THE EARL OF ESSEX AND MARY STUART

TWO OF JOHN BANKS' TRAGEDIES, WITH A SIDE REFERENCE TO TWO GERMAN PLAYS ON THE SAME SUBJECTS BY HERMANN MÜLLER.

A DISSERTATION, SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ARTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BERNE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

ADOLPHE RIETMANN

OF

MAMMERN

Accepted by the Faculty of Arts at the suggestion of Prof. Dr. Ed. Müller-Hess.

Berne, 20th december 1912. The Dean:

Prof. Dr. **G. HUBER.**

WETZIKON
J. WIRZ, PRINTER
1915.

THE EARL OF ESSEX AND MARY STUART

TWO OF JOHN BANKS' TRAGEDIES, WITH A SIDE REFERENCE TO TWO GERMAN PLAYS ON THE SAME SUBJECTS BY HERMANN MÜLLER.

A DISSERTATION, SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ARTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BERNE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

ADOLPHE RIETMANN

OF

MAMMERN

Accepted by the Faculty of Arts at the suggestion of Prof. Dr. Ed. Müller-Hess.

Berne, 20th december 1912. The Dean:

Prof. Dr. **G. HUBER.**

WETZIKON
J. WIRZ, PRINTER
1915.

The idea of this Dissertation occurred to me whilst studying at the University of Berne. Prof. Dr. Müller-Heß of Berne under whose direction I completed my work, gave me valuable help in my researches and I owe to him a deep sense of obligation and gratitude.

Preface.

In Spring 1908 an Inaugural Dissertation appeared: Der Graf Essex in der Literatur by H. Schiedermair. (Publisher: Kayser, Kaiserslautern), in which he treats, in a short way, the Essex literature in prose and poetry. Whilst studying the subject I have succeeded in finding another Essex play which has not been mentioned either by Schiedermair or by any other writer on the same subject: Elisabeth, Königin von England, Tragedy by Hermann Müller. As the same author has written a tragedy on Mary Stuart, I will endeavour to treat these two tragedies together with the plays by John Banks on the same subjects.

Chapter I.

Very little is known and has been written of the authors mentioned on the title page. I will first give a short account of the life of John Banks.

He is supposed to have been born about 1650. He was bred a lawyer and was a member of the Society at New Inn. His genius led him to make several attempts in dramatic poetry, in which he had various success: but even when he met with the greatest encouragement he was very sensible of his error in giving up the profitable practice of the law in order to pursue the profession of the stage: But he was fired with the thirst of fame, which reconciled to his mind the many uneasy sensations to which the precarious success of his plays and the indigence of his profession naturally exposed him: Mr. Banks no doubt has gained one part of his design by commencing poetry, namely, that of being remembered after death, which Pope somewhere calls "the poor estate of wits:" For this gentleman has here a place amongst the poets, while nine tenths of the lawyers of his time now sleep with their fathers in oblivion and of whom we can only say, they lived and died. —

In the year 1648 Mr. Banks offered a tragedy to the stage, called the Island Queens, or, the death of Mary, Queen of Scots, which, it seems, was re-

jected, whether from its want of merit, or motives of a political kind we cannot now determine, but Mr. Banks thought proper then to publish it. In the year 1706 he obtained the favour of Queen Anne to command it to be acted at the Theatre Royal, which was done with success, for it is really a very moving tragedy. It has often been revived and performed at the theatres with considerable success. —

The Earl of Essex, or the Unhappy favourite was acted 1682, with the most general applause. Mr. Dryden wrote the Prologue and Epilogue. It will without doubt be expected, that, having mentioned the Earl of Essex by Banks, we should say something of a tragedy of the same name, which appeared the same year at the theatre at Covent Garden. We cannot but acknowledge that Mr. Jones has improved the story and heightened the incident in the last act, which renders the whole more moving: After the scene of parting between Essex and Southampton, which is very affecting, Rutland's distress upon the melancholy occasion of parting from her husband is melting to the last degree. After Essex is led out to execution, Mr. Jones introduces the Queen at the Tower, which has a very happy effect, and her manner of behaving on that occasion makes her appear more amiable than she ever was in any play on the same subject. Mr. Jones in his language (in this piece) does not affect to be very poetical, nor is his versification always mellifluent as in his other writings. But it is well adapted for speaking: The design is well conducted, the story rises regularly, the business is not suspended and the characters are well sustained. —

Mr. Banks' other dramatic works are: The Rival Kings (1677). The Destruction of Troy (1679). Virtue Betrayed, or, Anne Bullen (1682). The Innocent Usurper (1694). Cyrus the Great (1696).

Nothing more is known about Banks, it is reported that he was buried at St. James, Westminster (1696?). He published nothing except the seven dramas mentioned above, all of which are tragedies in five acts and in verse. Banks is a dreary and illiterate writer whose blank verse is execrable. It appears however, that his scenes possessed a melodramatic pathos which appealed to vulgar hearers, and one or two of his pieces survived most of the Restoration drama upon the stage.

As mentioned before, Banks' leaning was entirely towards tragedy, his merit in which is of a peculiar kind. His language must be confessed to be extremely unpoetical, his characters are very far from being strongly marked or distinguished, and his episodes extremely irregular, yet it is impossible to avoid being deeply affected at the representation and even at the reading of his tragic pieces. This is owing, in general, to the happy choice of his subjects, which are all borrowed from history, either real or romantic and most of them from circumstances in the Annals of England. He has chosen as the bases of his plays such tales as were, in themselves and their wellknown catastrophes, best adapted to the purposes of the drama.

The false gems sometimes approach so near in glitter to the true ones, at least in the eyes of all but real connoisseurs, that bombast frequently passes for the true sublime and where it is rendered the vehicle of incidents in themselves affecting and in which the heart is apt to take an

interest: it will perhaps be found to have a stronger power on the human passions, than even that property to which it is in reality no more than a bare succedaneum (Baker, Biographia dramatica I. 20)

On this account only Mr. Banks' writings have in general drawn more tears from the eyes and excited more terror in the breasts, even of judicious audiences, than those of much more correct and more truly poetical authors. —

The writers on dramatic subjects have not ascertained either the year of the birth, or that of the death of this author. —

A few words should be said on H. Müller. In spite of having made thorough researches re the mentioned writer I have not succeeded in getting any detail of his life.

According to his two works:

„Elisabeth, Königin von England", Tragödie in 5 Akten, Berlin 1837.

„Maria, Königin von Schottland", Tragödie in 5 Akten, Altona 1840,

we may assume that he lived in the first half of the 19th century. The reader will find an account of H. Müller as a dramatic writer later on when we are analysing his works.

I shall deal in this chapter with a) J. Banks' Unhappy favourite and b) H. Müller's Elizabeth, Queen of England.

CHAPTER II.

a) I think it not necessary to give an analysis of Banks' Unhappy favourite, as it has already been done by G. E. Lessing in his Hamburgische Dramaturgie (Part 54—59). A few outlines may follow:

Essex arrives from Ireland without the Queen's leave; she admits him to her presence, but does not speak to him; Burleigh in the Queen's name demands from Essex his staff of office; he refuses to give it and appeals to the Queen; he vindicates his conduct and receives a blow from her; Essex is arrested; the Queen gives him a ring and promises that whensoever he shall return it, she will grant him, whatever he shall ask; Rutland tells the Queen that she is married to Essex and pleads for her husband's life. Essex, after he is condemned, sends the ring to the Queen by the Countess of Nottingham; the latter denies to the Queen that she has received it. Essex is beheaded and Nottingham's treachery is detected. —

Such is the argument of the play; Jones and Brooke in their plays are much indebted to it. — The first line: "Help me to rail prodigious minded Burleigh" is deservedly parodied in Tom Thumb. Act I scene V: "Teach me to scold prodigious minded Grizzle".

Banks' play was very successful. It is not clear, whether it was printed in 1682 or 85; but it was undoubtedly acted in, or before those years. Langbaine says it is founded on a novel, called the "Secret History of Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Essex." Rapin (vol. VI p. 484 of the French text.) observes: The Queen's irresolution, with regard to the execution of the Earl of Essex has furnished abundant matter for romances and plays, in which Elizabeth is represented as fluctuating between love and anger. She was however of an age, when the emotions of love should not be very violent: but without stopping at these trifles it is sufficient to say, that the Earl died as a good Christian &c.

As for the story of the ring, we read in the "Secret history of Queen Elizabeth and her great favourite, the Earl of Essex":

Ah, Madam, (said the Queen to Nottingham) interrupting the Countess, you do not know me, the force I have put on myself has raised me above the infirmities of nature, but alas, the case is otherwise, for the poor Elizabeth is a slave of her own weakness and has all along sacrified to reputation the quiet of her soul and happiness of her days. The Earl of Essex is not less famous for his rebellion against me than his victory over my heart; you know, what I have done to raise him, nor can you be ignorant how ill he has requited me by his crimes; a man, who, being governor of the Kingdom of Ireland, general of my Army, in possession of the best offices in my Kingdom and Master of my affection — yet to conspire against this authority. I was too much inclined, to give him a share of — and perhaps against — a life I took no pleasure in, but the opportunity I had by it to make him happy. —

The popular story that Elizabeth had given him a ring with a promise of pardon if he sent it to her when in danger, and that the Countess of Nottingham detained it, is unsupported by contemporary evidence. — (Political history of England, Vol. VI; 472 ff.)

The story of the ring is derived from the mentioned novel, written about 1650; and as it was esteemed to be inspired by Elizabeth, people ascribed historical credulity to it. This novel is divided into two parts: The first treats Elizabeth's confession to Lady Nottingham re her affection to Essex and her great grief about the treachery of her

faithless favourite. On her proposal to marry him he had to avow his love to Lady Rutland. (In reality he was married with Lady Walsingham in 1590; this marriage was to be held secret from Elizabeth). However, she gave him a ring with the promise to grant him anything if sent to her when in danger. — Th 2nd part treats mostly the relation between Essex and Rutland; Lady Nottingham, remembering Essex' unfaithful love to her, thinks the time come to revenge herself on him. She reveals his secret marriage to the Queen; the latter, beside herself, makes Rutland and Essex prisoners. Essex wishes to ask pardon and sends the ring by Lady Nottingham who detains it: Essex is beheaded. Soon after this, Lady Nottingham fell sick, and dying, she confessed her treachery to the Queen. The great historians of the 18th century, viz. Hume and Robertson, also Lessing, confirmed it as a historical fact. Among newer researches W. B. Devereux in his "Lives and letters of the Earls of Essex", seems to be the only one who keeps strictly to the same idea. Dyce and Collier tried to prove that the ring was already mentioned in 1623 in Webster's "The Devil's law case" (Act III.3); Schiedermair p. 34 says, and I agree with him, that the passage is not a proof of historical credibility. Sidney Lee, Dictionary of National Biography vol. XIV, pag. 437 ff. and Ebsworth (Roxburgh Ballads vol. VI, p. 406) call it apocryphical. It has probably to be taken together with the whole novel as a poetical imagination. Thos. Corneille has not used the incident of the ring in his drama; the reason why may be seen in a few outlines from "La Bibliothèque des Théâtres":

On voulait imputer à Mr. Corneille d'avoir falsifié l'histoire, parce qu'il ne s'était pas servi de l'incident d'une bague qu'on prétendait d'avoir été donnée par la reine au comte d'Essex pour gage d'un pardon certain, mais Mr. Corneille prétend que cette bague était de l'invention de Mr. Calprenède et qu'il ne se trouvait rien dans aucun historien." Let us believe that Elizabeth really gave the ring, a pledge of love and safety for Essex. And if this ring should even save his life when endangered as she promised him, why did Elizabeth yet consent to his death? This point seems to me to be a contradiction. The Queen must have remembered the fact, and I do not think that she, the proud Queen of England would have withdrawn her word, when Essex was about to try the power of the pledge. Nothing is mentioned about it in the State papers on the trial of the Earl. We must also take into account Essex' being obstinate; he refused to sue for mercy and declared that his life would be the Queen's destruction; then she sent a fresh command that he should be put to death. — About the year (1630) the Spanish Essex appeared; Dar la vida a Su Dama ù El Conde de Sex, there the Queen gives him as a pledge of love a scarf (in Othello a handkerchief); in 1638 "La Calprenède's" Essex was produced, where we hear for the first time of the ring. Could it not have been an invention of La Calprenède to give to this pledge another form — a ring? As mentioned on page 10, Corneille soon after pretended that this ring was La Calprenède's invention as he could not find anything in history about it. It can easily be supposed, that from the year of appearence of La Calprenède's tragedy in 1638 the "Ring" has survived in the Annals of Essex. The

novel "The secret history" appeared only in 1650, we do not exactly know who its author is; there are direct historical contradictions in it. How could Elizabeth, the Queen of England, propose to the young Essex to marry her, she, 57 years old, he 22, when he got married with Frances Walsingham? The Queen knew of it soon after. So we may assume that the ring forms for the whole a smart ornament, the only means for the dramatist to give to the reader or hearer a gleam of hope to save the life of the unfortunate Earl. —

Schiedermair in his dissertation: Der Graf von Essex in der Litteratur. Kaiserslautern 1908. p. 38 says that neither Lessing nor Kossack nor the editors of the Hamburgische Dramaturgie Schröter and Thiele, took the trouble to compare Banks' tragedy with the secret history of Queen Elizabeth. Now the reader expects that Schiedermair would undertake this comparison, but he contents himself with a few remarks occupying about half a page and goes on to say that the story about the blow on the ears, which Elizabeth struck to Essex, not being contained in the "Secret History", Banks must have used some other source besides. This other source must be, according to Schiedermair, Camden or Birch. Unfortunately Thomas Birch's "Memoirs of the reign of Queen Elizabeth from the year 1581 till her death" came out in 1754, that is to say 72 years after Banks' tragedy. Evidently Schiedermair means Anthony Bacon's papers up to 1597 which were embodied in Birch's memoirs.

The tragedy occupies the time from Essex' arrival in England to his execution (1599—1601). In the first act Essex returns from his expedition against Tyrone in Ireland without the Queen's leave.

Camden p. 788: Intra mensem Essexius omnium opinione citius in Angliam advolat cum selectis quibusdam amicis . . . . . atque ita maturavit ut reginæ bene mane ne opinanti quidem in penetrali sacratiori in genua provolutus se sisteret.

Essex was very much displeased that the Queen had in the meantime conferred on Sir Robert Cecil the office of master of the wards.

Camden p. 787: Sed maxime exulceratus quod regina Roberto Cecilio præfecturam regiorum pupillorum contulerat.

In Banks' play Elizabeth does not speak to Essex at this occasion while according to Camden (788) she granted him a short interview. Burleigh's demanding from Essex in the Queen's name his staff of office is not proved to be historical, Camden does not mention it. As Burleigh and Essex were personal enemies and the former was distinguished by the Queen, Banks probably gives him this office in order to heighten the dramatic effect.

The third act brings the story about the blow on the ears of Essex. We have seen already, that it is not contained in the secret history, but that it is historical (see above 12.) Lessing in his Hamburgische Dramaturgie part 56th was the first to find out from where Banks has taken this story. It happened in 1598 when the question of appointing a Lord deputy of Ireland was under consideration. The Queen suggested Sir Will. Knollys. Essex advised the appointment of Sir George Carew, a protégé of the Cecils and a personal enemy of Essex. In the heat of the dispute Essex turned his back on the Queen with a gesture of contempt. He told her that her conditions were as crooked as her carcase. Elizabeth struck him a violent blow on the ear.

Essex swore that he could not suffer this indignity in peace.

Camden p. 764: De hoc pacis negotio et de eligendo aliquem idoneum ad res Hibernicas introspiciendas acre inter reginam et Essexium intervenit dissidium. Cum enim illa Guilielmum Knolles Essexii avunculum præ cæteris omnibus in Hiberniam mittendum censeret, ille Georgium Carew, ut ab Aula amandaret, potius mittendun pervicaciter suaderet, nec persuadere posset, sui immemor et obsequii negligens quasi ex despicientia tergum obvertit et subsannavit. Illa impatienter alapam impegit et in malam rem abire jussit. Ille gladii capulo manum admovit. Admirallo se interponente dejeravit, nec posse nec velle tantam indignationem exsorbere, nec ab Henrico Octavo perferre voluisse. Fremensque ex Aula se proripuit.

Banks follows Camden closely, but he is not content with one Henry, he adds all the other Henrys and even Alexander: By all the Subtility and woman, in your sex I swear, that had you been a man, you durst not, nay, your bold father Harry durst not this have done. Why say I him? not all the Harrys nor Alexander's self, were he alive, should boast of such a deed on Essex done without revenge.

We see that the story of the blow does not concern the interview between Elizabeth and Essex after his return from Ireland. On the contrary it must have happened in the year before his departure to Ireland viz. in 1598. Banks has inserted it here in order to show us the versatility in Essex' character. Lessing blames him for that. He says: "Banks hat Essex zu sehr nach dem Leben geschildert. Ein Charakter, der sich so leicht vergißt, ist kein Cha-

rakter und der dramatischen Nachahmung unwürdig." I believe, if Banks had tried to change something in Essex' character, he would have been obliged to change it altogether and then nobody would have recognized the historical Essex in this dramatic figure.

The incident about the countess of Rutland, who is married to Essex in Banks' play, her pleading for Essex' life, her asking for the latter's detaining it etc. are inventions of the second part of the Secret History (German translation by Bernhard Oexlin. Schaffhausen 1786, p. 116—162).

b) Elisabeth, Königin von England.

Dramatis Personæ:

Elizabeth, Queen of England
Lord Egerton, Lord Chancellor of Engand
Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex
Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham
Sir Robert Cecil
„ Walter Raleigh
„ Christian Hutten
Countess of Nottingham
Lord Monteagle
Earl of Rutland
Earl of Southampton } Essex' Friends.
Lord Sandys
Sir Christian Blount
Sir James Mellville, Scotch Minister
Wentworth, Spokesman of the House of Commons
Sir Harry Lee
Cuff, Secretary to Essex
Stubbs, Officer of the Palace
Gentlemen and Ladies of the Court, Members of Parliament, Soldiers, Attendants &c.

Scene: In and near London.

Argument of the Play.

In the first scene we meet Lord Cecil and Lord Egerton. They are waiting for the Queen in order to ask her to sign some Bills. There is question at the beginning of the victory over the Armada. Raleigh approaches the group, they are all anxious about the Scotch Minister's being present. Lord Egerton seems to have very bad news of Essex. Lady Nottingham also expresses her displeasure with him; then she announces the coming of the Queen. She approaches first, trying to ingratiate herself into the Queen's favour. The sovereign thanks all for their being present and is glad about the victory over the Armada. Bowing to the Scotch Minister she asks him of her Royal brother's state of health. Lord Egerton now accuses Essex, but the Queen is deaf for this sort of conversation. They do not know whether Essex is in London or not and are afraid that he might come back. Scarcely said — he arrives. Essex wishes to be alone with the Queen, as the Lords meet him in a distrusting manner. He is now expected to justify himself; Elizabeth reproves him for returning from Ireland without her permission and a long discussion ensues on this subject; finally Elizabeth pardons him. In the whole scene they seem to be in love with each other. The Queen shows very little her dignity as a sovereign. Left alone, she confesses her love to Essex to herself, but nevertheless, she thinks it necessary to judge him for his doings. The Lords appear to learn Elizabeth's will. She gives order for the council to be assembled to impeach Essex of High treason. All are astonished

and at the same time pleased with Elizabeth's being willing to punish Essex. (First Act).

(London, House of the Earl of Essex). In a soliloquy Essex expresses his satisfaction for having obtained the Queen's pardon. Southampton appears; then follows the story of the ring, related by Essex to his friend. The latter is anxious about the security of Essex' life, as he has previously spoken to the Scotch Minister Melville who fears also for him. Cuff arrives and informs Essex of the council being assembled and that he has been forbidden to let him know of the fact. He warns Essex of Lord Nottingham as the latter could never forget the calumny about the victory of Cadix. The people are glad to know Essex back at London. Catholic citizens complain of being badly treated and persecuted; Essex expresses his willingness to intercede for them with the Queen, in return for which they will help him. — (Room in the Royal Palace). Essex and Southampton are introduced into a side room, Lord Egerton having given orders, that they should not be allowed to enter the Hall. Essex fears the worst. The Queen and the Lords enter, Essex is accused: he reads the impeachment, throws the paper on the ground and leaves the Hall. Elizabeth is amazed at Essex' behaviour, but hopes that nothing serious may occur. — (London, Essex House). The citizens have heard of Essex' being arrested, and they resolve to save him. Essex informs his friends of the event at court and asks them, whether he shall submit to the sentence. No! — they cry. Then they determine an insurrection for the following day, and parting at the end of the act, they swear to do their best for Essex. (2nd Act). —

(Essex' Court). The armed men prepare for a sally. Being glad to see his friends ready, Essex thinks the time come to revenge himself, especially perceiving that the greater number of them are of the Scotch party. All leave for the town.

(Garden in Westminster Palace). Elizabeth and Attendants. A long discussion follows amongst the society as to whether Essex is to be declared guilty or not. Cecil enters and informs the Queen of Essex' planed revolt. But she thinks Lord Cecil too prejudiced, she does not believe him. Lord Egerton can but confirm Cecil's evidence. The Queen now regrets her hasty action and orders Lord Egerton to warn Essex in her name. Elizabeth alone gives way to her great grief on Essex' behalf. Informed that troops have entered the garden she refuses to escape. Then she diapproves of Raleigh's action of having called up some troops, she orders them to be dismissed and the people to be calmed in her name. All are glad about their success. Nottingham appears to inform them of Essex' being taken prisoner and of the subduing of the rebellion. The Queen in her turn makes up her mind to judge Essex, the Lords are already glad to have him in their power and think that now his death is assured. (3rd Act). —

(Drawing Room of the Queen). Everybody is anxious about the Queen's health, she has neither eaten nor slept since the pronouncement of the sentence against Essex, she is in despair, expecting a sign from him and promises to herself her pardon. She sends Egerton to Essex and Southhampton to the Tower in order to speak to them. Raleigh argues with Nottingham about his wife's going to Essex into the prison. Lady Nottingham has

received the fatal ring from Essex, but her husband forces her to hand it to him. Elizabeth gives up every hope, she thinks everything lost. When Lord Egerton returns with the answer of Essex that he would not hear anything of the Queen: the latter beside herself, signs the death warrant. (4th Act).

(Throneroom of the Queen). The Queen makes a long speech to the Lords and appoints as her successor James Stuart. General protest. Raleigh gives way to his anger as all his plans have failed; he still hopes that the nomination of the new King may be changed. Elizabeth alone, reproaches her action to herself as too hasty. Lady Nottingham appears, giving the ring, which she had received the day before from Essex. Then she speaks of Essex' execution; the Queen faints. She is carried away: a surgeon is called, all fear for her life; but when Cecil enters to inform of his sovereign's state of health, it is too late, she has expired. (5th Act). —

Such is the course of action of the play. I shall first endeavour to throw some light on the origin of the plot. A glance at the list of the cast shows the play to be a rather complicated aparatus, and Mueller has succeeded in putting the action in an excellent form, observing the rules of the drama and the stage. The chief part of the action is, on the whole, the same as that of the previous writers. Mueller joins many more details than any of his predecessors. There is for instance question of the victory over the Armada; the Scotch Minister represents his King's opinion; the desperate position of the Catholics is spoken of; the succession of Elizabeth &c. —

In this play we remark a significant influence of Schiller; the whole construction recalls William Tell.

I will at first try to sum up the relationship between Banks' Essex and Müller's. For the German translation I use that of J. G. Dyk, Leipzig 1786.

(Banks' Essex = A., Müller's = B.)

A.	B.
First Act. One scene Room at Whitehall	First Act. One scene Room in the Royal Palace at Greenwich.
2nd Act. The same as the first	2nd Act. Two scenes 1)House of the Earl of Essex 2) Room in the Royal Palace.
3rd Act. As above.	3rd Act. Two scenes. 1) Essex' Court 2) Garden at Westminster.
4th Act. As above.	4th Act. Two scenes. 1) Drawing Room of the Queen 2) Room of the Queen
5th Act. One scene. The Tower.	5th Act. Two scenes. 1) Throneroom of the Palace 2) Room of the Queen.
* * *	
Essex appears in the 2nd Act in London	Elizabeth appears in the first Act.

A.	B.
The ring is mentioned in Act 4.	Mentioned in the 2nd Act.
No scene takes place in the Essex house	Two scenes in Essex's House
Rutland married to Essex	Rutland not mentioned; Essex not married.
Lady Nottingham keeps the ring back	Lord Nottingham keeps the ring.
Nottingham denies the ring; a letter from Essex sent to the Queen, betrays her treachery.	Nottingham brings the ring after the execution to the Queen.
L. Nottingham banished from Court by Elizabeth.	Elizabeth begs God to pardon Nottingham.
Elizabeth appears as a sovereign	Elizabeth as a woman in love
Elizabeth's sorrow at the end of the play.	Elizabeth dies.
Essex not warned by Elizabeth	Elisabeth warned by Egerton.
Essex received by the Queen, but does not answer him in the 2nd Act	Essex kindly received, obtains the Queen's pardon after a long scene.
Essex' conspiration only mentioned	The conspiration takes place on the stage
Southampton not condemned to be executed	Southampton in prison.
Burleigh speaks of the execution	Nottingham tells of the execution.

Cecil plays the same rôle.

A.	B.
No law court takes place	Essex has to appear before the Lords
The delivery of the ring takes place by the Queen.	Ring only mentioned.

As it may be seen from these examples, Müller's Essex is quite independent in course of action, just as well as in language from Banks. Müller lived 200 years afterwards, and the great classics of that time might have influenced him much more. Some of the passages bear a strong resemblance to one or other of the German classic writers and to Shakespeare; for inst.

Act I, Scene 2, 3, 4, 5. Act II, Scene 6, 9. Act IV, Scene 4, 7. Act V, Scene 4, 7, 8.

Essex: Jetzt laßt uns scheiden Freunde, wenn [mein Herz
Sich nicht in Worten Luft macht, so verzeiht.
Es ist ein großes Werk das wir beginnen. . .
Doch eure Hände reicht mir als ein Zeichen
Der innigen Verbrüderung.

Scene on the Rütli. Wilh. Tell: Kommt, laßt [uns scheiden
Eh' uns des Tages Leuchten überrascht. . . .
So reicht mir eure biedere Rechte . . . .

Essex: Wir sind Euch treu im Leben und im Tod!
(Recalls the Rütliscene in Will. Tell.)

Essex: Da traf mein Auge ein Gerüst . . . .

Egmont, Goethe: Aus der Nacht stieg mir ein schwarz Gerüst entgegen . . . . .

Essex: Ich sah ihn knien, das Haupt schon auf dem Block . . . .

M. Stuart, Schiller: Sie kniet aufs Kissen — legt das Haupt . . . .

Essex: So mag Euch Gott verzeihen! Ich kann es nicht.

These are Elizabeth's own words:
May God pardon him! I never can!

Essex: Dort liegt sie
Ich habe sie ermordet: sie und Essex
Was starrt ihr mich so an?

W. Tell: Was seht ihr mich so jammernd an?

Essex: Wer wirken will, muß jetzt an ein Ganzes sich anschließen.

Schiller. Pflicht für jeden: Als dienendes Glied schließ an ein Ganzes Dich an!

Essex: Die Kirche und die Heiligen helfen Euch.

W. Tell: Dem Mutigen hilft Gott.

Essex: Der Wind, der jetzt aus England weht, bringt weniges Erfreuliches.

Shak. Hamlet 4. 2: Not the ill wind, which blows none to good.

Essex: Er steht zu fest in ihrer Gunst gegründet.

W. Tell: Das Haus der Freiheit hat uns Gott gegründet.

Essex: Ich bin ein schwach' ein schwaches Weib!

Hamlet 1, 2. Schwachheit, dein Name ist Weib. (Frailty. thy name is woman).

Essex: Das Unterhaus hat hierin keine Meinung Es hat nur zu gehorchen und zu schweigen.

Schiller, Wallenstein: Ich hab hier bloß ein Amt und keine Meinung.

Essex: Von Rache schweigt! wir wollen unser Recht.

W. Tell: Sprecht nicht von Rache, nichts Geschehe-
[nes rächen,

Gedrohtem Uebel wollen wir begegnen.

Essex: Jede Waffe tut in braven Händen guten Dienst.

W. Tell: Die Axt im Hause spart den Zimmermann.

Essex: Ist einer unter Euch, der an sich selbst,
Nicht ihre Macht schon hart und schwer ge-
[fühlt,
Und der nicht wünscht, daß diese Tyrannei
Von Gott und Volk verhaßten Männern ende?

W. Tell: The scene of the Rütli.

Essex: Nun seht ihr selbst, was für ein Geist sie
[treibt
Sprecht ihr noch jetzt von Schonung?

W. Tell: Jetzt rede mir keiner mehr von Bleiben, von Verbergen . . . . .

Essex: Befiehl dem Strome nicht ins Meer zu
[fließen
Und sieh', ob er gehorcht.

Shakesp. Wint. T. 1, 5. Forbid the sea for to obey the moon.

The sentence passed on this play by an anonymous German critic is too severe:

Repertorium der gesamten deutsch. Literatur von Dr. Gersdorf. 17. Band. Leipzig 1838. p. 287. „Elisabeth, Königin von England." Ein Trauerspiel in 5 Akten von Hermann Müller, Berlin, Behr's Buchhandlung 1837.

Das Verhältnis des Grafen Essex zur Königin Elisabeth und sein tragisches Ende hat den Stoff zu diesem Trauerspiel gegeben. Das ganze ist mit einigen Abweichungen nach der bekannten historischen Vorlage, namentlich mit Benutzung der Erzählung von dem verhängnisvollen Ringe, den Elisa-

beth einst als Bürge ihrer Gnade an Essex gegeben, gearbeitet. Der Kampf des Weibes und der Königin ist das eigentliche Thema der Tragödie, das weniger in der Handlung als in den Monologen der Herrscherin entwickelt wird. Sie stirbt am Recht des Weibes, das sie selber in sich vermissen wollte. Nur muß der Leser dem Greisenalter der Elisabeth gegenüber den jugendlichen Essex aus seinem Gedächtnisse wegwischen, sonst wird die Königin statt tragisch, miserabel! Die übrigen mitredenden Personen des Stückes sind keine einzige notwendig hineinbedingt, sondern bloße Staffage und die Intrigen der Feinde des Grafen Essex haben weder scharfen Plan noch Resultat, denn der Sturz desselben geschieht ganz außerhalb ihres Terrains. Dramatischen Effekt kann diese Tragödie schwerlich machen, denn die Leidenschaften der Handelnden sind zu zahm und die theatralische Handlung zu matt. Es fehlt an Intividualitäten, die sich polarisieren, daß Schwung wird. Alles steht dem Indifferenzpunkt zu nahe. Auch ist der Dialog mitunter erbärmlich platt und nüchtern. Die richtig gezählten Jamben machen die ganze Poesie des Stückes aus.

By way of conclusion I shall try to sum up Müller's charateristic as a dramatist in so far as it is reflected in the play which I have discussed. If originality be demanded of a poet, Müller cannot be said to rank very high; his Essex does not show any attempt for innovation. In the form he implicitly bowed to the authority of Schiller, he is quite the man of his time, especially in the language. In the feeling for form which revealed itself in the delicate handling of language and metre, Müller is also under the influence of the great dramatists. But nevertheless, his qualities (as he is

doubtless a clever craftsman for the stage) ought at all events to secure for him a more considerable place in the Annals of the German drama.

A few words on the last scene of the play remain to be said. It is interesting in so far, as the Queen dies too. That is quite an audacious departure, perhaps not unjustified. It differs entirely from the historical fact. The idea of it is not new, for already in 1716, a German Student, F. H. Brauer, eleborated the Spanish drama "Essex" and lets the Queen die. (Straßburg 1716, Manuscript in Vienna).

Carl Heine (Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturgeschichte 1. 1888, p. 329 ff.) supposes in discussing the latter play and in giving a thorough analysis of it, that Brauer might have elaborated an Italian Drama or translated it into German.

The title of the Italian drama is: "La Regina Statista d'Inghilterra, Commedia di Nicolo Biancoelli." Müller is not likely to have known Brauer's translation, it was only found in 1888 by C. Heine. Thus it is to be supposed that he only became acquainted with the original Italian version. The action, however, is different altogether from Mueller's Essex. —

Another Italian elaboration of the Spanish Essex, independent from the above-mentioned may be a source to Mueller's: Roberto Devereux, opera, liberetto by Salvadore Camarano. Music by G. Donizetti. (In 3 Acts). The last act has much resemblance with Mueller's end of the play. There, Lady Nottingham intends to bring the Ring, received from Essex, to the Queen, but her husband prevents her from doing so; the same in Mueller's Essex (V; p. 123).

The last scene is similar altogether, the action goes parallel. In both the tragedies, Elizabeth expects a sign from Essex; but it is too late: Essex is already beheaded. Lady Nottingham comes to hand the ring, sent by Essex, to the Queen; the latter, on seeing it, breaks down and dies, after having appointed James of Scotland as her successor. —

Schiedermair calls this Italian play independent to a certain extent from those previously written, especially the end; he also points out a second tragedy with a similar action, without giving the title of it. So we may assume that the source to the conclusion of the last act in Mueller's Essex lies in the mentioned Italian drama. —

It is supported by contemporary evidence that Elizabeth fell sick from sorrow and remorse after Essex' death, for having given her consent to his execution. Then certainly we must understand the character of Mueller's Essex; he is more a lover than a hero; Elizabeth dares not for his sake punish him as he deserves, otherwise Mueller could not have let her die at the end of the play. Beside the intimate friendship existing between Elizabeth and Essex, there are no other facts supported by contemporary history in the play; they are all the fruit of the author's imagination.

The Scotch Minister Melville was not present at Essex' trial. Essex' unexpected arrival from Ireland was a surprise to Elizabeth, but he met her alone in the early morning in her dressing room, while Mueller puts the meeting in presence of the Lords and the courtiers. The discussion, which ensues between him and the Queen is quite different in Muellers tragedy from what it is in history; in the

former case she pardons Essex, in the latter, she orders him to stay in his apartments. (Camden p. 830). The preceding scene between Elizabeth and Essex and the following monologue have some resemblance with Grillparzer's Sappho. Elizabeth, being in love with Essex tries to change his mind. Sappho, loving Phaon, wishes to draw him into her favour. Then the above mentioned monologue in Act I, 1 as well as those in Act III, 2 and IV, 2 recall those of Sappho: III, 1; III, 2; IV, 1. Both women complain in these 3 soliloquies of their unhappy affection to the beloved men; in both cases they cannot understand their being rejected by them. Elizabeth's speech to the Lords has some resemblence with Sappho's oration to the people before going to die; their great grief at having lost their lovers makes the play finish tragically: Elizabeth dies of grief, Sappho in her sorrow throws herself into the sea. —

Some characteristics are to be found in the dialogue between Essex and Southampton resembling those in Goethe's Egmont, between Oranien and Egmont. In both cases the heroes speak of their awkward position. Egmont is advised to escape, Essex the same, but the ring dissuades him from doing so. After this scene Essex and Egmont are taken prisoners, Lord Nottingham, having a grudge against Essex tries to ruin him; Alba does the same with Egmont. —

The people wish to help Egmont, they do the same with Essex. — Other facts are simply the poet's invention: Elizabeth was never obliged to escape, not even advised to do so; she did not appoint, at that moment, her successor; she died only two years after Essex' execution. So we can

see that Mueller crowded all these facts into the course of a few days. —

Poetic license is allowed to every writer to a certain extent. In this case Mueller deviated too much from the historical truth. Elizabeth's death seems to me too sudden, without any motive; and yet I think it a good idea on Mueller's part to show us the weak side of a woman, who fought her whole life against the desire of her country that she should marry. She has gained this fight, but must sink. — I think, the character of Nottingham is better here than in Banks, it seems more natural. Her being prevented from handing the ring to the Queen is less unnatural than keeping it back on purpose in order to destroy a human life. Elizabeth's action against Essex is more justified than in any of the previous plays. She warns Essex beforehand by Lord Egerton and thinks herself finally obliged to sign the death warrant. Both sides of her character are excellently portrayed, on one side she is a woman, on the other a Queen. Her duty ruled her heart, she believes herself strong enough to endure this stroke, but no — she cannot bear it any longer. Being aged, her nature does not allow her to pass through this trial without suffering. In this way I think Mueller's idea — of letting the Queen die — is justified.

With regard to form, Mueller bowed implicitly to Schiller's construction of William Tell and Mary Stuart, especially in the charges of the dramatis personae. Each act is a complete picture in itself. The first is occupied entirely by Essex' enemies; the sudden unexpected arrival from Ireland gives an effective theatrical impression. M's Essex is, as Corneille says of his hero, proud and inflexible,

but he has not taken into account Lessing's warning not to make a languishing lover of him. He has avoided brutalities in the treatment of women. He only points out in a few short observations Essex' former relations to the Queen. In this he resembles Egmont; the domestic scenes between him and Southampton bear a strong likeness to those between Egmont and Oranien. Mueller does not weave the incident of the blow into his plot as Banks has done.

CHAPTER III.

The Island Queens,

or the Death of Mary, Queen of Scotland; a tragedy, published only in defence of the author and the play, against some mistaken censures, occasioned by its being prohibited on the stage. —

Vis consili expers mole ruit sua
Vim temperatam Dii quoque provehunt
In majus iidem odere vires
Omne nefas Animo moventes.
(Horace, Lib 3, Ode 2).

by John Banks. Printed 1684.

Dramatis Personæ:

Queen Elizabeth; Queen Mary; Duke of Norfolk; Morton, Regent of Scotland; Cecil; Davison; Young Douglas; Gifford. Scene London.

Genest says of the play: (Some account of the English stage, Bath 1832. Vol. I, p. 423.)

This tragedy by Banks was printed, but not acted. It is a poor play, particularly in point of language. The scene, in which Mary takes leave of her Attendants is not bad, the story is better calculated for the historian than the poet. — In such well known facts very little poetical license can be

admitted, and Banks has thought proper to make the Queens have two personal interviews, tho' it is notorious that they never saw each other. Norfolk says: Kings are like divinities on earth; but even this sentiment could not save this tragedy from being prohibited; for what reason this prohibition took place, it is not easy to conjecture. — Banks very probably published his play in his own defence; it was brought out at Drury Lane in March, 1704 as the Albion Queens. —

The original Epilogue was written by Joe Haines and intended to have been spoken by him; he addresses the Boxes and Pit and says:

My middle-gallery friends will sure assist me,
And for the upper tier, they never missed me.

In the first Edition of the Tragedy the names of Wilks, Booth, Oldfield, Porter &c. are added in the cast, from which it should be seen that it was afterwards allowed the liberty of being performed. (Theatr. Dictionary p. 73.) I had four different editions of Banks' Island Queens, but in none could I find the above mentioned names. It is also to be added that some parts of the original drama were cancelled for the performance, perhaps on account of political reasons; it confirms the tendency to a mild and not captious characteristic, especially for Elizabeth. Of the 2343 verses of the drama 680 are cancelled, for Banks often joined superabundant and copious parts, which made the course of action more difficult, it seemed to the hearer too pompous. Lessing says in this respect: (Hamb. Dramaturgie 59. Stück).

Many hold pompous and tragic to be much the same thing, their heroes are to talk like ordinary

mortals, and what sort of heroes would those be? sentences and bubbles a yard long, this constitutes for them the true tone of tragedy. —

We, moderns, who have abolished the chorus in the tragedies, who generally leave our personages between four walls, what reason have we to let employ such choice stilted rhetorical speech notwithstanding? Nobody hears it except those whom they permit to hear it; nobody speaks to them but people who are involved in the action, who are therefore themselves affected and have neither desire nor leisure to control expressions. It is as useless to invoke the high rank of the personages; aristocratic persons have learned how to express themselves better than the common man, but they do not affect incessantly to express themselves better than he. Least of all in moments of passion, since every passion has its own eloquence, is alone inspired by the most uneducated as well as by the most polished. There never can be feeling with a stilted, chosen, pompous language. It is not born of feeling, it cannot wake it. But feeling agrees with the simplest, commonest, plainest words and expressions. —

The preface in "Bells British Theatre" says: "The Albion Queens in diction is turgid and incorrect. The flights of Banks are the frenzies of fancied sublimity, soaring amongst the comets of irregular imagination.— Much of his exuberant bombast is retrenched in the representation The noisy declamation of the ranting tragedian has still an ample field to

Confound the ignorant, and amaze, indeed
The very faculties of eyes and ears."—

The characters of both these Queens seem to be at length clearly understood. Abilities of the first class at that time were the qualifications of both — but a good woman would conceive it a profanation to have it said, her heart was not better than either that of the one or the other. —

Of course, Mary's real character suffered much from the unhappy marriage with Darnley and afterwards with Bothwell. Her relations to the latter before Darnley's death seem to be not very clear. Nor do we know whether she was concerned in the murder of her husband; we are not even able to gather anything from her correspondence.

Much has been said and much written, respecting the authenticity of Mary's letters to Bothwell The guilt or innocence of the Queen's character was, in a great measure, involved in the question, and different opinions and arguments were consequently supported by different parties.

It seems, however, now to be agreed on all hands, that there is no real foundation, even upon the supposition most unfavourable to Mary, for the charge brought against her, of being accessary to the King's murder: or even of having previously given her consent to his death. Her passion for Bothwell — if such a passion ever existed in her mind — can never, indeed, be defended on the grounds of moral rectitude, or common justice; but its atrociousness will be highly extenuated, if the insolence and ingratitude of Lord Darnley are taken into account; he had repaid her tenderness with neglect and insult, had violated the marriage vow and carried that power which, in the moment of weakness and credulity, she fondly bestowed upon him to the most dangerous extremes.

Mary's heart was the heart of sensibility; she felt the insults that were offered her, and too rashly determined to revenge them. She felt too that she was a sovereign; and unhappily the prejudices she had imbibed in the court of France, where she was educated, did not at all serve to lessen her ideas of princely power and dignity. . But, though resolved on revenge, she was, as yet, undetermined as to the measures that were to be taken in order to complete her purpose. Her first step was to deprive him of that power which he had so grossly abused and to remove him from her person and court. —

Darnley appears to have felt the whole force of this indignity: for we find the tyrant soon afterwards sunk into the most abject of flatterers.

But Mary still kept him at a distance. She was in the bloom of youth, amiable, accomplished and allowed to be the most beautiful woman of the age. Every woman, who is handsome knows the power of her charms, but every woman can not handle these formidable weapons with equal dexterity. The Queen of Scots, however, was well skilled in the science of offence. Conscious of her strength she took the field against Darnley and began to play off her skilful manoeuvres. The custom of the age did not prohibit men from visiting the private apartments of ladies. The Queen gave splendid suppers and entertainments to the nobility in her bed-chamber. She selected her favourites and made use of every stratagem, to fire the mind of Darnley with rage and indignation. —

It was about this time that Lord Bothwell came to court. That Mary, from the first moment, she saw him, conceives a design of punishing Darnley

with the infringement of those vows, which he had himself violated, has been asserted by one party, and as strenuosly denied by the other. The truth seems to be that her pride and dignity only were wounded, and that her sole object was resentment. She meant to disturb, to harass and perplex him: "To speak daggers, but use none" (Hamlet 3, 2). —

An ingenious writer, Mr. Whitaker, in his vindication of Mary, has maintained that, far from being desperately in love with Bothwell, she absolutely despised him. But, why then did she marry him? — The most suspicious circumstance against the Queen and which indeed tends to give an air of probability to her being concerned in the murder of Darnley, is her marrying Bothwell within a few days after the King's death. —

In short, whatever was Mary's real character, whether she was the most abandoned and profligate, or the most innocent and virtuous of women; it appears, that Elizabeth was determined, at all events, to accomplish the destruction of her more beautiful rival. Many of the charges, which she brought against her, were weak and futile, and others openly flagitious: Nor can it any longer be doubted, neither need it to be concealed that the whole tenour of her conduct towards the unfortunate Mary was treacherous, persecuting and abominable. —

According to the mentioned lines, Mary was certainly not quite innocent in the matter, but I do not think that this fact prohibited the play from being acted; it is rather the language and reasons mentioned hereafter. The language is to be called pompous in Essex just as well as in the Island

Queens; therefore some parts of the play were cancelled; the actors even refused to perform it, if not reviewed.

It was said also for political reasons, but according to Chalmers there is hardly any fact to be observed in these 680 lines, which might have been offensive to the Queen. We do not know exactly the cause of its having been forbidden for a long time in the theatre; perhaps people of that time would not see their Queen on the stage, especially not a beheaded one.

The Bibliographia dramatica says in this respect:

But, from the profound penetration of the Master of Revels, who saw political spectres in the Island Queens that never appeared in the representation, it had lain so long upon the hands of the author. —

By special favour of Queen Anne Banks was allowed to see it acted at the theatre Royal. Then he published his tragedy with the title mentioned on page 30. The probable correctness of this supposition that only the disposition of that time has forbidden it to be acted, may be deducted from the following fact:

Alexander Pope once encouraged Nicholas Rowe to elaborate Banks' "Island Queens"; the latter refused, for he did not wish to offend in any way the esteem he had for Elizabeth and put Mary as the chief rôle of the play, neither would he be unjust to the historical facts. If even people liked Mary, they did not dare to show it openly in order not to get into trouble for having said or done something against Elizabeth. The play does not in the least attack either of the two Queens, on the

contrary, but the title itself "the Island Queens" made the people suspicious. —

Banks keeps less closely to history in his Island Queens than he does in the Earl of Essex. The two meetings of the Queens are an invention of the poet, as a matter of fact they never saw each other. Morton could not have been at the court of England in 1586, he was beheaded as Darnley's murderer in 1581. Of course, Banks had to be cautious with the picturing of the Queens, as he did not wish to prejudice himself in the eyes of the partisans of either of them; so we understand some defects of the play with regard to the disposition of the people and the conditional wants of the tragedy in order to fit it to the current of the time. If Lessing in the "Hamburg. Dramaturgie" blames Banks' artistic forms in his Essex, which may perhaps be observed to a certain extent in the Island Queens as well, his Drama is nevertheless very attractive and claims an eminent place in the history of the subject. —

Kipka in his Maria Stuart im Drama der Weltliteratur (Leipzig 1907) p. 262 ff. gives an argument of the play, but, as Richter: Swinburne's Verhältnis zu Frankreich und Italien (Leipzig 1911) p. 45 justly observes, he does not give the sources Banks used for his plot. He only says in a note on p. 268 that he most probably used Camden and Baker. We shall now show in which passages of his tragedy Banks followed Camden and in which he is independent from him.

Act I, Scene I.

Norfolk wants Cecil to speak to Elizabeth about his love to Mary:

Tell her, or, by my desperate love, I swear, I'll shout it in her ears, were she hemmed in with basilisks, or were she Queen of furies love, mighty love, should lead me and protect me.

Cecil promises to acquaint Elizabeth's favourite Leicester with this secret. He says "Twill be more welcome from his mouth than mine." Camden p. 166: Ferebatur his diebus rumusculi aura inter homines melioris notæ, Ducem Norfolciæ Scotorum reginam in uxorem ducturum.

p. 170. Mox harum nuptiarum rumor per mulierculam aulicas ad Reginæ aures clarius pervenit. Cecilius autem Ducem jam animo anxium admonet ut ipse rem reginæ explicaret.

Scene II.

The Scotch ambassador Morton invites Elizabeth to turn her attention to Mary's conspicuous plots against her; she has bargained with the pope and King of Spain to excommunicate Elizabeth and King James of Scotland and to give up her Kingdom to that most catholic tyrant Philip. He produces a letter:

"by Navus wrote and signed with her own hand
sent to the noblemen, her friends of Scotland
wherein she does asperse your majesty
with treachery and breach of promise to her."

The considerable part which Morton plays not only in this act, but in the whole tragedy, is not historical. Morton became viceroy of Scotland in 1572 and was beheaded in 1581.

Mary's secretary the Frenchman Navus as well as his colleague the Scotchman Curl play an eminent part in Babington's conspiracy and are mentio-

ned often in Camden and in other historical books. See later on in the argument of the 3d act.

Norfolk protests against Morton's accusations:

"Oh stop the traitor's mouth!
Hear not a monarch by her rebel stained
By that bright throne of justice which you fill.
'Tis false, 'tis forged, 'tis Lucifer's invention."

But Morton persists in his statement and mentions the names of three of the conspirators: Allen, Inglesfield and Ross. With this compare Camden p. 467: Ita interceptæ erant illae priores reginæ Scotorum ad Babingtonum, eiusdem ad illam responsoriæ nec non quæ eodem die ad Mendozam Hispani legatum, Carolum Pagettum, Baronem Pagettum, Archiepiscopum Glascuensem et Franciscum Inglefeldum conscriptae, quae singulae descriptae atque transmissae.

The archbishop of Rosse is also mentioned by Caussin Aula Sancta II. 316 where we read: Lesley évêque de Rosse, Gavin, Baron et d'autres que *la* reine avait commis pour sa défense lui répondirent par une forte apologie.

In Schiller's Maria Stuart (I, 6) Mortimer speaks to Mary about this Lesley:

"Den edlen Schotten Morgan fand ich hier
auch euren treuen Lesley, den gelehrten
Bischof von Rosse, die auf Frankreich's Boden
freudlose Tage der Verbannung leben".

The parallel passage in "Histoire universelle" de Jaques Auguste de Thou avec la suite par Nicolas Rigault. Basle 1742 VI p. 700 runs thus: Après le supplice de Guillaume Parry Antoine Babington entreprit de faire réussir l'attentat que Parry n'avait pu exécuter. Tout ce complot s'était

tramé chez Bernardin Mendoza, (mentioned also by Camden in the passage quoted above and by Schiller Maria Stuart I. 7.) ambassadeur d' Espagne à Londres. Maria lui avait fait entendre que, si son fils ne voulait pas se faire catholique, elle ferait son testament en faveur de Philippe. Le Lord Paget fut envoyé à ce dessin en Espagne et Charles son frère agissait en France par le moyen des Guises. ib p. 702: Lorsqu'on lui eût montré les lettres de Throckmorton, de François Englefield, du Lord Paget et de Charles son frère elle fit plusieurs objections sur ce chef etc.

According to Camden, whom de Thou follows, Inglefield and the two Pagets must have been prominent partners in the conspiracy against Elizabeth. Allen, cardinal and head of the seminary at Rheims is spoken of by Walsingham in Swinburne's Mary Stuart II, 1. He is also mentioned by Camden p. 583 seq. His death ib. 673. The other members Tilney, Barnwell, Savage and Charnock are not mentioned here by Banks, but later on in the 4th act.

Elizabeth has more confidence in Morton than in Norfolk, whom she dismisses with the warning:

"Beware what pillow 'tis you rest upon"

This is historical. Comp. Camden p. 170: Regina ad Farnhamiam ducem mensæ adhibet et false submonet, ut caveret cui pulvino caput inclinaret.

ib. p. 171: Quo tempore regina ducem in ambulacrum advocavit gravissimeque reprehendit quod ipsa inconsulta Scotorum Reginam in matrimonium postulasset.

The only difference is that according to Camden the interview between Elizabeth and Norfolk takes place in Farnham and according to Banks in London.

Mary's letter to Elizabeth and the subsequent change in Elizabeth's mind that induces her to order Norfolk to bring Mary to her are additions by Banks not founded on history.

Act II, Scene I.

Morton encourages Norfolk to marry Mary and urgently offers him the crown of Scotland. Norfolk says:

I would prefer the lovely Albion Queen
to crowns, to empire or ten thousand lives.

Then he leaves Morton in order not to be seen with him by Elizabeth.

Scene II.

Davison informs Elizabeth that the crowd did not let him pass to meet Mary, but that they gave way respectfully as soon as Mary appeared. Elizabeth is vexed about this impoliteness and in leaving the room says to her courtiers:

"Why stay you here? Each do his office strait and set her in my place; my crown present her and with your hollows echo all the rabble.
The deed is done that Mary is your Queen."

Scene III.

Mary deplores young Douglas, her faithful page, that his life is chained to her sorrowful existence. Douglas compliments her on her beauty which has not been destroyed by 18 years imprisonment, and, when she has convinced herself, that this is really the case she throws away the looking glass:

"False glass, that flatters and undoes the fond.
False beauty, may that wretch that has thee, curse thee,
And hold thee still detestable as mine".

Scene IV.

Norfolk enters and proposes Mary to fly with him. But Mary refuses:

"To fly suspected is to make me guilty."

Davison arrives to give her a personal guard and commands her at once to Elizabeth.

Act III.

Davison entertains Morton about his interview with Queen Elizabeth in the morning when Norfolk was present. He says that Elizabeth is looking out for an opportunity to meet Queen Mary.

„Then in a rage she darted from her closet and threw the door so hard with such a fury (as I have seen her father Harry do) that made us tremble."

Before leaving Morton tells Davison that he has sufficient means to ruin Norfolk:

"This mighty duke must be lopped low or fall, his towering branches are too vast and high under whose tops our queen securely lies and mocks the just avenging storms above. He thinks he's cleared from all accounts of guilt, but I have that will set him in arrear ne 'er to be paid and ne'ver to be forgiven".

Then Gifford enters and denounces Babington's conspiracy, Mary's consent and the negotiations with the pope. Davison wants to know if the letter to Babington is in Mary's own handwriting and who has given it to Gifford.

Davison: Dost know them to be hers. Who [gave them to thee?

Gifford: Her secretary Curl.

The second of Mary's secretaries Navus is mentioned in the following scene, where Douglas says that he has often seen him together with Gifford.

Camden p. 472: Navus gallus et Curlus Scotus, qui Scotorum reginæ ab epistolis examinati de literis, literarum exemplaribus, notulis et characteribus in reginæ conclavi deprehensis, sponte suis subscriptionibus agnoverunt, sua ipsorum esse autographa ab ipsa gallice dictata, a Navo exepta, a Curlo anglice conversa et occultis characteribus descripta. In Swinburne's Mary Stuart Act I, Scene 3 Curle and Nau appear on the stage. Caussin (II. 327) says that Nau and Curl did not show Babington's letter to Mary, but anwered them in an affirmative sense forging Mary's signature. (see Kipka p. 43).

Douglas entreats Mary to break off her marriage with Norfolk, but Morton encourages her in this project.

Morton: "Elizabeth shall jealous be no more nor fearful then that any foreign prince too soon should join his Kingdom to your right and claim your lawful title to the crown. Go instantly. Howe'er she seems to frown she ill smile within her heart when once t'is done.

Now Elizabeth enters. The following scene is not historical and not to be found in any other Stuart drama.

Elizabeth observes Mary's beauty with a certain jealousy and refuses to be flattered by Cecil. She tells her attendants to give her a looking glass. This episode is most probably taken from Brantôme: Vie des dames illustres de France de son temps. Leyde 1665. We read there on p. 137: Mais une des principales fut que la reyne d' Angleterre ne l'aymast jamais et a esté toujours et de

long temps jalouse de sa beauté qu'elle voyait surpasser la sienne.

A similar scene occurs in Act II, verse 278, where Mary says to Douglas:

„Lend me a glass and pry thee tell me truly
How do I look."

This repetition of the same subject in two consecutive acts does not speak in favour of Banks' taste.

The scene concludes with a complete reconciliation of the two Queens.

Act IV.

On Morton's instigation Norfolk is taken prisoner and accused. Cecil pleads in vain for him. He is sent at once to the Tower and, if found guilty, is to be executed the following day: The principal document on which the indictment is based is:

"The paper, which, alas. was found under the quilt, beneath poor Norfolk's bed placed there on purpose, as supposed by all, by Hickford, a domestic of the duke's, who, apprehended, has accused his master."

Camden p. 209: Regina commentarium prolixum de consiliis suis, quem jam ante scripserat et quasdam amatorias literas ad ducem Norfolciæ privato inter ipsos charactere latenter mittit aliasque literas ad pontificem et Hispanum deferendas per Ridolfum quem ut sui studiosissimum maximeque necessarium commendat. Higfordius Ducis amannuensis qui hunc commentarium et literas usitato charactere descripsit, jussus igni tradere sub storea in Ducis cubiculo occultavit.

After having dismissed the guilty Norfolk Elizabeth is decided to spare Mary. In this moment Cecil calls Gifford, whose revelations terrify the Queen. He tells her the names of the five conspirators against the queen's life: Babington, Tilney, Barnwell, Savage and Charnock.

Camden p. 464: His rem communicat Babingtonus, sed non omnia singulis, literas suas et Reginæ Scotorum Ballardo, Tichburno et Duno ostendit, agit cum Tilneio et Tichburno ut percussores sint . . . . . Abingtonus, Barnwellus, Charnocus et Savagius prompti et alacres in cædem jurant.

The corresponding passage in de Thou VI. 700 runs thus: Un jésuite nommé Ballard passa de France en Angleterre et pressa vivement Babington. Ce jeune ambitieux fit part de son dessein à Salisbury, à Savage, à Tichburn, à Tilney, à un autre Babington de la même maison que lui et à un jurisconsulte Hollandais (selon Camden Irlandais) nommé Barnwell. Il donna jour aux conjurés pour le 24 août, fête de S. Bartélémi, jour mémorable pour le massacre de Paris arrivé 14 ans auparavant. Mais leur complot fut découvert. Convaincus par leurs lettres qu'on avait interceptées ils convinrent tous que Marie avait eu connaissance de la conspiration.

The second Babington in de Thou is evidently a mistake for Abington in Camden. Besides de Thou does not mention Charnock. The whole list, omitting only Charnock is given by Swinburne in his Mary Stuart, where they play an important part in the development of the tragedy.

The second part of the 4th act, where Cecil and Davison threaten to go out of office until, at

last, the queen allows them to take Mary prisoner, is the poet's invention.

Act V, scene 1.

Morton hears from Davison of Barny's plot to release Norfolk, which has been discovered and was thought the means to urge his speedy end.

Camden p. 237: Paucis post diebus Barneius et Matherus morte affecti sunt, qui cum Herlo conscelerato de consiliariis quibusdam e medio tollendis et duce liberando conjurarunt.

Mary is condemned too, although she does not acknowledge the sentence, but finally she conforms herself to the crushing burden of proofs. Morton asks Davison:

„But what was the most stabbing proof against her,
Her correspondence had with Babington?"

Davison gives no answer to this question.
Norfolk and Mary take leave from each other.

Scene 2.

Cecil and Davison try to persuade Elizabeth that Mary must die, because her own life is not safe as long as Mary lives. Davison says:

„I kneel and humbly offer to your thinking a saying no less true to be observed than once was said of Conradine of Sicily and Charles of Anjou rivals in a crown, which is: The death of Mary is the life of Queen Elizabeth. The life of Mary the death of Queen Elizabeth."

Kipka in his pamphlet p. 268 takes this passage as a proof that Banks must have used Camden as his source. He evidently alludes to Camden p. 515; where Bellièvre says to Elizabeth: Eo rem devenisse, ut diverbium vetus de duobus principibus

Conradino Siculo et Carolo Andino jam de duabus reginis usurpetur.

Now it is quite possible that Banks may have taken this passage from Camden, but Kipka was not justified in choosing this as a characteristic example for the dependence of Banks from Camden. The passage about Inglesfield in the first act (see above p. 39) and the one about Hickford in the fourth act (see above p. 44) would have served him better in this case as they are only found in Camden. The story of Conradine occurs not only in Camden, but also in Brantôme: Vie des Dames illustres p. 158, and in de Thou VI. 706. In all these books it is Bellièvre who induces Conradine's death in order to persuade Elizabeth to spare Mary. Only Banks who has not got Bellièvre among his dramatis personæ, attributes these words to Davison. The interview between Elizabeth and Bellièvre occurs also in Swinburne's Mary Stuart act IV, scene I, but Swinburne, who in other passages follows Brantôme pretty closely, does not give here the story of Conradine.

Elizabeth's wavering whether she should sign the death warrant or not is fully spoken of in Camden p. 522. Davison urges her to do it as much as he can:

"Remember too your danger. News is brought
that Spain has an armada launched so vast
that o'er our narrow seas will form a bridge
to let in all their forces to this island
with iron rods to scourge and chains to bind us."

Camden p. 518: Ex hac molitione qui infesti et infensi Scotorum reginæ occasionem mortem accelerandi arripuerunt curaruntque ad majores terrores reginæ incutiendum falsos rumores passim per

Angliam spargi scil. Hispanicam classem Milfordico portu jam appulisse etc.

Elizabeth signs the death warrant and hands it to Davison.

Camden p. 522: Davisono e secretariis alteri literas sua manu signatas tradit, ut sub magno Angliæ sigillo mandatum de supplicio sumendo conficeretur.

Davison hands the fatal paper to Cecil.

Scene III.

Mary bids farwell to her attendants, especially Douglas and Melvil. Douglas' part is not historical, but the words spoken to Melvil are found in Camden:

„Haste into France and Scotland when I'm dead
There tell the Guises, my dear cousins and son
Thou saw'st me die in the true faith I lived in."

Camden p. 525: Nunties me in religione mea constantem, in fide erga Scotiam et Galliam firmam mori.

Davison tells Mary that the Scotch ambassador Patrick Grey has arrived "with letters to the queen wich have disturbed her."

Camden p. 511: Misit etiam Patricium Greium et Robertum Melvinum, qui reginæ significarent etc.

Then follows the execution which is not represented on the stage and Douglas' death. When the report of Mary's death reached Elizabeth's ears who little thought of such a thing she heard it with great indignation and accused Davison and Morton of treason. Davison she commanded to be tried in the starchamber.

Camden p. 531: Simul atque Scotorum reginam morte fuisse affectam ad Elizabetham nec opinantem quidem rumore nuntio perlatum, indignanter audi-

vit . . . . . consiliarios graviter reprehensos et a conspectu submotos examini subjecit, Davisonum judicio in camera stellata sisti jussit.

Kipka says p. 270 that Banks did not know any of his predecessors and I agree with him, perhaps the tragedy of Montchrestien might still have been remembered in England, where the character of both Queens seems to be similarly treated; apart from this similarity, the two plays are different in form altogether —

Some of the passages, which I will quote hereafter seem to me to have some resemblance with those of one or the other of the Dramatists of his time, especially Shakespeare:

The lion, when he is hunted to the toil
Spares not himself, not foes within his reach
But wounds his bristly hide. (Act II, 1.)

Sh. Rich. II. 5, 1. The lion, dying, thrusteth forth
[his paw
And wounds the earth, if nothing else, with rage
To be overpow'r'd. —

Curse me with madness, blast me with diseases,
Turn all these hairs to snakes upon my head
To hiss me from the stage of mortal life (Act IV, 4.)
(Recalls the soliloquy of Hamlet. Act III, 1.)
Woman was formed of mildness, love and pity.
(Act V, 1.)

Sh. Hen. 6. 3, 1.:

Woman are soft, mild and pitiful.
Oh doubt it not! One last farewell
Our souls shall soon a joyful meeting have
But to our mortal parts — a long farewell —
(Act V, 1.)

Shakespeare Rom. 4, 3:

Farewell! God knows, when we shall meet again
I have a faint cold fear thrills through my veins
That almost freezes up the heat of life. —

Other parts would be worth mentioning, if there the sound of words is not similar to some passages of Shakespeare, at least they recall some scenes of his in word and action.

CHAPTER IV

Maria, Königin von Schottland, by H. Müller was printed in 1840. The whole drama shows us again a complicated apparatus; the play is very long, 5 acts, each of them 4 scenes. I believe that the impression and success at a performance would be doubtful; too many details trouble the sight and the ear of the hearer, it may be well adapted for reading; the volume 8^0 has 226 pages, of small printing. The subject to be treated is not the same as in Banks' Island Queens, there is question of Darnley's relation to Mary and of Rizzio.

H. Kurz in his German Literature IV. 50 says:

Herm. Müller führt in Maria Stuart (Dramat. Gedicht in 5 Akten) die Geschichte der unglücklichen, aber nicht schuldlosen Fürstin bis zu dem Punkte, wo Schiller's Trauerspiel beginnt, nicht ohne Talent der Darstellung und Komposition, aber ohne künstlerische Mäßigung. —

An analysis of the play may give an idea of Müller's composition.

Cast:

Mary, Queen of Scots
Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, her husband
Jacob Stuart, Earl of Murray, Mary's brother

Countess of Argyle, Mary's sister
John Stuart, Earl of Lenox, Darnley's father
Henry Stuart, Earl of Atholl, his cousin
Jacob Douglas, Earl of Morton, Chancellor of Scôt-
[land
Jacob Hepbourn, Earl of Bothwell
Earl of Glencairne
Kirkaldy of Grange
Ochiltry
Boyd
} Murray's friends
Earl of Caithness
Lord Herreys
Patrik Lord Ruthven
Sir Nicl. Throgmorton, English Ambassador
George Douglas, Morton's cousin
Cunningham, Vasall of Lenox
David Rizzio
Sebastian and his bride
Lords, Attendants, Messengers.

Scene: 1st and 2nd Act in Edinburgh, afterwards in different parts of Scotland. (Compare p. 18.)

Argument of the Play.

Act 1. First scene. — Room in the Royal palace of Edinburgh. We meet in the first scene Douglas, who tries to force his "Way Out" from the castle; he fights with Rizzio. Bothwell appears in order to call his men together, as the Queen seems to be in danger. Morton speaks with Ruthven of the Queen's odious position. Herreys summons both of them to protect her from the advancing English; they resolve to do so. —

2nd scene. — Another Room in the castle. — Murray wishes to help his friends, he takes

leave from his sister Lady Argyle; the latter reveals the Queen's love for him and aids him to see her from a hidden place.

3rd scene. — Hall in the Royal Palace. Mary (Queen) is safe; she thanks Herreys for his assistance and offers him some wine. Exit. Darnley speaks with Cunningham of his distress being despised by his wife (Mary). Knowing of Rizzio's being the Queen's favourite, he makes up his mind to kill him. —

4th scene. — Room of the Queen. — Mary wishes Rizzio to give her a song. He does so, singing of his love for her, but at the same time desires to be back again in Italy. Darnley enters unexpectedly, Rizzio is wounded and carried away. (Exit King). Bothwell arrives to meet the Queen, they avow their mutual affection; the former plans revenge for the murder of Rizzio. Mary, informed of her husband's being ill, hurries to see him. —

2nd Act. First scene. — Edinburgh, dark Room. Douglas reveals to Morton a conspiracy against Darnley, for he had seen men carrying powder barrels into the cellar. Morton reproaches Bothwell with having a hand in the game, but he is talked into the plot and joins the conspirators.

2nd scene. — Queen's Room. Murray calls upon Mary not to do anything violent against her husband. Bothwell in his turn obtains her promise not to see Darnley next night.

3rd scene. — Night, open place. Douglas and Morton are waiting for Bothwell; being soon afterwards together, they make their preparations.

4th scene. — Room of the Queen. Wedding Music. The deed is accomplished. Bothwell in-

forms the Queen of the fact, the servants announce Darnley's death. General tumult. Murray is considered as the guilty person, he is obliged to flee. —

3rd Act. First scene. — Room at the castle of the Earl of Lenox. — Murray informs Lenox of his being considered as the murderer and of his innocence. He swears to prevent the true doer from mounting Scotland's throne and implores Lenox' assistance.

2nd scene. — Room in the law-court of Edinburgh. Bothwell, Morton and Douglas triumph on account of their success, the former thinks to be quite safe and uncompromised. (Exeunt) The judges appear, having a mind to pay a visit to Bothwell's apartments.

3rd scene. — Room of the Queen. the English ambassador arrives with a letter from Elizabeth; Mary, instead of giving an answer tears up the letter. Meanwhile, Bothwell is set free, for no plaintiff appears. A Bill was presented, in which Bothwell is to marry the Queen. Herreys tries to persuade the Queen not to accept it, Bothwell being suspected.

4th scene. — The same Room. The Peers read aloud the judgement, nobody was to be found guilty. Cunningham tries to render the conclusion avoid; Bothwell is getting suspicious; Mary promises him to be wedded to him within a few days.

4th Act. First scene. — Camp, Murray's tent. — A messenger is sent to Mary with a letter, in reply to which she has to revoke her calling the Barons traitors. —

2nd scene. — Room in the castle. — Bothwell is wedded to Mary, the former suspicious, fore-

bodes evil events. The messenger brings the letter. Cunningham challenges Bothwell to fight; he refuses and orders C. to be taken prisoner on account of audacity. But he doubts his security in the palace and leaves. Hardly outside, he is taken prisoner too, Mary is informed of it by Douglas.

3rd scene. — Camp of the Barons, Murray's tent. — The Barons are indignant on account of Mary's conduct and think her not worthy to occupy Scotland's throne, she must renounce it. They proclaim James VI.

4th scene. Room in the palace. — Mary is informed of the fact, Murray persuades her to give way, that he might govern instead of her son. Mary sees herself a prisoner; Douglas makes up his mind to save her. —

5th Act. First scene. — Night, a Room. Douglas appears to fetch the Queen in order to escape with her.

2nd scene. — Wood country. Soldiers. — Morton and the Barons learn by a letter of Mary's escape. —

3rd scene. — Room in Lord Herreys' castle. Murray and Herreys enter, the battle has begun, Douglas takes leave from the Queen; he is wounded; Mary flies, leaving Douglas dying. —

Last scene. — Strand of a river, Mary going up and down. — Herreys arrives to arrest Mary if she enters English territory. She has no other means but to throw herself into a river. English fishermen take her up and offer her a shelter. —

The End.

Blätter für literar. Unterhaltung 1840, p. 327. „Die Arbeit hat nicht die geringste Aehnlichkeit mit

Schiller's Trauerspiel und kann füglich auch zu gar keiner Vergleichung auffordern; allein die Persönlichkeit Maria's, die nun doch einmal durch Schiller zu einem poetischen, in seiner Art vollendeten Charakter erhoben worden ist, diese schwebt dem Leser stets vor Augen. Ohne Rücksicht auf den Abstand der Zeit zu nehmen, in welchen das Schillersche Trauerspiel fällt, hatte der Verfasser doch jedenfalls die grösste Sorgfalt auf die Darstellung seiner Heldin verwenden müssen, mochte er sie übrigens auffassen wie er wollte. Er mußte die Königin zu einem poetischen Charakter erheben, wie es Schiller tat, sie in die Mitte der Ereignisse stellen und ihr ganzes Sinnen und Trachten, ihr Tun und Handeln so bedeutend machen, daß sie als Weib und Königin imponierte, aber statt dessen was gibt uns Müller? Ein Weib, das schön geschildert wird, leicht von einer Liebe zur anderen hüpft, und vor dem Verbrechen des Gattenmordes kaum mit einiger Koketterie erschrickt, nachher ebenso leichtsinnig den Gatten vergißt, sich aus lächerlichem Leichtsinn einem schwärmerischen Jünglinge in die Arme wirft; nachdem alles verloren ist, ebenso leichtsinnig die Flucht ergreift. Dies ist aber weder ein historisch wahres, noch ein poetisches Photo von Maria. Der Verfasser konnte ihr alle ihre Züge lassen, welche die Geschichte ihrem Charakter gegeben, er konnte sie leichtsinnig, flatterhaft, eitel verliebt schildern, aber er mußte in Momenten, wo die Leidenschaft des Weibes mit dem furchtbaren, blutigen Dämon der rächenden Nemesis in Konflikt gerät, auch die gewaltige Seele Maria Stuarts in Wort und Tat hervorbrechen lassen. Ein schönes, liebendes, und zwar leidenschaftlich liebendes Weib,

wie Maria es war, spricht nicht so schläfrig flau, wie Hermann Müller sie sprechen läßt, als Bothwell ihr den Tod Darnley's meldet. Die meisten übrigen Charaktere verflachen sich gar zu sehr in das allgemeine der verschiedenen Genres, in die sie gehören. Morton und Bothwell sind die vorzüglichsten Figuren." —

Repertorium der gesamten deutschen Literatur von Dr. Gersdorff, Bd. 23 p. 572: Das Drama Maria, Königin von Schottland zeugt von einigem Talent, ist aber eigentlich nur ein fünfaktiges Vorspiel zu Schillers Maria Stuart, indem darin Maria's, des Sängers David Rizzio, Lord Darnley's und Bothwell's Schicksale bis zur Flucht der Königin nach England behandelt werden, so daß ein eigentlicher dramatischer Abschluß fehlt. Die Sprache ist gewandt, aber ohne rechte Intensität und dichterische Wärme, die Anordnung des Ganzen nicht ohne Geschick, nur treten zu viel gleich bedeutende oder unbedeutende Personen, Lords und andere Edelleute auf, welche einander Luft und Boden wegnehmen, ohne doch den Gang des Dramas zu beschleunigen. Der am kräftigsten gehaltenen Charakter ist Bothwell. Maria selbst ist wohl in der Geschichte treuer aufgefaßt als die Schiller'sche, interessiert aber wenig, da sie, wenn sie ihr Schicksal verdient, es nur durch leichtsinnige Schwäche verdient und außerdem die Teilnahme des Lesers durch endlose Deklamationen ermüdet.

We have seen that the play does not exactly treat the same subject as Banks' Albion queen. Where Müller stops with history, Banks begins. Only few Dramatists have chosen the same subject as Müller for a play, I will mention 1) Moncrieff, Mary,

Queen of Scots. (London 1872). 2) Swinburne: Bothwell. 3) Björnson: Maria Stuart in Schottland. Müller seems to follow more his own way in this play than in his Essex. The language is more self dependent; there are only few passages which recall a passage of Schiller or Shakespeare. The plot is historical, Mary's rôle is little developed, we are not able to recognise her real character, her whole conduct is wavering and sometimes unlikely. Nobody of the Cast belongs to one or the other of the 3 preceding plays, so it will not be possible to draw any parallel. Mary is a toy for her Ministers as she shows no will of her own and takes very little interest in anything except pleasure. Being in danger, she runs into a river in order to reach England, a most strange end of a tragedy, quite unworthy of a Queen.

Let me first of all draw a parallel between Müller's Mary Stuart and History. It is well known that Mary and her husband lived not on the best of terms. Already her marriage with him brought her into disgrace with Elizabeth. He was proud, conceited, but quite incapable and without principles and lived in company of the most abject of flatterers (Burton, 4. 137). He often demanded from his wife to have a lawful part in the government, but she positively refused to grant his request. The King thought the reason of her refusal to be especially in the almighty David Rizzio, Mary's favourite, and thus he made up his mind to get rid of him. For this purpose he joined Ruthven, the sullen Morton and the ambitious Murray; they all thought the design proper and approved of it, for it ought to be a salvation for the state and reli-

gion. (Morton and Ruthven to Cecil, 2/4 1566, Cal. of Statepapers, 7/43). It is said that even the preachers Knox and Craig allowed it (Bedford in Cal. of Statepapers, 7/35). They tried to take a judicial proceeding against Rizzio, but the King's jealousy and anger brought a quicker end. (Morton and Ruthven to Cecil, Cal. of St. P. 7/40). The conspirators fell upon Rizzio in Mary's apartments in her presence. He was wounded, carried away and killed afterwards. — This event brought a change at the Scotch court: Mary was guarded like a prisoner; the murderers returned quietly to Edinburgh, amongst them Murray. But Mary was clever enough to regain her power over Darnley. An insurrection of the catholic Lords was favourable to her, and she appeared as victor in Edinburgh. As her relations with Elizabeth became more and more friendly, her relations to her husband became worse. It is true, she hated him, but disapproved especially of Murray's murderous plot against Darnley. (Bedford, letters to Elizabeth; Raunier, Elizabeth and Mary). —

The chief part wich was to prove fatal for Mary was now played by Bothwell; clever and sharp as he was, he made the audacious plan of setting aside Darnley in order to become King of Scotland. Whether Mary was concerned in the matter or not remains an enigma up to our days. E. Becker tried to prove convincingly the impossibility of the authenticity of Mary's letter to Bothwell, although his proofs are not all valid. The work of Harry Bresslau „Die Kassettenbriefe der Königin Maria Stuart" (Hist. Tagebuch, Folge 6, Th. 1 (1882) S. 1—92) did not change my opinion

of the above mentioned lines of Becker, although he gives the translations of 4 letters. These pretended copies from Mary's French originals seem to be moderately successful translations from Scotch forgeries. If Becker consents to the legitimacy of Mary's most compromising letter Nr. 2, it was for him to prove the falseness of the others. Otherwise we may come to the conclusion in reading his work that those, who were capable of falsifying that fatal writing, could have done the same with the others just as well. Bresslau's comparisons between the „Kassettenbriefe" and her authentic letters are not a valid proof, because they concern only very ordinary and every day expressions. Another arbitrariness of his is to put Mary's departure in January 1567. So we may assume that these letters were not a sufficient proof of Mary's guilt. Even Gädeke (Maria Stuart, p. 389), who vigorously accented Mary's guilt, had to admit that Mary's adversaries were quite capable of forgery, and that they might have done very likely the same with the mentioned documents.

In 1567, Mary went back with Darnley to Edinburgh. She was reproached later on with having driven him to his ruin on purpose. The truth seems to be that she tried to arrange by it a quarrel, which she had with Darnley's family and the Earl of Lenox. In the morning of the 9th of February 1567, Mary attended the wedding of a maid of honour of hers, when Darnley was killed and the house blown up. People considered Bothwell to be the instigator of it, but at first Mary did nothing to ascertain the fact. Finally she was obliged to do so; the lawcourt was mostly composed of Both-

well's friends. — Her marriage with him was the beginning of her unfortunate end. He, then called Earl of Orknay, treated her in a most unworthy manner, she, in her despair, saw the wrong she had done and tried to commit suicide. (Raumer, lettres de Paris, 2/96). It was too late. Nearly the whole nobility formed a league against Bothwell. The latter had to flee, and Mary delivered herself to the insurgents who treated her as a prisoner.

There had been since the marriage with Darnley a close attention at the Scotch court, as the Queen allowed the re-establishment of Catholicism. The Earl of Murray found his credit much diminished by the interference of Lenox and his son (Catholics). The Earls of Argyle, Rothesay and Glencairne, the Lords Boyde and Ochiltry, Kirkaldy of Grange were instigated by similar reasons and as the latter were the persons, who had most zealously promoted the reformation, they were disgusted to find that the Queen's favour was entirely engrossed by the Earl of Bothwell. They were banished by her, but soon appeared armed (John Knox, p. 381); Müller uses the incident in his play 1, 1.

Die Königin ist in Gefahr, Lord Morton
Hat sichere Nachricht, die verbannten Lords
Von England her sind eingebrochen. Ich hörte
Seit lange nichts von den verbannten Lords
Als daß sie ruhig an der Grenze lagen. —
Da sind sie plötzlich nah bei Edinburgh. . . .

(Historical account, Hume, Hist. of Engl. Vol. 2,91.)

Rizzio, who had connected his interests with the Roman Catholics, was the declared enemy of the banished lords, especially of Lord Ruthven.

(Keith, p. 326). He was hated by the friends of the exiled nobles; the King communicated his resolution to be avenged of Rizzio to Lord Ruthven, = Müller, Act 1, 3.

Müller shows Rizzio not to be in criminal relations with the Queen, — Of all the historians, Buchanan alone avowedly accuses Mary of a criminal love for Rizzio (p. 340,344). Knox slightly insinuates that such a suspicion was entertained (p. 391). The King himself seems, both, by Melville's account and by his expostulation with the Queen, which Ruthven mentions, to have given credit to these suspicions (Melville, 127). Be this as it may, they were resolved to clear him out of their way. Müller lets Ruthven say:

Der welsche Schuft, so oft ich ihn nur sehe
Zuckt mir die Hand heimlich von selbst zum [Dolch.

Mary tried to revenge the murder of Rizzio only on her husband, whose person had been always disagreeable to her, and who, by his violation of every tie of gratitude and duty, had now drawn on him her highest resentment (Goodall, Vol. 1, p. 280). So we understand, that Mary appears in Müller's play not quite innocent of Darnley's murder, as probably she would also add her share of revenge. — The sudden illness of Darnley is mentioned by Müller in Act 1,4.

Diener: Der König, gnäd'ge Frau, ist schwer erkrankt
Mary: Was fehlt ihm denn?
Diener: Er tobt in Fieberglut
Mary: Geh nur, ich komme. — Er bereut es schon
Die Sonne dieses Tag's ging blutig auf.

This event may perhaps be based on Buchanan's and Knox' pretendings: They are positive that the King had been poisoned. They mention the black and putrid pustules which broke out all over his body. Blackwood (Caussin. ed. Jebb, vol. 2, 24, 59) asserts, that small pox was the disease with which the King was seized. Darnley's sickness seems to be in Müller's play an extraordinary one; for shortly before he was in Mary's apartments, and he did not mention any disease. We may assume that Müller probably thought of poisoning.

As for the following scene, the preparation of the plot to kill Darnley, Müller has the idea from the Cal. of Statepapers and the trial of the Earl of Bothwell. The latter's conspiracy seems to be clear in the play; if Mary were quite innocent she should have become suspicious of Bothwell's advice:

Brich lieber tausend Eide, als zu ihm
In dieser Nacht zurückzukehren! Und höre,
Laß keinen von den Dienern dort verweilen.
Ja, hast Du eine Katze, einen Hund
Die einen Strohhalm wert sind, leide nicht,
Daß sie zur Nacht in Darnley's Hause bleiben,

Mary, without reflecting, answers:

Ich bleibe hier im Schloß. —

The same morning Darnley sent for the Queen; she answered she would come in the afternoon and stay with him the night, as she wished to attend first the wedding of her servant Sebastian Pagez = Müller, Act 2, 4. (E. Pitawell, Mary Stuart, V. 3, p. 10).

Müller accuses Murray of having committed the crime; but what motive could Murray have had to

do it? Is it his ambition? The King's murder, indeed, procured Murray the regency, but much more Mary's ill conduct and imprudence (Müller 4/3. p. 183), which he could not possibly fore-see, and which never would have happened, had she been entirely innocent. Müller's presentation of the fact is in coherence with the following event: The Bishop of Rosse in an angry pamphlet, written by him under a borrowed name, affirms, that Lord Herreys, a few days after the King's death, charged Murray with the guilt, openly to his face, at his own table. This latter nobleman, as Lesly relates the matter, affirmed, that Murray, riding in Fife with one of his servants, the evenig before the commission of the crime, said to him among other talk: "This night, before morning the Lord Darnley shall lose his life." (Anderson, vol. 1. p. 75.) But this is only a hearsay of Lesly's concerning a hearsay of Herreys' and contains a very improbable fact. We may aslo observe, that Lord Herreys himself was one of the Queen Mary's commissioners who accused Murray; had he ever heard this story, or given credit to it, was not that the time to have produced it? and not to have affirmed, as he did, that he, for his part, knew nothing of Mary's guilt. (Goodall, vol. 2, p. 30 ff). Müller uses the incident in his play and sends Murray to Lenox, to ask for assistance. Murray in his turn knows the real murderer. As for Darnley's death, M. uses the opinion of the general acceptance, in letting Herreys say to Mary:

Dein Mann ist in die Luft gesprengt
Man fand die Leiche schon. . . . .

It was imagined that Darnley had been strangled before the house was blown up. But this supposition is contradicted by the confession of the criminals; and there is no necessity to admit it in order to account for the condition of his body. There are many instances that men's lives have been saved, who had been blown up in ships. Had Darnley fallen on water, he had probably not been killed. None of the conspirators of Müller's play speak of murdering first the King, but to blow him up with gun-powder. —

The Earl of Lenox, who lived at a distance from court, in poverty and contempt, was roused by the report of his son's murder (Müller, Act 3,1) and wrote to the Queen, imploring speedy justice against the assassins, among whom he named the Earl of Bothwell, Sir James Balfour and Gilbert Balfour, his brother; David Chalmers and four others of the Qeen's household, all of them persons, who had been mentoned in the bills affixed to the walls at Edinburgh. (Keith, p. 372). John Knox says in this respect: (History of the Reformation of Scotland, p. 408). The Earl of Lenox in the meantime wrote to the Queen to cause Bothwell to be punished with his other complices for murdering the King. The Queen, not daring to reject the Earl of Lenox' solicitation appointed a day for the trial of Bothwell by an assize, the members of which were the Earl of Caithness (Müller, Act 3, 2.) John Hamilton, John Ross, Lord Sample, Lord Boyd, Lord Herreys, (Act 3, 4) Lord Oliphant. Knox page 406: The nobles, who entered this bond were the Earls of Argyle, Atholl (Act 3,3), Morton, Glencairne (Act 3, 3) the Lords Lindsay and Boyd

(Müller, Act 3,2). The Earl of Lenox having ordered Cunningham, one of his retinue, to appear in court and protest in his name against the acquittal of the criminal, the jury proceeded to a verdict. (Keith, p. 376), Müller, 3, 3:

Cunningham: Ich muß herein.
Entschuldigt meine Kühnheit, Königin,
Ich muß die Richter suchen. —
Im Namen meines Herrn, des mächt'gen Grafen
Von Lenox tu' ich feierlichen Einspruch
In des Gerichtes Gang. —

A bond of association was framed; the subscribers mentioned the necessity of their Queen's marriage, in order to support the government, and they recommended Bothwell to her as her husband (Ibid. p. 381) — Müller, Act 3,3:

Morton: Wir wagen auch in aller Demut Euch
Den Mann zu nennen, welcher uns von allen
Am würdigsten erscheint. (Bothwell).

She consented to the marriage and remained willingly with Bothwell (Spotswood, p. 202); Müller, Act 4,2.

The Earls and the Lords formed an association for punishing the King's murderers. The Earl of Atholl himself, a known Catholic was the first author of the confederacy (Act 4' 1). The Lord mentioned on page entered zealously into it (Act 4, 2 Keith, pag. 394). Lord Home (not mentioned by M.) who was the first in arms, suddenly surrounded the Queen in the Castle of Borthwic. (Act 4,2) Meanwhile, Bothwell fled to Dunbar, he took his last farewell from the Queen and rode off (Act 4, 2 Robertson, History of Scotland II. 87) It is Müller's invention that he was kil-

led on his way by Cunningham. He also trusts Murray with the delicate commission of persuading the Queen to resign her crown. Müller, Act 4,4. — I found this "Entrevue" mentioned as follows in "Franz Wollmann: Politisch-satyrische Gedichte aus der schottischen Reformationszeit", p. 18:

Nach einer Unterredung mit Mary zu Lochleven am 15. August, in welcher sie um Annahme der Regentschaft bat, übernahm er dieselbe am 22. August 1567. —

In reality Sir Robert Melville was despatched by the nobles to Lochleven, carrying with him letters to the Queen, also one from Throgmorton who was then favourable to the unfortunate Mary, conjuring her to yield to the necessity of the times = Act 4, 4; p. 174. Knox says: Submitting to one part of her subjects Mary resigned her crown to her infant son, and to another she established the Earl of Murray regent. (Act 5, p. 182 ff.). Douglas' death in Müller's play has some connection with W. Scott's "Abbot". Mary orders Douglas to escape (Act 5, 3): "Save thyself, Douglas, I command thee"; he started up from the floor, and only exclaiming: My life or death are yours and at your disposal — drew his sword and broke through those, who stood betwixt him and the door. (W. Scott, Abbot p. 381, Müller, p. 186 und 206). — A romancer affirms, that Jaspar Dryfesdale, one of the Laird of Lochleven's servants, had threatened to murder W. Douglas (M. p. 207) and avowed that he would plant a dagger in Mary's own heart. (Chalmers, Life of Queen Mary, vol. 1, p. 278). —

Mary was now in contrivances for effecting her escape and she engaged by her charms and caresses a young gentleman, Georges Douglas, to assist her in that enterprise. (Act 5, 1, Home, Hist. of England, vol. 5, p. 127). He conveyed her in disguise into a small boat, and himself rowed her ashore. Müller lets Douglas die and gives the office of rowing Mary ashore to a servant of hers. She embarked in a fishingboat in Galloway (Act 5, 4) and landed the same day in Cumberland (Jebb's collection, vol. 1, p. 420). M. lets Mary throw herself into the river, where she is taken up by fishermen. The author gives Douglas the name of George. In narrating this romantic story, both history and tradition confuse the two Douglases and confer on George the successful execution of the escape from the castle, the merit of which belongs, in reality, to the boy called William, or more frequently "the little Douglas" either from his youth or his slight stature. In W. Scott's "Abbot" the part of the little Douglas has been assigned to Roland Graeme. The whole 35th chapter of the mentioned Novel seems to me to have strong motives, which were employed in Müller's play, (Act 5, 3). The note on William and George Douglas in W. Scott's "Abbot", p. 457 begins thus:

It is well known that the escape of Queen Mary from Lochleven was effected by George Douglas, the younger brother of Sir William Douglas, the lord of the Castle. But the minute circumstances of the event have been a good deal confused owing to two agents having been concerned in it who bore the same name. It has been always supposed that George Douglas was induced to abet

Mary's escape by the ambitious hope that by such service he might merit her hand. But his purpose was discovered by his brother Sir William and he was expelled from the castle.

Some resemblances are to be found in the course of action in the two plays of Hermann Müller. — Elizabeth has proclaimed Essex guilty of high treason; Mary does the same with the Lords. In both cases, Essex and the lords try to get the Queens into their power. We find also in Müller's Mary the history of a ring; Mary hands the jewel to Douglas:

Nehmt diesen Ring und zeigt ihn an Lord Herreys
Der sich schon lange nach mir sehnt.

Douglas hands the ring later on to the mentioned Lord, saying:

Lord, Herreys, wartet. Erkennt Ihr diesen Ring?

Lord Herreys.

Wie Douglas, Ihr —?

Douglas.

Ich bin kein Douglas mehr, ich bin ihr Freund.

This ring ought probably to save Mary's life, as Herreys knew, in receiving it, of his Queen's being in danger; she sent it by Douglas. Similar situation in "Elizabeth". Douglas performed the message conscienciously. Essex had to send the ring, Nottingham kept it back. We meet the name Douglas also in Banks' "Albion queens"; there he is page of his Queen and dies of poison; here he is a lover of hers and dies in the war.

The character of the old Earl of Lenox may be taken from "Attinghausen" in Schiller's Tell. There the Lords come to speak of his son's death, the old

man hopes, before dying to see his son revenged. Attinghausen in his turn hopes to see Rudenz back living with his people. — Morton's advice (Goodall, vol. 2. p. 165) to keep Mary as a prisoner in the castle of Lochleven is mentioned as follows in Müller's play:

Morton.

Ich weiß ein festes Schloß hier in der Nähe
Auf einer Insel; unergründlich tief
Bespült ein See die Mauern. Ihr Entkommen
Ist dort unmöglich. —

The motive of Rizzio's death seems to me to have been taken from J. Haynes "Mary Stuart." London 1840. Rizzio's song to the Queen has doubtlessly the same character in both plays:

Haynes:

When the dead sleep
'Tis weakness to weep
Their sorrows are past
And the hope that will last
Is that which looks over the earth's narrow [sphere,
For the Summer is there, but the winter is [here.
„When the dead rise
"From earth to the skies
"Subdued is the night
"By the angel of light
"And banished for ever's mortality's tear
"For the summer is there, but the winter is [here.

Müller:

Sonne, wo gehst Du hin, nimm mich mit
Nimm mich mit in die Ferne
Wo's auch sei, nur von hinnen flieh'n

Aus der Nacht, aus der Nacht ohne Sterne
Myrth' und hohe Cypressen stehn
Vor ihrer Tür'
Ach, ihrer Augen Sterne sehn
Nimmer nach mir.
Augen, ach seht mich an
Wie der Himmel, der Himmel so helle etc.

Mary:
Dein Lied ist nicht zu Ende

Rizzio.
Ich kann nicht

Mary:
Deine Stimme bebt. . . . .

Mary:
Thanks Rizzio for this sweetly plaintive Strain. Why do you rise?

Then follows in both the plays Rizzio's confession to the Queen that he wishes to go back to Italy; they are surprised by the entering of Lord Darnley. In the German play, Ruthven and Darnley wound Rizzio; in the English version, R. is carried away and Ruthven denounces himself afterwards as R.'s murderer. The whole scene is occupied by the same persons in both the plays: Mary, Lady Argyle and Rizzio. Robertson says in his "Hist. of Scotland": While the Queen was at supper with the Countess of Argyle and Rizzio (Müller, Act 1, 4), the King suddenly entered the apartment; at his back was Ruthven. Whether the King struck him or not, we cannot be here certain. But it is told that the King's own dagger was left sticking in him. (From a letter of the Earl of Bedford to the Lords of England,

27th/3, 1566). — Also Mary's distress upon Rizzio's death has some resemblance in both the plays: J. Haynes' Mary Stuart p. 21, Müller's M. St. p. 46. The cast of conspirators is the same:
Müller: Darnley, Ruthven, Morton, Douglas.
Haynes: Darnley, Ruthven, Morton, Douglas. In the latter play, Morton takes part in the plot, but does not appear at Rizzio's arrest. In M.'s play Darnley seems to be the chief instigator of the plot, which gives afterwards to Mary a reason to despise him and to agree more or less to his being set aside; Haynes puts Ruthven as the chief of the plot, Darnley plays a secondary part.

Doubtlessly Camden's "Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Annales regnante Elisabetha" is the main source of Müller's drama, which proves the historical truth of the tragedy. Camden is troughout favourably induced towards Mary; his positive, unpartial picturing of history has given to many poets a chance to use that volume, rich of contents. Darnley's murdering Rizzio is not proved to be historical; but we find this idea already dramatised in Joh. Riemer's „Von hohen Vermählungen" (1679). See Kipka, p. 151. Müller drops in that scene the political and historical matter and treats Mary's fate as a family tragedy. Riemer says in his preface: Da ich mir denn unterschiedliche Freiheiten genommen, und zuvörderst David Ritzen durch des Königs eigene Faust ermorden lassen, welches er sonst durch erkaufte precussores verrichten ließ. — The motive of Rizzio's death has also a certain resemblance with Ruy Blas by Victor Hugo (1838). Ruy Blas is at the court of Don Salluste, the latter lives in quarrel with the Queen, who, in her turn

despises her husband. Ruy Blas loves the woman, but dare not to say it openly; in some letters sent to her he gives way to his feelings. Finally his plot is discovered, he poisons himself in order not to get into trouble. We find a similar action in Rizzio, with the only difference that he is killed at the end. — Throgmorton's, the English ambassador part is the invention of Müller; he had to fulfill other duties at that time than those shown us by the poet. After Darnley's death, he was sent by Elizabeth with a message to the Scotch Queen (Müller, Act 3, 3) but in reality, there is no proof that she had torn up the letter, as it appears in Müller's drama. According to W. Robertson (History of Scotland) Mary answered it at once. The last scene of the play has to a certain extent some likeness with Grillparzer's Sappho (1818). Mary, knowing no other way in her trouble, throws herself into the water, the same motive in "Sappho", the farewell monologues bear a strong resemblance to one another. — The tragedy "Mary Stuart" finishes with her escape to England, for which Rizzio's death is only an inductive event; it calls the demon Bothwell, which was to be the Queen's downfall. This period, the 15 months between Rizzio's murder and Mary's being taken prisoner is the most doubtful and knotty point in her life; here we remark the mysterious enigma of her life, whose solution belongs to the Psychologue. An absolute verdict does not exist. The single events of a tragedy: a murder, then a second one, a new unfortunate marriage are rigorously painted; we know that violent passions run in that short fatal time, and that serious crimes took place; but there is darkness on the very

reasons of these events, and the decision remains very uncertain as to who was to be found guilty and how far Mary was concerned in the matter. The decision depends upon Mary's attitude, which had experienced up to our days the most contradictory critisism: Some raise the princess to be a model of all virtues, others judge her as a criminal and inconstant woman. From this point of view, there is a large field offered to the poet, to show the fate of the unfortunate Queen in the most various possibilities. —

Bibliography.

Baker, D. E. Biographia Dramatica, 2 Vols. London, 1782

Baker, J. History of the stage London 1904

Banks, John, Island Queens London 1797

Banks, John, Unhappy favourite L. 1731

Biographie, Allgemeine Deutsche, Leipzig 1875

Camden: Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum Anales regnante Elisabetha. Amstelodami 1677

Caussin, Nicolas: La cour sainte. Paris 1653

Chalmers, the works of the English Poets L. 1810

Cibber, Theoph. The lives of the English Poets L. 1753

Coello, A. Der Graf Essex übersetzt von H. L. Spitta Leipzig, 1822

Companion to the Theatre L. 1751

Companion to the Play House L. 1764

Dack, C. Trial of Mary Stuart L. 1889

Dictionary of National Biography

Fleay, F. G. A Biogr. Chronicle of Engl. Drama L. 1891

Friedemann, Das deutsche Drama im 19. Jahrh. Berlin 1902

Genest, John. Some account of he English stage Bath 1832

Johnson, Samuel. The lives of the most eminent Engl. Poets. L. 1854
Jones, Henri. The Earl of Essex L. 1753
Kipka, C. Maria Stuart in der Weltliteratur Leipzig 1907
Knight, J. Theatrical Notes L. 1893
Koerting, Dr. G. Engl. Literaturgeschichte Münster 1899
Langbaine, G. The lives and charactres of Engl. Dram. Poets London 1691
Lessing, G. E. Hamburgische Dramaturgie Halle 1837
Müller, Hermann, Maria, Königin von Schottland Altona 1840
Müller, Hermann. Elisabeth, Königin von England. Berlin 1837
Ralph, The Earl of Essex London 1731
Robertson, Will. History of Scotland. L. 1862
Secret, History of Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Essex L. 1785
Taine, H. Histoire de la litérature anglaise Paris 1897
Theatrical Dictionary L. 1792
Sharp, H. History of the English Stage L. 1909
Shaw, S. Dram. Opinions L. 1907
Schiller, Fr. Dram. Werke Leipzig 1869
Tronchin, F Maria Stuart. Paris 1735
Steele, Sir R. Tatler, Nr. 14 L. 1709—11
Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturgeschichte Berlin 1888 ff

Walkey, Playhouse impression L 1892
Whitaker, Mary, Queen of Scots, vindicated. London 1788
Ward, Ad. Will. History of Engl. Drama Oxford 1875
Wyndtham, H. S. Annals of Covent Garden L. 1906