NARRATIVE AND DRAMATIC SOURCES OF SHAKESPEARE

Edited by
GEOFFREY BULLOUGH

Volume VI

OTHER 'CLASSICAL' PLAYS:
TITUS ANDRONICUS
TROILUS AND CRESSIDA
TIMON OF ATHENS
PERICLES, PRINCE OF TYRE

First published in 1966 by Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd
Reprinted in 1996 ,2000 by Routledge

11 New Fetter Lane
London EC4P 4EE

© *1966 Geoffrey Bullough*

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

Printed in Great Britain by
Antony Rowe Limited, Chippenham, Wiltshire

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or utilized in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Cataloguing in Publication Data

ISBN: 0-415-16344-7 (volume 6)
ISBN: 0-415-14378-0 (8 volume set)

PREFACE

THE plays treated in this volume have little in common, but they are all based on themes which, if not classical in any modern historical sense, were in the sixteenth century regarded as authentically of the ancient world. Thus Timon, the prototype misanthrope, emerged from the pages of Plutarch to become a vehicle of Lucianic satire and a favourite 'Morality' allusion during the Renaissance. Troilus and Cressida were to Chaucer and later writers as real as the more truly Homeric participants in the Troy story. Apollonius-Pericles was a typical hero of Greek romance as Christianized by the Middle Ages and revived for Elizabethan popular reading. And Titus Andronicus was a figure (whether fictitious or not made no odds) from the last days of divided Rome when the darkness of savagery was falling over the Mediterranean world. Being written at very different periods of Shakespeare's career the plays afford scope for interesting comparative studies in his handling of source-material at the beginning, middle and towards the end of his development. In bringing together the chief sources and analogues I have tried to provide texts as full as possible within the limits of my space; but I have not sacrificed what Shakespeare may have used in order to include what he certainly did not. His omissions are often significant, but by no means always. There seemed, also, no good reason for giving the whole of the anonymous *Timon*, which he almost certainly never saw; on the other hand for *Pericles* I print Twine's and Wilkins's narratives entire, the latter because it is still a centre of controversy and because it may derive in part from a previous *Pericles* play.

My thanks go out to the staffs of the libraries where I have worked, at King's College and the Goldsmiths' Library of London University, at Edinburgh University and the British Museum. I am grateful to Dr L. B. Wright and the authorities of the Folger Library, Washington, for permission to print (for

the first time in its original form) the Titus Andronicus chapbook; to the Delegates of the Oxford University Press for allowing me to reproduce the late Sir W. W. Greg's invaluable transcript of the Troilus and Cressida 'plot' in B.M. Add. MSS. 10449; and to the Victoria and Albert Museum for allowing me to collate the anonymous *Timon* MS. Many scholars have kindly sent me offprints of relevant articles, and I have as usual made use of the invaluable work on Shakespeare's sources published over many years by Professor Kenneth Muir, to whom this volume is gratefully dedicated. Miss Rosemary Jackson has given constant help, and my wife has toiled over the proofs and generally made it possible for me to complete the work.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1. *Shakespeare's Works and Apocrypha*

Ado	*Much Ado about Nothing*
AFev	*Arden of Feversham*
AShrew	*The Taming of A Shrew*
AYL	*As You Like It*
CE	*Comedy of Errors*
Cor	*Coriolanus*
Cym	*Cymbeline*
Ham	*Hamlet*
1H4	*Henry the Fourth, Part I*
2H4	*Henry the Fourth, Part II*
H5	*Henry the Fifth*
1H6	*Henry the Sixth, Part I*
2H6	*Henry the Sixth, Part II*
3H6	*Henry the Sixth, Part III*
H8	*Henry the Eighth*
KJ	*King John*
LComp	*Lover's Complaint*
Lear	*King Lear*
LLL	*Love's Labour's Lost*
Luc	*The Rape of Lucrece*
Mac	*Macbeth*
MM	*Measure for Measure*
MND	*A Midsummer Night's Dream*
More	*Sir Thomas More*
MV	*The Merchant of Venice*
MWW	*The Merry Wives of Windsor*
NobKin	*Two Noble Kinsmen*
Oth	*Othello*
Per	*Pericles*
PhT	*The Phoenix and the Turtle*
PPil	*The Passionate Pilgrim*
R2	*King Richard the Second*
R3	*King Richard the Third*
RJ	*Romeo and Juliet*
Son	*Sonnets*
TA	*Titus Andronicus*
Tem	*The Tempest*
TGV	*Two Gentlemen of Verona*
Tim	*Timon of Athens*
TN	*Twelfth Night*
TrC	*Troilus and Cressida*
TSh	*The Taming of The Shrew*
VA	*Venus and Adonis*
WT	*The Winter's Tale*

2. *Modern Editions and Other Works*

Arden	The Arden Shakespeare
Camb	The New Cambridge edition, edited by J. Dover Wilson, A. Quiller-Couch, &c.
Coll	*Shakespeare's Library*, ed. J. P. Collier.
Conf	John Gower, *Confessio Amantis*.
ELH	*English Literary History* (Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland)
ElSt	E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols.
EngHist Soc	English Historical Society
EngStud	*Englische Studien*

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

Hol.	Holinshed's *Chronicles*
JEGP	*The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*
Jest Books	*Shakespeare Jest Books*, edited W. C. Hazlitt
Lee	Sir Sidney Lee, *Life of Shakespeare*
MalSoc	Malone Society Reprints
MedSt	E. K. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, 2 vols.
MLN	*Modern Language Notes*
MLR	*The Modern Language Review*
MPhil	*Modern Philology*
New Arden	The Arden Edition of Shakespeare (revised and reset)
N&Q	*Notes & Queries*
Oxf.	The Oxford Edition of Shakespeare, text by W. J. Craig; Introductory Studies by E. Dowden
PhilQ	*Philological Quarterly*
PMLA	Publications of the Modern Language Association of America
RES	*The Review of English Studies*
ShJb	Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare—Gesellschaft
ShLib	*Shakespeare's Library*, 6 vols. 2nd Edn. 1875, edited J. P. Collier and W. C. Hazlitt
ShQ	*Shakespeare Quarterly*
Sh.Soc. Trans.	*Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society*
SPhil	*Studies in Philology*
Sh Survey	*Shakespeare Survey*
Texas	*University of Texas Studies in English*
TLS	*The Times Literary Supplement* (London)
TR	*The Troublesome Raigne of King John*
Var.	*The New Variorum edition*, ed. H. H. Furness, &c.
WSh	E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare.*

3. *Other Abbreviations*

Arg	Argument
Chor	Chorus
Prol	Prologue
Rev.	Review
F	Folio edition
n.d.	No date
Q	Quarto edition
S.R.	The Stationer's Register
STC	*A Short-Title Catalogue of Books printed . . 1475–1640* (1950)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI

PREFACE *page* vii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xiii

1. *Titus Andronicus*. Introduction 3
Texts
I. Probable Source [A] and Analogue [B]. *The History of Titus Andronicus*. Anon. n.d. 34
A. The Tragical History of Titus Andronicus 35
B. The Lamentable and Tragical History of T. Andronicus (ballad) 44
II. Source. From Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Book VI, translated by Arthur Golding (1567) 48
III. Source. From *Thyestes*, by L. A. Seneca; translated by Jasper Heywood (1560) 58
IV. Analogue. *A Lamentable Ballad*. Anon. 71
V. Probable Source. From Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*, translated by Sir Thomas North (1579). (Scipio Africanus) 77

2. *Troilus and Cressida*. Introduction 83
Texts
I. Source [A] and Analogue [B]
A. *The Seaven Bookes of Homers Iliads*, translated by George Chapman (1598) 112
B. *The Iliads of Homer*, translated by George Chapman (1611) 138
II. Probable Source. From Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, translated by Arthur Golding (1567). (Books XII–XIII) 151

III. Possible Source. From *The Hystorye Sege and Dystruccyon of Troye*, by John Lydgate (1513) 157

IV. Source. From *The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye*, by Raoul Lefevre; translated by William Caxton (*c.* 1474) 186

V. Analogue. From *The Testament of Cresseid*, by Robert Henryson (1593 ed.) 215

VI. Possible Source. The *Troilus and Cressida* Plot, BM. MS. Add. 10449 220

3. *Timon of Athens*. Introduction 225

Texts

I. Source. Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes*, translated by Sir Thomas North (1579). (From The Life of Marcus Antonius) 251

II. Source. Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes*, translated by Sir Thomas North (1579). (From The Life of Alcibiades) 252

III. Translation of Possible Source. *The Dialogue of Timon*, by Lucian, from the Italian version by N. da Lonigo (1536) 263

IV. Analogue. From *Timone*, by M. M. Boiardo (*c.* 1487) 277

V. Analogue. *The Palace of Pleasure*, by W. Painter (1566). (The Twenty-Eighth Novell) 293

VI. Analogue. From *Theatrum Mundi*, by P. Boaistuau, translated by John Alday (1566?) 295

VII. Analogue. From *Timon*. Anon (after 1601) 297

VIII. Possible Source. From *Campaspe*, by John Lyly (1584) 339

4. *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. Introduction. 349

Texts

I. Source. From *Confessio Amantis*, book VIII, by John Gower (1554 edn.) 375

II. Source. *The Patterne of Painefull Adventures*, by Laurence Twine (1594? edn.) 423

III. Analogue. From *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia*, by Sir Philip Sidney (1590) 482

IV. Analogue. *The Painfull Adventures of Pericles Prince of Tyre*, by George Wilkins (1608) 492

V. Analogue. From *The Orator*, by Alexander Silvayn, translated by Lazarus Piot (1596) 546

APPENDIX. *Pericles* and the Verse in Wilkins's *Painfull Adventures* 549

BIBLIOGRAPHY 565

INDEX TO THE INTRODUCTIONS 575

TITUS ANDRONICUS

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

INTRODUCTION

ON 6 February 1594 'a Noble Roman Historye of Tytus Andronicus' was entered in the Stationers' Register to John Danter along with a ballad on the same subject. The play was printed in the same year (Q1). A second Quarto, printed in 1600 by James Roberts for Edward White, corrected the text somewhat. A third Quarto was printed for Edward White in 1611, and the first Folio text was set up from this, with the addition of some stage directions, the whole of Act III, Scene 2 (in which Titus expatiates on his grief and anger) and two other lines.

Another entry in the Stationers' Register, on 19 April 1602, allowed the transfer from Thomas Millington to Thomas Pavier of 'A booke called Titus and Andronicus'. It has been plausibly suggested[1] that both the 1594 entry and this of 1602 referred, not to the play, but to a prose story which together with a ballad survived in, or influenced, an eighteenth-century chap-book, now in the Folger Library [Text I]. On 14 December 1624, an entry of 128 ballads, made to John Pavier, Edward Wright and four other men, included a 'Titus Andronicus', probably the ballad of the 1594 entry. Two years later, after Thomas Pavier's death, his 'rights in Shakesperes plaies or any of them' and 'His parte in any sorts of Ballads' were made over to Edward Brewster and Robert Birde. The ballads included 'Tytus and Andronicus'.

Some items of stage history have a bearing on the play's date. Was it the *Tittus and Vespacia* played for Henslowe by Strange's men between 11 April 1592 and 25 January 1593; a new ('ne') play? This may have been a play on Titus Vespasianus, the virtuous monarch famed for the Siege of Jerusalem and for his conversion from profligacy on achieving the purple; perhaps on his relations with his father Vespasian—which resembled those of Prince Hal with Henry IV. Since Strange's men had

[1] Cf. J. Q. Adams, ed., *TA*, 1936; J. C. Maxwell, *New Arden*, 1953, p. 9.

another play *Jerusalem* in 1592 there may well have been two plays on different periods in the life of Titus. Sussex's men acted a 'ne' *Titus Andronicus* for Henslowe between 24 January and 6 February 1594. Later in the same year the Admiral's *or* the Chamberlain's Men played it on 7 and 14 June. [The Chamberlain's company had previously been Lord Strange's, before he became Earl of Derby in September 1593.]

Was our play really 'ne' when played by Sussex's men in 1594? The title page of Q1 refers to performances by men of the Earl of Derby (Strange) and the Earl of Pembroke, as well as those of Sussex. There may have been joint performances; or Henslowe may have taken over the play from Derby's or Pembroke's Company. Maybe it was rewritten for the 1594 production; this (or later revision) would help to account for some of its peculiarities. Ben Jonson in the Induction to *Bartholomew Fair* in 1614 declared satirically:

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

The number of years should perhaps not be taken too literally, since Jonson's purpose was satire, but he classed *Andronicus* with *The Spanish Tragedy*, which was probably written about 1589.

Francis Meres in 1598 included *Titus Andronicus* among Shakespeare's plays and this is good evidence that Shakespeare had a major part in it. Is it a very early piece by Shakespeare, or a work of collaboration dating from about 1590, or does the play as we have it represent a rewriting of someone else's play by Shakespeare as late as 1594, alone or in collaboration? Certainly *Titus* was old-fashioned in themes and style for 1594. But the evidence is diverse and contradictory, and cannot be discussed fully here. The First Folio editors, like Meres, attributed it to Shakespeare. Long afterwards, in 1687, Edward Ravenscroft, who 'improved' the play, declared that he was

> 'told by some anciently conversant with the Stage, that it was not Originally his, but brought by a private Authour to be Acted, and he only gave some Master-touches to one or two of the Principal Parts or Characters; this I am apt to believe,

because 'tis the most incorrect and indigested piece in all his Works; It seems rather a heap of Rubbish then a Structure.' (*WSh*, II, 255)

Ravenscroft was the first of many critics to doubt that Shakespeare was the sole or chief author. Others, while admitting that Shakespeare may have had a hand in it, have doubted whether he would have done so as late as 1594 and have suggested various dates from 1589 onwards.

Evidence of an early date for a *Titus* play comes from the anonymous *A Knack to Know a Knave*, in which someone is as welcome

> As Titus was unto the Roman Senators
> When he had made a conquest on the Gotts[1].

A Knack was registered on 7 January 1594, but entered in Henslowe's *Diary* as new when Strange's men played it on 10 June 1592. Was this reference caught up into *A Knack* from performances of *Titus*? Professor J. C. Maxwell (*New Arden*, xxvi–xxvii) points out two resemblances in *The Troublesome Raigne of King John* (printed 1591):

TA, AARON Even now I curse the day, and yet, I think
Few come within the compass of my curse,
Wherein I did not some notorious ill.
(V.1.125–7)

TR, JOHN How, what, when, and where, had I bestowed a day
That tended not to some notorious ill?
(Pt. II.1060–61 Cf. Vol. IV, p. 147)

and *TA*, No funeral rite . . .
But throw her forth to beasts and birds of prey
(V.3.196–8)

TR, Cast out of doors, denied his burial rite,
A prey for birds and beasts to gorge upon
(Pt. II.1.35–6)

The Troublesome Raigne might have taken this from *Titus*, but the indebtedness might equally be on the other side.

[1] Cf. Hazlitt's Dodsley, VI.572.

The external evidence is too elusive to disregard Henslowe's note that *Titus* as played in 1594 was new. But it may have been a revision of an earlier play written by Shakespeare or (more probably) by someone else.

Two foreign versions of the story have been thought by some scholars to spring from earlier English plays. These are the German *Tragœdia von Tito Andronico*, printed in 1620,[1] and a Dutch play by Jan Vos, *Aran and Titus*, printed in 1641.[2] In the Dutch play there is no mention of Alarbus, Tamora's son, but a similar incident, when the victorious Titus proposes to sacrifice the Moorish prisoner Aaron to the god of war, but is prevented from doing so when Tamora begs the Emperor to spare him. It has been argued that this was probably the original incident and that Shakespeare changed the sacrificial victim to Alarbus in order to give the Queen a stronger motive for revenge; but in view of her guilty passion for Aaron a change would scarcely be necessary. The sacrifice of Alarbus, like the killing of Mutius, does not occur in the prose narrative which may derive from the original source (*inf.* 38), and both may have been inserted by the dramatist into the play to reveal Titus's Roman qualities.[3] This suggests that the Alarbus-episode was altered by the Dutch playwright rather than by Shakespeare.

In the German play the names of all the characters except Titus's are changed, and Lucius becomes Vespasian. This led to the suggestion that the piece derived from Henslowe's *Tittus and Vespacia* of 1591/2. But Lucius' part is too small for him to have been a titular hero, and Henslowe's play is more likely to have been about the Emperor Titus. H. de W. Fuller argued very neatly that the Dutch play was an adaptation of Henslowe's 1594 *Titus*, that the German play came from *Tittus and Vespacia*, and that our play combined features of both English originals.[4] But the case is not proven, and it seems more likely that both continental plays descended from Shakespeare's play.

[1] Trans. by A. Cohn in *Shakespeare in Germany*, 1865.

[2] Cf. Cohn, *ShJb*, xxiii, 1888, 11ff.

[3] W. W. Greg noted that Mutius seems to be an extra son, for Titus had twenty-five and lost twenty-two, yet brought four to Rome.

[4] *PMLA*, xvi, 1901, 1ff.

Of all the other analogues of *Titus Andronicus* the one which comes closest to its plot is the prose story in the Folger Library chap-book. This work, printed in the mid-eighteenth century, probably goes back to a sixteenth-century original, possibly to the *Noble Roman Historye* of 1594, and may well represent a major source of the play [Text IA]. A modernised text was given in the Signet Library edition by Sylvan Barnet (1964).

The first two of the six chapters of the chap-book history describe how Titus Andronicus raised the siege of Rome but was forced to fight for ten more years, during which he slew Tottilius, King of the Goths, and captured his queen, Attava, himself losing many of his twenty-five sons in battle. Tottilius's sons Alaricus and Abonus continued the struggle until the Emperor obtained peace by marrying Attava. By opposing this union, for fear of the Emperor's weakness and Attava's bad influence, Andronicus excited the latter's hatred. She had him exiled but he was recalled owing to the popular outcry.

The Queen has a black child by her paramour, an unnamed Moor who seconds her plots against Titus. She persuades her astonished husband that the child is his and regains his favour. Soon however her power is threatened when the Emperor's son by a former marriage falls in love with Titus's daughter Lavinia and is betrothed to her. To prepare for her own sons' accession she removes the Prince with the help of the Moor and her sons by having him shot 'through the Back with a poyson'd Arrow'. His body is cast into a pit, into which Lavinia's three brothers fall when Lavinia persuades them to go searching for her fiancé. Being discovered with the corpse, they are condemned for murder.

The Queen plays a heartless trick on Titus, sending the Moor to offer him the lives of his sons in exchange for one of his hands. The Moor cuts off the hand and Titus is sent the heads of his three sons. Horror increases when Lavinia, mourning her lover in 'Woods and Groves' is raped by Alaricus and Abonus, who then, following the Moor's advice, cut off her tongue and her hands. Discovered by her uncle Marcus Andronicus, she is taken to her father, and writes in the sand the identity of her ravishers.

Titus now feigns madness, and shoots arrows 'towards Heaven, as in Defiance, calling for Vengeance'. The Empress and her

sons feel secure, but the citizens are alarmed, and some of Titus's friends help him to take bloody revenge on the Queen's sons. After cutting their throats he makes their flesh and ground-up bones into 'two mighty Pasties'. The Emperor and Empress accept an invitation to Titus's house, 'thinking to make sport with his frantick Humour'. After they have eaten of the pasties he tells them their contents, and his friends, emerging from hiding, kill the Emperor and his wife. The Moor is captured and confesses his crimes; he is punished horribly by being smeared with honey and left to starve among bees and wasps. Expecting dire punishment, Titus kills his daughter at her own request and then falls on his sword.

The temporal setting of this prose story is supposedly 'in the Time of Theodosius', presumably towards the end of the fourth century A.D., for Theodosius the Great (son of the Roman General who in Britain drove back the Caledonians and created the province of Valentia between Hadrian's Wall and the Forth and Clyde) was made Gratian's colleague and Emperor of the East in A.D. 379. By this time the Roman Empire had long passed its height, and barbarian invaders, and especially the Goths, were roaming about the Eastern Empire—not as yet, however, in Italy. Theodosius shattered the vast army of the Goths in four years, made peace with Athanaric and tried to use the Goths in Thrace against other tribes, but they were unruly and contemptuous of the Romans. When Maximus (elected Emperor of the West in Britain) was warring against his rival, Valentinian II, Theodosius incorporated Huns, Alani and Goths in his army and defeated Maximus at Aquilegia in A.D. 388. Later he defeated the Franks (394) and ruled as sole Emperor for four months only. A pious Christian, he did penance in 390 for massacring 7,000 citizens of Thessalonica, and died in 395 in the arms of his friend, St Ambrose. This Emperor had little in common with the Theodosius of the prose story. His grandson Theodosius II (A.D. 401–50) however was Emperor of the East from 408 to 450, and was greatly under the influence of his wife Eudocia; but she was not a Gothic princess. During his reign, when Theodosius' second son Honorius (384–423) was Emperor of the West, Italy was invaded and only the strenuous efforts of Stilicho his general (a Vandal by birth) whose daughter Honorius married in 398,

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com