to dwell: I wish only to call attention to the fact that more scenes end with tags than in any other play in Shakspere: that the number of tag-rhymes is also greater than in any other play, including his very earliest. In other words, that at a time when he had given up the use of rhyme in great measure (for all critics admit this for his 3rd period), in that part of the play where the supernatural is not introduced, he has on the common theory used more than twice as many tag-rhymes as he has used in any play subsequent to the *Merchant of Venice:* and these for the most part, as Clark and Wright have so justly pointed out, of the baldest and most feeble description. If the difference were small, it might be explained perhaps from the nature of the play; but such a difference is only explicable on the hypothesis of a second writer: the conclusion we have reached on other grounds.

F. G. FLEAY.

PART II. *JULIUS CÆSAR.*

MY theory as to this play is so unlike anything hitherto advanced that I shall begin by stating it; so that the startled reader may have it in his power to shut the book at once, if the hypothesis seems to him too absurd to be entertained. I believe that this play as we have it is an alteration of Shakspere's play, made by Ben Jonson. I will first give a number of reasons for my belief that the common theory cannot be true, and then enter into details as to my own.

1. The name Antony is a very favourite one with Shakspere: it occurs in *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Love's Labor's Lost*, *Macbeth*, *Henry V.*, *Richard III.*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *Antony and Cleopatra:* in all these seven plays it is always spelt Anthony, or Anthonie, with an h; but in this play invariably Antony or Antonie, without one. So Ben Jonson always rejects the h; see *Catiline*, especially; *passim.*

2. The number of participles in -èd, with the final syllable pronounced, is out of all proportion to the other plays, especially the

latter ones. I have not had time to count them, but it is clear on merely reading the play. Examples: plungèd, vexèd, transformèd.

3. I. ii. To-morrow, if you please to speak with me
I will *come home to you:* or if you will,
Come home to me, and I will wait for you.

Home = to thy house, chez toi: never used by Shakspere; but Jonson, *Catiline*, III. i.:

I'll *come home to you.* Crassus would not have you
To speak to him fore Quintus Catulus.

4. II. iii. "Quality and kind" not found elsewhere in Shakspere. He has "quality and brain," "quality and name," not kind. Jonson, *Every Man in his Humour*, II. i.:

Spirits of our kind and quality.

5. The phrase "bear me hard," occurs three times in this play; in I. ii.; II. i.; III. i., not elsewhere in Shakspere. But Jonson, *Catiline*, IV. v.:

Ay, though he *bear me hard,*
I yet must do him right.

Bear hard occurs in 1 *Henry IV.*, and *hard forbear* in *Othello*, but in a different sense from that in this place.

6. The number of short lines in this play, *where no pause is required*, is very great, and seems to point to the fact that it has been greatly abridged for the purpose of representation. Example:

II. i. He says he does, being then most flatterèd.
Let me work!
For I can give his humour the true bent.

II. i. Since Cassius first did whet me against Cæsar
I have not slept.
Between the acting of a dreadful thing, &c.

II. i. And by-and-by thy bosom shall partake
The secrets of my heart.
All my engagements I will construe to thee, &c.

III. i. Thy master is a wise and valiant Roman,
I never thought him worse.
Tell him so please him come unto this place, &c.

III. ii. Cassius, go you into the other street
And part the numbers.
Those that will hear me speak let 'em stay here!

These are exactly like the metrical forms assumed in the surreptitious issues of the first quartos of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet*, but extremely unlike Shakspere's manner in his complete works. I have intentionally taken the instances from the middle of continuous speeches; but the imperfection more usually occurs at the end of a speech, as excisions are more frequently made from ends of speeches than from the middle of them. On this point, also, compare my edition of *Romeo and Juliet*, Q1.

7. Mr R. Simpson has noticed that this play bears the same relation to the tragedies that the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* does to the comedies as to "once-used" words (once-used in his sense). This is just what would happen if Jonson edited the play. For his dislike to "strange words" and his satire on Marston for inventing them, see Act V. Sc. 1 of the *Poetaster*, where Crispinus vomits his linguistic inventions after the emetic administered by Horace.

8. Shakspere and Jonson probably worked together on Sejanus in 1602-3 (date of Shakspere's writing on another man's play in *Taming of the Shrew*: a thing which he never did after, and if before, only in the cases of *Andronicus* and *Henry VI.*). He having helpt Jonson then in a historical play, what more likely than that Jonson should be chosen to remodel Shakspere's history, if it needed to be reproduced in a shorter form than he wrote it originally.

9. We know that rival theatres and rival publishers in the Elizabethan times frequently brought out plays on the same subject close on each other's heels. Thus the old play of *Leir* was republisht when Shakspere's *Lear* was produced: *The Danish Tragedy* and *Hoffman's Tragedy* were run in opposition to *Hamlet*: *The Taming of the Shrew* was a rival piece to *Patient Grissel*, *The Woman Killed with Kindness*, and probably Dekker's *Medicine for*

a Curst Wife: Grissel, and the *Woman Killed* having come out first, the *Shrew* being then set up in rivalry, and the last-named piece being a retaliation for this opposition. (I do not regard the notice of Heywood's play in Henslowe's diary as necessarily that of its first appearance.) But this practice is too well known to require illustration. Is it not, then, highly probable that this play, produced about 1601 originally, should be revived in 1607, the date of L. Sterling's *Julius Cæsar* and of "*Cesar's Revenge, or the Tragedy of Cesar and Pompey*," called in the running title "*The tragedy of Julius Cesar*"; or if it were produced in 1607, as Malone believes it was, that the other play was then published in rivalry to it? In any case I think it likely that *some* production or reproduction was at that date, and another after Shakspere's death with Jonson's alterations.

10. There is a stilted feeling about the general style of this play; which is not the style of Jonson: but just what one would fancy Shakspere would become with an infusion of Jonson. I do not give passages here; as I look on the printing of long extracts from books in every one's hands, except for cases of comparison, as useless and wasteful. I prefer relying on the taste and judgment of those who will take the trouble to read the play, and judge for themselves.

11. There is a quarrelling scene in the *Maid's Tragedy* imitated from the celebrated one between Brutus and Cassius: just in the same way *Philaster* is imitated from *Cymbeline*. The *Maid's Tragedy* was probably produced in 1609, the year after *Philaster*. It is therefore not improbable that *J. Cæsar* was reproduced in the year after, or at any rate about the same time as *Cymbeline*, that is, in or close on 1607, just as Shakspere's fourth period began.

12. Act I. Sc. 2. "Chew upon this;" no such expression elsewhere in Shakspere. Compare the use of "work upon that now" *passim* in *Eastward Ho*, of which Jonson was one of the authors.

13. Act II. Sc. 1. Scorning the base *degrees*
By which he did ascend.

The word *degrees* never used by Shakspere, as meaning "stairs,"

but always of "steps" metaphorical; as we use "gradually" now. But in *Sejanus* we have:

> Whom when he says lie spread on the *degrees*.
> And turn pre-ordinance and first decree

14. Into the *lane* of children. Act III. Sc. 1,

where *lane* means narrow conceits. Compare *Staple of News*:

> A narrow-minded man! my thoughts do dwell
> All in a *lane*.

I do not know an instance of such a usage in any other author.

15. V. v. His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixt in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man."

Compare *Cynthia's Revells*, II. iii. A creature of a most perfect and divine temper: one in whom the humours and elements are peaceably met without emulation of precedency (acted in 1600). Surely Shakspere did not deliberately copy Jonson: but if he wrote before him *Julius Cæsar* must come before 1600 into the time of the historical plays.[1]

16. Jonson was in the habit of altering plays, e.g. he altered and adapted *Jeronymo* by Kyd; and his share of work in the *Widow*, *Eastward Ho*, and other plays, was evidently of the supervising and trimming kind, as the main execution of every scene is clearly traceable to the other writers.

We now come to an important argument:

In a celebrated passage in the *Discoveries* of Ben Jonson, we read: "I remember, the players have often mentioned it as an honour to Shakspere, that in his writing (whatsoever he penned) he never blotted out a line. My answer hath been, would he had blotted a thousand. Which they thought a malevolent speech. I had not told posterity this, but for their ignorance, who chose that circumstance to

[1] This agrees with the date of allusion discovered by Mr Halliwell; but the paucity of rhymes, number of short lines, and brevity of the play are conclusive as to its not having been produced in its present state at that date. It has been abridged by some one for theatrical representation: if not by Jonson, then by some one else.—F. G. F.

commend their friend by, wherein he most faulted; and to justify mine own candour: for I loved the man and do honour his memory on this side idolatry as much as any. He was, indeed, honest, and of an open and free nature; had an excellent phantasy, brave notions, and gentle expressions: wherein he flowed with that facility, that sometimes it was necessary he should be stopped: *Sufflaminandus erat*, as Augustus said of Haterius. His wit was in his own power, would the rule of it had been so too. Many times he fell into those things, could not escape laughter: as when he said in the person of Cæsar, one speaking to him, 'Cæsar, thou dost me wrong.' He replied, 'Cæsar did never wrong, but with just cause,' and such like; which were ridiculous. But he redeemed his vices with his virtues. There was even more in him to be praised than to be pardoned."

It is clear from this passage (1) that a line in *Julius Cæsar*, as it originally stood, has been altered from its first form as quoted by Jonson into

> Know, Cæsar doth not wrong, nor without cause
> Will he be satisfied.

(2) That this alteration had been made in the acting copy, published in Folio in 1623; though Jonson's statement of its being an alteration was not published till after his death in 1637.

(3) That Jonson gives this as one of "many" instances. We cannot now find these in Shakspere's works: but it is a fair inference that other similar corrections have been made.

(4) These alterations were not commonly known:[1] such an opportunity for what our forefathers called "merry jests" would never have been lost: we should have had traces of them in contemporary writing.

We have, then, a play in which one error at least (perhaps many) has been corrected; and an author to whom this correction (or these corrections) was privately known: a play in which there is a deficiency of some thousand lines as compared with the others of the same

[1] Yet the distinct allusion in *The Staple of News* (Induction), "Cry you mercy, you never did wrong but with just cause," shows that in 1625 an allusion to this alteration at any rate was well understood.—F. G. F.

class by the same author; and a critic who desired that the author in his writing had blotted a thousand: a play remarkable for speeches ending on the second or third beat of an incomplete line, and one known alteration, with others to be presumed, which introduces this peculiarity contrary to the author's usual manner: a play with various peculiar phrases and usages of words; and the same critic-author in whose works these peculiar words and phrases are found. Add to these considerations the spelling of Antony, the use of words in -èd, the small number of once-used words, and the probability that these two writers had worked together in *Sejanus*, and I think there is a case made out that the play of *Julius Cæsar* as we have it was corrected by Ben Jonson: whether it had been produced by Shakspere in 1600-1 in a different form or not. If it had, all questions of early allusion are accounted for: and it would be written by him as a continuation of the series of Histories immediately after *Henry V.*, to which play the general style of *Julius Cæsar* seems to me more like than to any other work of Shakspere: also the pronunciation of the final -èds would be accounted for, as this is more frequent in *Henry IV.* and *V.* than in any other plays next to *Cæsar*.

It is fair also to consider what would probably have been Ben Jonson's conduct supposing he had revised this play. Would he have made any allusion to it such as that in *The Staple of News* quoted in the note on the preceding page? We may judge of this by a parallel instance. We know that he made alterations in Kyd's *Hieronymo is mad again*, or *Spanish Tragedy*. Accordingly, in the Induction to *Cynthia's Revells* Jonson alludes indirectly to the alterations he had made. Another, he says, swears down all that sit about him "that the old Hieronymo *as it was first acted* was the only, best, and judiciously penned play of Europe." This is just such an indirect allusion as I have pointed out to the passage in *Julius Cæsar* in *The Staple of News*: and so far agrees with what may be expected in my theory.

Again, the speech of Polonius (*Hamlet*, iii. 2), "I did enact Julius Cæsar: I was killed in the Capitol: Brutus killed me," seems to me to allude to Shakspere's play: "played once in the University," it may be: but if so, by a regular company, not by the students. But

if this allusion is to Shakspere's play, it distinctly points to an acting of Cæsar's part by an inferior player: which would give us a reason for the ill success of the piece at its first production. Hamlet's speech, "It was a brute part of him to kill so capital a calf there. Be the *players* ready?" so strongly contrasts Polonius with the good actors, that he must, I think, be referring to some actual performer. May not the play that was "caviare to the general, that pleased not the million" allude to the same failure? It can hardly refer to *Sejanus* acted in 1603, as it occurs in the first draft of *Hamlet*, which was acted probably in 1602, and printed certainly in 1603.

Of course, as I hold the alterations in this play, like those in *Macbeth*, to have taken place principally at the ends of speeches, and specially at the ends of scenes, the proportion of rhymes has been too seriously interfered with for our tables to be of any use by way of comparison with other plays of Shakspere. The increased number of tags in the Middleton part of *Macbeth*, put in to hide the alterations, and the diminished number of rhymes in *J. Cæsar*, caused by Jonson's abbreviations, alike interfere with the direct application of the rhyme-test. But to it indirectly I owe the fact of my attention being called to the very unusual characteristics of both plays: to it also I owe the determination of one of the authors to whom these alterations are due: for although Messrs Clark and Wright, to my great satisfaction, were the first in the field with the *Macbeth* theory, my work on *Cæsar* was done independently. I should probably not have cared to publish my theory of the latter play had not they issued theirs of the former; for I know that people do not like to be told that what they have been admiring all their lives as pet bits of the finest Shakspere, in many cases turns out to be spawned by one of those inferior "mushrooms that sprung up under the Shaksperian oak;" and that criticism which, however certain in its method, does not lead to pre-determined results so as to satisfy the reader with a show of reasoning in behalf of his former belief, and leave him in placid but idle content, is no more popular in this country when applied to literary matters, than it is in other departments. I am quite prepared for the usual witticisms as to "arithmetic not being science," "statistics being capable of proving

anything," "æsthetic being the supreme test," &c.; because I *know* that the truth can only be attained in this by the same kind of induction as in other scientific subjects, and that all the tall talk in the world will never induce any mineralogist, who has been trained in his work, to give up Wollaston's Goniometer, and depend entirely on the first impressions of his eyes and hands, however acute, subtle, or experienced they may be.

At this point, then, where I reach my first resting-place in the application of metrical tests, it may be well to say a few words on their relation to "higher" criticism. If the peculiarities of a writer are regarded as matters of chance or arbitrary choice, it is absurd to take them as a basis of investigation: but they are not so: in every writer there are tricks of style and of metre which *unknown to himself* pervade all his work: the skill of the critic lies, first in selecting those which are really characteristic, and establishing their existence by adequate proof: then in tracing their gradual development or decay: and finally in showing their connection with each other and with the higher mental characters out of which they spring, and to which they are inseparably attacht. The first part of this task I have approximately accomplished for Shakspere; the latter, and far more difficult one, I have also attempted and shall publish in due course. I only here desire to record that I have not workt mechanically in this matter: and that I have studied the psychology of Shakspere quite as diligently, and I hope as accurately, as I have the statistical phenomena which are its outcome and indication. As yet I have given only a *diagnosis* for individual authors and for individual plays, so as to classify and form a basis for higher investigations. The anatomy of each, and the comparative physiology of dramatic authors as a class, have yet to be given, and then the crowning work, the life history of our greatest men, as shown in their writings, their dynamical psychology, will become possible, which (with all deference to the metaphysical critics who have wasted their great acumen by beginning at the wrong end) it has not yet been and could not yet be.

I am happy to add that with this paper ends my destructive work, with which I know some are dissatisfied; as was to be expected in the case of results that must offend so many prejudices deep-rooted

and of long-standing. In the future my work in this matter (if I have life and opportunity to do any more) will be almost all constructive or reconstructive. It was unfortunately necessary to take the work in the order I have chosen, subject to the limitations imposed on me. I am hence exposed to much criticism that seems to me premature: to others, who do not know the extent of my yet unpublisht work, it does not very probably seem so: yet I think I have been right in going on with the work and leaving criticisms unanswered: inasmuch, as if I ever finish what I have begun, many of them will not need answering, being simply based on the partial ground of an imperfectly expounded and not half-published investigation.

F. G. FLEAY.

[*For the Discussion on this* Macbeth *and* Julius Cæsar *Paper, which was strongly opposed, see the end of this volume, before the Appendix.*]