the priest is gone,  
 And at the church your father and the rest  
 Do stay to see our marriage rites performed,  
 And knit in sight of heaven this Gordian knot,  
 That teeth of fretting time may ne'er untwist:  
 Then come, fair love, and gratulate with me  
 This day's content and sweet solemnity.

TTS. Act 111, 1.

Bian. Where left we last?

Luc. Here, madam:

'Hic ibat Simois; hic est Sigeia tellus;  
 Hic steterat Priami regia celsa senis.'

Bian. Construe them.

Luc. 'Hic ibat,' as I told you before, 'Simois,'  
 I am Lucentio, 'hic est,' son unto Vincentio of  
 Pisa, 'Sigeia tellus', disguised thus to get your  
 love; 'Hic steterat', and that Lucentio that  
 comes a-wooing, 'Priami,' is my man Tranio,  
 'regia,' bearing my port, 'celsa senis,' that we

- might beguile the old pantaloon.
- +Hor. Madam, my instrument's in tune.
- +Bian. Let's hear. O fie! the treble jars.
- +Luc. Spit in the hole, man, and tune again.
- Bian. Now let me see if I can construe it;  
 'Hic ibat Simois,' I know you not, 'hic est Sigelia  
 tellus,' I trust you not; 'Hic steterat Priami,' take  
 heed he hear us not, 'regia,' presume not, 'celsa  
 senis,' despair not.
- Hortensio(aside )  
 How fiery and forward our pedant is!
- +ll Now, for my life, the knave doth court my love:  
 -----
- Luc. Are you so formal, sir? well, I must wait,  
 +(aside) And watch withal; for, but I be deceived,  
 Our fine musician groweth amorous.
- Hor. Before you touch the instrument,  
 To learn the order of my fingering,  
 I must begin with rudiments of art;  
 To teach you gamut in a briefer sort,  
 More pleasant, pithy and effectual,  
 Than hath been taught by any of my trade:  
 And there it is in writing, fairly drawn.
- Bian. Why, I am past my gamut long ago.
- Hor. Yet read the gamut of Hortensio.
- Bian,(reads) " 'Gamut' I am, the ground of all accord,  
 'A re,' to plead Hortensio's passion;  
 'B mi,' Bianca, take him for thy lord,  
 'C fa ut,' that loves with all affection:  
 'D sol re,' one clef, two notes have I:  
 'E la mi,' show pity, or I die."  
 Call you this gamut? tut, I like it not;  
 Old fashions please me best; I am not so nice,  
 ll To change true rules for odd inventions.

I have given these scenes at length for they illustrate so aptly the superior dramatic technique of TTS. Here we have conflict, suspense, and differentiation of character. Hortensio is not above intrigue but he dares not trust himself except in writing. Not so with Lucentio. With what vim and fearlessness he begins his courtship! His reward comes in Bianca's "despair not". Yet even here Lucentio is kept in suspense by her "I trust you not." The dramatist here has done his best. Could the author of TAS have omitted this scene had TTS been the earlier play?

Refinement of situation is best illustrated in the wooing and taming of Katherine. The wooing scene will be given in part

\* T.A.S.1,1, beginning with line 145 with scattered lines here and there throughout the scene.

Peran. I tell thee, Kate, I know thou lov'st me well.  
 Kate. The devil you do! Who told you so?  
 Feran. My mind, sweet Kate, doth say I am the man  
 Must wed, and bed, and marry bonny Kate.  
 Kate. Was ever seen so gross an ass as this?  
 Feran. Ay, to stand so long and never get a kiss.  
 -----  
 Feran. She's willing sir, and loves me as her life.  
 Kate. 'Tis for your skin then, but not to be your wife.  
 -----  
 Alfon. Give me thy hand. Ferando loves thee well,  
 And will with wealth and ease maintain thy state.  
 Here, Ferando, take her for thy wife,  
 And Sunday next shall be your wedding day.

TTS, 11, 1, beginning with line 184.

Pet. Good morrow, Kate; for that's your name, I hear.  
 Kath. Well have you heard, but something hard of hearing:  
~~nb~~ They call me Katherine that do talk of me.  
 Pet. || You lie, in faith; for you are call'd plain Kate,  
 + And bonny Kate and sometimes Kate the curst;  
 But Kate, the prettiest Kate in Christendom,  
 Kate of Kate Hall, my super-dainty Kate,  
 For dainties are all Kates, and therefore, Kate,  
 Take this of me, Kate of my consolation;  
 Hearing thy mildness praised in every town,  
 Thy virtues spoke of, and thy beauty sounded,  
 Yet not so deeply as to thee belongs, (58)  
 Myself am moved to woo thee for thy wife.  
 Kath. Moved in good time; let him that moved you hither  
 Remove you hence.  
 -----  
 Kath. Too light for such a swain as you to catch;  
 B And yet as heavy as my weight should be. (59)  
 Pet. Should be! should buzz!  
 Kath. Well ta'en, and like a buzzard.  
 Pet. O slow-wing'd turtle! shall a buzzard take thee?  
 Kath. Ay, for a turtle, as he takes a buzzard.  
 Pet. Come, come, you wasp; i' faith, you are too angry.  
 Kath. If I be waspish, best beware my sting.

This brisk stichomythia continues, after which comes Petruchio's paradoxical speech, an excellent example of finessing.

Pet. No, not a whit; I find your passing gentle.  
 'Twas told me you were rough and coy and sullen,  
 || And now I find report a very liar;

(58). Petruchio's finessing.  
 (59). Full of puns.

\* For thou art pleasant, gamesome, passing courteous, (60)  
 But slow in speech, yet sweet as spring-time flowers.  
 Pet. Here comes your father; never make denial  
 I must and will have Katherine to my wife.

The finessing of Petruchio makes this scene so superior to that parallel scene in TAS with all its crudities that we think we again have evidence of the priority of TAS. Would not some of the finessing of TTS have found its way into TAS had TTS been in existence?

The taming scene should be read as a whole to be appreciated. However, we give portions.

TAS, 111, 3. Stage directions between 28 and 29.

\* Enter Ferando with a piece of meat upon his dagger's point, and Polidor with him.

TTS, IV, 3. Stage directions between 35 and 36.

\* Enter Petruchio and Hortensio with meat.

Creizenach tells us that the writer of TAS here presents a new feature when introducing Ferando with meat on the point of his dagger. He considers it a parody of Peele's *Battle of Alcazar*. But why is it not given in imitation of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*? This would be in keeping with the Marlowesque diction and would not in any measure show the author's originality. It does, however, give us an idea of Ferando's coarseness.

TAS, 111, 3, 29.

Feran. See here, Kate, I have provided meat for thee;  
 Here, take it; what, is't not worthy thanks?  
 Go, sirrah, take it away again.  
 You shall be thankful for the next you have.

Kate. Why, I thank you for it.

Feran. Nay, now 'tis not worth a pin. Go, sirrah, and take it hence, I say.

San. Yes, sir, I'll carry it hence. Master, let her have none, for she can fight, as hungry as she is.

---

(60). The remainder of his speech is given in characterization of Petruchio.

Pol. I pray you, sir, let it stand, for I'll eat some with her myself.

Feran. Well, sirrah, set it down again.

Kate. Nay, nay, I pray let him take it hence,  
And keep it for your own diet, for I'll none;  
I'll ne'er be beholding to you for your meat;

\* I tell thee flatly here unto thy teeth,  
Thou shalt not keep me nor feed me as thou list,

\* For I will home again unto my father's house.

Feran. Ay, when you're meek and gentle, but not before;

2 I know your stomach is not yet come down.

With this compare TTS 1V,3, 29.

\* Pet. How fares my Kate? What sweating all amont?  
Hor. Mistress, what cheer?  
Kath. Faith, as cold as can be.  
Pet. Pluck up thy spirits; look cheerfully upon me.  
Here, love; thou see'st how diligent I am  
To dress thy meat myself and bring it thee:

\* I am sure, sweet Kate, this kindness merits thanks.  
What, not a word? Nay then thou lovest it not;  
And with all my pains is sorted to no proof.  
Here take away this dish.

Kath. I pray you let it stand.  
Pet. The poorest service is repaid with thanks;  
And so shall mine, before you touch the meat.

Kath. I thank you, sir.

-----

Pet.(Aside)  
Kate eat apace: and now my honey love,

\* We will return unto my father's house.

TAS. 111,V,3.

Feran. Come hither, sirrah! What have you there?  
Haber. A velvet cap, sir, and it please you.  
Feran. Who spoke for it? Did'st thou, Kate?  
Kate. What if I did? Come hither, sirrah, give me the cap!  
I'll see if it will fit me.(She sets it on her head).

Feran. O monstrous, why, it becomes thee not;

-----

Tailor. Item, a loose-bodied gown.  
Sander. Master, if ever I said loose body's gown, sew me in a  
3 seam and beat me to death with a bottom of brown thread!

Tailor. I made it as the note bade me.  
Sander. I say the note lies in his throat, and thou too, and thou  
say'st it.

Tailor. Nay, nay, n'er be so hot, sirrah; for I fear you not.  
Sander. Doust thou hear, tailor? Thou hast braved many men:  
brave not me. Thou'st faced many men-

Tailor. Well, sir.  
Sander. Face not me: I'll neither be faced nor braved at thy hands,  
I can tell thee!

-----

Ferand. [Come, Kate, we now will go see thy father's house,  
Even in these honest mean habiliments;  
4 Our purses shall be rich, our garments plain,  
To shroud our bodies from the winter rage,  
And that's enough; what should we care for more?

TTS. 1V, 3, 63.

Hab. Here is the cap your worship did bespeak.  
Pet. Why, this was moulded on a porringer;  
A velvet dish: fie, fie! 'tis lewd and filthy:  
Why, 'tis a cockle or a walnut-shell,  
A knack, a toy, a trick, a baby's cap:  
Away with it! come, let me have a bigger.  
Kath. I'll have no bigger: this doth fit the time,  
2 And gentlewomen wear such caps as these.  
Pet. When you are gentle, you shall have one too,  
∞ And not till then.

-----  
line 123.

Gru. [Thou hast faced many things.  
Tai. 1 I have.  
Gru. ∞ Face not me: thou hast braved many men; brave not me;  
I will neither be faced nor braved. I say unto thee, I  
bid thy master cut out the gown; but I did not bid him  
cut it to pieces: ergo, thou liest.

Tai. (Reads). 'Imprimis, a loose bodied gown:'  
Gru. 3 Master, if ever I said loose-bodied gown, sew me in the  
∞ skirts of it, and beat me to death with a bottom of  
brown thread: I said a gown.

Pet. Well, come, my Kate; we will unto your father's  
Even in these honest mean habiliments:  
4 Our purses shall be proud, our garments poor;  
For 'tis the mind that makes the body rich;  
And as the sun breaks through the darkest clouds,  
So honour peereth in the meanest habit,  
\* What is the jay more precious than the lark,  
Because his feathers are more beautiful?  
Or is the adder better than the eel,  
Because his painted skin contents the eye?  
O, no, good Kate; neither art thou the worse  
For this poor furniture and mean array.

Let us, for a moment, consider Hickson's argument in regard to the  
jokes.

1. Bad reporting may have caused the loss of the joke in TAS. With  
the substitution of the word "things" for "men" the joke would be  
complete.

2. This was not given as a joke in TAS but Shakespeare with his fondness for punning converted it into one.
3. This joke as reported by Hickson is a good example of clever manipulation. Hickson took only the part that suited his fancy. To be sure, the joke seemed lost when given in this distorted fashion, not so when given in its entirety. Then it reads,
- Grumio. Master if ever I said loose-bodied gown sew me in the skirts of it, and beat me to death with a bottom of brown thread.
- Sander. Master, if ever I said loose body's gown, sew me in a seam and beat me to death with (a) bottom of brown thread.

In this case the joke in its entirety is more clever in TAS for the play is undoubtedly on "loose body's" and "loose-bodied". As this part of the joke is lost in Shakespeare, Hickson omits it so that it may serve his turn. We, however, meet this argument as we met the other one on the joke in (1) and attribute it to bad reporting, this time in TTS. As for the rest of the joke, it is a good example of Shakespeare's improvement of a poor joke.

4. Petruchio's words would have been inappropriate coming from the uncouth Ferando. Petruchio, however, with his refinement of character naturally says,-

Our purses shall be proud, our garments poor  
For 'tis the mind that makes the body rich.

5. Does it really make very much difference, except for argument, whether we have "morning newly washed with dew" or "morning roses newly washed with dew"?

To be sure each of these examples shows a refinement of style and we can only answer Hickson with the words of Tupper, -

---

(61). Tudor, TTS Introduction IX.

"To invert with a few critics these 'understood relations' and to regard A Shrew as the copy, not the model, is to ignore all the probabilities of progressive workmanship.

If the parallel passages have served their purpose of showing the "probabilities of progressive workmanship" we are prepared to acknowledge the superiority of TTS in every particular which makes a play <sup>at</sup> good, not a mediocre play. How can Creizenach, and with him Tolman, account for the three editions of this inferior but "later" play, TAS? "Aye, there's the rub."

We have shown thus far that the portions of TAS which Creizenach considered inconceivable if TAS were the earlier play, are easily conceivable; that the new features of TAS are not new features but merely borrowed, and that Hickson, whom Creizenach quotes, has not presented a good case. The questions of close verbal resemblances and the use of "The Supposes" by Shakespeare are still unsettled.

Let me quote R. Warwick Bond <sup>(62)</sup> on the question of parallelism and plagiarism,—"As regards 'plagiarism' it seems perfectly possible and natural at that date for a writer to reshape old pieces for the theatre without any intention of claiming their authorship or any thought of plagiarism at all; the idea of printed publication, always quite secondary and remote, being perhaps entirely absent, and that of copyright still quite indefinite. But work begun in this spirit, not of author but of mere stage provider, would inevitably assume in Shakespeare's hands an original character that rendered any such attitude a gross injustice to himself.----- The custom of the time considered, there is, I say,

---

(62). Dowden TTS, XL1.



no need to charge him with plagiarism because he remodelled other men's work for his company's use." This is, undoubtedly, the case with TTS. If we look at the records of Henslowe's Diary <sup>(63)</sup> we find the following interesting and unique record,-

In the name of God Amen begininge at Newington my Lord Admeralle men & my Lord chamberlen men as followethe 1594.

ye 11 of June 1594 R/ at the taminge of a shrowe/x <sup>8</sup>

3. June The Admiral's and Chamberlain's men act together at Newington Butts and act till 13 June

Thus Lord Pembroke's (Admiral's) men to whom TAS belonged was joined with Strange's (Chamberlain's) company to which Shakespeare belonged. Thus TAS became available to Shakespeare and his revision was rendered not only possible but probable. Shakespeare's haste in furbishing up an old play will account for the close verbal resemblances.

But why did Shakespeare in TTS depart from his usual custom and borrow more from Supposes than did TAS, his prototype? It is evident that Shakespeare used Gascoigne's "Supposes" more freely than had the author of TAS. The solution of this problem, the stumbling block to Creizenach, is simple. Shakespeare's greater familiarity with Ariosto caused him to appreciate more fully the value of intrigue and conflict. TAS pointed the way; Shakespeare followed. Thus TTS is not the connecting link between Ariosto and TAS as Creizenach suggests. TAS is rather the connecting link between TTS and Ariosto.

Thus all of the difficulties presented to us by Creizenach have, one by one, melted away in the light of our reasonable conjecture.

---

(63). Greg. Henslowe's Diary part 11, p. 17

But what can be said of Tolman's conjecture that TTS is the "Lost Labor's Won" of Meres' list? No better answer can be found than in Tolman's two articles "Shakespeare's part in TTS and Shakespeare's Love's Labor Won". A close examination of these articles in question reveals the fact that Tolman is not altogether consistent.

In his dissertation on "Shakespeare's part in TTS" he tries to prove TAS the source of TTS. He does this so effectively that his thesis seemed proved, though he quotes Ten Brink and says that some things, as for instance the borrowing of the language and plot from TAS and the reason for TAS being published anonymously can be explained by accepting his theory. However, he makes no attempt to bring proof of this in his dissertation, and we cite him as an authority for the orthodox view.

When trying, in his other article, to prove TTS 'Love's Labor Won' he says, - "We may suppose that Love's Labor Won became at a later day TTS whether or not a change in form accompanied the change of name." He also thinks TAS based on this early play. If no change of form accompanied the change in name then TAS is based on TTS, though Tolman does not tell us this, perhaps because it is in direct opposition to his earlier view which makes TAS the source of TTS.

Again in his essay on "Love's Labor Won" he tells us that Shakespeare in borrowing the language and plot from TAS is simply taking what belonged to him. In opposition to this is a state-

(64). P.M.L.A. V, 202.

(65). Hamlet and other essays, p.245.

(66). P.M.L.A. IV, 227.

(67). Hamlet and other essays, 204.

(68). Hamlet and other essays p. 251.

ment he makes when trying to disprove Shakespeare's authorship of TAS. He writes <sup>(69)</sup> , - If Shakespeare made direct use of TAS, as he is usually supposed to have done, he certainly borrowed the plot and the situations of that play with complete freedom and fullness; in his additions and alterations, however, there are some very fine touches. He is also free in appropriating the very language of TAS, if he used that play at all, but he does not seem to follow that language as if it were his own." Why should he not follow that language as if it were his own if Love's Labor Won" is the source of TAS?

Furthermore Tolman, in his article on "Shakespeare's Part in TTS", tries to prove that Shakespeare had a colaborer in writing TTS. If Shakespeare's "Love's Labor Lost" was TTS in "same form" and Shakespeare had a colaborer, ~~Wares~~ assigned a play to Shakespeare which Shakespeare did not write without assistance. Inconsistency again. If Shakespeare's "Love's Labor Won" was TTS in altered form, why did Shakespeare employ a colaborer to recast his own play?

To repeat, Tolman has proved TAS the source of TTS and has tried to prove TTS the source of TAS. Both cannot be true. Thus his arguments no longer have any weight.

If the conclusion as to the superior excellence of TTS in regard to style, structure, dramatic technique, and humor as here presented is sound the priority of TAS seems established. However, if further evidence of the priority of TAS is necessary it may be found in some of the passages from TTS which can be explained only on the supposition that TAS is the earlier play.

---

(69). Pub. Mod. Lang. Ass. 11, p. 251.

1. In the Induction, Sly in addressing the hostess uses these words: "I'll not budge an inch boy". (Ind. 1,15). These words, as Tolman <sup>(70)</sup> suggests would have been appropriate in TAS where Sly was talking to the tapster. Shakespeare, working hurriedly on the play, failed to remember the change of sex.

2. In TAS, Ind. 1, 86, we read,-

San. And I'll speak for the properties. My lord we must  
Have a shoulder of mutton for a property,  
And a little vinegar to make the devil roar.  
Lord. Very well; sirrah, see that they want nothing.

This in TAS is clear, but in TTS without an introductory speech similar to Sander's the lord says:

Go, sirrah, take them to the buttery,  
And give them friendly welcome every one.

Obviously they were not taken to the buttery for properties, neither does it seem probable that the company to which Shakespeare belonged were taken to the buttery to be fed. <sup>(71)</sup>Malone says that there is no reason to suppose that our author, Heminge, Burbage, and Condell, etc., who were licensed by King James were treated in this manner,- fed in the buttery. Evidently Shakespeare had in mind the old play where the properties were mentioned.

3. In TTS Gremio on asking his master if he will "woo this wild-cat", received this answer-

Act. 1, 11, 199.

Pet. Why came I hither but to that intent?

This reply seems somewhat inappropriate coming from one who had not until that day known of her existence. In TAS, Ferando is a "gentleman of Athens", Katherine's home, and in response to Pol-do's remark.(Act 1, 1, 109)

(70). Pub. Mod. Lang. Ass'n., VI, 226.

(71). Variorum Shakespeare V, 370.

I would my master once were in the vein  
To try himself how he could woo a wench.

Ferando replies, - Faith I am even now a-going.

Tolman suggests here too that the author had TAS in mind.

4. In TAS Polidor, Ferando's friend, acts as sponsor for his non-appearance.

TAS. Act 11, 1, 95.

Alfon. I marvel that Ferando comes not away.  
Pol. His tailor, it may be, hath been too slack  
In his apparel which he means to wear.

Again it is the friend who speaks (1.124), -  
Fie, Ferando; not thus attired for shame!  
Come to my chamber and there suit thyself  
Of twenty suits that I did not wear.

TTS gives this part to Tranio, a mere acquaintance of a day or two at most.

TTS. Act 111, 11, 21.

Tra. Patience, good Katharine, and Baptista too.  
Upon my life, Petruchio means but well,  
Whatever fortune stays him from his word;  
Though he be blunt I know him passing wise,  
Though he be merry, yet withal he's honest.

Again 1.74.

Tra. 'Tis some odd humor pricks him to this fashion;  
Yet oftentimes he goes but mean apparell'd.

L.92.

Tra. Not so well apparell'd  
As I wish you were.

In L. 104.

Tra. And tell us what occasion of import  
Hath all so long detain'd you from your wife,  
And sent you hither so unlike yourself.

Had Shakespeare not worked hurriedly he would have given these lines to Petruchio's friend Hortensio, as in TAS.

5. TTS. Act 1V, 11, 88 gives these words to the pedant:-  
Alas! sir, It is worse for me than so;  
For I have bills for money by exchange  
From Florence and must here deliver them.

Evidently Shakespeare had in mind the merchant who impersonated Aurelius' father in TAS.

6. The wager at the end can be explained only on the conjecture that TTS is the later play. Hortensio who has been witness to Katharine's transformation from a veritable shrew to the most docile<sup>of</sup> wives (Act IV, 111 and IV, 5) should not, and would not, have accepted Petruchio's challenge so quickly, had Shakespeare not had the conditions of the early play (TAS) in mind this error would not have crept in here. The words in TTS. Act V, 107 are,-

Pet. O, ho, entreat her!

Nay then she must needs come.

Hor. I am afraid, sir,

Do what you can yours will not be entreated.

However in TAS Polidor (Hortensio) does not remain long enough to see Katharine's transformation. She is still the shrew.

TAS. Act 111, 111, 42.

Kate. Nay, nay I pray you let him take it hence,  
And keep it for your own diet, for I'll none,  
I'll ne'er be beholding to you for your meat;  
I tell thee flatly here unto thy teeth,  
Thou shalt not keep me nor feed me as thou hast.  
For I will home again unto my father's house.

Quite apropos is Polidor's excuse for Petruchio's absence from the wedding.

TAS. Act IV, 11, 5.

No marvel if Ferando be away;  
His wife, I think, hath troubled so his wits,  
That he remains at home to keep them warm;  
For wedlock, as the proverb says,  
Hath brought him to his nightcap long ago.

One can readily understand Polidor's willingness to accept the challenge. Shakespeare, presumably, had the wager of TAS in mind and through an oversight neglected to take into account the changed situation.

As above stated, these defects in TTS find their only explanation in Shakespeare's haste in recasting the play , and would not have been possible in an original work by this great artist.

We may safely conclude, then, that there is nothing in the way to invalidate our theory that TTS is based on TAS as well as "Supposes".

## I.

## Authorship.

The question of the priority of TAs settled we are now prepared to discuss the question of authorship. Nearly all of the early Elizabethans with the exception of Lily and Nash have been cited as authors of TAs.<sup>(71)</sup> Many there be who discern the work of two authors in TAs. The concensus of opinion seems to point to our present TAs as a recast of a still earlier play of the same name without the embellishment of the Marlowesque portions, the supposition being that these portions were added by the second author. However, the authorship of TAs seems shrouded in such mystery that we hazard no conjecture.

On the question of the authorship of TAs Shakespearian critics are far from unanimous. Farmer,<sup>(72)</sup> Richard Grant White,<sup>(73)</sup> Fleay,<sup>(74)</sup> Furnivall,<sup>(75)</sup> Herford,<sup>(76)</sup> Tolman<sup>(77)</sup> and Sidney Lee<sup>(78)</sup> maintain the view of divided authorship. Steevens.<sup>(79)</sup> Gervinus,<sup>(80)</sup> Schomburg,<sup>(81)</sup> Ward,<sup>(82)</sup> Courthope,<sup>(83)</sup> and Boas.<sup>(84)</sup>

- (71). Dowden TAs. XXXVII.  
 (72). Variorum Shakespeare V.  
 (73). Shakespeare's Works IV.  
 (74). Transactions New Society Shakespeare 1874.  
 (75). Discussion of Fleay's paper in N.S.S.T. 1874.  
 (76). Eversley Shakespeare II. Introduction to TAs.  
 (77). P. M. L. A. V.  
 (78). Lee. Life of Shakespeare.  
 (79). Variorum Shakespeare V.  
 (80). Gervinus-Shakespeare Eng. Trans. p. 138.  
 (81). Studien zur Englischen Philologie Vol. 20.  
 (82). Eng. Dramatic Literature.  
 (83). History of English Poetry. IV.  
 (84). Shakespeare and his Predecessors.



thinking that they see evidences of Shakespeare's work throughout the play see no necessity of considering an intermediate play, as do most critics, and, therefore, assign the whole play to Shakespeare. Creizenach also leaves with us the impression of single authorship.

It is remarkable that none of these chorizontes (so called by R. Warwick Bond) have a very definite thesis for their division of parts as do the critics who make a similar division of Beaumont and Fletcher's works. This may be due to the fact that but two of the many chorizontes attempt to assign the "non-Shakespearean" parts to a definite Elizabethan. The chorizontes with almost one accord quote Richard Grant White <sup>(85)</sup> who says,—"In it three hands at least are traceable; that of the author of the old play, that of Shakespeare himself, and that of a co-laborer. The first appears in the structure of the plot, and in the incidents and the dialog of most of the minor scenes; to the last must be assigned the greater part of the love business between Bianca and her two suitors; while to Shakespeare belong the strong, clear characterization, the delicious humor and the rich verbal coloring of the recast Induction, and all the scenes in which Katharine and Petruchio and Grumio are the prominent figures, together with the general effect produced by scattering lines and words and phrases here and there, and removing others elsewhere, throughout the rest of the play." Doubtless they are all influenced by White, yet most of them seem to forget that he assigns the incidents and the dialog of most of the minor scenes to the author of T&S.

As Fleay, Furnivall, Herford, and Tolson alone of all the

---

(85). Shakespeare's Works. Vol. IV.

chorizontes have made definite assignments we shall consider them only.

Fleay <sup>(86)</sup> in his Manual writes,- I assign to the second author the following parts:- I. 1; II. 1 except line 168-326; III. 1; III. 2, 124-150; IV. 2; IV. 4; V. 1 and perhaps V. 2, 176-189. This second hand is probably T. Lodge. It is observable that in all these parts, there is scarcely a trace of the old play TAS; while in the other parts, plot and even language is freely borrowed; exactly in the way in which Shakespeare revised his freer drafts of the "Merry Wives of Windsor" and "Hamlet."

Furnivall <sup>(87)</sup> gives the adapter the same parts with these exceptions III.2, 126-150, 242-254; V. 2, 181-189. His sense of style is his criterion.

Herford <sup>(88)</sup> says, "the portions generally assigned to him (Shakespeare) are II.1, 164-326; III.2 (except vv. 130-150); IV.1, 3, 5; V.2; except the last eight lines. To the co-laborer Tolman <sup>(89)</sup> assigns I.1; I.2; II.1, 1-104; 327-413; III.1; III.2, 1-88, 126-185, 242-254; IV. 2; IV. 4; V. 1; V. 2, 182-189. There is, therefore, unanimity of opinion among the chorizontes on I.1; I. 2; III. 1; IV. 2; IV. 4; V.2, 178-187; II. 1, 1-114, III. 2, 126-150. All but Fleay give the induction to Shakespeare. These, then, are the lines in question.

Now that we have a clear idea of the relative portions assigned to each author we are in a position to examine the arguments of the chorizontes. The critics who have thus divided the work

(86). Shakespeare Manual. p. 42.

(87). Discussion of Fleay's paper. Trans. N.S.S. 1874. pp. 106 & 107.

(88). Eversley Shakespeare. IV. 270.

(89). Pub. M.L.A.V.

have done so largely from the standpoint of diction and metre.

It will, therefore, be our endeavor to clear up some of the metrical difficulties. Fleay mentions no less than six metrical peculiarities to be found in the "non-Shakesperian" portion. (90)

- 1. There are lines deficient by a whole measure or foot.
- II. 1, 51 I pray you, sir, is it your will.
- II. 1, 259 Go, fool, and whom thou keepst command.
- II. 1, 300 I'll see three hanged on Sunday first.
- III. 2, 185 Hark, hark I hear the minstrels play.
- III. 2, 233 My household stuff, my field, my barn.
- IV. 1, 164 'Tis burnt and so is all the meat.
- IV. 4, 46 The match is made and all is done.
- V. 2, 66 Let's each one send unto his wife.

2. There are lines deficient by a single syllable in some part of the line marked in the following examples.

- I. 1, 14 Vincentio's son brought up in Florence ^
- I. 2, 190 No; say'st me so ^ friend! What countryman?
- I. 2, 25 Sir, let me be so bold to ask ^ you.
- II. 1, 73 Baccare! you are marvellous ^ forward.
- III. 2, 168 What said the wench when ^ he rose again?
- IV. 1, 124 Where be these knaves! What no man at ^ door.
- IV. 3, 30 Why, then, the mustard ^ without the beef.
- IV. 3, 62 Lay forth the gown! What news with you sir ^?
- IV. 4, 33 No worse than I ^ upon some agreement.
- IV. 4, 34 Me shall you find ready and willing ^
- IV. 4, 55 Then at my lodging and it like you,

3. There are lines in which one syllable constitutes the first measure.

(90) T.N.S.S. 1874. p. 86.

## Examples.

- I. 1, 48      Gentlemen, importune me no farther.
- I. 1, 73      Well, said, master; mum! and gaze your will.
- I. 1, 74      Gentlemen, that I may soon make good.
- I. 1, 90      Gentlemen, content ye! I'm resolved.
- I. 2, 160     O this learning. What a thing it is?
- I. 2, 161     O this woodcock, what an ass it is!
- I. 2, 198     Will he woo her? Ay, or I will (Ile F) hang her.
- I. 2, 247     What! this gentleman will out-talk us all.
- II. 1, 109    Sirrah, lead these gentlemen to my daughters.

If the Globe arrangement be taken the line is still worse, viz.

To my daughter, and tell them both.

- II. 1, 202    No such jade as you, if me you mean.
- III.2, 89     Come, where be these gallants? Who's at home?
- III.2, 92     Were it better I should rush in thus?

x x x

- IV. 1, 150    Out you rogue! you pluck my foot awry.
- IV. 1, 163    What's this? Mutton? Ay. Who bought it? I.
- IV. 2, 120    Go with me to clothe you as becomes you.
- IV. 4, 2      Ay, what else and but I be deceived.
- IV. 4, 71     Come, Sir, we will better it in Pisa.
- V. 2, 39      How likes Gremio these quick-witted folks?
- V. 2, 40      Head and butt: a hasty witted body.
- V. 2, 93      Not quoted: pronounce worse ( r vocal)
- Ind.II,114    Madam wife, they say I have dreamed.

4. There are lines of six measures, with the first measure monosyllabic.

## Examples.

- IV. 1, 153 Where's my spaniel, Troilus! Sirrah, get you hence!
- IV. 2, 4 Sir, to satisfy you in what I have said.
- IV. 2, 11 Quick, proceeders marry! Now tell me, I pray.
- IV. 2, 33 Never to marry with her, though she would entreat.  
(1st foot 2 syll, but no cesura)
- I. 2, 194 O, sir, such a life, with such a wife, were strange.
5. The doggerel lines are chiefly of four measures in each line:-
- I. 1, 168. Hush, master, here's some good pastime toward!  
The wench is stark mad, or wonderful forward.
- I. 2, 11 Villain, I say, knock me at the gate;  
And rap me well, or I'll knock your knave's pate.
- I. 2, 16 Faith, sirrah, and you'll not knock I'll ring it,  
I'll try how you can sol fa and sing it.

The doggerel in "Love's Labor Lost," "Comedy of Errors," etc., has either five or six measures in each line; and lines like these of four measures occur nowhere else in Shakespeare.

6. There are many rhymes of one or two measures in each line introduced in the midst of the dialog.

## Examples.

- I. 1, 79 Put ginger in the eye,  
And she know why.
- III, 2, 83 Nay, by S. Jany  
I hold you a penny.  
  
A horse and a man  
Is more than one.
- IV, 1, 6 Little pot  
And soon hot
- IV, 4, 101 And so may you, Sir;  
And so adieu, Sir!

This, then, is Fleay's contribution to the metrical peculiarities found in the Shakesperian portion.

The other chorizontes make some additions. Furnivall

touches but little on metrical peculiarities, though he makes this contribution,<sup>(91)</sup> "I have applied the stopt-line test to "The Shrew." The test shows that the adapter used the unstopt-line oftener ( 1 in 12.68) than Shakespeare (1 in 22.31), and thus distinguishes broadly the two men's work." To this Dr. Abbott<sup>(92)</sup> adds by calling attention to the frequent stress upon unemphatic syllables receiving the metrical accent. Tranio's speech in III. 2, 130-135, and the pedant's speech in IV. 4, 28-37 seem the particular portions attacked. Tolman<sup>(93)</sup> does the same and in addition calls attention to a three-accent line in the middle of Gremio's speech III.2, 169-185, which accent occurs in none of the Shakesperian parts, though it does occur in III, 2,346-349. Furthermore he writes, "The most striking fact about the table is that Shakespeare's associate has all the doggerel and more than four-fifths of the rhyme."<sup>(95)</sup> He also finds<sup>(96)</sup> that the non-Shakesperian portion contain more unstopped lines than do the Shakesperian portions. These are the comments on metre.

Let us turn first to Fleay's examples. He gives under 1 eight examples only two of which II. 1, 151 and IV. 4, 46 are found in the "un-Shakesperian" portion. Six of these eight examples II.1, 259; II. 1, 300; III. 2, 185; III. 2, 233; IV. 1, 164 and V. 2, 66 are all found in the parts Fleay himself has assigned to Shakespeare. Furnivall and Tolman would assign all of these lines

(91). T.N.S.S. 1874, p. 110

(92). Ibid p. 121.

(93). F.M.L.A. V. 254

(94). Ibid 258.

(95). Ibid p. 259.

(96). Ibid p. 271.

to Shakespeare except III. 2, 186 which Tolman assigns to Shakespeare's co-laborer. Herford would assign the first example to Shakespeare; he would, however, exclude II. 1, 300. This, then, is not very strong evidence for double authorship. In fact, Fleay, thus far, is a good authority for single authorship.

Of Fleay's second list of examples in which one syllable constitutes the first measure Fleay has again quoted three,- IV.1, 124; IV. 3, 30; IV. 3, 62 which he later assigns to Shakespeare. Tolman and Furnivall also assign these lines to Shakespeare. This in itself proves that Shakespeare wrote lines of this nature. If any further evidence is needed it may be found in the following lines from Merchant of Venice.

As far as Belmont.

^ In such a night. V. 1, 17.

That she did give me, whose posy was V. 1, 146.

I'll wait as long for you then, Approach II. 6, 24.

I. 1, 14 Vincentio's son brought up in Florence scans regularly though the accent falls on a syllable usually unaccented.

But as a parallel to this read,-

And what of him did he like interest.

II. 1, 73 might be read in like manner.

In Fleay's third group he has twenty-one examples five of which III. 2, 89; III. 2, 92; V. 2, 39; V. 2, 40; V. 2, 93 come in the part he has before assigned to Shakespeare. The last example, taken from the Induction, is by all of the other critics assigned to Shakespeare. This disposes of six, leaving fifteen. An examination of the remaining fifteen shows that I. 1, 73 contains a dissyllabic "well", I. 2, 160 and I. 2, 161 each a dissyllabic

"O", I. 2, 247 a dissyllabic "what" for emphasis, IV. 2, 120 a dissyllabic "go," IV. 4, 2 a dissyllabic "ay," I. 2, 198 scans easily and regularly, as follows:

Will he/woo her/ay or/I will/hang her/

II. 1,109 can be regularly scanned though not so easily.

Sirrah/lead these/gent'men/to my/daughters

Parallel passages from Merchant of Venice scans,-

Vailing/her high/top lower than/her ribs I. 1, 27.

That you/today/promised/to tell/me of II. 1, 121.

IV. 1, 124 should certainly be read

There be/these knaves/what/no man/at door

We find this reading not at all unusual in Shakespeare. This accounts for eight of the remaining fifteen, leaving a total of seven.

It might, however, be said in passing that Fleay in this test has not given very good examples from the Shakesperian portion. Of these six, III. 2, 89 has a dissyllabic "come."

IV. 1, 150 a dissyllabic out, while V. 2, 38 scans regularly. We however, append the following from the Shakesperian portion,-

IV. 1, 1. Thus/have I/politically/begun/my reign

We find in Fleay's fourth group, one IV. 1, 153 belonging to the portion of the play assigned by Fleay to Shakespeare, though that could be read otherwise. IV. 2, 4.

Sir/to satisfy you/in what/I've said

I. 2, 194 with "O" a dissyllable becomes a regular Alexandrine.

We make no objection to Fleay's three examples of doggerel in his fifth group. We do, however, object to his statement following,- "The doggerel in "Love's Labor Lost," "Comedy of



Errors" etc., has either five or six measures in each line, and lines like these of four measures occur nowhere else in Shakespeare. (97)

This last statement comes as near the truth as many of Fleay's examples. "In "Comedy of Errors" we can find a "hatful" as Tolman says. (98)

1. For a fish without a fin, there's a foul without a feather. III. 1, 82.
2. And welcome more common: for that's nothing but words. III. 1, 25.
3. What needs all that, and a pair of stocks in the town. III. 1, 60.
4. Who is that at the door that keeps all the noise. III. 1, 61.

To multiply examples is unnecessary. Fleay's statement is proved unsound.

In Fleay's sixth group he has drawn two examples I. 1, 79 and III. 1, 83 from the portion which, according to his own assignment is Shakespeare's. Tolman is the only one of the chorizontes who would exclude III. 1, 83. However, this passage may be classed as doggerel. He gives further examples from the Shakesperian portion found in Grumio's speech in IV. 1.

Was ever man so beaten?  
Was ever man so ray'd. line 34

Fire, fire  
Cast on no water. line 20.

With the exception of III. 1, 83 all of these lines are given as prose. However, they show the metrical peculiarity mentioned by Fleay.

(97). See supra.

(98). P.M.L. A. V. 272.

Has it not been shown clearly that the metres mentioned by Fleay are peculiar not only to the "un-Shakesperian" but the Shakesperian portion as well? On the whole, Fleay's lengthy discussion of metre is most unsatisfactory.

In answer to Furnivall's and Tolman's statements in regard to unstopped lines it may be said that the percentage of unstopped lines seems a trifle higher in the "un-Shakesperian" portions. Using Tolman's division I find that I give eight unstopped lines to his five in the Shakesperian portion of II.1, two to his one in IV. 1, six to his five in IV. 5 and V.2, otherwise our figures agree in the Shakesperian portions. In the "un-Shakesperian" portions I have eleven to his eighteen in I. 2, six to his ten in II. 1, four to his six in III. 2, 126-135, four to his six in IV. 2. Tolman's totals are thirty-three unstopped lines in the Shakesperian portion, sixty-eight in the "Un-Shakesperian." My figures are respectively thirty-eight and fifty-four. As Tolman (99) says, König (100) shows the difficulty of making a sharp division into two distinct classes, stopped and unstopped. This may account for the difference in our figures.

Tolman (101) and Dr. Abbot agree in noting "the frequent stress upon unemphatic syllables receiving the metrical accent." (102) Lucentio's first speech, Tranio's speech in Act III. Sc. II, 130-135 and the pedant's speech in Act IV. Sc. IV. 28-37 seem the parts that trouble the chorizontes. I would refer them to the

(99). P.M.L.A. V. 271.

(100). Der versin Shakesperes Dramen-Quellen und Forschungen. Vol. 41, p. 97.

(101). P.M.L.A. 254.

(102). Discussion of Metre of The Shrew. T.M.S.S. 1874, p. 121.

Induction which all (barring Fleay) assign to Shakespeare. In Ind. I. consisting of one hundred and thirty-eight lines, only one hundred and twenty-three of which are verse I find eighteen examples of like nature. In Ind. II. consisting of one hundred forty-seven lines, only one hundred and twelve of which are verse, I find thirteen examples. This gives us thirty-one examples in the Induction alone. I quote also,-

And woo her with some spirit when she comes. II. 1, 170.

O be thou Dian and let her be Kate. II. 1, 262.

Thou must be married to no man but me. II. 1, 277.

And bring you from a wild Kate to a Kate. II. 1, 271.

Go to my chamber put on clothes of mine. III. 2, 115.

That take it on you at the first so roundly. III. 2, 216.

Go to the feast revel and domineer. III. 2, 226.

I will be master of what is mine own. III. 2, 231.

My tongue will tell the anger of my heart. IV. 3, 77.

Ever more cross'd and cross'd nothing but cross'd. IV. 5, 10.

Has it not been proved that the stress upon unemphatic syllables is in no measure peculiar to the "un-Shakesperian" portions?

We now turn to Tolman and consider first his statement in regard to the doggerel. It is true that all of the doggerel as he sees it, has been given to the co-laborer by him but in many instances one feels there is no particular justification for such a gift. It looks as though Shakespeare were to be held guiltless of writing lines of like nature. Why was the doggerel at the end of the play not given to Shakespeare? The line "Come Kate, we'll to bed" V. II. 184 has a counterpart in the old play. As a matter

of fact, the five lines IV. 1, 83 "May by S. Jamy" are so assigned by all of the chorizontes except Tolman. If we deduct these five lines our numbers are thirty-nine for the "un-Shakesperian" to fifteen from the Shakesperian portion, a trifle more than twice as many. That ratio might be found in any play examined in this manner. We ask Tolman or any of the chorizontes how they can account for the large number.

As to rhyming lines Tolman gives the Shakesperian portion thirty, the "un-Shakesperian" portion one hundred twenty-four. Of the latter we find but one hundred five. We can in no manner account for this except by the way of insertions <sup>(103)</sup>. Insertions could, however, not lessen the proportion a great deal. The answer Tolman in his own words:-<sup>(104)</sup> "We can only console ourselves with the thought: 'It is a part of probability that a great many improbable things may happen.'"

Tolman gives the Shakesperian portion but four Alexandrines. An examination by no means exhaustive, reveals at least a dozen. With Tolman we find no great difference in the number of feminine endings. We, therefore, leave the question of metre, for the present, and turn to that of diction.

Diction seems the determining factor to most of the critics. Tolman <sup>(105)</sup> mentions the inversions, vagueness and strutting rhetoric of Lucentio's and Tranio's first speeches and the use of unusual words. Fleay, in addition to the metrical

---

(103). See Manley's article on Cuts and Insertions in Shakespeare. *Studies in Philology* April 1917.

(104). *P.M.L.A.* p. 266.

(105). *P.M.L.A.* p. 254.

(106). *Ibid* p. 261.

peculiarities, calls attention to the use of Latin and Italian quotations and classical allusions (similes), also to new words occurring in no other undoubted play of Shakespeare. (107) These are the contributions of the chorizontes on diction.

In regard to inversions we would ask Dr. Abbott and Prof. Tolman to observe the following examples.

Sufficeth, I am content to keep my word.

Though in some part enforced to digress;

Which at more leisure, I will so excuse

As you shall well be satisfied withal. III. 2, 109.

How she prayed, that never prayed before. IV. 1, 183.

And better 'twere that both of us did fast,

Since of ourselves, ourselves are choleric,

Than feed it with such over-roasted flesh.

Aye, but the mustard is too hot a little. IV. 3, 125.

She is of good esteem.

Her dowry wealthy, and of noble birth. IV. 1, 165.

In addition to the above examples from the Shakesperian portion of TTS we append More to know did never meddle with my thoughts. Tempest I. 2, 22.

You to your former honor I bequeath.

As You Like It. V. 4, 192.

My vessels are not in one bottom trusted,

Nor to one place

An honest man I warrant; who deserved

So long a breeding as his white beard came to,

Cymbeline. V. 3, 16.

In doing for's country.

Shakespeare frequently wrote lines like these. The repartee and brisk stychomythia of Petruchio and Katherine would, in a measure, account for the larger proportion of inversions in the "un-Shakesperian" portion of the play.

Tolman calls for a comparison of Lucentio's opening speech with Petruchio's soliloquy in II. 1, 69-182. Why choose the poorest of the "non-Shakesperian" portions and the best of the Shakesperian? Compare rather Petruchio's speech (V.2, 114)

May I will win my wager yet,  
And show more sign of her obedience,  
Her new-built virtue and obedience,  
See where she comes and brings your froward wives  
As prisoners to her womanly persuasion.  
Or still better, compare Katherine's last  
Fie, fie! unknit that threatening unkind brow  
And dart not scornful glances from those eyes  
To wound thy lord, thy king, the governor.  
It blots thy beauty as frosts do bite the meads,  
Confounds thy fame as whirlwinds shake fair buds,  
And in no sense is meet or amiable.

-----  
But now I see our lances are but straw,  
Our strength but weak, our weakness past compare,  
That seeming to be most which least we are.

The last two lines are not like the lines Shakespeare gives to Vincentio,-

Fair sir and you my merry mistress  
That with your strange encounter much amazed me,  
My name is call'd Vincentio; my dwelling Pisa;  
And bound I am to visit Padua; there to visit  
A son of mine, which long I have not seen

By strutting rhetoric Tolman undoubtedly means conceits.

He has but to turn to Lucentio's opening speech in V. 2.

Katherine's last long speech V.2 and Biron's speeches in "Love's Labor Lost" IV. 3, to find more than enough to satisfy him that form of metaphor was not unknown to Shakespeare.

True, the frequency of Latin and Italian quotations is very evident. However, much of the Latin comes in the tutoring

scene where it is very apt. "This species of humor in which Latin is translated into English of a perfectly different meaning is not uncommon among our old writers!"<sup>(108)</sup> Instances are found in Middleton's Witch and Chaste Maid of Cheapside, also in "The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London." History tells us, too, that the custom of studying Latin is not unusual. Queen Elizabeth herself had as Latin tutor, Roger Ascham.

Englishmen's interest in Latin and everything Italian is exemplified in an interesting article<sup>(109)</sup> on "Shakespeare's Italian names." We read there of one Paulo Marco Lucchese, Master of the Italian Ordinary in the parish of St. Olaves, Hart St. "Master of the Italian Ordinary", according to Smart, means the keeper of a restaurant. Says Smart "Such a place would be a centre of Italian society visited by Englishmen who desired to join it. Is it too much to suggest that Shakespeare was one of them?" This would give him familiarity with the Italian tongue. What more natural than to use it when presenting characters from Italian life? How do Tolman and Fleay account for the large amount of Latin and French in "Love's Labor Lost" and "Henry V"?

Fleay's statement in regard to the manner of introducing classical allusions is little short of surprising. Examples of classical similes may be found in most of Shakespeare's plays.

We quote,-

If I live to be as old as Sibylla I will die as  
chaste as Dian 1,2,117.  
For valor, is not love a Hercules  
Still climbing trees in the Hesperides?

(108). Variorum Shakespeare V, p. 436.

(109). Shakespeare's Italian Names- John S. Smart-Modern Language notes July, 1916.

Subtle as Sphinx; as sweet and musical  
 as bright Apollo's lute. L.L.L. IV, 337.  
 As black as Vulcan in the smoke of war.  
 Twelfth Night V, 1, 52.

Of the contribution to diction there remains but that of the question of once-used words. That is by no means so formidable as Fleay's long list might indicate. A perusal of two hundred thirty-nine pages of Schmidt's Shakespeare Lexicon brings light forty-three examples of once-used words in 'King Lear', ten of which are in the first act. An examination of one hundred forty pages with reference to "Love's Labor Lost" shows twenty new words, one-half of which are found in the fifth act. Can any author of the Elizabethan Age show a vocabulary that is comparable to Shakespeare's? With H. Warwick Bond we say,—"that a high percentage of once-used words is argument rather for than against Shakespeare's authorship."<sup>(110)</sup>

Fleay's mere mention of Lodge as the collaborer of Shakespeare need not be taken seriously since he also mentions Kyd and Drayton in the same connection.<sup>(111)</sup> Tolman,<sup>(112)</sup> on the other hand, writes:- "I have no clear light as to who Shakespeare's associate was in composing this play but I would call attention to certain correspondences between his work and that of Robert Greene. These correspondences concern especially Greene's masterpiece, the play entitled "Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay".

The similarities are,-

1. Abbreviated words such as "point" for "appoint".
2. Word-twistings, as for instance "reparrel" for "apparel".
3. One infinitive with "for to" in TTS.

(110). Dowden TTS, p. 36.

(111). Fleay-Life and Works of Shakespeare, p. 226.

(112). P.M.L.A. p. 213.



4. Fondness for word "for".
5. Abundance of classical quotations and manner of introducing them.
6. Use of word "gramercies".
7. "Friar Bacon" has a number of Latin quotations.
8. Greene's "James IV" uses "seen" in the sense in which it is used in TTS.

Then again Tolman says: "I wish to ask the question whether Greene may not have been the associate of Shakespeare in writing TTS?-- The fact that Greene died in 1592, much before the supposed date of TTS, is a difficulty. Shakespeare may have revised in riper years this part of an earlier play which he and Greene wrote together. It is more probable, however, that Shakespeare's helper in writing TTS was simply an ardent admirer of Greene's work, and especially of the play 'Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay'." (113)

Again, we are forced to attack Tolman. We have seen (in the division of the play by Tolman) one of Katherine's speeches (111,2,185) excluded because the word "pointed" appeared. Though Shakespeare did not in any other play use this particular abbreviation he used others. Community of style will account for these similarities in style as it does in our own day.

"Word-twistings", as Tolman calls them, are so frequent in most of Shakespeare's plays that we need not go to "Friar Bacon" for the source. Grumio has a long line of progenitors in Launcelot, Antipholus, and Dromio.

Paucity of reasons must have been the cause of Tolman mentioning "for to" and "gramercy" as having their origin in

"Friar Bacon". Subsequently Tolman has told us that "All's Well" and Twelfth Night" each have one example of the use of "for to". Why then go to "Friar Bacon"? Has Tolman forgotten Bassanio's use of "gramercy"?

Indeed, we are not unaware of the use of Latin quotations in "Friar Bacon". Why should Tolman seek so far afield for his example when Shakespeare's other plays illustrate this abundantly?

"May not Greene have been the associate of Shakespeare"? (114) asks Tolman. With the help of Hubbard we mean to show Tolman (115) the futility of such a conjecture. In his article, "A Type of Blank Verse Found in Earlier Elizabethan Drama" Hubbard calls attention to similar lines found in much of the Elizabethan literature and shows in tabulated form Shakespeare's fondness for such lines in his historical plays. The table shows Marlowe a close competitor, whereas Kyd, Peele and Greene come in for only a small number. The latter has but ten examples each in "Friar Bacon" and "The Looking Glass", as many as sixteen in "Alfonsus" (due to the influence of Marlowe).

What are similar lines? Hubbard tells us "A line of this type consists of two symmetrical parts joined by a preposition or conjunction. Each part consists of an article or some pronominal word followed by an adjective which is in turn followed by a noun.-- The pronominal word may sometimes be wanting or may be replaced by some other part of speech without changing the characteristic structure. (116) As one of the examples he gives the following,--

Ye holy priests of heavenly Mahomet. 1 Tamb. 1V,2,1446.

(114). See supra.

(115). P.L.M.A New Series XXV. No. 1. p.68.

(116). Ibid., p. 69.

By means of these similar lines we mean to show that Greene was not Shakespeare's colaborer. As example we quote from Shakesperian and "un-Shakesperian" portions alike;-

Each in his office ready at thy beck. Ind. 11,36.

Than any woman in this waning age. Ind 11,65.

And rail upon the hostess of the house. Ind.11, 88.

The pleasant garden of great Italy. 1,1,4.

A course of learning and ingenious studies. 1,1,9.

Gave me my being and my father first. 1,1, 11.

The mathematics and the metaphysics. 1,1,37.

Put my apparel and my countenance on.1,1,251.

My best beloved and approved friend. 1, 2, 3.

He hath the jewel of my life in hold. 1,2,119.

I know my duty to my elders. 11, 1, 7.

That being a stranger in this city. 11, 1,90.

Why 'tis a cockle or a walnut shell. 1V,3,66.

Like to a censer in a barber's shop. 1V, 3,91.

The lines given above are significant as evidence that Greene did not write the "un-Shakesperian" portions. Every character except the two fathers, the pedant, and Bianca uses puns. There is a remarkable similarity in these puns to be accounted for only by single authorship.

Another reason for the belief in single authorship is the use in the "un-Shakesperian" portions of expressions found elsewhere in Shakespeare. For example:

Put finger in the eye. 1,1, 78. Comedy of Errors. 11,2,206.

Devil's dam 1,1,105. King John.11,1,128.

Merry Wives.1V,5,108. Othello.1V,1,150.

Happy man be his dole.1,1,141. Winter's Tale.1,2,163.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott. Discussion of the Metre of The Taming of the Shrew in Transactions of New Shakespeare Society, Series I, 1874
- Aldus. Shakespeare. N.Y. Bigelow, Smith & Co. n.d.
- Anders. Shakespeare's Books. Berlin G. Reimer, 1904.
- Baker. The development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist. N.Y. The Macmillan Co., 1907.
- Bankside. Shakespeare, Vol. 11. The Shakespeare Society of New York, n.d.
- Baskerville, O.H. English Elements in Jonson's early Comedy. Reprint of U. of Texas Bulletin No. 178. Austin, Texas, 1911.
- Boas. Shakespeare and his Predecessors. N.Y. C. Scribner's Sons, 1908.
- Boas. The Taming of the Shrew. N.Y. Duffield & Co., 1908.
- Bolte, Johannes. Der Widerspenstigen Zähmung als GÖrlitzer Schulkomodie in Jahrbuch der deutscher Shakespeare Gesellschaft. Vol. XXVII, Weimar, 1892.
- Bolte. Eine Parallele zu Shakespeare's The Taming of the Shrew. Vol. XXVII, Weimar, 1892.
- Brandes. William Shakespeare. N.Y. The Macmillan Co. 1897.
- Browne, O.H. Notes on Shakespeare's Versification. Ed. 4, Boston, 1894.
- Cambridge. Shakespeare edited by Neilson. Boston, Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1906.
- Castle. Shakespeare, Bacon, Jonson, and Greene. London. Sampson, Low, Marston & Co., 1897.
- Chalmers. Shakespeare's Plays with Life of Shakespeare. London, 1811.
- Churton Collins. Studies in Shakespeare. N.Y. E.P. Dutton & Co., 1904.
- Collier. History of English Dramatic Poetry. London. J. Murray, 1831.

Love in Idleness.1,1,153. Midsummer Night's Dream.11,1,168.  
 Keep house and port.1,1,205. Merchant of Venice.1,1,124.  
 Knock you here sir. 1,11,9. Henry 1V,Act 1,2,224.Othello 1,3,90.  
 As old as Sybil.1,2,70. Merchant of Venice.1,2,17.  
 Ben venuto.1,2,232. Love's Labor Lost. 1V,2,154.

But why multiply examples?

Can the chorizontes account for the following Shakesperian lines in the "un-Shakesperian" portion of the play?

No profit grows where is no pleasure ta'en;  
 In brief, sir, study what you most effect. 1,1,40.  
 I saw her coral lips to move. 1,1,179.  
 He hath the jewel of my life in hold. 1,2,121.  
 'Tis deeds must win the prize. 11,1,350.  
 Pitchers have ears and I have many servants. 1V,4,52.  
 Love wrought these miracles.V,1,133.

Fleay frankly admits that if it were not too much like taking the plums from the pudding he would give some of the good lines in the "un-Shakesperian" portion to Shakespeare. We mean to give all of the lines, poor as well as good, to the "ardent admirer of Greene" of whom Tolman speaks. Why is not this ardent admirer Shakespeare?

Have we not shown that the metre of the two portions is not dissimilar, that the diction is uniform in the two parts of the play? We have also, in the preceeding chapter, called attention to the interweaving of plots. Applying Tolman's <sup>(117)</sup> own words in another connection we conclude this discussion:—"The play makes so distinctly the impression of having been written at one burst, the two styles are at some points so intimately woven together, that I feel forced to hold the view of unity of authorship".

---

(117). P.M.L.A. V, p. 243.

- Collier. Reasons for a new Edition of Shakespeare's books. London, Whittaker & Co., 1841.
- Courthope. History of English Poetry, Vol. III. N.Y. and London, Macmillan & Co., 1895
- Dyce. Works of Shakespeare. London, Chatto and Windus, 1877.
- Delius. Die Prosa in Shakespeare's Dramen in Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft. Berlin, A. Asher and Co., 1870.
- Dowden. Shakespeare, His Mind and his Art. N.Y. Harper & Bros., n.d.
- Dowden. Shakespeare-The Taming of the Shrew, edited R. Warwick Bond, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Co., n.d.
- Elze. William Shakespeare-A literary biography, translated by L. Dora Schmitz, London, C. Bell and Co., 1885.
- Eversley edition. The Taming of the Shrew, edited by C.H. Herford. N.Y. London, The Macmillan Co., 1900.
- First Folio edition. The Taming of the Shrew, edited by Charlotte Porter and Helen A. Clarke. N.Y. T.Y. Crowell Co., 1908.
- First Quarto edition. The Taming of a Shrew. London, C. Praetorius, 1886.
- Fleay. A Chronicle History of the Life and Works of Shakespeare. London, John C. Nimmo, 1806.
- Fleay. A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama. London, Reeves and Turner, 1891.
- Fleay. On the Authorship of the Taming of the Shrew in Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society. Series 1, 1, 1874. London, Alexander Moring.
- Fleay. Shakespeare Manual. London, Macmillan Co., 1878.
- Furnivall. Discussion on Fleay's paper On the Authorship of The Taming of the Shrew in Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society. Series 1, 1, 1874. London, Alexander Moring.

- Furnivall. The Succession of Shakespeare's Works.  
London, 1874.
- Furnivall. Shakespeare, Life and Works.  
London, N.Y. Cassell & Co., 1910.
- Gascoigne. Supposes in Early Plays from the Italian.  
Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Gayley. Beaumont, the Dramatist.  
N.Y., The Century Co., 1914.
- Gayley. Representative English Comedies.  
N.Y., The Macmillan Co., 1914.
- Gervinus. Shakespeare, Commentaries translated by  
F.E. Burnett.  
London, Smith, Elder and Co., 1892.
- Grosart. Greene's Works. Ruth Library. Vol. XLIII and  
XLV. Printed for private circulation only.  
1881-83.
- Halliwel-Phillipps. Shakesperians.  
London, J.R. Smith, 1890.
- Hazlitt. Shakespeare's Library, vol. 11, Part 11,  
London, Reeves and Turner, 1878.
- Hazlitt. Shakespeare, the Man and his Work.  
London, Bernard Quaritch, 1912.
- Henslowe. Diary edited by Greg, London, A.W. Bullen, 1904
- Henslowe. Papers edited by Greg, London, A.W. Bullen, 1907.
- Hickson. In Notes and Queries.  
London, Geo. Bell and Co., 1850.
- Hubbard. A type of Blank Verse found in Earlier  
Elizabethan Drama in Publications of Modern  
Language Association.  
New Series XXV, No., 1, 1916.
- Hudson. Shakespeare, Life, Art and Characters.  
Boston, Ginn Brothers, 1878.
- Jonson. Plays. Mermaid Series.  
N.Y. Scribner's Sons, n.d.
- Kohler. Zu Shakespeare's The Taming of the Shrew in  
Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesell-  
schaft, 1868, Berlin Georg Reimer.
- Konig. Der Vers in Shakespeare's Dramen in Quellen  
und Forschungen v. 61.  
Strassburg, E.J. Trubner, 1888.

- Lambert. Shakespeare's documents.  
London, Geo. Bell & Sons, 1904.
- Lee. A Life of William Shakespeare-new edition rewritten  
and enlarged.  
N.Y. Macmillan Co., 1916.
- Lee. Four Quarto Editions of Plays by Shakespeare-  
Stratford upon Avon, The Trustees and guardians of  
Shakespeare's birthplace, 1908.
- Lee. Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies,  
being a reproduction in facsimile of the first  
folio edition.  
Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1902.
- Leopold. Shakespeare.  
London, Paris, N.Y. Cassell and Co.,  
limited, reprinted 1894.
- Mabie. William Shakespeare, Poet, Dramatist and Man.  
N.Y. The Macmillan Co., 1906.
- Madden. Shakespeare and his Fellows.  
London, Smith Elder & Co., 1916.
- Manley. Cuts and Insertions in Shakespeare in Studies in  
Philology, April, 1917.
- Masson. Shakespeare Personally.  
London, Smith, Elder & Co., 1914.
- Moulton. Shakespeare as a Dramatic Thinker.  
N.Y., The Macmillan Co., 1907.
- Neilson. Chief Elizabethan Dramatists.  
Boston and N.Y., Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1911.
- Neilson. Some Facts about Shakespeare.  
N.Y., The Macmillan Co., 1913.
- Old Spelling. Shakespeare edited by F.J. Furnivall and F.S.  
Boswell-Stone.  
N.Y. Duffield and Co., 1908.
- Raleigh. Shakespeare.  
N.Y., The Macmillan Co., 1907.
- Rolfe. Shakespeare- The Taming of the Shrew.  
N.Y., Harper Brothers, 1895.
- Schelling. Elizabethan Drama.  
Boston, N.Y., Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1908.



- Schomburg. Eine Studie zu Shakespeare's Kunst in studien zur englischen Philologie, vol.20.  
Max Niemeyer, 1904.
- Schmidt. Shakespeare's Lexicon.  
Berlin, W. Reimer, 1874-5.
- Shakespeare Society Publications, vol. 25 containing Taming of a Shrew and The Wife Lapped in Morels Skin.  
London, 1844.
- Smart. Shakespeare's Italian Names in Modern Language Notes, July, 1916.
- Stratford-town edition. The Taming of the Shrew.  
Stratford on Avon, The Shakespeare Head Press, 1904.
- Symonds. Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama.  
London, Smith, Elder & Co., 1884.
- Ten Brink. Über den Sommernachtstraum in Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft.  
Weimar, A. Buschke, 1878.
- Tolman. Shakespeare's Part in the Taming of the Shrew in Publications of Modern Language Association of America, 1890.
- Tolman. Views about Hamlet and other Essays.  
Boston, N.Y., Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1904.
- Tudor.edition. The Taming of the Shrew, edited by Frederick Tupper, Jr.  
N.Y., The Macmillan Co., 1912.
- White, F.G. The Taming of the Shrew.  
Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1850.
- Ulricé. Shakespeare's Dramatic Art translated by L. Dora Schmitz.  
London, George Bell & Co., 1878.
- Ward. History of English Dramatic Literature.  
London, The Macmillan Co., 1896.