


Shakespeare's Antagonistic Disposition: A Personality Trait Approach

by Andrew Crider

ny personality assessment of William Shakespeare of Stratford is constrained by the paucity of biographical material relevant to questions of character and motivation. Shakespeare appears to have left no notes, diaries, memoirs, or personal correspondence that would facilitate such an assessment.¹ Nor, with one important exception, do we have any elaborated descriptions of Shakespeare the man derived from personal acquaintance. The exception is an unflattering portrayal of Shakespeare appearing in *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* (1592), a pamphlet attributed to Robert Greene and appearing shortly after his premature death at the age of 34. The testimony of *Groatsworth* is potentially compromised because it is delivered in the form of a dying writer's disparaging commentary on actors in general and Shakespeare in particular. Yet an accurate personality assessment does not necessarily depend on a positive attitude toward the subject, and we cannot assume that Greene's rhetoric invalidates his testimony. The following analysis aims to demonstrate that Greene's depiction of Shakespeare, however forcefully expressed, is nonetheless credible. The assessment appears to be internally consistent, congruent with contemporary trait theory, and corroborated by several subsequent events in Shakespeare's life history.

Greene's Groatsworth of Wit

Although Robert Greene is the putative author of *Groatsworth*, the text may be at least partially the work of Henry Chettle, the printer and writer who oversaw its publication.² Chettle admitted only to having edited and produced a fair copy of the manuscript, but extensive scholarship has pointed to his deeper involvement in

its production. However, the question of attribution does not necessarily diminish the biographical importance of *Groatsworth's* unique assessment of Shakespeare early in his career as a member of the London theater community.³ To simplify matters, I adopt the traditional practice of referring to the author of *Groatsworth* as “Greene” in this discussion.

The greater part of *Groatsworth* is devoted to a repentance tale of a young man named Roberto, whom Greene ultimately identifies as himself. After a series of turbulent experiences Roberto takes up writing play scripts for an acting company. Soon “famoused for an arch playmaking poet,” he nonetheless falls into a life of dissipation and licentiousness, for which he repents at length on his deathbed. Greene concludes his story by appending two items directly pertinent to the question of Shakespeare’s character: an open letter to three fellow writers and a retelling of the ancient fable of the ant and the grasshopper.

The open letter exhorts the three writers to find better occupation than to “spend their wits in making plays” at the risk of falling prey to disreputable actors, particularly one who considers himself “the only Shake-scene in a country”:

...Base-minded men all three of you, if by my misery you be not warned, for unto none of you (like me) sought those burrs to cleave, those puppets (I mean) that spake from our mouths, those antics [*dumb show performers*] garnished in our colours. Is it not strange, that I, to whom they all have been beholding, is it not like that you, to whom they all have been beholding, shall (were you in that case as I am now) be both [*both you and I*] at once of them forsaken? Yes, trust them not, for there is an upstart crow, beautified with our feathers [*cf. Aesop's pretentious crow adorned in peacock feathers*], that with his tiger's heart wrapped in a player's hide supposes he is as well able to bombast out [*inflate, augment*] a blank verse as the best of you, and, being an absolute Johannes factotum [*Johnny do-all*], is in his own conceit [*conception*] the only Shake-scene in a [*the*] country. O that I might entreat your rare wits to be employed in more profitable courses, and let those apes imitate your past excellence, and nevermore acquaint them with your admired inventions. I know the best husband [*most frugal*] of you all will never prove an usurer, and the kindest of them all [*actors*] will never prove a kind nurse; yet, whilst you may, seek you better masters, for it is pity men of such rare wits should be subject to the pleasure of such rude grooms [*coarse servants*].⁴

The passage begins with a general indictment of actors as mere parasites (“puppets that spake from our mouths; antics garnished in our colours”), whose art depends on exploiting the creativity (“rare wits”) of writers. Greene then quickly focuses the charge of exploitation on one specific actor, “an upstart crow, beautified with our feathers.” Further, this upstart arrogantly imagines himself to be an accomplished showman (“the only Shake-scene in a country”) and able to devise (“bombast out”) a blank verse equal to “the best of you.” Finally, and more bitterly,

he is a man with a “tiger’s heart wrapped in a player’s hide.” The line itself suggests duplicity, while “tiger’s heart” served as a contemporary metaphor for both deceit and cruelty.⁵

How to account for Greene’s thinly disguised attack on Shakespeare’s character? The internal evidence of the passage points to a connection between Greene’s feelings toward Shakespeare and his perception of having been abandoned in a time of need. The lengthy sentence depicting “Shake-scene” follows immediately on the word “forsaken,” which appears to have served as an associative trigger for the angry outburst. The theme of abandonment is subsequently reinforced by an allusion to the futility of finding a “kind nurse” among actors.

As if to cement his complaint of abandonment, Greene follows the open letter with his version of the fable of the industrious ant and the improvident grasshopper. Here Greene likens himself to the hedonistic grasshopper, inviting the reader to identify the ant with Shakespeare.⁶ The grasshopper scorns “needless thrift” in summer while rebuking the ant as a “greedy miser” whose “thrift is theft.” But with the onset of winter, the grasshopper – hungry, weak, and uncared for – approaches his acquaintance for help. Hoping for charity, the grasshopper is instead coldly rebuffed and abandoned to die a “comfortless” death. This allegory of the circumstances of Greene’s final illness thus connects the callous ant to Greene’s previous indictment of a tiger-hearted Shakespeare, while also adding “greedy miser” to the portrayal.

Dispositional Antagonism

Taking the open letter and the fable together, and casting Greene’s language in terms of contemporary personality descriptors, Greene portrayed Shakespeare as *exploitative* (beautified with our feathers), *arrogant* (as well able to bombast out; the only Shake-scene) *callous* and *deceptive* (tiger’s heart in a player’s hide; cruel ant), and *greedy* (greedy ant). Although this assessment may appear to be little more than a series of discrete epithets angrily delivered, it in fact betrays a psychologically coherent underlying structure: Greene’s characterizations are correlated markers of dispositional antagonism, one pole of the bipolar personality dimension of agreeableness-antagonism. Characteristic adjectives describing agreeableness include among others trusting, open, generous, cooperative, humble, and kind, whereas characteristics of antagonism include skeptical, deceptive, greedy, exploitative, oppositional, arrogant, and callous (see Table 1). Agreeableness-antagonism is a robust component of the empirically derived five-factor model of personality, which also includes the bipolar dimensions of extraversion-introversion, neuroticism-stability, conscientiousness-undependability, and openness-closedness to experience.⁷ The five-factor model is generally considered to be a reasonably comprehensive taxonomy of individual variation in personality dispositions. Each of the five major dimensions, or *domains*, can be decomposed into several component traits, or *facets*, which are in turn defined by the empirical clustering of specific personality descriptors, or *characteristics*. In sum, agreeableness-antagonism denotes

a major personality dimension that appears to have provided the evaluative structure informing Greene's portrayal of Shakespeare.

FACETS	CHARACTERISTICS
Trust:	trusting, naive, gullible versus skeptical, cynical, suspicious, paranoid
Straightforwardness:	honest, open, confiding versus shrewd, cunning, manipulative, deceptive
Altruism:	generous, self-sacrificing versus stingy, selfish, greedy, exploitative
Compliance:	cooperative, docile, meek versus oppositional, combative, aggressive
Modesty:	humble, self-effacing, self-denigrating versus confident, boastful, arrogant
Tender-mindedness:	kind, empathic, gentle, soft-hearted versus tough, callous, ruthless

Table 1. *Facets and Characteristics of Agreeableness-Antagonism*⁸

Corroborating Evidence

Greene's consistent use of markers of five-factor antagonism to describe Shakespeare attests to his intuitive grasp of this personality disposition. Nevertheless, Greene may have erroneously applied the concept of antagonism to the specific case of Shakespeare, whether deliberately or inadvertently. The validity of Greene's assessment therefore requires corroboration from independent sources of information. Contemporary interpretations of Shakespeare biography in fact strongly suggest that evidence of dispositional antagonism can be found in the biographical record beyond *Groatsworth*.⁹

Shakespeare biography is anchored in a relatively small number of public records generated by various contacts with legal and civil authorities.¹⁰ The majority of these documents concern property transactions, business investments, and minor litigation with no obvious bearing on the question of five-factor agreeableness-antagonism. The remaining documents are absent any indication of actions reflecting agreeable tendencies. However, three civil actions brought against Shakespeare – a restraining order to insure the peace, two citations for tax evasion, and an instance of commodity speculation – do lend themselves to interpretation in terms of dispositional antagonism. In addition Shakespeare's last will and testament is an important personal statement that reveals less than generous intentions toward

members of his immediate family. Although these four documents are well known to Shakespeare biographers, they have not heretofore been collectively examined as evidence for a specific personality disposition. The following review therefore aims to determine the extent to which the behavior and attitudes revealed in each of these documents are consistent with characteristics of five-factor antagonism. Specific characteristics from Table 1 identified in each document are indicated by italics.

The Wayte Affair

In November of 1596 William Wayte of London, affirming under oath to be in fear of his life, sought court protection against William Shakespeare, Francis Langley, Dorothy Soer, and Anne Lee. The court in turn issued a writ of attachment to the sheriff of Surrey, whose jurisdiction included the south bank environs of the Thames where the incident occurred. There is no record of follow-up, but in the normal course of events the named individuals would have been arrested and required to post bond to insure against further breeches of the peace.¹¹ Because Wayte did not allege battery, the form of the assault was most likely an admonition to take or desist from some action, coupled with the intimidating threat recognized in the writ. Shakespeare's primacy of place in the complaint suggests that he was no innocent bystander.

The two named women have never been identified and probably had no important relationship to either Langley or Shakespeare. But Langley was well known as an unscrupulous entrepreneur and loan broker with a propensity towards violent behavior.¹² Indeed, Wayte's complaint was but one episode in a continuing personal feud between Langley on one hand and Wayte and his employer on the other.¹³

We do not know precisely how Shakespeare came to be involved with Langley in this affair. However, in the fall of 1594 a convergence of interests developed between Langley and the Lord Chamberlain's Men, the acting company to which Shakespeare was attached. Langley was in search of an acting company to occupy his newly constructed Swan theater; at the same time, the Lord Chamberlain's Men were experiencing difficulties with extending the lease on their usual venue.¹⁴ Shakespeare may have been the point man for negotiations with Langley regarding the company's possible use of the Swan. Whatever the case, Shakespeare evidently befriended Langley to the extent of joining him in an *oppositional* and *aggressive* confrontation with Wayte serious enough to prompt judicial intervention.

Tax Evasion

In 1597 the London tax commissioners certified that William Shakespeare, a resident of London's Bishopsgate ward, had defaulted on an occasional personal property tax levied by Parliament in 1593. A similar certification a year later found that Shakespeare had also defaulted on a second personal property tax levied in 1597. Both defaults were reported to the royal exchequer, which in turn instructed the local sheriff to take remedial action. At some point during this period

Shakespeare moved his lodgings to a different jurisdiction south of the Thames. There is no record that the taxes were ever paid.¹⁵

It is implausible that the two tax defaults were due either to ignorance or inadvertence on Shakespeare's part. All evidence suggests that he was a successful businessman and investor sensitive to financial issues.¹⁶ The defaults involved two separate tax levies, stimulated a good deal of bureaucratic activity, and caused the Bishopsgate tax commissioners to mount active searches for him on both occasions. Nor were the defaults motivated by economic hardship: the sums involved were small, and at the time of the second levy Shakespeare was wealthy enough to purchase an imposing residence in Stratford. Thus the infractions appear to have been deliberate and purposeful.

From the perspective of the rational economic actor of mainstream economics, tax evasion involves a calculation that the benefits of noncompliance outweigh the costs of possible detection and sanction.¹⁷ Shakespeare obviously misjudged the probability of detection on both occasions, which implies that the infractions were driven, at least in part, by personal idiosyncrasy. Because tax evasion comes at others' expense, the infractions suggest a sense of entitlement consistent with Greene's depiction of an *arrogant* Shakespeare; given the relatively small amounts involved, they also echo Greene's portrayal of the *greedy* ant, whose "thrift is theft."

Grain Hoarding

Shakespeare was cited by Stratford authorities in 1598 for holding a quantity of grain, presumably malted barley, that greatly exceeded household requirements.¹⁸ The citation was a result of successive failures of the grain crop during 1594-96 in Warwickshire. The dearth of wheat and barley led to widespread famine and civil unrest, as well as to speculative withholding of grain from the market in anticipation of selling at higher prices. In an attempt to alleviate the suffering by forcing withheld supplies to market, the Queen's Council directed local authorities to conduct a census of private grain holdings, castigating hoarders as "wycked people in condicions more lyke to wolves or cormerants than to naturall men."¹⁹ Shakespeare was cited for holding eighty bushels of grain on his premises, which violated a government prohibition of several years standing.

Greene had upbraided Shakespeare for exploiting the talents of others for his own aggrandizement. The grain hoarding incident reveals a rather more tragic *exploitation* of a mass famine for financial gain. Shakespeare's apparent absence of fellow-feeling in this instance has been aptly described as "ugly evidence of man's *callous*, cold social indifference in modern times."²⁰

Last Will and Testament

Shakespeare died in Stratford in late April of 1616. An initial version of his will, probably taken down by a local lawyer in January of that year, was amended and

executed in March.²¹ The will addresses the three members of his immediate family—his wife and two married daughters—with markedly different degrees of favor. Elder daughter Susanna Hall inherited the bulk of the estate, including substantial holdings in buildings, lands, and personal property. The transfer of this large legacy was accomplished with little qualification or commentary, save for a somewhat overbearing set of instructions for entailing the estate to a male heir in succeeding generations.

In contrast, younger daughter Judith Quiney received a much smaller and more restrictive legacy, an apparent consequence of Shakespeare's dissatisfaction with her marriage in February 1616 to the somewhat disreputable Thomas Quiney.²² In the second version of the will Judith received the modest sum of £100, which was initially intended as a marriage dowry to be paid to a future husband. Shakespeare also withdrew the initial bequest to Judith of his domestic silver, which he awarded instead to Susanna's eight-year-old daughter. In addition Judith was given the interest, but not the principal, on a second sum of £150. Clearly antipathetic toward Thomas Quiney, Shakespeare structured the will to deprive him of access to Judith's money and even speculated that Judith might find another spouse. His intentions towards Judith were ambivalent: although her legacy was protected from a presumably unreliable husband, the amount was insufficient to guarantee financial security. As it happened, Judith remained married to Quiney, and the couple indeed went on to lead "a fairly penurious existence."²³

If Shakespeare was manipulative and stingy toward Judith and Quiney, he was unreservedly callous toward his wife, Anne. The initial draft of the will conspicuously failed to acknowledge his marriage to her in any manner. The silence is exceptional and unconventional; comparable wills left by members of the London theater community in the same era are typically solicitous for the financial security of spouses, often including moving testimonials of affection and appreciation.²⁴ By excluding Anne from his estate, Shakespeare abandoned her to the kindness of others, not unlike the fate Robert Greene had railed against a quarter century earlier.

Shakespeare biographers often adopt Chambers' conjecture that Anne would have been a beneficiary of the common law practice of assigning one-third of an estate to the widow.²⁵ But there is no evidence that this practice was observed in Warwickshire at the time, nor would such assignment be compatible with Shakespeare's explicit conveyance of the great majority of his estate to Susanna. As if to cement his intention, Shakespeare added to the March revision the infamous interlineation: "Item: I give unto my wife my second best bed with the furnishings." This dismissive but specific amendment had the effect of reducing the likelihood of any future claim for a more reasonable portion of the estate.²⁶

Shakespeare's will is a businesslike document devoid of evidence of caring or warmth toward his wife and daughters. The large legacy to Susanna, taken in context with his disregard for Judith and Anne, can be read as a unsentimental device to entail his estate intact in an anticipated male line of descent. Judith's bequest was structured to express Shakespeare's disapproval of her recent marriage and to deny her more than a meager existence from the inheritance. The humiliation of

Anne betrays a marked antipathy and lack of obligation toward the mother of his children and overseer of his domestic life in Stratford for more than three decades. Shakespeare's will reveals a dying man who was nonetheless capable or reacting to those near to him in the *manipulative, callous, and stingy* manner described many years earlier in *Groatsworth*.

Summary

Several public documents were examined to test the validity of Robert Greene's identification of an antagonistic tendency in Shakespeare's personality. Shakespeare's last will, as well as three civil actions brought against him, revealed attitudes and behavior consistent with specific characteristics of five-factor antagonism. These findings are summarized in Table 2 in terms of the associated second-level facets; Shakespeare's antagonistic propensity appears to have been most reliably expressed in the facets of low altruism and tough-mindedness. A limitation of this method of validation is that each of these documents was generated by actions in a specific context, such that each document taken separately is subject to alternative interpretation in terms of immediate situational factors. When jointly considered, however, the documents show a cross-situational consistency of antagonistic behavior in accord with Greene's initial portrayal.

	Groatsworth	Wayte Affair	Tax Evasion	Hoard- ing	Last Will
Low Trust					X
Low Straightforwardness	X				X
Low Altruism	X		X	X	
Low Compliance		X			
Low Modesty	X		X		
Tough-mindedness	X			X	X

Table 2. *Facets of Dispositional Antagonism in Five Documents.*

The character information gleaned from these four documents is also pertinent to perennial questions regarding the identification of the player Greene dismisses as an "upstart crow" and as "Shake-scene." Although the present discussion follows mainstream scholarly opinion in identifying William Shakespeare as

the target of these pejorative allusions,²⁷ alternative candidates continue to be debated.²⁸ Nevertheless, the antagonistic tendencies revealed in the public records discussed here are clearly consistent with Greene's earlier portrayal of "Shake-scene" and therefore support the conventional view that Greene's nemesis was William Shakespeare of Stratford.

Discussion

The documents examined here are standard items in Shakespeare biography, although their psychological implications are not typically at issue. For example, Robert Greene's comments on Shakespeare are often cited as evidence of Shakespeare's entry into the rough-and-tumble world of the Elizabethan theater, rather than for what they reveal about his character.²⁹ In contrast, the psychologically focused interpretations of *Groatsworth* and other biographical materials by Honigmann³⁰ and Price³¹ reveal an often disagreeable Shakespeare consistent with the findings presented here. The present analysis adds to this earlier work the concept of dispositional antagonism, which assumes that phenotypically diverse attitudes and behavior reflect the operation of a common latent trait. The dispositional approach therefore facilitates a unitary psychological interpretation of what might otherwise be regarded as a disparate set of biographical events.

Although five-factor antagonism appears to be a prominent component of Shakespeare's personality, this information carries no predictive implications regarding the remaining five-factor domains of extraversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. A complete personality assessment following the five-factor scheme requires assessment of the five major domains, each decomposed into several more specific facets. Unfortunately, the limited documentary evidence directly pertinent to Shakespeare psychobiography undoubtedly precludes any comprehensive assessment. The five-factor model may nevertheless provide potentially useful insights into at least some of the extant biographical materials. For example, Shakespeare's successful career as a businessman may have been influenced by dispositional conscientiousness, which the five-factor model opposes to undependability. Shakespeare rose from an economically distressed family background to become a wealthy member of the Stratford gentry through judicious investments in two London theaters, real estate in Stratford and London, and income-producing land in the environs of Stratford.³² This successful investment career is consistent with the planfulness, persistence, and self-discipline of conscientiousness rather than the disorganization, negligence, and carelessness of undependability. Although we cannot assume that personality factors influenced Shakespeare's financial success, the concept of conscientiousness-undependability does suggest a plausible hypothesis for further psychobiographical inquiry. Other five-factor concepts may suggest similar analytical strategies.

The notion of an antagonistic Shakespeare must contend with the continuing biographical tradition of describing him as a modest, retiring, and agreeable individual.³³ This view was in place by 1709 when Nicholas Rowe, an early editor of

the collected works, wrote that Shakespeare was reputed to have been "...a good-natur'd Man, of great sweetness in his Manners, and a most agreeable Companion."³⁴ Honigmann attempted to reconcile the divergence between this "gentle" Shakespeare tradition and his own identification of "ungentle" elements in the documented history by arguing that a presumably complex personality was capable of expressing contradictory tendencies at different times. However, this conjecture is not compatible with the structure of bipolar traits, in which the degree of expression of one tendency is inversely related to the degree of expression of the opposite. In the case of agreeableness-antagonism, a conspicuously antagonistic disposition necessarily implies a correspondingly weaker expression of agreeable behavior and attitudes. Shakespeare's antagonistic tendencies would therefore tend to reduce the likelihood of concurrent agreeableness.

The persistence of the "gentle" Shakespeare tradition is remarkable in the absence of any contemporaneous depictions of Shakespeare's agreeableness analogous to the antagonistic individual described by Greene, or of any public documents consistent with agreeable behavior. Several years following Shakespeare's death in 1616, his acquaintance Ben Jonson did allude to "gentle Shakespeare" in a short poem and a longer eulogy introducing the First Folio of the collected plays. But "gentle" was a common device in eulogies of the period and is in accord with the poem's generally hyperbolic tone.³⁵ Whatever Jonson intended by the usage, his two allusions to an agreeable Shakespeare remain idiosyncratic. The available evidence points consistently in the opposite direction toward a man with markedly antagonistic tendencies.

Endnotes

- ¹ Stephen Greenblatt, *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare* (New York: Norton, 2004), 13.
- ² Diana Price, *Shakespeare's Unorthodox Biography* (Westport CT: Greenwood Press, 2001), 28-30.
- ³ D. Allen Carroll, ed., *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit*. (Binghamton NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1994), 132.
- ⁴ Modern spelling version from Nina Green, ed., *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* (1996), <http://www.oxford-shakespeare.com/Greene/Greene'sGroatsworth.>; parenthetical glosses after Carroll.
- ⁵ Price, 48.
- ⁶ E. A. J. Honigmann, *Shakespeare's Impact on His Contemporaries* (Totowa NJ: Barnes & Noble Books, 1982), 5.
- ⁷ Robert R. McCrae and Oliver P. John, "An Introduction to the Five-Factor Model and Its Applications," *Journal of Personality* 60 (1992): 175-215.; Stephenie N. Mullins-Sweatt and Thomas A. Widiger, "The Five-Factor Model of Personality Disorder: A Translation Across Science and Practice," in *Personality and Psychopathology*, eds. Robert F. Krueger and Jennifer L. Tackett (New York: Guilford Press, 2006), 39-70.
- ⁸ Adapted from Thomas A. Widiger, "Personality Disorder Diagnosis," *World Psychiatry* 2 (2003): 131-35.
- ⁹ Honigmann, "Shakespeare's Impact"; Price.
- ¹⁰ See compilation in E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems, Vol. II* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930); an additional writ of attachment (1596) is the subject of Leslie Hotson, *Shakespeare Versus Shallow* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1931).
- ¹¹ Hotson; William Ingram, *A London Life in the Brazen Age: Francis Langley, 1548-1602* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978).
- ¹² Ingram.
- ¹³ Hotson.
- ¹⁴ Park Honan, *Shakespeare: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 226.

- ¹⁵ Chambers, 87-90.
- ¹⁶ Price.
- ¹⁷ Gary S. Becker, "Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach," *Journal of Political Economy* 104 (1968): 169-217.
- ¹⁸ Chambers, 99-101.
- ¹⁹ Chambers, 100.
- ²⁰ Honan, 244.
- ²¹ Chambers, 169-74.
- ²² E. A. J. Honigmann, *Myriad-minded Shakespeare*, 2nd ed. (London: MacMillan Press, 1998), 223-24.
- ²³ Honan, 400.
- ²⁴ E. A. J. Honigmann and Susan Brock, *Playhouse Wills 1558-1642: An Edition of Wills by Shakespeare and His Contemporaries in the London Theatre* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993).
- ²⁵ Chambers, 176-77.
- ²⁶ Honan, 396-97.
- ²⁷ Carroll.
- ²⁸ For example: Daryl Pinkson, "Was Robert Greene's 'Upstart Crow' the Actor Edward Alleyn?," *The Marlowe Society Research Journal* 6 (2009): 1-18.; A. D. Wraight, *Christopher Marlowe and Edward Alleyn* (Chichester UK: Adam Hart Publishers, 1993).
- ²⁹ Honigmann, "Shakespeare's Impact," 1.
- ³⁰ Honigmann, "Shakespeare's Impact."
- ³¹ Price.
- ³² Chambers; Honan.
- ³³ Honigmann, "Shakespeare's Impact," 14-19.
- ³⁴ Chambers, 264.
- ³⁵ Honigmann, "Shakespeare's Impact," 16; Price, 184.