

THE WORKS
OF
SHAKESPEARE

THE TWO GENTLEMEN
OF VERONA

EDITED BY
R. WARWICK BOND



METHUEN AND CO.
36 ESSEX STREET: STRAND
LONDON

INTRODUCTION

The Two Gentlemen of Verona was first printed, so far *The Text.* as is known, in the Folio of 1623, where it stands second among the Comedies, being immediately preceded by *The Tempest* and followed by *The Merry Wives*. It is there divided into Acts and Scenes, and is one of the few plays to which a list of the *dramatis personæ* is appended. It marks no locality, general or particular. The text is unusually free from corruption; a circumstance from which Johnson argued that it was seldom played, but which Malone attributed, I think with more reason, to the simplicity of the style, the play being written so clearly as to escape emendation.

Following the First Folio wherever possible, I have accepted sixteen small corrections from the Second (of which all but III. i. 149, IV. iv. 79, V. iv. 67 are of easily corrigible misprints), besides seven inserted stage-directions for exit and many for entry, the First Folio contenting itself with the customary enumeration at the head of each scene of all the characters which are to appear in it. I have taken no corrections from the Third Folio (save comma, IV. i. 49), and but one from the Fourth (V. ii. 32). In the Second Folio I count sixty other changes from the First, most of them careless errors, though one or two are attempts at emendation. The Third reproduces all of these save three or four, and adds thirty-five more; while the Fourth further swells the number by about a dozen. I have chosen for record only a small proportion of these changes or corruptions, usually such as might have something to recommend them or may have led to more successful emendation by the editors. From the editors I have, of course, accepted many corrections. Rowe supplied the most necessary stage-directions;

Pope first marked localities; and Theobald and Capell ably revised and supplemented their work in these respects. Important emendations in text are those at I. i. 65; II. iii. 30, 56, iv. 116, 195; III. i. 283, 320, 357; IV. iii. 17, iv. 60; V. ii. 7, 13; of which four are from Theobald, two from Rowe, and one each from Pope, Hanmer, Singer, Collier, and the Cambridge editors. The importance of Grant White's correction of the locality of IV. i., and consequently of the other forest-scenes, though it was adopted by Dyce, has been overlooked by some more recent editors. Mantua and its neighbourhood have no business in our scenario. Its mention in the text, IV. iii. 23, V. ii. 46, though there is no sufficient reason why it should there be altered, is probably just as much an oversight as the retention by Shakespeare of "Verona" in III. i. 81 and V. iv. 126—is, in fact, a corollary of that, Mantua being the natural resort of an exile from Verona, as in Brooke's *Romeus and Juliet*.

The only change for which I am responsible is the shifting of a comma in IV. iv. 6, "say, 'precisely thus'" etc. In three other places I restore the Folio reading, altered by Theobald or the Cambridge editors, I. ii. 92, IV. i. 49, V. iv. 26; I have once or twice slightly altered the received metrical arrangement; I favour an anonymous proposal to insert "writ" in II. i. 121; and I propose in I. iii. 36 "make it known" for "make known," V. iv. 49 "Re-rented" for "Descended," V. iv. 141 "Plant" for "Plead."

I hope the Introduction and Notes, wherein each fresh editor must be infinitely indebted to innumerable predecessors, may yet contain something of novelty. I am pleased to be able to introduce to readers Dr. Battsesson's ingenious argument in regard to the famous difficulty of Valentine's resignation of Silvia—see below, pp. xxxvi, xxxvii. To Mr. W. J. Craig, the general editor of this series, I am under special obligation for many suggestions, the fruit of a study longer, wider, and far more minute than my own.

Date.

There is no evidence sufficient to enable us to date the play precisely. It is mentioned in Meres' list of Shake-

Shakespeare's plays already known in 1598, and that is the earliest mention we have. Malone detected in the lines, "Some to the wars . . . discover islands far away" (I. iii. 8, 9), an allusion to the levying of soldiers and equipping of fleets to meet a projected Spanish invasion of 1595, and another allusion to Raleigh's expedition to discover Guiana in the same year, or to Sir Humphrey Gilbert's similar expedition in 1594; while he referred Speed's "walk alone, like one that had the pestilence" (II. i. 20), to the plague which carried off nearly 11,000 Londoners in 1593. Later he changed his date for the play to 1591; referring the allusions rather to Essex' expedition in aid of Henri IV. in that year, to voyages of discovery by Raleigh and others about the same time, and to the epidemic of 1583. Clearly in a time of frequent hostilities, much exploration, and not infrequent plague, these allusions can hardly be held to give us a definite year at all. Mr. Fleay, having in his *Manual*, p. 28, assigned the first two Acts to 1593 and the rest to 1595, considered in 1886 (*Chronicle Hist. of the Life of Shakespeare*, p. 188) that "the play was produced in 1591 with work by a second hand in it, which was cut out and replaced by Shakespeare's own in 1595," a conclusion repeated in his *Biog. Chronicle of the English Stage* (1891), ii. 176, 179, where he dates the Folio form of the play "c. 1595, altered from an earlier version," such earlier version, "in which Shakespeare was most likely a coadjutor," being probably acted by Lord Strange's men, c. 1591. To my mind, while I see no reason to raise the question of collaboration, there is much in this idea of the present as a revised form of the play;¹ and much, too, in Knight's argument that if Shakespeare had produced seventeen plays by 1598, many of these must have existed in some form

¹ Herr Sarrazin (*Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1896, xxxii. 163) sees in the vocabulary of the play ground for supposing that "this comedy, begun in the earliest period, had been continued or worked over later." On grounds of style, the use of euphuistic antithesis, the playing on words (II. iv. 154-157, vi. 17-22; III. i. 146, 171-174), and the repetition of words in inverted order (I. i. 34, "a folly bought with wit . . . a wit by folly vanquished"), he classes it with *Venus and Adonis*, *Lucrece*, the love- and friendship-*Sonnets*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Richard III.*, and *Romeo and Juliet*, as all composed 1592-1594, a fertility to be explained by the closing of the theatres in 1592 and 1593 (*ib.* pp. 149-154).

(however sketchy, faulty, incomplete) before 1591, the date at which his dramatic labours have been generally held to commence. Seventeen plays in seven years, in addition to the *Venus and Adonis*, *Lucrece*, and the great majority of the *Sonnets*, seems altogether too much, even for Shakespeare,¹ especially for the young less-practised Shakespeare, still subject to the delays and constraints of a more formal and often rhymed versification. If Jonson began to write at nineteen, why not our poet?

*Metrical
Evidence.*

The idea of a revised form is confirmed by the conflicting metrical evidence. The *rhyme* test (1 in 17) seems to place it late, while, on the other hand, we have 16 lines of the irregular dancing doggerel only found in *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Comedy of Errors*, and *Taming*, though in the two latter it may possibly be a relic of another's work rather than early Shakespeare. The *double-ending* test gives us 273 in the play, i.e. 1 in 7.54 or 13.25 per cent. (Hertzberg makes it 15 per cent.), as against 4 per cent. in *Love's Labour's Lost*: but since *Richard III.* has 18 per cent., *Richard II.* 11.39, and *Comedy of Errors* 12, we ought rather to conclude to an earlier change from the masculine-ending habit of *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Titus Andronicus* than to a late date for *The Two Gentlemen*. The *run-on* test is apt to be vitiated by the uncertainty of the standard to be adopted in counting. One cannot regard as run-on such lines as, though grammatically incomplete, the ear easily separates from what follows, such, for instance, as consist of or end with a prepositional phrase or relative clause, nor yet lines in which the ear's demand for onward progress is modified, as so often here, by a strongly accented verb or substantive at the close. At any rate there is scarce an instance of weak or even light ending in the play. I count only 123 run-on lines, or 1 in 16.67. Dr. Furnivall, however, gave the following table:—

<i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> . . .	1 in 18.14	<i>Tempest</i>	1 in 3.02
<i>Comedy of Errors</i> . . .	1 „ 10.7	<i>Cymbeline</i>	1 „ 2.52
<i>The Two Gentlemen</i> . .	1 „ 10.0	<i>Winter's Tale</i>	1 „ 2.12

¹ For "the Stratford man," that is. Doubtless Bacon, born some three years earlier, would quite easily add this enormous literary output to his school and university training, his study for and practice at the Bar, his foreign travel, his service in Parliament, his *Essays*, etc., of 1597, and such studies and collections for his great scheme as he had made before 1598!

But, whatever the counting, everybody is conscious of the end-stopped nature of the verse in *The Two Gentlemen*, and accepts it as evidence of early date. In the same direction is its markedly dissolute character, *i.e.* its tendency to split diphthongs, to make a dissyllable of final *-ion* and the like, also of "fire" and "hour," to introduce an *e* between a mute and a liquid, as in "resembleth" (I. iii. 84), "dazzled" (II. iv. 209), and to pronounce as separate the *-ed* of past tense or participle; and to do all this simply *metri gratia*, with instances of the precisely opposite practice in every case.¹ Undoubtedly the versification owes as much impression of weakness to this habit as it does of monotony to the end-stopped habit; and it marks, I think, one who, making the transition from rhymed to blank verse, realises the danger from relaxed restraint, is anxious to write the new line correctly, and trusts at first too little to his ear. It is still more a mark, like the end-stopped habit, of a mind not yet so prolific in suggestion that the verse is overcrowded. There can be no doubt that the progress from thinness to compression and pregnancy, from exactitude and rigidity to irregularity and fluidity, corresponds to a growth in readiness and fecundity of suggestion that overpowers attention to metre. But we have here at the same time much of the precisely opposite tendency to slurring and elision (fifty or more instances), *i.e.* to write by ear instead of by rule; an unusual number, for this date, of lines with extra-metrical syllables; and some few which we are obliged to take as Alexandrines.² The frequency of

¹ I count fourteen instances of "Proteus" as trisyllable, twelve of *-ion* as dissyllable at the end of a line (cf. "ocean," II. vii. 32; "influence," III. i. 183; "suppliant," III. i. 234; "emperor," I. iii. 41, as contrasted with dissyllable at line 38, "fire" (dissyllable), I. ii. 30; "fire's," II. vii. 22 (as monosyllable, lines 19, 20); "hour's," III. ii. 7 (monosyllable, II. ii. 9)); and nineteen of final *-ed* as a separate syllable.

² I recognise as Alexandrines—

I. i. 30. Coy looks with heart-sore sighs; one fading moment's mirth
 II. i. 105. I thank you, gentle servant: 'tis very clerkly done.
 II. iv. 62. I know him as myself; for from our infancy: (but see below (1)).
 and possibly, though they might be taken as prose,
 III. i. 204. Sirrah, I say, forbear. Friend Valentine, a word.
 IV. i. 10. Ay, by my beard, will we, for he's a proper man.
 IV. iii. 45. I will not fail your ladyship. Good morrow, gentle lady.
 All these have a well-marked pause at the middle ("servant" and "ladyship" have an extra-metrical syllable, as below (4)); and the reader may be inclined to

cases like these, and the large number of unfinished lines in the play—I count 65—support the idea of a later working-over of the piece; just as the doggerel, the end-

class them with those short lines of three accents found in this play (i. ii. 33-37, 92-94; v. ii. 4, 5, 8, 9, 15, 16, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29); and in *Richard III.* i. ii. 192-202. The three-accent lines may possibly be regarded as six-accent lines halved to give briskness to the dialogue (stichomythia), and six-accent lines would be natural to an ear accustomed, like our poet's, to the Alexandrines of Brooke; but whereas the three-accent lines are certainly intentional, these occasional six-accent lines may be written unconsciously for decasyllabics.

I should explain all the other cases in this play under—

- (1) Final contraction, two superfluous syllables passed as one—

- i. ii. 3. Ay, madam, so you stumble not unheedfully.
 ii. iv. 87. This is the gentleman I told your ladyship } as above, iv. iii. 45.
 ii. iv. 105. To be my fellow-servant to your ladyship }
 ii. iv. 62. (above—should perhaps be ranged here).
 iii. i. 64. Were rich and honourable; besides the gentleman (second syllable elided in "honourable").

- iv. iv. 45. And will employ thee in some service presently.

- (2) Contraction of proper names, generally final as (1)—

- i. ii. 110. Look, here is writ "kind Julia." Unkind Julia!
 ii. iv. 84. Silvia, I speak to you, and you, Sir Thurio, ("Thurio" again, line 117, and iii. ii. 30, 50; iv. ii. 2; and internal in
 iv. ii. 16. But here comes Thurio: now must we to her window,
 v. ii. 34. Why then, she's fled unto that peasant Valentine.
 v. ii. 50. I'll after, more to be revenged on Eglamour.

- (3) Internal slurring, or trisyllabic feet—

- ii. iv. 179. Ay, and *we are* betroth'd: nay, more, our marriage-hour.
 iv. iv. 185. A virtuous *gentlewoman*, mild and beautiful!
 and, without Alexandrine effect,

- i. ii. 131. *Madam*, dinner is ready, and your father stays
 iv. iii. 4. *Madam*, madam!—Who calls?—Your servant and your friend;
 iv. iv. 113. *Gentlewoman*, good day! I pray you, be my mean
 v. iv. 118. *And I mine*.—A prize, a prize, a prize!—Forbear.

- (4) Extra-metrical syllables, before pause—

- ii. ii. 19. Sir Proteus, you are stay'd *for*.—Gò; I come, I come.
 v. iv. 71. The private wound is deepest: O time most accurst,
 and, without Alexandrine effect,

- i. ii. 66. What, ho! *Lucetta*!—What would your ladyship?
 ii. i. 114. And yet I will not name *it*;—and yet I care not—
 v. iii. 10. There is our *captain*: we'll follow him that's fled;
 v. iv. 65. Could have persuaded *me*: now I dare not say
 v. iv. 94. But how cam'st thou by this *ring*? At my depart

But though many of these cases are thus explicable by recognised habits of elision in the blank decasyllabic verse of Shakespeare and others, I feel sufficient peculiarity in the verse of the play to suggest that *Felix and Philismena* of the Revels Account, or some other piece on which he possibly worked, was written in lines of six accents (or even in couplets, like Brooke's of twelve and fourteen syllables alternately), some of which may survive entire in *The Two Gentlemen*. Similar six-accent lines may be found in the unsuspected portions of *The Taming of the Shrew*, e.g.—

For such an injury would vex a very saint (iii. ii. 28).

Here, take away this dish.—I pray you let it stand (iv. iii. 44).

She says your worship means to make a puppet of her.

O monstrous arrogance! Thou liest, thou thread, thou thimble

(iv. iii. 105, 106).

That seeming to be most which we indeed least are (v. ii. 173).

stopped lines and markedly dissolute character of the generality of the verse indicate an original composition during the poet's earliest period.

The Lylian influence, discussed later, has also been urged in favour of an early date. It is seen, I think, more in the symmetrical structure, and in the general manner of Launce and Speed, than in actual euphuism of the diction, though I have noted below a few instances of the latter. The play is connected by a great number of links both with *Romeo and Juliet* and *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*; and some critics, e.g. Dr. Furnivall, have supposed it to follow the latter.¹ But if our play exhibits, as I agree that it does, a high degree of dramatic skill, there can be no question that the *Dream* stands much above it in imaginative beauty and original power; and some of the marks that connect ours with the latter may have been inserted at the time of revision.² Against the *Dream's* precedence, too, is its undoubtedly simpler and more natural style, as Sarrazin remarks. In regard to *Romeo and Juliet*, connected with our play by so many links,³ I merely note that Valentine's banishment speech (III. i. 170-187) is certainly earlier than

¹ "The play is strongly linkt with the *Dream*. Its subject is the same, fickleness of love. Two men seek one girl; one of the men (Proteus, Demetrius) is loved by another girl (Julia, Helena), to whom he was betrothed, but whom he deserts for a time, who follows him, and whom he at last turns to again. Both couples are to be married on the same day, both girls run after their lovers, both fathers want to marry their daughters to men whom they dislike, but consent to their girls' choice at last. Hermia trusts Helena with her secret, and she betrays it; Valentine trusts Proteus with his secret, and Proteus betrays it. We have a Duke and a wood in both plays" (*Leopold Shakespeare*, p. xxvii). Dr. Furnivall considers our play the later as being "a great advance on the *Dream* in dramatic construction."

² E.g. Julia's reference to "Ariadne passioning For Theseus' perjury," IV. iv. 173 (*Midsummer-Night's Dream*, II. ii. 20, 21), and compare the surrender, "All that is mine in Silvia I give thee," V. iv. 83, with Lysander to Demetrius (*Midsummer-Night's Dream*, III. ii. 164, 165)—

And here with all good will, with all my heart

In Hermia's love I yield you up my part

—both noted by Mr. Fleay (*Life of Shakespeare*, pp. 188-191), who also compares with less point Valentine's "How like a dream is this I see and hear," V. iv. 26, with *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, III. i. 190, "It seems to me | That yet we sleep, we dream."

³ Sarrazin (*Jahrbuch*, xxxii. 170) gives several close verbal resemblances. He considers *Romeo and Juliet* the play that immediately precedes ours. Certainly it has the lyrical feeling and the marks of early euphuistic style in a much greater degree than ours; but these may be marks of the earliest sketch, retained, and perhaps developed as appropriate, in a later production of far greater power.

Romeo's similar speech (III. iii. 12-70), which, since that play was acted "by the L. of Hunsdon his Seruants" between July 22, 1596, and April 17, 1597, can hardly have been written later than the first half of 1596. It stands almost entire in the Quarto of 1597.

On the whole, I incline to suppose the earliest form of *The Two Gentlemen* produced about 1590, though later than *Love's Labour's Lost* and *The Comedy of Errors*, and to recognise with Fleay a probable revision not later than 1595.

Sources:
Monte-
mayor's
"Diana."

That part of the play which concerns the loves of Proteus and Julia is largely borrowed from the tale of Felix and Felismena in the romance *Diana Enamorada* (Pt. I. Bk. ii.), written in Spanish by the Portuguese poet Jorge de Montemayor, and first printed at Valencia, 1542 (Ticknor, iii. 82 *sqq.*). That Shakespeare read Spanish there is no reason to suppose: but in the Preface to the earliest complete English translation, which appeared in 1598, Bartholomew Yonge, the translator, tells us that his work had been completed in MS. for upwards of sixteen years, *i.e.* it existed complete in 1582. He mentions another partial translation by Edward Paston, while we know further that Thomas Wilson translated the First Part in 1596: neither of these, however, were ever printed. The wooing of a Court-lady (Claudia) by a knight (Faustus) through the agency of a page (Valerius), with the same result of her suicide for vain love of the page and Faustus' secret retirement from Court, obviously borrowed from Montemayor, is the subject of the Fifth Eclogue in the *Eglogs, Epytaphes and Sonettes*, 1563, of Barnabe Googe, who, from other passages in his book, may have read Spanish:¹ but Googe's page is not a woman in disguise; and the close correspondence with Montemayor of the scene between Julia and Lucetta (I. ii.), of that where Julia and the Host overhear Proteus' music (IV. ii.), and of that between Julia and Silvia (IV. iv.), compels us to regard the

¹ He was sent to Spain by Cecil in 1561.

Diana as Shakespeare's real source. It has, however, been overlooked that there existed a French translation of the First Part of Montemayor's work by Nicolas Collin (Rheims, 1578, 8°), reprinted with a further translation of the additions of Perez and Polo by Gabriel Chappuis at Paris, 1587, 12° (see Brunet). Shakespeare, who some half-dozen years later wrote a whole scene in French (*Henry V.* III. iv.), may very well have read Collin's version, which was also perhaps used by Sidney in composing the *Arcadia* and in translating certain songs from Montemayor which appear among his miscellaneous poems.¹ Yet it is possible that neither Collin's printed French, nor Yonge's MS. English, version was Shakespeare's immediate source; for the Revels Accounts for the period November 1584 to February 1584-85 record, "The history of Felix et Philomena [? Felismena] shewed and enacted before her highness by her Ma^{tes} servauntes on the sondaie next after neweyeaes daie at night at Grenewiche, wherein way [were] ymployed one battlement et a house of canvas," a near enough approximation to Silvia's window in the palace. Until a copy of this lost play is found, it must remain uncertain whether Shakespeare used or adapted it, and whether or no it contained anything more than the tale of Julia and Proteus.

For illustrative purposes Yonge's translation will serve us best. The passages of Montemayor's tale laid under contribution are quoted at length in the Notes, from the *Shakespeare Library*, Pt. I. vol. i., with reference to the pages of that collection. The chief *points of resemblance* are the use by Don Felix of Felismena's maid as intermediary, and the coyness exhibited by the heroine in receiving his letter; the breach of their intimacy by his despatch to Court; the pursuit of him thither by Felismena in male dress at some risk to her reputation; her lodging on arrival at an inn and hearing by the host's means the serenading of Celia (Silvia) by Don Felix; her taking service as a page (Valerius) with the latter, and being sent

¹ Sidney's knowledge of Spanish, however, seems evident from some remarks near the end of his *Apologie for Poetrie*, p. 71, ed. Arber.

by him to forward his new suit; the conversation between her and Celia about Don Felix' former love, and Celia's unfavourable reception of his addresses; and the heroine's final recognition by, reproach of, and reunion with Felix effected later in a forest after a scene of combat. Also Launce is in some sort represented by Felix' page Fabius, however conventional the latter.

Shakespeare's chief *points of difference* are—the changed names; the dramatic compression of Felix' first courtship of “almost a whole yeere”; the tearing of the letter by Julia, and her pretty soliloquy occasioned thereby; the fact that, while Felismena's father has died before her passion begins, Julia resides with hers (I. ii. 131, iii. 48), though from II. vii. 86 we should infer her independence; the ignorance of the attachment on the part of Proteus' father, who sends him to Court merely to complete his education;¹ the translation of Felix' grief-stricken inability to take his leave into Julia's silent tearful parting from her lover; the insertion of the Duke and the interest derived from making him the father of Proteus' new love, while in Montemayor Celia is clearly distinguished from “the great Princesse Augusta Cæsarina” to whose Court she is presumably attached; the substitution of Lucetta for one of Felismena's “approoved friends and treasouresse of my secrets” who assists her departure; the deletion of the motive of jealousy for the journey, though the weakening of Julia's first confidence of her welcome is pathetically evident in the course she takes on her arrival and in the melancholy noticed by the Host²—unlike Felismena, however, she ventures on direct inquiry about Proteus (IV. ii. 31); the deletion of Celia's passion for the supposed page; the corresponding deletion of her chagrin and death, and the bringing of Silvia to the forest to share in the *dénouement*; the retention of Julia in the company of Proteus, and the

¹ “Perhaps Shakespeare would not allow Proteus the pretext that in his untruth to Julia he was shewing himself a good son.”—Zupitza in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, xxiii. 1–17.

² So Lear's certainty of Regan's kindness, I. iv. 327, 328, seems to suffer the inroad of doubt before he quits Goneril's roof—“Acquaint my daughter no further with anything you know than comes from her demand out of the letter,” I. v. 2–4.

anagnorisis occasioned by her swoon and subsequent reproduction of the ring, while in Montemayor after a separation of two years occurs Felismena's chance meeting with and rescue of her lover, Felix faints beneath her reproaches and is recovered both of his wounds and his erring love by a potion. Shakespeare further adds Thurio and Eglamour.

The Duke's resentment of his daughter's secret love "Gismond of Salern." for a courtier far below her rank, and especially the lines
III. i. 24, 25,

This love of theirs myself have often seen
Haply when they have judged me fast asleep,

remind Mr. Craig of Boccaccio's novel (*Decamerone*, Giorn. iv. Nov. 1) of Tancred and his daughter Ghismonda and her love for Guiscardo; wherein Tancred, who has been accidental witness of their embraces, entraps and kills Guiscard, and sends his heart in a cup to Ghismonda, who pours poison upon it and drinks it. The tale includes the secret conveyance of a letter in a cane from the Princess to her lover. It is worth remarking that after inclusion in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* (1566), vol. i. No. 39, it had been dramatised by five young barristers of the Inner Temple in 1567 as *Gismond of Salern*; and that, as lately as 1591, Robert Wilmot, the contributor of the original fifth Act, had issued a revised form of the play as a whole, which appears in Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, vol. vii.¹

With, I think, insufficient reason, some independent influence on the close of the piece has been traced to the tale of Apollonius and Silla, as translated in Riche's *Farewell* (1581) from Cinthio's *Hecatommithi* (pub. 1561), wherein two couples are made happy—an ending more or less imposed on Shakespeare, as Zupitza observes, by his design of writing a comedy. The earlier date of Montemayor's work (1542) disposes of Simrock's theory that the brother of Felismena, whose fortunes, linked with hers at the outset, are never followed up, was originally intended

¹ The original play was printed from the English MSS. by Dr. A. Brandl in *Quellen und Forschungen*, Heft 80 (1898). The story is included by Dryden in his *Fables or Tales from Chaucer and Boccaccio* under the title of "Sigismonda and Guiscardo."

to answer Celia's passion for the page, just as the brother Paolo in Bandello's "Apollonius and Silla" and Silvio in Riche's version, indemnify Catella and Julina respectively. The later dates of Bandello's *Novelle* (1554), and of Cinthio's work, show that Montemayor at least had no example for such supposed intention. Shakespeare's motive for suppressing Celia's passion for the page is obvious in the pre-engagement of Silvia's affections. Later, in *Twelfth Night*, he takes up and develops this dropped thread, evidently following, however, Riche rather than Montemayor. The single point in Riche that may be recalled in our play is, that the captain of the vessel, in which Silla, having "stole awaie from out her fathers court . . . disguising herself in verie simple attire," is sailing to Constantinople, conceives a passion for her and, entreaties failing, threatens to force her compliance; which a little reminds us of Proteus' conduct towards Silvia in the forest.¹

*The
Friendship
Story.*

With this tale of faithful and fickle love Shakespeare has interwoven another of truth and falsehood in friendship, *i.e.* the whole relations of Valentine and Proteus, for which his dependence on any original is far less obvious. Delius has shown that the general subject of friendship occupied so prominent a place in Shakespeare's mind that it not only furnished the chief motive of his Sonnet-series²—a form

¹ J. L. Klein (*Geschichte des Drama's*, 1866, bd. iv. 785-791) considers that Shakespeare took the elopement and double wooing of Silvia from Parabosco's *Il Viluppo*; and that he had before him as model for Julia, not only Montemayor's Felismena, but Cornelia in that play, who takes service as a page (Brunetto) with Valerio whom she loves, and has, like Julia, to forward his suit to Sophonisba. Klein relies particularly on the resemblance between Julia's soliloquy (iv. iv. 95-112) and that of Cornelia on the like occasion, especially the words "che farò io? sarò così crudele contra me stessa, ch' io medesima a me usi tanto tradimento?" (cf. 109, 110, "But cannot be true servant to my master, Unless I prove false traitor to myself"); and notes further that while Julia speaks of her "blackness" since she threw her mask away, and alludes to having played a part in a pageant, Parabosco's page has stained her face artificially, and has also played a woman's part at Valerio's request. The connection seems to me rather possible than necessary: the brief verbal resemblance cited is represented in Montemayor (p. 307) by "I was a solicitor against my selfe," and is indeed almost inseparable from the dramatic position. *Il Viluppo* was first published by G. Giolito "Vinegia, 1547, 80" (Brunet), and included in a collection of six comedies of Parabosco "Vinegia, 1560, 120": there seems to have been no English translation.

² Cf. with Valentine's surrender of Silvia, Sonnet 40, "Take all my loves, my love, yea, take them all," and 42.

hitherto regarded as the proper vehicle for the love-passion only, but also received emphatic and varied treatment in many other plays, *e.g.* Antonio and Bassanio, Brutus and Cassius, Romeo and Mercutio, Hamlet and Horatio, Sebastian and Antonio (*Twelfth Night*), Achilles and Patroclus, Coriolanus and Menenius.¹ It was a subject, indeed, that formed part of general mental furniture in the time immediately preceding: it had been handled dramatically by Richard Edwardes in his *Damon and Pithias*, c. 1564, and in prose by Stephen Gosson in his *Ephemerides of Phialo*, 1579. The men of the Renaissance were familiar enough with the treatises of Cicero and Plutarch, but this theme was also part of their inheritance from the Middle Age. For the sacrifice of a mistress to a friend Halliwell cited the old English romance "Amis and Amiloun"; and Professor Herford recurred to Boccaccio's tale of Tito and Gisippo (*Decam.* x. 8), a tale introduced in Sir Thos. Elyot's *Governour*, 1531, and versified therefrom in a dull poem by Edward Lewicke in 1562,²—wherein two friends, Titus a Roman and Gisippus a Greek, study under one master at Athens; Titus falls in love with the lady whom Gisippus is about to marry, and Gisippus magnanimously resigns his claim, the main interest of the tale drifting away from this love-affair. A much fainter parallel may be found in Lyly's *Endimion* (printed 1592; acted, I believe, February 2, 1586), wherein the chivalrous Eumenides, confronted with the alternative offer of Endimion's restoration or the enjoyment of his love Semele, sacrifices the latter to the claims of friendship. The opening scene of *Endimion* exhibits the friends in just the same respective attitude towards love as in I. i. of our play.

But it is not the faithful but the faithless friend that bulks most largely in Shakespeare's work; and, if source be required for Proteus and his treachery, I find one obvious

Lyly's
"Eumenides."

¹ "Die Freundschaft in Shakspeare's Dramen"—*Abhandlungen zu Shakspeare*. Elberfeld, 1888.

² See Warton's *Hist. Eng. Poetry*, iii. 468 (sec. lx.), and Collier's *Poetical Decameron*, 7th Conversation, pp. 79-85. "The petifull history of ij lovyng Italyons" which Warton noted as entered on the Sta. Reg. to Hen. Binneman in 1570 (probably early in 1571; cf. *Transcript*, i. 440) sounds more like some version of the tale of Romeo and Juliet.

enough, however overlooked, in Lyly's *Euphues*, 1578. Of the poet's familiarity with that novel there is no possible doubt: he reproduces its phrases, he imitates its style. In it friendship and its conduct are as much a leading motive as are youthful folly and fickleness in love; and in recounting the relations of Euphues and Philautus, reference is made more than once to the famous friendships between Damon and Pithias, Scipio and Lælius (*De Amicitia*), and Titus and Gisippus, already alluded to. Philautus, living at Naples, unsuspectingly introduces his accomplished and witty friend, newly come from Athens, to his love Lucilla. Euphues falls in love at first sight, and after a long self-communing, in which he debates the claims of passion and friendship, decides boldly to gratify the former.¹ The issue and the circumstances differ from those in the play, but might nevertheless afford suggestion to Shakespeare. Euphues' passion, which is returned, has to be pursued without the approval or knowledge of the girl's father: the latter prefers the wealthy suitor, Philautus, whom Euphues contemptuously outwits. This hackneyed situation is reproduced in the relations between the Duke, Valentine, Proteus, and Thurio; while the latter's name is noticeably similar to that of the worthless Curio, the *tertium quid* in the novel, who ultimately bears off the prize. The friends are subsequently reconciled, though Philautus takes a later occasion to retort on Euphues, as Proteus on Valentine, the tirades against love he has himself endured.² Some parallel for Valentine's love-maxims (III. i. 89-105) might be found in *Euphues*, but they are really derived rather from Lyly's *Sapho and Phao* (1582). Finally, the debated "Emperor" of the play is probably transferred from the novel wherein he holds Court at Naples (vol. i. 314, 319, 323), reproducing anachronistically his model, Guevara's Marcus Aurelius.

"Julio
und Hyp-
polita."

Some notice must, however, be taken of another suggestion. In 1817 Tieck pointed out³ a resemblance to

¹ With Lyly's *Works*, vol. i. 208-211, *e.g.*, "Where loue beareth sway friendship can haue no shew," compare Proteus' soliloquies, and v. iv. 53, 54, "In love | Who respects friend?"

² Cf. *Works*, ii. 92, 93, with II. iv. 125-150 of our play.

³ *Deutsches Theater*, Berlin, 1817, bd. i. ss. xxiii-xxvii.

our play in an old German piece called *Tragædia von Julio und Hyppolita*, which forms No. 7 in a collection published in 1620 under the title of *Englische Comoedien und Tragœdien*, professing to be those given by English actors in Germany at various royal, electoral, and princely Courts, or in important towns. The late Mr. Albert Cohn, following up this line of investigation in his *Shakespeare in Germany*, 1864, has made the presence and influence of English actors there from 1586 onwards abundantly clear; and has given us good reason for supposing, what Tieck already suspected, that the collection of 1620 did not emanate from the English players themselves, whose market would only be spoilt by publication, but was in reality a body of pirated and mutilated work, taken down from the English uttered by the actors and then translated, with the view of appropriating their pieces for the benefit of German companies, who had already begun to compete with their more highly skilled visitors.¹ This is quite borne out by the incomplete and fragmentary nature of the printed pieces, in which speeches are often broken off with "&c."; and in reading the extremely summary, rude, and poor *Julio und Hyppolita*, in which this interruption occurs, we need not conclude to a corresponding rudeness and poverty in its English original. To my mind, the doubt of a connection between that and *The Two Gentlemen* centres rather on the question of date. Tieck, and Cohn after him, says that the piece was "played in Germany about 1600"; but neither of them offer any precise evidence for the statement, and the single suggestion which supports the notion of contemporaneity with Shakespeare's play is the later one² of its possible identity with the lost *Phillipo and Hewpolyto*, often mentioned in Henslowe's Diary, and first as a piece already old under date 9th July 1594.³ Except that *Julio und Hyppolita* as it stands is so much the ruder and less complicated piece (a circumstance partly attributable, as

¹ *Shakespeare in Germany*, pp. civ-cvi.

² First (?) by Zupitza in the *Jahrbuch*, xxiii. 4 (1888).

³ Ed. Shaks. Soc. 1845, p. 37. Eleven other performances of it are recorded within the next three months, with diminishing receipts.

said, to the circumstances of its German publication), I see no particular reason why its English author may not rather have been indebted to *The Two Gentlemen*. In a brief account of it below (Appendix I.) I have been careful to indicate everything in the least suggestive.

Munday's
"Two
Italian
Gentle-
men."

Equally uncertain is Shakespeare's debt to an earlier piece, the title of which seems to promise a closer connection. "Fedele et Fortuna [Fortunio]. The deceptes in love Discoursed in a Commedia of ij Italian gent and translated into Englishe" is entered on the Stationers' Register to Thomas Hackett, under date 12th November 1584 (*Transcript*, ii. 437). Only two copies of this work are known; and Collier, who discusses it,¹ Hazlitt, who mentions it in his *Handbook*, p. 406, and Halliwell, who prints considerable extracts from it,² have religiously kept the secret of their whereabouts. One of them has a dedication signed A. M. reprinted by Collier, who supposed the initials to stand for Anthony Munday; and on the verso of that leaf is a prologue spoken before the Queen. The title-page is missing in one, or (as Hazlitt) in both copies: the running title is "The Two Italian Gentlemen." Halliwell's extracts amount to about 310 lines, apart from a few stage-directions. He supplies further directions, and intersperses brief summaries of parts he omits; but nowhere makes the least suggestion of any connection with Shakespeare's play, which is first found in Mr. Gollancz' "Temple Shakespeare" edition, 1897, and has received support in the Eversley edition of Professor Herford, and a mention in the "Little Shakespeare" of Mr. W. J. Craig. I append the following argument, so far as I can gather it from the extracts.

Fedele, forsaking his love Virginia, woos Victoria. The latter being in love with Fortunio, whose affection she hopes to secure by aid of Medusa's magic, tries to rid herself of Fedele by engaging a comic bully, Captain Crackstone, to kill him, a plan easily defeated by the cowardice of Crackstone, who is captured by the

¹ *Hist. Dram. Poetry*, ed. 1879, iii. 60-65.

² *The Literature of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries illustrated by Reprints of very rare Tracts*, 1851.