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This article is an offshoot of work towards an edition of Bel-vedére or The Garden of the Muses, a printed commonplace book published in 1600. The editors’ comprehensive analysis of the origins of the 4,482 one- or two-line passages has resulted in the discovery of thirteen hitherto untraced passages that are based on Shakespeare (and of a fourteenth passage whose Shakespearean origins were discovered by the scholar Charles Crawford in the early twentieth century but not published). These passages and their Shakespearean source texts in Romeo and Juliet, Love’s Labour’s Lost, Richard II, Richard III, Venus and Adonis, and The Rape of Lucrece are discussed here and serve to illustrate the range of adaptive strategies used in the compilation of the commonplace book. Three additional passages which have perhaps been adapted from Shakespeare source texts, including one of his sonnets, are also discussed. Discussion of the Shakespearean presence in Bel-vedére is contextualised by a brief account of prior work on the commonplace book and the attempted identification of its origins.

Bel-vedére or The Garden of the Muses is an early modern printed commonplace book consisting of 4,482 one- or two-line quotations of decasyllabic verse, arranged under topical headings, including well over two hundred quotations of William Shakespeare and of Edmund Spenser, and over 50 of Christopher Marlowe. It appeared in octavo format in 1600 (STC 3189) and received a second edition, also in octavo, in 1610, with the title The Garden of the Muses (STC 3190). The book is of exceptional importance for the early reception history of leading early modern authors such as Shakespeare, Spenser and Marlowe, for the late Elizabethan practice of commonplacing, for the rising status of English literature (including dramatic literature), and for early modern English canon formation.

The importance of Bel-vedére has long been recognised, and the appearance of passages by early modern authors in it is often recorded and discussed. For instance, in his important multi-volume reference work, British Drama 1533–1642: A Catalogue, Martin Wiggins references all known quotations from plays in Bel-vedére. Regularly, scholars writing about single authors refer to Bel-vedére as an indicator of that author’s early reception: R.M. Cummings does so for Spenser (295–96), Anne Sweeney for Robert Southwell (17–18), and Edward Gieskes and Kirk Melnikoff for Robert Greene (110). C.M. Ingleby’s Shakspere Allusion-Book devotes a separate appendix to Bel-vedére, and so do several single-play Shakespeare editions – for instance, William C. Carroll’s New Cambridge edition of Love’s Labour’s Lost (200–02). Sasha Roberts has examined the uses to which Romeo and Juliet and The Rape of Lucrece are put in Bel-vedére (“Shakespeare’s Tragedies of Love” 125–28; and Reading Shakespeare’s Poems in Early Modern England 129–33), and Neil Rhodes has raised the question of...
what Bel-vedére can tell us about Shakespeare’s place in “the newly emerging literary canon” (“Shakespeare’s Popularity and the Origins of the Canon” 114).

Considerable work has also been done to shed light on the genesis of Bel-vedére. The book belongs to a group of five printed prose and poetical commonplace books and miscellanies published in quick succession: Politeuphuia, Wit’s Commonwealth (1597, STC 15685); Palladis Tamia: Wit’s Treasury (1598, STC 17834), famous for its Shakespeare allusions; Wit’s Theater of the Little World (1599, STC 381); Bel-vedére (1600); and, later in the same year, England’s Helicon (STC 3191). They are sometimes referred to as the “Bodenham miscellanies” or “Bodenham anthologies”, owing to their association with the grocer John Bodenham (c.1559–1610) – their “initiator, projector, and patron” – who collected the material printed in the five books during his extensive reading before handing it over to others for final arranging and editing (Marotti; see also Williams). In the case of Bel-vedére, the editing appears to have been done by Anthony Munday (see Wright, “Anthony Mundy” and “Young Anthony Mundy”). Several of the Bodenham miscellanies show an explicit concern with English canon formation, most notably the famous “Comparative Discourse of our English Poets with the Greeke, Latine, and Italian Poets” in Palladis Tamia (see Allen). Neil Rhodes has called them “the first anthologies of English literature” (Origins of English 155) and has added elsewhere that “these volumes start to establish a national literary canon” (“Shakespeare’s Computer” 253).

The importance of Bel-vedére for the status of English literature and the desirability of a fuller understanding of its make-up and literary context have been made clear in an important article by Zachary Lesser and Peter Stallybrass. In “The First Literary Hamlet and the Commonplacing of Professional Plays”, they argue that Bel-vedére took a lead role in “transforming professional plays into poetry worthy of standing alongside classical authorities” (399), a project that other scholars (e.g. Brooks and Loewenstein) had associated almost exclusively with Ben Jonson. Lesser and Stallybrass’s article builds on work by Stallybrass and Roger Chartier in which they argue that Bel-vedére is important for demonstrating that by 1600 modern vernacular poets were considered “suitable authorities on which to base an entire commonplace book” (48). It is in Bel-vedére, they suggest, that Shakespeare “emerges as a canonical English poet” (46). Whereas earlier printed commonplace books such as Politeuphuia and Palladis Tamia had used Christian and classical writers alongside a limited number of contemporary English writers, Bel-vedére confined its sources to contemporary English writers. That the importance of Bel-vedére for transforming the status of vernacular literature was recognised by early readers is suggested by the censorious treatment it received in the Cambridge play The Second Part of the Return from Parnassus (c. 1601/2, printed 1606) (see Lesser and Stallybrass 387–93; and Leishman). Stallybrass and Chartier’s analysis builds on Ann Moss’s assertion that for most of the sixteenth century “there is little evidence that vernacular literature (as distinct from vernacular translations, proverbs, and the sayings of important historical figures) had acquired sufficient status to be excerpted for commonplace-books, at least in print” (209). This starts to change, as Stallybrass and Chartier show, first under the impetus of Politeuphuia (1597) and Palladis Tamia (1598), then, and even more so, with Bel-vedére. Bel-vedére thus emerges from the work by Stallybrass, Lesser and Chartier as a key agent in the elevation of the status of English literature and the transformation of English plays into literature.

Given the undeniable importance of Bel-vedére and the presence of Shakespeare and other leading authors in it, it is surprising that it has not been edited in modern times. This is about to change since our edition, published by Cambridge University Press, is now forthcoming. The reason why no one else may have been tempted to undertake this labour before us is that Bel-vedére’s many passages are not assigned to their authors. A prefatory epistle “To the Reader” provides a list of purported authors whose works are supposed to have been drawn upon, but which, on close examination, turns out to be wholly unreliable.

The starting point for the making of a modern edition of Bel-vedére is the astounding scholarly work carried out by Charles Crawford in the early twentieth century. In 1913, Crawford published, with Oxford University Press, an edition of England’s Parnassus, another printed commonplace book that had originally appeared in 1600, and which includes slightly longer verse quotations by
From Rome and Juliet we have been able to trace more than 1,150 additional lines in untraced lines from Belvedere searching early modern corpora, including a sequence-matching algorithm that searches the corpus out, yet Crawford – long before the invention of digital search engines and thus working purely from his astounding memory and the editions and concordances at his disposal – managed to identify 2,380 of them. In an appendix to The Shakspere Allusion-Book (1909), he listed all the Shakespeare allusions he had traced, and in an article published in 1910/11, he provided a short introduction to the printed miscellany and indicated the number of quotations he had managed to identify from various authors, including Shakespeare, Edmund Spenser, Christopher Marlowe, George Chapman, Samuel Daniel, Michael Drayton, Robert Greene, Sir John Harington, Ben Jonson, Thomas Kyd, Thomas Lodge, John Lyly, John Marston, Thomas Middleton, Sir Philip Sidney, Robert Southwell, and so on (a total of thirty-eight authors). Yet Crawford’s article does not identify the individual quotations and sources, only their total number, and the bulk of his labours on Belvedere are thus not in print. They have been preserved, however, in manuscript, namely on interleaved sheets inserted into an 1875 facsimile of Belvedere, now at the British Library (General Reference Collection C.116.e.14).

For our edition, we have undertaken a systematic investigation into the book’s effaced sources. We have heavily relied on Crawford’s papers in the first instance, and have checked all of his identifications – which are nearly always correct – using EEBO-TCP. We have checked all the remaining untraced excerpts – more than 2,000 – against EEBO-TCP as well. We have also relied on other methods of searching early modern corpora, including a sequence-matching algorithm that searches the corpus of untraced lines from Belvedere against the entirety of any uploaded text. Using these methods, we have been able to trace more than 1,150 additional lines in Belvedere. Although over 900 lines remain untraced, we now have a substantial pool of new data to add to Crawford’s original counts.

Much of the remainder of this article focuses on newly traced Belvedere lines that originate in Shakespeare. Before we move on to these newer discoveries, we will provide a brief summary of Crawford’s Shakespeare identifications. In the appendix to the Shakspere Allusion-Book, he mentions the overall number of passages he has been able to trace to their sources (“about 1200”) and adds that they include, he believes, “all those from Shakespeare” (Crawford, “Appendix D: J. Bodenham’s Belvedere” 489). He goes on to quote all the Shakespeare-based passages in Belvedere along with their source texts (493–518). Their total number is 213, including ninety-one from The Rape of Lucrece, forty-seven from Richard II, thirty-four from Venus and Adonis, thirteen from Richard III, twelve from Romeo and Juliet, ten from the True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York (of which a different version is titled The Third Part of Henry VI in the First Folio), five from Love’s Labour’s Lost, and one from The First Part of Henry IV. Crawford added that he “believed Shakespeare to be the author of Edward III”, at a time when few scholars did so, and he therefore added “a list of the quotations from Edward III … at the end” of his appendix (Crawford, “Appendix D: J. Bodenham’s Belvedere” 493), of which he had identified twenty-three.

By the time of his article of 1910/11, Crawford could report that “out of the 4482 quotations in the book 2380 have been identified” (Crawford, “Belvedere” 202). His Shakespeare total had gone up from 213 to 214 (Crawford, “Belvedere” 204), including no longer twelve but “thirteen” from Romeo and Juliet (206), which means that the additional identification is from this play. Our work on Crawford’s papers at the British Library has allowed us to ascertain which passage he managed to trace between the publication of the Shakspere Allusion-Book and his Belvedere article (see below).

The Newly Discovered Shakespeare Passages

In the course of our research, we have discovered thirteen previously untraced passages in Belvedere that originate in Shakespeare, one each from Romeo and Juliet, Love’s Labour’s Lost, and Richard III, two each from Richard II and Venus and Adonis, and six from Lucrece.
Romeo and Juliet


Comment: In Q2, the line reads, “Ay me, sad houres seem long” (sig. B1r, 1.1.148). The choice to use Q1 over Q2 is consistent with most of Bodenham’s passages from *Romeo and Juliet*.

Love’s Labour’s Lost

Bel-vedére, “Of Fame and Infamie”: “To know too much, is to know nought but fame.” (sig. G5r, QN 1783).

Shakespeare, *A Pleasant Conceited Comedie called Loues labors lost* (1598, STC 22294), “Too much to know, is to know nought but fame:” (sig. A3r, 1.1.92).

Comment: The change in word order from “Too much to know” to “To know too much” is in keeping with Bodenham’s practice elsewhere.

Richard III

Bel-vedére, “Of Flatterie, &c.”: “Plaine, and not honest, is too harsh a style.” (sig. M8r, QN 3412).


Comment: Such verbatim quotation of the source text is common in *Bel-vedére*, but so are various forms of adaptation, as exemplified above and below.

Richard II


Shakespeare, *The Tragedie of King Richard the second* (1597, STC 22307), “What my tong dares not, that my heart shal say.” (K1r, 5.5.97).

Comment: In a change that is typical of the process of commonplacing, the line in *Bel-vedére* changes the personally specific (“my tong”, “my heart”) to the generic (“the tongue”, “the mind”). The change from “heart” to “mind” may have been dictated by the topical heading, “Of the Mind”.


Shakespeare, *Richard the second*, “The loue of wicked men conuerts to feare,/That feare to hate, and hate turns one or both/To worthy daunger and deserued death.” (sig. H3r, 5.1.66–68).

Comment: In adapting Shakespeare’s passage, *Bel-vedére* condenses three lines to two, the self-imposed maximal length in Bodenham’s commonplace book.

Venus and Adonis

Bel-vedére, “Of Thoughts”: “If springing thoughts be any iot diminisht,/They wither in their prime, and prooue nought worth.” (sig. N5v, QN 3604).


Comment: The change from “thoughts” to “things” makes the passage fit for inclusion under the topical heading “Of Thoughts”. 

Comment: The adaptation reverses the sense. The passage in Bel-vedére distils Shakespeare’s two lines into one, drops two of the three nouns in the first line (“vows” and “flattry”), keeps Shakespeare’s alliteration while inverting the word order (“heart is hard”/“hardest heart”), eliminates the negative (“make no batterie”/“make batterie”), preserves an adjective but adds the superlative (“hard”/“hardest”), and adds a key word, indeed starts the line with, it (“Soft”), the antonym of a word in the source (“hard”), so as to create an antithesis. While the verbal material is mostly borrowed or adapted from Shakespeare, the antithesis, which, rhetorically, is the main point of the line, is the adapter’s invention, not Shakespeare’s. Note that the previous passage (QN 3604) and two other passages in Bel-vedére (QN 602 and 608) are based on lines from the same page of Venus and Adonis (sig. D1v).

The Rape of Lucrece

Bel-vedére, “Of Kings and Princes”: “Princes are glasses to their subiects eyes.” (sig. E5r, QN 1154) Shakespeare, Lucrece (1594, STC 22345), “For Princes are the glasse, the schoole, the booke,/Where subiects eies do learn, do read, do looke.” (sig. E3v, ll. 615–16).

Comment: This and the following verse in Bel-vedére (see below) adapt the same two-line passage in Lucrece.

Bel-vedére, “Of Kings and Princes”: “The liues of princes are their subiects bookes.” (sig. E5r, QN 1155).

Shakespeare, Lucrece, “For Princes are the glasse, the schoole, the booke,/Where subiects eies do learn, do read, do looke.” (sig. E3v, ll. 615–16).

Comment: See the comment on the preceding passage.

Bel-vedére, “Of Friendship, &c.”: “Looke what abuse is offer’d to a friend,/The shame and fault finds no excuse or end.” (sig. G8r, QN 1876).

Shakespeare, Lucrece, “But as he is my kinsman, my deare friend,/The shame and fault finds no excuse nor end.” (sig. C2v, ll. 237–38).

Comment: While the second line in Bel-vedére is almost identical with Shakespeare’s (the only exception being “or”/“nor”), the first underwent adaptation for the purposes of commonplacing.

Bel-vedére, “Of Patience”: “They that loose halfe, with greater patience beare it,/Then they whose all, is swallowed in confusion.” (sig. H2r, QN 1972).

Shakespeare, Lucrece, “They that loose halfe with greater patience beare it,/Then they whose whole is swallowed in confusion.” (sig. H4v, ll. 1158–59).

Comment: The only significant difference is Bel-vedére’s substitution of “all” for “whole”.

Bel-vedére, “Of Couetousnes, &c.”: “Couetous wretches doe such griefes sustaine,/That they proue bankrupts in their greatest gaine.” (sig. I8r, QN 2452).

Shakespeare, Lucrece, “Those that much couet … such griefes sustaine,/That they proue bãckrout in this poore rich gain.” (sig. B4r, ll. 134–40).

Comment: The couplet in Bel-vedére draws on the beginning and the end of one of Shakespeare’s rhyme royal stanzas. The whole stanza was included in England’s Parnassus (1600, STC 378), sig. B6v.

Bel-vedére, “Of Life”: “Ill, compassing fit opportunitie,/Or kiles his life, or else lifes qualitie.” (sig. Q2r, QN 4368).

Comment: The change from “his quality” to “lifes qualitie” in the second line seems to have been dictated by *Bel-vedére*’s topical heading, “Of Life”. The passage was also included in *England’s Parnassus* (1600, STC 378): “But ill annexed opportunities, / Or killles his life or else his qualitie. W. Sh.” (sig. V3r).

The following passage, adapted from *Romeo and Juliet*, was not included in Crawford’s Appendix to the *Shakspere Allusion-Book* (1909), although Crawford appears to have been aware of it by the time he published the *Bel-vedére* article in *Englische Studien* in 1910/1911, and he recorded it in the manuscript notes interleaved into a copy of the 1875 Spenser Society reprint, now at the British Library (see above).

*Bel-vedére*, “Of Youth”: “It’s often seen, that loue in young men lyes/Not truely in their hearts, but in their eyes.” (sig. P6v, QN 4230).

Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, “Is Rosaline whome thou didst loue so deare/So soone forsook, yonng mens loue then lies/Not truelie in their harts, but in their eies.” (Q1, D4v, 6.61–63).

Comment: Whereas Friar Laurence’s comment in *Romeo and Juliet* arises from a specific situation, the adaptation in *Bel-vedére* stresses its commonplace nature (“It’s often seen”) and makes the couplet rhyme (“lyes”/“eyes”). The passage in Q2 (“Is Rosaline that thou didst loue so deare, / So soone forsaken? yonng [sic] mens loue then lies/Not truly in their hearts, but in their eies.”, sig. E1v) departs little from Q1’s, and which text underlies the couplet in *Bel-vedére* thus seems impossible to determine (see also above).

**Three Doubtful Passages**

Apart from those recorded above, there are three passages whose relationship to Shakespeare seems to us intriguing without being of a nature that makes us confident that he is the creditor. In our edition, we therefore consider the passages as untraced. Nonetheless, for the sake of completeness they seem worth recording here, and also serve to illustrate the kind of judgement calls that are involved in the identification of *Bel-vedére*’s source texts. The first two passages are related to *The Rape of Lucrece*; the third, most interestingly, to one of Shakespeare’s *Sonnets*.

*Bel-vedére*, “Of Pleasure, &c.”: “As sad minds brooke no merrie companie,/So sorrow is to pleaure enemie.” (sig. O6r, QN 3943).

Shakespeare, *Lucrece*: “Sad soules are slaine in merrie companie,/Griefe best is pleas’d with griefes societie;” (sig. H3v, ll. 1110–11).

Comment: The first line in *Bel-vedére* may echo the first line in *Lucrece*. They share the idea that “Sad soules”/“sad minds” do not enjoy “merrie companie”. The couplet in *Bel-vedére* appears among a series of “Similies on the same subiect” (sig. O4v), i.e. on the subject of pleasure, which accounts for its “As … So” structure. However, although *Bel-vedére*’s “Similies” are often the result of some degree of adaptation, the present one would have an unusually distant relationship to its source. The passage in *Lucrece*, along with its adjacent lines, is highlighted in the early editions with commonplace markers. Line 1110, “Sad soules are slaine in merrie companie,” (sig. H3v, l. 1110), is used verbatim in *Bel-vedére* for QN 2748 (K7v).

*Bel-vedére*: “Short walkes seeme long when sorrow metes the way.” (sig. K8r, QN 2781).


Comment: The line in *Bel-vedére* shares the sense and several keywords with that in *Lucrece*, but it is unclear why it would have been adapted quite extensively rather than copied verbatim, or near-
verbatim. Shakespeare’s line is included in *England’s Parnassus* (1600, STC 378): “Short time seems long in sorrowes sharp sustaining, […] W. Shakespeare.” (sig. X1v).

**Bel-vedére:** “Some men so striue in cunning to excell,/That oft they marre the worke before was well.” (sig. E3v, QN 1110).

Shakespeare, Sonnet 103: “Were it not sinfull then striuing to mend,/To marre the subiect that before was well,” (ll. 9–10).

Comment: The thought is commonplace (cf. Dent W260), but the specific form its expression takes in the two texts is in several ways parallel: both passages end with “before was well”, and both employ “marre” and “striue”/“striuing”.

Several of the differences could be accounted for by the process of commonplacing: *Bel-vedére’s* “Some men” and “that oft” are formulations that render the content more generally applicable. The word “excell”, on the other hand, is a result of the rhyme, whereas lines 9 and 10 of Shakespeare’s sonnet belong to its third cross-rhyming couplet and therefore do not rhyme. What we know about Bodenham’s practice of commonplacing is not incompatible with the idea that he transformed the passage in Sonnet 103 in such a way as to produce QN 1110 in *Bel-vedére*. And what we know about the manuscript circulation and dating of Shakespeare’s sonnets could be reconciled with the availability of (a version of) Sonnet 103 to Bodenham at the very end of the sixteenth century. That Bodenham used manuscript poetry in assembling the material for *Bel-vedére* is stressed in the prefatory epistle “To the Reader” and borne out by our research. However, since the case for the indebtedness of QN 1110 to Shakespeare’s Sonnet 103 seems to us possible rather than certain, we consider the passage in *Bel-vedére* as untraced.

We conclude with the new totals of passages in *Bel-vedére* that can be traced to Shakespeare, noting parenthetically whether and, if so, how our numbers differ from Crawford’s:

*The First Part of Henry IV*: 1 (+0)

*Love’s Labour’s Lost*: 6 (+1)

*The Rape of Lucrece*: 97 (+6)

*Richard II*: 49 (+2)

*Richard III*: 14 (+1)

*Romeo and Juliet*: 14 (+1)

*The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*: 10 (+0)

*Venus and Adonis*: 36 (+2)

More than a century after Crawford published his appendix in the *Shakspere Allusion-Book*, the belief that Shakespeare was involved in the writing of *Edward III* has become the majority opinion. There is disagreement as to how much of the play Shakespeare composed, although most scholars now agree that he wrote the “Countess Scenes” (Scenes 2 and 3). We thus consider passages drawn from these two scenes as Shakespeare’s, and the rest of the play as anonymous. Remarkably, of the twenty-three passages drawn from the play, thirteen are from Shakespeare.

*Edward III*: 23 (+0), of which anon.: 10; Shakespeare: 13

If we include the passages from the “Countess Scenes” in *Edward III*, the number of quotations from or adapted from Shakespeare is thus 240. This places him in second place in our list of the most frequently quoted authors in *Bel-vedére*, just ahead of Samuel Daniel and Edmund Spenser, and second only to Michael Drayton.
Notes

1. For information about Shakespeare’s presence in Bel-vedère that deserves to be updated with reference to the present article, see vol. 3, 1590–1597, pp. 225 (R3), 273 (RJ), 291 (R2), and 324 (LLL).
2. We are grateful to Adam Hooks for sharing his transcription of Crawford’s letter with us.
3. Our forthcoming edition will provide detailed information, including a note for every one of the 4,482 passages, and a synthetic index and tables.
4. Our forthcoming edition assigns consecutive quotation numbers (QNs) to the 4,482 passages.
6. Shakespeare returns to the idea in The History of King Lear: “Striving to better aught, we mar what’s well.” ((1.4).330).
7. Sonnets 61–103 have been tentatively dated to the mid-1590s (see Colin Burrow, ed., Complete Sonnets and Poems 104–05). For the manuscript circulation of Shakespeare’s sonnets, see Erne, “Manuscript and Print,” 58, 62–64.
8. The address “To the Reader” mentions that passages have been excerpted “out of sundry things extant, and many in priuat” (sig. A4v). We have identified a number of quotations in Belvedère whose sources do not seem to have been in print by 1600, including several from a poem called “The Bee” which was likely written by Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex.
10. Since no similar consensus has so far emerged with regards to the authorship of Arden of Faversham (included in The New Oxford Shakespeare and in the RSC Shakespeare Collaborative Plays volume, ed. Bate and Rasmussen, but in no other recent Shakespeare edition or series), we do not count any of that play’s ten passages in Bel-vedere as Shakespeare’s. Four of the ten Arden passages are from the portions the editors of The New Oxford Shakespeare assign to Shakespeare (all from Scene 8).
11. Titus Andronicus and The First Part of the Contention, which both first appeared in 1594, are the only Shakespeare plays published before 1600 from which no passages seem to have found their way into Bel-vedere. Neither play was attributed to Shakespeare on the quarto title pages in the 1590s.
12. The exact figures for these and other authors will be supplied in our edition.
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