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Notes on Books, &c.

Notes.

ON THE PRINCIPAL PORTRAITS OF SHAKESPEARE.

In offering a few notes at this season, on the personal representations of Shakspeare, I propose to limit my attention to the three best known and generally accepted types. These are (1) the Droeshout, (2) Stratford monument, and (3) Chandos portraits; which embody respectively engraving, sculpture, and oil painting. The two first, on account of the circumstances connected with them, and from the testimony afforded by contemporary evidence, possess a special claim to authenticity. The third is distinguished by having a longer history than any of the other painted portraits connected with the name of the poet; and it is certainly, in itself, a genuine and fairly well-preserved picture of the commencement of the seventeenth century, painted probably before 1610. Its existence as a recognised portrait of Shakspeare can be readily traced back to a time when there was no popular demand for his works, or even such a general appreciation of his merit among the better educated as to make a counterfeit or misapplication of his name apparently worth any one's while. I do not desire to enter into controversy; but simply to record a few broad facts, and to note two or three points of comparison which these three portraits suggest.

In the first rank I would place the engraving by Martin Droeshout, which is professedly a portrait of the great dramatist; and is placed on the very title-page of the first collected editions of his plays, between the actual words of the title and the names of the publishers: "London, printed by Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount, 1623." Upon the leaf, facing this title-page, are the well-known ten lines addressed to the reader by "B. L," vouching, on the part of the players who issued the volume, for the correctness of the likeness.

The lines —

"This figure that thou here seest put,
It was for gentle Shakespeare cut;"

and —

"O could he but have drawn his wit
As well in brasse as he hath hit
His face: the Print would then surpass
All that was ever writ in brasse,"

leave nothing to be desired either in point of strength, or directness of testimony.

The exact date of the execution of this engraving remains a matter of uncertainty. All we know is, that it was the work of Martin Droeshout, probably a Dutchman; who, judging from the other portraits he engraved, must have resided some time in England. This portrait of Shakspeare bears the engraver's signature in full; but the only date on the page is that of 1623, marking the publication of the book seven years after Shakspeare's death. In the third folio edition, 1664, the lines are brought into still closer relation with the engraved portrait. Droeshout's plate was then removed from the title-page, to make way for the enumeration of the seven additional plays, and placed over the ten lines on the left-hand page; so as to face the title, like a modern frontispiece. By this time the copper-plate had become very much worn, and the printing of it was conducted with much less care. When badly printed, an engraving of this kind degenerates into a mere caricature; but those who have seen impressions in a perfect state, especially that of the fine Grenville copy, now in the British Museum, will admit that it affords a very satisfactory indication of the individual appearance of the man. As the style of wearing the hair, and the smooth round cheeks, accord with the monumental bust, the engraving very probably represents him as he appeared towards the close of his life. His dress, far from indicating anything like the theatrical or character-costume, is simply that which was worn by the opulent and noble personages of the day: witness numerous portraits, especially of James I., Richard Sackville (third Earl of Dorset), and Sir Philip Sidney. The stiff flat collar which he wears round his neck, and which appears in many pictures of this period, was described in old catalogues as a "wired band." A general feeling
of sharpness and coarseness pervade Droeshout's plate, and the head looks very large and prominent with reference to the size of the page and the type-letters round it; but there is very little to censure with respect to the actual drawing of the features. On the contrary, they have been drawn and expressed with great care. Droeshout probably worked from a good original, some "limning," or crayon-drawing, which, having served its purpose, became neglected, and is now lost. The disposition of the lines, and the general treatment of the shadows, do not give me the impression of the engraving having been taken directly from an oil painting. The Droeshout head and stiff collar, were evidently followed by William Marshall in his small oval portrait of Shakspeare, prefixed to the 1640 edition of his poems. That Marshall worked on his plate with an impression of the Droeshout engraving before him, is shown by the head in his copy printing the reverse way. The body-dress, and close-fitting sleeve, are quite similar in point of construction to those of his prototype. The buttons are all there, even to the exact number; whilst the embroidery is omitted. The chief deviations are a light background, recessed like a niche; the introduction of his left hand holding a sprig of laurel; and a cloak with a cape to it, covering his right shoulder. This cloak has become a distinctive feature in some of the later imitations and Shakspearian fabrics. It appears in the oval woodcut which Jacob Tonson, of the "Shakespear's Head over against Katharine Street in the Strand," used as a device on the title-page of his books (witness the Spectator) as early as 1720. This little woodcut, a curious combination of the Chandos and other portraits, with bold deviations on the part of the artist, originated from B. Arlaud, of whom more will be said hereafter. In this design Arlaud seems to have been influenced by a painting by Zoust, which Simon afterwards engraved in mezzotint about 1726 (see Wivell's Remarks, p. 159); but upon this, my remarks must be reserved till speaking of the Chandos picture.

Another early copy from the head by Droeshout is to be found in the frontispiece to a volume of Tarquin and Lucrece. It is a small oval, inserted in an octavo page, above two figures of Tarquin and Lucretia stabbing herself. The Shakspeare head is turned the same way as in Marshall's engraving; but it is more directly true to the Droeshout original. The lines of the hair are more correct, and the dress has all the embroidery, and no cloak. The date of this volume is 1655 (the period of the second folio edition of Shakspeare's plays), and the workmanship is attributed to Faithorne. The background to this head has been shaded, like in Marshall's engraving, to look as if it were placed in a niche.

The second unquestionably authentic portrait of Shakspeare is to be found in his monumental effigy at Stratford-upon-Avon, where he spent so large a portion of his life, and where his fellow-townsmen knew him so well. The name of the sculptor was Johnson, as shown by the following entry in Dugdale's Pocket-Book of 1653:—

"The monument of John Combe, at Stratford-upon-Avon, and Shakspeare's, were made by one Gerard Johnson."—(H. Friswell, Life Portraits, p. 10.)

This monument, Mr. Britton justly says, is to be regarded as a family record, and was probably erected under the superintendence of Shakspeare's son-in-law, Dr. Hall. It is, nevertheless, very rude and unsatisfactory as a work of art. Carved in soft stone, intended to be viewed at a distance, and moreover destined, in accordance with the prevailing fashion of the day, to be fully painted, or completed in colour, it contrasts very unfavourably with the highly-finished and more carefully modelled figures, both in marble and alabaster, which are so frequently seen recumbent in our cathedrals and country churches. We find here that many of the most important details of the poet's countenance have been slurred over or neglected, either through ignorance or in dependence on the correcting and supplemental powers of the painter's brush; yet when originally done a satisfactory effect may have attended the combination. But it is manifestly unfair to place a plaster cast from a rough sculpture, wrought at an elevated position, and always intended to be looked up to, side by side with a finished picture or engraving made and adapted for a convenient distance from the eye.

That is one great advantage which the Droeshout portrait has over the Stratford bust. The Droeshout can always be seen, as it was intended, in a book, and at such a distance from the eye as the legibility of the letter-press connected with it, would readily determine. The eyebrows of the bust are most imperfectly defined, whilst the lips are composed of mere straight lines without any modelling. The shortness of the nose is a defect as little striking when seen from below in the chancel, as it is offensive when the plaster cast is brought down to a level with the spectator, and measured with the Droeshout or any other portraits.

It may reasonably be inferred that the figure on the monument exhibits Shakspeare as he appeared towards the close of his career, and in this respect the engraved portraits would seem to be in close accordance with it. I have already expressed my conviction that the title-page to his plays does not represent him in any theatrical costume, nor do I see any reason for assuming that the hair seen in the Droeshout engraving is otherwise than his own. There is too little of it on those parts of the head where a wig would be most effective, and the long curved lines laid down by the engraver are no more than a special mode.
of dressing would naturally produce. In the bust the hair is arranged in comparatively short round curls. The full indications in the engraving of stubble on the cheek and chin, and also the short upturning hairs on the moustaches, mark a period of transition towards the smooth full cheek and crisply projecting patches of hair about the mouth, as seen at the last on his monument. These quaint upturned moustaches, large tufts of hair under the chin, and smooth cheeks bear a singular resemblance to the well-known portraits of Archbishop Laud. The expression of whose countenance has been so unfortunately distorted by the adoption of a ridiculous fashion.

Much of the expression of hilarity which has been noticed by many on the countenance of the Stratford bust, is produced by the prominence and upward direction of the moustaches. The upper eyelids in the Stratford bust are remarkably poor, and narrow, whilst in the Droeshout engraving they are full, and exhibit a great refinement of curve. This, again, is a point which is at once lost-sight of when the monument is seen from its proper position, the pavement of the chanceal, and colour may have originally played an important part, if the eyeballs were faithfully and judiciously added by the pencil. The collar or band round his neck is quite plain, but so brought over the top of his dress as to give rather a high-shouldered or short-necked appearance to the figure. Camden's effigy in Westminster Abbey wears a similar collar and a ruff above it. The fulness of the lower part of the cheeks is a remarkable feature.

The picture discovered recently at Stratford, and upon which much stress has been laid, is manifestly an imitation or lame transcript of the Stratford monument. It certainly has no appearance of having been done from the life, and, excepting the form of the lips, has all the faults observable in the modelling of the bust. The moustaches are simply ridiculous. The picture may possibly be two hundred years old, for competent judges have declared that the paint employed on it is such as was used at the close of the seventeenth century. It would, therefore, stand in its relation to the Stratford monument as the Marshall and Faithorne engravings do to the Droeshout.

The Chandos portrait is a far different painting, and a much less injured picture than has generally been supposed. During many years there was great difficulty in seeing it. Even when access was obtained to it at Stowe, the light and its position in the deep recesses of a cumbersome frame were alike unfavourable to anything approaching a critical examination. At present it is placed in a strong light in the National Portrait Gallery, and brought within easy reach of the eye. It is painted on coarse English canvas, covered with a groundwork of greenish grey, which has been rubbed bare in several parts, where the coarse threads of the canvas happen most to project. Only a few parts have been retouched with a reddish paint. Some portions of the hair seem to have been darkened, and a few touches of deep madder red may have been added to give point to the nostrils and eyelids. The background is a rich dark red; but the whole tone of the picture has become blackened, partly in consequence of the grey ground protruding, and partly from the red colours of the flesh tints having deepened to a brownish tone. This at first sight gives the complexion a dull swarthly hue. The features are well modelled, and the shadows skilfully massed, so as to produce a portrait in no way unworthy of the time of Van Somer and Cornelis Janssens. It would be folly to speculate upon the name of the artist, but any one conversant with pictures of this period would, upon careful examination, pronounce it remarkably good if only the production of an amateur. Most of the historians of this picture, it may be remembered, lay no superior claim for it than to have been the work of one of Shakspeare's brother actors. Amateur artists have certainly attained a very high degree of merit in this country, and it is remarkable that at this very period a gentleman of high rank was occupied in painting some very excellent pictures merely for his own amusement. This was Sir Nathaniel Bacon, K.B., half-brother to the great Lord Bacon, whose pictures are still preserved at Gorhambury, Redgrave, and Oxford. It is also observable that in the whole-length portrait of himself at Gorhambury, he wears a flat wired band round his neck, and a very similar dress to that already described in the Droeshout engraving. The Chandos portrait is stated to have belonged to Sir William Davenant. After his death in 1668, Betterton, who had industriously collected information relating to Shakspeare, and visited Stratford for that purpose, bought it. Whilst the picture was in his possession, Betterton let Kneller make a copy of it as a present to Dryden, who acknowledged the painter's gift by the verses beginning—

"Shakspeare, thy gift, I place before my sight;
With awe I ask his blessing ere I write;
With reverence look on his majestic face;
Proud to be less, but of his godlike race."

These lines were written between 1683 and 1692. Whilst still in Betterton's possession, the picture was engraved by Vandergucht, in 1709, for Rowe's edition of Shakspeare. It is remarkable that the first volume of Rowe's Shakspeare contains two portraits of Shakspeare. One from the Chandos picture, turned the same way as the original, in a small medallion surrounded by female figures; and a second, facing "Some account of the life," &c. by Duchange, from the drawing by Arlaud. This is the first appearance of the Arlaud type; and it is a curious combination of the Chandos,
Marshall, and Droeshout likenesses. The second edition of Rowe, 12mo, 1714, likewise contains two portraits, but the picture in the oval is no longer from the Chandos; it is a reduction of the Arlaud, only turned a different way. It corresponds exactly in size with the Shakespeare head woodcut which Tonson afterwards adopted on his title-pages. After Rowe’s death, the Chandos portrait passed to Mrs. Barry the actress, who sold it to Mr. Robert Keck, of the Inner Temple, for 40l. Whilst in his possession it was engraved in 1719, by Vertue, for his series of poets.

The picture afterwards passed into the possession of Mr. Nicoll of Minchinend House, and was engraved, in 1747, by Houbraken for Dr. Birch’s Illustrious Heads. On the marriage of Mr. Nicoll’s daughter with the Duke of Chandos, it devolved to his family, with whom it remained till the dispersion of the effects at Stowe in 1848.

The engraving by Vertue in 1719 exhibits several unjustifiable modifications and departures from the original. He alters the nature of the curling of the hair, and changes the epaulettes or bands across the shoulders of the sleeves. He covers the black satin dress with sprigs or, S-like flames of black velvet, and, by setting the figure in a large oval, creates a false impression as to the size of the person. That Vertue afterwards lost confidence in this Chandos portrait might naturally be inferred from the circumstance of his having engraved a totally different picture, as the frontispiece to Pope’s 4to edition of Shakespeare, published by Tonson in 1725. But a curious example of his method of working occurs in the very same volume. He engraves on one of the pages of an account of Shakespeare’s life, a very inaccurate, but pretentious, representation of the entire monument at Stratford-upon-Avon, in which the original sculptured head of Shakespeare in supplanting by a poor adaptation of the Chandos picture, retaining all his faults of the curly hair, and introducing the round gold ear-ring—a distinctive feature of the Chandos portrait. From these circumstances it becomes tolerably evident that Vertue still adhered, in his own mind, to the Chandos picture, and that both Pope and Vertue

*When Jacob Tonson published the first edition of Rowe’s Shakespeare he resided, according to the statement on the title-page, “within Gray’s Inn Gate, next Gray’s Inn Lane.” In the second edition, published 1714, we find by an inner title-page that he resided “in the Strand.” The sign of the Shakespeare’s Head is supplied on this same page by a very rude woodcut head, with large eyes, and on a gigantic scale in proportion to the size of the medallion bounded by a palm-branch frame. The improved design adopted by Tonson on the title-page to his edition of The Spectator, 1720, was evidently suggested by, and actually traced from, the little medallion on the title-page to the 12mo edition of Rowe’s edition of Shakespeare, published in 1714. Benedict Arlaud was a miniature painter, and brother of the celebrated Jacques Antoine Arlaud. He died in London, 1719.

were willing to gratify Lord Oxford, their patron, by selecting a portrait in his possession and which he had fondly believed to be Shakespeare’s. The picture which they adopted is in reality merely the portrait of a gentleman of the period of King James I. and not even, as some have surmised, one of the monarch himself. The engraving, however, is admirably executed. That Vertue was aware of the history of the Chandos picture is shown by the following extract which I have taken from one of his note-books in the British Museum, 21, 111, Plut. cccix. H. page 68:

“Mr. Betterton told Mr. Keck several times that the picture of Shakespeare he had was painted by John Taylor, a player, who acted for Shakespeare, and this John Taylor in his will left it to Sir William Davenant. Mr. Betterton bought it, and at his death Mr. Keck bought it, in whose possession it now is, 1719.”

This was the date at which Vertue published his engraving. The mischievous spirit of deviation from the original picture seems, unfortunately, to have possessed other artists also, and I may particularly name Zoust and Arlaud, whose productions have been already mentioned. Notwithstanding these alterations, the plain falling collar and style of dress in the one, and the bald forehead and ear-ring, with shadow down the side of the nose towards the spectator, clearly show that the Chandos picture afforded them their principal groundwork. In both these pictures the treatment of the hair differs remarkably from the original; each of them being in an opposite direction. The one has short, crisp, compact curls; the other, wavy and loosely-flying locks. In Arlaud’s portrait, the dress, independently of the cloak derived from Marshall, has evidently been modified according to the taste of the eighteenth century, for the shirt-collar with unbuttoned vest betray a close affinity to the style of Kneller’s portraits of Sir Isaac Newton, John Dryden, and Locke. The countenance adopted in both these portraits, with rounded features, bearing some resemblance to Charles I., directly prepared the way for the peculiarities so marked in Roubiliac’s statue and other portraits of the bard about the period of Garrick’s influence at Stratford. The monument in Westminster Abbey was executed by Scheemakers in 1740 (see Gentleman’s Magazine for February 1741, page 105.)

In Hanmer’s 4to edition, Oxford, 1744, the Stratford monument, in illustration of Rowe’s description, is exchanged for an engraving of the more novel one at Westminster by Gravelot.

The marked difference in the Westminster head from the earliest portraits of Shakespeare raised considerable discussion at the time, and the question was well stated in a letter signed J. G., and dated Stratford-upon-Avon, May 30, 1759, in the Gentleman’s Magazine for that year, page 257. This produced a letter from J. S. dated Crane...
"That there is no genuine picture of Shakspeare existing, nor ever was, that called his having been taken long after his death from a person supposed extremely like him, at the direction of Sir Thomas Clarges, and this I take upon me to affirm as an absolute fact."

This broad assertion was challenged, but never explained. Boaden grafts the story upon the Zoust portrait, which certainly would go far to account for the decidedly cavalieresque character pervading it. (Boaden, page 93.)

I now proceed to a comparison of the three principal portraits. The Chandos, on internal evidence alone, is a genuine old picture, and is the only one in which the colour of the eyes and hair has remained undisturbed. It has, moreover, several points in common with the Droe-shout engraving, and which are entirely deficient in the bust. This is especially the case in the large broad eyelid and the full soft lower lip. The growth of the moustaches, descending from the centre of the nose to the corners of the mouth, forms a triangle, which, in the Chandos picture, as the division of the lips is remarkably V-shaped, almost assumes the shape of a lozenge. With exception of the neck-bands, the construction of the dress is the same both in the engraving and painting; but there is no ear-ring in the Droe-shout portrait. The manner in which the white sparkling touches are introduced in the eyes are very different in the picture and the engraving. They are on opposite sides of the central part of the iris. The tuft of hair immediately below, or hanging from, the lower lip, with an almost bare place on the chin under it, and a gathering of hair on the under part of the chin, seems common to all three. The form of the nostril likewise is the same in all. The eyebrows are strongest defined, in fact, quite ropy, in the Droe-shout engraving. They are less marked in the Chandos, and least of all in the modelled surface of the bust; but in the last instance, that might naturally have been reserved for colour alone to express. There is but little depression in the engraving between the eyebrows, a marked characteristic observable in both the other portraits. The white falling bands both in the bust and painting are quite plain. The top of the head seen in the bust and in the engraving, is quite bald, whilst in the picture there is a decided growth of hair along the top of the lofty forehead. This latter point has led me to a different conclusion from what I had formerly held. The very dark tone of the flesh and worn nature of the surface of the Chandos picture, had always given the impression of a more advanced age than the really soft and careful modelling of the features and the plumpness of the cheeks in the original freshness of this picture would warrant, if seen under more favourable circumstances.

The smooth-shaven face, such as actors are generally compelled to exhibit in private life, always gives a comparative appearance of youth. They have no grey hairs to tell tales. The full rich eye is common both to the engraving and the picture; but in the latter it is softer, and at the same time more penetrating. The occasional appearance and disappearance of hair on the face of an actor would afford very little indication of his age at relative periods. The shaven cheeks, upturned moustaches, and pointed beard at the bottom of the chin, were very fashionable after the middle of the reign of James I. It was accompanied with the flat wired-bands.

I now believe the Chandos picture to represent Shakspeare at a somewhat earlier period than that of either the engraving or the bust. It may probably belong to the time of his retirement, when occupied upon some of his best plays. "Anno aetatis 40" appears on one of the engravings.

The other two portraits have both of them smooth shaven cheeks; whilst the moustaches in the Droe-shout engraving show signs of the commencement of that training which subsequently took such a positive and Laud-like form at the close of his career. That the Chandos would probably be the earlier, is shown even by certain points of costume, as the falling plain white band was used extensively from the middle of the sixteenth century, whilst the wired bands, as seen in the Droe-shout engraving, hardly appeared before the time of James I., but continued to be used some time after the period of Shakspeare's death, as seen in a portrait by Mytens of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, painted on canvas, and several times repeated. A whole-length miniature of the Earl of Dorset by Isaac Oliver, signed and dated 1616, the year of Shakspeare's death, exhibits a striking example of the flat wired band; and the well-known picture of Milton as a boy, dated 1618, and painted also on canvas, affords a marked instance of the same peculiarities. Although this style of neck-collar remained in vogue for a considerable time, the falling band continued much longer in use till, after various modifications, it fell into the puritanical cut, as seen in portraits of Milton in advanced life, and finally degenerated into the small strips or appendages fastened by modern clergymen under their chins. The term "bands," by which they are still known, has undergone no change. It probably had its origin in the Italian word banda, which was ample in its extent and of sufficient importance to have served as the badge of a well-known order of knighthood. The plain falling band occurs very frequently in the portraits of noblemen during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Ben Jonson and Spenser are striking contemporary examples.

A very curious essay might be written on
chance resemblances, and their mischievous influence on the pursuit of authentic portraiture. It would, in fact, be very serviceable to work out, as a commencement of this branch of investigation, a list of all the contemporaries of Shakspeare who, with a high bald forehead, and other similarity of features, might, if their likenesses were discovered unshackled by any pedigree, be very plausibly invested with his name.

GEORGE SCHABF, F.S.A.

SHAKESPEARE AND MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS.

Miss Strickland, in her rather too flattering Life of Mary Stuart (Queens of Scotland, vol. v. p. 231), alluding to the period just after the murder of Darnley, says:—

"Among other cruel devices practised against Mary, at this season by her cowardly assailants, was the dissemination of gross personal caricatures; which, like the placards charging her as an accomplice in her husband's murder, were fixed on the doors of churches and other public places in Edinburgh. Rewards were vainly offered for the discovery of the limners by whom these treasonable painted tickets, as they were styled in the proclamations, were designed. Mary was peculiarly annoyed at one of these productions, called 'The Mermaid,' which represented her in the character of a crowned siren, with a sceptre formed of a fish's tail in her hand, and flanked with the regal initials 'M. R.' This curious specimen of party malignity is still preserved in the State Paper Office.

This caricature fully corroborates the idea first propounded by Bishop Warburton that, in the well-known passage quoted below from Midsummer's Night's Dream, Shakspeare, by the "mermaid on a dolphin's back," made a pointedly satirical allusion to Mary, Queen of Scots. For, here is historical evidence that Mary was so represented, many years before the comedy was written:—

"Oberon. My gentle Puck, come hither: thou remember'st
Since once I sat upon a promontory;
And heard a mermaid, on a dolphin's back,
Uttering such dulcet and harmonious breath,
That the rude sea-gulls grew civil at her song;
And certain stars shot madly from their spheres,
To hear the sea-maid's music."

"Puck. I remember.
"Oberon. That very time I saw (but thou could'st not),
Flying between the cold moon and the earth,
Cupid all arm'd: a certain aim he took
At a fair vestal throned by the west,
And loosed his love-shaft smartly from his bow,
As it should pierce a hundred thousand hearts;
But I might see young Cupid's fiery shaft
Quench'd in the chaste beams of the wat'ry moon,
And the imperial vot'ress passed on
In maiden meditation, fancy-free;
Yet mark'd I where the bolt of Cupid fell:
It fell upon a little western flower;
Before milk-white, now purple with love's wound,—
And maidens call it, Love in idleness."

How Ritson attacked this idea of Warburton, in his usual slashing style,—how Boaden and Halpin advanced theories on the passage very similar to each other, but quite at variance with that of the Bishop—is well known to all versed in the literature of the commentators. All agreed, however, that Elizabeth was figured by

"The fair vestal throned by the west;"
buth the grand bone of contention was, whether by

"The mermaid on a dolphin's back;"

Shakspeare denoted Mary, Queen of Scots; and by the stars, which "shot madly from their spheres," such persons as the Duke of Norfolk and the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, who fell from their allegiance out of regard to her?

The late Rev. J. Hunter, in his New Illustrations, re-opened the question: ably showing that the mermaid of Shakspeare exactly corresponded with the character and history of Mary. The dolphin being symbolical of her first marriage to the Dauphin of France; and the "dulcet and harmonious breath," referring to her "alluring accent," which, with the agreeableness of her conversation, fascinated all that approached her, subduing even harsh and uncivil minds.

"Some," says Mr. Hunter, "were touched by it more than others. She had not been long in England, when the two northern Earls broke out into open rebellion, and would have made her queen. Leonard Dacre, a member of another noble house in the north, ventured everything for her; and finally, the Duke of Norfolk forgot his allegiance, and sought to make her his bride. Here, at least, it must be admitted that we have what answers very well to the stars that 'shot madly from their spheres to hear the sea-maid's music.'"

In the other half of the allegory, Mr. Hunter is equally as pointed. The time being indicated. For "that very time," to use Shakspeare's own words, when the Duke of Norfolk was madly shooting from his sphere by aspiring to the hand of Mary, Elizabeth was strongly solicited to marry the Duke of Anjou. But the "fiery shaft," aimed by Cupid against the Queen of England, fell innocuous; and she passed on—

"In maiden meditation fancy free."

A copy of the caricature in the State Paper Office, alluded to by Miss Strickland, was about a year ago published in the Illustrated News. Mary might well feel a peculiar annoyance at being represented in the character of a mermaid. Jeremy Collier, alluding to sea monsters, half woman and half fish, says:—

"By this fable poets give us an ingenious description of the charms of voluptuousness, which men of spirit avoid by the force of their courage."

In the caricature, the mermaid is represented on a butcher's block, as an emblem probably of a cruel bloodythroisy character. The artist being