SHAKESPEARE'S HAND IN "THE SPANISH TRAGEDY" 1602

by

S. W. Stevenson

A thesis

submitted to the

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research,

McGill University,

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts.

S. Warren Stevenson,
McGill University,
June, 1954.

CONTENTS

The parts pointed out in Hieronimo as Ben Jonson's bear no traces of his style; but they are very like Shakespeare's; and it is very remarkable that every one of them re-appears in full form and development, and tempered with mature judgment, in some one or other of Shakespeare's great pieces.

(Coleridge, Table Talk, April 5, 1833).

Search thou the book.

(Fourth Addition to The Spanish Tragedy, line 47).

Introduction

The Spanish Tragedy, in its original form, was written by Thomas Kyd (1558-94), probably during the period 1585-7. A dramatic adaptation of a tale of human passion--the revenge of Hieronimo, Marshall of Spain, on the murderers of his only son--The Spanish Tragedy soon became one of the most popular of Elizabethan plays. It achieved this distinction, as Dr. Boas points out, not because Kyd was a great poet, thinker, or moralist, but because he was a born dramatist with a talent for impressive rhetoric, for exploiting the full technical resources of the Elizabethan stage, and for adapting the Senecan tradition to suit the sympathies of contemporary taste.[1]

There are three extant editions of The Spanish Tragedy in its original form, each represented by a single copy. These are: (1) the undated quarto in the British Museum, (2) the quarto of 1594, and (3) the quarto of 1599. Of these, the undated quarto is apparently the oldest and in the main probably represents the play to us in the right reading. But this undated quarto was, as the title-page tells us, a second edition 'amended of such grosse faults as passed in the first impression'. Of this first impression, no copy is extant.[2]

From entries in Henslowe's Diary, we learn that the play was already an established favourite in the early nineties.[3] It is clear that it commonly passed under the title 'Jeronimo', and was acted by the Lord Strange's men at the Rose on March 14, 1592, and thence until January 22 following, sixteen performances in all. After January 22, 1593, there is no record by Henslowe of any representation of 'Jeronimo' until January 7, 1597, when the Lord

---

1. See F.S. Boas, ed. The Works of Thomas Kyd, (Oxford At the Clarendon Press, 1901), pp. xxvi-xxxi.
2. Ibid., p. xxvii.
3. See Henslowe's Diary, ed. W.W. Greg (A.H. Bullen pub., 1904), I, 13-15,50-54. See also Boas, op. cit., p. xli, for a full table of the relevant entries.

Admiral's men acted the play, again at the Rose, from thence until October 11, thirteen performances in all. At this time the play was acted as new and had in all probability undergone recent revision--a fact which (as we shall see) has emerged only during the past fifty years or so.

On September 25, 1601, and again on June 22, 1602, Philip Henslowe recorded in his Diary notes of payments to Ben Jonson for additions of some sort to 'jeronymo', which is generally taken to mean The Spanish Tragedy. Also in 1602, a new quarto of Kyd's play was published, with the original text enlarged by recent (anonymous) additions, which are given prominent mention on the title-page:

THE
Spanish Tragedie:
containing the lamen-
table end of Don Horatio, and Bel-imperia:
with the pittifull death of olde
Hieronimo.

Newly corrected, ammended, and enlarged with
new additions of the Painters part, and
others, as it hath of late been
divers times acted.

(Printer's device)

Imprinted at London by W.W. for
T. Pavier, and are to be sold at the
signe of the Catte and Parrats
neare the Exchange.
1602. 1

The rapid succession of editions of The Spanish Tragedy after 1602 testifies to the popularity of the play in its revised form. In the quarto of 1602 these Additions, five in number, constitute about 330 new lines all told (ll. 977-1030; 1272-81; 1866-1910; 2063-2247; and lines 3126-76, which however incorporate twelve lines of the original text). It is with the authorship of these Additions that this paper is concerned.

---

1. This transcript of the title-page is taken from The Spanish Tragedy with Additions 1602, ed. W.W. Greg, Malone Society Reprint (Oxford, 1925).

As we shall see, qualified critics from Lamb and Coleridge on have paid tribute to the high poetic quality of these Additions; and it is chiefly this quality which justifies our concern over the identity of their author. More specifically, most commentators have agreed with Lamb and Coleridge, that in writing these Additions, their author (whatever his identity) attained to rare heights of imaginative passion and power--heights reached elsewhere in Elizabethan drama only by Shakespeare and Webster in their greatest pieces. At the same time, the majority of critics have agreed that the style and manner of these Additions is in no respects like the style and manner of Ben Jonson. As a result, the relationship of Jonson's alleged additions to The Spanish Tragedy (as mentioned in Henslowe's entries) to the extant Additions of the quarto of 1602 has been subjected to close questioning by modern scholars.

In this paper it will be shown that recent scholarship (by Jonson's modern editors and others) has rather thoroughly exploded the nineteenth-century academic myth of Jonson's authorship of these Additions, belatedly corroborating the judgment of Lamb, Coleridge and Edward Fitzgerald: that the style of the Additions is virtually the antithesis of Jonson's. It will also be shown that Webster (whose name was rather fancifully mentioned in connection with the mood of the Additions by Lamb and Fitzgerald) was in all probability far too young and inexperienced in 1601-2 to achieve the supreme poetic triumphs of those passages. It will be observed that this is the judgment of Webster's modern scholars, who are of the opinion that his genius matured slowly and did not reveal itself until about ten years after the Additions were published.

It will then be demonstrated at length that the full probabilities of the case support Coleridge's brief suggestion (see above, p.1) that the author of the Additions was Shakespeare. It will be observed in passing that this assertion is in accord with the personal opinions of C.H. Herford and P. Simpson (Jonson's modern editors) and of F.L. Lucas (the standard editor of Webster). The present writer--so far as he is aware, the first person to attempt to present the full

evidence for Shakespeare's authorship of these Additions--is heavily indebted to the aforementioned editors for their respective demonstrations that neither Jonson nor Webster can conceivably have written the passages in question.

In the chief chapter of this paper--a detailed comparison of the style of the Additions with the style of Shakespeare--it will be shown that these Additions bear an organic relation to Shakespeare's writings as a whole, and especillly to his tragedies of the period 1602-6. External allusions and tests of volcabulary also will be used to further corroborate the overwhelming indications of style which point to Shakespeare's authorship of the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy. Finally, it will be suggested that in these passages we may have a personal reference by Shakespeare to the death of his son, Hamnet, in 1596.

Jonson and the Additions to "The Spanish Tragedy"

External Evidence:

Until comparatively recently, the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy have been generally assigned to Ben Jonson, on the grounds of two entries in Henslowe's Diary. These entries, the first dated September 25, 1601, and the second June 22, 1602, are as follows:

> Lent vnto mr alleyn the 25 of septembr 1601
> to lend vnto Bengemen Iohnson vpon his
> writtinge of his adicians in geronymo s
> the some of xxxx
>
> Lent vnto bengemy Iohnsone at the a
> poyntment of E Alleyn & wm birde the
> 22 of Iune 1602 in earneste of a
> Boocke called Richard crockbacke & for ⅄
> new adicyons for Ieronymo the some of .....X 1

Scholars of the last century usually and naturally assumed that the additions thus referred to were those of the 1602 quarto of The Spanish Tragedy. Thus, solely upon this evidence, Jonson was widely credited with the authorship of the Additions. This view became a sort of ipse dixit for commentators (with a few notable exceptions) until the beginning of the present century, since when it has been gradually abandoned.[2] While Coleridge, Lamb and Edward Fitzgerald each in turn had pointed out that the Additions are totally unlike Jonson's style (see above, p.1, and below, p.19), their brief protests were summarily dismissed by scholars from J.P. Collier to F.S. Boas, the latter of whom was inclined

---

1. Henslowe's Diary, ed. W.W. Greg (1904), F. 94 and F. 106v., pp. 149 and 168.
2. However, this view is still occasionally encountered. See, for example, John Palmer's Ben Jonson (New York, 1934), p. 125. Conceding that the Additions are "completely different from anything he ((Jonson)) wrote", Palmer nevertheless maintains Jonson's authorship on the ridiculous and inadequate grounds that "such stuff as this was cheap....Jonson could write it as well as another." So far as the present writer is aware, Mr. Palmer is alone in his opinion of the low literary calibre of the Additions, which have been acclaimed as the work of supreme poetic genius by authoratative critics from Lamb and Coleridge to Herford and Simpson (Jonson's modern editors). Indeed, Mr. Palmer does not seem conversant with the full facts of the case (beyond Henslowe's entries), and his brief discussion gives the impression of being hasty and uninformed, unsupported as it is by a single shred of further evidence.

(albeit with genuine misgivings) to credit the dogma of Jonson's authorship of the Additions, in his standard edition of Kyd's Works (1901).[1]

This traditional interpretation of these two entries in Henslowe's Diary (which, it must be emphasized, constitute the sole evidence for Jonson's authorship of the Additions) has depended upon several tacit assumptions. Firstly, it was long assumed that Henslowe's entries refer to the first and only re-working of The Spanish Tragedy after its initial publication in the early 1590's. Thus, there was no hesitation in identifying the work for which Henslowe paid Jonson with the Additions of the 1602 version of The Spanish Tragedy. The possibility that the great popularity of Kyd's play might well (after his death in 1594) have prompted several revisions of his famous tragedy does not seem to have occured to scholars of the nineteenth century, if only because there seemed to be little evidence to support such a view. Now that such evidence has been discovered, proving that The Spanish Tragedy must have been added to and revised several times by various persons, the identification of Henslowe's entries (and Jonson's alleged additions) with the Additions of the quarto of 1602 has been generally abandoned as untenable.

The evidence in question has been provided partly by Dr. Boas, who has shown that the full-length play The First Part of Ieronimo (first published in 1605), which was long ascribed to Kyd, is in fact the work of an anonymous playwright, that it was written after 1600 and that it is in effect another 'addition' in the form of a humerous burlesque. From references in Henslowe's Diary to a (lost) 'comodey of Ieronimo', acted in 1591-2 as a humerous fore-piece to The Spanish Tragedy, Boas concludes that such a play, presumably by Kyd, probably existed in 1592. However, Boas demonstrates convincingly that the black-letter quarto of 1605, entitled The First Part of Ieronimo or The Warres of Portugal,

---

1. See Boas, ed., Kyd's Works, op. cit., p. lxxxvii.

cannot possibly be identified with the earlier fore-piece.[1] His reasons are that in the first place, as Henslowe does not mention the early fore-piece after June, 1592, it would seem to have had a short stage life. Nor was it ever printed, either by itself, or together with any of the numerous editions of The Spanish Tragedy up to 1603. That it should suddenly have appeared by itself in 1605 is highly improbable. Further, Boas points out that this quarto of 1605 contains internal proofs of having been written after the beginning of the seventeenth century. "The allusion in Act. 1. i. 25-9 to the year of Jubilee in Rome is an evident reference to the Jubilee of 1600."[2] Boas further observes that The First Part of Ieronimo is a farcical burlesque of The Spanish Tragedy, and that it cannot possibly be Kyd's. He concludes: "Thus on a review of all the evidence I have no hesitation in rejecting The First Part of Ieronimo as spurious, and in endorsing the conclusion of Rudolf Fischer that it is the work of a journeyman playwright who found in the Induction to The Spanish Tragedy hints from which he manufactured his crude melodrama, whose title served as a decoy to the theatre-going public."[3]

Secondly, W.W. Greg has shown in his edition of Henslowe's Diary (1904) and again in his introduction to the Malone Society reprint of the 1602 quarto of The Spanish Tragedy (1925), that the play was in all probability revised substantially before its performance at the Rose theatre in 1597. This fact, as Greg points out, has been hitherto obscured by a nineteenth-century erasure in the manuscript of Henslowe's Diary. Greg summarizes the case thus:

> The play was almost certainly written in the eighties . . . and was apparently already an established favourite when we first meet it in Henslowe's records in the early nineties. It is clear from various allusions that it commonly passed under the title

---

1. Ibid, p. xli ff.
2. Ibid, p. xlii.
3. Ibid, p. xliv.

> Jeronimo, and there is no reason to question the natural identification of Kyd's play with the Jeronimo acted, as an old piece, by Lord Strange's men at the Rose, on 14 March 1592, and thence till 22 January following.. . . We next find . . . Jeronimo in the hands of the Lord Admiral's Men, and acted by them, again at the Rose, on 7 January 1597, and thence till 11 October, thirteen performances in all. The play was entered as new, though the note recording the fact has been erased from the manuscript with a knife in modern times (with the consequence that it does not appear in the text as printed either by Collier or Greg, though the latter duly records the fact in his errata and notes, i.223). The probability is that . . . The Spanish Tragedy . . . was marked as new not merely because it was being revived by a new company but because it had received some substantial revision. 1

Thus, just as the scholarship of Boas and Fischer has shown that the anonymous First Part of Ieronimo is in reality an addition (in the form of a burlesque) to Kyd's play written after 1600, so these findings by Greg demonstrate that The Spanish Tragedy had earlier been revised in 1597. Both these facts have emerged only during the past half-century and were perforce not taken into consideration by those nineteenth-century scholars who assumed that the alleged additions for which Jonson was paid by Henslowe must be identified with the extant Additions of 1602. Greg goes on to point out the inadequacies of this traditional view in the light of recent scholarship:

> Thus, in 1601-2 we find Ben Jonson receiving, for additions to The Spanish Tragedy apparently, a sum which can hardly have been less than £5, that is, as much as Henslowe often paid for a whole new play. It has been usually assumed . . . that these additions are in fact those which first appear in the quarto of 1602. . . . The identification, however, far from being certain, is hardly even conceivably correct. As regards internal evidence, critics have felt the greatest difficulty in believing that Jonson can ever have been responsible . . . for these remarkable scenes, and although the difficulties raised by external evidence have been less fully recognized, they are at least equally formidable. 2

Greg proceeds to present the difficulties, the most imposing of which is the fact that the amount paid by Henslowe to Jonson indicates that the latter's contributions to The Spanish Tragedy must have been considerably more extensive than

---

1. W.W. Greg, ed. The Spanish Tragedy with Additions 1602 (Oxford, 1925), pp. xvii-xviii. (Italics added).
2. Ibid, xviii-xix. (Italics added).

the Additions of 1602, which do not exceed 330 lines.[1] Indeed, the amount paid by Henslowe would seem to indicate that Jonson wrote something approaching a full-length play, yet something which might still be considered an 'addition' to The Spanish Tragedy. Such a play is the anonymous First Part of Ieronimo, which, as we have seen, was written around this time but not published until 1605.

Another difficulty raised by external evidence, as Herford and Simpson point out, is the known reluctance of theatrical companies to allow their plays to be published while still earning money on the stage, which introduces the suspicion that Jonson's alleged additions of June, 1602, were too recent to be published in the same year, and therefore that the Additions that were so published were not by him.[2]

Before proceeding further, let us consider Jonson's own allusions to The Spanish Tragedy, for whatever light they may throw on the nature of any writing he may have done in connection with the old play. Firstly, it is significant that Jonson repeatedly ridicules Kyd's style. In Every Man in his Humour (1597-8), written three or four years after Kyd's death, he takes up this condescending attitude towards The Spanish Tragedy, representing it as the favourite reading of the buffoon Bobadill and the town gull Master Mathew (i.5):

> Bob. . . . What new booke ha' you there? What! Goe by, HIERONIMO!
>
> Mat. I, did you ever see it acted? is't not well pend?
>
> Bob. Well pend? . . .
>
> Mat. Indeed, here are a number of fine speeches in this booke! O eyes, no eyes, but fountaynes fraught with teares! There's a conceit! fountaines fraught with teares! O life, no life, but lively form of death! Another! O world, no world, but masse of publique wrongs! A third! Confus'd and fil'd with murder, and misdeeds! A fourth! O, the Muses! Is't not excellent? Is't not simply the best that you ever heard, captain? [3]

---

1. Henslowe usually paid from £4 to £6 for a whole new play, never more than £11.
2. C.H. Herford and Percy Simpson eds. Ben Jonson (Oxford, 1927), II, 238.
3. This and all other quotations from Jonson's plays follow the text of the standard edition of Jonson's works--Ben Jonson, eds. C.H. Herford and Percy Simpson (Oxford, 1927).

Of course Master Mathew, "the town gull", is held up to ridicule throughout the play, so that his elaborate praise of Kyd's style is simply a vehicle for Jonson's sarcastic scorn. Again Jonson slights The Spanish Tragedy in the Induction to Cynthia's Revels (1600):

> Another (whom it hath pleas'd nature to furnish with more beard then braine) . . . sweares . . . That the old Hieronimo (as it was first acted) was the only best, and iudiciously pend play of Europe.

The parenthetical phrase "as it was first acted" would seem indeed to distinguish a revised from the original form of the play. But this does not, as Dr. Boas seems to think, suggest "a personal motive for belittling the play, derived from his ((Jonson's)) own authorship of the 'Additions' ((of 1602))".[1] For as Herford and Simpson point out, this passage was written, and printed, at least a year before the date of the Additions. Herford and Simpson justly conclude that "no inference affecting the present question ((viz, the authorship of the Additions)) can therefore be drawn from the words 'as it was first acted', pointed as they seem".[2] Furthermore, as the Additions of 1602 do not either parody or significantly alter the text of Kyd, Jonson's qualifying phrase would be pointless if referred to these Additions. In other words, the Additions of 1602 do not change the play in any way that might save it from Jonson's ridicule, as they depend for their very validity upon a serious interpretation of Kyd's text, and as they do not delete more than a line or two of the original. Clearly, Jonson's phrase "as it was first acted" seems to refer to the original as distinct from the revised form of the play when it was acted as new by the Admiral's men in 1597. Indeed, it is no doubt only the diabolical nineteenth-century erasure in the manuscript of Henslowe's Diary that has prevented the probabilities of the case from being recognized long ago.

In The Poetaster (1601), iii.4.210-43, Jonson again parodies The Spanish

---

1. Boas, op. cit., p. lxxxvii.
2. Herford and Simpson, op. cit., II, 238.

Tragedy (ii.1.9-28, & ii.5.1-12). For less important slighting allusions by Jonson to Kyd's play, see The Alchemist (iii.2), A Tale of A Tub (iii.4) and The New Inn (ii.2). Jonson thus maintained a sort of running attack on The Spanish Tragedy, culminating in the Induction to Bartholomew Fair (1614), where he strikes out at both 'Ieronimo' and Titus Andronicus:

> Hee that will sweare, Ieronimo, or Andronicus are the best plays, yet, shall passe unexcepted at, heere, as a man whose Iudgement shewes it is constant, and hath stood still, these five and twentie, or thirtie yeers.

Herford and Simpson say of this passage: "In this, Jonson's only explicit reference . . . to the play ((The Spanish Tragedy)) after the date of the 'Additions', it will be seen that he entirely ignores them".[1]

In view of this continual antipathy or condescension on the part of Jonson for The Spanish Tragedy--an attitude which remains constant in his allusions to the play from 1597 to 1614, both before and after the Additions of 1602--it would indeed be surprizing if he were the author of those same Additions which in fact gave the play a new lease on public favour. The rapid succession of editions of the play after 1602 proves the popularity of the play in its revised form (subsequent quartos with the Additions appeared in 1603, 1611, 1615, 1618, 1623 and 1633) and its very popularity seems to have caused Jonson much displeasure. The passage quoted above from Bartholomew Fair is thus almost conclusive evidence that Jonson did not write the Additions of 1602. Indeed, judging from Jonson's acid allusions to The Spanish Tragedy, we might reasonably expect his pen to have contrived some sort of parody or burlesque of the play, such as the anonymous First Part of Ieronimo, which as we have seen was probably written about the same time as the Additions of 1602.

Upon a review of the external evidence for Jonson's authorship of the Additions

---

1. Herford and Simpson, op. cit., II, 238.

to The Spanish Tragedy, we must conclude with Herford and Simpson and with W.W. Greg that such evidence is less than valid; that the entries in Henslowe's Diary do not indicate Jonson's authorship of the extant Additions, but rather, they suggest that he wrote a full-length play; that Jonson's constant cavilling with The Spanish Tragedy virtually precludes the possibility of his having written the Additions which contributed so much to its renewed popularity, and that this same cavilling surely tells us that any writing Jonson might have undertaken in connection with Kyd's drama was probably in the nature of a parody or burlesque. Judging from external evidence alone, we should conclude that Jonson is much more likely to have written the anonymous First Part of Ieronimo than the Additions of 1602. It is not here contended that Jonson did write the First Part; however, it is probable that if he did not write it, he wrote something similar--a full-length burlesque of The Spanish Tragedy. For our present purposes, it is sufficient that the external evidence, in the light of authoratative scholarship by Greg and by Jonson's modern editors, can no longer support the view that he wrote the Additions of 1602.

Internal Indications:

It has long been recognized that the style of the Additions is totally unlike anything Jonson ever wrote. This judgment has the support of poets--Coleridge and Edward Fitzgerald--as well as critics from Charles Lamb to E.K. Chambers. No one, to the knowledge of the present writer, has ever maintained that the style of these Additions is in any respects Jonsonian.[1] On the contrary, they have long been acclaimed for their outstanding literary merit in the romantic vein by commentators from Coleridge to Boas, the latter of whom says of the 'Painter's scene': "In the design for this unparalleled 'night-piece', Elizabethan romantic art achieves one of its supreme triumphs".[2]

---

1. Although J.A. Symonds fancied that the scenes may have been written before Jonson settled down to his classical manner (Ben Jonson, 1886, p. 15, quoted by Boas, op. cit., p. lxxxvii).
2. Boas, op. cit., p. lxxxix.

Herford and Simpson, in their standard edition of Jonson's works (Ben Jonson, 1927), devote a short chapter to a consideration of Jonson's claims to the authorship of the Additions of 1602, reviewing the evidence and supplementing it by a close and penetrating comparison of Jonson's early style with the style of the Additions.[1] Appraising the author of the Additions as "a poet of rare poetic and tragic power", Herford and Simpson proceed to compare the style of the Additions with The Case is Altered (1598), a tragi-comedy in Jonson's less classical manner. Their verdict: "both the psychology and the poetry are of a wholly different order".[2] They further compare the language used by Jonson to express the grief of Count Ferneze for his captive son with the language used by Hieronimo in his lament for Horatio (in the Additions), for "the situation of Count Ferneze was . . . one likely to elicit whatever capacity for rendering the pathos of a son's loss Jonson possessed". They conclude: "Jonson's description of Ferneze's symptoms is competent and well expressed, but without one rare touch, one penetrating or memorable trait; on the whole, his emotion is described from without, not from within. . . . ((Ferneze's speeches are)) the language of analysis rather than of passion". With regard to measure, "the verse throughout is Jonson's uniform, regular, measured blank, without either the subtle modulations or the bold departures from the norm which add so much to the moving power of Hieronimo's outbursts".[3] Of the masterly portrayal of Hieronimo's madness in the Additions, Herford and Simpson are of the opinion: "it is hard to believe that Jonson, the most 'rational' of them all, could here have found and walked securely on the path known otherwise almost alone to the poet of Ophelia and of Lear. Hieronimo's 'lunacy' is, no more than theirs, incoherent; its wildest fancies are held together by . . . the thread of reason in their unreason".[4]

---

1. See Herford and Simpson eds. op. cit., II, 237-45.
2. Ibid, p. 242.
3. Ibid, p. 242-3.
4. Ibid, p. 243.

Herford and Simpson go on to note one or two Shakesperian parallels with the Additions, and to conclude: "To prove that Jonson cannot have written these scenes is of course impossible. But to admit that he may have written them is to strain almost to the breaking-point the theory which would credit even his rugged nature with incalculable reserves of power, only on this one occasion disclosed. . . . No such links can be discovered between the 'Additions' and any part of Jonson's authentic writing".[1] With the opinion of such authoratative commentators in support of the view that the style of the Additions is virtually the antithesis of Jonson's, we shall not pause to labour the point, beyond making a few brief observations based upon internal evidence which may contribute to the final overthrow of the myth of Jonson's authorship of these passages--a myth that has long obfuscated the true identity of their author. These points have not been observed before, so far as the present writer is aware, and they are given here merely as further proof (albeit hardly necessary) of the virtual impossibility of Jonson's authorship of the Additions.

Firstly, there is the fact that Jonson killed Gabriel Spencer in a duel in 1598, for which he was imprisoned for three months, and only escaped hanging by pleading the ancient benefit of the clergy.[2] Nor was Jonson allowed quickly to forget his narrow escape; his opponents in the 'stage quarrel', Marston and Dekker, rapped him mercilessly in their satires and held the inglorious episode of Jonson's trial and release up to public ridicule. Dekker, in Satiromastix (1601), refers satirically to Jonson's trial and to his narrow escape from hanging, ridiculing Jonson in the character of Horace.[3] So too, Marston takes up the attack in his What You Will (1600-1), à propos of which Penniman says: "It is probable that every time the word "hang" is used in connection with any

---

1. Ibid, p. 244.
2. See Middlesex Session's Rolls (1598), quoted in The Jonson Allusion-Book eds. J.F. Bradley and J.Q. Adams (Yale University Press, 1922), p. 34.
3. See J.H. Penniman, The War of the Theatres, Pubs. of the Univ. of Penn., vol.IV, no. 3 (1897), p. 122.

representation of Jonson, there is an allusion to his narrow escape from the gallows".[1] In view of this piece of manslaughter, and in view of Jonson's subsequent notoriety in connection with it, we should indeed be surprized if he wrote the lines in the Additions where Hieronimo curses the 'damned murderer' of his son. With all due allowance for poetic license, it is not easy to believe that in 1601 (the very time of the 'stage quarrel') Jonson could write--or would be allowed by Marston and Dekker to get away with writing--such a passage as this one of Hieronimo's:

> Well, heaven is heaven still,
> And there is Nemesis, and Furies,
> And things called whips,
> And they sometimes do meet with murderers:
> They do not always 'scape, that's some comfort. (A3.39-43)[2]

Indeed Hieronimo, in this passage from the Additions, is so genuinely outspoken in his heart-felt condemnation of the fact that murderers sometimes "'scape" from justice, and in his conciliatory assertion of divine retribution, that if (as will be presently contended) Shakespeare wrote the Additions, here may possibly be the long-sought-for 'purge' which Shakespeare gave Jonson at about this time, cryptically referred to in The Return From Parnassus (1601-2):

> Why heres our fellow Shakespeare puts them all downe,
> I and Ben Jonson too. O that Ben Jonson is a pestilent
> fellow, he brought up Horace giving the Poets a pill,
> but our fellow Shakespeare hath given him a purge that
> made him beray his credit. (iv.5)[3]

In any event, it is clear that Jonson's chronic dislike of The Spanish Tragedy was not likely to have been assuaged by such passages in the Additions. Far less credible would it be that he himself should have written these lines.

---

1. Ibid, p. 142.
2. Italics added. This and all other quotations from the Additions (unless otherwise noted) follow the modernized text of A.K. McIlwraith ed. Five Elizabethan Tragedies, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1950) pp. 229-240, where the Additions are conveniently printed separately, following the original text of The Spanish Tragedy. The Additions, five in number, are referred to as A1, A2 etc.; line references are McIlwraith's, and refer to each Addition as a separate unit.
3. Quoted in The Shakspere Allusion-Book, ed. E.K. Chambers (Oxford, 1932), I, 102.

Secondly there is Jonson's own judgment, for what it is worth, of grammatical correctness with regard to relative pronouns. Drummond of Hawthornden tells us: "Questioned about English . . . ((Jonson said)) Which, who, be relatives, not that".[1] In the 330 lines of the Additions, 'that' is used as a relative rather indiscriminately:[2]

> It was a man, sure, that was hanged up here (A1.40)
>
> The very arm that did hold up our house (A3.31)
>
> We are your servants that attend you sir (A4.23)
>
> Doth give consent to that is done in darkness (A4.34)
>
> And those that should be powerful and divine (A4.37)
>
> Wouldst thou have that that lives not in the world? (A4.83)
>
> Is there no tricks that comes before thine eyes? (A4.109)
>
> 'Twas it that stabbed his heart (A5.39)

Finally, we have Jonson's own testimony of his well-known pride of his knowledge of Latin. Jonson could boast to Drummond of Hawthornden, perhaps without exaggeration, that "he . . . knew more in Greek and Latin, than all the Poets in England".[3] In view of such learning, and such pride, we should indeed be surprized if Jonson were responsible for the blunder in the penultimate line of the fifth Addition to The Spanish Tragedy, which reads in the quarto of 1602:

> Nunck mors caede manus

and in subsequent editions until 1618:

> Nunck mers cadae manus

and in the 1623-33 quartos:

> Nunck mens cadae manus.

---

1. Notes of Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden ed. David Laing, printed for The Shakespeare Society (London, 1842), p. 37.
2. Yet it must be mentioned that Jonson uses 'that' as a relative in non-defining clauses fairly often. See A.C. Partridge, Studies in the Syntax of Ben Jonson's Plays (Cambridge, 1953), p. 65. But the syntactical structure of the Additions (like the prosody--see below p. 14) seems somewhat less regular than that of Jonson, who was of course a grammarian in his own right.
3. Notes of Ben Jonson's Conversations . . ., op. cit., p. 37.

These grammatically senseless readings have been judiciously emended by modern editors (Shick, Boas) to read:

Nunc iners cadat manus.

Even if such bungling be attributed to careless printing (which is unlikely, as it affects several letters in two consecutive words) we might expect Jonson, of all persons, to see that the error was soon corrected. More likely, the interpolator knew small Latin in comparison with Jonson's erudition.

These considerations are intended solely to supplement the preceding remarks upon the more evident disparities between the Additions and Jonson's known work. We must conclude that the internal indications are entirely against the possibility of Jonson's having written the Additions. With regard to style, one can but repeat the considered judgment of Herford and Simpson: "is it credible that one who was capable of the 'Additions' should for the rest of his life betray no hint of the same quality and the same kind of power?"[1]

Upon a final review of the evidence, both external and internal, we are surely compelled (in agreement with Herford and Simpson) to abandon as untenable the view that Jonson had any part in the Additions of 1602 to The Spanish Tragedy. With regard to Henslowe's entries, we must conclude either that the work undertaken by Jonson was carried out by someone else, or that these entries refer to Jonson's authorship of some sort of a full-length burlesque of The Spanish Tragedy, such as the anonymous First Part of Ieronimo; and if Jonson's burlesque is not to be identified with that extant play, it must have perished.

---

1. Herford and Simpson eds. op. cit., II, 245.

Webster and the Additions to "The Spanish Tragedy"

Charles Lamb, in his Specimens of English Dramatic Writers (1808), called the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy "the very salt of the old play". On record as the first person to challenge the view that Jonson wrote the Additions, Lamb continues: "There is nothing in the undoubted plays of Jonson, which would authorize us to suppose that he could have supplied the scenes in question. . . . Webster might have furnished them. They are full of that wild, solemn, preternatural cast of grief which bewilders us in The Duchess of Malfi."[1]

Edward Fitzgerald at a later date wrote in a similar vein: "Nobody knows who wrote this one scene (III.12A): it was thought Ben Jonson, who could no more have written it than I who read it: for what else of his is it like? Whereas, Webster one fancies might have done it".[2]

It will be noted at once that both Lamb and Fitzgerald are chiefly concerned with expressing their impatience with the myth of Jonson's authorship of the Additions--a myth which their critical and aesthetic insight quickly penetrated, and which, as we have seen, recent scholarship has rather thoroughly exploded. Both commentators then very tentatively suggest that Webster 'might' have written the passages in question; then they let the matter drop, for want of further evidence. We are given to understand that the Additions are at any rate more like Webster's style than Jonson's. Of that there can be no doubt. It is easy enough, as F.L. Lucas has wittily said, at the first croak of a toad to exclaim "Webster!". But is the style of the Additions

---

1. Quoted by Boas, op. cit., p. lxxxvii.
2. Letters of Edward Fitzgerald to Fanny Kemble, (1895), p. 63, quoted by Boas, op. cit., p. lxxxvii.

really like Webster's style in 1602?

The case for Webster's authorship of the Additions, unsupported as it is by a single shred of tangible evidence, has gained little attention from modern critics. In the first place, whatever weight the brief suggestions of Lamb and Fitzgerald may carry must be qualified by the fact that both men were writing under the impetus of the nineteenth-century revival of Webster, so that their inclination to claim new glories for that playwright may have been (understandably) a trifle too keen.

At the time when the Additions were written (circa 1601), Webster was a mere apprentice hack-writer, about twenty-one years old, just entering what E.E. Stoll terms his "period of apprenticeship and partnership: mainly under the influence of Dekker".[1] Webster's extant works of this period are:

Sir Thomas Wyatt (partly)	1602
Induction to Marston's The Malcontent	before July, 1604
Westward Ho (partly)	1604-5
Northward Ho (partly)	1605-6

[2]

Stoll, in his exhaustive study of Webster's development as a dramatist, describes this early work of his as follows: "The wooden Induction to the Malcontent, and some slight . . . part in the more colorless and stereotyped portions of Wyat, Westward Ho, and Northward Ho, under the shaping and guiding hand of Dekker! It is a long road from this sort of thing to the White Devil."[3] Stoll again refers to Webster's writing of this period as that of "a characterless, colorless hack".[4] Everything we know about Webster's development suggests that his genius matured slowly: it will be recalled that The White

---

1. John Webster (Boston, 1905), p. 43.
2. Ibid, p. 43-4.
3. Ibid, p. 79.
4. Ibid, p. 208.

Devil and The Duchess of Malfi were not written until well after Shakespeare's great tragedies had, as it were, shown him the way.[1] Stoll does not even deign to comment upon the possibility of Webster's authorship of the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy , but all his remarks on Webster's early style demonstrate that during this period Webster was in all probability incapable of the sustained power and poetic maturity of the Additions. Indeed, any hypothesis ascribing these Additions to Webster would lead to the dilemma of acknowledging them as his earliest extant work, for they precede even his uninspired hack-writing. Clearly, such an hypothesis would be at variance with everything we know of Webster's early style.

F.L. Lucas also is of the opinion that Webster could not have written the Additions of 1602. Lucas, in his standard edition of Webster's Works (1927), devotes a short but succint appendix to the question, where, after a review of the evidence, he concludes:

> I do not think the additions are really very like Webster. They treat indeed of death and madness; but that is common in Elizabethan drama. They treat them with extreme effectiveness; that is less common; but it is far from proving Webster's authorship.. . .
> Throughout, these additions seem to me to flow with a swifter, easier motion than Webster's style. Indeed I could far more readily believe, with Coleridge, that they were the work of Shakespeare himself. . . . It remains only to point out the scarcity of satisfactory parallels with Webster's known work; and there is the difficulty of the date. In 1602 Webster was doing his share in Sir Thomas Wyat, a poor piece of uninspired hack-work. Two years later in the Induction to The Malcontent and Westward Ho! he still shows not a glimmer of genius; and genius is hardly too strong a word for the author of the additions. Ten years later Webster was writing, not indeed like this, but as well. But it would seem improbable that he had written the additions in 1612; it seems all but impossible in 1602. [2]

This admirable summary of the case (founded as it is upon Lucas's authority

---

1. Stoll (op. cit., pp. 22 & 30) dates The White Devil 1612, The Duchess of Malfi 1617.
2. F.L. Lucas, ed. The Complete Works of John Webster, 4 vols. (London, 1927), IV, 248-9.

as Webster's standard editor, and entirely in accord with Stoll's earlier study of Webster's development as a dramatist) commands our complete assent. Further, it is noteworthy that Lucas, like Herford and Simpson, is personally inclined to attribute the Additions to Shakespeare.

Shakespeare's Hand In "The Spanish Tragedy"

Shakespeare in 1601:

In 1601 or thereabouts (the time of the composition of the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy[1]) Shakespeare had written the twenty-three plays which are now considered to comprise his works of experiment and development. Within the next six years or so, he was destined to write his great tragedies: Hamlet, Othello, Lear and Macbeth. Thus, we may picture Shakespeare in the year 1601 as a successful and mature playwright, thirty-seven years old, and approaching the height of his creative powers. Shakespeare's works of this period after 1601 are as follows:

Troilus and Cressida	c. 1602
Hamlet	c. 1602
Measure for Measure	c. 1604
Othello	c. 1604
Lear	1605?
Macbeth	1606? [2]

---

1. The wording of the title-page of the 1602 quarto of The Spanish Tragedy (see below, p. 3) suggests that the Additions were written not very long before that date. All indications point to 1601 as the probable date of composition. The passage in Marston's Antonio and Mellida (performed 1600, pub. 1602) in which a painter is asked to paint "Uh!" and to "make a piqture sing" (v.1), may or may not be a parody of the scene in the Additions where Hieronimo requests Bazardo to "paint a doleful cry" (A4.129). For a full discussion, see Penniman, op. cit., pp. 98-101. Penniman concludes: "the evidence seems to show that the scene in The Spanish Tragedy was written later than . . . Antonio and Mellida". As Penniman suggests, the scene of Marston's, if a parody, must have been written later than the rest of Antonio and Mellida, and inserted when the play was published in 1602, for "Marston's scene is not an organic part of the play, and might have been interpolated" (p. 100).
2. This list is taken from The Complete Works of William Shakespeare, ed. W. J. Craig (Oxford, 1945), p. 1165.

Clearly, in 1601 the high poetic calibre and psychological dimension of the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy were not beyond Shakespeare's attainment.[1]

It is a commonplace of Shakesperian scholarship that the first quarto of Hamlet (1603) is a re-working of the lost "Ur-Hamlet", which was in all probability written by Kyd. Thus Shakespeare, in the period around 1601, was busy revising an old revenge drama of Kyd's. It would be wholly possible for Shakespeare at this very time to turn his hand briefly to a retouching of Kyd's more famous play, The Spanish Tragedy. It has been long recognized that the similarities between the two plays are manifold. In both plays, the theme is revenge; in both the revenge is delayed; in both there is a 'play within the play'. And the central situation of Hamlet--a son seeking to avenge his murdered father--is simply a reversal of the motif of The Spanish Tragedy--a father seeking vengeance for the murder of his son. If ever in his dramatic career Shakespeare was ready to retouch The Spanish Tragedy, he could hardly have chosen a more congenial time than the period around 1601, when he was re-working Kyd's (lost) "Hamlet".

---

1. Webster, we have observed, was at this time a twenty-one year old apprentice. A brief comparison of the above list with Webster's works of the same period (see below, p. 20) will strikingly illustrate the respective stages, in their development as dramatists, attained by Shakespeare and Webster at the period around 1602.

Allusions linking Shakespeare with the Additions to "The Spanish Tragedy":

The chief objection of commentators upon the Additions to Coleridge's suggestion that Shakespeare wrote them has been that the evidence, no matter how convincing, is purely internal. This conservative view is perhaps justified so far as it goes. There are, however, at least two seventeenth-century allusions which link Shakespeare with these Additions, but which have not, to the knowledge of the present writer, yet been brought forward in connection with the question of their authorship. One of them is quite 'weak' and will be disposed of quickly; the other, set in its proper perspective, looks like the missing link in the evolution of criticism upon the Additions, and will be treated at some length.

Firstly, there is Edward Archer's Exact and Perfect Catalogue (London, 1656), which magnanimously credits Shakespeare with the authorship of the whole of The Spanish Tragedy and The First Part of Ieronimo:[1]

Hieronimo, both parts IHI Will Shakespeare

This catalogue is neither exact nor perfect, for it contains many inaccuracies and ascribes several other spurious plays to Shakespeare. Thus, the above reference is noteworthy only because of the faint possibility that some sort of tradition may have come down to Archer linking Shakespeare's name with Kyd's play. Shakespeare's authorship of the Additions of 1602 would provide the basis for such a tradition.

The other allusion connecting Shakespeare with the Additions is much more important, as it was written and published during Shakespeare's lifetime by an actor who played in his dramas, namely Robert Armin. This invaluable

---

1. Quoted in Some 300 Fresh Allusions to Shakspere, ed. F.J. Furnivall, The New Shakspere Society (London, 1886), p. 176.

allusion occurs in Armin's pamphlet A Nest of Ninnies, published in 1608--only six years after the Additions.[1] Armin writes:

> Ther are, as Hamlet saies, things cald whips in store.[2]

J.P. Collier says in his note (p. 67) to this allusion: "No such passage is to be found in Shakespeare's Hamlet, as it has come down to us . . . Possibly Armin may refer to the old Hamlet, which preceded Shakespeare's tragedy; but this seems unlikely, as he was an actor in the same theatre as that for which Shakespeare wrote".

The phrase which Armin ascribes to Hamlet, namely "things called whips", appears only twice in extant Elizabethan drama.[3] Its first occurrence is in the Second Part of King Henry VI (ii.1.136). Its only other occurrence is in the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy (A3.41). One possible explanation of Armin's baffling allusion is that he refers to the old (lost) Hamlet. But Collier is justified in considering this facile explanation "unlikely", because (1) Armin belonged to the company of actors playing at the Globe and he acted in Shakespeare's plays;[4] (2) the "Ur-Hamlet" never became popular; there is no record of it ever having been printed, and our authority for its very existence rests on a couple of allusions; (3) after 1602 or thereabouts, Shakespeare's Hamlet entirely supplanted the older version in public favour. In support of this last assertion we have the testimony of Scoloker in 1604,[5]

---

1. Perhaps the allusion comes within three years of the Additions. "The Nest of Ninnies is but a reprint of Armin's Foole upon Foole, 1605 (Mr. Huth, unique), with certain alterations, according to Mr. Hazlitt, Handbook, p. 12." (The Shakspere Allusion-Book, op. cit., I, 192, note.)
2. A Nest of Ninnies (London, 1608), repr. Old Shakespeare Soc. 1842, ed. J. P. Collier, p. 55.
3. See The Shakspere Allusion-Book, op. cit., I, 192.
4. See J.P. Collier, Memoirs of the Principal Actors in the Plays of Shakespeare (London, 1846), p. 190 ff.
5. "Faith it should please all, like Prince Hamlet" (Epistle to the Reader, Diaphantus, or the Passion of Love (1604), quoted in The Shakspere Allusion-Book, op. cit., I, 133.)

and the title-page of the first quarto of Hamlet, proclaiming that the play had been widely performed.[1]

These considerations make it seem improbable that Armin is referring in his allusion to the old play, at a time when Shakespeare's version was the talk of the town. At the time when Armin was writing, the old Hamlet had probably not been performed for a number of years, and was not available in print. Armin's very phrasing, "Hamlet saies", further indicates that he is thinking of Shakespeare's currently popular drama. But why does Armin ascribe the spurious phrase "things called whips" to Shakespeare's Hamlet?

We have observed that this phrase occurs in the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy, and is in fact spoken by Hieronimo:

> And there is Nemesis, and Furies,
> And things called whips,
> And they sometimes do meet with murderers:
> They do not always 'scape, that's some comfort. (A3.40-43)

Here, clearly, is not only the phrase Armin mistakenly quotes as Hamlet's, but the very context: Hieronimo is in effect saying that "things called whips" (as well as Nemesis and Furies) are in store for murderers. Armin, obviously, has confused the Hieronimo of the Additions with Shakespeare's Hamlet, to the extent at least of ascribing a phrase of the former role to the latter. We must now try to determine why Armin should have made this slip.

We know that Richard Burbage acted most of Shakespeare's chief roles, including Hamlet, and that he also played the part of Hieronimo in The Spanish Tragedy.[2] Might not Armin, who had in all probability seen and heard Burbage play both Hamlet and Hieronimo around 1602, mistakenly ascribe a brief phrase of the latter role to the former, since both parts were played by the same

---

1. By 1603 Shakespeare's Hamlet had been "divers times acted . . . in the Cittie of London: . . . also in the two Universities . . . and elsewhere". (The Shakespeare Documents, ed. B.R. Lewis (Stanford, 1940), II,357.

2. See J.P. Collier, Memoirs of Actors, op. cit., p. 19 ff.

actor, since Shakespeare's Hamlet was written about the same time as the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy, since the roles of Hamlet and Hieronimo--especially the Hieronimo of the Additions--are psychologically similar, since Hamlet himself refers notably to "the whips and scorns of time", and especially since (if our conjectures are just) Shakespeare wrote these new lines of the part of Hieronimo? We must of course assume that Armin has his author correct (always bearing in mind that he belonged to Shakespeare's group) and merely slips up on the dramatic character to whom he refers the phrase "things called whips". Such a slip might be expected of one who played Dogberry, and who, in his own words, "hath been writ downe for an Asse in his time".[1] Armin himself elsewhere cautions us with reference to his garbled allusions: "such as knew me remember my meaning".[2] Thus, the least vulnerable conclusion is that when Armin clumsily referred the phrase "things called whips" (in a context dealing with retribution) to Hamlet, he was confusedly thinking of the author-actor combination of Shakespeare and Burbage in connection with Hamlet and with the recent Additions to The Spanish Tragedy.[3]

These conjectures, it will be objected, rest upon the assumption that the roles of Hamlet and Hieronimo were closely identified by Shakespeare's contemporaries. For this there is abundant evidence, and as it serves further to illustrate the probability that Armin's allusion confuses the two roles, by showing their frequent and close association in the minds of Elizabethan writers, we will briefly consider some of these other allusions linking Hamlet and Hieronimo.

---

1. Armin here speaks of himself in the third person. Dedication of The Italian Taylor and his Boy (1609), quoted in The Shakspere Allusion-Book, op. cit., I, 194.
2. A Nest of Ninnies (1608), quoted in The Shakspere Allusion-Book, loc. cit.
3. An alternative possibility is that Armin intentionally refers to Shakespeare as Hamlet, in the same way that the anonymous writer of a letter (1600-10) is thought to quote Shakespeare under the name of Falstaff: "as that excellent author, Sr. John Falstaff sayes . . ." (The Shakespeare Allusion-Book, I, 88) This less likely interpretation would still indicate Shakespeare's authorship of the Additions.

Thomas Dekker, in his prose account of the trick of two London porters, one of whom shammed mad, illustrates the fellow's antics by calling him first "furious Hamlet", and then a few lines later "this olde Ieronimo".[1] Similarly, a line in the elegy on Burbage's death (1618) tells us not only that the actor played the parts of both Hamlet and Hieronimo, but indicates by their close juxtaposition that the anonymous poet closely identified the two roles:

> no more young Hamlet, ould Hieronymoe
> . . . and more beside,
> that lived in him; have now for ever dy'de. [2]

Likewise John Gee mentions the two plays in a single context (1624):

> Representations and Apparitions from the dead might be seen farre cheaper at other Play-houses. As for example, the Ghost in Hamblet (sic), Don Andreas Ghost in Hieronimo. [3]

Thomas Randolph (d. 1634) also notably links the two plays together:

> By Jeronymo, her looks are as terrible as . . . the Ghost in Hamlet. [4]

Anthony Scoloker, writing in 1604, even implies that the actor playing Hamlet's part was likely to imitate the dishabille of Hieronimo (who is made by Kyd to appear in his nightshirt). Writing of a love-melancholiac, Scoloker says he

> Puts off his cloathes; his shirt he onely weares,
> Much like mad-Hamlet; thus as passion teares. [5]

Or possibly Scoloker is confusing the two roles in the same manner as Armin.

---

1. The Dead Tearme, (London, 1608), quoted in The Shakspere Allusion-Book, I,185.
2. "A Funerall Ellegye on ye Death of . . . Richard Burbedg", quoted in The Shakspere Allusion-Book, I, 272.
3. New Shreds of the old Snare, quoted in The Shakspere Allusion-Book, I, 327.
4. Hey for Honesty, Down with Knavery, (pub. 1651) ii.4, quoted in The Shakspere Allusion-Book, II, 19.
5. Diaphantus, quoted in The Shakspere Allusion-Book, I, 133. Doubtless this allusion, like Armin's, would have been hastily referred to the old Hamlet (a sort of repository for perplexing allusions) had not Scoloker left no room for doubt by specifying in his preface "Friendly Shakespeare's Tragedies".

All these allusions clearly indicate what we might in any case expect: that Shakespeare's contemporaries regarded Hamlet and The Spanish Tragedy almost as twin compositions, often to be referred to in a single breath. The roles of Hamlet and Hieronimo were likewise identified.

The probability is, then, that Armin carelessly ascribes the phrase of Hieronimo's from the Additions of 1602 to Shakespeare's Hamlet.[1] This in turn provides a valuable clue to the authorship of these Additions, since Armin in effect refers the phrase (and by implication the Additions) to Shakespeare.

---

1. A somewhat analogous example of a Jacobean writer confusing two parallel dramatic roles is found in Geffray Mynshul's Essays (1617-18): "If with the Jew of Malta, instead of coyne, thou requirest a pound of flesh next to thy debtor's heart . . . " (Essayes and Characters of a Prison and Prisoners. Of Creditors, Reprint, Edinburgh, 1821, pp. 30-31. Quoted in The Shakspere Allusion-Book, I, 269.)

Here Mynshul confuses Shakespeare's Shylock with Marlowe's Jew of Malta. But whereas Armin merely misappropriates a single phrase, Mynshul confuses a whole plot.

Tests of Style and Imagery

In considering Shakespeare's claims to the authorship of the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy (1602), we may well look for relationships between the passages in question and Shakespeare's tragedies of the period 1602-06. In the following pages it will be shown that these Additions do in fact bear an unmistakable affinity in style, imagery and language to Shakespeare's writings as a whole, and especially to his tragedies of the period after 1600.

At the outset, we may remark upon the general principle that relationships between the Additions and Shakespeare's plays produced after 1602 are, for our present purpose of establishing authorship, even more important than similar relationships with the style and imagery of his earlier plays. For instance, a striking image or phrase from the Additions which is shown also to occur in King Lear is (other things being equal) a far more significant indication of Shakespeare's hand in the Additions than, say, a parallel with Love's Labour's Lost. While contemporary playwrights may have been familiar with some patterns of imagery employed by Shakespeare in his earlier dramas, it is clear that no one but Shakespeare in 1601-2 could have anticipated the style and poetic figures of his subsequent tragedies with an organic resemblance.

When this has been said, it is sufficient that many of the most striking parallels brought forth in the following pages are in fact evidence that the interpolator of 1602 was time and again unconsciously anticipating the style, imagery, language and mood of Shakespeare's then-unwritten tragedies with a frequency that is all but incredible unless Shakespeare himself was the interpolator. That this assertion is in full accord with the probabilities of the case will of course be illustrated throughout by copious parallels between the Additions and Shakespeare's other writings--his history plays and comedies (both earlier and later) and his poems.

In many instances the relative importance of a particular parallel--perhaps depending on a myriad minor considerations--is left to the judgment of the reader. But it should be borne in mind throughout that no one but Shakespeare could conceivably anticipate the very stuff of his later tragedies, or reproduce the veritable fabric of his writings as a whole, so notably and so often in the mere 330 lines which constitute these Additions.

First Addition (54 lines):

The first Addition is an interpolation of scene (ii.5) in which Hieronimo discovers his murdered son, Horatio. In the quarto of 1602 this Addition extends from line 977:

> Aye me, Hieronimo, sweet husband speake

to line 1051:

> How strangly had I lost my way to griefe.[1]

Firstly, we note that Hieronimo's phrase "short-lived" (l. 13) appears twice in Love's Labour's Lost (ii.1.54 & iv.1.15), and that his oath "Saint James" (l. 25) occurs in slightly altered form in The Taming of the Shrew, as "by Saint Jamy" (iii.2.84). Hieronimo's expression:

> Nay, blush not, man (l. 24)

recurrs thus in Antony and Cleopatra:

> Nay, blush not, Cleopatra. (v.2.149)

Hieronimo's phrase "pure and spotless" (l. 36) echoes the phrase "immaculate and spotless" (Lucrece, l. 1656), and his assertion in the following line--"I am ashamed"--recurrs in The Winter's Tale (v.3.37).

Hieronimo's exclamation upon recognizing his murdered son:

---

1. The Spanish Tragedy With Additions 1602, ed. W.W. Greg (Oxford, 1925). All other quotations from the Additions (unless otherwise noted) follow the modernized text of McIlwraith, as explained below (p. 16).

All quotations from Shakespeare follow the text of The Complete Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, eds. W.A. Neilson and C.J. Hill (Cambridge, Mass., 1942).

Confusion, mischief, torment, death and hell (l. 45)

is parallel to several similar series of expletives used by Shakespeare, as:

Wrath, envy, treason, rape, and murder's rages (Lucr. 909)

woe, destruction, ruin and decay (R.II. iii.2.102)

Death, desolation, ruin and decay (R.III. iv.4.409)

Vengeance! plague! death! confusion! (Lear ii.4.96)

Hieronimo's next line--

Drop all your stings at once in my cold bosom[1] (l. 46)

--compares with an expression in Hamlet:

. . . thorns that in her bosom lodge,
To prick and sting her. (i.5.87)

Four lines later, when Hieronimo invokes Night--

Gird in my waste of grief with thy large darkness (l. 50)

--the submerged word-play is illuminated by Shakespeare's lines:

Girdle with embracing flames the waist
Of Collatine's fair love. (Lucr. 6)

A pun on 'waste' similar to Hieronimo's appears (at the expense of Falstaff) in Henry IV:

Your means are very slender, and your waste is great. (2H.IV i.2.160)

Further, Hieronimo's metaphorical "waste of grief" is paralleled by a figure in the first line of Shakespeare's sonnet 79:

The expense of spirit in a waste of shame

--and by the expressions "wastes of time" and "beauty's waste" in his twelfth and ninth sonnets respectively. Again, compare Hieronimo's figure of Night enfolding, or 'girding in' grief, with a line in Pericles:

. . . night, the tomb where grief should sleep. (i.2.5)

---

1. Italics added for emphasis here and in subsequent quotations without further comment.

Second Addition (10 lines):

The second Addition is a short interpolation (iii.2) of the scene where Lorenzo prevents Hieronimo from visiting Bel-imperia. In the quarto of 1602 this Addition extends from line 1272:

Who, you my Lord?

to line 1281:

A thing of nothing my Lord

which replaces a line and a half of the original text.

Firstly, Hieronimo's words:

This is a very toy, my Lord, a toy (l. 3)

very closely echo a line in Love's Labour's Lost:

A toy, my liege, a toy. (iv.3.201)

The expressions used by Hieronimo to express triviality--"a toy . . . an idle thing" (l. 3-5)--admittedly common ones, are paralleled by "idle toys" (L.L.L.iv.3.170), "a toy, a thing of no regard" (1H.VI iv.I.145) and "idle shallow things" (Twel.iii.4.136).

In the next line Hieronimo says he has been

too tardy, too remiss (l. 6)

--a phrase which appears in Troilus and Cressida as:

tardy and remiss (iv.4.143).

Hieronimo's last words of this Addition are replete with irony; Lorenzo asks him what his trouble might be, and Hieronimo replies:

In troth, my Lord, it is a thing of nothing:
The murder of a son, or so--
A thing of nothing, my Lord! (ll. 8-10)

The irony of these lines, and the bitterness akin to distraction of their speaker, are remarkably reminiscent of Hamlet. And at least one point, the similarity becomes almost too obvious for comment. Compare the following lines of Shakespeare's with the last line of Hieronimo's quoted immediately above:

Ham. . . . The king is a thing--

Guil. A thing, my lord!

Ham. Of nothing: (iv.2.32).

Thus, Hieronimo says: "A thing of nothing, my Lord", and Hamlet and Guildenstern together make up the line: "A thing, my lord! / Of nothing". The two passages are verbally identical (with 'my lord' in a different place) and they both achieve the same dramatic effect: the expression of the bitter irony of a hero whose search for revenge is frustrated.

Third Addition (47 lines):

The third Addition is an insertion, consisting of a long soliloquy spoken by Hieronimo, at the beginning of the scene (iii.2) between him and the two Portugese. In the quarto of 1602 this Addition extends from line 1866:

'Tis neither as you thinke, nor as you thinke

to line 1910:

And so doth bring confusion to them all.

In this soliloquy the character of Hieronimo attains to a psychological realism and a three-dimensional stature quite different from his role in Kyd's play. He begins:

'Tis neither as you think, nor as you think,
Nor as you think; you're wide all:
These slippers are not mine, they were my son Horatio's.
My son! and what's a son? A thing begot
Within a pair of minutes, thereabout;
A lump bred up in darkness, and doth serve
To ballace these light creatures we call women;
And, at nine moneth's end, creeps forth to light.
What is there yet in a son
To make a father dote, rave or run mad?
Being born, it pouts, cries, and breeds teeth.
What is there yet in a son? . . . (ll. 1-12)

Compare this with Juliet's lines:

> 'Tis but thy name that is my enemy;
> Thou art thyself though, not a Montague.
> What's Montague? it is nor hand, nor foot,
> Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part
> Belonging to a man. O! be some other name;
> What's in a name? that which we call a rose
> By any other name would smell as sweet. (Romeo ii.2.38-44)

Here we see Hieronimo in his grief, and Juliet in the first ardour of her love, both revealing the same curious habit of analysing their respective emotions by asking themselves what is real and what merely external or superficial in the objects of their affections. Thus Hieronimo's "what's a son?" corresponds to Juliet's "what's Montague?", as does his "what is there yet in a son?" to her "what's in a name?". The two speeches are almost parallel constructions in so far as they are both formed on the same principle of rational analysis of emotional connotations.

Further, we see this same habit of mind linking the Hieronimo of the Additions with Shakespeare's Hamlet. Hieronimo continues:

> What is there yet in a son? He must be fed,
> Be taught to go, and speak. Ay, or yet?
> Why might not a man love a calf as well,
> Or melt in passion for a frisking kid,
> As for a son? (ll. 12-16)

Cp. Hamlet:

> . . . What is a man,
> If his chief good and market of his time
> Be but to sleep and feed? a beast, no more. (iv.4.33-35)

Thus, Hieronimo asks himself "what is a son?", and Hamlet wonders "what is a man?". Hieronimo concludes that, as a son "must be fed", one might as well love a calf or a kid; Hamlet decides that if a man does nothing but "sleep and feed", he is nothing more than "a beast". The stylistic similarities are quite noticeable.

The style and phrasing of these lines invites closer comparison with Shakespeare. When Hieronimo refers to a son as

> A lump bred up in darkness (l. 6)

there is an echo of the reference to Gloucester's birth in Henry VI:

> Thy mother . . .
> brought forth . . .
> an indigest deformed lump. (3H.VI v.6.51 f.)

There is an incidental play on the word 'light' in Hieronimo's phrase:

> To ballace these light creatures we call women (l. 7)

depending for its double significance on the Elizabethan use of the word 'light' as meaning 'inconstant', and for a possible third nuance in contrast to the phrase "bred up in darkness" of the preceding line. Shakespeare puns on the word 'light' as applied to women in the same way:

> . . . you are a light wench.
> Indeed I weigh not you, and therefore light. (L.L.L. v.2.25)
>
> women are light at midnight (Meas. v.1.280)
>
> Pet. Alas! good Kate, I will not burden thee;
> For, knowing thee to be but young and light--
> Kath. Too light for such a swain as you to catch;
> And yet as heavy as my weight should be. (Shrew ii.1.203-5)

Hieronimo's phrase "a father dote, rave, or run mad" (l. 10) is comparable to the line:

> . . . my daughter will run mad
> So much she doteth . . . (1H.IV iii.1.146).

The phrase "doting father" occurs in Lucrece (l. 1064).

Hieronimo's peculiar phrase "breeds teeth" (l. 11) recurs as "breed / No teeth" in Macbeth (iii.4.31).

Hieronimo continues with his soliloquy, proceeding to generalize upon his personal grief, attempting to rationalize his bereavement, then returning again to the lament for his son Horatio:

> Methinks a young bacon
> Or a fine little smooth horse colt
> Should move a man as much as doth a son.
> For one of these in very little time
> Will grow to some good use, whereas a son,
> The more he grows in stature and in years,
> The more unsquar'd, unbevelled he appears;
> Reckons his parents among the rank of fools,
> Strikes care upon their heads with his mad riots,

> Makes them look old before they meet with age.
> This is a son!--And what a loss were this,
> Considered truly!--O, but my Horatio
> Grew out of reach of these insatiate humours!
> He loved his loving parents;
> He was my comfort, and his mother's joy,
> The very arm that did hold up our house!
> Our hopes were stored up in him,
> None but a damned murderer could hate him. (l. 16-33)

Here, Hieronimo's digression about an imaginary prodigal son, to whom his murdered Horatio was a shining contrast, reminds us of King Henry's concern over Prince Hal's 'riots'. Thus, when Hieronimo says that a prodigal son is a burden to his parents and

> Strikes care upon their heads with his mad riots (l. 24)

we recall Knig Henry's words to Hal:

> When that my care could not withhold thy riots,
> What wilt thou do when riot is thy care? (2H.IV iv.5.136)

Towards the end of this soliloquy, thinking of his son's murderers, Hieronimo says:

> Well, heaven is heaven still,
> And there is Nemesis, and Furies,
> And things called whips,
> And they sometimes do meet with murderers:
> They do not always 'scape, that's some comfort. (ll. 39-43)

Firstly, Hieronimo's very phrase--"and things called whips"--occurs in 2 Henry VI (ii.1.136). Secondly, Hieronimo's assertion that murderers do not always "'scape" from the symbolic "whips" recalls Shakespeare's phrase "'scape whipping", also used figuratively in connection with justice (Ham. ii.2.556 and Per. ii.1.93). Thirdly, the association of heavenly justice or divine retribution with 'whips' and 'whipping' is a favourite one with Shakespeare:

> Not all the whips of heaven (Tim. v.1.64)
>
> Whip me, ye devils (Oth. v.2.277)
>
> the whips and scorns of time (Ham. iii.1.70)
>
> . . . undivulged crimes,
> Unwhipped of justice (Lear iii.2.52)

> use every man after his desert,
> and who should 'scape whipping? (Ham. ii.2.562)
>
> O Heaven! . . .
> . . . put in every honest hand a whip (Oth. iv.2.141)

It will be noted that in each of these instances, as in Hieronimo's lines, whips and the act of whipping are symbolic of true, as opposed to temporal justice.

At the close of the soliloquy, Hieronimo says:

> Ay, ay, ay; and then time steals on,
> And steals, and steals, till violence leaps forth,
> Like thunder wrapp'd in a ball of fire,
> And so doth bring confusion to them all. (ll. 44-47)

Compare this with the famous passage in Macbeth:

> To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
> Creeps in this petty pace from day to day
> And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
> The way to dusty death . . .
> . . . it is a tale
> Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
> Signifying nothing. (v.5.19-28)

Here there is a threefold parallelism. The imitative harmony of the thrice-uttered 'steals' in Hieronimo's speech corresponds to the similar effect achieved by Macbeth's triple intonation of 'to-morrow', so that the verse veritably creeps (or steals) in both instances. In both passages, the slow progress of time is employed in a pessimistic commentary upon life, leading as it does to "violence" and "confusion" for Hieronimo, or "dusty death" and "nothing" for Macbeth. Finally, Hieronimo's "thunder wrapp'd in a ball of fire", bringing ultimate "confusion", seems to show a submerged affinity with Macbeth's phrase "sound and fury" and the final "nothing".

Hieronimo's phrase "time steals on" is further paralleled by "time steals" (All's W. v.3.42), "the stealing hours of time" (R.III iii.7.168) and "the hour steals on" (Errors iv.1.52). And finally, Hieronimo's vivid phrase:

> wrapp'd in a ball of fire (l. 46)

compares closely with these of Shakespeare's:

wrapp'd in fire	(John ii.1.227)
a ball of wild fire	(IH.IV iii.3.45)
balls of quenchless fire	(Lucr. 1. 1554).

Fourth Addition (175 lines):

The fourth Addition consists of an additional scene (iii.12bis.) containing the famous 'Painter's part' so alluringly described on the title-page. In the quarto of 1602 this Addition extends from line 2063:

Enter Iaques and Pedro

to the final direction, lines 2246-7:

He beats the Painter in, then comes out again,
with a book in his hand.

This scene, introducing the new figures of Pedro, Jaques, and above all the Painter, is the longest and most important of the Additions. The scene begins with a brief discourse between Pedro and Jaques. Jaques' Senecan phrase, "for rape and bloody murder"(l. 4), is found with variations throughout Titus Andronicus:

bloody murder or detested rape	(v.2.37)
for murders and for rapes	(iv.1.58)
murders, rapes	(v.1.63).

Pedro proceeds to comment upon his master Hieronimo's condition:

O Jaques, know thou that our master's mind
Is much distraught since his Horatio died,
And--now his aged years should sleep in rest,
His heart in quiet--like a desperate man,
Grows lunatic and childish for his son.
Sometimes, as he doth at his table sit,
He speaks as if Horatio stood by him. (ll. 5-11)

This description of Hieronimo's strange behaviour while eating reminds us of the scene in Macbeth (iii.4) where the hero sees Banquo's ghost while at the table. Pedro's phrase "desperate man" recurs in Romeo and Juliet (v.3.59). Pedro continues:

> Then starting in a rage, falls on the earth,
> Cries out "Horatio, where is my Horatio?"
> So that with extreme grief and cutting sorrow
> There is not left in him one inch of man. (ll. 12-15)

The phrase "starting in a rage" is paralleled in Hamlet:

> . . . his rage!
> Now fear I this will give it start again. (iv.7.194)

Pedro's phrase "extreme grief" recalls "extremity of griefs" and "extreme laughter" in Titus Andronicus (iv.1.19 and v.1.113), and "extremes of . . . grief" in Lear (v.3.198). And when Pedro tells us how Hieronimo is wont to fall "on the earth", and behave in general so that "there is not left in him one inch of man", we are reminded of the scene in Romeo and Juliet, where Romeo likewise falls on the ground in a fit of grief, so that Friar Lawrence reprimands him:

> Stand up, stand up; stand, an you be a man (iii.3.87).

And when Othello falls into an epileptic fit, Iago exclaims--

> Would you would bear your fortunes like a man! (iv.1.63)

--and,

> Or I shall say you are all in a spleen,
> And nothing of a man. (iv.1.89)

Pedro's phrase "one inch of man" is also echoed by "every inch of woman" (Wint. ii.1.137) and "every inch a king" (Lear iv.6.110).

Hieronimo enters, and his first line is:

> I pry through every crevice of each wall (l. 17).

Here the parallel, this time a rather remarkable one, is with Titus Andronicus:

> I pry'd me through the crevice of a wall (v.1.114).

The verbal and syntactical similarity of these lines is self-evident and would seem almost alone to point to a single author; in both contexts, the line is curiously incongruous to the point of eclecticism and seems hardly the sort of thing that would interest a plagarist. Hieronimo continues:

> I pry through every crevice of each wall,

> Look on each tree, and search through every brake,
> Beat at the bushes, stamp our grandam earth.
> Dive in the water, and stare up to heaven. (ll. 17-21)

Here, there is a certain similarity to Hotspur's lines:

> By heaven methinks it were an easy leap
> To pluck bright honour from the pale-fac'd moon,
> Or dive into the bottom of the deep . . . (IH.IV i.3.201-3).

And Hieronimo's phrase "our grandam earth" occurs identically in another speech of Hotspur's:

> Our grandam earth . . . (IH.IV iii.1.34).

Hieronimo's description of his distracted behaviour, when he tells us he did

> . . . search through every brake,
> Beat at the bushes, stamp our grandam earth,
> . . . and stare up to heaven (ll. 18-20)

echoes "through bush, through brake" (Dream iii.1.110) and "nor stamp, nor stare" (Shrew iii.2.230).

Hieronimo's servants then enter with their torches, as it is past midnight. Hieronimo's query--

> What make you with your torches in the dark? (l. 24)

--where the verb 'make' is used in the interrogative for 'do', is identical with a phrase in As You Like It:

> What make you here? (i.1.32).

Upon receiving his servants' reply that they are merely carrying out his order, Hieronimo raves:

> No, no, you are deceivéd--not I, you are deceiv'd. (l. 26)

Cp. Coriolanus:

> No, you are deceived (v.2.51).

The interpolator then portrays Hieronimo's unbalanced condition by introducing into his speech a significant figure of the inversion of natural order:

> Was I so mad to bid you light your torches now?
> Light me your torches at the mid of noon (l. 28).

There is an important parallel to this use of the inversion motif in Lear:

> Lear. . . . We'll go to supper i' the morning: so,so,so.
> Fool. And I'll go to bed at noon. (iii.6.90)

In fact, Shakespeare often symbolizes disorder in nature by introducing into the speech of his characters figures of inversion and reversal. Thus--

> Now Phaeton hath tumbled from his car,
> And made an evening of the noontide prick. (3H.VI i.4.33)

Again--

> . . . his ((the sun's)) smother'd light
> May set at noon and make perpetual night. (Lucr. 783)

In these figures of Shakespeare's, as in Hieronimo's, the inverted concepts are those of light and darkness, of noon and night. It is upon the validity of such striking similitudes as this that the case for Shakespeare's authorship of the Additions may ultimately rest.

Hieronimo continues:

> Light me your torches at the mid of noon,
> Whenas the sun-god rides in all his glory:
> Light me your torches then. (l. 28-30)

Pedro's reply--

> Then we burn daylight. (l. 30)

--is an Elizabethan expression meaning 'to waste time', although here it has something of the literal sense as well. The phrase is used twice by Shakespear:

> We burn daylight: (Wives ii.1.54)
>
> We burn daylight, ho! (Romeo i.4.43)

Cp. also--

> To burn the night with torches (Antony iv.2.41).

Hieronimo's next lines--

> Night is a murderous slut,
> That would not have her treasons to be seen (ll. 31-32)

--are reminiscent of an expression in Henry VI:

> Piercing as the mid-day sun,
> To search the secret treasons of the world (3H.VI v.2.18).

Hieronimo continues his invective against the powers of Night:

> . . . Night is a murderous slut,
> That would not have her treasons to be seen,
> And yonder pale-faced Hecat there, the moon,
> Doth give consent to that is done in darkness;
> And all those stars that gaze upon her face,
> Are aglots on her sleeve, pins on her train;
> And those that should be powerful and divine,
> Do sleep in darkness when they most should shine. (ll. 31-38)

Compare this with Lucrece's extended curse of Night:

> O comfort-killing Night, image of hell!
> Dim register and notary of shame!
> . . . Vast sin-concealing chaos! . . .
> Blind muffled bawd! . . .
> Grim cave of death! (Lucr. l. 764-9).

Lucrece goes on to refer to the moon as a queen, with the stars as handmaids:

> Were Tarquin Night, as he is but Night's child,
> The silver-shining queen he would distain;
> Her twinkling handmaids too . . . (ll. 785-8).

And in the midst of her diatribe against Night, Lucrece employs a figure of inversion--of night at noon--

> . . . his ((the sun's)) smother'd light
> May set at noon and make perpetual night. (ll. 783-4)

--which, as we have already noted, resembles Hieronimo's figure of inversion, immediately preceding his own rant against Night.

In the original Kydian version of The Spanish Tragedy, the fact that the moon is hidden on the night of the murder of Horatio is established by a single line, spoken by Horatio himself:

> Luna hides herself to pleasure us. (ii.4.19)

The interpolator of 1602 has Hieronimo elaborate (as we have seen) upon the darkness of the murder night, so that the mood comes to resemble the night of Duncan's murder in Macbeth, when Fleance tells us:

> The moon is down (Mac. ii.1.2).

In the same scene in Macbeth, there is a reference to "Pale Hecate" (l. 52), paralleling Hieronimo's "pale-faced Hecat". Cp. also: "pale-faced moon" (R.II ii.4.10, and IH.IV i.3.202).

The similarities with Macbeth continue when Hieronimo goes on to say:

> Had the moon shone, in my boy's face there was a kind of grace,
> That I know--nay, I do know--had the murderer seen him,
> His weapon would have fall'n and cut the earth,
> Had he been framed of naught but blood and death. (ll. 48-51)

This belated assertion by Hieronimo of the power of a noble countenance to sway the heart and stay the hand of even the most hardened murderer is psychologically similar to Lady Macbeth's--

> . . . Had he not resembled
> My father as he slept, I had done't. (ii.2.14)

It will be recalled that Lady Macbeth had previously called for spirits to "unsex" her and to fill her "from the crown to the toe top full / Of direst cruelty". Thus, in her involuntary revulsion from the murder of Duncan, Hieronimo's hyperbolical conditions--a murderer "framed of naught but blood and death"--are virtually fulfilled.

When Pedro cautions his master:

> Provoke them ((the heavens)) not, fair sir, with tempting words (l. 39)

we observe that the phrase "tempt the heavens" occurs in Julius Caesar (i.3. 53). Hieronimo replies:

> Villain, thou liest (l. 42)

--and the identical phrase "villain, thou liest" occurs in The Comedy of Errors (ii.2.165).

Hieronimo continues:

> Villain, thou liest, and thou doest nought
> But tell me I am mad: thou liest, I am not mad!
> I know thee to be Pedro, and he Jaques.
> I'll prove it to thee; and were I mad, how could I? (ll. 42-45)

This speech greatly resembles that of Constance in King John, who has been

temporarily deprived of her son, and is thus in a state of mind close to Hieronimo's.

> Const. I am not mad: this hair I tear is mine;
> My name is Constance; I was Geffrey's wife;
> Young Arthur is my son, and he is lost!
> I am not mad: (iii.4.45-48).

So too, in Titus Andronicus the hero says:

> I am not mad; I know thee well enough: (v.2.21).

And when Hieronimo is thus made to emphasize his distraught mental state by insisting "I am not mad" (just like Constance and Titus Andronicus), the dramatic device is identical to that employed by Shakespeare in Othello, when the drunken Cassio belies his condition by repeatedly proclaiming his sobriety:

> . . . Do not think, gentlemen, I am drunk:
> this is my ancient; this is my right hand,
> and this is my left hand. I am not drunk
> now; I can stand well enough, and speak well
> enough. (ii.3.118-120)

Cp. also Hamlet's lines:

> . . . it is not madness
> That I have utter'd: bring me to the test,
> And I the matter will re-word, which madness
> Would gambol from. (iii.4.140)

These parallels, it is suggested, are so close (without ever being the too exact copy of a plagarist) as to point strongly in themselves to identical authorship.

This same speech of Hieronimo's provides an even more fascinating indication of Shakespeare's hand in these Additions. Hieronimo continues to lament the fact that the moon was hidden on the night of his son's murder:

> Where was she ((the moon)) that same night, when my Horatio
> Was murdered? She should have shone: search thou the book.
> (ll. 47-48).

This enigmatic injunction--"search thou the book"--has not been explained or even commented on by modern editors of The Spanish Tragedy. Boas passes it over in silence. Perhaps the phrase is not very important from a dramatic

viewpoint, but there is something intriguing about it which demands elucidation. What book does Hieronimo intend should be searched--if only in a rhetorical sense? Firstly, it cannot be the book of Latin quotations he reads from at the beginning of the next scene: this book has not yet been mentioned, and it has no connection with the fact that the moon did not shine on the night of his son's murder. Upon turning to the third act of A Midsummer-Night's Dream, we find the solution to this question:

> Snout. Doth the moon shine that night we play our play?
> Bot. A calendar, a calendar! Look in the almanac!
> Find out moonshine, find out moonshine.
> Quin. Yes, it doth shine that night. (iii.1.52-56).

Clearly, Hieronimo is referring to the calendar-almanac--a book which would be familiar in connection with phases of the moon to Elizabethan audiences. And just as Shakespeare has Snout consult the almanac to find out whether the moon will shine, so Hieronimo in his distraction insists (quite rhetorically) that the almanac be consulted to find out whether the moon "should have shone" on the night of his son's murder. Here, where we find that a passage of Shakespeare's explains a similar (and not too common) passage in the body of text under consideration, we are surely compelled to regard the case for identical authorship undeniably strong.

If one may for a moment digress to comment upon the dramatic and poetic art of the interpolator (we shall refrain from calling him 'Shakespeare' until the full evidence is presented); it is notable that whereas the technical word 'almanac' is quite appropriate in the comic scene between Snout and Bottom, for Hieronimo to exclaim in his depth of grief: "Search thou the almanac!" would be dangerously close to over-stepping the thin line between the sublime and the ridiculous. The interpolator never burlesques his subject, but maintains throughout the Additions a pitch of high seriousness (albeit relieved by witty word-play, as so often in Shakesperian tragedy). Like Shakespeare when writing the most pathetic lines of Lear (and in marked

contrast to Kyd) the writer of these Additions knew the psychological truth that in a moment of true grief one is more likely to use plain and common words than technical or bombastic ones. Thus, we sense that Hieronimo knows what book he is referring to, even if we do not. The interpolator prefers dramatic impact to explicit statement--as Shakespeare so often in Hamlet and Lear.

Further, Hieronimo's notion--

> Had the moon shone, in my boy's face there was a kind of grace,
> That I know--nay, I do know--had the murderer seen him,
> His weapon would have fall'n and cut the earth . . . (ll. 48-50)

--in other words, that if the moon had shone his son would have been saved (but the moon was down and his boy died); this reminds us of the last scene in A Midsummer-Night's Dream--the death of Pyramus consequent upon the departure of Moonshine:

> Pyr. . . . Moon, take thy flight. (Exit Moonshine)
> Now die, die, die, die, die. (Dies.) (v.1.310-11)

Thus, both Shakespeare and the interpolator briefly link life with the light of the moon, death with its departure.

Hieronimo finishes his speech, and his wife Isabella enters to tell him:

> Dear Hieronimo, come in a-doors;
> O, seek not means so to increase thy sorrow.

Hieronimo replies with bitter irony:

> Indeed, Isabella, we do nothing here;
> I do not cry: ask Pedro, and ask Jaques;
> Not I, indeed; we are very merry, very merry.

Isabella exclaims:

> How? be merry here, be merry here? (ll. 54-59).

Compare this with the irony of Hamlet:

> Oph. You are merry, my lord.
> Ham. Who, I?
> Oph. Ay, my lord.
> Ham. O God, your only jig-maker, What should a man do but be merry? For, look you, how cheerfully

my mother looks, and my father died within's two hours.
(iii.2.129-35).

Isabella then calls Hieronimo's attention to the tree on which they found hung their son's body:

Is not this the place, and this the very tree,
Where my Horatio died, where he was murdered?

Hieronimo replies:

. . . This was the tree; I set it of a kernel: (ll. 60-63).

The psychological verisimilitude attained by this simple remark is paralleled in The Merchant of Venice, when Shylock learns from Tubal that his departed daughter has sold his ring for a monkey. Shylock replies:

. . . Thou torturest me, Tubal: it was
my turquoise; I had it of Leah
when I was a bachelor. (iii.1.128-30)

Hieronimo then talks about the tree from which his son's body was hanging. He says:

And when our hot Spain could not let it grow . . . (l. 64)

which reminds us of a couple of phrases in The Comedy of Errors:

Spain? . . . I felt it hot. (iii.2.133)

the hot breath of Spain (iii.2.140).

Hieronimo's speech about the tree is important, as it reveals the interpolator's analogous conception of human and vegetable life:

This was the tree; I set it of a kernel:
And when our hot Spain could not let it grow,
But that the infant and the human sap
Began to wither, duly twice a morning
Would I be sprinkling it with fountain water.
At last it grew and grew, and bore and bore,
Till at length
It grew a gallows, and did bear our son:
It bore thy fruit and mine: (ll. 63-71).

Compare this with Shakespeare's fifteenth sonnet:

When I perceive that men as plants increase,
Cheered and check'd e'en by the self-same sky,
Vaunt in their youthful sap, at height decrease . . .

and his sixteenth:

> . . . many maiden gardens, yet unset,
> With virtuous wish would bear you living flowers.

When Hieronimo speaks of "the infant and the human sap" of a tree, he is epitomizing an integrated concept of the processes of nature and the whole of life as a living organism, in very much the same way that Shakespeare sees men as plants, women as gardens, children as "living flowers". The lines of the gardener in Richard II reveal this same organic view of life:

> Go, bind thou up yon danglig apricocks,
> Which, like unruly children, make their sire
> Stoop with oppression of their prodigal weight. (iii.4.29-31)

> . . . We at time of year
> Do wound the bark, the skin of our fruit-trees,
> Lest, being over-proud with sap and blood,
> With too much riches it confound itself. (iii.4.57-60)

This peculiar reference to the "sap and blood" of a fruit-tree is similar to Hieronimo's phrase "the infant and the human sap", likewise applied to a tree. In fact, this phrase of Hieronimo's and the conception underlying it are echoed throughout Shakespeare's works in metaphors which fuse the figures of vegetable sap and human blood:

> . . . the purple sap from her sweet brother's body (R.III iv.4.277)

> sapless age (IH.VI iv.5.4)

> . . . the bark peel'd from the lofty pine,
> His leaves will wither and his sap decay;
> So must my soul, her bark being peel'd away. (Lucr. 11. 1167-9)

> . . . her material sap, perforce must wither (Lear iv.2.35).

Still speaking of the tree, Hieronimo says:

> At last it grew and grew, and bore and bore,
> Till at length
> It grew a gallows, and did bear our son:
> It bore thy fruit and mine: (11. 68-71).

Here again, the central motif is an organic view of life. Compare this with Shakespeare:

> The trees by the way
> Should have borne men. (Antony iii.6.46)

. . . then was I as a tree
Whose boughs did bend with fruit (Cymb.iii.3.60)

Hang there like fruit, my soul,
Till the tree die! (Cymb.v.5.264)

The royal tree hath left us royal fruit (R.III iii.7.166)

. . . hang him on this tree
And by his side his fruit of bastardry. (Tit. v.1.48)

That I love the tree from whence thou sprang'st,
Witness the loving kiss I give the fruit. (3H.VI v.7.32)

((of Antiochus' daughter)):
. . . the fruit of yon celestial tree (Per. i.1.21).

Cp. also:

Dun. I have begun to plant thee, and will labour
To make thee full of growing. . . .
Ban. There if I grow,
The harvest is your own. (Mac. i.4.28-32).

Following this speech of Hieronimo's there is a knock at the door:

Hier. See who knock there.
Ped. It is a painter, sir.
Hier. Bid him come in and paint some comfort,
For surely there's none lives but painted comfort. (ll. 72-74)

The Painter, Bazardo, who enters seeking justice for his own murdered son, is a completely new character introduced by the interpolator of 1602. The Painter says very little (his longest speech is nineteen words); his function is that of a dramatic device to enable Hieronimo to enlarge upon his grief in language which reminds us of that of Lear in the storm scenes. But the Painter also serves as a foil for Hieronimo's distraught personality, for he too has sufferred the loss of a son by murder, and has come to Hieronimo for justice. Ironically, Hieronimo is so completely engrossed in his own grief that he fails to sympathize with his bereaved counterpart.

This device of drawing parallel emotional states for heightened dramatic effect is common in Shakesperian tragedy. Thus, the situation of Hamlet contemplating the revenge of his murdered father is contrasted with the more direct behaviour of Laertes following the slaying of Polonius. If further

proof were needed that Shakespeare contrived this contrast meaningfully, Hamlet himself supplies it when he says of Laertes:

> . . . by the image of my cause, I see
> The portraiture of his: (v.2.77)

and again, ironically:

> I'll be your foil, Laertes. (v.2.269)

So too, in King Lear there are several such examples of parallel emotional states. Most notable of these, perhaps, is the balance of Lear's downfall by that of Gloucester. Similarly, the unsettled Lear reads his own misfortunes into the aspect of the disguised Edgar, just as Hieronimo's self-centered grief is mirrored by the Painter. Thus Lear exhorts Edgar:

> Didst thou give all to thy two daughters?
> And art come to this? (iii.4.47)

and again:

> What! have his daughters brought him to this pass?
> Couldst thou save nothing? Wouldst thou give 'em all? (65-66).

Now Hieronimo is not quite so obviously mad as Lear, and the Painter really has lost a son; but it is significant that Hieronimo is just as self-engrossed as Lear. Lear regards Edgar as merely a mirror for his own tragedy, and so too Hieronimo sees only himself in the visage of the laconic Painter. Compare Hieronimo's interrogation of the Painter with the lines of Lear quoted above.

> Hier. . . . was thy son murdered?
> Paint. Ay, sir.
> Hier. So was mine. How dost take it? art thou not sometimes mad? Is there no tricks that comes before thine eyes? (ll. 105-9).

The Painter's simple and unaffected expression of his loss--

> no man did hold a son so dear (l. 91)

--as contrasted with Hieronimo's more swelling effusions, is much like Gloucester's brief statement during the storm scene, unheard by Lear:

> . . . I had a son
> . . . I lov'd him, friend,

No father his son dearer (iii.4.170).

Further, Hieronimo's incongruous remark to the Painter--

Come, let's talk wisely now (l. 105)

--subtly recalls Lear's desire to

talk a word with this same learned Theban (iii.4.161).

When the Painter speaks of his own loss--"no man did hold a son so dear"--Hieronimo replies angrily:

What, not as thine? that's a lie
As massy as the earth: I had a son
Whose least unvalued hair did weigh
A thousand of thy sons: (l. 92-95).

Here the hyperbole is strikingly similar to Hamlet's:

I lov'd Ophelia: forty thousand brothers
Could not, with all their quantity of love
Make up my sum. (v.1.291)

In addition to the similarity of figures, it will be observed that here again, Laertes' lesser grief in the eyes of Hamlet is paralleled by Hieronimo's insistence that the Painter's bereavement cannot equal his own. The scene ends with Hieronimo beating the Painter, without cause, just as the grief-crazed Lear beats his Fool.

In like manner, the psychology, tone, language and dramatic technique of this scene shared by Hieronimo and the Painter can be traced throughout scenes in Hamlet and Lear.

Hieronimo's speeches in this scene, as throughout the Additions, invite close comparison with Shakespeare's writings. At the outset, Hieronimo ignores the Painter's plea for justice, which succeeds not a whit, and tells him that in this world justice is not to be found:

O ambitious beggar!
Wouldst thou have that that lives not in the world?
Why, all the undelved mines cannot buy
An ounce of justice,
'Tis a jewel so inestimable! I tell thee,
God hath engrossed all justice in his hands,
And there is none but what comes from him. (ll. 82-88)

Firstly, the phrase "undelved mines" reminds us of Hamlet's line:

> But I will delve one yard below their mines (iii.4.208).

And Hieronimo's "jewel so inestimable" recalls:

> Inestimable stones, unvalued jewels (R.III i.4.208).

Secondly, the gist of Hieronimo's remarks about justice, namely that "God hath engrossed all justice in his hands, / And there is none but what comes from him", is paralleled by a passage in Titus Andronicus:

> And, sith there's no justice in earth nor hell,
> We will solicit heaven and move the gods
> To send down justice for to wreak our wrongs. (iv.3.49)

Hieronimo's hyperbole "a thousand of thy sons" (l. 95) echoes Shakespeare's twice-used "a thousand sons" (2H.IV iv.3.133, and Troilus iii.3.156). And when Hieronimo says--

> . . . this good fellow here and I
> Will range this hideous orchard up and down
> Like to two lions reaved of their young (ll. 100-3)

--the phrase "range this . . . orchard up and down" is very like Shakespeare's:

> Walk in the orchard . . .
> As we do trace this alley up and down (Much ii.1.5-16).

(The 'alley' thus referred to by Shakespeare is a path in the orchard between the rows of trees; cp. Hieronimo's similar use of the word 'alley', l. 149.) And Hieronimo's comparison of himself and the Painter "to two lions" recalls the phrase in Julius Caesar, "we are two lions" (ii.2.46).

Hieronimo proceeds to interrogate the Painter, preparatory to giving him grief-crazed instructions for a fantastic painting of the murder night:

> Art a painter? Canst paint me a tear, or a wound,
> a groan, or a sigh? (l. 111)

--recalling the triple combination (perhaps not an uncommon one):

> groans . . . tears . . . sighs (T.G.V. ii.4.131)
>
> sighs and tears and groans (R.II v.5.57)
>
> tears . . . groans . . . sighs (2H.VI iii.2.60).

When the Painter says that his name is Bazardo, Hieronimo exclaims:

> Bazardo! afore God, an excellent fellow! (l. 115)

Cp. a phrase in Pericles:

> afore me, a handsome fellow! (ii.1.84).

Hieronimo continues:

> . . . draw me five years younger than I am--do ye
> see sir, let five years go; let them go . . . (ll. 117-19).

This is similar to the phrasing in a somewhat analogous scene in The Winter's Tale, where the work of art discussed is not a painting, but a statue:

> . . . our carver's excellence . . .
> lets go by some sixteen years and makes her
> As she liv'd now. (v.3.30-32)

Indeed, the whole of this last scene of The Winter's Tale bears a certain intangible relationship to the "Painter's scene" of the Additions. In both scene there is a discussion of the extent to which art may surpass nature. But where Hieronimo is chafing under the inevitable restraints of pictorial art--

> Canst paint me a tear, or a wound, a groan, or a sigh? (l. 111)

--Leontes and Polixenes in The Winter's Tale (beholding Hermoine, and thinking her to be a statue) feel they are "mock'd with art". But Leontes' line:

> What fine chisel
> Could ever yet cut breath? (v.3.78-79)

is like Hieronimo's:

> Canst paint me a doleful cry? (l. 128).

Hieronimo's giving of advice to the Painter bears a technical resemblance to Hamlet's instruction of the actors. However, the resemblance is chiefly one of situation, rather than style: in each instance, the revengeful hero is made to instruct professionals in the execution of their art. But the Painter replies mainly in monosyllables and is employed merely to let Hieronimo create a word-picture of the murder night which, for imaginative intensity, is sur-

passed by few passages in Elizabethan drama. The form of Hieronimo's horrendous description is prose, as contrasted with the irregular blank verse of the remainder of the Additions. Hamlet's advice to the actors is also in prose, but beyond this there is necessarily little stylistic resemblance of the two pieces, as Hamlet is surrounded by persons and his discourse is under certain restraints. Yet Hieronimo's injunction:

> Draw me like old Priam of Troy, crying: "The house is a-fire, the house is a-fire, as the torch over my head!" (ll. 161-3)

reminds us that Hamlet has the players recite for him a passage he "chiefly loved" in which Aneas "speaks of Priam's slaughter" (ii.2.479 ff.). Thus Shakespeare (who was writing Troilus and Cressida at about the same time) had the tale of Troy in his mind when he composed Hamlet (1601-2). So, apparently, did the interpolator of The Spanish Tragedy. Further proof of this is Hieronimo's reference to Hector in the last line of this scene with the Painter.

When Hieronimo instructs the Painter to draw him with his wife and son--

> --my wife Isabella standing by me with a speaking look to my son Horatio (ll. 120-121)

--we observe that the expressive phrase "speaking looks" occurs in Lear (iv.5.25) and is echoed by "a hanging look" (Meas. iv.2.35). The Painter's reference to "notorious villains" (l. 136) recalls the phrase "notorious villain" in The Taming of the Shrew (v.1.54) and Othello (v.2.239).

Hieronimo soon waxes impatient with the bounds of pictorial art and exclaims to the Painter--

> Stretch thine art . . . (l. 138)

--which reminds us of a phrase in Shakespeare's seventeenth sonnet:

> stretched metre of an antique song.

Hieronimo continues:

> . . . stretch thine art,
> and let their beards be of Judas his own colour (ll. 138-9).

Here, Hieronimo is telling the Painter to paint the beards of his son's murderers the colour of Judas's beard--an allusion to some contemporary practice either in Elizabethan painting or the Miracle Plays.[1] The exact tradition referred to is somewhat obscure and need not detain us here. But it is of prime importance that this same allusion, with the same trick of phrasing--"Judas's own"--occurs in As You Like It:

> Ros. His very hair is of the dissembling colour.
> Cel. Something browner than Judas's. Marry, his kisses are Judas's own children. (iii.4.7-10).

These references to the colour of Judas's hair, if one may judge by the note of Boas (who does not, however, note these lines of Shakespeare's), are by no means common in Elizabethan literature, although the casual allusiveness of the phrasing seems to suggest that the tradition referred to was taken for granted at the time. Here then, is an uncommon expression occuring with close resemblance in the Additions and in Shakespeare's earlier comedy. The inference is again in favour of Shakespeare's authorship of the Additions.

Hieronimo continues:

> . . . and let their eyebrows jutty over (1. 140).

The rare verb 'jutty' occurs in Henry V (iii.1.13). Hieronimo's phrase in the same speech, "my sword reared up", where 'reared' is used to mean 'raised' or 'brandished', is paralleled in Titus Andronicus:

> . . . rear'd aloft the bloody battle axe (iii.1.169).

Hieronimo's description of the murder night, beginning as a set of instructions to the Painter, soon bursts the bounds of pictorial art. The mood becomes somewhat reminiscent of the storm scenes in Lear.

> Hier. . . . this good fellow here and I
> Will range this hideous orchard up and down,

---

1. Boas, op. cit., p. 407, where he quotes an illustration from Middleton's Chaste Maid in Cheapside (iii.2) showing that the colour of Judas's beard was supposed to be red. Boas concludes: "there may be an allusion . . . to the 'make-up' of Judas in the Miracle Plays".

Like to two lions reaved of their young.

. . . stretch thine art . . .

. . . then bring me forth, bring me through alley and alley, still with a distracted countenance going along, and let my hair heave up my night-cap. Let the clouds scowl, make the moon dark, the stars extinct, the winds blowing, the bells tolling, the owls shrieking, the toads croaking, the minutes jarring, and the clock striking twelve. And then at last, sir, starting, behold a man hanging, and tottering, and tottering, as you know the wind will wave a man, and I with a trice to cut him down. And looking upon him by the advantage of my torch, find it to be my son Horatio. There you may show a passion, there you may show a passion! . . . Make me curse, make me rave, make me cry, make me mad, make me well again, make me curse hell, invocate heaven, and in the end leave me in a trance . . .

Paint. And is this the end?

Hier. O no, there is no end: the end is death and madness! (ll. 100-69)

With passages like this, the final test of affinity must reside in the response of the individual reader to the atmosphere and pervading mood. No amount of cross-references and analysis can finally prove such a speech to be from the pen of the author of King Lear and Macbeth, any more than it can adequately define the essence of poetry. But when all is said, the less tangible qualities of these passages must somehow be accounted for in our search for the author. The question resolves itself thus: could anyone (in 1601-2) but Shakespeare have limned such an atmosphere?

Hieronimo's lines:

then bring me forth . . . with a distracted countenance . . . and let my hair heave up my night-cap.

remind us of Hamlet's appearance--

distraction in's aspect (Ham. ii.2.581)

--and compare with:

Mine hair be fix'd on end, as one distract (2H.VI iii.2.318).

Hieronimo's phrase "the minutes jarring" (referring to the jerky movement of the hands of Elizabethan clocks) is paralleled by--

My thoughts are minutes, and with sighs they jar (R.II v.5.50)

jar o' the clock (Wint. i.2.43).

Shrieking owls are referred to often by Shakespeare (Venus 531, R.II ii.3.183, Mac. ii.2.3, and 3H.VI v.6.44), and Hieronimo's phrase--

the owls shrieking, the toads croaking (l. 153)

--is like:

. . . the owl scream and the crickets cry (Mac. ii.2.16).

In fact, every one of the natural phenomena mentioned in Hieronimo's description of the murder night (quoted above) recurs in the descriptive background of the night of Duncan's murder in the second act of Macbeth:

Hieronimo's description of the murder night (ll. 150-4):	The murder night in "Macbeth" (Act ii):
the moon dark	The moon is down (1.2)
the stars extinct	There's husbandry in heaven; Their candles are all out. (1.5)
the winds blowing	Our chimneys were blown down (3.60)
the bells tolling	. . . the bell invites me. Hear it not, Duncan; for it is a knell That summons thee to heaven or to hell. (1.62-64)
the owls shrieking, the toads croaking	the owl . . . shrieked (2.3) the owl scream and the crickets cry (2.16)
the clock striking twelve	The moon is down; I have not heard the clock. And she goes down at twelve. (1.2).

In 1602, of course, Macbeth was as yet unwritten.

Hieronimo continues:

Draw me like old Priam of Troy (l. 161).

We have already noted Hamlet's liking for the scene of Priam's slaughter.

Indeed, the reference to Priam and the burning of Troy is a favourite one with Shakespeare, for it occurs throughout his plays, especially to emphasize moments of grief. Thus Shakespeare describes a scene which anticipates Hieronimo's description of the murder night, coupling as it does the allusion to the burning of Troy and the shrieking of owls:

> The time of night when Troy was set on fire;
> The time when screech-owls cry (2H.VI i.4.20).

For other Shakesperian references to Priam and the burning of Troy, see 2 Hen. VI (iii.2.118), Caesar (i.2.113), Troilus (ii.2.109), Titus (iii.1.69 and iii. 2.28 and v.3.84) and 2 Hen.IV (i.1.72).

Especially does the 'set piece' in The Rape of Lucrece (ll. 1356-1582), where the grief-stricken heroine sees the image of her sorrow in a painting of "Priam's Troy", resemble in many respects this scene of Hieronimo and the Painter. If our belief as to Shakespeare's authorship of the Additions is just, it will then be perceived that we have three 'set pieces' giving us something of Shakespeare's view of the arts of painting and sculpture, as well as the relationship between art and nature. The first of these is the two-hundred line section devoted to Lucrece's observations and comments upon a painting of the fall of Troy; the second (we trust) is the scene of the "Painter's part" in the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy and the third is the "statue scene" in The Winter's Tale, to which reference has already been made. A full study of the aesthetic theory underlying these passages is beyond the limits of our present inquiry, but the materials are there.

Hieronimo in his grief tells the Painter:

> Draw me like old Priam of Troy, crying: "The house is a-fire, the house is a-fire, as the torch over my head! (ll. 161-3).

And Lucrece in her anguish

> . . . calls to mind where hangs a piece
> Of skilful painting, made for Priam's Troy: (ll. 1359-60).

The painting which Lucrece beholds is so skilfully drawn that

> In speech, it seem'd, his ((Nestor's)) beard, all silver white,
> Wagg'd up and down, and from his lips did fly
> Thin winding breath, which purl'd up to the sky. (ll. 1405-07)

This is the quality of skill Hieronimo requires of Bazardo:

> Canst paint a doleful cry? (l. 129).

Shakespeare's description of the painting in Lucrece continues:

> Here one man's hand lean'd on another's head (l. 1415).

Compare this with Hieronimo's line instructing the Painter to draw him with his son Horatio--

> my hand leaning upon his head, thus; (l. 125).

Finally, we recall that Hieronimo had earlier bid the Painter to "paint some comfort",

> For surely there's none lives but painted comfort (l. 73).

Whereas Lucrece

> weeps Troy's painted woes (l. 1492).

And just as Hieronimo compares himself in extremity of grief to "old Priam" (l. 161), so does Lucrece (l. 1546). But the parallels here are general as well as specific, pertaining to mood as well as language, and need not be laboured further.

Near the end of this, the longest of the interpolations, Hieronimo says:

> I am never better than when I am mad: then I
> do wonders: but reason abuseth me, and there's
> the torment, there's the hell. (ll. 169-172)

Here, there is a resemblance to Hamlet's lines:

> . . . Rashly,--
> And prais'd be rashness for it, let us know,
> Our indiscretion sometimes serves us well
> When our deep plots do pall; (v.2.6-9)

--as well as to the more famous ones:

> Thus conscience does make cowards of us all;
> And thus the native hue of resolution
> Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought. (iii.1.83)

Then, at the close of the scene, Hieronimo, still thinking of Troy, says:

> At the last, sir, bring me
> to one of the murderers; were he as strong as Hector,
> thus would I tear and drag him up and down. (ll. 173-5)

Compare Hieronimo's phrase "as strong as Hector" with Shakespeare's--

> As valorous as Hector (2H.IV ii.4.237)
>
> as fairly built as Hector (Troilus iv.5.109)
>
> valiant--As Hector (Much ii.3.196)
>
> A second Hector (1H.VI ii.3.20).

And compare Hieronimo's final phrase--"thus would I . . . drag him up and down" --with:

> I'll drag thee up and down (1H.VI i.3.51).

Fifth Addition (37 new lines):

The fifth Addition is an interpolation in the catastrophe, extending in the quarto of 1602 from line 3126 to line 3176. This, however, replaces twenty-four lines of the original text, while incorporating out of these lines 1-7 as lines 3146-52, lines 8-11 as lines 3142-5, and line 24 as line 3175. Of the forty-nine lines of this Addition (incorporating twelve lines of Kyd's), thirty-seven are thus new lines of the interpolator. The following discussion is concerned with these thirty-seven new lines only.

This Addition consists mostly of dialogue which helps to clarify the proceedings near the end of the play. Thus, we do not find as much poetry here as in the third and fourth Additions. There are, however, several Shakesperian touches. Hieronimo's hyperbole--

> Had I as many lives as there be stars,
> As many heavens to go to as those lives . . . (ll. 12-13)

--reminds us of Shakespeare's fondness for similar figures:

> Had I as many sons as I have hairs . . . (Mac. v.8.48-49)
>
> Had I as many mouths as Hydra . . . (Oth. ii.3.309)

> Had all his hairs been lives, my great revenge
> Had stomach for them all. (Oth.v.2.74)
>
> I'll have more lives
> Than drops of blood were in my father's veins. (3H.VI i.1.96)

Hieronimo's expression in the following line--

> I'd give them all, ay, and my soul to boot (1.14)

--exactly echoes a phrase in Henry IV:

> . . . and my soul to boot (IH.IV ii.2.97).

The next twelve lines, as explained above, are simply transposed lines from Kyd's original text. These twelve lines are transposed verbatim--with one slight yet significant alteration. The eleventh of these transposed lines reads in the text of Kyd:

> Upon whose souls may heavens be yet avenged (iv.4.175).

In the Additions, line 26 (A5), this line reads:

> Upon whose souls may heavens be yet revenged.

Thus the interpolator, for reasons of his own, changed Kyd's "avenged" to read "revenged". This small point becomes of considerable significance when we inquire into Shakespeare's use of these two forms. Bartlett's Concordance to Shakespeare reveals (1) that the common word 'revenged' occurs, as we might expect, over forty times throughout Shakespeare's works, whereas (2) the form 'avenged' occurs only four times, the latest occurence being in Julius Caesar (v.1.54).[1] Thus Shakespeare, for reasons of his own, never employed the word 'avenged' in his dramas after 1599 (the date of composition of Julius Caesar); and in 1601 or thereabouts the interpolator of The Spanish Tragedy, as we have seen, actually went out of his way, when transposing twelve lines of Kyd's, to make the singular alteration of substituting "revenged" for "avenged". It is seldom indeed that we are afforded such curiously mechanical testimony of the identity of our interpolator.

---

1. The other three places Shakespeare uses 'avenged' are: 2H.VI i.3.85, Titus v.1.16, and Rom. i.4.70. See Bartlett's Concordance (London, 1922), p. 71.

With line 28, the interpolator continues:

> Methinks, since I grew inward with revenge,
> I cannot look with scorn enough on death. (ll. 28-29)

Cp. these phrases of Shakespeare's:

> revenge shall hide our inward woe (Troilus v.10.31)
>
> revenge. . . doth . . . gnaw my inwards (Oth. ii.1.308).

The latter of these phrases is spoken by Iago. Just as Iago is finally borne away to be tortured, Hieronimo is threatened with corporal punishment for his revenge (a significant alteration of Kyd's action).

When the king says:

> Bring tortures forth (l. 30)

Hieronimo replies ironically:

> Do, do, do; and meantime I'll torture you. (l. 31)

He then proceeds to 'torture' the king by exulting over the completeness of his revenge. Exactly the same technique is employed by Shakespeare in a comic scene in Troilus and Cressida, where sharp-tongued Theristes berates the hulking Ajax with extensive vocal abuse. Ajax retaliates by beating Theristes, who replies with further verbal goadings:

> do, rudeness; do, camel; do, do.

A few lines later, Theristes exults:

> I have bobbed his brain more than he has
> Beat my bones. (ii.1.45-75)

Thus, in both passages physical violence is opposed by mental torment and verbal invective; and both Hieronimo and Theristes are conscious of their psychological advantage, as they express their contempt for brute force: "do, do".

Hieronimo then delivers his final taunting speech--which is also the last full speech of the Additions. He exults over the fullness of his revenge, scorning the threat of torture:

> . . . meantime I'll torture you.
> You had a son, as I take it, and your son
> Should ha' been married to your daughter:
> Ha, was't not so? --You had a son, too;
> He was my liege's nephew; he was proud
> And politic . . . (ll. 31-36).

Firstly, we observe that Hieronimo's parenthetical phrase, "as I take it", occurs in Henry V (iv.7.22) and Othello (v.1.51). Secondly, his phrase:

> Ha, was't not so?

is very reminiscent of Hamlet's:

> ha, boy! say'st thou so? (i.5.150).

And thirdly, Hieronimo's expression "proud / And politic" recalls--

> I will be proud, I will read politic authors (Twel.ii.5.175).

Hieronimo continues:

> 'Twas I that killed him; look you, this same hand,
> 'Twas it that stabb'd his heart--do you see, this hand! (l. 39)

--with an emphasis and phrasing that recalls:

> This is the hand that stabb'd thy father. (3H.VI ii.4.6)

At the end of Hieronimo's harangue, the Viceroy exclaims:

> Be deaf, my senses, I can hear no more. (l. 44)

Here the word "senses" is curiously employed to mean 'ears', or the sense of hearing. Observe Shakespeare's similar use of the word:

> All their senses stuck in ears (Wint.iv.3.621)
>
> Senseless . . . they cannot hear (Pas.Pil. 393)
>
> . . . my senses would have cool'd
> To hear a night-shriek. (Mac. v.5.10)

Then follows:

> King. Fall, heaven, and cover us with thy sad ruins.
> Cast. Roll all the world within thy pitchy cloud.

The phrase "pitchy night" occurs in Venus and Adonis (l. 821) and All's Well (iv.4.24).

Hieronimo then speaks the final three lines of the Additions, beginning:

Now do I applaud what I have acted. (l. 47)

Shakespeare supplies two close parallels:

Now . . . I do applaud thy spirit (T.G.V. v.4.140)

Now . . . I do applaud his courage (Per. ii.5.58).

This brings us to the last two lines of the Additions, which give rise to some further conjectures about the person who wrote them.

Hidden Personal References by the Interpolator:

The last line of the Additions is a witty play on words, pregnant with double meaning, which tells us something about the interpolator. Editors of The Spanish Tragedy have passed this line over in silence, possibly considering the double entendre to be clear enough. The line, although it does not come at the end of a scene, is made to rhyme and thus dovetail neatly with the following original line of Kyd's. The last three lines of the Additions (with the following line of Kyd's) are:

Hier. Now do I applaud what I have acted.
Nunc iners cadat manus!
Now to express the rupture of my part,
(First take my tongue, and afterward my heart.) (Kyd's line).

The Latin quotation ("Now may my hand fall still") refers primarily to Hieronimo's revenging hand, and may well refer also to the interpolator's own hand, which subsequently "falls still", as this is the end of his last Addition. More certainly, the line--

Now to express the rupture of my part

--refers not only to the fact that Hieronimo is made by Kyd to bite out his tongue after the following line, but clearly refers as well to the rupture, or breaking off, of the part of the interpolator of 1602. The personal reference is cleverly inserted at the appropriate place, as the understandable pride of authorship on the part of the interpolator pointedly asserts itself. Of couse, this does not tell us the identity of the interpolator;

but it does tell us something of his wit, mastery of words and literary self-respect. It also tells us what we should in any case expect--that he was able to fully identify himself with the character whose part he was penning. The relevance of these facts may in turn have some bearing on our interpretation of another intriguing passage of the Additions, namely lines 117-118 of the fourth Addition. These are the lines where Hieronimo, crazed with grief over the death of his son, instructs the Painter:

> . . . draw me five years younger than I am--
> do ye see, sir, let five years go; let them go
> like the Marshal of Spain.

These lines have no apparent meaning in the light of the rest of the play; they have no bearing on Kyd's text, and they are nowhere else elucidated in the Additions. The logical inference is that they are some sort of personal reference on the part of the interpolator--who, as we have seen above, clearly refers to himself (speaking through the character of Hieronimo) in at least one other instance. If the generally accepted date of composition of these Additions--1601--is correct, the fact emerges that Shakespeare, who had lost his only son, Hamnet, in 1596, was not only eminently qualified to write Hieronimo's great speech of the third Addition beginning--

> My son! and what's a son?

--but also that in the year 1601 Hamnet Shakespeare had been dead five years. Did Shakespeare, in the heat of artistic creation, identify himself for a moment with Hieronimo to the extent that he allowed his personal bereavement to condition his writing? How else, in view of the overwhelming indications of style and imagery, are we to account for this incongruous desire on the part of Hieronimo while lamenting the death of his only son to turn back time five years?

Psychologically, it might be conceivable for Shakespeare to write in a far more intimate vein in these 'anonymous' interpolations than in any of the

plays written as it were under his own name. Certainly, Hieronimo's forty-six line elegy for his son, constituting the third Addition, has a ring about it that is both intimate and authentic. This is most evident in the lines:

> O, but my Horatio
> Grew out of reach of these insatiate humours!
> He was my comfort, and his mother's joy,
> The very arm that did hold up our house!
> Our hopes were stored up in him. (A3. ll. 27-32)

Of course, it is possible to carry a point like this too far. However, we have endeavoured to show that these conjectures are in full accord with the stylistic qualities of the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy, and that these qualities point very strongly to Shakespeare's hand.

# # #

Appendix I

A Note on the Volcabulary of the Additions:

The words 'noose' (A5.6) and 'matted' (A4.116) are the only two words in the Additions to The Spanish Tragedy which do not appear in some form in Bartlett's Concordance to Shakespeare. The meaning of 'matted' is uncertain, but it is probably a technical term relating to oil painting.[1] Little can be said about 'noose', except that it appears in English literature only after 1600, and its origin is obscure (N.E.D.).

The words 'infective' (A1.48) and 'ballace' (A3.7), although not specifically Shakesperian, may be regarded as fairly common Elizabethan variants of 'infectious' and 'ballast', which are forms used by Shakespeare. The rare word 'unbevelled' (A3.22) can be referred to Shakespeare's solitary use of the word 'bevel' (meaning, for the first recorded instance, 'oblique'--N.E.D.) in his seventeenth sonnet.

When this has been said, the remainder of the volcabulary of the Additions is entirely Shakesperian. This statement holds true for the modern emended text, as well as for the actual quarto of 1602.[2] Thus, the word 'aggots' (1602 quarto, l. 2101), a common Elizabethan variant of 'agate', can be referred to Shakespeare (Much iii.1.65); and the modern emendation of this word to 'aglòts' (on the basis of subsequent quartos) is comparable to the Shakesperian form 'aglet' (Shrew i.2.79).

For our present purpose of establishing Shakespeare's authorship, these facts need to be supplemented only by a consideration of a group of rare

---

1. Boas, op. cit., 407.
2. The Spanish Tragedy With Additions 1602, ed. W.W. Greg, op. cit.

words occuring in the Additions, which are also listed by Bartlett in his Concordance to Shakespeare. These words are as follows:

Alley (A4.149; & see 1. 101):

This word in the Additions means a path in an orchard. The identical use of the word 'alley' in Much Ado--

> Walking in a thick pleached alley in my orchard (i.2.10)

--is the sole instance recorded by N.E.D. of the use of the word with this precise meaning.

Bacon (A3.16):

Hieronimo's use of this word to mean 'a live pig' is considered rare (N.E.D.). But Falstaff's figurative use of the word--

> gorbellied knaves . . . fat chuffs . . .
> On, bacons, on! (1H.IV ii.2.95)

--seems to have the same meaning as Hieronimo's, namely 'live pigs'; for a few lines earlier Falstaff calls the same 'fat' knaves 'caterpillars', and refers to them figuratively as sheep:

> Fleece them!

This rare use of the word 'bacon' is thus common to Shakespeare and to the interpolator.

Breed (v.t.)

The uncommon use of the verb 'breed' in Hieronimo's phrase:

> breeds teeth (A3.11)

is paralleled by Macbeth's phrase:

> . . . the worm
> . . . in time will venom breed,
> No teeth for th' present. (Mac. iii.4.29-31)

Distraught (A4.6):

This use of the word 'distraught' to mean 'mentally deranged' is paralleled by its similar use in Romeo and Juliet (iv.3.49) and Richard III (iii.5.4)--the first recorded instances of this use of the word (N.E.D.).

Engrossed (A4.87):

Hieronimo's use of this word to mean 'collected' is significant in view of the fact that the first person to use 'engross' to mean 'collect' was Shakespeare (N.E.D.).

Frisking (A3.15):

Hieronimo's phrase "frisking kid" is close to Shakespeare's "lambs that did frisk"--the first known uses of this verb in connection with cattle (N.E.D.).

Inestimable (A4.86):

Hieronimo's phrase "a jewel so inestimable" recalls Shakespeare's similar use of the adjective in connection with jewels (R.III i.4.27)--the first (N.E.D.) quotation where the word is thus used to describe jewels.

Jarring (A4.154):

Hieronimo's phrase "the minutes jarring" is noteworthy because Shakespeare's use of the verb 'jar' meaning 'tick' (R.II v.5.51) is the sole N.E.D. reference before the Additions.

Jutty (A4.140):

The first N.E.D. example of the verb 'jutty' meaning 'project' is its use by Shakespeare in Henry V (iii.1.13). Hieronimo uses it with exactly the same meaning.

Seemingly (A4.130): ("2. To external appearances, apparently"--N.E.D.)

The only other instance of this use of this word before 1634 is Shakespeare's (Wives iv.6.33).

Set (v.t.=to plant)(A4.76):

The only other N.E.D. references for this use of the word between 1572 and 1612 are to Shakespeare.

Short-lived (A1.13):

The first known occurence of this adjective is in Love's Labour's

Lost (ii.1.54, and iv.1.15).

Unsquar'd (A3.22):

The only other figurative use of this word (before 1607) recorded by N.E.D. is in Troilus and Cressida (i.3.159).

When we take into consideration that the Additions do not exceed 330 lines in length, it is evident that these instances of uncommon words and meanings which occur both in Shakespeare's work and in the Additions are sufficiently numerous to fully corroborate the stylistic evidence of Shakespeare's authorship of the Additions. Indeed, the case would stand firmly on grounds of volcabulary alone.

Appendix II

A Line-by-line Comparison of the Language and Phrasing of the Additions with that of Shakespeare:

The following expository comparison of the language and phrasing of the Additions with Shakesperian parallels is appended for the sake of completeness, to facilitate reference, and to further illustrate the homogeneousness of the Shakesperian style of the Additions. The emphasis here is on language and phrasing, so that this analysis is not entirely a repetition of what has already been said. However, the most important of these parallels have been commented on in the discussion of style and imagery so that the following list is largely self-explanatory, and is intended chiefly as a supplement to the preceding material.

Additions to "The Spanish Tragedy":	Shakesperian Parallels:
First Addition (54 lines):	
line no.	
2. frolic (adj.)	frolic (adj.) (Dream v.1.394)
13. short-lived	short-lived (L.L.L. ii.1.54; & iv.1.15)
19. strange dreams	strange dreams (Romeo v.1.7)
24. Nay, blush not	Nay, blush not (Antony v.2.149)
25. Saint James (oath)	by Saint Jamy (Shrew iii.2.84)
26 & 27. deluded	deluded(°)(1H.VI v.4.76)
37. I am ashamed.	I am ashamed. (Wint. v.3.37)
36. pure and spotless	immaculate and spotless (Lucr. 1656)
45. Confusion, mischief, torment, death and hell	Vengeance! plague! death! confusion! (Lear ii.4.96)

(°) This symbol indicates a nonce use by Shakespeare, which renders an otherwise common word more significant.

46.	cold bosom	frozen bosoms (Romeo i.4.101) ------ ------ (2H.VI v.2.35)
50.	waste of grief	waste of shame (Son. 129)

Second Addition (10 lines):

3.	a very toy, my Lord, a toy	A toy, my liege, a toy (L.L.L. iv. 3.201)
3-5.	a toy . . . an idle thing	idle toys (L.L.L. iv.3.170 a toy, a thing of no regard (1H.VI iv.1.145) idle shallow things (Twel. iii.4.136)
6.	too tardy, too remiss	tardy and remiss (Troilus iv.4.143)
10.	A thing of nothing, my Lord!	A thing, my lord! / Of nothing (Ham. iv.2.32)

Third Addition (47 lines):

6.	a lump bred up (ref. a son)	lump (ref. Gloucester's birth) (3H.VI v.6.51)
7.	these light creatures we call women	women are light . . . (Meas. v.1.280)
10.	run mad	run mad (1H.IV iii.1.212) --- --- (Troilus v.1.56)
10.	dote, rave, or run mad	. . . my daughter will run mad, So much she doteth . . . (1H.IV iii.1.146)
11.	breeds teeth	breed, / No teeth (Mac. iii.4.31)
10.	To make a father dote	doting father (Lucr. 1064)
15.	melt in passion	melting with . . . compassion (R.III iv.3.7)
15.	frisking kid	lambs that did frisk (Wint. i.2.67)
16.	bacon (=live pig)	bacons (=live pigs, fig?) (1H.IV ii.2.95)
22.	unsquar'd	unsquar'd (Troilus i.3.159)
22.	unbevelled	bevel (°) (Son. 121)

24. ((A son)) Strikes care upon their ((his parents)) heads with his mad riots.

When that my care could not withhold thy riots,
What wilt thou do when riot is thy care?
(2H.IV iv.5.136)

24. his ((a son's)) mad riots

riotous youth (Meas. iv.4.32)
riotous madness (Antony i.3.29)

35. unhors'd

unhorse (°) (R.II v.3.19)

40. Nemesis

Nemesis (°) (1H.VI iv.7.78)

41. And things called whips

And things called whips (2H.VI ii.1.136)

43. They do not always 'scape ((i.e., from the whips)).

'scape whipping (Ham. ii.2.556)
----- -------- (Per. ii.1.93)

44. time steals on,
And steals, and steals

Time steals (All's W. v.3.42)
the hour steals on (Errors iv.1.52)
the stealing hours of time (R.III iii.7.168)

46. wrapp'd in a ball of fire

wrapp'd in fire (John ii.1.227)
a ball of wild fire (1H.IV iii.3.45)
balls of quenchless fire (Lucr. 1554).

Fourth Addition (175 lines):

4. for rape and bloody murder

for murders and for rapes (Tit. iv.1.58)
murders, rapes (--- v.1.63)
bloody murder or detested rape (--- v.2.37)

8. desperate man

desperate man (Romeo v.3.59)

12. starting in a rage

. . . his rage!
. . . this will give it start again.
(Ham. iv.7.194)

14. extreme grief

Extremity of griefs (Tit. iv.1.19)
grief and extreme age (R.III iv.4.185)
extremes of . . . grief (Lear v.3.198)
extreme laughter (Tit. v.1.113)

15. one inch of man

every inch of woman (Wint. ii.1.137)
every inch a king (Lear iv.6.110)

17. I pry through every crevice of each wall

I pry'd me through the crevice of a wall (Tit. v.1.114)

18. . . . search through every brake,
Beat at the bushes

through bush, through brake (Dream iii.1.110)

18-19. stamp . . . and stare — nor stamp, nor stare (Shrew iii.2.230)

19. our grandam earth — our grandam earth (1H.IV iii.1.34)

24. What make you with your torches ...? — What make you here? (A.Y.L. i.1.32)

26. No, no, you are deceived — No, you are deceived (Cor. v.2.51)

28. mid of noon — mid of night (R.III v.3.77)

30. we burn daylight — we burn daylight (Wives ii.1.54)
-- ---- ------- (Romeo i.4.43)

33. yonder pale-faced Hecate there, the moon — pale Hecate (Mac. ii.1.52)
pale-faced moon (R.II ii.4.10)
---------- ---- (1H.IV i.3.202)

39. Provoke . . . with tempting words The heavens — tempt the heavens (Caesar i.3.53)

42. Villain, thou liest — Villain, thou liest (Errors ii.2.165)

43. I am not mad! — I am not mad (Tit. v.2.21)
- -- --- --- (John iii.4.45)

47. She ((the moon)) should have shone: search thou the book. — Look in the almanac; find out moonshine (Dream iii.1.54)

54. in-a-doors — in-a-door (°) (Lear i.4.139)

64. hot Spain — Spain? . . . I felt it hot (Errors iii.2.133)
the hot breath of Spain (------ -- 140)

65. the infant and the human sap — sapless age (1.H.VI iv.5.4)
sap from her . . . brother's body (R.III iv.4.277)

65-66. . . . the human sap Began to wither — her material sap, perforce must wither (Lear iv.2.35)

63. I set it of a kernel — set(=planted) (R.II ii.4.105)
(Per. iv.6.92)

70-71. ((the tree)) did bear our son; It bore thy fruit and mine. — The trees by the way Should have borne men (Antony iii.6.46)

. . . then was I as a tree Whose boughs did bend with fruit (Cymb. v.5.264)

Hang there like fruit, my soul, Till the tree die! (Cymb. iii.3.60)

the royal tree hath left us royal fruit
(R.III iii.7.166)

. . . hang him on this tree,
And by his side his fruit of bastardy
(Tit. v.1.48)

That I love the tree from whence thou sprang'st,
Witness the loving kiss I give the fruit.
(3H.VI v.7.32).

71. plant (n.=tree)
plants (n.=trees) (Lov. Com. 171)
plant (n.=tree) (A.Y.L. ii.2.378)

74. painted comfort
painted woes (Lucr. 1492)

85. undelved mines
delve one yard below their mines (Ham. iii.4.208)

87. jewel so inestimable
Inestimable stones, unvalued jewels
(R.III i.4.27)

95. A thousand of thy sons
a thousand sons (2H.IV iv.3.133)
- -------- ---- (Troilus iii.3.156)

101. range this . . . orchard up and down
Walk in the orchard . . .
As we do trace this alley up and down
(Much ii.1.5-16)

102. Like to two lions
We are two lions (Caesar ii.2.46)

110-11. a tear . . . a groan, or a sigh
groans...tears...sighs (T.G.V. ii.4.131)
tears...groans...sighs (2H.VI iii.2.60)
sighs and tears and groans (R.II v.5.57)

115. afore God, an excellent fellow
afore me, a handsome fellow (Per. ii.1.84)

117-19. draw me five years younger than I am . . . let five years go; let them go
our carver's excellence . . . lets go by some sixteen years and makes her As she liv'd now. (Wint. v.3.30-32)

121. a speaking look
speaking looks (Lear iv.5.25)

a hanging look (Meas. iv.2.35)

130. seemingly
seemingly (°) (Wives iv.6.33)

136. notorious villains
notorious villain (Shrew v.1.54)
--------- ------- (Oth. v.2.239)

138. stretch thine art
stretched metre of an antique song (Son. 17)

139. let their beards be of Judas his own colour
His very hair is of the dissembling colour--Something browner than Judas's: marry, his kisses are Judas's own children. (A.Y.L. iii.4.9)

140.	jutty (v.t.)	jutty (v.t.) (H.V ii.1.13)
144.	my sword reared up	rear'd aloft the bloody battle axe (Titus iii.1.169)
149.	with a distracted countenance	distraction in's aspect (Ham. ii.2.581)
150.	let my hair heave up . . .	Mine hair be fix'd on end, as one distract (2H.VI iii.2.318)
152.	the stars extinct	light shall be extinct (R.II i.3.222)
153.	croaking	croaking (°) (Ham. iii.2.264)
153.	owls shrieking	The owl . . . shrieks (Venus 531) night-owls shriek (R.II iii.3.183) the owl that shriek'd (Mac. ii.2.3)
161.	old Priam	old Priam (Lucr. 1522)
174.	as strong as Hector	As valorous as Hector (2H.IV ii.4.237) as fairly built as Hector (Troilus iv.5.109) A second Hector (1H.VI ii.3.20) valiant--As Hector (Much ii.3.196)
174.	thus would I tear and drag him up and down	I'll drag thee up and down (1H.VI i.3.51)

Fifth Addition (37 new lines):

14.	and my soul to boot	and my soul to boot (1H.IV ii.2.97)
28.	inward with revenge	revenge doth . . . gnaw my inwards (Oth. ii.1.308) revenge shall hide our inward woe (troilus v.10.31)
29.	look with scorn . . . on death	scorn death (Mac. iii.5.30)
32.	as I take it	as I take it (H.V iv.7.22) -- - ---- -- (Oth. v.1.51)
33.	ha' (=have)	ha' (=have) (3H.VI iv.5.27) -- (2H.IV ii.4.258) -- (Antony ii.6.78)
34.	Ha, was't not so?	ha, boy! say'st thou so? (Ham. i.5.150)
35.	proud / And politic	I will be proud, I will read politic authors (Twel. ii.5.175)

38-39. . . . this same hand,
'Twas it that stabb'd his heart

This is the hand that stabb'd thy father
(3H.VI ii.4.6)

41. hang'd up

hang'd up (2H.VI iv.2.190)

44. Be deaf, my senses

All their senses stuck in ears
(Wint. iv.3.621)
Senseless . . . they cannot hear
(Pas. Pil. 393)

46. pitchy cloud

pitchy night (Venus 821)
(All's W. iv.4.24)

47. Now do I applaud what I have acted

Now . . . I do applaud thy spirit
(T.G.V. v.4.140)
Now . . . I do applaud his courage
(Per. ii.5.58).

# # #

Bibliography

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles, Oxford At the Clarendon Press, 1888-1933.

Armin, Robert, A Nest of Ninnies in themselves without Compound, London, 1608; reprinted in Fools and Jesters: with a Reprint of Robert Armin's "Nest of Ninnies", J.P. Collier ed., the Shakespeare Society, London, 1842.

Bartlett, John, A Concordance to Shakespeare, Macmillan and co. ltd., London, 1894, reprinted 1922.

Bradley, J.F. and J.Q. Adams eds., The Jonson Allusion-Book, Yale University Press, 1922.

Chambers, E.K., John Munro and F.J. Furnivall eds., The Shakspere Allusion-Book: A Collection of Allusions to Shakspere from 1591 to 1700, vols. I and 2, Oxford University Press, 1932.

Collier, John Payne, Memoirs of Edward Alleyn, The Shakespeare Society, London, 1841.

----------, The Alleyn Papers, The Shakespeare Society, London, 1843.

----------, Memoirs of the Principal Actors in the Plays of Shakespeare, The Shakespeare Society, London, 1846.

Dekker, Thomas, "Satiro-mastix", in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, London, 1873.

Furnivall, F.J. ed., Some 300 Fresh Allusions to Shakspere, The New Shakspere Society, N. Truber & Co., London, 1886.

Henslowe, Philip, Henslowe's Diary, ed. W.W. Greg, A.H. Bullen pub., 2 vols., London, 1904 & 1908.

Herford, C.H. and Percy Simpson eds., Ben Jonson, Oxford At The Clarendon Press, 1927, 10 vols.

Jonson, Ben, Notes of Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden, ed. David Laing, printed for The Shakespeare Society, London, 1842.

Kyd, Thomas, The Works of Thomas Kyd, ed. Frederick S. Boas, Oxford At The Clarendon Press, 1901.

----------, The Spanish Tragedy With Additions 1602, ed. W.W. Greg, The Malone Society Reprints, Oxford University Press, 1925.

----------, "The Spanish Tragedy" in Five Elizabethan Tragedies, ed. A.K. McIlwraith, Oxford University Press, 1950.

Lewis, B. Roland ed., The Shakespeare Documents, Stanford University Press, 1940, 2 vols.

Marston, John, The Works of John Marston, ed. A.H. Bullen, the Ballantyne Press, London, 1887, vol. 1.

Murray, J.T., English Dramatic Companies (1558-1642), London, 1910.

Palmer, John, Ben Jonson, New York, 1934, pp. 123-126.

Partridge, A.C., Studies in the Syntax of Ben Jonson's Plays, Cambridge, 1953.

Penniman, J.H., The War of the Theatres, published separately in the series Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, 1897, vol.iv, no. 3.

Shakespeare, William, The Complete Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, eds. W.A. Neilson and C.J. Hill, Houghton Mifflin Co., The Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1942.

Stoll, E.E., John Webster, Boston, 1905.

Webster, John, The Complete Works of John Webster, ed. F.L. Lucas, Chatto & Windus, 1927, 4 vols.