Manly 1896 J. M. Manly (ed.), Shakspere's Macbeth (New York, 1896).

<v>

PREFATORY NOTE

Macbeth has been edited so often and so well that a school edition can contain little that is new. The present edition is, therefore, a compilation, and that to a much greater extent than the acknowledgments in the notes would imply. The notes of previous editors have been freely used without indication of the sources from which they were drawn; when authority is given for a note, it is usually due to some special reason. Furthermore, in quoting other editors I have almost invariably quoted not from the original, but from Dr. Furness's variorum edition; in cases in which reference to that storehouse of learning will not disclose the source of my information, I have mentioned the scholar to whom I am indebted. It remains to say that of the few notes which I suppose myself to have contributed, such as are good probably belong in reality to the two men who taught me to read Shakspere, President Charles Manly of Furman University, and Professor G. L. Kittredge of Harvard.

J. M. M.

Providence, R. I., August 4, 1896.

.
.
.

<ix>

INTRODUCTION

I. Date of Composition.

"Macbeth" was first published in the first folio,/1 seven years after the death of Shakspere. That it had not previously been published is indicated by its presence among the plays for which Edward Blount and Isaac Jaggard, the publishers of the first folio, secured copyright November 8, 1623, as not previously entered to other men.

The composition of the play is assigned by nearly all scholars to 1605 or 1606; it has even been suggested that

the particular occasion for which it was composed was the visit of the King of Denmark in July, 1606, but numerous as were the entertainments then provided, there is no

/1 The first folio appeared in 1623, the second in 1682, the third (two issues) in 1663 and 1664, the fourth in 1685. These are collections of all the plays, essentially as they now appear in complete editions of the plays, the poems and sonnets not being included. Pericles, a part of which is regarded as Shakspere's, was not printed in the first folio or second folio, but appeared in the 1664 issue of the third folio (and in the fourth folio) along with six other plays which are not admitted by most scholars to be Shakspere's. The folios vary somewhat in size, but measure about thirteen inches by eight and three quarters.

The quartos, on the other hand, are small books, about eight and a quarter by five and a half inches, containing each a single play. They began to appear as early as 1594, sometimes with the permission of Shakspere and his partners in the theatre, sometimes against their wish, the manuscript having been obtained fraudulently. Before 1623 seventeen of the thirty-seven plays had appeared in quarto.

evidence that this was one of them. The arguments made use of to determine the date are not very strong. One of them is that when King James visited Oxford in August, 1605, there advanced to meet him, out of a castle made of ivy, near St. John's Gate, three students dressed to represent the weird sisters, and, after referring to the prophecy long before made to Banquo, his ancestor, all-hailed him and the Queen and the two princes. By some report of this, it is said, the subject of "Macbeth" may have been suggested to Shakspere. In the Porter's speech (II, iii, 1 ff.) are three passages supposed to be allusions to topics of the day: (a) mention of the "farmer that hanged himself on the expectation of plenty" is supposed to point to the plentiful corn harvest of 1606; (b) the "equivocator" is interpreted as being a hit at Henry Garnet, Superior of the Order of Jesuits in England, who was tried March, 1606, for complicity in the Gunpowder Plot; (c) the humor of the English tailor's stealing out of a French hose is thought to be increased by the (unproved) fact that in 1606 tight-fitting hose were the fashion. A further argument for 1605 or 1606 depends upon the supposition that in I, iii, 108 is implied an actual ceremony of investiture, suggested by the investiture, in Scotland, of Sir David Murray as Lord Scone. Insufficient as these arguments are, there seems little reason to doubt the proposition they are used to support. This conclusion is in harmony also with the fact that the prediction of "two-fold balls and treble sceptres" would be

especially appropriate after -- but would it not take with the audience equally well immediately before? -- the official proclamation of James as King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland on the 24th of October, 1604./1

/1 In The Puritan, a play published first in 1607 -- conjectured by Fleay to have been written by Middleton in 1606 -- and republished in the third folio as by Shakspere, occurs a passage which has been

Mr. Fleay ("Life and Work of Shakespeare," pp. 238-243, and Poet-Lore, 1893, pp. 419, 513, 564) maintains that Shakspere was one of the party of players who went to Scotland in 1601 and performed before King James at Aberdeen, and that while there he wrote a version of "Macbeth," which he revised and improved in 1606, the subject having been recalled to his attention by the

called "a manifest allusion" to Banquo's ghost. Could we be sure of this, we should have a very convenient upper limit for the date of Macbeth. But the allusion is far from manifest. The situation is this (Act IV, sc. iii): George Pyeboard and Captain Idle have "by magic" recovered for the simple Sir Godfrey a fine gold chain, which they had had stolen and hid by a confederate, and now have raised from his coffin Corporal Oath, who is just being carried past the house to be buried, having been given a sleeping potion a few hours before by George. The coffin is opened, the Corporal revives, sees the white sheet in which he is wrapped, and says: "Zounds, where am I? Covered with snow!" Then, taking Lady Plus for the hostess of an inn, he orders a hot porridge and a fire. She commands her servants Nicholas and Frailty to help him into the house, but Nicholas says: "Pray, call out the maids; I shall ne'er have the heart to do't, indeed la!" Frailty: "Nor I, neither; I cannot abide to handle a ghost, of all men." Then Sir Godfrey, feeling particularly gay over the recovery of his chain, invites the whole crowd in to a banquet: "Ay, and a banquet ready by this time, Master Sheriff, to which I most cheerfully invite you and your late prisoner there. See you this goodly chain, sir? Mum! no more words; 'twas lost and is found again. Come, my inestimable bullies, we'll talk of your noble acts in sparkling charnico [wine]; and instead of a jester, we'll have the ghost in the white sheet sit at the upper end of the table." I have given the situation in detail, because I think that, taken apart from its context, the passage produces an entirely false impression. It is not some well-known ghost that is to be called in for the occasion; it is the one who has just been raised in his white sheet, who is invited with the rest of the crowd. Of course it may still be said that to such a banquet the Macbeth-Banquo scene on the boards of a rival theatre at the same time would give additional point. Granted: but that is very different from an unmistakable allusion; the situation does not need that aid.

Oxford address to the King. His arguments are, that the description of Cawdor's death is remarkably like that of the Earl of Essex (February 25, 1601) in Stowe's "Chronicle," and that the play is more closely related to "Hamlet" and "Julius Caesar" than to "King Lear" or "Timon of Athens." He thinks that there was probably a play on the subject prior to 1596, which may have been used by Shakspere. The evidence for this is that a "Ballad of Macdobeth" is mentioned in the "Stationers' Register" for 1596, and again by Kempe in his "Nine Daies Wonder" (1600)./1 To the arguments for the 1601 date, he might have added -- had he chosen to do so -- a "manifest allusion" to "Macbeth," II, ii, 3, in Middleton's "Blurt, Master Constable" (1602), III, i, sign. E. (cf. "Centurie of Prayse," p. 51).

II. Forman's Diary.

When Collier first published Dr. Simon Forman's account of a performance of "Macbeth" attended by him at the Globe Theatre, some scholars were inclined to revise their opinion as to the date of the play, because it seemed unlikely that Forman would have taken the trouble to give so detailed an account of any play that was not new. But this argument was based on a misapprehension of Forman's purpose in taking notes. The title of the little MS. volume of fourteen leaves, only five of which contain writing, is: "The Booke of Plaies and Notes therof per formans for Common Pollicie." The words, "for Common Pollicie," indicate that he thought he might obtain from plays valuable hints for his own guidance in life. This is confirmed by the notes themselves; for instance,

/1 It can be proved -- by the sort of proof commonly used in such matters -- that Shakspere himself was the author of this early version, but perhaps it is just as well not to prove it.

after recording how in "Richard II" Jack Straw, "not being pollitick," was suddenly stabbed by Walworth, he says: "Therfore in such a case or the like, never admit any party, without a bar betwen, for A man cannot be so [too] wise, nor kepe him selfe to safe;" and so frequently. Besides this "Richard II," which is not Shakspere's, Forman took notes on three plays, all Shakspere's: "Winter's Tale," "Cymbeline," and "Macbeth." His account of "Macbeth" is as follows:

"In Mackbeth at the glob, 16j0, the 20 of Aprill,/1 ther was to be

obserued, firste, howe Mackbeth and Bancko, 2 noble men of Scotland, Ridinge thorowe a wod, the[r] stode before them 3 women feiries or Nimphes, ...

/1 I follow Dr. Furnivall's reprint, Trans. New Sh. Soc. 1875-76, App. ii. All other copies of Forman give *Saturday* as standing in the text after *Aprill*; Dr. Furnivall omits it, and has no note. The presence or absence of this word is decidedly important, for in 1610 April 20 did not fall on Saturday, whereas in 1611 (the year of the two other dated accounts) it did. If Forman really wrote *Saturday*, it is easy to understand how he came to set down the wrong year, or the wrong day of the month; but if he did not give the day of the week, there is no reason for maintaining that this entry also belongs to 1611, as has been argued.

...... howe mackbetes quen did Rise in the night in her slepe, & walke and talked and confessed all, & the docter noted her wordes."

What valuable lessons the old quack doctor learned from this play is not altogether clear -- perhaps that crime may be revealed in the talk of an unquiet sleeper. To the omissions and inaccuracies of his account attention has often been directed, and some rather remarkable inferences have been drawn. His silence about the events of I, i, ii, has been urged as proof that the play began with I, iii, 38, preceded by a conversation between Macbeth and Banquo, narrating the events of the battle. But it is to be noted that he lays very little stress upon the supernatural elements of the play, entirely omitting Macbeth's second meeting with the weird sisters, and

mentioning neither the prophecies in regard to Macbeth's destruction nor the means of their fulfilment. Perhaps, as a professional astrologer, he took no particular interest in the supernatural except for business purposes. The touching for the King's Evil, in like manner, failed to interest him, -- or, quite as probably, was not played. His statement that Macbeth was appointed Prince of Northumberland (i.e., Cumberland), is clearly due to a failure to understand the significance of the appointment of Malcolm. His placing Duncan's visit to Macbeth on the day after the appointment of the Prince of Cumberland may indicate only that he followed the time-scheme of the play very poorly. His omission of the meeting of Ross and Angus with Macbeth and Banquo shows how careless his account is, for the jumbled expression "Hail, King of Codon!" proves that it occurred. That the

witches met Macbeth and Banquo in a wood, may be due to a recollection of Holinshed's account (cf. note on II, iii, 121), may be due to the absence of any scenery to make a definite impression on his mind, or may be due to failure of memory. What is said about the inability of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth to wash the blood from their hands does not imply, as has been suggested, that such a scene was enacted; it may be the resultant impression of Macbeth's speech, II, ii, 60, and Lady Macbeth's actions and words in the sleep-walking scene. On the whole it seems highly probable that Forman wrote this account when some time had elapsed since he saw the play, and his recollections had become vague and confused. If 1610 is a mistake for 1611, one could account for the note of this play of April 20th following the notes of the other three -- one on April 30th and the other on May 15th -- by supposing that this entry was not made until after May 15th. There is some support for this in the fact that while the notes on the first two plays contain several inferences and

hints for "Common Pollicie," those on the last two contain none.

III. The King's Evil.

The passage concerning the healing of the King's Evil (IV, iii, 140-159), has been supposed by some editors to indicate that "Macbeth" was originally composed for performance at Court, by others it is regarded as a later interpolation for a court performance; but all, I believe, agree in regarding it as a compliment to King James. It is asserted that he "fancied himself endowed with the Confessor's powers;" that "he was especially proud of exercising" them; that the touching for the Evil was "revived by him, and claimed by him as hereditary in his house."

That he exercised the power is, of course, perfectly certain; but it is by no means certain that he ever did so willingly. Professor S. R. Gardiner ("History of England," ed. 1884, vol. i, p. 152) cites two contemporary documents -- one of September-October, 1603, the other of January, 1604 -- as authorizing the following statements: "When he first arrived in England James had objected to touch for the king's evil. He had strong doubts as to the existence of the power to cure scrofulous diseases, which was supposed to be derived from the Confessor. The Scotch ministers whom he had brought with

him urged him to abandon the practice as superstitious. To his English counsellors it was a debasing of royalty to abandon the practice of his predecessors. With no very good will he consented to do as Elizabeth had done, but he first made a public declaration of his fear lest he should incur the blame of superstition. Yet as it was an ancient usage, and for the benefit of his subjects, he would try what would be the result, but only by way of prayer, in which he requested all present to join."

xvii

Professor Gardiner thinks that later James had no hesitancy about the touching, but apparently his only reason for thinking so is this passage in "Macbeth." There is, however, some evidence that even so late as 1613 he retained his scruples. In that year Johann Ernst, Duke of Saxe-Weimar, visited the Court of England, and on Sunday, September 17th, was present at Theobalds at the religious service held in the palace. "When it was concluded," says the contemporary account, "the Royal Physician brought a little girl, two boys, and a tall strapping youth, who were afflicted with incurable diseases, and bade them kneel down before his Majesty; and as the Physician had already examined the disease (which he is always obliged to do, in order that no deception may be practised), he then pointed out the affected part in the neck of the first child to his Majesty, who thereupon touched it, pronouncing these words: *Le Roy vous touche, Dieu vous guery* (The King touches, may God heal thee!) and then hung a rose-noble round the neck of the little girl with a white silk ribbon. . . . During the performance of this ceremony the above mentioned Bishop, who stood close to the King, read from the Gospel of St. John, and lastly a prayer, whilst another clergyman knelt before him and made occasional responses during the prayer. . . . This ceremony of healing is understood to be very distasteful to the King, and it is said he would willingly abolish it; but he cannot do so, because he assumes the title of King of "France" as well; for he does not cure as King of England, by whom this power is said to have been never possessed, but as a King of France, who ever had such a gift from God. The Kings of England first ventured to exercise this power when they upward of two centuries and a half ago had possession of nearly the whole of France, and when Henry VI had himself crowned at Paris as King of France [Dec. 17,

xviii

1431]." -- Rye, "England as seen by Foreigners," pp. 151, 152. This evidence of a general belief in James's reluctance to touch can hardly be set aside, or regarded as merely an echo of his feeling when he ascended the throne. The only thing that even seems to weaken the evidence is the explanation given of the origin and significance of the power. But there is reason to think that this was a current explanation; the discussion cannot be undertaken here, but cf. Delrio's remarks, "Disq. Mag.," pp. 24, 25, on Tooker's book and its purpose; and consider the significance of the fact that the formula used by James is not Latin or English, but French. [The account above is translated from the German.]

On the whole it is at least doubtful whether this famous passage was intended to please James. It may have been; but it is quite as probable that it was intended to please the audience at the Globe, by supporting the patriotic theory of the origin of the healing-touch.

IV. The Suspected Passages, and "The Witch."

In 1778 Steevens discovered a play (in MS.) called "The Witch," written by Thomas Middleton, who died in 1627. It was found to contain the full text of the two songs, "Come away" ("Macbeth," III, v, 33) and "Black spirits" (IV, i, 43), indicated in "Macbeth"/1 by the first words only.

The question at once arose whether they were the composition of Shakspere or of Middleton. The presence in "The Witch" of a considerable number of expressions that recall certain lines of "Macbeth"/2 seemed to indi-

/1 The first of them had been given in full in the 1673 version of Macbeth, and both in the 1674 version.

/2 The most striking are: "I know he loves me not," said by Hecate of Sebastian, who has come to seek her aid (cf. Macbeth, III, v, 13); "For the maid-servants and the girls o' th' house, I spiced

cate that one of the two was well acquainted with the work of the other, and the fact that in other plays Middleton clearly imitated Shakspere suggested that he was the imitator in this instance. But if the songs implied in F1 are rightly given in the 1673 and 1674 versions of "Macbeth," and there is reason to think that they are,/1 it can be shown that they, at least, are the work of Middleton./2 But, as we shall see, this conclusion need not carry with it as a corollary the general priority of Middle-

ton's play, which there is some reason to think was not written until after 1613./3

them lately with a drowsy posset" (cf. II, ii, 6); "the innocence of sleep" (cf. II, ii, 36); "There's no such thing" (cf. II i, 47); "Come, my sweet sisters; let the air strike our tune" (cf. IV, i, 129).

/1 In the first place, it is improbable that, as some have supposed, the first song consisted of only two lines, and the second of only four; secondly, the stage-directions as given in F1 (not as in modern editions) suit the songs in their expanded form; thirdly, it is clear that the songs in the 1673 and 1674 versions were not copied from the only known copy of The Witch, and, as Davenant's company did not act The Witch, it is a gratuitous assumption that a copy was in their possession; fourthly, if Maidment and Logan (Davenant, vol. v) give the title page of the 1673 edition correctly (but cf. Furness, Macbeth, preface, p. vii), the play was performed by both the Duke's and the King's players with the same versions of the songs.

/2 In the "Black spirits" passage, the lines which in Macbeth read: "1. Put in all these, 'twill raise the stanch. 3. Nay here's three ounces of a red-hair'd wench," have, in The Witch, the following form: "1. Put in -- there's all -- and rid the stench. 3. Nay, here's three ounces of *the* red-hair'd wench." The use of *the* in the latter is due to the remark of Hecate, about thirty lines above: "And fetch three ounces of the red-hair'd girl I killed last midnight." No one will maintain, probably, that Middleton borrowed the "Black spirits" passage, changed *a* to *the,* and then wrote in an antecedent for the allusion.

/3 The title page says it was performed by the King's Men at Blackfriars, and according to Mr. Fleay, they did not begin to play

Besides this vexed question of the songs, there are two others that have been much discussed. In the first place, because of certain inconsistencies (all pointed out in the notes), obscure sentences, and lines metrically imperfect, as well as on account of its shortness, "Macbeth" is regarded by some as a hasty sketch left unpolished by the author, while by others it is regarded as cut and mangled by some not very skilful hand; in the second place, there are passages which, for reasons mainly stylistic, have been regarded by some scholars as interpolations. We may treat both problems at once, as they are intimately connected. The editors of the Clarendon Press "Macbeth," were inclined to reject as un-Shaksperean/1 the following passages:

(a) I, ii. Their reasons are: because the metre is too slovenly for Shakspere, the language is too bombastic,

there until 1613; besides there are enough resemblances between The Witch and Jonson's Masque of Queens (1609) to suggest very strongly that Middleton's witches are as nearly related to Jonson's

as to Shakspere's. Mr. Fleay's conjecture is that The Witch was composed in 1622, after Middleton began to wiite for the King's Men.

/1 The lines about the King's Evil, they think, "were probably interpolated previous to a representation at Court," but I do not understand them to hint that Shakspere himself was not the interpolator. Mr. Fleay once argued for a larger number of interpolations than were assumed by the Clarendon Press editors, but he has since altered his opinion. In his Life and Work of Shakespeare, p. 238, he speaks only of III, v, and IV, i, 39-43; and he makes no modification of this in his Chron. Hist. of the English Drama, II, 188. His latest utterance, so far as I know, is in the series of papers published in Poet-Lore, 1893, where he says: "He [Middleton] put in two songs from his play of The Witch, and a dance of six witches, there being only three in the scene as it first stood, and to this end added the character of Hecate. This making the presentment too long for the patience of the auditors, we [i.e., the players] made more omissions in other parts than to most of us seemed desirable" (p. 564).

the account of the Thane of Cawdor is inconsistent with I, iii, 72 f. and 112 ff., and the sending of a wounded soldier to carry the news of victory is too absurd to have been tolerated by Shakspere. But Mr. Daniel has pointed out that the soldier was not sent, but was merely a wounded straggler, -- Fife, the scene of the battle, being so near Forres, according to Shakspere, that the noise of battle could be heard by the King. The bombast is not greater than in other similar cases, and the metrical irregularities may be due to corruption, or to cutting of the text. The inconsistency about Cawdor is real, and, although it has a parallel in Lennox's accounts of Macduff, in III, vi, and IV, i, is too complicated a problem to be discussed here./1

(b) I, iii, 1-37, seems to them un-Shaksperean. But this is not an impression shared by most scholars, and surely the word "aroint," which is used by no other Elizabethan dramatist, counts for something.

(c) The Porter scene in II, iii; because it is low and vulgar. But cf. note on the passage, and see Dr. Hales's masterly discussion in his "Essays and Notes on Shakespeare."

/1 Mr. M. F. Libby, of Toronto, holds that the inconsistencies are intentional, and sees the reason for them in the character of Ross, who, he argues, by false accusations procured the death of Cawdor, thereby securing the patronage of Macbeth, whose chief confidant and instrument he afterwards became. Stated in this crude form his theory may seem absurd, but no one, I think, who reads his little book (Some New Notes on Macbeth, Toronto, 1893) can fail to admire the ingenuity with which it is carried through the whole

play, and the subtlety of some of the arguments, or to be surprised more than once by the success with which it is applied to the solution of other difficulties. I think it possible to show that the theory is untenable, but that does not lessen my sense of its ingenuity, nor my thanks to Mr. Libby for his book and the private letters supplementing it.

(d) V, ii, they do not reject, but are inclined to doubt; cf. note on the scene.

(e) "The last forty lines of the play show evident traces of another hand than Shakespeare's. The double stage direction, 'Exeunt fighting' -- 'Enter fighting, and Macbeth slaine,' proves that some alteration had been made in the conclusion of the piece." There is some force in this argument, as well as in the suggestion that "fiend-like queen" is not likely to have been Shakspere's term for Lady Macbeth.

(f) A number of couplets, lines, and half-lines (II, i, 60, 61; V, v, 47-50; V, viii, 32, 33) are rejected because of weakness. That they (and IV, i, 95-100) are weak is true, but they may nevertheless be Shakspere's.

(g) Besides these more or less disconnected passages, they reject all the passages bound together by the presence of Hecate as a speaker; these are: III, v; IV, i, 39-47,/1 and 125-132. These do form a group; they have common characteristics. They are the only passages in the play written in iambic couplets of eight syllables; they differ markedly in tone from the rest of the play; they are unnecessary; and, moreover, they and the two songs are bound together almost indissolubly by cross-references and by a common style -- the style, be it said, of Middleton's witch scenes. I therefore agree with Mr. Fleay in assigning them, songs and all, to Middleton.

Now let us see how this affects the question of the relations of "The Witch" to "Macbeth." The only theory that will account for all the facts is that proposed by Mr.

/1 I cannot follow them in rejecting the last four lines of this passage (44-47). In the first place, it is not connected with the Hecate passage preceding, and is with the entrance of Macbeth; in the second place, what an interpolator would have made of it may be seen by examining these lines in the 1674 version (see note on IV, i, 43).

Fleay. Middleton wrote his play after the appearance of "Macbeth" -- probably, as has been said, after 1613. It was, as he himself says in his dedication, unsuccessful.

The witch scenes in "Macbeth" had meanwhile been very successful, and the management of the theatre, perhaps at the suggestion of Middleton, allowed him to expand those scenes by the introduction of two songs from his unsuccessful, and perhaps forgotten, play, and the composition of another scene. It is clear from IV, i, 39-43 and 125-132, that a good deal was made of the dances and other spectacular features of the witch scenes. Of course there had always been a liking for that sort of thing, but the list of plays and masques indicates a growing tendency to the spectacular during the second decade of the seventeenth century. It seems reasonably probable, therefore, that these additions, and some excisions perhaps, were made by Middleton, and that they were made after the death of Shakspere, perhaps in 1622, as Mr. Fleay conjectures.

It may be regarded as some confirmation of this view that the remarks of Pepys,/1 and the variations between the 1673 and 1674 versions seem to indicate a progressive

/1 Pepys records in his diary, Nov. 5, 1664: "To the Duke's house to a play, Macbeth, a pretty good play, but admirably acted;" Dec. 28, 1666: "To the Duke's house, and there saw Macbeth most excellently acted, and a most excellent play for variety;" Jan. 7, 1667: "To the Duke's house, and saw Macbeth, which, though I saw it lately, yet appears a most excellent play in all respects, but especially in divertisement, though it be a deep tragedy;" April 19, 1667: "To the play-house, where we saw Macbeth, which, though I have seen it often, yet is it one of the best plays for a stage, and variety of dancing and musique, that I ever saw." This must have been the version which Downes says was prepared by Sir Wm. Davenant, with music by Mr. Lock, and new machines for the flying of the witches; but whether the true Davenant version be that of 1673 or that of 1674 is a puzzle. Oldys called the 1674

series of changes in "Macbeth" from the form in which Shakspere left it to that in which it appeared in 1674. It was long, too, before the play recovered from this treatment; Delius says (Jahrbuch d. d. Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, xx, 84) nearly eighty years, but Mrs. Inchbald's print of the Drury Lane stage copy and Edwin Forrest's prompt-book show that it was nearer two centuries.

V. The Witches.

On most problems suggested by the weird sisters, or witches, sufficient information is probably given in the notes. We may here confine ourselves to two or three questions that have been raised.

First, how does it happen that Hecate, the tri-form goddess of classic mythology, appears in modern witchcraft? Simply because she was in classic times the goddess of cross-roads and forks (where later the assemblies of witches were supposed to occur, and where suicides were buried with a stake through the heart), the mistress of darkness and the under-world, the patroness of sorcery,

version Betterton's; Dr. Furness calls it Davenant's, and suggests that the 1673 be called Betterton's.

Downes's account of the great success of Macbeth, and of the financial and spectacular success of Shadwell's Lancashire Witches, lends some support to my suggestion that if Davenant had had a copy of Middleton's Witch he would have staged it.

Perhaps it may be allowable to correct here the story that at a performance of Macbeth in 1673 an actor named Harris, who performed Macduff, accidentally killed his fellow actor by piercing his eye, in the combat between Macbeth and Macduff. Thomas Isham entered this as a rumor in his diary, Aug. 20, 1673 (see Centurie of Prayse, 2d ed., p. 355); but the rumor was false. Downes (Roscius Angl., p. 21) tells us that the play was Davenant's The Man's the Master; the wounded man Mr. Cademan, who, however, was not killed, but maimed, and in consequence had received a pension "ever since 1673, being 35 years a goe."

and as such probably continued to be known to the peoples of Latin civilization long after the other gods were forgotten; and because magic is the most retrospective of arts, seeking the old, deriving from its cult of the distant past much of the mystery that lends it effectiveness. Besides the note on II, i, 52, cf. Scot, "Discoverie of Witchcraft," ed. Nicholson, 131, 438; Delrio, "Disq. Magic.," 129, 254, 284; Jonson, "The Sad Shepherd," II, i, and the four other passages in Shakspere where Hecate is mentioned (see Schmidt, s. v.).

Whether the weird sisters are the Fates, or Norns, has been the subject of much discussion; and some scholars cannot reconcile with this conception of them the incantations of IV, i, 1-38, which, along with the actions attributed to them in I, iii, 1-37, seem characteristic of mere vulgar witches. Mr. Spalding has pointed out that Holinshed's account of them is rather ambiguous; and nothing is more certain than that in the days when witchcraft flourished there were no hard and fast lines of division drawn between the different classes of spirits,/1 or even between spirits and witches. In E. H. Meyer's "Germanische Mythologie" examples are given of confusions of every sort. Cf., e.g., § 174: "Finally the elves/2 of Teutonic mythology often become witches.

/1 Delrio inferred from the description given by Hector Boece of the beings which addressed Macbeth and Banquo that they were sibyls or white nymphs, whom he identifies with the Parcae; see the whole curious passage, Disq. Mag., p. 295.

It is a delicate question whether, when Ben Jonson wrote his note (Masque of Queens, l. 33) on the treatment of wax images, in which he mentions "the known story of King Duffe out of Hector Boëtius," he knew of Shakspere's use of that "known story;" -- so delicate a question, in fact, that I dared not bring it into the discussion of the date of the composition of Macbeth.

/2 In Meyer's classification, "elves" includes all anthropomorphic nature-spirits (whether of earth, air, water, or forest), except giants.

Like elves, witches cause tempests, hail, waterspouts; ride storm-clouds and whirlwinds; travel in sieves or on brooms; poison fountains; hurl the thunderbolt," etc. See also §§ 225, 226, 228, 231 on the Norns, and §§ 224, 225, 235 on their relations to the cloud-maidens. Meyer's book, it may be remarked, is a general index to the literature of the subject.

Mr. Spalding attempted to show that Shakspere must have had Scotch witches in mind, and particularly those whose doings are recorded in "Newes from Scotland," a book published in 1591 about an attempt to "bewitch and drowne His Majestie [King James, then of Scotland only] in the sea." His argument is that the production of storms is not a function commonly ascribed to English witches. It would not be difficult to show that the production of storms is perhaps the commonest of charges against witches all over the world. Probably no treatise on witchcraft fails to mention it many times. It would be idle to collect references for so absolute a commonplace; I give those only which have recently attracted my attention: Scot's "Discoverie," pp. 1, 7, 8, 26, 38, 43, 45, 47, 48, 142, 176, 178, 218, 441, 472, 509, 526; Delrio, "Disq. Mag.," 130, 135, 155, 158; Aubrey, "Miscellanies," p. 141; Holinshed, v, 146, 223 (Scotch witches indeed); Jonson, "Masque of Queens," with notes. The case of Jonson's "Masque" is against Mr. Spalding's further effort to infer the dates of "Macbeth" and "The Witch" from the above argument; Jonson wrote in 1609, and, so far as his notes show, had no Scotch witches in mind when he described his witches as raising storms.

VI. Duration of the Action.

The best time-analysis of the play is that of Mr. P. A. Daniel. His summary, with a few notes on certain points, follows:

"Time of the Play nine days represented on the stage, and intervals.

"Day 1. Act I, sc. i to iii.
[Cf. I, i, 5-7.]

"Day 2. Act I, sc. iv to vii.
[These scenes are bound together by I, iv, 42 ff. and I, vii, 62. "In II, i, 20, Banquo says: 'I dreamt last night of the three weird sisters;' this 'last night' must be supposed between scenes iii and iv of Act I: there is no other place where it could come in. The letter to Lady Macbeth, I, v, must also have been written and despatched then." But Ross and Angus enter with Macbeth and Banquo, I, iv, as if they had just arrived. Had they spent the night together on the way, or got together in the morning after a night at Forres?]

"Day 3. Act II, sc. i to iv.
["Scene iv is on the same day as the murder of Duncan; cf. II, iv, 3." But if that be true, then -- to say nothing of the celerity indicated in II, iv, 31-33 -- some, at least, of the prodigies preceded the murder, II, iv, 11 ff.]

"An interval, say a couple of weeks. A week or two -- Professor Wilson; three weeks -- Paton.
["Between II and III the long and dismal period of Macbeth's reign described in III, vi, IV, ii, iii, and elsewhere must have elapsed; cf. III, iv, 131 f., 136 ff. But cf. III, iv, 142-144, and the first words with which Banquo opens this Act would lead us to suppose that a few days at the utmost can have passed since the coronation at Scone."]

"Day 4. Act III, sc. i to v.
["When sc. iv closes, it is almost morning of the fol-

lowing day; but sc. v must be put on the same day, although there is no point at which it can be introduced."]

"Act III, sc. vi. It is impossible to fix the time of this scene. Cf. III, iv, 130, with III, vi, 40; and III. vi, 37, with IV, i, 142.

"Day 5. Act IV, sc. i.
"Professor Wilson supposes an interval of certainly not more than two days between Days 5 and 6; Paton marks two days. No interval is required, in my opinion.

"Day 6. Act IV, sc. ii.
"An interval, for Ross to carry the news of Lady Macduff's murder to England.

"Day 7. Act IV, sc. iii, Act V, sc. i.
[Of course there is nothing to fix the sleep-walking scene upon the night of the day on which Ross reaches England; it is put there merely in order to make the number of "dramatic days" as few as possible, and because nothing prevents its being assigned to that day. I fancy that V, i, usually seems to spectators of the play considerably later than IV, iii.]

"An interval. Malcolm's return to Scotland.

"Day 8. Act V, ii, iii.
["We may fairly allow one day for these two scenes; although no special note of time is to be observed from here to the end of the play."]

"Day 9. Act V, sc. iv to viii."

From the inconsistencies exhibited by this time-analysis many lovers of Shakspere have sought -- and found -- relief in an ingenious and amusing theory proposed by Professor John Wilson ("Christopher North") in his

"Dies Boreales" Nos. V, VI, and VII ("Blackwood's," Nov., 1849; April and May, 1850; reprinted in condensed form, "Trans. New Sh. Soc," 1875-76, pt. ii, App. i; 1877-79, pt. iii, App. iii) and, independently, by the Rev. N. J. Halpin, in "The Dramatic Unities of Shakspere" (reprinted "Trans. New Sh. Soc," 1875-76, pt. ii, App. i). This theory, roughly stated, is, that Shakspere introduced into his plays two time-indicators, as it were, each running independently of the other, but consistently with itself, and that he forced the audience to take note of the passage of time by referring now to one indicator and now to the other. Thus the time between two scenes might be twenty-four hours by one indicator and two or three months, or even several years, by the other; but the audience readily accepts either -- or both at once -- as giving a

true measure of the passage of time. Inconsistencies of time are therefore not real, but only apparent, and are easily removed by assigning one of the conflicting indications to "short time" and the other to "long time." By this means, it is supposed, Shakspere's art is relieved of a blemish, if indeed it does not gain by his demonstrated ability to run two irreconcilable timepieces.

Had the theory remained where Professor Wilson's third article left it, there would be no occasion for discussing it; for it seems pretty clear that the great humorist was only amusing himself with a highly ingenious fancy, and using it as the basis for an interesting exposition of the freedom with which the Elizabethan dramatists treated time-relations. But since it has been adopted and maintained in all seriousness, there is sufficient excuse for pointing out that the theory is inadequate; two timepieces are not enough; there are plays which require at least three, and there are scenes -- such as III, vi of the present play -- which a hundred would not suffice to set right. Moreover, such a theory would need as a corollary

a manifold system of measures of space, not to speak of other devices for bringing the plays into accord with reality.

The theory, however, is not only inadequate; it is unnecessary. The blemish which it was intended to remove does not exist. For it is not a blemish in a work of art that it fails to do what it does not undertake and is under no obligation to undertake. Shakspere was a consummate artist, it is true, and the evidences of careful planning in his plays are so abundant that we may be sure that he could and would have carried through consistently any time-scheme that he undertook to carry through. But he undertook none. The events of his plays do not stand in temporal relations to one another, but in logical relations. The events follow one another because of logical reasons. The indications of time that are given are given not for the purpose of letting us know the time, but to produce each a definite momentary impression; as soon as that is done we have no further concern with that time indication, we are expected to forget it and to be ready to receive another when it is needed for another impression, however irreconcilable it may be with the previous one -- and, as a matter of fact, we do so receive and forget these indications while retaining the impressions intended. When Banquo says, "Thou hast it now: King, Cawdor, Glamis, all, as the weird women promised," we are not to

learn that Macbeth has just ascended the throne, but only that Banquo's mind is wholly occupied with the predictions, the manner of their fulfilment, and the relation of these facts to his own ambitions. When the Porter is rated for sleeping so late in the morning that he is dilatory in answering the knock of unreasonably early visitors, we are not thereby invited to inquire into contemporary social customs and discover an hour that would be late for a porter and early for visitors -- easily as that might be

found. When we hear the discussions of Macbeth's cruelty, we are not to draw an inference as to the length of his reign, but only to understand what is the attitude of the people toward him. Time is simply a means by which the dramatist suggests to us the force or the reality of emotions or the logical propriety of situations; when once the suggestion has been received, the means may be and is neglected.

In real life we do not so easily forget the time-relations of events, because the events of life are, as a rule, bound up in our memories with a multitude of definite and unmistakable time indications. When we look at a play, however, the various series of regularly recurring events by which we ordinarily measure the passage of time cease to be available; they are not connected with the series proceeding upon the stage, nor related to it in any way. We are looking upon a single series of events unfolding before us at a rate unknown to us, and known only to be variable. We cease to attempt an account of time, and forget the few indications given us almost as soon as they are made. We have no concern with them; the sentiment, the passion, the situation, the event, these concern us, and these we remember.

This is true to a great extent of the stage of to-day; it was true beyond question of the Elizabethan stage. As Professor Wilson says, in his third article: "He [Shakspere] came to a Stage which certainly had not cultivated the logic of time as a branch of the Dramatic Art. It appears to me that those old people, when they were enwrapt in the transport of their creative power, totally forgot all regard, lost all consciousness of time. Passion does not know the clock or the calendar. Intimations of time, now vague, now positive, will continually occur; but also the Scenes float, like the Cyclades, in a Sea of time, at distances utterly indeterminate. Most near? Most remote? That is a

Stage of Power, and not of Rules -- Dynamic, not Formal. I say again, at last as at first, that the time of Othello, tried by the notions of time in *our Art,* or tried, if you will, by the type of prosaic and literal time, is -- INSOLUBLE."

VII. Metre.

The speeches of the three weird sisters are written in verses of four feet, or measures, of the type commonly called trochaic. That the individual verses do not all contain exactly the same number of syllables is obvious to the most careless reader; but the rhythmical equivalence of them never admits of doubt. The movement is as free and varied as that of popular rhymes and jingles, and consequently as hard to deal with by rule-of-thumb scansion; and we as yet know so little about the fundamental rhythmical principles of English verse that scansion, in the ordinary sense of the word, had perhaps better be avoided. But though we are unable to say as yet wherein consists the rhythmical equivalence of verses, we can nevertheless attempt a comparative study of different verses of the same type, and try to discover as many of the features of difference between them as we can. And inadequate as was the old mode of dividing English verses into feet, it seems still, notwithstanding the investigations of modern students of rhythm, to have some claim to be used for establishing the typical verse, the variations from which we are to study. For it is certain that for a very long time English poets were under the impression that the old theory was correct, and they themselves established their typical verses in accordance with its principles. The variations from the type seem to fall in a different category, for after the establishment of the type the sense of rhythm alone seems to have been

applied as a test of equivalence. These variations, therefore, should be the object of study; and while the beginner cannot hope to discover the principle of equivalence, he can at least awaken his sense of the freedom of variation.

Besides such matters as number and place of accents, length of syllables, omission of syllables, presence of extra syllables, he should note the effect of differences in the distribution of syllables into words, and of words into phrases (for these constitute well-defined metrical groups),

upon the rhythm of verses identical in number, arrangement, and weight of syllables and accents. These things, apparently, determine the tempo of verse, and have a marked influence upon the quality of emotion which responds to the rhythm. In music, as is well known, a melody which appeals to the most elevated and delicate emotions is often, by the change of absolutely nothing except the tempo, made into a popular song which arouses either the lower emotions or the coarser phases of the higher. Observations along this line -- even if they lead to no explanation of the phenomena of rhythm, and they probably will not -- can be made by anyone who is sensitive to rhythm, and will reward him by increasing his perception of the subtlety of English verse. These remarks, of course, hold good for all the varieties of verse as handled by masters of verse.

The speeches of Hecate are in iambic measures. They are dull and mechanical in movement, and consequently offer few attractions to the student of verse. The variations from the typical form are comparatively few.

The play, as a whole, is written in dramatic blank verse, that is, in lines, typically, of five iambic feet. In Shakspere's early work the rhythm was varied, but never so as to obscure the metrical equivalence of the verses. It is held by most scholars that although his

later plays exhibit a marvellous freedom of variation from the type, the single verse nevertheless remains the type, and that it is therefore the duty of the student of his verse to explain all rhythms as modifications of the single verse. Consequently verses of less than five feet are looked upon with suspicion, verses of six feet are either reduced to five by slurs, elisions, and shiftings of accents -- sometimes with pretty harsh results -- or are broken into couplets of three feet each. But the test of verse is that it be rhythmical when read freely in the manner demanded by the thought or sentiment it contains. And this is especially true of verse, like these plays, written not to be read, but to be recited. In such cases, moreover, it seems obvious that the poet who has written such verse so long that the rhythm of it has become too familiar to him to need the application of any tests, will not be careful to determine whether the proper rhythm runs unbrokenly through each single verse, but whether each natural division of speech preserves as a whole the proper movement. If this be true, it may be expected that he will often end one well-defined rhythm-

phrase with any one of the legitimate endings, and begin the next without reference to the way in which that will affect at the junction the carrying through of a system of scansion based on the verse. Thus, I think, are the half lines, lines with an extra syllable or an omission at the caesura, and other similar problems to be explained.

In reading Shakspere, slurs, elisions, resolutions, and contractions occur and must be reckoned with. But they will always be found to be such as harmonize with the proper recitation of the lines, and not mere artificial products of forcing the rhythm into a system. It is also to be remembered that variations occurred in Elizabethan English in normal speech which no longer seem easy or

natural to us, as for instance, the double pronunciations *ignominy* and *ignomy, whether* and *wher, entrance* and *enterance.*

But it may safely be asserted that whether the line be rhythmical or not when read alone, the speech phrase always is, due regard being had to the fact that Shakspere wrote and spoke the English of his own time, not that of ours.

VIII. Language.

A useful classification of the main differences in vocabulary, morphology, and syntax between the English of Shakspere's time and the English of to-day, is given in Abbot's "Shakespearian Grammar."/1 Here it may suffice to call attention to the fact that there is scarcely a difficulty in Shaksperean syntax that cannot be illustrated by an example drawn from current English speech. Of course in such cases the construction is no longer a living part of English syntax, that is, it is no longer available as a form by which new expressions may be modelled; if it were, its use in Elizabethan syntax would present no difficulty to us. It is usually available only for the particular words forming the phrase in which it is preserved; occasionally it can be used in a limited number of combinations. Examples of both these classes are commented on in the notes, and others will readily suggest themselves to the student who searches his own speech for illustrations of such of Shakspere's phrases as sound queer to him. It will be found that our ordinary speech is full of phrases which are preserved as phrases and never resolved into their elements. Most of us, indeed, form our sen-

/1 See also the extremely valuable treatment of certain important and puzzling constructions in the Appendix to Schmidt's Shakespeare Lexicon.

tences not by combining words, but by combining phrases and clauses which we treat as integral units.

In Elizabethan English, on the other hand, the functions of prepositions and conjunctions had not become so differentiated and specialized; there was, consequently, greater freedom in the formation of phrases and clauses, and a less noticeable tendency towards monotony of expression. English was once possessed of a sufficiently elaborate inflectional system to admit of the expression of a great many syntactical relations without the aid of prepositions. It is, perhaps, true that these relations were not expressed with great definiteness by the inflections themselves; the general relation only was indicated, the particular phase had to be inferred. Prepositions and conjunctions were used to define the relation more accurately, and as the progress of language brought about a constant decrease in the number of inflections the functions of the relational particles became more and more important. Again, in the course of time, relations formerly expressed indifferently by either of two particles became restricted, as a rule, to one of them; and, on the other hand, the number of relations indicated by a particle was, in the effort to avoid ambiguity, greatly reduced: for example, "in rest" and "at rest" were once used indifferently, and "because" had, in addition to the relations now expressed by it, the function now performed by "in order that." Other similar processes of restriction of meaning and functions were going on at the same time. Many of the peculiarities of Elizabethan English are due to its being a stage of the language when most of the constructions of present English had come into use, but when the process of limitation of function had not yet gone so far as it now has.

Above all let the student never forget that the language of Shakspere is no special creation of his own; that he

wrote the same sort of English that was written and spoken by cultivated men in London at that time, with only such differences as properly belong not to language, but to style. He was a master of words, indeed, but that does not mean that he invented new ones or used the old

in new significations. It ought not to be necessary to utter such a warning, but the terms in which this mastery of language has been praised by some critics can imply no other mode of dealing with words than that so happily explained by Humpty Dumpty in his famous interview with the inquisitive and charming Alice.

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The best handbook for the beginner in Shakspere study is still Dr. Edward Dowden's "Shakspere," in the series of Literature Primers, which contains chapters on "The Elizabethan Drama," "Shakspere's Life," "Early Editions," "Evidences of Chronology," "Groups and Dates of the Plays," and introductions to each of the plays and poems. In Dr. H. H. Furness's magnificent variorum edition of "Macbeth" will be found all that anyone needs in the way of annotations by the best editors and commentators, discussion of dates, reprints of interesting illustrative materials, and a well selected body of aesthetic criticism.

Those who wish to study more thoroughly the life and work of Shakspere may consult: "Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare," 2 vols. (9th ed.), by J. O. Halliwell-Phillips; "William Shakespeare," by Karl Elze; "The Life and Work of Shakespeare," by F. G. Fleay; "Shakespeare," by B. ten Brink; "William Shakspere," by B. Wendell; "Shakspere: His Mind and Art," by E. Dowden.

On Metrical Tests of Chronology, consult the papers by

Spedding, Fleay, Furnivall, and Ingram in "Trans. New Shakspere Society;" "A Shakespeare Manual," by F. G. Fleay; the "Report of Com. of St. Petersburg Shakspere Circle" in "Englische Studien," iii, 473 ff.

On Elizabethan English there is no really satisfactory book. E. A. Abbott's "Shakespearian Grammar" is very useful, but needs to be read in the light of later treatises on grammar and the history of English, such as H. Sweet, "A New English Grammar," pt. i, and "A Short Historical English Grammar;" L. Kellner, "Historical Outlines of English Syntax;" E. Matzner, "English Grammar," (transl.) 3 vols.; O. Jespersen, "Progress in Language," and either T. R. Lounsbury's or O. F. Emerson's "History of the English Language." The standard books on the pronunciation of English in Shakspere's day are: A. J. Ellis, "Early English Pronunciation," and H.

Sweet, "A History of English Sounds" (cf. also Sweet's grammars). As to lexicons, for etymologies one may consult W. W. Skeat, "An Etymological Dictionary," or "The International;" for illustrative quotations, etc., Nares's "Glossary," ed. Halliwell and Wright, 2 vols.; "The Century Dictionary," and that greatest of all dictionaries, "A New English Dictionary" (which, however, is still in the letter F); for Shakspere, of course, A. Schmidt, "A Shakespeare Lexicon," 2 vols., and J. Bartlett, "A Concordance to Shakespeare." Nothing, however, can take the place of extensive reading in the literature of the period.

Indispensable for the study of the Elizabethan drama are: J. A. Symonds, "Shakspere's Predecessors" (which needs to be corrected by the chapters on the drama in B. ten Brink's "History of English Literature," and the essay in J. C. Collins's "Essays and Studies"); J. P. Collier, "The History of English Dramatic Poetry," 2 vols. (1st ed. 1831, 2d ed. 1879); A. W. Ward, "A History of

English Dramatic Literature," 2 vols.; F. G. Fleay, "A History of the London Stage," and "A Chronicle History of the English Drama," 2 vols.

For the general principles of dramatic composition, consult G. Freytag, "The Technique of the Drama," or A. Hennequin's little book, "The Art of Play-writing."