

A NEW VARIORUM EDITION

OF

# SHAKESPEARE

---

## *THE POEMS*

---

*Venus and Adonis*

*Lucrece*

*The Passionate Pilgrim*

*The Phoenix and the Turtle*

*A Lover's Complaint*

---

Volume 22

---

EDITED BY

HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS

---

PHILADELPHIA & LONDON

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY

1938

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

THE PLAN OF THIS EDITION . . . . .	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	xvii
THE POEMS: TEXTS, TEXTUAL NOTES, AND COMMENTARY	
<i>Venus and Adonis</i> . . . . .	I
<i>Lucrece</i> . . . . .	109
<i>The Passionate Pilgrim</i> . . . . .	265
<i>The Phoenix and the Turtle</i> . . . . .	323
<i>A Lover's Complaint</i> . . . . .	333
APPENDIX	
<i>Venus and Adonis</i>	
The Texts . . . . .	369
The Date of Composition . . . . .	384
The Sources	
Scholarly Opinion . . . . .	390
Selections from Golding's Ovid . . . . .	401
Selection from Spenser . . . . .	404
<i>Lucrece</i>	
The Texts . . . . .	406
The Date of Composition . . . . .	413
The Sources	
Scholarly Opinion . . . . .	416
Selection from Livy . . . . .	427
Selection from Ovid . . . . .	430
Selection from Chaucer . . . . .	432
Selection from Painter . . . . .	437
John Quarles's <i>Tarquin Banished</i> . . . . .	439
The Vogue of <i>Venus and Adonis</i> and <i>Lucrece</i> . . . . .	447
General Criticism of <i>Venus and Adonis</i> and <i>Lucrece</i> . . . . .	476
<i>The Passionate Pilgrim</i>	
The Title . . . . .	524
The Texts . . . . .	525

William Jaggard, Heywood, and Shakespeare. . .	533
Date and Authenticity. . . . .	538
<i>The Phoenix and the Turtle</i>	
The Texts. . . . .	559
Authenticity. . . . .	561
The Date of Composition. . . . .	563
Criticism. . . . .	564
Interpretation. . . . .	566
The Meter. . . . .	583
<i>A Lover's Complaint</i>	
The Texts. . . . .	584
Scholarly Opinion and Criticism before 1912 . . .	585
Scholarly Opinion and Criticism after 1912. . .	596
The Cotes-Benson Edition of Shakespeare's <i>Poems</i> . .	604
Musical Settings for the Poems . . . . .	610
LIST OF BOOKS. . . . .	622
INDEX OF FIRST LINES. . . . .	633
INDEX TO THE COMMENTARY AND THE APPENDIX. . . . .	634

# THE PLAN OF THIS EDITION

---

In this edition an effort is made to give, first, as Textual Notes, on the same page with the text of the first quarto, or first octavo, the variant readings of Shakespeare's poems from the second quarto or second octavo down to the latest critical edition; next, as Commentary, notes which the editor has considered important for the purpose of elucidating the text or of illustrating the history of Shakespearean criticism; and, finally, as Appendix, certain discussions and critical articles which, because of their length, could find no place in the Commentary.

All remarks in the Commentary not otherwise assigned and all matter in the Commentary and the Appendix printed within square brackets [ ] are the editor's. Where square brackets appear in the works quoted, they have been changed to shaped brackets < >. Quotations and references made by the commentators have been verified and, wherever necessary, silently corrected; and citations of volume, page, act, scene, and so forth have been supplied within square brackets. Quotations from and references to Shakespeare's plays and sonnets have been made to conform to the text of Kittredge (1936), but for Shakespeare's five other poetical works the present text is followed. Chaucer and Spenser are quoted from the editions of F. N. Robinson (1933) and R. E. N. Dodge (1908), *Hero and Leander* from L. C. Martin's *Marlowe's Poems* (1931).

Obvious misprints in the basic texts of Shakespeare that I reprint are corrected in my own text, but all are enumerated in the Textual Notes.

## EARLY EDITIONS<sup>1</sup> OF THE SEPARATE POEMS REFERRED TO IN THE COMMENTARY AND THE APPENDIX AND COLLATED IN THE TEXTUAL NOTES

### *Venus and Adonis*

The text here reprinted is that of the first quarto, 1593, Bodleian Library. With Q<sub>1</sub> are collated the second quarto (Q<sub>2</sub>) and the subsequent octavos (for which, following the example of the

<sup>1</sup> See "The Texts" in the Appendix for a discussion of these editions and of extant copies.

Cambridge Editors, I use the convenient abbreviations Q<sub>3</sub>, Q<sub>4</sub>, and so on, rather than the more exact O<sub>1</sub>, O<sub>2</sub>, and so on) as follows:

Q <sub>2</sub>	1594	(British Museum, Bodley, Huntington, Yale)
Q <sub>3</sub>	1595?	(Folger)
Q <sub>4</sub>	1596	(British Museum, Bodley)
Q <sub>5</sub>	1599	(Huntington)
Q <sub>6</sub>	1599	(Folger)
Q <sub>7</sub>	1602?	(Bodley)
Q <sub>8</sub>	1602	(?1607/8, Bodley)
Q <sub>9</sub>	1602	(?1608/9, British Museum)
Q <sub>10</sub>	1617	(Bodley)
Q <sub>11</sub>	1620	(Trinity College)
Q <sub>12</sub>	1627	(British Museum, Huntington)
Q <sub>13</sub>	1630?	(Bodley)
Q <sub>14</sub>	1630	(Bodley)
Q <sub>15</sub>	1636	(British Museum, Folger)
Q <sub>16</sub>	1675	(Folger [2], Harvard)
State	1707	( <i>Poems on Affairs of State</i> , vol. IV) <sup>1</sup>

### *Lucrece*

The text here reprinted is that of the first quarto, 1594, Folger Library (W. A. White copy). With it are collated nine other copies of Q<sub>1</sub> and the subsequent octavos (for which, as in the case of *Venus and Adonis*, I use the convenient abbreviations for "quarto" rather than "octavo") as follows:

Q <sub>2</sub>	1598	(Trinity College)
Q <sub>3</sub>	1600	(Folger)
Q <sub>4</sub>	1600	(Bodley [2])
Q <sub>5</sub>	1607	(Trinity College, Huntington)
Q <sub>6</sub>	1616	(Bodley, Huntington)
Q <sub>7</sub>	1624	(Folger [2], Huntington)
Q <sub>8</sub>	1632	(Folger, Huntington)
Q <sub>9</sub>	1655	(Folger [4], Harvard, Boston Public Library)
State	1707	( <i>Poems on Affairs of State</i> , vol. IV)

### *The Passionate Pilgrim*

The text here reprinted is that of the first octavo, 1599, Huntington Library. With it are collated the Trinity College copy and the fragmentary Folger copy of O<sub>1</sub>, and the subsequent octavos, as follows:

O <sub>2</sub>	1599?	(Folger fragment)
----------------	-------	-------------------

<sup>1</sup> This abbreviation is used only in the Textual Notes.

O<sub>3</sub> 1612 (Bodley, Folger)  
 Ben. 1640 (Sh.'s *Poems*, printed by John Benson; Folger, Harvard)<sup>1</sup>

*The Phoenix and the Turtle*

The text here reprinted is that in Robert Chester's *Love's Martyr*, 1601, Folger Library. With it are collated the Huntington Library copy of Chester, 1601, the 1611 reissue of Chester (British Museum), and

Ben. 1640 (Sh.'s *Poems*, printed by John Benson; Folger, Harvard)

*A Lover's Complaint*

The text here reprinted is that in the first quarto, 1609, of the *Sonnets*, Harvard Library. With it are collated other copies of Q<sub>1</sub> (British Museum, Folger) and

Ben. 1640 (Sh.'s *Poems*, printed by John Benson; Folger, Harvard)

MODERN EDITIONS REFERRED TO IN THE COMMENTARY  
 AND THE APPENDIX AND COLLATED IN THE TEXTUAL  
 NOTES FOR ALL<sup>2</sup> THE POEMS

Bernard Lintott ( <i>Poems</i> , 2 vols.) <sup>3</sup>	[Lint.]	[1709, 1711]
Charles Gildon ( <i>Poems</i> )	[Gild. <sup>1</sup> ]	1710
Charles Gildon ( <i>Poems</i> )	[Gild. <sup>2</sup> ]	1714
George Sewell ( <i>Poems</i> )	[Sew. <sup>1</sup> ]	1725
George Sewell ( <i>Poems</i> )	[Sew. <sup>2</sup> ]	1728
Thomas Ewing ( <i>Poems</i> )	[Ew.]	1771
Thomas Evans ( <i>Poems</i> )	[Evans]	[1775]
Edmond Malone ( <i>Supplement</i> ) <sup>4</sup>	[Mal. <sup>1</sup> ]	1780
Edmond Malone ( <i>Plays and Poems</i> ) <sup>4</sup>	[Mal. <sup>2</sup> ]	1790
James Boswell ( <i>Plays and Poems</i> ) <sup>5</sup>	[Var.]	1821
Alexander Dyce ( <i>Poems</i> , <i>Aldine Poets</i> )	[Ald.]	1832
Charles Knight ( <i>Works</i> , <i>Pictorial Edition</i> )	[Knt. <sup>1</sup> ]	1841
J. P. Collier ( <i>Works</i> )	[Coll. <sup>1</sup> ]	1843
Robert Bell ( <i>Poems</i> , <i>English Poets</i> , <i>Annotated Edition</i> )	[Bell]	1855

<sup>1</sup> This abbreviation is used only in the Textual Notes.

<sup>2</sup> Important exceptions are: Lintott omits the *P. & T.*; Wyndham, the *P. P.* and the *P. & T.*; Ridley, the *P. P.* and the *L. C.* (For these abbreviations see p. xvii, below.) The abbreviations of editors' names in the list of Modern Editions are used only in the Textual Notes—not in the Commentary or the Appendix.

<sup>3</sup> See the preceding note.

<sup>4</sup> With notes by George Steevens and others.

<sup>5</sup> With notes by Malone, Steevens, and others.

H. N. Hudson (Works)	[Huds. <sup>1</sup> ]	1856
Alexander Dyce (Works)	[Dyce <sup>1</sup> ]	1857
J. P. Collier (Works)	[Coll. <sup>2</sup> ]	1858
Howard Staunton (Plays)	[Sta.]	1860
W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright (Works, Globe Edition)	[Glo.]	1864
Thomas Keightley (Plays and Poems)	[Ktly.]	1865
R. G. White (Works)	[Wh. <sup>1</sup> ]	1865
J. O. Halliwell [-Phillipps] (Works, Folio Edition)	[Hal.]	1865
W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright (Works, Cambridge Sh.)	[Cam. <sup>1</sup> ]	1866
Alexander Dyce (Works)	[Dyce <sup>2</sup> ]	1866
Charles Knight (Works, Pictorial Edition) <sup>1</sup>	[Knt. <sup>2</sup> ]	1867
Nicolaus Delius (Works)	[Del.]	1872
Alexander Dyce (Works)	[Dyce <sup>3</sup> ]	1876
J. P. Collier (Plays and Poems)	[Coll. <sup>3</sup> ]	1878
H. N. Hudson (Works, Harvard Edition)	[Huds. <sup>2</sup> ]	1881
R. G. White (Works, Riverside Sh.)	[Wh. <sup>2</sup> ]	1883
W. J. Rolfe (Poems, English Classics)	[Rol.]	1883
W. J. Craig (Works, Oxford Sh.)	[Oxf.]	1891
W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright (Works, Cambridge Sh.)	[Cam. <sup>2</sup> ]	1893
George Wyndham (Poems) <sup>2</sup>	[Wynd.]	1898
C. H. Herford (Works, Eversley Edition)	[Herf.]	1899
Edward Dowden (Poems)	[Dow.]	1903
W. A. Neilson (Works, Cambridge Poets)	[Neils.]	1906
A. H. Bullen (Works)	[Bull.]	1907
C. K. Pooler (Poems, Arden Sh.) <sup>3</sup>	[Pool.]	1911
C. K. Pooler (Sonnets, Arden Sh.) <sup>4</sup>	[Pool.]	1918
Albert Feuillerat (Poems, Yale Sh.)	[Yale]	1927
M. R. Ridley (Poems, New Temple Sh.) <sup>5</sup>	[Rid.]	1935
G. L. Kittredge (Works)	[Kit.]	1936

The following ten editions I have not collated beyond referring to them in certain disputed passages and recording occasional readings that have significance of one sort or another; but all are frequently cited in the Commentary and the Appendix.

William Hazlitt (Supplementary Works)	1852
F. J. Furnivall (Works, Leopold Sh.)	1877
Henry Irving and F. A. Marshall (Works, Henry Irving Sh., Introduction by A. W. Verity)	1890

<sup>1</sup> "The Second Edition, Revised."

<sup>2</sup> Omits the *P.* & *T.* and the *P. P.*

<sup>3</sup> Lacks the *L. C.*

<sup>4</sup> Contains the *L. C.*

<sup>5</sup> Omits the *P. P.* and the *L. C.*

Israel Gollancz (Poems, 2 vols., Temple Sh.) <sup>1</sup>	1896
W. J. Craig (Poems, 2 vols.) <sup>2</sup>	1905
Sidney Lee (Poems and <i>Pericles</i> ) <sup>3</sup>	1905
Sidney Lee (Works, Renaissance Sh.) <sup>4</sup>	1907
Charlotte Porter (Poems, 3 vols., First Folio Sh.) <sup>5</sup>	1912
Carleton Brown ( <i>Venus, Lucrece, etc.</i> , Tudor Sh.) <sup>6</sup>	1913
R. M. Alden ( <i>Sonnets</i> , Tudor Sh.) <sup>7</sup>	1913

The Textual Notes need a few words of explanation.

Variations of spelling are not noted except in cases where uncertainty may exist about what word is intended, or where they may be significant for the history of textual usage. Mere modernizations of spelling are, except for a number of unusual words, ignored. But wherever the spelling adds or omits what is, or what might be, an extra syllable it is noted—except for the edition (1855) of Robert Bell, whose consistent change of *t* or *d* to *ed* is meaningless.

Unmistakable misprints, like inverted, transposed, or mis-spaced letters, in the eighteenth-century and later editions are passed over silently. They are noted for those earlier than 1700 when they play a part in establishing a later reading or in differentiating two editions, or issues, of the same date; as are misprints in all editions when they spell a different word.

In order to condense the readings as much as possible, no attention is paid to capitalization unless (as in Love = Venus or Cupid) it has a significance beyond that of "style" or personification of abstractions.

An asterisk prefixed to a word or an editor's name indicates that the readings are substantially given, and that immaterial deviations in spelling or punctuation are disregarded. But editions listed immediately after the bracket often have only sub-

<sup>1</sup> One volume has *Venus* and the *P. P.*, the other *Lucrece*, the *L. C.*, and the *P. & T.*

<sup>2</sup> One volume has *Venus*, the *P. P.*, and the *P. & T.*, the other *Lucrece* and the *L. C.*

<sup>3</sup> Also issued in five volumes—(1) *Venus*, (2) *Lucrece*, (3) the *P. P.*, (4) the *Sonnets* (with the *L. C.*), (5) *Pericles*—each with its own title-page.

<sup>4</sup> Vol. XXXIX has *Venus, Lucrece*, and the *P. P.*, vol. XL the *L. C.* and the *P. & T.*

<sup>5</sup> One volume contains *Venus*, another *Lucrece*, the third the *Sonnets*, the *L. C.*, the *P. P.*, and the *P. & T.*

<sup>6</sup> Lacks the *L. C.*

<sup>7</sup> Contains the *L. C.*



stantially the reading before the bracket, even though no asterisk is prefixed. For example, in "tooke] Qq., State, Lint." or "selfe same] Q<sub>4</sub>-Q<sub>7</sub>, Lint., Mal." some editions naturally have the modern spellings *took* or *self*.

Readings like "*wakes* Q<sub>1</sub> (Bodley)" or "*innotations* Q<sub>5</sub> (Huntington)" occur only in the copies so specified, not in others of the same edition.

Changes in punctuation are entered only where the sense is clearly affected or where the pointing of the text that I reprint requires specific comment or emendation. Generally no notice is taken of the substitution of commas for parentheses or of any other mark for ! or ?, of the presence or absence of italics, or of the omission or insertion of quotation marks.

"Conj." signifies a conjectural reading not actually printed in a text, and the name of the first editor who records it in his notes is given in parentheses, as "Farmer conj. (Mal)." "Capell MS." refers to the manuscript corrections (only the more significant of which are here reproduced) made about 1766 by Edward Capell in his copy of Lintott's edition (Trinity College, Cambridge).

Agreement of the texts earlier than 1700 is specified by a dash between symbols. Thus "Q<sub>3</sub>-Q<sub>15</sub>" means that the octavos of *Venus and Adonis* from 1595 to 1636 have an identical reading. "Qq." implies that all the editions before 1700 have the reading given before the bracket. When the eighteenth-century editions up to Evans or Malone have an identical reading, that fact is shown by a dash between the abbreviations "State-Evans" or "State-Mal.," as the case may be. "The rest" includes all the other editions in my lists of "Early Editions" and "Modern Editions" (all, that is, from Q<sub>2</sub>, or O<sub>2</sub>, to 1936) that are not specifically named in the entry in question. Where an editor like Malone or Dyce has the same reading in each of his editions, that fact is indicated by the unqualified entry "Mal." or "Dyce"; where the readings differ, "Mal.<sup>1</sup>," "Mal.<sup>2</sup>," "Dyce<sup>1</sup>," "Dyce<sup>2</sup>," "Dyce<sup>3</sup>" give due warning. A plus sign indicates that a certain reading is found in all the editions which in my lists follow the edition just cited. So "Q<sub>2</sub>+" means (for *Venus and Adonis*) that the reading occurs in the second quarto of 1594, in all the octavos down to 1675, and in all the modern editions from 1707 to 1936.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

---

Abbott	Edwin Abbott, A Shakespearian Grammar
Blackwood's	Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine
C. H. E. L.	Cambridge History of English Literature (New York)
D. N. B.	Dictionary of National Biography
E. S.	Englische Studien
Jahrbuch	Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft
J. E. G. P.	Journal of English and Germanic Philology
L. C.	A Lover's Complaint
M. L. N.	Modern Language Notes
M. L. R.	Modern Language Review
M. P.	Modern Philology
N. & Q.	Notes and Queries
N. E. D.	New English Dictionary on Historical Principles
P. & T.	The Phoenix and the Turtle
P. M. L. A.	Publications of the Modern Language Association of America
P. P.	The Passionate Pilgrim
P. Q.	Philological Quarterly
R. E. S.	Review of English Studies
S. P.	Studies in Philology
Schmidt	Alexander Schmidt, Shakespeare-Lexicon
Sh.	Shakespeare (Shakspere, etc.)
T. L. S.	The [London] Times Literary Supplement
Venus	Venus and Adonis
Year's Work	Year's Work in English Studies

# The Phoenix and the Turtle

1    **L** Et the bird of lowdeſt lay, 1  
      On the ſole *Arabian* tree,  
      Herauld fad and trumpet be:  
      To whoſe found chaſte wings obay. 4

Printed without stanza division in Mal.<sup>1</sup>, as No. *XVIII* by Mal.<sup>2</sup>, Var.,  
Ben., Gild., Sew., Ew., Evans; Bel.  
printed in the *P. P.* as No. *XX* by 1. *lowdeſt*] *lowest* Ben., Gild.,  
Sew., Ew., Evans.

---

1-4.] FAIRCHILD (*E. S.*, 1904, XXXIII, 363) paraphrases: Let the bird of loudest cry (come and sit) on the sole Arabian tree, . . . and let it be the sad herald and *trumpet* to whose *sound* "chaste wings" or gentle birds will respond.

1. the bird] GROSART (*Loves Martyr*, 1878, p. 241) rightly denies that the bird is the phoenix, but makes a queer guess about its identity: I think it was left intentionally indefinite. I would suggest the 'Nightingale.' [See also his comments on l. 4.]—HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS (*Outlines*, 1882, p. 264): There is no necessity for believing that a special bird was in Shakespeare's thoughts.—FAIRCHILD (*E. S.*, 1904, XXXIII, 363) cites Chaucer's *Parliament of Fowls*, l. 344, "The crane, the geaunt, with his trompes soun," and adds: It seems highly probable, even aside from the presumable suggestion from Chaucer, that Shakespeare here referred to the crane both because it was a common emblem, and because its cry seems to have received special attention.—Various editors agree with BROWN (ed. 1913): It is not certain what bird is intended.

2.] MALONE (ed. 1780) had determined to follow "a learned friend" in reading "Sole on the Arabian tree" until he observed *The Tempest*, III.iii.22-24, "in Arabia There is one tree, the phoenix' throne; one phoenix At this hour reigning there."—IDEM (*Sh.'s Plays*, 1821, XV, 123): Our poet had probably Lyly's Euphues, and his England, particularly in his thoughts: signat. Q3 [Bond's Lyly, 1902, II, 86].—"As there is but one *Phœnix* in the world, so is there but one tree in *Arabia* where-in she buyldeth." See also, Florio's Italian Dictionary, 1598 [sig. 2C6<sup>v</sup>]: "*Rasin*, a tree in Arabia, whereof there is but one found, and vpon it the Phenix sits."—GROSART (*Loves Martyr*, 1878, p. 241): The Palm is meant. In Greek *phoinix*, and meaning both phoenix and palm-tree.

sole] RIDLEY (ed. 1935): [In *sole*] there is probably also the sense of 'deserted.'

3. trumpet] STEEVENS (ed. 1780) compares *King John*, I.i.27 f., "Be thou the trumpet of our wrath And sullen presage of your own decay."—POOLER (ed. 1911): Trumpeter to summon all good birds; cf. *Troilus and Cressida*, IV.v.6 f., "Thou, trumpet, there's my purse. Now crack thy lungs."

4. To] ROLFE (ed. 1883) compares a similar use of *obey to* in *Troilus and Cressida*, III.i.163-165, "His stubborn buckles . . . Shall more obey than to

- 2 But thou shriking harbinger, 5  
 Foule precurrer of the fiend,  
 Augour of the feuers end,  
 To this troupe come thou not neere.
- 3 From this Seffion interdict 10  
 Euery foule of tyrant wing,  
 Sauē the Eagle feath' red King,  
 Keepe the obsequie fo strict.
- 4 Let the Priest in Surples white, 14  
 That defunctiue Musicke can,

6. *precurrer*] \**procuror* Gild., Sew., Ben. *feather'd* The rest.  
 Ew., Evans. 13. *Surples*] *surplis* Ben. *surplice*  
 10. *tyrant wing*] Hyphened by Gild. +.  
 Ktly. 14. *can*] *ken* Gild.<sup>2</sup>, Sew.<sup>2</sup>, Ew.,  
 11. *feath' red*] Neils., Kit. *feathered* Evans.

the edge of steel." In his notes on that play (1882, p. 187) he cites Spenser's *Faery Queen*, 1590, III.xi.35, "Lo! now the hevens obey to me alone," and Romans vi.16, "his servants ye are to whom ye obey."—*N. E. D.* (1905): The construction with *to* has now become obsolete . . . the object was orig[inally] a dative.

**chaste wings**] GROSART (*Loves Martyr*, 1878, pp. 241 f.): I have, myself, often watched the lifting and tremulous motion of the 'singing' Nightingale's wings, and *chaste* was the exquisitely chosen word to describe the nightingale, in reminiscence of the classical story [i. e. of Tereus and Philomela].—PORTER (ed. 1912): The wings of the Turtle, emblem of constant love.—Both Grosart and Miss Porter entirely miss the point. As in Fairchild's paraphrase (see above) *chaste wings* does not refer to the bird of l. 1 but to the other birds summoned to the obsequies by the trumpeter bird of loudest lay.

5. **harbinger**] MALONE (ed. 1780): The scritch-owl; the *foul precurrer* of death. [He compares *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, V.i.383-385, "the screech owl, screeching loud, Puts the wretch . . . In remembrance of a shroud," and *Hamlet*, I.i.121 f., "the like precurse of fierce events, As harbingers preceding still the fates."]—FAIRCHILD (*E. S.*, 1904, XXXIII, 364): As Chaucer has it [*Parliament of Fowls*, l. 343], "The oule ek, that of deth the bode bryngeth."—PORTER (ed. 1912): Chaucer's 'wys raven' [*Parliament of Fowls*, l. 363], the hoarse-voiced bird that croaks ill omens, is probably meant, as in 'Mach.' I.v.39.

6. **precurrer**] *N. E. D.* (1909): Forerunner. [Only this example is recorded.]—POOLER (ed. 1911): For the sake of the rhythm I would read "precursor." [He cites *precursors* in *The Tempest*, I.ii.201, and *precurse* (quoted above) in *Hamlet*.]

14.] MALONE (ed. 1780): That understands funereal musick.—GROSART

Be the death-deuining Swan, 15  
Left the *Requiem* lacke his right.

5 And thou treble dated Crow,  
That thy fable gender mak'ft,  
With the breath thou giu'ft and tak'ft, 19

15. *death-deuining*] *death-deui ning* 18, 19. *mak' st...giu' st...tak' st*] *makest*  
Q1. Two words in Ben. ...*givest...takest* Glo., Cam., Huds.<sup>2</sup>,  
17. *treble dated*] Hyphened by Herf., Dow., Bull., Pool. *makest...*  
Gild.<sup>2</sup>+. *giv' st...takest* Wh.<sup>2</sup>

(*Loves Martyr*, 1878, p. 242) quotes Malone, adding: But query—Is it [*can*] here used from the Latin 'cano'? (Dr. Brinsley Nicholson, to me.)—SCHMIDT (1874) explains *can*: Knows, is skilled in.—The line is borrowed by T. S. ELIOT, *Poems*, 1925, p. 43, "Defunctive music under sea Passed seaward."

15. *death-deuining Swan*] FAIRCHILD (*E. S.*, 1904, XXXIII, 366) compares Chaucer, *Parliament of Fowls*, l. 342, "The jelous swan, ayens his deth that syngeth."—LEE (ed. 1907): Cf. Roydon's elegy [in *The Phoenix Nest*, 1593 (ed. Rollins, 1931, pp. 10, 15)]: "The swan that sings about to dy," and "The swan . . . Began his funerall dirge to sing."—See the notes to *Lucrece*, ll. 1611 f. It may, or may not, be significant that Chester, in *Loves Martyr*, 1601, mentions not only "The sweet recording Swanne," sig. R2, but also the crane, sigs. Q2<sup>v</sup>, Q3 (cf. l. 1 n.), "The skreeching Owle," sig. Q3, who is "The filthy messenger of ill to come" and "This ill bedooming Owle," sig. R1 (cf. l. 5 n.), and "The Princely Eagle of all Birds the King," sig. Q3<sup>v</sup> (cf. l. 11).

16. *his right*] FAIRCHILD (*E. S.*, 1904, XXXIII, 365): Its right (of music).—BROWN (ed. 1913): "Its rite" or "its due."

17. *treble dated Crow*] STEEVENS (ed. 1780) cited Lucretius, "cornicum ut secla vetusta. Ter tres aetates humanas garrula vincit Cornix," and played a good trick on his followers, only one of whom looked up the Latin, V, 1084. As LEE (ed. 1907) remarks, the last seven words are not in Lucretius, "although Steevens' error has been universally accepted by the commentators."—R. H. LEGIS (*N. & Q.*, Sept. 18, 1875, p. 236): The "treble-dated crow" means Time. . . . [Ll. 18 f. are] synonymous with Goethe's—"A seizing and giving The fire of the living," in the celebrated time speech in *Faust*.—FAIRCHILD (*E. S.*, 1904, XXXIII, 367): It seems most likely that the word "treble-dated" means a comparatively large number, for the crow was and still is believed by many to live for one, two, three, or even four hundred years.—POOLER (ed. 1911): See Holland's *Pliny*, VII.xlviii. p. 180: "*Hesiodus* . . . saith forsooth, That a crow liveth 9 times as long as we; and the harts or stags 4 times as long as the crow; but the ravens thrice as long as they." Possibly "crow" is meant for raven, and "treble-dated" means living as long as three stags.

18, 19.] STEEVENS (ed. 1780): I suppose . . . that the *crow*, or *raven*, continues its race by the *breath* it *gives* to them as its parent, and by *that* which it *takes* from other animals: i. e. by first producing its young from itself, and then providing for their support by depredation. [LEE (ed. 1907) repeats

Mongst our mourners fhalt thou go. 20

6 Here the Antheme doth commence,  
Loue and Constancie is dead,  
*Phœnix* and the *Turtle* fled,  
In a mutuall flame from hence. 24

22. *is*] *are* Ew.  
25. *loued*] *lov'd* Mal., Var., Ald., Knt., Coll., Huds.<sup>1</sup>, Dyce, Sta., Ktly., Wh., Hal., Del., Rol., Oxf., Neils., Pool., Yale, Kit.  
27. *Two distincts*] *For distinction* Gild.<sup>2</sup>  
*Diuisio none*] *but in none* Ben., Gild.<sup>1</sup>, Sew., Ew., Evans. *there was none* Gild.<sup>2</sup>

this explanation with no reference to Steevens.]—HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS (ed. 1865): This is explained by a passage in Swan's *Speculum Mundi*, 1635, p. 397,—"Neither (as is thought) doth the raven conceive by conjunction of male and female, but rather by a kinde of billing at the mouth, which *Plinie* [x.12] mentioneth as an opinion of the common people."—GROSART (*Loves Martyr*, 1878, p. 242): It is a 'Vulgar Error' still, that the 'Crow' can change its 'gender' at will. My friend Mr. E. W. Gosse puts it—"thou Crow that makest <change in> thy sable gender, with the mere exhalation and inhalation of thy breath' (letter to me).—In his final notes (p. 18\*) GROSART remarks: I fear the reference is to the belief that the crow (or rather the raven) engendered by the mouth; a belief mentioned . . . by Martial and discredited by Aristotle and Pliny. . . . I don't feel disposed to say more than that 'gender' here is = kind, not sex.—E. C. HAMLEY (*N. & Q.*, Oct. 16, 1886, p. 312): [*Gender* is] equivalent to "race" or "kind." It would appear that there is an allusion to some myth as to the crow propagating its species in the way indicated. [He cites *Hamlet*, IV.vii.18, "the great love the general gender bear him."—POOLER (ed. 1911): Prof. Case cites Seager, *Natural History in Shakespeare's Time* (1896), which . . . under *Raven* has this from *Hortus Sanitatis*, bk. iii. §34: "They are said to conceive and to lay their eggs at the bill. The young become black on the seventh day." This seems conclusive.—H. LITTLEDALE (in *Sh.'s England*, 1916, I, 520): [Ll. 18 f. embody the curious belief] that the crow can change its sex at will.

25. *as*] SCHMIDT (1874): That. [He cites also *Lucrece*, ll. 1372, 1420. So ROLFE (ed. 1883).]—HERFORD (ed. 1899): As if.

27. *distincts*] *N. E. D.* (1897), citing this use only: Separate or individual persons or things.—ONIONS (*Sh. Glossary*, 1911): Separate things.—RIDLEY (ed. 1935): In the language of the schools 'distinction' implies a verbal, 'division' a real, difference.

28.] FAIRCHILD (*E. S.*, 1904, XXXIII, 369): Though there were two there was yet, by the power of love, only one. [He compares *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, III.ii.208-212, "we grew together, Like to a double cherry, seeming parted, But yet an union in partition— Two lovely berries moulded on one stem; So, with two seeming bodies, but one heart."—ADAMS writes to me: L. 28 refers to the mathematical dictum "one is no number." That is, by the "two" being "one" they "slay" number.

- 7 So they loued as loue in twaine, 25  
 Had the effence but in one,  
 Two distincts, Diuision none,  
 Number there in loue was flaine.
- 8 Hearts remote, yet not afunder;  
 Diftance and no fpace was feene, 30  
 Twixt this *Turtle* and his Queene;  
 But in them it were a wonder.
- 9 So betweene them Loue did shine,  
 That the *Turtle* faw his right,  
 Flaming in the *Phœnix* fight; 35  
 Either was the others mine.

30. *Distance*] *Distance*, Gild.<sup>2</sup>, 32. *in*] to Gild.<sup>2</sup>  
 Sew.<sup>2</sup>+ (except Rid.). *it*] all Ew.

31. *this*] *thy* Ben., Gild., Sew., Ew., 34. *right*] *light* Steevens conj.  
 Evans. *the* Mal.+ (except Hal., (Mal.).  
 Dyce<sup>2</sup>, Dyce<sup>3</sup>, Huds.<sup>2</sup>, Neils., Kit.).

31. *this*] MALONE's error (ed. 1780), *the*, has been kept by nearly all subsequent editors, notable exceptions (see also Textual Notes) being VERITY (ed. 1890) and PORTER (ed. 1912).

32.] MALONE (ed. 1780): So extraordinary a phaenomenon . . . would have excited astonishment, had it been found any where else *except in these two birds*. In them it was not wonderful.

34. *the . . . right*] STEEVENS (ed. 1780) explains his emendation (see Textual Notes): The turtle saw all the *day* he wanted, in the eyes of the phoenix.—MALONE (the same) defends the text: The turtle saw those qualities which were his *right*, which were peculiarly *appropriated* to him, in the phoenix.—*Light* certainly corresponds better with the word *flaming* in the next line; but Shakspeare seldom puts his comparisons on four feet.—GROSART (*Loves Martyr*, 1878, p. 243): It is merely a variant mode of expressing seeing love-babies (or one's self imaged) in the other's eyes.—POOLER (ed. 1911): I do not see how the turtle himself or himself imaged could well be said [in l. 35] to flame. . . . [He explains] "his right" as "what is due to him," viz. love in return, and this he sees shining in her eyes.

36.] B. NICHOLSON (*Athenaeum*, Feb. 3, 1883, p. 150) argues that *mine* here and in Sonnet 113 (14) is "the Anglo-French 'mine,' our present 'mien.'" In l. 36, "indeed, 'mine' by its sound may have been intended to suggest the possessive-pronoun meaning as a secondary sense, but it is not good English to speak of two third persons as being each other's 'mine.'" The meaning is "that each—in the other's eye—took the form or image of the other, each was the other's self."—SCHMIDT (1875) defines *mine*: A rich source of wealth.—

10 Propertie was thus appalled, 37  
 That the felfe was not the fame:  
 Single Natures double name,  
 Neither two nor one was called. 40

11 Reason in it felfe confounded,

37, 40. *appalled...called*] *appall'd...* 38. *the selfe*] *thy self* Gild.<sup>2</sup>  
*call'd* Mal., Var., Ald., Knt., Coll., 39. *Natures double*] *natures, double*  
 Huds., Dyce, Sta., Glo., Ktly., Wh.<sup>1</sup>, Sew., Ew., Evans, Sta. conj. *na-*  
 Hal., Del., Rol., Oxf., Yale. *ture's double* Mal. †.

FAIRCHILD (*E. S.*, 1904, p. 370) paraphrases, "What was possessed was held in common," and cites a line from the verses attributed to Marlowe in *England's Parnassus*, 1600 (ed. Crawford, p. 351), "Turtle-taught louers either other close."—PORTER (ed. 1912): Either was in sight of the other, 'mine own,' 'mine alone.'—C. D. STEWART (*Some Textual Difficulties in Sh.*, 1914, pp. 245 f.): [The line] does not simply mean that each *belonged* to the other. It means . . . that each was the other's *self*—"mine" in every regard that *me* could convey.—RIDLEY (ed. 1935): Cf. Donne ["The Ecstasy," l. 4], 'we two, one another's best.'—FEULLERAT (ed. 1927) explains ll. 33–36: Their love shone so bright that the turtle could see his right, that is, the love due to him, all a-blaze in the ardent eyes of the phoenix: Each was the source of inexhaustible treasure (*mine*) to the other.—The explanation of *mine* given by Schmidt and Feuillerat seems to me correct.

37, 38.] MALONE (ed. 1780): This communication of *appropriated* qualities alarmed the power that presides over *property*. Finding that *the self was not the same*, he began to fear that nothing would remain distinct and individual; that all things would become common.—GROSART (*Loves Martyr*, 1878, p. 243), riding his hobby (see pp. 568 f., below), has a remarkable note on *Propertie*: Great proprietors, or the nobility. I imagine there is an enigmatical hitting at the jealousy of Essex among the nobility of England, in the possibility of marriage between him and Elizabeth.—FEULLERAT (ed. 1927): Property is a Latinism, 'proprietas,' peculiar or essential quality. . . . 'Property' was appalled to find out that personality had been destroyed, since each lover's identity was merged into the other's, and was no longer itself.—RIDLEY (ed. 1935): In Shakespearean idiom 'self' and 'same' are almost always identical. The phrase means, I think, that the sense of the proper use of language is outraged by the discovery that a synonym is not a synonym. [Ridley's explanation can hardly supplant that of Malone or Feuillerat. See also the following note.]

39, 40.] POOLER (ed. 1911): They could not be called one because their persons were distinct, the self (nature) was not the same (person), l. 38, or two, because their nature or essence was the same; division, *i. e.* distinct or sundered persons, grew one in nature, l. 42.

41–44.] FAIRCHILD (*E. S.*, 1904, XXXIII, 371) paraphrases: Pure reason



- Saw Diuifion grow together, 42  
 To themfelues yet either neither,  
 Simple were fo well compounded.
- 12 That it cried, how true a twaine, 45  
 Seemeth this concordant one,  
 Loue hath Reafon, Reafon none,  
 If what parts, can fo remaine. 48

42, 43. *together, To themfelues*] together *To themfelues*, Grosart conj. (*Loves Martyr*, 1878, p. 243).  
 43. *either neither*] *either, neither* Knt., Ktly., Wh.<sup>1</sup> Hyphened by Mal., Ald., Knt., Bell, Sta., Wh.<sup>1</sup>  
 44. *compounded.*] Ben., Gild.<sup>1</sup> *compounded*, Gild.<sup>2</sup>, Sew., Ew., Evans, Glo., Del., Wh.<sup>2</sup>, Rol., Oxf., Herf., Dow., Neils., Yale. *compounded*: Knt., Ktly., Wh.<sup>1</sup> *compounded* Bell. *compounded*; The rest.  
 45. *cried*] *cry'd* Mal.<sup>2</sup>, Var., Coll.<sup>1</sup>, Hal.

had seen those unlike and, according to its insight, quite incompatible, unite together. In the union neither had an entirely separate identity, simple, that is, simples or elementary elements, were so perfectly compounded or united.

43, 44.] MALONE (ed. 1821) cites Drayton's *Mortimeriados*, 1596 (Hebel's Drayton, 1931, I, 377), "fire seem'd to be water, water flame, Eyther or neyther, and yet both the same."—Of this quotation POOLER (ed. 1911) says: I doubt if this is relevant. Can the construction be "Yet neither saw either grow to themselves," *i. e.* to himself or herself, because they grew for and to each other? . . . This requires the lines, "To . . . compounded" to be regarded as a parenthesis. . . . [But CASE suggests,] "Reason . . . saw division grow together, yet saw neither grow to or become absorbed in the other, so well were simple compounded; So that it cried," etc.—RIDLEY (ed. 1935): The sense has to be felt and not arrived at by analysis. [A comment hardly more illuminating than the words of RANJEE, for which see pp. 579 f., below.]

45, 46. *twaine . . . one*] MALONE (ed. 1790) and many later editors cite Drayton's *Mortimeriados*, 1596 (Hebel's Drayton, 1931, I, 342), "Nor can her tongue pronounce an I, but wee, Thus two in one, and one in two they bee." But the figure is an Elizabethan commonplace, especially in Donne. See the examples given by FAIRCHILD (*E. S.*, 1904, XXXIII, 379 f.).—FEUILLERAT (ed. 1927) restates the thought of ll. 43-46: And yet Reason saw that the lovers were different in themselves, for the elements in their several natures were so strongly compounded or blended that Reason could exclaim: 'In this unity, there is a real duality.'

47, 48.] MALONE (ed. 1780): Love is reasonable, and reason is folly, (has no reason) *if two that are disunited* from each other, can yet remain together and undivided.—FEUILLERAT (ed. 1927): So that Love is right while Reason, which ought to be right, is wrong—since there remains a union where there should be a division.

- 13 Whereupon it made this *Threne*,  
 To the *Phœnix* and the *Doue*, 50  
 Co-supremes and starres of Loue,  
 As *Chorus* to their Tragique Scene.

### *Threnos.*

- 14 **B**Eautie, Truth, and Raritie,  
 Grace in all simplicitie,  
 Here enclosde, in cinders lie. 55
- 15 Death is now the *Phœnix* nest,  
 And the *Turtles* loyall breft,  
 To eternitie doth rest.
- 16 Leauing no posteritie,  
 Twas not their infirmitie, 60  
 It was married Chastitie.

49. *it*] *is* Ew.  
*Threnos*] *Threnes* Ben., Gild.,  
 Sew., Ew., Evans.  
 55. *Here*] *Hence* Ben., Gild.<sup>1</sup>, Sew.,  
 Ew., Evans.  
*enclosde*] *\*inclosed* Ben., Gild.,  
 Sew., Ew., Evans, Glo., Cam., Huds.<sup>2</sup>,  
 Wh.<sup>2</sup>, Herf., Dow., Bull.  
 56. *Phœnix*] *phœnix'* Mal. + (ex-  
 cept Coll.<sup>2</sup>). *phœnix's* Coll.<sup>2</sup>  
 58. *rest.*] *rest*; Gild.<sup>2</sup>, Sew.<sup>2</sup>, Ew.,  
 Evans, Neils. *rest*, Mal. + (except  
 Neils.).  
 59. *posteritie*] Gild.<sup>2</sup>, Sew., Ew.,  
 Evans. *posterity* Ben., Gild.<sup>1</sup> *pos-*  
*terity*:—Mal., Var., Ald., Knt., Dyce,  
 Sta., Ktly., Wh.<sup>1</sup>, Huds.<sup>2</sup> *posterity*:  
 The rest.  
*William Shake-speare*] Wm.  
*Shake-speare* Var., Coll., Ktly. Wm.  
*Shakespeare* Ald., Huds.<sup>1</sup>, Wh.<sup>1</sup> Om.  
 by the rest.

49. *Threne*] MALONE (ed. 1790) compares Kendall's *Flowers of Epigrammes*, 1577 (ed. Spenser Society, 1874, p. 157), "Of Verses, Threnes and Epitaphes." —SCHMIDT (1875) defines *threne* and *Threnos* (the title of the concluding part) as "lamentation, funeral song." In his Appendix (p. 1425) he says that *threnos* is one of the two Greek words used by Sh.—*N. E. D.* (1919) has only three other examples of *threnos* (1840, 1850, 1903), but it cites five uses of *trenes* (1432–1450), *trenys* (1493), and *threnes* (1593, 1651, 1811).

56–58, 62–64.] RUSKIN (*Nineteenth Century*, Sept., 1880, pp. 405 f.) quotes these lines as a "master song" and "perfect verses."

61.] This line appears in Dudley Fitts's *Poems 1929–1936*, 1937, p. 17.

- 17 Truth may feeme, but cannot be, 62  
Beautie bragge, but tis not she,  
Truth and Beautie buried be.
- 18 To this vrne let those repaire, 65  
That are either true or faire,  
For these dead Birds, figh a prayer. 67

*William Shake-speare.*

## THE PHOENIX AND THE TURTLE

### THE TEXTS

Sh.'s poem on the Phoenix and the Turtle can scarcely be understood except in its context—if at all. It was published in a volume of Robert Chester's (1601), described as follows:

LOVES MARTYR: / OR, / ROSALINS COMPLAINT. / *Allegorically shadowing the truth of Loue,* / in the constant Fate of the Phoenix / and Turtle. / A Poeme enterlaced with much varietie and raritie; / now first translated out of the venerable Italian Torquato / Caeliano, by ROBERT CHESTER. / With the true legend of famous King Arthur, the laft of the nine / Worthies, being the first *Effsay* of a new *Brytish* Poet: collected / out of diuerfe Authentically Records. / To these are added some new compositions, of severall moderne Writers / whose names are subscribed to their severall workes, vpon the / first Subject: viz. the Phoenix and / Turtle. / Mar:—*Mutare dominum non potest liber notus.* / [Ornament] / LONDON / Imprinted for F. B. / (4°, sigs. A-2A<sup>4</sup>, 2B<sup>2</sup>.)

Chester's own work ends on Y<sub>4</sub> with "*Finis. quoth R. Chester.*" On Z<sub>1</sub> is the title-page:

HEREAFTER / FOLLOVV DIVERSE / Poeticall Effaies on the former Sub- / iect; viz: the *Turtle* and *Phœnix*. / Done by the best and chiefeft of our / moderne writers, with their names sub- / scribed to their particular workes: / neuer before extant. / And (now first) consecrated by them all generally, / to the loue and merite of the true-noble Knight, / Sir Iohn Salisburie. / *Dignum laude virum Musa vetat mori.* / [Device] / MDCI. /

Then follow poems signed "Vatum Chorus" (two, Z<sub>2</sub>, Z<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup>), "Ignoto" (Z<sub>3</sub>),<sup>1</sup> "William Shake-speare" (Z<sub>3</sub><sup>v</sup>-Z<sub>4</sub><sup>v</sup>), "John Marston" (2A<sub>1</sub>-2A<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup>), "George Chapman" (2A<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup>), "Ben Johnson" (two, 2A<sub>3</sub>-2B<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup>, 2B<sub>1</sub><sup>v</sup>-2B<sub>2</sub>). HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS (*Some Account*, 1865, p. 23) believed that the "introductory poem, written in the name of all the writers [i. e. Vatum Chorus], may possibly have been submitted to Shakespeare, and received a touch or two of alteration from his pen." From the appearance of Sh.'s lines in the book he thought (p. 5) it "natural to conclude that Chester was an intimate friend" of Sh.'s. GROSART, editing Chester in 1878, suggested (p. lxi) that Jonson was "Vatum Chorus." NEWDIGATE (*Jonson's Poems*, 1936, p. ix) agrees, but adds, "It is possible that one or more of the other *vates*—Chapman, perhaps, and Marston—also had a hand in writing them."

In 1611 the old sheets of Chester's book were reissued with a new title-page by a different publisher:

[Ornament] / THE / Anuals [*sic*] of great / Brittain. / OR, / A MOST EXCEL- / lent Monument, wherein may be / *seene all the antiquities of this*

<sup>1</sup> "It is tempting to think that 'Ignoto' may be John Donne," "Ignoto might indeed be [Henry] Goodere himself, but he seems generally to have avouched his work by his initials."—NEWDIGATE, *T. L. S.*, Oct. 24, 1936, p. 862.

*King- / dome, to the fatisfaction both of the / Vniuerfities, or any other place  
ftir- / red with Emulation of long / continuance. / Excellently figured out in a  
worthy Poem. / [Device, McKerrow 310] / LONDON / Printed for  
MATHEW LOWNES. / 1611. /*

The only copy known is in the British Museum.

For more than a century after 1601 no references or allusions of any kind have been found to the *P. & T.* apart from the mere editions in which it was printed.<sup>1</sup> Its third appearance in print was in *Poems Written by Wil. Shake-speare. Gent.*, 1640, sigs. K6<sup>v</sup>-K7<sup>v</sup>, where it follows another untitled lyric of Sh.'s, "Take, O take those lips away." LINTOTT in 1709 and 1711 did not know, or in any case did not reprint, the *P. & T.* But from the 1640 volume it made its way into GILDON'S 1710 collection, and from one or the other of these sources, directly or indirectly, it reappeared in many later editions of Sh.'s poems.<sup>2</sup> In MALONE'S ed. 1780 the poem was reproduced directly from Chester's book of 1601, but with the spelling and punctuation modernized and with a few other editorial changes. Oddly enough, Malone gave it no title but printed it as poem XX of the *P. P.*; and, more oddly still, QUILLER-COUCH (*Adventures*, 1896, p. 39) says that the *P. P.* "contains twenty-one numbers [see p. 532, above], besides that lofty dirge, so unapproachably solemn," the *P. & T.* In his eds. 1790 and 1821 MALONE, omitting two other *P. P.* poems, changed XX to XVIII, and those two numbers enable one to tell at a glance when later editors follow, as many of them do follow, Malone at first or second hand. Only six of the editions later than 1780 that I have collated restore in l. 31 the original wording that Malone had corrupted (see also l. 31 n.). DRAKE (*Sh. and his Times*, 1817, I, 728) calls the *P. & T.* "the twentieth poem" in the *P. P.*, and as such it was printed in ANDERSON'S *Works of the British Poets*, 1793, vol. II; in the 1795 (JEFFERY), 1797 (COOKE), and 1806 *Poems*; in CHALMERS'S *Works of the English Poets*, 1810, vol. V; in the 1822 *Sonnets* and the 1825 *Poems*; and in HARNES'S *Shakspeare*, 1825, vol. VIII. BOSWELL (1821), BARRY CORNWALL (1843), and BELL (1855) make it poem XVIII, while without any number at all it is printed at the end of HUMPHREYS'S edition of the *P. P.*, 1894 (pp. 29-32). It is curious that, so far as I can discover, the two Boston editions of 1807<sup>3</sup> were the first to give the poem a title, "The

<sup>1</sup> Because of the scarcity of such references attention may be called to Edward Jerningham's *The Sh. Gallery*, 1791 (written in praise of John Boydell's collection of Sh. pictures), where, above the note "See the Poems.—'The Passionate Pilgrim,' at the end," the *P. & T.* is mentioned in the following terms (p. 22):

See where the Birds forsake the realms of air,  
And to yon melancholy spot repair;  
Where press the bier those images of love,  
The radiant Phenix and the faithful Dove:  
Just o'er the summit of the funeral pyre,  
Wak'd by the gale, ascends the sacred fire. . . .

<sup>2</sup> See p. 609, below.

<sup>3</sup> I. e. in *Poems* and in *Works*, vol. IX. The Boston *Poems* of 1809 is a re-issue of the poems from the 1807 vol. IX with a new title-page.

Phoenix and the Turtle." One of these, with the imprint of OLIVER and MUNROE, Boston, bears on its title-page the phrase "First American Edition." Actually the first American edition, in vol. VIII of *The Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare*, Philadelphia, 1796, follows Malone's 1790 text and hence prints the *P. & T.* as the eighteenth poem of the *P. P.* The Boston title is adopted by, among others, the GLOBE, WHITE (1883), ROLFE, OXFORD, HERFORD, DOWDEN, NEILSON, and YALE editions. Other editors—as COLLIER, HUDSON, DYCE, STAUNTON, WHITE (1865), HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS, CLARK and WRIGHT (1866, 1893), DELIUS, BULLEN, POOLER, RIDLEY, and KITTREDGE—omit the second *the*; PORTER prefers "Phoenix and Turtle"; while KNIGHT uses the title in DYCE's Aldine edition (1832), "Verses among the Additional Poems to Chester's Love's Martyr, 1601."<sup>1</sup> To cite a few German translations, the poem appears in the *P. P.* as XX in those made by BAUERNFELD and SCHUMACHER (1827), REGIS (*Sh.-Almanach*, 1836),<sup>2</sup> KÖRNER (1838), WAGNER (1840), ORTLEPP (1840, 1843), JORDAN (1861), NEIDHARDT (1870), and FLORENS (1920). VON MAUNTZ's translation was first published in an article on the Southampton theory of the *Sonnets* in the *Jahrbuch*, 1893, XXVIII, 311 f., and then in the middle of the *Sonnets* in his 1894 edition of *Sh.'s Gedichte*, pp. 201–203. The *P. & T.* appears also in the French translation of *Sh.* by HUGO (1866), the Spanish of the MARQUÉS DE DOS HERMANAS (1877) and of MARÍN (1929?), the Catalan of M. MORERA Y GALICIA (1917),<sup>3</sup> the Dutch of BURGERSDIJK (1888), the Russian of VENGEROV (1904), and the Bohemian of KLÁŠTERSKÝ (1925), to give only a few important examples.

In addition to establishing the text MALONE gave elaborate explanatory annotations. But for about a century the English and American editors ordinarily printed these difficult lines with little or no explanation. Later annotators show considerable indebtedness to Malone.

## AUTHENTICITY

MALONE (ed. 1780, p. 732) thought there was "no room to doubt of the genuineness of this little poem," and most of his immediate successors—like apparently all his predecessors—agreed. But skeptics soon appeared. WHITE (ed. 1865, p. 260), unconvinced by the attribution to *Sh.*, concluded that "the style . . . is at least a happy imitation of his, especially in the bold and original use of epithet." FLEAY (*Sh. Manual*, 1876, p. 8) somewhat non-committally remarked: "In 1601 his [*Sh.*'s] name is attached to a poem in *Love's Martyr* . . . and, which is much more important, his father dies." FURNIVALL (ed. 1877, p. xxxvi) wrote that the *P. & T.* "first appeared, with Shakspeare's name to it . . . in 1601. It is no doubt spurious." Almost simultaneously DOWDEN (*Shakspeare*, 1877, p. 112) considered *Sh.*'s authorship "in a high degree doubtful," though later he, like Fleay and Furnivall, changed his mind. ROLFE (ed. 1883, p. 15), following the lead of White and Furnivall, thought the poem "of doubtful authorship, and the date . . . equally uncertain." But in the

<sup>1</sup> *A Lover's Complaint & The Phoenix and Turtle* is the title of no. VI of the *Sh.* Head Press Booklets (Stratford-on-Avon, 1906).

<sup>2</sup> Reprinted in ALBERT RITTER's *Der unbekanntte Sh.* (Berlin, 1923).

<sup>3</sup> See PAR, *Sh. en la Literatura Española*, 1935, II, 215.

*Literary World*, March 24, 1883, p. 96, he declared that "the poem is clearly Shakespeare's," and in two succeeding issues (May 19, June 2, pp. 161 f., 181) quoted FURNIVALL as having said in a letter, "Alas, that 'spurious' . . . was a mistake for 'genuine.' I've no doubt that the poem is Shakspeare's," and DOWDEN as confessing, "I have long since given up my doubts as to" the *P. & T.* In 1890 Rolfe (*Poems*, p. 15) spoke of the poem as "almost certainly Shakespeare's." Meanwhile KOCH (Sh.'s *Leben*, 1884, p. 134) had expressed the opinion that "on internal and external evidence Shakespeare's authorship can be neither denied nor recognized as certain"; but his compatriot, SACHS (*Jahrbuch*, 1890, XXV, 176), insisting that "we have no certainty at all about the authenticity of the poem," rebuked HÖHNEN for assigning it without evidence to Sh. in his work on *Sh.'s P. P.*, 1867. In the first edition of the *Life* (1898, pp. 183 f.) LEE characterized the *P. & T.* as Sh.'s "alleged contribution," adding, "Happily Shakespeare wrote nothing else of like character,"<sup>1</sup> but he lost his doubts in subsequent editions. SAINTSBURY (*History of English Prosody*, 1908, II, 66) called it "doubtfully Shakespeare's as far as proof goes," REIMER (*Der Vers in Sh.s nicht-dramatischen Werken*, 1908, p. x) had a similar view, while MATHEW (*Image of Sh.*, 1922, pp. 114 f.) qualified his comments on the poem with "if it is his," and the like. In 1931 SHAHANI (see pp. 579 f., below) rejected Sh.'s authorship and tentatively favored John Fletcher.

On the other hand, in 1886 FLEAY (*Chronicle History*, p. 44), bolder than in 1876, had come to believe that "the appearance of Shakespeare's name, as fellow-contributor to Chester's *Love's Martyr* with Jonson, Marston, and Chapman, marks the conclusion of the theatrical quarrel, and the reconciliation of all the principal combatants, except Dekker." To BULLEN (ed. 1907, p. 451) "its authenticity is unquestionable," and such is the opinion of NEILSON and THORNDIKE (*Facts*, 1913, p. 156), who note that the poem has "been sometimes rejected as unworthy, but there is no other evidence against the ascription" to Sh. In his own edition of Sh. NEILSON (ed. 1906, p. 1201) had written: "The ascription to Shakespeare is generally, though not universally, accepted, such scepticism as exists being usually based upon the absence among his acknowledged works of anything with precisely the same characteristics."

The most determined attack on the authenticity of the poem—"hitherto accepted without question, though with small gratitude"—is in ROBERTSON'S *Sh. Canon*, 1925 (pt. III, pp. 105-112), where Chapman is said to be the author. Robertson insists (pp. 106-108): "It is Chapmanese in spirit, in form, in theme, in diction, in vocabulary, in crudity, in convulsive infelicity, in alternate terseness and circumlocution, in force and in febleness. In the opening stanza it executes a rhetorical collapse which recurs in nearly every quatrain to the close, the final rhyme being a flat makeshift in the manner of so many of Chapman's. . . . For the assertion that it is Shakespeare's, we have simply the uncommented testimony of the publisher of LOVE'S MARTYR, who puts the signature 'WILLIAM SHAKE-SPEARE' after the 'Threnos' [which, Robertson adds in a note, is printed as a separate piece]. . . . The phoenix is a Chapman property; and so is the turtle; and the bizarre notion of figuring a dead husband

<sup>1</sup> A remark which F. A. MUMBY (*Publishing and Bookselling*, 1930, p. 103) quotes with approval.

and wife by a he-dove and a she-phoenix is quite in keeping with his artistic methods. [But this notion was followed by Chester and is adopted by Jonson and Marston as well as by Sh. and Chapman.] . . . Interpretation [of the second stanza] may be sought in Chapman's EPICEDUM, where we may get the clue that the shrieking harbinger and foul precurrer of the fiend is the 'fierce Rhamnusia,' the 'grim fury' who saw, fast by, the blood-affecting fever of Prince Henry, and, accompanied on her chariot by 'infernal Death,' hauls up from Hell 'the horrid monster, fierce Echidna called,' who functions as the fatal fiend. A mere owl foreboding death seems inadequate to the epithets." He gives (pp. 108-110) various examples of words and ideas that to him suggest Chapman, and concludes (pp. 110 f., 112): "The judicial reader will admit that in the PHOENIX AND THE TURTLE we either have Chapman's work or an astonishingly laborious imitation of him. . . . It is critically thinkable that Shakespeare wrote the 'Threnos,' which is separated from the rest of the piece by a printer's ornament, and to which, thus separated, his name is put. It is credible only by traditionary faith that he wrote the whole."<sup>1</sup>

Traditionary faith has, in the main, stood firm. To be sure, POEL (*Prominent Points*, 1919, Table 1) asserts that Sh.'s authorship of the poem is "unproved"; but almost no later scholars have agreed with him. For instance, ALDEN (*Shakespeare*, 1922, p. 117) admits that "the style of the elegy is unlike any known work of Shakespeare's, in its emphasis on both symmetry of form and metaphysical processes of thought," but decides that "there is no convincing reason for rejecting it." ADAMS (*Life*, 1923, pp. 335-342) without any doubts accepts it as authentic. BROOKE (*Sh. Songs*, 1929, p. 152) says "there is little reason to doubt its authenticity," and CHAMBERS (*William Sh.*, 1930, I, 549 f.) sees no reason at all. The poem is not named in PARROTT'S *William Sh.*, 1934, a fact that very likely signifies not so much suspicion of its genuineness as dependence on WYNDHAM'S edition (1898) of the poems, where (because of its unimportance) it is omitted. In the most recent edition of Sh., KITTREDGE'S (1936, p. 1492), the *P. & T.* is called "unquestionably genuine."

#### THE DATE OF COMPOSITION

The date of composition has come in for practically no discussion. VON MAUNTZ in 1893, as is shown below, giving a symbolical interpretation of the poem, first dated it 1595-1596 and then, apparently, 1593. But his reasons are purely fanciful. Likewise MASSON, sometime before 1895 (*Sh. Personally*, 1914, p. 92), declared that Sh.'s verses may belong to any date between 1593, "if not earlier," and 1601. The evidence clearly is against him, and it is difficult to see how anyone could believe the *P. & T.* earlier than *Venus*. The views of BOAS (*Sh. and his Predecessors*, 1896, p. 163) are not plainly expressed: "The fine verses [27 f.] describing the 'mutual flame' of the two birds . . . are quite in Shakspeare's early lyrical manner." Among more recent scholarly

<sup>1</sup> Considerably earlier BARTLETT (*Catalogue*, 1917, pp. 9, 13) had asserted that Sh. wrote only the "Threnos." Her words are, "[There is] a poem called 'Threnos' and signed by him [Sh.] in Chester's 'Love's Martyr,' 1601." "In the supplement . . . is one [poem] entitled 'Threnos' and signed by Shakespeare."



pronouncements, LEE's (*Life*, 1916, p. 272) stands almost alone: "The internal evidence scarcely justifies the conclusion that Shakespeare's poem . . . was penned for Chester's book. It must have been either devised in an idle hour with merely abstract intention, or it was suggested by the death within the poet's own circle of a pair of devoted lovers." But he gives no details about *when* he supposes the lines to have been composed. Likewise without details POEL (*Prominent Points*, 1919, Table 1) dates them 1599. By far the majority of scholars believe that the *P. & T.* was written as a sort of "commendatory poem" expressly for Chester's book just before the latter was published in 1601. FLEAY (*Chronicle History*, 1886, p. 44) says that the "new compositions, of seuerall moderne Writers" mark the end of the war of the theaters and hence prove that Chester's volume cannot "have been issued earlier than March 1601-2."

#### CRITICISM

Concerning the literary merits of the *P. & T.* opinion has varied widely. EMERSON (*Parnassus*, 1874, p. vi) found the poem "quaint, and charming in diction, tone, and allusions, and in its perfect metre and harmony," and he added: "I consider this piece a good example of the rule, that there is a poetry for bards proper, as well as a poetry for the world of readers. This poem, if published for the first time, and without a known author's name, would find no general reception.<sup>1</sup> Only the poets would save it." How prophetic that remark was, later extracts will show. In 1879 the distinguished poet, LANIER (*Sh. and his Forerunners*, 1902, I, 94 f.), for example, admired "Shakspere's singular threnody . . . where the Phoenix represents constancy . . . and the Turtle-dove represents true love. . . . [The poem] has more complex ideas in it, for the number of words, than perhaps any other poem in our language, and it takes some diligence of mind . . . to make out all its meaning. . . . For a certain far-withdrawn and heart-conquering tenderness, we have not another poem like it." And the present poet-laureate, MASEFIELD (*William Sh.*, 1911, pp. 249 f.), even more enthusiastically declares: "This strange, very beautiful poem was published in 1601. . . . In dark and noble verse it describes a spiritual marriage, suddenly ended by death. It is too strange to be the fruit of a human sorrow. It is the work of a great mind trying to express in unusual symbols a thought too subtle and too intense to be expressed in any other way. Spiritual ecstasy is the only key to works of this kind. To the reader without that key it can only be so many strange words set in a noble rhythm for no apparent cause. Poetry moves in many ways. . . . This poem gives to a flock of thoughts about the passing of truth and beauty the mystery and vitality of birds, who come from a far country, to fill the mind with their crying."

Editors and other more or less professional scholars seldom indulge in praise of the *P. & T.* HUDSON (ed. 1856, p. 220) says it "relishes somewhat" of Sh.'s "cunning style"; HERFORD in 1899 (p. 504) considered it "a trifle, thrown off perhaps at the urgency of a resolute Album-maker," though in 1923 (*Sketch*, p. 24) he refers to it as a "curious piece of allegory and symbolism

<sup>1</sup> [GREENWOOD (*Sh. Problem Restated*, 1908, pp. 522 f.) agrees with this statement, adding, "Anything that bears the signature of 'Shakespeare' is, of course, perfection in the eyes of some of his worshippers."]

which mystifies many readers"; and GEORGE STRONACH (*N. & Q.*, Oct. 3, 1903, p. 274) frankly damns it as "doggerel." LUCE (*Handbook*, 1906, p. 101) writes that Sh.'s "effort is not without charm" and still more sympathetic is the view of SAINTSBURY (*C. H. E. L.*, 1910, V, 262): "The extreme metaphysicality of parts of it . . . [as ll. 37 f.] is by no means inconceivable in the Shakespeare of *Love's Labour's Lost* and of some of the *Sonnets*. The opening lines and some of those that follow, are exceedingly beautiful, and the contrast of melody between the different metres of the body of the poem and the concluding *threnos* is 'noble and most artful.'" But the chorus of faint praise is soon resumed. Thus PORTER (ed. 1912, p. 284) tepidly describes Sh.'s lines as "singular and mystical"; W. C. HAZLITT (*Shakespeare*, 1912, p. 233), as "obviously early work—inferior even to the *Sonnets*"; BROWN (ed. 1913, p. xxvi), as "an ingenious exercise"; BRANDL (*Shakespeare*, 1922, p. 151), as an occasional poem of obscure meaning, lamenting the death of a pair of lovers; ADAMS (*Life*, 1923, p. 341), as "a graceful funeral song"; RIDLEY (ed. 1935, p. 172), as "this trifle, for trifle it is." RYLANDS (in Granville-Barker and Harrison's *Companion to Sh. Studies*, 1934, p. 111) sees in the *P. & T.* "the quality of a proposition in Euclid and of a piece of music. It is pure, abstract, symbolical and complete."

Totally unexpected is the rhapsody of MURRY in 1922 (*Discoveries*, 1924, pp. 22–26, 43),<sup>1</sup> where idolatry of Sh. reaches its apex: "We should distinguish between the poetry of Shakespeare and Shelley somewhat after this manner. Shakespeare, far more than Shelley, actually does submit the shadows of things to the desires of the mind. There is an objectivity, a substantiality, in Shakespeare that Shelley did not achieve. And, again, while we are conscious in both of 'the desire of the mind,' in Shelley it appears much more as a desire perpetually unsatisfied, even as a desire by nature incapable of any satisfaction, 'the desire of the moth for the star.' We realise the difference most clearly if we consider the one sole poem in which Shakespeare's inspiration seems strangely akin to Shelley's. *The Phoenix and the Turtle* is platonic and mystical; it can be compared to Shelley's *Sensitive Plant*. The only reason why we do not think immediately of Shelley when we read it is that, in spite of all apparent similarity of conception, the quality of Shakespeare's poem is absolutely different from that of anything Shelley wrote. Shakespeare is secure and serene; in his poem we can detect no tremor of the agitation by which Shelley is incessantly disturbed. *The Phoenix and the Turtle* is mysterious, but it is crystal-clear. We can express the difference only by saying that what Shelley longed for, Shakespeare at that moment possessed. It would not be easy to say with confidence what *The Phoenix and the Turtle* is about. On the face of it, it is a requiem over the death of a phoenix and a turtle-dove, who are the symbols of a love made perfect by refinement from all earthly passion and become virginal. There is surely no more astonishing description of the high-

<sup>1</sup> "Inspired," says ROBERTSON (*Sh. Canon*, 1925, pt. III, p. 105), "by the deliverances of Emerson and Grosart." "It is to be feared," he adds (p. 111), "that even the poetic status of Emerson, Dr. Grosart, and Mr. Murry will fail to bear out the last sentence [of Emerson]. . . . 'The poets' have been mortally reticent on the subject."

est attainable by human love. . . . But the poem floats high above the plane of intellectual apprehension: what we understand is only a poor simulacrum of what we feel—feel with some element of our being which chafes in silence against the bars of sense. And in the poet's own imagination it is Reason itself which makes and chants the dirge, Reason baffled by the sight of perfect individuality in perfect union. . . . And we feel, in some inexplicable sense, that the poet's claim that Reason bows its head in this poem is a true one. There is an absolute harmony in *The Phoenix and the Turtle* which can easily appear to our heightened awareness as the necessary gesture of Reason's deliberate homage to a higher power. Through it we have a glimpse of a mode of experience wholly beyond our own, and touch the finality of a consummation. This veritably, we might say if we had the courage of our imaginations, is the music of the spheres; this is indeed the hymn of that celestial love which 'moves the sun and the other stars.' For reasons which evade expression in ordinary speech, *The Phoenix and the Turtle* is the most perfect short poem in any language. It is *pure* poetry in the loftiest and most abstract meaning of the words: that is to say, it gives us the highest experience which it is possible for poetry to give, and it gives it without intermission. Here for once, it seems, Shakespeare had direct command over an essential source of inspiration; here he surrendered himself completely to a kind of experience, and to the task of communicating a kind of experience, which elsewhere he conveys to us only through 'the shadow of things'; for a moment he reveals himself as an inhabitant of a strange kingdom wherein he moves serene and with mastery. Beside the unearthly purity, the unfaltering calm of this poem, even the most wonderful poetry of his dramas can sometimes appear to us as 'stained with mortality.' . . . [P. 43] There is a poetry that may almost be called absolute. *The Phoenix and the Turtle* belongs to this kind of poetry. It is the direct embodiment, through symbols which are necessarily dark, of a pure, comprehensive and self-satisfying experience, which we may call, if we please, an immediate intuition into the hidden nature of things. It is inevitable that such poetry should be obscure, mystical, and strictly unintelligible: it is too abstract for our comprehension, too essential, too little mediated. There is not much poetry of this kind; because it is too personal and too esoteric to gain the general ear. And it necessarily hovers between the condition of being the highest poetry of all and not being poetry at all. But, wherever in the scale we place it, it gives us a clue to the nature of poetry itself."

For a parallel to Murry's enthusiasm one must turn to the Hindu critic, Shahani, who is quoted on pp. 578-580, below.

#### INTERPRETATION

Innumerable attempts have been made to explain the meaning of the *P. & T.* Among them are such absurdities as the effort of J. F. FORBIS (*Shakespearean Enigma*, 1924, pp. 200-206) to prove it Sh.'s dirge for the failure, caused by his over-indulgence in wine, of his poetical aspirations; and of ALFRED DODD (*Personal Poems of Francis Bacon*, 1931, pp. 34-38) to convince his readers that it is Bacon's Death Song, prophesying "that after the black crow of slander has gone among the generations of men for three hundred years the Poet will rise once more revealing his personality to his country-

men."<sup>1</sup> Perhaps here, too, should be mentioned HENRY BROWN (*Sh.'s Patrons*, 1912, p. 15), who remarks that—Mighty Prophet! Seer blest!—Sh.'s ll. 53–55, 62–64 (printed in 1601) “appear allusively to refer to the death of Elizabeth” (1603), and SYDNEY KENT (*People in Sh.'s Sonnets*, 1915, p. 13), who explains that “it is Lord Wriothesley who is intended in Shakspeare's threnody, called ‘The Phoenix and the Turtle,’ Shakspeare being the Turtle, while Lord Wriothesley is the Phoenix. The poem is fanciful, and, as I think, beautiful.” Scarcely less far-fetched are the interpretations given by certain writers of fiction—though as fiction they may be pleasant enough.<sup>2</sup> HARVEY O'HIGGINS tells in “The Fogull Murder” (*Detective Duff Unravels It*, 1929) of George Sylvanus Fogull, a member of the English Department at Columbia University on a salary that “would have made any ambitious burglar blush.” Fogull believed (pp. 245 f.) that he had discovered Sh.'s meaning. “He was writing a monograph on ‘The Phoenix and the Turtle’ to show how it derived from Chaucer's ‘Parlement of Foules’ and to display his own astounding knowledge of the Elizabethan [*sic*] literature of England, France and Italy. This monograph was to add new laurels to his academic fame. He had been an authority on Milton. He had written a thesis on the classical allusions in Tennyson. Now he was deserting the classics for the romance languages and he was nervous in his new field. He had come to Whytesand Beach with a trunkful of notes, quotations, cross-references and literary parallels, and he had dedicated his summer to the solitary labor of stewing down this hash of scholarship into the fluent extract of erudition which he was to pour out in his book.” Unhappily for scholarship, Fogull was murdered before his hash could stew—and before he had read the article of Fairchild mentioned below. The COMTESSE DE CHAMBRUN, in *My Sh., Risel*, 1935, explains the poem as a dirge for Anne Lyne, an unfortunate woman executed on Feb. 27, 1601, with a seminary priest, Mark Barkworth (or Boseworth), whom she previously had harbored. In the poem Sh. (pp. 275 f.) “summoned all free and high souls to the obsequies of the victims of oppression, but forbade the Queen and Topcliffe, or any other who was borne on tyrant wings, to approach the mourners. He invoked the presence of King James—royal Eagle—to bury with obsequious rites these emblems of love and constancy.” Identifying the “shrieking harbinger” (p. 276 n.) “either with Popham, the ‘hanging justice,’ or more probably with his henchman Topcliffe,” the “treble-dated crow” with Archbishop John Whitgift, Mme. de Chambrun remarks (p. 281 n.) that “until now critics have vainly searched for the tragic event recorded” by Sh.<sup>3</sup>

Scholarship, as will be seen, frequently rivals fiction. Few early editors or commentators seem to have been concerned with the meaning of the poem.

<sup>1</sup> W. F. C. WIGSTON (*Bacon Sh.*, 1888, p. xvi) had described *Love's Martyr* itself as “the product of a secret [Rosicrucian] society of men, contributing and assisting to one common end—the plays of Lord Bacon. . . . Everything in that work hints at secrecy, for fear of envy.”

<sup>2</sup> CUNLIFFE OWEN's *Phoenix and the Dove*, 1933, quotes ll. 49–52 on its title-page but actually deals with personages, real and imaginary, from the Sonnets.

<sup>3</sup> She had announced her “discovery” in her *Essential Documents*, 1934, pp. 50 f.

Notable exceptions were REGIS and JORDAN. The former (*Sh.-Almanach*, Berlin, 1836, p. 351) confessed: "What death, whether historic or poetic, is the basis of this threnody, and whether its author is Shakspeare himself or another poet, remains problematical. . . . One may almost believe that these verses were perhaps originally intended for the epilogue of an allegorical masque." The latter (Sh.'s *Gedichte*, Berlin, 1861) prints his translation not in the text of the *P. P.* but in the Notes because (p. 419) "in spite of all efforts I don't understand it. It seems to be an occasional poem on the obsequies of a dead childless married couple. Did this couple perhaps belong to a society whose members conferred birds' names on one another? Is Shakespeare himself perhaps meant by the swan?" Impetus to interpretation—and guesswork—came from a casual remark of EMERSON'S in the preface to his anthology *Par-nassus*, 1874, pp. v f.: "I should like to have the Academy of Letters propose a prize for an essay on Shakspeare's poem, '*Let the bird of loudest lay*,' and the '*Threnos*' with which it closes; the aim of the essay being to explain, by a historical research into the poetic myths and tendencies of the age in which it was written, the frame and allusions of the poem. . . . To unassisted readers, it would appear to be a lament on the death of a poet, and of his poetic mistress."

GROSART, editing *Robert Chester's "Loves Martyr"* for the New Sh. Society in 1878, tried to satisfy Emerson's curiosity: "[Pp. xliii-xlv] Who were meant by the 'Phoenix' and the 'Turtle-dove' of these Poems? I must hold it as demonstrated, that the 'Phoenix' was Elizabeth and the 'Turtle Dove' Essex. . . . Our interpretation . . . is the more weighty and important, in that it for the first time enables us to understand Shakespeare's priceless and *unique* 'Phoenix and Turtle' . . . [which] has universal elements in it at once of thinking, emotion and form. . . . I discern a sense of personal heart-ache and loss in these sifted and attuned stanzas, unutterably precious. . . . It seems to me unmistakable that ROBERT CHESTER, as a follower not to say partizan of Essex, designed his *Love's Martyr* as *his* [i. e. Chester's] message on the consummation of the tragedy of his [i. e. Essex's] beheading. . . . [P. lvi. In the additional poems] we have SHAKESPEARE, BEN JONSON, GEORGE CHAPMAN, JOHN MARSTON and others (anonymous), siding (so-to-say) with Robert Chester in doing honour to Essex. . . . [Pp. lviii f.] The fact of such a contribution by him [Sh.] is, in itself, noticeable. For while Ben Jonson and Chapman and others contemporary lavished their 'Commendatory Verses,' Shakespeare, with this solitary exception, wrote none as he sought none. This surely imparts special significance to the exception. Internally, the 'Phoenix and Turtle' is on the same lines with *Love's Martyr*. To my mind there is pathos in the lament over the 'Tragique Scene.' . . . In the *Threnos*, Shakespeare regards not the beheaded Essex only, but his 'Phoenix' too as dead. . . . All this, be it noted, fits in with the 'allegorical shadowing' of *Love's Martyr*; for therein BOTH die. . . . [Pp. lx f.] There might indeed be policy and wariness alike in Chester and Shakespeare in such representation. Let the reader take with him the golden key that by the 'Phoenix' Shakespeare intended Elizabeth, and by the 'Dove' Essex, and the 'Phoenix and Turtle,' hitherto regarded as a mere enigmatical epicedial lay . . . will be recognized as of rarest interest. I cannot say that I see my way through it all—st. 5 . . . I do not quite understand; but it is a mere accident of the poem[!]. But I do see that Shakespeare

went with Robert Chester in grief for Essex, and in sad-heartedness that the 'truth of love' had not been accomplished." Grosart's "evidence" has been thoroughly discredited by Furnivall and others.<sup>1</sup> FURNIVALL (*New Sh. Society's Transactions*, 1877-9, pp. 454 f.) paraphrased some of it thus: "Elizabeth having had Essex's head cut off, Shakspeare writes her a poem saying, in fact, that this head-off-cutting was an entire delusion; the truth was, that she really so lov'd Essex, was so one with him, that she died with him, was his wife, and only had no children by him because of their 'married chastity.'" He decided that "the muddle of Chester's poem seems to me too great to be untangled. But if the poets whose *Essaies* follow his, meant Elizabeth by their Phoenix, I believe their Turtle-Dove was a mythic man, invented to live and die with her."<sup>2</sup> Nearly all later scholars have mentioned Grosart's theory only to ridicule it,<sup>3</sup> although PORTER (ed. 1912, p. 287) grants that the *P. & T.* may have "an undercurrent of allusion to Elizabeth and Essex," while C. R. HAINES (*Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1922, p. 4) apparently adopts Grosart's views when he remarks that "Shakespeare seems to have had an admiration for Essex, which he showed in 'Henry V' and in the 'Phoenix and Turtle.'" "

HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS (*Outlines*, 1882, p. 126) gave a cautious and general explanation: "[Sh.'s] is a remarkable poem in which he makes a notice of the obsequies of the phoenix and turtle-dove subservient to the delineation of spiritual union. It is generally thought that Chester himself intended a personal allegory, but, if that be the case, there is nothing to indicate that Shakespeare participated in the design, nor even that he had endured the punishment of reading Love's Martyr." But DOWNING (*God in Sh.*, 1890, pp. 222 f.) found the *P. & T.* a biographical document paralleling the story of the *Sonnets*: "Shakspeare, woe-worn with love of the dark lady, woe-worn with love of his friend [the Earl of Pembroke], found at last the Ideal. But no sooner had he become reconciled and at one with it, than he perceived that it was necessary, in an imperfect world, to act in some measure contrary to it, to sacrifice the pure ideal of love to justice, and to sacrifice the pure ideal of art to a moral purpose. Hence he conceives that, in his case, the pure ideal, and his own life in it, have suffered actual, if only temporary death. For from the ashes of the pure ideal arises the practical ideal, which as it grows to maturity

<sup>1</sup> But in his *Fly-Leaves, or Additional Notes and Illustrations*, 1883, p. 60, GROSART refuses to admit defeat: "The proof already given I hold as absolutely untouched. Mr. Furnivall has not so much as mastered the elementary facts of the problem."\*

<sup>2</sup> In reprints of his *Leopold Sh.*, 1877, and in his *Royal Sh.*, n. d., XII, xxxv, FURNIVALL flatly says of the poem: "It refers to Queen Elizabeth and a mythic spouse, not Essex."

<sup>3</sup> The Baconians, like WALTER BEGLEY (*Is It Sh.?*, 1903, pp. 167, 288) and E. G. HARMAN ("*Impersonality*" of *Sh.*, 1925, pp. 111-122), are an exception. According to the former (p. 288), "the best scholars are agreed that the Phoenix=Elizabeth and the Turtle=Essex." The COMTESSE DE CHAMBRUN (*Sh. Actor-Poet*, p. 196) in 1927 was convinced that in the *P. & T.* Sh. "commemorated his loving admiration for Robert Devereux"; but by 1935, as shown above, she had changed her mind.

becomes the pure ideal again. For the present, he has adopted justice as rule of action, inspired doubtless by love, yet contrary to its idea. He therefore signs his name to the poem thus—'Wm. Shake-speare'—rather a cloudy discussion and a cloudier ending.

WYNDHAM (ed. 1898, p. 258) thought it "impossible to understand exactly what these poems [in Chester's book] are about. But it is interesting to note that they all contain attacks on Time and that they all draw on the catch-words of Platonism." Almost simultaneously LEE (*Life*, 1898, pp. 183 f.) was writing: "The poem may be a mere play of fancy without recondite intention, or it may be of allegorical import; but whether it bear relation to pending ecclesiastical, political, or metaphysical controversy, or whether it interpret popular grief for the death of some leaders of contemporary society, is not easily determined." In a footnote he suggested that it is a "fanciful adaptation" of Matthew Roydon's elegy on Sidney "without ulterior significance." This latter suggestion reappears in the text of his 1916 *Life* (p. 272): "[The] closest affinity [of the *P. & T.*] seems to lie with the imagery of Matthew Roydon's elegy on Sir Philip Sidney, where the turtle-dove and phoenix meet the swan and eagle at the dead hero's funeral, and there play rôles somewhat similar to those [of Sh.'s birds]." The elegy in question was first published in *The Phoenix Nest*, 1593 (ed. Rollins, 1931, pp. 9-16), and thence in Spenser's *Colin Clout* volume, 1595. In each it is anonymous, though Roydon's authorship is generally accepted.

DOWDEN, editing the *Poems* in 1903, wrote (p. lxi): "Shakspeare, like his fellow-poets, endeavours to do justice to the prescribed theme; his general intention is to celebrate the decease of two chaste lovers, who were perfectly united in an ideal passion; but he omits one motive of which Marston makes much—the birth of the new phoenix, ideal Love, from the ashes of the chaste and impassioned birds. If actual persons were allegorised, it must not be assumed that the fiery transmutation typifies death in the literal sense of the word."<sup>1</sup> But such conclusions were too tame for VON MAUNTZ. In 1893 (*Jahrbuch*, XXVIII, 308-310) he argued at length that the poem is complementary to the *Sonnets*, and is indeed "a symbolic representation of Shakespeare's estrangement" from the Friend, or the Earl of Southampton. The Phoenix is the earl, the Turtle-dove Sh. To the funeral obsequies of their friendship the bird of loudest lay invites all chaste birds, or good people, whereupon follow four stanzas with allusions to persons who are interested in the estrangement. Excluded are the shrieking harbinger, who helped bring it about, and all tyrant birds with the exception of the eagle, feathered king. This latter is a discreet, indirect reference to Queen Elizabeth, by which Sh. means, "You are indeed a tyrant, but I dare not fail to invite you, or show you my anger, because you *are* the queen." Ll. 13-16, on the swan, though somewhat obscure, are a reference to Elizabeth Vernon, who will sing the swan-song of her love for Southampton; and, in connection with *Sonnets* 33-35, they indicate that Sh.'s estrangement from the earl came in 1595 and that the poem was written about 1595-1596. Other over-ingenious details follow, as that ll. 17-20 on the

<sup>1</sup> A similar interpretation by DOWDEN appears also in Craig (ed. 1905, pp. xxvi f.).

"treble-dated crow" refer to Greene, who had called Sh. "an upstart crow." The interpretation is repeated in von Mauntz's edition of Sh.'s *Gedichte*, 1894, pp. 157 f., 319-322, with the added detail that Sh. made use of Ovid's *Amores*, II.vi, which begins, "Psittacus . . . Occidit—exequias ite frequenter, aves! Ite, piae volucres. . . . Omnes, quae liquido libratis in aere cursus, Tu tamen ante alios, turtur amice, dole! Plena fuit vobis omni concordia vita, Et stetit ad finem longa tenaxque fides."<sup>1</sup> The funeral obsequies, the selection of the dove as the representative of faithfulness, the unusual comparison of a bird's song to the sound of a trumpet, and still other smaller correspondences with Ovid cannot, he insists, be accidental; and the borrowing from the *Amores* merely reinforces his other arguments for a date of composition about 1595-1596. It will be seen that von Mauntz takes no account whatever of the part played by Chester's own book in Sh.'s *P. & T.*

Fantastic as his explanation is, he surpassed it in 1903 when, in his *Heraldik in Diensten der Sh.-Forschung* (pp. 163-311), acknowledging an indebtedness to BRANDL,<sup>2</sup> he argued that the poem (1601) is Sh.'s lament for the death of Marlowe (1593) and particularly for the loss of his great blank-verse. The various birds are suitably identified, the eagle as Spenser, in whose heraldic device that bird figured; the "treble-dated crow," for a similar reason, as Nashe; the owl as Harvey; the swan as Sh. This theory, which has met with no acceptance, was roughly assailed by FAIRCHILD (*E. S.*, 1904, XXXIV, 308-315). He writes (p. 313) that it "is absolutely without value. It does not explain a single difficult passage. It hangs by the merest thread of chance coincidence of external fact and in no respect upon anything embodied in the poem itself." Likewise WOLFGANG KELLER (*Jahrbuch*, 1903, XXXIX, 285) in a review confesses that he finds the poem altogether obscure, but that von Mauntz's theory removes none of the obscurity.

FAIRCHILD's own explanation appeared in 1904 (*E. S.*, XXXIII, 337-384). The *P. & T.* (pp. 346 f.) "belongs to that class of poems connected with the institution (real or otherwise) known as the Court of Love. It has a twofold source, stanzas (I-V) especially being suggested by Chaucer's poem *The Parlement of Foules*, part IV (ll. 323 to end); the remaining stanzas (VI-XVIII) being adapted to these from the emblem literature and conceptions of Shakespeare's period. . . . [P. 350] *The Parlement of Foules*, while unquestionably belonging to the Court of Love literature, departs in several respects from the set traditions. The prominence of birds 'as erotic symbols' is especially noticeable. The Court of Love commonly closed with a service sung by birds in honor of the God of Love, and this feature seems to have been selected as a prolific source for poetic material. It is that which affords the central situation in *The Phoenix and Turtle*. . . . [P. 376] The features which specially

<sup>1</sup> GREENWOOD (*Sh. Problem Restated*, 1908, p. 522) likewise cites the *Amores*, but with no reference to von Mauntz.

<sup>2</sup> But in his *Shakespeare*, 1922, pp. 151 f., Brandl calls the *P. & T.* an occasional poem of obscure meaning, lamenting the death of a pair of lovers. He adds that Sh., by allowing the poem to appear in a volume honoring Salisbury, an insignificant Maecenas, showed his gratitude to one who was a patron of poetry.



characterize the Court of Love . . . make it apparent . . . that this poem falls readily into this class. This is because the symbols employed in it, the peculiar manner of their arrangement, the subject itself, and the method of treatment, all harmonize with the dominant conceptions of the class as seen in their later development. This theory, moreover, affords a most inviting field for conjecture, which is not entirely unsupported by historical evidence. Courtly love is said by Mott to have been declared incompatible with marriage. That something of the conception came to Shakespeare as a lingering heritage, which was finally vitalized by the great preceptors of love, is not, perhaps, an altogether baseless supposition. . . . [Pp. 381 f.] The one indisputable fact . . . is that *The Phoenix and Turtle* is a poem of a common class and that that class is the Court of Love. Viewed in the light of this fact and of the evidence generally which has been presented, the logical *inference* is that Shakespeare, in company with Jonson, Chapman, Marston, and some unknown writer, contributed verses for a volume all of which were upon a conventional Court of Love subject, though not all written in precisely the same conventional manner. In the light of the evidence adduced, therefore, and of the prevalence of certain dominant conceptions, and of the common use of phrases and of such words as 'constancy,' 'rarity,' 'wonder,' 'urne,' etc., found in the companion poems, we conclude that *The Phoenix and Turtle* was written, possibly as a Valentine-poem (without explicit reference) to Sir John Salisbury, but most probably simply in compliance (such as is adequately paralleled) with a prevalent literary vogue, which encouraged the writing of Court of Love poems of a modified character; that it has no recondite meaning beyond that involved in the historic conditions of its production; that it contains no allusions either to the poet's own life or to that of another; and, finally, that it contains the confession of metaphysical conceptions only to the extent to which they would be implied by an emotional interest in a peculiar form of poetic activity, devoid, however, of any explicit intellectual formulation. . . . [Pp. 383 f.] [In Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*] we have the source of suggestion, in part, for Shakespeare's poem. The remainder . . . was doubtless adapted from the emblem literature and conceptions of the period. . . . On the assumption of emblems as completing the suggestion . . . [we acquire] a reasonable explanation of Shakespeare's departure from his usual style, as manifested in the peculiar Platonic and epigrammatic qualities of *The Phoenix and Turtle*. Conciseness was the cardinal virtue of emblems; and the subtleties of love afforded a subject of perennial interest. No other poem by Shakespeare possesses the same peculiar epigrammatic quality; and none is so manifestly indebted to emblems for its suggestions."

The interest and value of Fairchild's article are usually admitted by critics, even when they fail to accept all its conclusions. Thus BROWN (ed. 1913, p. xxvi) is of the opinion that in Sh.'s verses "one detects the influence of the conventions of the 'Courts of Love,' the Birds' Parliament, and the Platonic theories of the Renaissance"; LEE (*Life*, 1916, p. 272) asserts, "Chaucer's 'Parliament of Foules' and the abstruse symbolism of sixteenth-century emblem books are thought to be echoed in Shakespeare's lines"; and FEUILLERAT (ed. 1927, p. 184) agrees that "some of the resemblances with Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules* are striking enough," though he wonders "whether it is neces-

sary to find any particular source at all for Shakespeare's use of the different emblems of the allegory, for they were part of the symbolical language of the time."

Somewhat earlier—in the *Shrine*, May, 1902, pp. 34-37—DOWNING developed his 1890 thesis so as to give an abstruse explanation of the poem in terms of Sh.'s own philosophy: "Upon careful inspection of Shakespeare's poem, and of the poems by Marston and Chapman upon the same subject, it becomes clear that the Phoenix is symbol of the Ideal, and the Turtle symbol of the Idealist; and when one finds Chapman directly comparing himself to the Turtle, and making open profession of his devotion to the Phoenix or Ideal, it is strongly suggested thereby that Shakespeare also, in his poem, is making a less direct and open profession of idealistic faith, that the Phoenix is his Ideal also; and that he also sees himself in the Turtle. This should appear an interesting possibility, because it is not uncommonly thought—it is, indeed, the orthodox view—that Shakespeare, as a tranquil mirror of nature, had no ideal. The intimate spiritual relation of pseudo-identity described by Shakespeare as existing between the Turtle and Phoenix, the Idealist and the Ideal, must now inevitably recall to mind the similar relation of pseudo-identity represented by the poet as existing between himself and the beautiful youth of *The Sonnets*. Amid the various significance of *The Sonnets* have we, then, there Shakespeare figuring in person as the Turtle or Idealist, while his Phoenix or Ideal assumes human form as the beautiful youth? The question involves a prolonged examination of *The Sonnets*, but with resultant prolonged answer only, I think, in the affirmative. And the answer, with the many elucidations of the more spiritual meaning of *The Sonnets* which it involves, renders it not only certain that Shakespeare had an Ideal, but that his devotion to it was of the intense kind exemplified in the devotion of the Turtle to the Phoenix. But the spirit of comparison cannot stop at this point; the relations of the Turtle to the Phoenix inevitably suggest the relations of Orsino to Viola, of Ferdinand to Miranda, of Florizel to Perdita, even of Leontes to Hermione, and certainly of Posthumus to Imogen. And in all these cases it appears, upon examination, that the story of the Turtle and Phoenix, of the Idealist and his Ideal, is reproduced in human types. And the due consideration of these types, and of the plays in which they appear, leads to the conclusion that Shakespeare had not only an Ideal to which he was devoted, but that he thought much and long about it; that he had, in short, a philosophy of the Ideal, which in his works, with due regard to immediate pleasure to be afforded by them, he could only convey symbolically. Finally, the love of Shakespeare for his Ideal is to be found reflected in his works not symbolically alone. If you would seek its monument, Circumspice! We shall find him telling us himself that his works are a direct manifestation of his Ideal, wrought by him in devotion to it, and under its immediate inspiration. Thus the relations of the Phoenix and Turtle, the Ideal and Idealist, receive a supreme illustration. . . . Shakespeare's Phoenix or Ideal he characterises as—

'Beauty, truth and rarity,  
Grace in all simplicity.'

In *The Sonnets* he reduces these expressions to 'Fair, kind and true in one.' . . .

An Ideal thus constituted is the perfect, all-comprehensive, absolute Ideal of the human spirit."

Equally esoteric is J. M. (*Sh. Self-Revealed*, 1904), who (p. 114) "can explain the enigma of the 'sphinx.' The enigma of this poem and the enigma of the Sonnets are one. . . . [Sh.] was the lover—the Turtle Dove; he loved Beauty—the Phoenix; he died to posterity (as far as his own efforts to get Fame were concerned) in witness of the purity of his love—he was Love's Martyr. Whereas 'Ignoto,' Marston, Chapman, Jonson, write their 'new compositions on the first subject, viz., the "Phoenix and Turtle,"' with eyes fixed on Chester's poem, Shakespeare writes his with eyes fixed on his Sonnets." Further light is shed thus: "[P. 122] Since he began to write the Sonnets, in 1594—if not earlier,—Shakespeare had been struggling against what he considered his great failing—his passion for Fame. He felt that he ought to love the Beautiful and Good for its own sake. He felt that his thoughts of Fame prevented the perfecting of his love and perception of Truth and Beauty. At length an occasion presented itself which affected him so greatly as to cause him to come to close quarters with this enemy of his highest self, and put to the proof whether Love of Beauty or Lust of Fame were to prevail. About 1600–1601, Chester (evidently one of his friends), brought to him the poem 'Love's Martyr.' . . . [Pp. 123 f.] Chester's request brought to a climax Shakespeare's struggle against his consuming passion: it was in no sudden heat of enthusiasm that the 'Phoenix and Turtle' was written. . . . That struggle we shall not attempt to picture. We shall merely point out that he was the man who had written of himself and his work . . . [Sonnets 62]. None knew better than he—none knew so well—of the Beauty and Truth that was enshrined in his work; and how wishful he was too to receive the credit of it, let the *passion* in this sonnet witness. It was through being intensely human that he so thoroughly understood human nature. But great though his passion, his faithfulness to his ideal proved greater. What a compound was he: what intellect; how tender a conscience; what passion; what firmness of will! Such a trial as he had gone through, and such a resolve as he had formed, must have had a permanent effect on him; and that effect is shown in his plays. That a great and sudden change in Shakespeare's self occurred about 1601, immediately after which year begins the great series of tragedies, has long been recognised. The decision registered in the 'Phoenix and Turtle' was the cause. . . . [P. 126] 'Hamlet' was the first play written after the 'Phoenix and Turtle,' and it reflects the experiences through which the writer had just passed."

WOLFF (*Shakespeare*, 1907, I, 280 f.) objects to all attempts at giving the poem a metaphysical, spiritual, or political interpretation.<sup>1</sup> They seem to him profitless; and, indeed, the *P. & T.* deserves mention, not for any intrinsic value, but because it shows a side of Sh.'s character otherwise unknown, its interest lying simply in the fact that Sh. made use of the allegorical stuff common in the medieval bestiaries. POOLER (ed. 1911, pp. xci f.) also has little regard for symbolical explanations: "After all, it is possible that Chester meant what he said on his title-page, and in his book. The Phoenix may represent love, and the Turtle constancy, *i. e.* faithfulness to the memory of his dead turtle. The love between the Phoenix and the Turtle shows no sign of pas-

<sup>1</sup> But see p. 582, below.

sion. They were united in will and in deed; and the object of their self-immolation was attained when a new and more beautiful Phoenix arose from their ashes. This too seems to be the subject of Shakespeare's poem, though it might, as far as could be seen without Chester's guidance, have been written as an elegy on two lovers who died unmarried or at least childless. . . . Were Shakespeare and his fellows expected to write the usual complimentary verses as an introduction to Chester's poem, and did they, after consultation, decide to save their credit by substituting independent studies of Love and Constancy?"

BROWN (*Poems by Salusbury and Chester*, 1913) presents many new facts about the life of Sir John Salusbury of Lleweni, Denbighshire (1566?-1612), and about two manuscripts at Christ Church, Oxford, containing (p. xxvii) "Welsh verse composed by various bards in praise of members of the Salusbury family" and English verses by Salusbury himself, Chester, Jonson, and others. Though he was unsuccessful (pp. lii-liv) "in discovering *who* Robert Chester was, the Christ Church MS. gives us much additional information concerning his relationship to . . . Sir John Salusbury. His poems in this MS. . . . were clearly written in the neighbourhood of Lleweni, the seat of the Salusburies in Denbighshire," and many deal with Sir John's relatives. "Chester may have been installed in the Salusbury household . . . as family chaplain. . . . He was in any case a person of humble social station and his relation toward his patron, though familiar, was always that of a dependant. . . . The recognition that . . . Chester was merely a satellite and dependant, helps us to understand how the publication of *Loves Martyr* . . . must have come about. Chester himself would hardly have been able to secure contributions from Shakspeare, Jonson, and the others, to grace his volume. On the other hand, Salusbury, with the rank of a Knight and with his position as Esquire of the body to Elizabeth, would meet with no difficulty in soliciting these poems. . . . One may most easily account for the publication of *Loves Martyr*, then, by supposing that Sir John Salusbury, in order to gratify the literary ambition of Chester, who was his friend as well as his dependant, took the MS. . . . to London, asked a few of the most prominent poets . . . to lend their names and verses to the success of the volume, and then sent it to the printer." *Love's Martyr* (p. liv) "falls easily into three general divisions: (1) The Allegory of the Turtle and Phoenix, which consists for the most part of a dialogue between the Phoenix and her instructor, Dame Nature; (2) 'The Birth, Life, and Death of honourable Arthur King of Brittain,' a narrative composed on the basis of the Elizabethan Chronicle Histories; (3) a series of 'Cantoes' (i. e. lyrics) addressed to the Phoenix by the 'Paphian Doue.'" The second division has no connection with the allegory of the *P. & T.* It is, however, continued in the third part, where the Turtle (p. lv) "is himself the speaker and addresses the Phoenix in terms of ardent passion." In brief, the allegory tells how the grief-stricken Turtle is consoled by the Phoenix, and how (pp. lviii f.) "both birds set to work light-heartedly to build the pyre upon which they propose to burn both their bodies 'to reuiue one name.' After prayers to Apollo they enter the flame . . . and are consumed. . . . The conclusion leaves us uncertain whether to weep over the funeral pyre of the burned birds or to offer congratulations upon the birth of another Phoenix." Brown argues (pp. lix f.) that "the

meeting of the Turtle and Phoenix is intended to represent a nuptial union," and that the flame into which they plunged "was kindled by the torch of Hymen"; in other words, that Chester is referring to the marriage of Salusbury and Ursula Stanley<sup>1</sup> in December, 1586, and the birth of the female Phoenix, their daughter Jane, in October, 1587. Hence (p. lxix) "*Loves Martyr*—or at least that portion of it which is concerned with the story of the Turtle and Phoenix—must have been written more than a decade before its publication in 1601. . . . Harry [Salusbury], the next child, was born in September, 1589, but the poem makes no reference to any male issue of the Turtle and Phoenix . . . although one readily sees that the birth of a second child would have been difficult to reconcile with the allegory of the Phoenix." The poems signed "Vatum Chorus" (p. lxxi) "suggest that Sir John Salusbury was not only the person to whom the 'Essaies' were dedicated . . . but that he was also the subject of them. When we turn to the 'Essaies' themselves we note the tone of friendly regard in which several of the poets refer to the Turtle-dove, as to a familiar acquaintance. Particularly is this the case with Ben Jonson. . . . It is clear that to Jonson both Turtle and Phoenix were living persons—man and wife—with whom he stood on terms of acquaintance, perhaps even friendship. . . . Marston's contribution differs from all the others in singing the praises 'of a most exact wondrous creature, arising out of the Phoenix and Turtle Doues ashes.' This creature was, of course, the 'princely Phoenix' whose birth Chester announced in his 'Conclusion' . . . [and who], he informs us, 'now is growne vnto maturitie' [i. e. Jane Salusbury, who was fourteen in 1601]. . . . [Pp. lxxii f.] Shakspeare differs essentially in his treatment of the allegory from the other members of the 'Chorus Vatum' and also from Robert Chester. . . . In his poem the note from first to last is funereal. A Requiem is sung for the Phoenix and Turtle; and over the urn which encloses their ashes is pronounced a Threnos. . . . Again, though the central point in the myth of the Phoenix is the resurrection from the ashes, Shakspeare holds out no such hope for either Phoenix or Turtle. . . . [The third stanza of the 'Threnos'] is especially remarkable, for it flatly contradicts Marston and Chester, both of whom . . . give account of a fair creature which issued from the ashes of the Phoenix. To reconcile Shakspeare's allegory either with *Loves Martyr* or with the other 'Poetical Essaies' is thus manifestly impossible. Also, besides these contradictions in matters of fact, his lines contrast sharply with the other poems in their detached and impersonal tone. One searches in vain for any such familiarity as is displayed in Ben Jonson's reference to 'our Doue.' The Turtle and Phoenix are declared 'Co-supremes and starres of Loue,' but their love is set forth in abstract and philosophical terms. Indeed, in spite of its ingenuity and its epigrammatic brilliance, the poem as a whole impresses one as frigid and perfunctory." This coldness cannot be fully accounted for by the conventionality of the figures employed. "The answer which readily suggests itself is, that Shakspeare's relations with Sir John Salusbury were less close than those of Jonson, Marston, and Chapman, so that his lines on the Phoenix and

<sup>1</sup> Ursula was the natural daughter of Henry Stanley, fourth Earl of Derby, a fact which ABEL LEFRANC (*Sous le masque de "Wm. Sh." Wm. Stanley VI<sup>e</sup> Comte de Derby*, 1918, I, 93, 150 f., 182) finds of great significance.

Turtle were a matter of courteous compliance rather than a tribute to a personal friend. The complete absence of personal allusion which one notes with surprise in Shakspeare's contribution is satisfactorily explained only on this hypothesis."

HERFORD (*Sketch*, 1923, p. 25) accepts Brown's interpretation. So does ADAMS (*Life*, 1923, pp. 341 f.), with the added suggestion that "Shakespeare seems not to have read Chester's tedious poem far enough to have unraveled its cryptic meaning. . . . Accordingly, in his haste jumping to the conclusion that the two birds died in reality 'leaving no posterity,' he wrote a graceful funeral song, in which, in the metaphysical style of John Donne, he played with the ideas that marriage makes two into one and that 'One is no number.'" Just so in the opinion of FEULLERAT (ed. 1927, p. 182): "Shakespeare alone of all the contributors does not seem to have clearly understood . . . the real meaning of the allegory." On the other hand, LEE (*Life*, 1916, pp. 272 f.) thinks that "the internal evidence scarcely justifies the conclusion that Shakespeare's poem . . . was penned for Chester's book. . . . The resemblances with the verses of Chester and his other coadjutors are specious and superficial and Shakespeare's piece would seem to have been admitted to the miscellany at the solicitation of friends who were bent on paying as comprehensive a compliment as possible to Sir John Salisbury."

Such, too, is the position of GOLLANCZ, chronicling (*T. L. S.*, Jan. 26, 1922, p. 56) his discovery of "a manuscript volume of over 170 leaves belonging to the early seventeenth century," which contains plays, poems, and other items largely by members of the Salusbury family. Among them are verses congratulating Heming and Condell upon their publishing of Sh.'s First Folio in 1623, possibly written by Sir John Salusbury's eldest son, Henry. Gollancz gives his conclusions as follows: "Although certain baffling problems in respect of Shakespeare's poem still remain undetermined, we may be sure that Chester's Phoenix and Turtle stood for Ursula Stanley and Sir John Salusbury, and that his allegory had reference to their marriage. Shakespeare's poem, however, in its purport seems so utterly apart from the other poems in the collection as to lead to the impression that, though added to the volume, it may have been originally written as an elegiac poem on some other love-story—a Phoenix and Turtle united in death, and 'leaving no posterity.' Sir John Salusbury . . . evidently held a recognized position as poet and patron of poets. . . . We may safely infer that Sir John Salusbury was known to Shakespeare, and that the poet was willing to help forward Salusbury's *protégé*, Robert Chester, . . . [by penning] a poem on some theme of 'The Phoenix and Turtle,' or to allow a poem already written for some other purpose to figure among the compositions consecrated" to Salusbury. In a later article on the same manuscript (*T. L. S.*, Oct. 8, 1925, p. 655) Gollancz announces that he has found another version of the ode Jonson contributed to *Love's Martyr* with an entirely different "Prelude":<sup>1</sup> "The great Ode had certainly circulated in manuscript before the appearance of 'Love's Martyr' in 1601. The last line . . . is quoted in 'England's Parnassus,' 1600 [ed. Crawford, p. 198]." "Whatever may have been the re-

<sup>1</sup> For another copy, described as the "first draft" and printed from "a 17th century MS.," see THORN-DRURY'S *Little Ark*, 1921, p. 1.

lationship between Shakespeare and the Salusbury family, it is safe to assert that Sir John Salusbury, his son Sir Henry, and his grandson Sir Thomas were proud to number Ben Jonson among their cherished friends."

MATHEW (*Image of Sh.*, 1922, pp. 114 f.) comments on Brown's thesis: "The title page [of *Love's Martyr*] . . . has been taken as meaning that Sir John Salis-bury and his wife were the Turtle and the Phoenix, and this may have been an old view, for Father Henry More, telling a ghost-story in his *History of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*,<sup>1</sup> written in 1660, says 'Lord Stourton called his wife, a daughter of Edward, Earl of Derby, and sister to the Stanley whose epitaph Shakespeare wrote.' . . . Father Henry More may have thought that Poems must be founded on fact, and (if he referred to this Poem) he was probably wrong in thinking that Ursula Stanley and Anne Lady Stourton were sisters. This Poem was stated to be a poetical essay written on a particular theme, and this dedication to Salisbury may have been merely a compliment without any reference to his private affairs. If Shakespeare wrote these beautiful Verses he never wrote anything else like them. . . . He may have echoed Donne's brooding austerity. This is one of Donne's themes, as in *The Relic*, and in *The Funeral* in which he described himself as Love's Mar-tyr. This Poem (if indeed it is Shakespeare's) could not have been written by him when he was young enough and foolish enough to write" the narrative poems and the early sonnets.

RANJEE [R. G. SHAHANI] (*Towards the Stars*, 1931) writes exuberantly of the merits of the poem. It has (pp. 11 f.) "supreme poetic quality. . . . The supposed blemishes of the poem are really the secret of its beauty. The greater the critic's knowledge, the more wondrous will this poem appear. It is difficult to speak without extravagance of the seductive bouquet of these verses. . . . This poem concentrates as in a dew-drop the mellow philosophy of a life-time's devotion. The study of it is an education in itself." Again (p. 33), "The lyrical note is too poignant. Our poem breathes something more than personal heart-ache—rather something of the cosmic tragedy of love." It (p. 57) "would alone suffice to confer immortality on its author." Finally (pp. 59-62), "The first thing that impresses me about the poem is its fearless, uncompromising assurance. It is a *brave* poem. There is nothing quite like it in all English literature. . . . The language of a Tennyson or Browning seems hollow in comparison. The mist that shrouds the meaning is illumined by an inner fire—like the mystic fire in the heart of the opal. In what other poem in the whole of English literature do we find this effect? . . . The academic aroma of this poem greatly enhances its charm. The allusive-ness is truly delightful. . . . There is, further, a quality about the poem which is hard to define. It can only be felt. It is after a life-time of culture that we become human. Shelley, with all his gossamer web of dreams, never attained the height of the solid earth. He was not of the celestial fibre of our poet—tenuous as moonbeams yet strong as steel. Our poet has the note of humanity—the highest of all—in the supreme degree. It is the summit of the human adventure. The elusive Platonism of the poem is another of its precious fea-tures. It seems like a voice from beyond the limits of normal human experi-

<sup>1</sup> [*Historia missionis Anglicanae Societatis Jesu*, which I have not seen.]

ence. Finally, there is a heroic and exultant ring about the poem—resignation, yet triumph. . . . It may be vouchsafed to others do [*sic*] discern further beauties in the poem, for it is as full of magic fire as the urn of heaven. The selfless loyalty that it breathes awakens ‘thoughts too deep for tears.’ Does the reach of poetry extend further?”

This breathless eulogy from India is all the more noteworthy because it was not inspired by the great name of Sh., in whose authorship, indeed, Ranjee disbelieves. In his preface (p. 11) he confesses to “grave surprise” that the *P. & T.* “is commonly accounted as a product of Shakespeare’s youth,” whereas its distinctive feature is “singular maturity of thought.” Sh., however, was born in April, 1564, and the poem is almost universally supposed to have been written in 1600 or 1601, when he was a middle-aged man of about thirty-six. Hence Ranjee’s argument completes a circle when he assigns the authorship to John Fletcher, who, he asserts (p. 57 n.), “was 25 years of age at the date of this publication.” (Actually, since he was born in December, 1579, he was about twenty-one.) Sh.’s authorship is rejected (pp. 40–54) because the poem (1) has an academic tone; (2) embodies an apotheosis of love found nowhere else in his work; (3) differs verbally and spiritually from his style; (4) stresses a “note of mysticism” which he lacks; (5) places an “unwavering trust . . . in what is called love” that strongly contrasts with Sh.’s “somewhat tepid patronage of the passion”(!); and (6) treats the phoenix very differently than in the numerous references to that bird in Sh.’s genuine works.

For reasons equally untenable the author is said to be Fletcher, who, accordingly (p. 57), must now “be ranked among the supreme poets of the world.” He was (p. 55) “a scholar of academic training, not without a suggestion of the courtly lover. All his work is saturated with the love element. And it would not be incorrect to call him the apostle of the heart.” Parallel passages from *The Mad Lover* and *The Pilgrim* are cited (pp. 55 f.) in support, the former running (in part),

If a tear escape her eye,  
'Tis not for my memory,  
But the rights of obsequy,

and the latter,

These sacred lie  
To virtue, love, and chastity,  
Our wishes to eternity.

But as the plays in question date about 1616 and 1621 respectively,<sup>1</sup> the parallels (some of which “can scarcely be a mere coincidence”) are of no significance—unless as showing that Fletcher was imitating Sh.

Hardly more successful is Ranjee’s explanation of the poem, at least to the present writer. To be sure, he remarks that (p. 11) “those who call this poem obscure and even unintelligible . . . are but admitting their own limitations,” that (p. 33) it is “self-interpreting,” and that (p. 35), “in fact, the poem is

<sup>1</sup> According to E. H. C. OLIPHANT, *Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*, 1927, pp. 505 f. A. H. THORNDIKE’s opinion (*Maid’s Tragedy and Philaster*, 1906, p. x) is “c 1618” and “c 1621.”



crystal clear when once the subtle allusions are grasped." But that "crystal clear" is a slight exaggeration appears from his comments (p. 47) on ll. 59-61: "To me the stanza is perfectly clear, but directly an attempt is made to translate it into the dialect of thought called commonsense, all meaning vanishes. The poet has expressed his idea simply and perfectly." Nor does he inspire confidence in a reader who notices his remarks (p. 39) on l. 6: "'Foul' . . . does not mean vile or ugly or anything of the kind, but simply a bird (the fowl). Jonson too calls the owl 'the foul bird.'" Ranjee everywhere assumes that Fletcher wrote the verses in open imitation of a *Phoenix Nest* elegy on Sidney (see p. 570, above), and he ignores the significance of their appearance in Chester's *Love's Martyr*, a work eccentrically characterized (p. 49) as belonging "to the class of publications called Miscellanies, more or less in vogue at that time. The several poems that it contains are ascribed to Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Chapman, and several others. In later times it became the fashion to connect the poem with the name of Shakespeare." Such statements, apparently made without reading—or even looking at—the book in question, give fair warning that Ranjee's interpretation is altogether impressionistic and subjective.

He finds (pp. 35 f.) that "the main intention is . . . an offering of divine honours to the mutual loyalty of married souls. . . . Two hearts that beat as one is the consummation the poet demands, despite gods or men." Ll. 29-36 express what to the poet "is the finality—nothing else matters. *Amor vincit omnia.*" Various phrases are said to be derived from scholasticism. For example (p. 42), l. 32 "shows kinship in thought with the dialect of Trinitarian Doctrine. It means: duality transcended into unity"; while (p. 44) "the words 'Property was thus appalled' mean that there was a logical conflict with the very concept of 'proprium.' Existence in its metaphysical aspect was scandalised at this impossible condition." Other words "are taken from alchemy."

EDWARD GARNETT, in a letter prefixed to Ranjee's book, agrees that Sh. is not the author of the *P. & T.*, and inclines to Fletcher. On the contrary, G. W. KNIGHT, reviewing it in the *Criterion*, April, 1931, pp. 571-574, dissents, though he praises Ranjee's critical thesis.<sup>1</sup> In his own work, *The Imperial Theme*, 1931, he advances (pp. 349 f.) new interpretative ideas. In Sh.'s *Troilus and Cressida* and *Antony and Cleopatra* "extreme love-consciousness is considered a kind of death. . . . In death there is no unfaithfulness. Troilus forecasts the vision of *Antony and Cleopatra* in thus associating death and Cressida. . . . Moreover, this is the very theme of *The Phoenix and the Turtle*. . . . [It] and *Antony and Cleopatra* are reciprocally illuminating. . . . Their vision is . . . a 'fearless, uncompromising assurance.' It is an assurance of immortality, in terms of 'death' and 'love.' These are shown as synchronized, mated in time." Knight's notion is developed at length in a discussion of "The Shakespearian Aviary" appended to *The Shakespearian Tempest*, 1932 (pp. 320-324): "I have observed instances where birds are metaphorically

<sup>1</sup> In the *Aryan Path*, Feb., 1933, p. 133, Knight calls "his recent essay" on the *P. & T.* "one of the finest pieces of Shakespearian commentary I have read."

related to qualities specifically human. There is one instance where what must be considered a specifically human theme is given an exact and comprehensive 'bird' formulation. I refer to *The Phoenix and The Turtle* . . . [which is] a compressed miniature of . . . [*Antony and Cleopatra*]. Its theme is the same: the blending of duality in unity, of life and death in love's immortality. . . . One of Shakespeare's finest visions is well embodied in *The Phoenix and the Turtle*. Our bird references will help our intuitive understanding of the poem. It is a vision of love's aspiring immortality, upwinging beyond the world of appearance and multiplicity to the air and fire and music of union, the empyrean of divinity. . . . [Ll. 1-4 quoted.] This opening stanza, perhaps, may be best explained by saying that it suggests the quality of the *Romeo and Juliet* vision. The detailed analogy, however, is not close or very valuable. Next, we have *Macbeth*. . . . [Ll. 5-8 quoted.] 'Harbinger,' 'fiend,' 'augur,' 'fever'—all call to mind the same words in *Macbeth*; and 'precurrer' also more indirectly recalls the play. Thus are our 'evil' birds to be warded off, as evil forms of life are charmed away from Titania's bower, to give place to Philomel's music. Thus, in a *Cymbeline* stanza. . . . [Ll. 9-12 quoted.] I have already observed how the eagle is a bird of grandeur. In *Cymbeline* he is very important, both as the Roman eagle and as Jove's bird, occurring in the Vision of Jupiter. . . . [*Cymbeline*, V.iv.115-119, quoted.] He occurs in other resplendent passages throughout the play. So all tyrannic birds are to absent themselves; even, perhaps, falcons, in so far as pride may be guilty and earth-bound rather than pure air and fire. Next, we have the swan. . . . [Ll. 13-16 quoted.] 'Defunctive music,' 'death-divining.' Now we are in *The Merchant of Venice*:

Let music sound while he doth make his choice;  
Then, if he lose, he makes a swan-like end,  
Fading in music. (III.ii.43)

Music is truly 'death-divining' in Shakespeare, especially in the final plays. The swan is indeed apt here: symbol of white purity and music-in-death. Next we have the 'crow,' often used as a symbol of blackness in Shakespeare, here placed, shall we say, in a *Hamlet* stanza. . . . [Ll. 17-20 quoted.] And then *Antony and Cleopatra*. . . . [Ll. 21-24 quoted.] 'Mutual flame'—fire imagery is powerful here: so later we have love 'shining' or 'flaming' (33, 35), 'stars of love' (51), 'cinders' (55). And the theme here is clearly the offering up of differentiation, slain on the altar of love: 'twain' is resolved by love into 'one,' there are 'two distincts' without 'division' (one of Shakespeare's usual tempest words); 'number' itself is 'slain' (25-8); 'space' and 'distance' are transcended (29-30); each lover was the very being of the other, the 'self' indeed no longer itself; the 'single,' or simple duality of 'nature' was now neither 'one' nor 'two' (33-40). Not merely is dualism transcended into unity, but rather the unity-dualism antinomy is itself transcended. Before such a state, reason fails, 'confounded,' as it sees 'division' melted into unity (42), the 'twain,' still twain, yet now also a 'concordant one' (45-6), a single music—we remember 'the true concord of well-tuned sounds' in a similar context (Sonnet VIII). Such is the mystery of this love-death intercourse. Even 'truth' and 'beauty' falsify the intuition since 'truth' and 'beauty' are buried with the

Phoenix and the Turtle (62-4). They are but mortal categories: yet the very death of 'truth' and 'beauty' creates a third unknown immortality. So fine a mystic paradox vitalizes this bird-song of tragic joy."

WOLFF<sup>1</sup> (*E. S.*, 1932, LXVII, 159) sees a literary allegory involved. He argues (what nobody doubts) that one of the significations of the phoenix was feminine chastity, and that Queen Elizabeth was often associated with the fabulous bird; and refers to a medal struck during her reign which bore on one side an image of the queen, on the other a representation of the phoenix with certain Latin verses. All of which is interpreted as evidence that Sh.'s Phoenix is Queen Elizabeth, his Turtle Sir John Salusbury. How this interpretation squares with Chester's own poem is not clear.

Dealing specifically with Chester (not Sh.) IRMA R. WHITE (*T. L. S.*, July 21, 1932, p. 532) lists about a dozen sources slavishly followed by Chester,<sup>2</sup> and asserts that her discoveries appear "to be taking away the probability of biographical allusion. The curious volume purports to be a translation from the Italian Torquatus Coeliano.<sup>3</sup> This it definitely is not. In the first place, the name Torquatus Coeliano seems to be simply a Latinized form for 'silver-coloured' or 'heavenly dove,' a character which plays a role in the allegory;<sup>4</sup> in the second place, books from which Chester 'translated' are English, published between the years 1557 and 1592. . . . [Chester's] only contribution lay in dovetailing his sources. . . . It would seem, then, that when all the patchwork is fitted together there will be little room for anything other than an Elizabethan adaptation of Platonic allegory concerning Beauty, Love, and Chastity. . . . [His book] is but one of the several Platonic adaptations of the time." How her conclusions about *Love's Martyr* affect the *P. & T.* is a matter which she does not clear up.

In 1936 an entirely new interpretation was made by NEWDIGATE (Jonson's *Poems*, pp. 365 f.). He calls attention to a copy of Jonson's *Love's Martyr* ode

<sup>1</sup> See p. 574, above.

<sup>2</sup> Earlier CHARLOTTE D'EVELYN, "Sources of the Arthur Story in Chester's *Loves Martyr*" (*J. E. G. P.*, 1915, XIV, 75-88), had shown that Chester drew lavishly on Malory's *Morte D'Arthur*, Holinshed, Leland's *Collectanea*, Geoffrey of Monmouth, and John of Glastonbury.

<sup>3</sup> [Thus misleading PALGRAVE, who wrote (Sh.'s *Songs*, 1865, p. 244): "That strange, but strongly Shakespearian piece of fantasy-painting [the *P. & T.*] . . . was probably suggested in some degree by the Italian allegory of *Torquato Celiano*, translated by Chester himself."]

<sup>4</sup> [GROSART (editing Chester, 1878, p. lxviii) writes, "By accident or design Chester has here combined the Christian name of TASSO, and the surname of one of the minor poets of Italy of the same period [i. e. Livio Celiano]." LEE (*Life*, 1916, p. 271) adopts Grosart's explanation. DOWDEN (*Letters*, 1914, p. 288) suggests: "Possibly 'Coeliano' is chosen as connected with *Celare* to *conceal*, or *Celia*, waggery. ? The motto from Martial refers to the hoax, 'a known book cannot change its lord' (= ? author), but an *unknown*, like this, may." "Celiano" is mentioned along with Tasso and Petrarch in Nashe's preface to Greene's *Menaphon*, 1589, and in Meres's *Palladis Tamia*, 1598.]

in Bodley MS. Rawl. Poet. 31: "[It] is headed To: L: C: Of: B:: and she can be no other than Lucy Harington, who in December 1594 married the 3rd earl of Bedford. That affords ground for believing that the Phoenix of *Loves Martyr* and Shakespeare's 'The Phoenix and Turtle' is the brilliant figure on whom Drayton, Chapman, Florio, Daniel, Jonson and Donne lavished their praises and their flattery. No one is more likely than Jonson himself to have brought this *vatum chorus* together; and the 'Invocatio' and the lines to Sir John Salisbury are perhaps his work with or without the collaboration of the others. . . . *Loves Martyr*, or rather the story of the Phoenix and Turtle which is there told, is an allegory of married love. It ends with the mating of the two birds and the birth of a new phoenix. The allegory perhaps bears upon the married relations of the earl of Bedford and his countess and the hope of an heir. Lucy was only fourteen years old at her marriage in 1594. There was no child till February 1601, when a son was born, who died soon after his birth." In his preface (p. x) Newdigate remarks that "if we can accept the ascription of the MS." the Phoenix of Jonson's poem "was the countess of Bedford. If she is the Phoenix of Jonson's contributions to *Loves Martyr*, then she is the Phoenix of Chester's poem also and of the poems which follow it, including Shakespeare's *The Phoenix and Turtle*. The interpretation of Shakespeare's poem is a problem which has hitherto baffled all the scholars." These *if's* (especially the second) seem to me formidable obstacles in the way of accepting Newdigate's theory, but possibly he will remove all doubts in a promised book in which "whatever evidence is forthcoming" will be discussed.<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile, the riddle of Sh.'s poem has not been, probably never will be, solved to the satisfaction of all scholars.

#### THE METER

The *P. & T.*, FEUILLERAT (ed. 1927, p. 184) notes, "consists of thirteen quatrains in truncated trochaics rhyming abba. The concluding Threnos consists of five three-line stanzas, in octosyllabic trochaics, each stanza having a single rhyme." LEE (*Life*, 1916, p. 272) had described it as "untried metre" with "the rhymes disposed as in Tennyson's 'In Memoriam.' The concluding 'threnos' is in five three-lined stanzas, also in trochaics, each stanza having a single rhyme." He observes that the threnos "is imitated in metre and phraseology by Fletcher in his *Mad Lover* in the song 'The Lover's Legacy to his Cruel Mistress'" (see p. 579, above). Trochaic octosyllabics in the *In Memoriam* rime-scheme occur in Jonson's lyric beginning "Marble, weep, for thou dost cover" (SAINTSBURY, *History of English Prosody*, 1908, II, 156 n.); the same rime-scheme (but employing iambic, not trochaic, measures) was used also by Raleigh, Jonson, George Sandys, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, and others (the same, II, 90, 131 n., 280 n., 333 f.).

<sup>1</sup> Newdigate has repeated his conjectures in an essay, "The Phoenix and Turtle. Was Lady Bedford the Phoenix?", *T. L. S.*, Oct. 24, 1936, p. 862, and in letters printed in the same, Nov. 28, 1936, p. 996, and Feb. 20, 1937, p. 131. But his theory, at any rate so far as concerns Sh., is still unproved. For some objections to it see the letter in the same, Feb. 13, 1937, p. 111, by R. W. SHORT.