Obelisks and Pyramids in Shakespeare, Milton and Alcalá

Gordon Campbell

UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER

leb@leicester.ac.uk

I first attended a SEDERI conference in 1992, when the Society met in Las Palmas, a delightful setting which combined sybaritic living with architectural feasts such as the Gothic interior of the cathedral. When I returned in 1998 to read the paper on which this essay is based, the setting had shifted from Las Palmas to Alcalá, from the Gothic to the Renaissance. The Dionysian in me, the part that revels in Shakespeare, values Alcalá because of its associations with Cervantes, who is often said to have died on the same day as Shakespeare. That is true inasmuch as both are believed to have died on 23 April 1616, but in fact Cervantes died ten days before Shakespeare: the Gregorian calendar in use in Spain was ten days ahead of the Julian calendar still in use in England. I am also an Apollonian, a student of Milton, and in that mode my love of Cervantes is eclipsed by thoughts of Cardinal Cisneros and his Complutensian University and, most of all, his trilingual Bible. It is appropriate that all this should have happened in Alcalá, because this city can legitimately claim to be the place where the Spanish Renaissance began and where it flowered. A few miles from Alcalá, in the village of Mondéjar, the church of San Antonio can, despite its Gothic beginnings, reasonably be claimed as the first Renaissance church in Spain. The Renaissance subsequently reached its highest expression in the façade of the university building in which the Society met, Rodrigo Gil de Hontañón's masterpiece and one of the greatest Renaissance façades in Europe. The only gesture towards the Gothic past is the rope motif, representing the girdle of St Francis; the Renaissance present is represented in the courtyard of Saint Thomas of Villanueva by High Renaissance ball-topped obelisks –and obelisks are a subject to which I shall return in connection with Shakespeare– and by a characteristic Renaissance gesture towards the patron in the form of decorative and heraldic swans, a visual pun on *cisne* and Cisneros. I shall resist the temptation to pun too strenuously on the notion of Shakespeare as the swan of Avon, but I cannot help but notice the connection. Doctorands of the Complutensian University expounded their theses from the tribune of the Senate House, the Paraninfo, the glories of which are a Plateresque gallery and a Mudéjar ceiling with Renaissance coffering. This room is the architectural apogee of the Spanish Renaissance, and there could be no more fitting place in all of Spain for this learned Society to have met, nor any greater honour for the Society to have conferred on a guest lecturer than an invitation to lecture in this elegant and historically-resonant chamber.

There are many ways of approaching the literary and cultural history of the Renaissance; one of the delights of attending SEDERI conferences and reading their proceedings is that so many members of the Society have tapped the rich vein of Anglo-Hispanic literary relations, which are examined from a

Sederi 9 (1998), ISSN 1135-7789

wide variety of perspectives. In the spectrum of approaches to literature that extends from the theoretical to the antiquarian, I tend towards the latter, because I work with manuscripts and with early printed books. Such an approach may not seem surprising in the case of Milton, of whom there are thousands of records in hundreds of manuscripts in scores of archives, all of which I have had occasion to survey in recent years. One important manuscript has never been found: at the end of 1638 or early in 1639, Milton visited the vice-regal court in Naples. The record of that visit must be in the archives at Simancas, awaiting discovery by an enterprising member of SEDERI. In the case of Shakespeare, however, it is routinely assumed that the manuscripts have all been examined exhaustively, and that there is nothing more to be discovered. That assumption is simply wrong, as I hope to demonstrate in this paper.

The two figures at the heart of the English Renaissance are Shakespeare and Milton, and my topic is the possibility of a relationship between them. They are often assumed to be unrelated, because we associate the style of Milton with the very unShakespearian style of *Paradise Lost.* What we often forget are those moments in early Milton when his style imitates that of Shakespeare. Here is a passage from *Comus*:

> What might this be? A thousand fantasies
> Begin to throng into my memory
> Of calling shapes, and beckoning shadows dire,
> And airy tongues, that syllable men's names
> On sands, and shores, and desert wildernesses. 210
> (ll. 206-210)

A reader who did not recognise that passage as early Milton would note features such as the verbal use of "syllable" and almost certainly identify the style as that of late Shakespeare, for the simple reason that at this stage in his career Milton was trying to write like Shakespeare, just as, a few years before, he had attempted in "The Passion" to write like a metaphysical poet.

Is this, I wonder, anything more than a case of one writer influencing the style of another? I think it is, and in order to develop my case would like to sketch in some dates and details of early seventeenth-century London. Milton was a generation younger than Shakespeare. When Milton was born in 1608, Shakespeare was 44 years old, and when Shakespeare died in 1616, Milton was only seven. Shakespeare's last documented visit to London was in 1614. Did he, one wonders, call on his friends, Ben Jonson among them, for a drink or twelve at the Mermaid Tavern? This famous tavern was at the top of Bread Street, close to the old St Paul's Cathedral, and if one lived south of the river, as Shakespeare did, one had to walk down Bread Street to go home. On that same Bread Street was a house known as the Spread Eagle, where the Milton family lived. The house had been owned for more than a century by Eton College, who continued to own it until it disappeared in the Fire of London in 1666. On 16 October 1617 the house was surveyed, and that survey survives, together with a set of plans, in the library of Eton College. I was able recently to inspect the survey. The room in which young Milton lived was on the second floor, at the front of the house. As a child, he later explained, he used to sit up late at night in order to further his studies. We might therefore dally with the surmise of five-year-old John Milton looking up disapprovingly from his volume of Byzantine history late one evening in response to drunken singing, and seeing in the street below two revellers, Jonson and Shakespeare, noisily staggering home after an evening at the Mermaid. It is a beguiling image, but it is hardly a scholarly reconstruction. I propose to move from speculation to fact.

Let me begin with a little mystery. A few years after Shakespeare died, his two surviving colleagues decided to collect his plays in a folio volume. This edition, published in 1623, is known as the First Folio, and it is only the Second Folio volume in our literary history to contain vernacular plays. The first was Ben Jonson's folio of 1616, which had broken new ground by including not only poems,

Sederi 9 (1998), ISSN 1135-7789

which were readily accepted as literature, but plays, for which that claim had never before been made. The Shakespeare first folio was a conscious imitation of Jonson's, and its size proclaimed that Shakespeare's plays were literature rather than ephemeral drama. The Shakespeare folio was expensive –it cost £1– but it sold reasonably well, and in 1632 a Second Folio was published. This Second Folio, like the first, contained a series of dedicatory poems by a variety of authors. One of these poems in the Second Folio was written by young Milton, and it was his first publication. In what circumstances, I shall be asking later, was a totally unknown poet with no known interest in drama asked to contribute a poem to the Second Folio of Shakespeare's collected works?

A few years ago Oxford University Press published an old-spelling edition of Shakespeare. When I received my copy, I turned to Milton's poem in the Second Folio:

ON SHAKESPEARE

What neede my Shakespeare for his honour'd bones,
The labour of an Age, in piled stones
Or that his hallow'd Reliques should be hid
Vnder a starre-ypointing Pyramid?
Deare Sonne of Memory, great Heire of Fame, 5
What needst thou such dull witnesse of thy Name?
Thou in our wonder and astonishment
Hast built thy selfe a lasting Monument:
For whil'st to th' shame of slow-endevouring Art
Thy easie numbers flow, and that each hart, 10
Hath from the leaves of thy unvalued Booke,
Those Delphicke Lines with deepe Impression tooke
Then thou our fancy of her selfe bereaving,
Dost make us Marble with too much conceiving,
And so Sepulcher'd in such pompe dost lie 15
That Kings for such a Tombe would wish to die.

The poem itself is relatively straightforward, but there are a few points that may require clarification, apart from the star-ypointing pyramid to which I shall return. '"Numbers", in line 10, means 'metrical verses'; "Delphic", in line 12, does not have its modern meaning of 'oracular', but the seventeenth-century meaning of 'inspired by Apollo, the god of poetry'; "unvalued", in line 11, does not have its modern meaning, but precisely the opposite: it means 'invaluable', or 'of very great value indeed'. Finally, there are two textual details that will affect my argument as it develops The first is that in the Oxford text the poem is signed Iohn Milton. The second is that the last word in line 10 of the Oxford text is "hart". In the Second Folio the word is "part". The Oxford editors explain in their preface that "although the later texts published in Milton's lifetime probably contain authorial revisions, we have adhered to the text first published as prefatory material to the edition of Shakespeare". In fact the Oxford editors have ignored their own policy, taking the word "hart" from a later edition. This error is compounded by the fact that what Milton actually wrote was "heart" with an *e*; perhaps the leaves in the next line suggested to the Oxford editors an image of grazing deer. We should also notice a point to which I shall return, which is that the version in the folio is unsigned.

Where has this poem come from? On what was it modelled? What occasioned its composition? The ultimate origins of the poem lie in the Collegiate Church of St Bartholomew, in the village of Tong, in Shropshire. The church is known to the older generation of literary pilgrims as the burial place of Sir Richard Vernon, the "King of the Peak" in Scott's *Peveril of the Peak.* Perhaps more famously, it is the church beside which Little Nell dies in *The Old Curiosity Shop.* In the Dickens version of the story Nell is buried inside the church, but some time in the nineteenth century a verger discovered that

showing Little Nell's grave to literary pilgrims was a good source of income, and so erected a gravestone and forged an entry in the burial register.

The church is filled with monuments, including one to three members of the Stanley family, which has some memorial verses carved into the stone at each end (see Plate 1). At the head of the effigies six lines are engraved (see Plate 2):

ASK WHO LYES HEARE, BUT DO NOT WEEP,

HE IS NOT DEAD, HE DOOTH BVT SLEEP

THIS STONY REGISTER, IS FOR HIS BONES

HIS FAME IS MORE PERPETVALL THÊ THEISE STONES

AND HIS OWNE GOODNES, W^{T} HIM SELF BEING GON

SHALL LYVE WHEN EARTHLIE MONAMENT IS NONE

Six more lines are engraved at the foot:

NOT MONV[M]ENTALL STONE PRESERVES OVR FAME

NOR SKY ASPYRING PIRAMIDS OVR NAME

THE MEMORY OF HIM FOR WHOM THIS STANDS

SHALL OVTLYVE MARBL AND DEFACERS HANDS

WHEN ALL TO TYMES CONSVMPTION SHALL BE GEAVEN

STANDLY FOR WHOM THIS STANDS SHALL STAND IN HEAVEN

It is not clear whether these twelve lines constitute one poem or two, and if one, which stanza comes first. What is clear, however, is that Milton's poem is modelled on this text. Both his poem and the epitaph rhyme "bones" and "stones" and "fame" and "name", and perhaps most strikingly, the original of Milton's "star-ypointing pyramid" is recognisable in this poem's "sky-aspiring pyramids", which conveys the same idea in the same rhythm.

The tomb is surmounted by four obelisks that would seem to be the "pyramids" of the memorial poem; in early modern English the word "pyramid" could be used of any structure of pyramidical forms, including spires, pinnacles and obelisks. The main structure commemorates Sir Thomas Stanley, second son of the third Earl of Derby, and his wife Margaret. The figure beneath is their son Sir Edward Stanley. Sir Thomas died in 1576, Sir Edward in 1632, the year in which the Second Folio was published. The date of the tomb cannot be precisely fixed, but various inscriptions on it, together

Sederi 9 (1998), ISSN 1135-7789

PLATE 1. Stanley Monument, Collegiate Church of St. Bartholomew, Tong (Shropshire).
Photo: Courtesy of Professor Roy Flannagan, Ohio University.

Sederi 9 (1998), ISSN 1135-7789

PLATE 2. Inscription at the head of the effigies. It reads:

ASK WHO LYES HEARE, BUT DO NOT WEEP,
HE IS NOT DEAD, HE DOOTH BVT SLEEP
THIS STONY REGISTER, IS FOR HIS BONES
HIS FAME IS MORE PERPETVALL THÊ THEISE STONES
AND HIS OWNE GOODNES, W^{t} HIM SELF BEING GON
SHALL LYVE WHEN EARTHLIE MONAMENT IS NONE

Photo: Courtesy of Professor Roy Flannagan, Ohio University.

Sederi 9 (1998), ISSN 1135-7789

with stylistic considerations, incline me to think that we should think in terms of two dates. The tomb of Sir Thomas and Lady Stanley seems to date from the opening years of the seventeenth century, perhaps 1602 or 1603; the effigy of their son Edward was slid in afterwards, presumably shortly after his death in 1632. Milton's poem was dated 1630 by Milton. If it is imitating the verse on this tomb, then the verse must have been there by 1630, so it cannot commemorate Sir Edward. We may therefore conclude that it is one poem rather than two, though we cannot be certain which stanza comes first, and that it commemorates Sir Thomas Stanley.

Milton never visited Tong, so he could not have seen the tomb that is the source of his poem; similarly, the epitaph was never printed, so Milton could not have seen it in a book. What he could have seen, however, is a manuscript: the poem survives in at least five seventeenth-century manuscripts. One of these is in the Rawlinson manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. In this and subsequent transcriptions I have retained punctuation but modernised spelling, except for the word "Stanley":

An Epitaph

Not monumental stones preserves thy fame
Nor sky aspiring pyramids thy name
The monument of him for whom this stands
Shall outlive marble or defacers hands
Ask who lies here but do not weep [5]
He is not dead he doth but sleep
This earthly register his [*sic*] for his bones
His fame is more perpetual than these stones
And when to time consumption shall be given [10]
Stanlye for whom this stands shall stand in heaven.
(MS 2, fol. 269v°)

This is clearly a corrupt text; it has no title, offers no context, omits two lines, transposes two others and contains seven substantive variants from the other texts: in line 3, for example, it reads "monument" for "memory" and in line 7 it reads "earthly" for "stony". The scribe assumes that it is a single poem, beginning with "Not monumental stones", the quatrain at the foot of the effigy. That does not seem to me likely, because "Ask who lies here" is surely a more appropriate opening, and the last line of that stanza, with its mention of the earthly monument, would seem to lead naturally on to "nor monumental stone".

The second and third manuscripts add some significant details. One is a collection of epitaphs in the Portland manuscripts at Nottingham University:

An Epitaph on Sir Edward Standly
Shakespeare Engraven on his Tomb
in Tong Church

Not monumental stone preserves our fame
Nor sky-aspiring pyramids our name;
The memory of him for whom this stands,
Shall outlive marble, and defacers hands:
When all to times consumption shall be given [5]
Standley for whom this stands shall stand in heaven.

Idem, ibidem. On Sir Thomas Standley

Ask who lies here, but do not weep
He is not dead, he doth but sleep;
This stony register is for his bones
His fame is more perpetual than these stones:
And his own goodnes with himself being gone [5]
Shall live, when earthly monument is none.
(MS 9, p. 12)

The other is a related collection in the Folger Library:

An Epitaph on Sir Edward Standly
Shakespeare Engraven on his Tomb
in Tong Church

Not monumental stones preserves our fame,
Nor sky-aspiring pyramids our name;
The memory of him for whom this stands
Shall out live marble and defacers hands
When all to times consumption shall be given, [5]
Standly for whom this stands shall stand in heaven.

Idem, ibidem. On Sir Thomas Stanley

Ask who lies here but do not weep,
He is not dead he doth but sleep;
This stony register is for his bones,
His fame is more perpetual, than these stones:
And his own goodness with himself being gone, [5]
Shall live when earthly monument is none.
(MS 7, fol 8)

These manuscripts assume that there are two poems, transcribe them in the opposite order to the Bodleian manuscript and identify, as the Bodleian manuscript does not, the poems as having been written in memory of Sir Edward Stanley and Sir Thomas Stanley. This identification is clearly problematical, because Milton could not have imitated in 1630 an epitaph written for Sir Edward Stanley, who died in 1632. The other striking feature of these manuscripts is that they attribute the poems to Shakespeare. They are not, however, independent witnesses, because the two manuscripts are written in the same hand, and the pages on which the "Shakespeare" poem is written contain among other memorial poems transcriptions of the Latin poem in memory of Dr Godfrey Goldsborough, Bishop of Gloucester (who had died on 26 May 1604) on his tomb in the Lady Chapel of Gloucester Cathedral.

The final texts are in the College of Arms, in London. Both are contained in Dugdale's "Visitation of Shropshire, 1663-1664" (MS c.35). The first is in the hand of the antiquarian Sir William Dugdale:

Sederi 9 (1998), ISSN 1135-7789

These following verses were made by William Shakespeare
the late famous tragedian

Written upon the east end
of this tomb

Ask who lies here, but do not weep
He is not dead he doth but sleep
This stony register is for his bones
His fame is more perpetual than these stones.
And his own goodness with himself being gone
Shall live when earthly monument is none.

Written upon the west end
thereof

Not monumental stone preserves our fame,
Nor sky aspiring pyramids our name
The memory of him for whom this stands
Shall out-live marble and defacers hands.
When all to times consumption shallbe given
Stanley, for whom this stands, shall stand in heaven.
(MS 7, p. 20)

Once again the poems are attributed to Shakespeare. Why? It is, I suppose, remotely possible that Dugdale had seen a manuscript attribution, and it is possible that as a native of Warwickshire he knew of some tradition there, but it is surely more likely that he heard about the attribution to Shakespeare when he visited the church that contains the tomb. There must have been a local oral tradition, and that tradition may have been independent of the manuscript tradition.

The final text, which occurs later in the same manuscript but in a different hand, is one that is unknown to Shakespeare scholars. It presents yet another text:

At the head of the tomb are these verses

Not monumental stone preserves our fame
Nor sky aspiring pyramids our name
The memory of him for whom this stands
Shall out-live marble and defacers hands.
When all to times consumption shall be given
Standley for whom this stands shall stand in heaven

a little lower on the verge

Beati mortui qui in Domino moriantur

[drawing]

At the foot of the monument

Ask who lies here, but do not weep,
He is not dead, he doth but sleep.
This stony register is for his bones
His fame is more perpetual than these stones
And his own goodness with himself being gone

Sederi 9 (1998), ISSN 1135-7789

> Shall live when earthly monument is none.
> (MS 8, p. 41)

Although it lacks an attribution, this text does contain a drawing that shows that the obelisks –the pyramids– originally surrounded the tomb. The drawing is in the hand of Francis Sandford, who was then Lancaster Herald.

The attributions in the manuscript tradition lend respectability to the contention that the poem is Shakespeare's. Shakespeare is linked in various ways with the Stanley family, the family of the earls of Derby, so it is not inherently improbable that he might have been the author of these verses. If it is Shakespeare's, then one of the rhymes becomes significant, in that the bones-stones rhyme appears on Shakespeare's tomb in Stratford. It does not matter for my argument whether or not Shakespeare wrote the Stanley verses, but it does matter that this attribution was current in the seventeenth century, because it means that Milton wrote his poem on Shakespeare in the belief that he was imitating a poem by Shakespeare. The answer to the question of why Milton might have taken an interest in the poem may lie in the fact that Milton, like Shakespeare, was connected with the Stanley family. The Dowager Countess of Derby, widow of Ferdinando Stanley, the fifth Earl of Derby, was entertained, probably in the summer of 1632, with Milton's *Arcades.* James Stanley, Lord Strange, who in 1642 became the seventh Earl, had been a client of Milton's father (MSS 3 and 34); he was a nephew of the Dowager Countess. Sir Francis Leigh, godson of the Dowager Countess (and nephew of the Earl of Bridgewater) was also a client in the 1620s (MSS 3, 4, 10 and 34), and Milton's father testifies to knowing him (as Lord Dunsmore) in 1634 (MS 16). The seventh Earl of Derby, who became known as "the Martyr Earl" following his execution after the Battle of Worcester, was a patron of literature and the theatre, a family tradition that extended back at least as far as the fourth Earl, patron of the company known as Lord Strange's Servants, of which Shakespeare may have been a member.

There are some well-known variants in the text of Milton's poem, even within issues of the Second Folio, and the most contentious is the "star-ypointing pyramid", which is in some copies is "star-ypointed". This little discrepancy is the tip of a bibliographical iceberg; indeed, the page on which Milton's poem appears in the Second Folio of Shakespeare has been subjected to more critical scrutiny than any other page in the history of analytical bibliography. The groundwork for a solution to the notorious bibliographical difficulties presented by these variants was laid in two fine bibliographical studies by R. M. Smith (1928) and his pupil William Todd (1952). These scholars demonstrated that there were three published states of the page on which Milton's poem is printed, and an earlier proof sheet of the same page. Their work superseded that of one of the most delightful of the Shakespearean cranks, Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, who argued at the beginning of this century that the "star-ypointed" text, a copy of which he happened to own, was the first issue. In pursuit of this claim he wrote a pamphlet which he sent to 1,000 libraries around the world and to 15,000 newspapers, with the result, he claimed, that 10 million copies were circulated in full and another 10 million in abbreviated form. It would seem that some 20 million people pondered the question of whether Milton wrote "y-pointed" or "y-pointing".

Durning-Lawrence's argument centred on the occurrence in his copy of the archaic "y-pointed"; the usual reading, as in the other two versions, is "y-pointing". Durning-Lawrence argued that the English 'y', like the German 'ge', is a prefix of the past participle, and that Milton, who was far too learned to make grammatical mistakes, must therefore have written "y-pointed". Moreover, said Durning-Lawrence, Milton wrote it that way to signal to the initiated that Bacon had written Shakespeare's plays, a pyramid with a star on it being a beacon, which was then pronounced "Bacon"; the leaves so printed were of course only issued to those to whom Bacon's secret had been entrusted. I am sorry to report that Durning-Lawrence was wrong. The first issue, the one that can be linked to the proof sheet which is now in the Folger Library, reads "y-pointing". The fact that one of the later issues amends

Sederi 9 (1998), ISSN 1135-7789

this to "y-pointed" merely reflects the fact that someone was correcting Milton's error; Milton seems to have dug in in defence of his mistake, because in the later texts "y-pointing" is restored.

My confident judgement is based on an analysis of the quiring of the Second Folio. A folio is a book in which the pages have been folded once; every page is therefore attached to one other page. The page on which Milton's poem is set is the other half of the title page of the volume, and in that fact lies the reason that it is the only page in the volume to have been repeatedly reset. The physical link between the two pages is uncommonly easy to observe, because the paper of this particular page is distinctive: indeed, it is thicker than any other page in the volume, almost as thick as parchment. The reason that this particular page had to be thick is that the title-page contained a heavily-inked engraving of Shakespeare which would have lost its sharpness on ordinary paper.

There are nine surviving title-pages of the Second Folio of Shakespeare's plays. Why are there so many? The answer relates to publishing practices in the seventeenth century and to what we would now call copyright. Publishers and booksellers were the same people, so someone intending to buy a book would go, as one can see from the various title-pages of the Second Folio, to Robert Allot's shop "at the sign of the Black Bear in St Paul's churchyard" or Aspley's shop "at the sign of the parrot in Paul's churchyard". The reason for the proliferation of booksellers for the Second Folio was that copyright on the plays was held by five different publishers, and the printer had to run off a different title-page for each one. Robert Allot held the copyright on eight of Shakespeare's plays, so every time he ordered a new batch of copies from the printer, the printer produced a new title page with Allot's name on it, and bound it with previously-printed copies of the text. Every time one of the five shops selling the volume wanted more copies, the printer would set a new title page, and each time he would have to re-set Milton's poem.

These resettings are the reason for the variations in Milton's poem. But which variant was first, and therefore most likely to be authoritative? The answer lies in the distinctive paper. Because it is thick, thick enough to cope with the heavily-inked engraving, it is relatively easy to trace. The grade of this paper is fairly uniform, but in fact it comes from different batches. Paper was made by pouring a pulp made out of liquefied rags onto a screen of interwoven wires like a flattened tea-strainer. Manufacturers wove into the wires designs that identified the sources of the paper, and these designs produced watermarks on the pages. The pages on which Milton's poem and the title-page of the Second Folio were printed come from two different batches, one with a broad watermark and the other with a narrow one. The watermarks can appear either on the title-page side of the page or on the Miltonic half, because two workers might handle the paper in different ways, just as two different people feeding sheets of paper into a photocopier or a printer might feed them in in different ways, back to front or end to end. Pursuing that modern analogy, we might also note that we tend not to open a new box of paper until the old one is finished. Exactly the same is true of the Shakespeare Second Folio, and that is what enables us to solve the problem of which came first, "y-pointed" or "y-pointing". Copies with the narrow watermark are invariably printed on the batch of paper known as H-1731, whereas copies with the broad watermark are invariably printed on the pages known as H-594. All the title-pages say 1632, but the use of paper from these batches in other books enables us to establish the real date of printing. Every known surviving piece of paper from batch H-594, with the broad watermark and the variant "y-pointing", is contained in a book printed in 1632 or earlier; pieces of paper from batch H-1731, with the narrow watermark and the variant "y-pointed", appear in at least three books printed in 1637 and 1640. "Y-pointed" is therefore a misprint introduced into editions printed in the late 1630s, all of which have 1632 on the title-page.

It seems safe to conclude that the variations in the three states of the Second Folio are compositorial rather than authorial, and that Milton was not involved in later printings of the Second Folio, which, *pace* the date of 1632 on the title page, can be shown from the evidence of paper and watermarks to extend as late as 1640. The text of the poem published in *Poems: Written by Wil. Shakespeare* (1640),

however, contains changes that would seem to be authorial, chief of which is the last word in line 10, which is "part" in the early text by "heart" in the revised text. Another bit of tinkering occurs in line 13, which has "her self" in 1632 and "our self" in 1640; the phrase was to be changed to "it self" in 1645. The fact that Milton had a hand in the text of the 1640 edition of Shakespeare's poems would suggest that he had some connections with those responsible for the volume, and these may have been theatrical connections.

The final problem that I should like to consider is the question of how Milton came to publish the poem. Milton was utterly unknown as a poet and indeed as a person, and had no known theatrical connections, and yet his first publication was a poem prefaced to the Second Folio of Shakespeare. One way ahead lies in a consideration of a poem published in the First Folio:

We wondered, Shakespeare, that thou went'st so soon
From the world's stage to the grave's tiring room.
We thought thee dead, but this thy printed worth,
Tells thy spectators that though went'st but forth
To enter with applause. An actor's art 5
Can die, and live to act a second part.
That's but an exit of mortality;
This, a re-entrance to a plaudite.

The poem is signed "I. M.", who has been variously identified in the scholarly literature as Jasper Mayne or John Marston, but the best claimant is said to be the Hispanist James Mabbe, who was well-known as a translator of Fernando de Rojas' *Celestina* and Cervantes' *The Spanish Lady* into English. The attribution to Mabbe centres on the phrase "grave's tiring room": "tiring" is an aphetic form of "attiring", so the phrase means 'the grave's dressing room'. This phrase is said to echo Mabbe's use of a similar metaphor, "the tiring-house of the grave" to translate the Spanish phrase "*el vestuario del sepulcro*". The difficulty with this argument is that the idea that the grave is the tiring-house of death is very common. Indeed, there is an example elsewhere in the dedicatory poems of the First Folio, in that Hugh Holland uses the phrase "the grave / Death's public tiring-house".

My candidate for the authorship of this poem is John Milton the elder. Only two of his poems survive: one is a six-line epigram that survives in the Bodleian Library (MS 1) and the other is a sonnet in the Harleian collection in the British Library:

Johannes Melton, Londinensis civis, amico
suo viatico in poesis laudem. S.D.P.

If virtue this be not, what is? Tell quick!
For childhood, manhood, old age, thou dost write,
Love, war, and lusts quelled by arm heroic,
Instanced in Guy of Warwick (knighthood's light):
Heralds' records and each sound antiquary [5]
For Guy's true being, life, death, eke has sought,
To satisfy those which praevaricari;
Manuscript, chronicle (if might be bought);
Coventry's, Winton's, Warwick's monuments,
Trophies, traditions delivered of Guy, [10]
With care, cost, pain, as sweetly thou presents,
To exemplify the flower of chivalry:
From cradle to the saddle and the bier,
For Christian imitation, all are here.

I. M.

This sonnet is on the verso of the title-page of an unpublished sequel to Lydgate's *Guy Earl of Warwick*, written by a versifier called John Lane. The Latin at the beginning means "John Milton, citizen of London, to his travelling friend, in praise of his poetry". The letters "SDP" are an abbreviation of *salutem dicat plurimam*, the superscription of Cicero's letters. The rhyme that is central to my argument is "antiquary" (line 6) and "*praevaricari*" (line 8).

Lane's book was never published, and so the elder Milton's sonnet was assigned to oblivion, perhaps rightly so. Lane's enormous and equally dreadful "Triton's Trumpet to the Twelve Months, husbanded and moralised", dated 1621, also remains unpublished, and lies in manuscript among the Royal Manuscripts in the British Library and in Trinity College Cambridge. Both versions of the poem contain a passage that describes the music of the elder Milton:

> Those sweet sweet parts Meltonus did compose,
> As wonder's self amazed was at the [c]lose,
> Which in a counterpoint maintaining hielo
> Can all sum up thus: *Alleluia Deo*.
> (MS 6, fol. 179v^{o}; MS 35, fol. 187)

That odd word "hielo" is not in the *Oxford English Dictionary,* but I suspect that it is an English word, *i.e.* high-low, used in a musical sense which is appropriate to counterpoint. If one considers all three poems together it becomes clear that they have a common feature, one that I have never seen before in Renaissance poetry, which is the rhyming of an English word with a Latin word. Milton's sonnet in praise of Lane rather painfully rhymes "*praevaricari*" with "antiquary"; Lane's encomium strains to return the compliment by imitating this striking feature, and he rhymes "hielo" and "*Deo*". The IM sonnet contains the same odd feature, in that it rhymes "morality" and "*plaudite*". Those rhymes are the shaky foundation of my suspicion that Milton's father is the author of the poem in the First Folio. That comforting hypothesis provides the explanation, albeit a contingent one, for the publication of the young Milton's poem in the Second Folio: Milton the elder published a poem in the First Folio, and so arranged for his son to publish a poem in the second.

Is there a demonstrable connection between Milton's father and the theatrical world of Shakespeare? One possible link might be musical. Thomas Morley, who was a patron of the elder Milton and had been the first to publish his music, was a close neighbour of Shakespeare and the author of versions of "It was a lover and his lass" and "O mistress mine", though not, apparently, the versions sung when Shakespeare's *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night* were performed. Shakespearean scholars have long known about the five Exchequer documents (MSS 22-26) that establish Shakespeare's residence in the tiny parish of St Helen's, Bishopsgate, but despite the fact that the parish had only seventy-three rateable residents, the fact that Thomas Morley was another of the residents is not noted by scholars such as E. K. Chambers and Samuel Schoenbaum. Morley's name is clearly listed, and he is identified as one of the defaulters, as is Shakespeare (MS 23). The fact that the valuation of their properties was identical (£5) makes it likely that they lived in the same tenement. These facts are almost certainly verified somewhere in the Accounts of Subsidies, Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer (MS 24), but I have not been able to conduct a systematic search of that vast and difficult document.

A few years ago the Shakespearean scholar Herbert Berry noticed two documents in the Wallace transcripts in the Huntington Library that named Milton's father as a trustee of the Blackfriars Playhouse. Berry was not absolutely certain that the John Milton named in the documents was Milton's father, because he is described as a gentleman, and Berry was right to assume that scriveners did not normally style themselves gentlemen. Milton's father, however, is described as a gentleman in a series of Chancery documents drawn up in 1634 and 1645 (MSS 15-18), so the term is not an obstacle to the identification of this John Milton with the poet's father. Indeed, as Berry has noted,

Sederi 9 (1998), ISSN 1135-7789

there is a firm piece of evidence for this identification within the documents, because one of the other trustees is named as Edward Raymond, to whom the elder Milton lent £50 on 9 February 1622; Milton's father struggled unsuccessfully to regain his money after Raymond's death in 1623; documents relating to the dispute submitted to the Court of Chancery in May 1624 describe Raymond as an attorney in the Court of Common Pleas (MS 12).

The documents that Berry noticed were transcriptions of two Exchequer manuscripts, a bill of April 1640 (MS 20) and an order from the following autumn (MS 21). These documents relate to an action in the Court of Requests the previous year (MSS 30-33) and to earlier King's Bench records (MSS 27-29) and Chancery suits (MSS 13 and 14). The Exchequer documents refer to a (lost) contract of 4 July 1620 in which Milton's father is named as a trustee of the Blackfriars Playhouse, along with Raymond and two ale brewers called Henry Hodge and William (or Robert) Hunt.

What are the implications of the trusteeship? Berry speculates agreeably that "if the descendants of James Burbage dealt with their trustees as he did with his landlord at the Theatre in Shoreditch, the trustees and their families could even have had the right to attend plays gratis at the Blackfriars Playhouse" (Berry 1992: 514). Could young Milton have attended the Blackfriars with his father? Perhaps. In *Elegia Prima*, which may have been written in April 1626, Milton tells Diodati that he has been enjoying the plays of classical antiquity. Greek and Roman plays were not performed in Caroline London, so he must be referring to plays that he had been reading. Berry notes hopefully (1992: 510) that the theatre Milton had in mind was *sub tecto* (under a roof), as was the Blackfriars, but it seems more likely that Milton was simply referring to reading as an indoor activity. It is difficult to be certain of the date at which the trusteeship lapsed, but the documents specify that in the event of a trustee's death, the trusteeship would pass to his heirs. It is possible, though arguably unlikely, that the trusteeship was still in effect when Milton's father died in March 1647, in the which case Milton would have become a trustee and retained that position until the Blackfriars was sold by William Burbage in 1651 (MS 19).

In conclusion, it would seem that the young Milton who wrote "On Shakespeare" and appreciatively noted "sweetest Shakespeare fancy's child" in "L'Allegro" (possibly echoing "child of fancy" in the opening scene of *Love's Labour's Lost*) had grown up in a home with closer connections to the playhouses than has hitherto been assumed. Nothing except the trusteeship of the Blackfriars can be proved, but it seems not altogether improbable that Milton's father was also connected to the playhouses through Shakespeare's neighbour Thomas Morley, that his father had contributed a poem to the Shakespeare First Folio and had arranged for his son to contribute one to the Second Folio. That poem, Milton's "On Shakespeare", may reflect a family connection with Shakespeare that should make us consider our sense of the youth of Milton. In his maturity the scholarly polyglot Milton would have been drawn to the solemn Alcalá of Cisneros and his Complutensian Bible, but in his youth Milton's heart would have been in that other Alcalá, the city that gave birth to the fecund creative imagination of Cervantes.

REFERENCES

MANUSCRIPTS

Bodleian Library, Oxford:

1. MS Douce 170 (John Lane's continuation of Chaucer's "Squire's Tale".

2. MS Rawlinson Poetical 117 ("Shakespeare" poem fol 269v).

British Library:

3. Cottonian Charter 1/5/4 (Schedule drawn up by Thomas Bower (Milton's father's partner) of Thomas Cotton's bonds, including loans to Sir Francis Leigh, Mr Lea and Mr Leigh (all three may be the same person) and James Stanley, Lord Strange.

4. Cottonian Charter 1/5/5 (records debts of Sir Francis Leigh and Lord Strange to Milton's father).

5. MS Harleian 5243 (John Lane, "Historie of Sir Gwy, Earl of Warwick").

6. Royal MS 17, B.XV (John Lane, "Triton's Trumpet to the Twelve Months").

College of Arms, London:

7. MS c.35 (William Dugdale, "The Visitation of Shropshire, 1663-1664"; "Shakespeare" poems pp 20 and 41).

Folger Shakespeare Library:

8. MS V.a.103, Pt 1 ("Shakespeare" poem fol. 8).

Nottingham University Library:

9. Portland MS Pw.V.37 ("Shakespeare" poem p. 12).

Public Record Office, London:

10. C2 Charles I/D37/49 (records Sir Francis Leigh's repayment of his debt to Milton's father).

11. C2 Charles I/D39/47 (another record of Sir Francis Leigh's debt to Milton's father).

12. C2 James I/A6/35 (Milton's father's loan to Edward Raymond).

13. C2 James I E4/9 (Chancery suit relating to Blackfriars).

14. C2 James I/K5/25 (Chancery suit relating to Blackfriars).

15. C24/587/46 (deposition of 14 September 1632, describing Milton's father as a gentleman).

16. C24/591/2 (deposition of 17 April 1634, describing Milton's father as a gentleman and affirming that he has known Sir Francis Leigh, Lord Dunsmore, for about ten years).

17. C24/596/33 (deposition of 5 August 1634, describing Milton's father as a gentleman).

18. C24/600/37 (deposition of 8 January 1634/5 describing Milton's father as a gentleman).

19. C54/3579/m.39-40 (record of sale of Blackfriars in 1651).

20. E112/221/1215 (bill naming Milton's father as trustee of Blackfriars, April 1640).

21. E125/27/199-200 (order naming Milton's father as trustee of Blackfriars, autumn 1640)

22. E179/146/354 (Subsidy Defaulters, Bishopsgate, 15 November 1597).

23. E179/146/369 (Subsidy Defaulters, Bishopsgate, 1 October 1598).

24. E359/56 (Enrolled Subsidy Accounts, 1598-99).

25. E372/444 (*Residuum London* accounts, 6 October 1599).

26. E372/445 (*Residuum Sussex* accounts, 6 October 1600).

Sederi 9 (1998), ISSN 1135-7789

27. KB27/1408/m.303 (King's Bench records relating to Blackfriars).

28. KB27/1414/m.456 (King's Bench records relating to Blackfriars).

29. KB27/1432/m.359 (King's Bench records relating to Blackfriars).

30. Req 1/85, p. 283 (Court of Requests action relating to Blackfriars).

31. Req 1/87, p. 187 (Court of Requests action relating to Blackfriars).

32. Req 1/90, p. 29 (Court of Requests action relating to Blackfriars).

33. Req 2/388/48 (Court of Requests action relating to Blackfriars).

34. Req 2/630 (records debts of Sir Francis Leigh and Lord Strange to Milton's father).

Trinity College, Cambridge:

35. 0.ii.68 (MS copy of John Lane's *Triton's Trumpet*).

PRINTED ARTICLES AND BOOKS

Berry, Herbert 1992: The Miltons and the Blackfriars Playhouse. *Modern Philology* 89: 510-14.

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin 1913: *Milton's Epitaph to Shakespeare (in the 1632 Edition of the Plays Known as the Second Folio).* London.

Smith, R. M. 1928: The Variant Issues of Shakespeare's First Folio and Milton's First Published English Poem: A Bibliographical Problem. *Lehigh University Publications* 2, no. 3.

Todd, William 1952: The Issues and States of the Second Folio and Milton's Epigraph on Shakespeare. *Studies in Bibliography* 5: 81-108.

* * *

Sederi 9 (1998), ISSN 1135-7789