

Chambers 1893 E. K. Chambers (ed.), *The Tragedy of Macbeth* (London: Blackie & Son, 1893). "The Warwick Shakespeare."

145

APPENDIX A.

SIMON FORMAN.

Simon Forman was a quack and astrologer, who died in 1611, and left, amongst other MSS., a *Book of Plaies and Notes thereof, for common Pollicie*. This is now in the Bodleian Library (Ashmolean MSS. 208), and has been privately reprinted by Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps. Amongst the plays seen by Forman were *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, *Macbeth*, and a play of *Richard II.* which was not that by Shakespeare. He gives the following account of *Macbeth*.

"In *Macbeth*, at the Globe, 1610, the 20th of April, Saturday, there was to be observed ...

146

... and the Doctor noted her words."

The passages printed in italics show either that Forman was an inaccurate observer, or that the play as presented on April 20, 1610, was in several points different from the version which we possess. The statement that *Macbeth* was created Prince of Northumberland makes one incline towards the former explanation.

APPENDIX B.

THE EDITIONS OF 1673 AND 1674.

These two versions have been confused by editors; but they are quite distinct, and different in character. The edition of 1673 is in the main a reprint, with some inaccuracies, of the First Folio. But it contains, in addition, three songs. One of those is that indicated in the stage-direction to iii. 5. 33. It occurs also in Middleton's *The Witch*, act iii. sc. 3. There are a few differences between the texts, of no great moment. ...

147

.
. .
.

The other two songs are introduced for the Witches at the end of act ii. sc. 2, and of act ii. sc. 3, respectively. There is no proof of their authorship, but they may be by Davenant, who seems to have acted as editor to the version published in the next year, 1674.

The title-page of this is as follows: --

Macbeth | A | Tragedy. | With all the | Alterations, | Amendments,
| Additions, | and | New Songs. | As it's now Acted at the

Duke's Theatre | London. | Printed for P. Chetwin, and are to
be Sold | by most Booksellers, 1674.

The 'new songs' include the three already printed in 1673, and a fourth, also taken from *The Witch*, act v. sc. 2, and indicated in the stage-direction to iv. 1. 43 of the Folio *Macbeth*.

.
.
.

Davenant's "Amendments, Alterations and Additions" amount to an entire recasting of the play. Many of Shakespeare's most characteristic passages are cut out, and replaced by worthless stuff of the

148

adapter's own. It would be mere waste of time to consider these changes more closely. But it is notable that several of the passages omitted by Davenant are exactly those which more recent editors have wished to reject as un-Shakespearian. Such are the episodes of the Porter, of the touching for the evil, of Siward and his son. (Cf. Appendix G.)

APPENDIX C.

SHAKESPEARE'S HISTORICAL AUTHORITY.

The historical incidents of *Macbeth* are derived by Shakespeare from Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicle of Scotland*. This was part of a great folio collection of *Chronicles and Descriptions of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, which Holinshed, with the assistance of William Harrison and Richard Stanihurst, gave to the world in 1587. A second edition, apparently the one used by Shakespeare, was published in 1587.

.
.
.

163

.
.
.

APPENDIX D.

WITCHCRAFT IN THE AGE OF SHAKESPEARE.

The belief in evil spirits, and in the power of witches to do harm by their aid, was wide-spread both amongst Catholics and Protestants in the 16th and 17th centuries. Allusions to it are frequent in literature. Statutes were constantly passed against sorcery, and there are many accounts of the trials of persons suspected of the practice. The most interesting contemporary books on the subject are Harsnet's *Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures* (1603); and Reginald

Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584, recently edited by Dr. Brinsley Nicholson). Harsnet's tract is an enquiry into certain cases of demoniacal possession alleged to have been cured by Parsons, the Jesuit: Scot's is a noteworthy attack upon the whole superstition, and is crammed with curious magical lore. It is said to have been publicly burnt, and was reprinted in 1651. Shakespeare seems to have borrowed learning from Harsnet for *King Lear*, and possibly from Scot for *Macbeth*. He must also have had in mind a group of cases of alleged witchcraft which took place in Scotland in 1590. These are distinguished from the English cases by the importance which the power claimed for the witches of ruling the elements assumed in them (cf. i. 1. 11, sqq.; iv. 1. 52, sqq.). In 1589 the royal fleet in which James VI. was bringing home his bride, Anne of Denmark, was dispersed by a sudden and violent storm. James, always intensely superstitious, became convinced that this storm was due to supernatural influence, and in the next year commenced a vigorous campaign against witches. In the course of this the charge of raising tempests and wrecking ships recurred again and again. The Scottish witches, also, unlike the English, appear to have been in the habit of going to sea in sieves (cf. i. 3. 8). A full account of these proceedings may be found in a pamphlet called *News from Scotland, declaring the damnable life of Doctor Fian, a notable Sorcerer, &c.*, 1591. Eight years later (1599) James published his *Demonologie*, which was intended largely as a counterblast to the scepticism of Reginald Scot. He came to the English throne in 1603, and in 1604 passed a new statute to suppress witchcraft. This may well have recalled public attention to the matter, and suggested to Shakespeare the production or revival of *Macbeth*.

164

APPENDIX E.

ON THE WITCH-SCENES.

The passages which I believe to have been interpolated into Shakespeare's work by a later hand are three: act iii. sc. 5; act iv. sc. 1, lines 39-43; and act iv. sc. 1, lines 125-132. These are distinguished from the genuine witch-scenes by --

i. The introduction of a superfluous character, Hecate, who takes no real part in the action of the play.

ii. A metre which is mainly iambic, whereas that of Shakespeare's undoubted witch-scenes is, as a rule, trochaic.

iii. A lyrical element alien to the original conception of the witches. One can hardly imagine the awful beings, who meet Macbeth and Banquo on the blasted heath, singing little songs and dancing 'like elves and fairies'.

iv. Certain prettinesses of fancy, which are much more like Middleton than Shakespeare. See e.g. iii. 5. 23, 34.

With these exceptions the witch-scenes are harmonious in character, and strictly in keeping with the weird temper of the whole play. I cannot, therefore, agree with Mr. Fleay in attributing also to Middleton act i. sc. 1, and act i. sc. 3, lines 1-37; nor do I think there is sufficient evidence to decide for or against his hypothesis that the apparition speeches in act iv. sc. 1 and lines 92-103 of the same scene have been 'worked over'.

Mr. Fleay has a further theory as to the witch-scenes which demands a brief consideration. It is that the supernatural beings in

act i. sc. 3 and those in act iv. sc. 1 were not meant by Shakespeare to be identical. In the heath scene he introduces 'weird sisters' proper, three 'fates' or 'destinies' akin to the Scandinavian Norns or goddesses of past, present, and future. These in the cavern scene are replaced by three beings of quite a different type, the ordinary vulgar witches of Elizabethan popular belief. Mr. Fleay argues/¹ --

(i) Holinshed speaks of Macbeth and Banquo as originally greeted by three "weird sisters, that is, as ye would say, the goddesses of destiny, or else some nymphs or fairies". (See Appendix C.) Forman also calls them "women-fairies or nymphs". (Appendix <>C.) These terms, 'weird', 'nymph', 'fairy', are usual terms in Elizabethan literature for such Fate-goddesses. At a later period Holinshed speaks of Macbeth as listening to "witches" and "wizards", and it is these, quite distinct from the "weird sisters", who are represented in act iv. sc. 1.

(ii) The characteristics of the two types are different. It is the Norns who can 'look into the seeds of time', and prophesy of what is to come. Mere witches have no such power. On the other

/1 F. G. Fleay, *Shakespeare Manual*, and *Anglia*, vol. vii.

165

hand, it is the witches, and not the Norns, who use magical charms and incantations.

(iii) This view gives an explanation of the curious stage-direction in iv. 1. 38, *Enter Hecate with the other three witches*. (See notes ad loc.)

Mr. Fleay admits that in iii. 4. 133 and in iv. 1. 136 Macbeth speaks of the later witches as "the weird sisters". This, he somewhat tentatively suggests, may be due to a corrupt text.

Several considerations seem to be fatal to Mr. Fleay's theory.

(a) It implies the rejection of certain passages -- i. 1; i. 3. 1-37, and iv. 1. 130, sqq., which on all other grounds may well be thought genuine.

(b) It is most unlikely that the distinction between Norns and witches, which we, with our modern knowledge of comparative mythology can make, would have been appreciated by Shakespeare and his audience. They would quite naturally identify the two.

(c) Mr. Spalding/¹ has conclusively shown that what Mr. Fleay regards as the special note of the Norns, the power to see into the future, is among the common accusations made in witch trials. He also quotes instances of the use of "wayward" (= "weird") and "sisters", as applied to witches.

APPENDIX F.

ON THE PORTER SCENE: Act ii. sc. 3.

Coleridge was one of the most helpful and suggestive of Shakespearean critics. A poet himself, he had a genuine insight into the workings of another poet's mind. But he had not the scholarly temper, and his speculations were often brilliant rather than sane. So that his judgments upon disputed points are apt to need some reconsidering.

Speaking of *Macbeth*, act ii. sc. 3, Coleridge says/²: "This low

soliloquy of the Porter and his few speeches afterwards I believe to have been written for the mob by some other hand, perhaps with Shakespeare's consent; and that finding it take, he, with the remaining ink of a pen otherwise employed, just interpolated the words --

'I'll devil-porter it no further: I had thought to have let in some of all professions, that go the primrose way to the everlasting bonfire'.

Of the rest not one syllable has the ever-present being of Shakespeare".

The Clarendon Press editors, following Coleridge, attribute this

/1 T. A. Spalding, *Elizabethan Demonology*.

/2 *Shakespeare Notes and Lectures*.

166

passage, amongst others, to the hand of Middleton. Such a view appears to me undoubtedly wrong, and it is of some importance to the right understanding of Shakespeare's dramatic methods to see why it is wrong. A complete survey of the whole question is given by Mr. J. W. Hales in his *Notes and Essays on Shakespeare*, and the following argument is largely condensed from his.

.
. .

167

.
. .

As to the style of the speech, Mr. Hales conclusively shows it to be quite Shakespearian. The use of 'old', the phrase 'devil-porter it', the conception of an infernal janitor, the manner of the dialogue with Macduff, all of these can be easily paralleled./1 Even Coleridge had to make an exception to his theory in favour of the bit about 'the primrose way to the everlasting bonfire' -- an exception fantastic in itself, and quite fatal to the Clarendon Press idea that Middleton was the author of the passage.

APPENDIX G.

ON VARIOUS SUSPECTED PASSAGES.

I accept the general contention of the Clarendon Press editors and of Mr. Fleay that this play has been rehandled, and in part at least, by Middleton. But I am very sceptical about some of the passages which they have condemned. Arguments which depend upon a

/1 See notes to act ii. scene 3.

168

sense of style are to a certain extent legitimate in criticism, but after

all they are unverifiable; they can hardly be safely applied to single lines, and the conclusions derived from them should always be held as merely probable. I cannot think that these critics have always observed a decent caution in this respect. It is worth while to consider the passages in question under various heads.

i. The Witch Scenes. -- The Clarendon Press editors reject i. 3. 1-37; iii. 5; and iv. 1. 39-47, 125-132. Mr. Fleay adds i. 1; iv. 1. 71-2, 79-81, 89-92, 92-103, and as a corollary, iii. 4. 130-144. These have been already discussed in Appendix E.

ii. The Porter Scene. -- The Clarendon Press editors reject ii. 3. 1-46. Mr. Fleay does not. This has been already discussed in Appendix F.

iii. The Sergeant Scene. -- The Clarendon Press editors reject i. 2, and say: "Making all allowance for corruption of text, the slovenly metre is not like Shakespeare's work, even when he is most careless. The bombastic phraseology of the sergeant is not like Shakespeare's language even when he is most bombastic. What is said of the thane of Cawdor, lines 52, 53, is inconsistent with what follows in scene 3, lines 72, 73, and 112 sqq. We may add that Shakespeare's good sense would hardly have tolerated the absurdity of sending a severely wounded soldier to carry the news of victory."

The only serious points here seem to be (a) the 'slovenly metre' and (b) the 'inconsistencies'. (a) Lines 3, 5, 7, 34, 37, 41, 45, 64, 66 may be explained as instances of ordinary metrical irregularities, though it must be admitted they come rather thick and fast in this scene (cf. notes ad loc. and Essay on Metre, § 5 (iii)). But some of them may also be due to the shortening of the scene for stage purposes, and to this also I should attribute lines 20 and 51 (cf. Introduction, p. 8).

(b) This is a real difficulty and I cannot entirely explain it. But Macbeth, on the field of battle, may not have known, as Ross did, of Cawdor's treachery. So that the only absolute inconsistency is between Angus' speech, lines 109-116, and the general drift of sc. 2. And even here I think the confusion is more likely to be due to compression than to interpolation. For instance -- in sc. 2, lines 62-66 may have replaced a much longer passage, in which Cawdor 'confessed' his treason, and was condemned. Angus may have entered at the close of that, and have been sent with Ross to Macbeth, without knowing exactly what Cawdor's crime was. I have seen an absurd book/1 by a Canadian schoolmaster, in which an attempt is made to show that Cawdor was innocent, and that Ross was a creature of Macbeth's, who had slandered Cawdor to Duncan, and then fooled Angus with a false version of the matter!

iv. Rhyme-tags. -- The Clarendon Press editors reject ii. 1. 61. Mr. Fleay adds i. 4. 48-53; ii. 3. 127-8, 4. 37-8, 40-1; iv. 1. 153-4;

/1 *Some New Notes on Macbeth.* By M. F. Libby, B.A., English Master of the Jameson Ave Collegiate Institute, Toronto.

v. 1. 76-7, 2. 29-30, 3. 61-2, 4. 19-20, 6. 9-10. I have no doubt that rhymed closes to speeches and scenes were often introduced to please the actors, but may they not have been written by Shakespeare himself for that purpose? Moreover I cannot see why these particular tags should be taken away and others left. They are not all particularly feeble (e.g. i. 4. 48-53) or un-Shakespearian (e.g. <v. 2. 152-4. cf. note), nor is Shakespeare quite incapable of writing a

feeble line at times.

v. Miscellaneous passages. -- The Clarendon Press editors reject --

(a) iv. 3. 140-159 -- the 'king's evil' scene. These lines, they say, "were probably interpolated previous to a representation at Court". The judgment seems to me perfectly arbitrary, and it is very likely that the play was originally written for a 'representation at Court'. (Cf. Introduction, p. 10.)

(b) v. 2, about which they "have doubts". But the scene is wanted as a pendant to sc. 3, and to show the feeling of Scotland towards Macbeth. The language is exceedingly Shakespearian.

(c) v. 5. 47-50, which they call "singularly weak" and "an unskilful imitation of other passages". The line "I 'gin to be aweary of the sun" does not strike me as at all "singularly weak".

(d) v. 8. 32-3 --

'Before my body
I throw my warlike shield'.

They think that these words are also 'interpolated'. But surely no critic can seriously persuade himself that he has a sense of style delicate enough to determine whether they are Shakespeare's or not.

(e) v. 8. 35-75 -- the relation of young Siward's death and crowning of Malcolm. Here they say, "The double stage direction. '*Exeunt fighting*' -- '*Enter fighting, and Macbeth slaine*', proves that some alteration had been made in the conclusion of the piece. Shakespeare, who has inspired his audience with pity for Lady Macbeth, and made them feel that her guilt has been almost absolved by the terrible retribution which followed, would not have disturbed this feeling by calling her a 'fiend-like queen'; nor would he have drawn away the veil which with his fine tact he had dropt over her fate, by telling us that she had taken off her life 'by self and violent hands'."

Here I need only note that the double stage-direction only points to some rearrangement of the fighting-scenes which immediately precede, a thing very likely in view of stage-requirements; that a priori arguments as to what Shakespeare would have or would not have done are very untrustworthy; that, to me at least, there seems to be a final touch of irony in the contrast between Lady Macbeth as Malcolm thought of her, and Lady Macbeth as we know her; that the Siward episode follows naturally on sc. 7; and that the way of winding up the play is very like that adopted also in *Hamlet*.

On the whole I think that the Clarendon Press editors were well advised in their determination to eschew 'signpost' (i.e. 'aesthetic')

170

criticism, and devote themselves to the linguistic and grammatical illustration of Shakespeare's plays.

(f) Mr. Fleay adds iii. 4. 130-144, partly because it interferes with his theory of the two sets of witches, partly because of 'poverty of thought', a 'long tag', and 'marks of inferior work'. I fancy that no one who does not hold Mr. Fleay's peculiar witch-theory will share his objections to this passage. I should perhaps add that I believe Mr. Fleay has modified his published views on *Macbeth*.