KING RICHARD II IN ELIZABETHAN DRAMA

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF

ENGLISH AND THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF THE KANSAS STATE

TEACHERS COLLEGE OF EMPORIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

By

LEO PAUL DANGEL

May, 1968

Approved for the Major Department

Charles F. Walton

Approved for the Graduate Council

PREFACE

This study was undertaken to determine the relationship and significance of three Richard II plays, the anonymous *The Life and Death of Jack Straw* (1587?), the anonymous *The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second or Thomas of Woodstock* (1591), and Shakespeare's *Richard II* (1595). Upon the suggestion of Dr. Charles E. Walton, the Head of the Department of English of Kansas State Teachers College, the present author embarked upon basic textual and source studies of the three plays. These studies, coupled with an investigation of the events and attitudes of medieval and Renaissance England, led to and supported two basic conclusions as follows: the three plays have a high degree of moral and political significance in relationship to Elizabethan ideals, dealing with a controversial subject (rebellion) and a controversial king; and, although the plays present and sometimes defend the Tudor theory of kingship, most of the other moral ideas in the plays date back to medieval times. Perhaps, the most significant discovery resulting from this study is the evidence that the Middle English poem, *Mum and the Sothsegger*, which also deals with the reign of Richard II, contains most of the moral and

political ideas to be found in the plays and may have been, therefore, a source for the dramas.

The present author gratefully acknowledges the kind advice and the invaluable assistance of Dr. Walton and also thanks Dr. June Morgan for her help in proofreading.

Emporia, Kansas L. P. D.

May 10, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE TEXTUAL HISTORIES OF THREE RICHARD II PLAYS

A. Shakespeare's Richard II

For the date of August 29, 1597, the Stationers' Register has the following entry relating to Q_1 of Shakespeare's Richard II:

> 29° Augusti./.
>
> Andrew Wise./.Entered for his Copie by appoyntment from master Warden man / The Tragedye of RICHARD the SECOND. vjd[1]

The title page of the first edition of Richard II indicates that Valentine Simes printed this quarto for Andrew Wise during the same year as the entry given in the Stationers' Register.[2] There are four surviving copies of the 1597

---

[1]Edward Arber (ed.), A Transcript of the Register of the Company of Stationers of London, III, 23. Leo Kirschbaum, Shakespeare and the Stationers, pp. 34-57, proves that, normally, a work entered in the Stationers' Register had been licensed for printing, and, therefore, the entry guaranteed the publisher a copyright, which was intended to last forever (unless, of course, the English government objected to the contents of the work).

[2]Charlton Hinman and W. W. Greg (eds.), Richard the Second, 1597, (title page of facsimile). Kirschbaum, op. cit., pp. 318-319, finds that little is known about the Elizabethan publisher, Andrew Wise, who also published Shakespeare's Richard III (a so-called "bad" quarto), 1 Henry IV, 2 Henry IV, and Much Ado About Nothing.

quarto, as follows: the Capell copy is preserved at Trinity College of Cambridge; a copy that once belonged to Henry Huth is held in the British Museum; the Huntington Library holds the copy once belonging to the Duke of Devonshire; and the Pentworth copy is to be found at Pentworth Castle.[3] Facsimile editions are readily available for all except the Pentworth copy, which has not been edited.[4]

All four copies vary slightly, because corrections were apparently made during the course of printing.[5] Elizabethan printing was slow, which method probably left time for discovering mistakes, either by chance or by

---

[3]Matthew Black (ed.), A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Life and Death of King Richard the Second, pp. 336-337. Hereafter the title is given as A New Variorum.

[4]The edition of Hinman and Greg, op. cit., p. v, is from the Capell copy. Charles Praetorius and W. A. Harrison (eds.), King Richard the Second. By William Shakespeare. The First Quarto, 1597, have produced a facsimile edition of the Huth copy. William Griggs and Peter A. Daniel (eds.), King Richard the Second by William Shakespeare, the First Quarto, 1597, have produced a facsimile edition of the Devonshire copy.

[5]Hinman and Greg, op. cit., p. v. Daniel, op. cit., pp. vi-vii, catalogs the variants, but he does not record the reading of the Pentworth copy, which had not been brought to the attention of scholars when he did his work. Black, A New Variorum, pp. 357-358, includes the Pentworth readings in his table of variants, which is not quite complete. Hinman and Greg, op. cit., pp. v-vii, provide the most complete list of variants.

intentional proofreading.[6] Actually, the Elizabethan method of press correction is fairly simple.[7] For example, if a printer had processed a number of sheets before noticing certain errors in them, he might correct his type case and continue with the printing.[8] However, paper was expensive, and, consequently, if many sheets had already been printed with these errors, these uncorrected sheets were retained and bound in the same way as the corrected ones.[9] Therefore, when an edition was issued with these kinds of stop-press corrections, the resulting individual texts might

---

[6]A. W. Pollard (ed.), A New Shakespeare Quarto: The Tragedy of King Richard II, pp. 5-6. Pollard describes Elizabethan printing problems and the conditions within the printing shops, ibid., pp. 5-6; 18-20; 34-35. Charlton Hinman, The Printing and Proofreading of the First Folio of Shakespeare, I, 281, says that the proofreading of the 1623 folio was usually rather unsystematic, concerned only with manifest errors, and intended to provide an acceptable text rather than an entirely accurate one. Hinman's remarks would logically apply to Elizabethan printers, who also would have concerned themselves with eliminating as many errors as was practically possible in order to produce a fairly acceptable publication.

[7]R. B. McKerrow, An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students, pp. 204-213, gives an extensive account of Elizabethan printing, including a special section on the kinds of corrections made during the course of printing.

[8]Pollard, op. cit., p. 6.

[9]Loc. cit.

contain corrected and uncorrected sheets in any given proportion or order, because the sheets were gathered for binding somewhat at random, and it is doubtful that any personnel paid much attention as to where the uncorrected sheets were inserted in the making up of the books.[10] The four extant copies of Q_1 of Richard II illustrate how corrected and uncorrected sheets became mixed during the binding process, because not one of these four texts is without some uncorrected sheets.

---

[10]McKerrow, op. cit., p. 209. One should keep in mind how the sheets of a quarto are set up. Four pages are printed on each side of a sheet and in such a way that, when the sheet is folded properly, once horizontally and once vertically, the pages come out in the right order. A folded sheet is called one gathering. Before the first sheet for a book is folded, one side (called the outer form) is made up of pages 1, 4, 5, and 8. The other side of that sheet (the inner form) contains pages 2, 3, 6, and 7. The first gathering is designated by the letter A, the second gathering, by the letter B, and so on. Elizabethan printers usually printed the letter of the gathering and a number at the bottom of each page (sometimes only on every other page), and this imprint is known as a signature. For example, the signatures for the first gathering of a quarto would be as follows: page 1 ($A1^r$, that is the recto side of the first leaf), page 2 ($A1^v$, the verso side of the first leaf), page 3 ($A2^r$), page 4 ($A2^v$), page 5 ($A3^r$), page 6 ($A3^v$), page 7 ($A4^r$), and page 8 ($A4^v$). Then, the next gathering begins with page 9 ($B1^r$), and so on. The purpose of the signatures is to make certain that the sheets are folded properly. It should be remembered that $A1^r$ would be the title page and not page 1 of the actual text, ibid., pp. 14-18.

A complete list of variants is hereafter given in order to throw some light on the editing problems by illustrating exactly how the copies of Q_1 differ. In this list, the reading believed to be the uncorrected one is cited first, with a sufficient amount of text to insure clarity. The proposed corrected reading follows, with, in this case, only enough text quoted to show the corrections that had been made by the printer. The four copies, Devonshire, Capell, Huth, and Pentworth, are represented by their respective initials, D, C, H, and P. Each variant reading is preceded by a number facilitating cross-reference. The signatures of the quarto pages on which the readings occur follow the act, line, and scene designations:

DCP	H
(1) Ah but ere I last receiued the Sacrament, (I.i.139) $A4^r$.	But ere . . . (I.i.139) $A4^r$.[11]

It seems improbable that when the sheets found in the Devonshire, Capell, and Pentworth copies were printed, the

---

[11]As the first variant occuring in the Q_1 copies, Black, A New Variorum, p. 359, has strangely listed, under "misprints are corrected," the following: "$A2^v$ I.i.29 [H] immortall [D] immortall [P] immortall [C] immortall." (The period is not part of the reading.) Black's reading shows no variation. All of the copies are in agreement here, and there is no reason to enter immortall as a variant.

printer erroneously obtained the Ah, which destroys the meter, from a nearby line. Line 138 begins with the words, A trespasse, but it is doubtful that this A could have been read as Ah. An Elizabethan minuscule h is quite distinct.[12] Moreover, if the printer read A correctly from his copy source for line 138, and if he read it again as part of the next line, he hardly would have interpreted it differently in the second instance. It seems strange that a printer would add an unnecessary word, unless it stood in his copy source. Pollard thinks that a reader may have been dictating from the MS to the typesetter, and that this reader, as people will often do in pausing, might have said, "ah."[13] Consequently, the printer easily might have understood this voiced pause to be a part of the written text.[14] Although it is known that Elizabethan printers usually read from their copy sources themselves while setting type, Pollard thinks that if the light happened to be bad, it is possible that

---

[12]McKerrow, op. cit., p. 343. Cf. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, The Handwriting of the Renaissance, p. 48. Both men give extensive accounts of Elizabethan handwriting.

[13]Pollard, op. cit., p. 35.

[14]Loc. cit.

an assistant might have taken the copy near a window to read a few lines of obscure handwriting to the printer.[15] However, F. J. Hall, Controller of the Oxford University Press, doubts Pollard's theory.[16] Hall suggests that the copyist of the MS from which Q_1 was printed might have begun line 139 by starting to write the word, And.[17] Having written the An, the copyist may have realized his mistake and, thus, altered the n, changing it to an h.[18] If one assumes that Ah was an error in the MS copy, he must also assume that the printer of Q_1 was inclined to take the trouble to correct metrical imperfections in his copy. However, there may be a slight possibility that the correction went the other way. That is, the omission of Ah in the Huth copy might be an error, in which case, the Devonshire, Capell, and Pentworth copies would have the corrected sheets. It is probably unlikely that Shakespeare would have written a metrically bad line in among several

---

[15]There are paintings showing printers reading their MSS and setting type at the same time, loc. cit.

[16]Cited in Black, A New Variorum, p. 30.

[17]Loc. cit.

[18]Loc. cit.

perfect lines of iambic pentameter. However, although most editors delete the Ah on the grounds that it disrupts the meter, one proposes that the line as found in the Devonshire, Capell, and Pentworth copies would work well for an actor. For example, one should consider the whole sequence of Mowbray's speech:

> For you my noble Lord of Lancaster
> The honourable father to my foe,
> Once did I lay an ambushe for your life,
> A trespasse that doth vex my grieued soule:
> Ah but ere I last receiude the Sacrament,
> I did confess it, . . . (I.i.135-140)

All four copies have the full stop after soule, a stop which would give the actor a good opportunity to use the Ah for a change in pace and tone.[19] Moreover, there are other lines in the play with extra syllables, for example, the next line:

P	DCH
(2) Shall I seeme Crest-fallen	
in my fathers sight?	
Or with pale beggar-feare	
impeach my height?	. . . impeach my height,
Before this out-Darde	Before this out-Darde
Dastarde, . . .	Dastarde? . . .
(I.i.188-190) $A4^{v}$.	(I.i.188-190) $A4^{v}$.

---

[19]One feels that theories of Pollard and Hall are probably stronger than the one offered, here. However, one should beware of taking a stand precluding all possibility that Shakespeare might have deviated from rigid form in order to create new meaning and effect.

The second question mark definitely should follow Dastarde rather than height.

	HC	DP
(3)	Where then may I complain my self? (I.ii.42) Bl^{V}.	Where then alas may . . . (I.ii.42) Bl^{V}.

The omission of alas as in Huth and Capell copies shortens the line by one foot.

	HC	DP
(4)	That it may enter butchers Mowbraies brest: (I.ii.48) Bl^{V}.	. . . butcher Mowbraies breast: (I.ii.48) Bl^{V}.

The line preceeding the one cited here has several words ending in s. The printer, in setting up the type for the sheets in the Huth and Capell copies, might have had his mind attuned to s endings, and, consequently, he could have printed butchers. In the line of the Devonshire and Pentworth copies, the spelling of breast represents a correction, which the printer probably would not have made had he not been forced to re-set the last part of the line on account of the first error.

	HC	DP
(5)	Not with the emptines, hollownes, but weight: (I.ii.59) Bl^{V}.	. . . emptie hollownes, . . . (I.ii.59) Bl^{V}.

The cause for the printer's having read emptines for emptie might have been an anticipation of the suffix of hollownes. There seems to be no other explanation for the error in the

Huth and Capell copies.

	HC	DP
(6)	Alacke and what shall good olde Yorke there see, But empty lodgings and vnfurnisht wals, Vnpeople offices, vntrodden stones, And what cheere there for welcome but my grones? (I.ii.67-70) $B1^{V}$.	And what heare there . . . (I.ii.67-70) $B1^{V}$.

Malone contends that cheere is the correct reading, explaining that the offices were rooms where food and drink were stored, and that such offices were opened on festive occasions for the guests to eat and drink to their satisfaction; hence, there would be no "cheer," because Plashy House, to which the Dutchess is referring in this passage, would have been void of guests.[20] However, Daniel, Wilson, Pollard, and Sisson all prefer heare.[21] In this sequence, the Dutchess is lamenting her husband's death. Because of the empty house, one assumes that everything about Plashy would be

---

[20]Edmond Malone (ed.), The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, XVI, 22-23, fn. 6.

[21]Griggs and Daniel, op. cit., pp. v-vi. J. Dover Wilson (ed.), King Richard II, p. 133. Pollard, op. cit., p. 36. C. J. Sisson, New Readings in Shakespeare, II, 16.

engulfed in silence; hence, " . . . what hear there . . ."[22] Moreover, there is the direct sequence of " . . . what shall good olde Yorke there see . . . and what heare . . .?"[23]

	HC	DP
(7)	A traitor to God, his kins, and him, (I.iii.108) $B3^{V}$.	A traitorto his God . . . (I.iii.108) $B3^{V}$.

The his must be used twice to complete the meter. The printer could have easily left out one his the first time, and, in correcting the error, he made another by crowding traitor and to together.

	HC	DP
(8)	Of cruell wounds plowd vp with neighbours sword, (I.iii.128) $B3^{V}$.	Of ciuill wounds . . . (I.iii.128) $B3^{V}$.

Malone, although civil stands in his text, argues for cruell, claiming that wounds made by neighbour's swords " . . . are necessarily civil . . . ," preferring the reading of cruell, because it provides a new idea.[24] However, King Richard here is speaking, it seems, about strife

---

[22]Loc. cit.

[23]Pollard, op. cit., p. 36. Thus far, the arguments given for cheere and heare are based on meaning alone and fail to resolve completely the editorial problem. However, there is another method whereby one may show that heare can be proven beyond almost any doubt to be correct, but it is necessary for one to consider first a few more variants.

[24]Malone, op. cit., XVI, 30-31, fn. 4.

among fellow citizens that has made the country weak and suseptible to attack from neighbouring nations. It follows, then, that " . . . civil wounds ploughed up by neighbour's sword," could mean, civil wounds reopened by neighbour's swords.[25]

	HC	DP
(9)	With riuall hating enuy set on you (I.iii.131) $B3^{V}$.	With riuall-hating enuy . . . (I.iii.131) $B3^{V}$.

The missing hyphen probably results from loose type rather than an error on the printer's part.[26]

	HC	DP
(10)	. . . peace . . . Draw the sweet infant breath of gentle sleep, (I.iii.133) $B3^{V}$.	Drawes . . . (I.iii.133) $B3^{V}$.
(11)	Which so rouzde vp with boistrous vntunde drummes, With harsh resounding trumpets dreadfull bray, And grating shocke of harsh resounding armes, (I.iii.134-36) $B3^{V}$.	. . . wrathful yron armes, (I.iii.134-36) $B3^{V}$.

The printer read harsh resounding twice.

---

[25]Following the examples of a few variants, it becomes clear that the reading of ciuill in the Devonshire and Pentworth copies is the safer choice for an editor.

[26]Matthew Black, A New Variorum, p. 359.

	HC	DP
(12)	Doubly portculist with my teeth and lippes, (I.iii.167) $B4^{r}$.	Doubly portcullist . . . (I.iii.167) $B4^{r}$.

This line refers to the tongue's being closed off behind the lips and teeth as if behind gates.[27] There is only the spelling change.

At this point, one may summarize variants numbered 3 through 12, drawing some important conclusions. Variants 3 through 12 occur on pages $B1^{v}$, $B3^{v}$, and $B4^{r}$. These three pages are all on the inner form of sheet B (all three pages were on the same side of the sheet before it was folded). Therefore, all corrections on the inner form of sheet B were made at the same time. Consequently, since variants 4, 10, and 11 are, with absolute certainty, corrected readings in the Devonshire and Pentworth copies, there can be no doubt that these two copies contain corrected sheets for the inner form of B, while the Huth and Capell copies have the uncorrected ones. Hence, the Devonshire and Pentworth copies have the corrected reading for variants 3 through 12.[28]

---

[27] Ibid., p. 69. Cf. OED.

[28] McKerrow, op. cit., p. 212, says that if a form, one side of a sheet, can be proven to have the corrected reading in one case, the copies containing this corrected reading also have the corrected reading for all other variants on that form.

Problems about doubtful readings, such as heare and cheere (cf. no. 6), may also be solved in this manner. When the inner form of B was first printed, the printer must have read his copy as cheere, as in the Huth and Capell copies. Then, when the corrections were made for the inner form of B, the printer must have reconsidered his earlier reading of cheere and have decided that the word was heare.[29] Of course, considering the confusion that could have resulted from handwriting (cheere and heare might have looked very much alike), one might still doubt exactly which meaning was the one intended by Shakespeare. Cruell and Ciuill might also have resembled one another in MS. However, editors have little choice but to trust the printer of Q_1 in corrections to which he must have given at least some consideration. No other evidence is available, since F_1 also reads heare and ciuill, and, therefore, one must assume that the printer of Q_1 made the proper corrections for these readings in his MS. Certainly, it would be less compelling to think that he had cheere and cruell correct the first time and made a mistake in changing them.

---

[29] Exactly the same reasoning used here to prove that heare is the corrected form can also be used to prove that ciuill (variant 8) is the corrected form.

	CP	DH
(13)	A partiall slander ought I to auoide, (I.iii.241) $C1^r$.	A partial slander sought . . . (I.iii.241) $C1^r$.

In this sequence, Gaunt is speaking about his part in passing judgment on his son, Bolingbroke. Gaunt, seeking to avoid being accused of showing favoritism, has approved King Richard's decision to banish Bolingbroke.

	CP	DH
(14)	[missing] (I.iii.248) $C1^r$.	Exit. (I.iii.248) $C1^r$.
(15)	With reuerence he did throw away on slaues, (I.iv.27) $C2^v$.	What reuerence . . . (I.iv.27) $C2^v$.

Possibly, there was confusion about the Elizabethan abbreviations, w^{th} (with) and w^{t} (what), or perhaps the printer picked up With from the previous line, 26.[30]

	CP	DH
(16)	A brace of draimen bid God speed him well, (I.iv.32) $C2^v$.	. . . bid, God speed him wel, (I.iv.32) $C2^v$.

In spite of the misspelling of well, the Devonshire and Huth copies have the corrected reading for variant 16 and for variants 13, 14, and 15 as well. There can be no doubt that variants 13 and 14 are corrected readings in the Devonshire and Huth copies. Therefore, since variants 13 through 16

---

[30]Pollard, op. cit., p. 37

all occur on the outer form of sheet C, the Devonshire and Huth copies have the corrected readings for all four variants. Variant 16 indicates that the printer of Q_1 followed copy without much question. The omission of the comma is not an obvious error. Yet, although the line could stand without the comma, this printer took the trouble to put it in, because that is the way his MS must have read. The misspelling of well resulting from the correction is easily explained: the whole second half of the line had to be re-set, and one of the l slugs could have been dropped unnoticed.

	DCP	H
(17)	We must supplant those rough rugheaded kerne, (II.i.156) $D1^r$.	. . . kernes, (II.i.156) $D1^r$.

This is the only correction on the outer form of D.

The rest of the variants in Q_1 require little explanation. At the end of each series of variants, the copies containing the corrected sheets are indicated, and, in the case of doubtful readings, one has only to remember that if the sheet is a corrected form, each reading on that sheet is a corrected reading.

	P	DCH
(18)	The plate, coines, reuenews, and moueables (II.i.161) $D1^v$.	. . . coine, . . . (II.i.161) $D1^v$.

	P	DCH
(19)	About his marriage, nor his owne disgrace, (II.i.168) $D1^{V}$.	. . . nor my . . . (II.i.168) $D1^{V}$.

The printer probably repeated the first his by mistake.

	P	DCH
(20)	[missing] (II.i.186) $D1^{V}$.	Why Vncle whats the matter? (II.i.186) $D1^{V}$.
(21)	At nothing trembles, at something it grieues, (II.ii.12) $D3^{V}$.	With nothing . . . (II.ii.12) $D3^{V}$.
(22)	Sorrowes eyes . . . Shews nothing but confusion; eyde awry, (II.ii.19) $D3^{V}$.	Shew nothing . . . (II.ii.19) $D3^{V}$.
(23)	[missing] (II.ii.33) $D3^{V}$.	Tis nothing but conceit my gratious Lady. (II.ii.33) $D3^{V}$.
(24)	The lord of Rosse, Beaumond, and Willoughby, (II.ii.54) $D4^{r}$.	The lords of . . . (II.ii.54) $D4^{r}$.
(25)	Comfort's in heaven, and we are in the earth, (II.ii.78) $D4^{r}$.	. . . on the earth, . . . (II.ii.78) $D4^{r}$.

Variants 18 through 25 occur on the inner form of D. It can be clearly seen that the Devonshire, Capell, and Huth copies have the corrected sheets for the inner form of D: variants 20, 22, 23, and 24 are, without doubt, incorrect in the Pentworth copy and corrected in the other three copies.

	H	DCP
(26)	He is as like three as any man may be Not like me or a of my kinne, (V.ii.108-109) $I1^r$.	. . . as a man may be Not like me or any of my kinne, (V.ii.108-109) $I1^r$.

Possibly because of the handwriting of the MS, the printer confused a and any of lines 108-109.

	H	DCP
(27)	Or in this piteous heart plant thou thine eare, (V.iii.126) $I3^r$.	Or in thy . . . (V.iii.126) $I3^r$.

Variants 26 and 27 are on the outer form of I. Since the Devonshire, Capell, and Pentworth copies are correct for variant 26, they are also correct for 27.

The following table is a summary of the Q_1 variants:

Variant(s)	Signature(s)	Form	Copies with corrected reading
1	$A4^r$	inner	H
2	$A4^v$	outer	DCH
3-12	$B1^v$, $B3^v$, $B4^r$	inner	DP
13-16	$C1^r$, $C2^v$	outer	DH
17	$D1^r$	outer	H
18-25	$D1^v$, $D3^v$, $D4^r$	inner	DCH
26-27	$I1^r$, $I3^r$	outer	DCP

Following Q_1 of Richard II, there appeared four more quarto editions, printed before the appearance of the 1623

folio: Q_2 (1598), Q_3 (1598), Q_4 (1608), and Q_5 (1615).[31] Each of these subsequent quartos, two through five, was printed from the immediately preceding edition.[32] Each new quarto edition corrected a few errors, but there was a tendency for more new errors to be introduced with each succeeding quarto than were corrected, resulting in Q_5 being much less accurate than Q_1.[33]

Shakespeare's name does not appear on the title page of Q_1, but does appear on that of Q_2 and on all the other quartos.[34] Both Q_2 and Q_3 were published in 1598 by Wise, and Simes printed them. In 1603, however, Wise's copyright was transferred to Matthew Law, as indicated in an entry in the Stationers' Register as follows:

---

[31]It should be remembered that editors and critics writing prior to the discovery of Q_3 refer to the 1608 quarto as Q_3 and to the 1615 quarto as Q_4.

[32]Hardin Craig (ed.), The Complete Works of Shakespeare, p. 643.

[33]The history of the later quartos is reviewed, here, without a detailed study of their variants, a study which is beyond the scope of this paper and, as will become apparent, has been done in enough detail for the purposes of editorship.

[34]Griggs and Daniel, op. cit., p. vii. A Facsimile of Q_2 has been compiled by E. W. Ashbee (ed.), Shakespeare's Richard the Second, Facsimiled From the Edition Printed at London in the Year 1598. Pollard's edition is a facsimile of Q_3.

25 Junii [1603]

Mathew Lawe Entered for his copies in full courte Holden this Day. These ffyve copies folowing . . ijs vjd

viz

iij enterludes or playes.
The ffirst is of RICHARD the .3.
The second of RICHARD the .2.
Th Third of HENRY the .4.
the firste Part. all Kinges
. . . . . .
all whiche by consent of the Company are sett ouer to him from Andrew Wyse.[35]

Law published Q_4 in 1608, a highly significant edition, because it contains the Parliament episode and the deposition of King Richard, a scene of about 160 lines which was not present in all earlier quartos.[36] Scholars do not doubt that the Parliament scene had always been a part of the play and agree that it was not something written later.[37] Greg thinks that the Deposition scene was omitted in the

---

[35]The full entry includes, in addition to the plays, two sermons. Arber, op. cit., III, 98-98a.

[36]Charles Praetorius and W. A. Harrison (eds.), King Richard the Second. By William Shakespeare. The Third Quarto, 1608, p. iii. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, p. 63, points out that Wise is not heard of after the 1603 transfer entry and may have been dead.

[37]Charles Praetorius and W. A. Harrison (eds.), King Richard the Second. By William Shakespeare. The Third Quarto, 1608, p. iii.

earlier quartos, because it would have been offensive to Elizabeth, noting that the omission " . . . leaves an obvious scar."[38] The line spoken by the Abbot, "A woefull pageant have we here beheld," (IV.i.321) is found in all the quartos and makes no sense without the Deposition scene.[39] Harrison, among others, has pointed out that the Q_4 Deposition scene is grossly inferior to the same sequence in the folio.[40] In Q_4, the printer has omitted parts of lines and has continued these lines with parts of following lines.[41] Hence, the meter is often completely obliterated. Most editors agree that the Deposition scene of Q_4 was obtained by some devious means, that is, that the publisher possibly sent a team of scribes to the playhouse to record the scene while it was being acted, or, what is probably more likely, some actor reported the scene to the publisher for the price

---

[38]Hinman and Greg, op. cit., p. viii.

[39]Griggs and Daniel, op. cit., p. x.

[40]Charles Praetorius and W. A. Harrison (eds.), King Richard the Second. By William Shakespeare. The Third Quarto, 1608, p. iv. Pollard, op. cit., pp. 62-63. Wilson, op. cit., p. 113. Malone, op. cit., XVI, 131, fn. 5.

[41]Black, A New Variorum, p. 370, finds that "thirty-six of the added verses are mislined, ..."

of a few shillings.[42] Ure agrees that reporting was probably the means through which Law obtained the Parliament scene.[43] It is doubtful that Elizabethan shorthand could have produced a text even as good as that of the Parliament scene in Q_4.[44] However, Daniel thinks that Law might have obtained from Wise a copy of Q_3 made over with the Deposition scene added in MS.[45] But if Wise were dead, as suggested by Greg (fn. 36), Daniel's suggestion is worthless. At any rate, Daniel is in agreement regarding the theory that Law could never have had an authentic MS for his imperfect version of the scene.[46] The 1615 quarto (also

---

[42] W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, pp. 120-121. Albert Feuillerat, The Composition of Shakespeare's Plays, p. 210, and C. A. Greer, "More About the Deposition Scene of Richard II," N&Q, CXVIII (February 10, 1953), 49-50, think that the scene was obtained in a legitimate way, explaining the Q_4 errors as being due to carelessness on the part of the printer. However, Black, A New Variorum, p. 370, points out that the errors in the Deposition scene of Q_4 are of unusually high proportions when compared to the errors in the rest of the text (one error every three and one half lines for the Deposition scene as compared to one error every nine lines for the rest of the play).

[43] Peter Ure (ed.), King Richard II, p. xv, fn. 1.

[44] Loc. cit. George Duthie, Elizabethan Shorthand and the First Quarto of King Lear, passim, describes Elizabethan shorthand.

[45] Griggs and Daniel, op. cit., p. xi.

[46] Loc. cit.

published by Law), having been printed from Q_4, has the same corrupt version of King Richard's deposition.[47]

Pollard lists the variants of all the quartos, showing the errors introduced by each new edition.[48] He sums up his findings in a concise table which indicates the relationship of all the editions including the folio.[49] Pollard's table is reproduced here with only slight modifications (for example, Pollard uses letters instead of numbers to designate the quartos):

	New Errors	First Corrected by					Left Uncorrected
		Q_2	Q_3	Q_4	Q_5	F_1	
Q_1	69	14	8½	2	0	24½	20
Q_2	123		3	1	2	58	59
Q_3	35			2	0	15	18
Q_4	18				1	14	3
Q_5	38					33	5

Pollard's table shows how errors were passed on from one

---

[47]There is a facsimile by E. W. Ashbee, Shakespeare's Richard the Second, Facsimiled From the Edition Printed at London in the Year 1615.

[48]Pollard, op. cit., pp. 39-51.

[49]Ibid., p. 51.

quarto to the next and how many of these errors ultimately reached the folio. Since 105 of the errors introduced by the quartos are left uncorrected in the folio, scholars think that at least one of the quartos was used in printing the folio. Also, in addition to one or more quartos, some other copy lies behind the folio edition.[50]

At one time, Chambers proposed that the folio was printed from all five quartos.[51] However, Craig explains that a collation of the five quartos, which would have been required to produce the reading given by the folio, would have been a tremendous undertaking, a work beyond what 1623 publishers and editors were inclined or willing to do.[52] Moreover, Chambers modifies his first contention and, thinks that the folio was probably printed from Q_5 or, possibly, from Q_3.[53] The traditional view is that Q_5 was the quarto source for the folio, because the folio repeats five of the

---

[50]W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, pp. 336-337.

[51]Sir E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, III, 484.

[52]Hardin Craig, A New Look at Shakespeare's Quartos, pp. 96-97.

[53]Sir E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, II, 350.

errors introduced by Q_5.[54] Pollard, the first to raise the idea that Q_3 might have been the copy behind the folio, thinks that the few errors of Q_4 and Q_5 repeated in the folio could have resulted from coincidence, because he discovers that the editors of the folio have corrected only about half of the errors of the first three quartos but miraculously have avoided all but an insignificant percentage of the errors first committed by the last two quartos.[55] Pollard ultimately rejects the hypothesis that Q_3 might have been the source, but his initial proposal has been revived by Hasker.[56] Hasker attempts to prove that a damaged copy of Q_3, with the last few leaves supplied from Q_5, served as the source for the folio.[57] Hasker's theory, though complex and unprovable, is fairly strong.[58] One

---

[54]Robert T. Petersson (ed.), The Tragedy of King Richard the Second, p. 154.

[55]Pollard, op. cit., pp. 51-52.

[56]Richard E. Hasker, "The Copy for the First Folio Richard II," Studies in Bibliography, V (1953), 53-72.

[57]Loc. cit.

[58]Pollard, op. cit., p. 89, considers the case for Q_3 only a little less strong than the generally accepted theory that Q_5 was the source. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 121, thinks that one cannot be certain which quarto was used.

doubts the final value of Hasker's detailed study, for, in regard to the editing of the play, it matters not in the slightest whether Q_3, Q_4, or Q_5 was the folio's quarto source. Where the folio differs from Q_1, an editor, to be absolutely certain, must check all the quartos to see if these differences are due to errors introduced by one of the later quartos. The first quarto is, of course, the most authoritative edition, but where differences between Q_1 and the folio are not due to the errors of later quartos, editors must consider the origin of these discrepancies.[59]

Greg lists three reasons proving that a source in addition to one of the quartos was utilized (directly or indirectly) in the printing of the folio: (1) the folio shows an extensive revision of Q_1's stage directions; (2) over 50 lines, found in all the quartos, are missing in the folio; (3) the folio corrects and restores some of the readings of Q_1, readings that had been corrupted by the later quartos.[60] Moreover, as already mentioned, the folio

---

[59]Fredson Bowers, On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists, pp. 33; 36; 55-56, discusses points pertaining to authority of quarto and folio texts.

[60]W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio, pp. 336-337. The restoration in the folio of some of the readings found in Q_1 but corrupted by later quartos does not

version of the Parliament scene was certainly derived from a source other than one of the quartos.

Stage direction can provide clues to the nature of the copy sources behind various editions of a play, and a comparison of the quarto and folio stage directions of Richard II yields conclusive evidence in regard to the copies used in the printing of this particular play.[61] One must use caution, but, in general, an author's stage directions are rather graphic, indefinite as to numbers and action (for example, "Enter four or five citizens," or "A song if you will,"); and, also, an author's directions are often insufficient.[62] Prompter's directions are usually more direct and consistent.[63] Greg contends that the stage directions of the quartos of Richard II " . . . are clearly

---

(continued) necessarily mean that Q_1 was a source for the folio, because there are many places where the folio repeats the errors of the later quartos. Cf. Pollard, op. cit., p. 89. It is likely that the editors of the folio relied, in part, on an MS originating from the MS copy used for Q_1, which fact would explain the sporadic folio restorations of some Q_1 readings.

[61] W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, pp. 158-159; 177-178.

[62] Ibid., pp. 36-37.

[63] Loc. cit.

the author's, and are full of graphic touches, while at the same time quite inadequate for production."[64] The folio, on the other hand, eliminates the quartos' inconsistencies in names and the superfluous titles; numbers of actors and necessary entrances have been added in the folio.[65] The evidence presented thus far strongly suggests that Q_1 was printed from an author's MS and that the folio editors used a quarto and some kind of a prompt copy for their edition. The large number of lines missing in the folio but found in all of the quartos seems to strengthen this theory.

The great omissions of the folio have been quoted ad infinitum by scholars, and authoritative editions of the play usually indicate where these omissions occur.[66] A few of the quarto lines not found in the folio are given, here, and the following quotations should be sufficient to indicate the nature of the absent lines, set off here by brackets.

---

[64] Ibid., pp. 177-178. Greg lists all the significant stage directions of the play in a comparative study of those directions found in the quartos and folio.

[65] Loc. cit.

[66] Pollard, op. cit., pp. 88-97, quotes all of these omissions. Malone's text indicates the omitted lines with brackets. Specifically, the major omissions are I.iii.129-33, 239-42, 268-94; II.ii.30-33; IV.i.52-59.

In the following sequence, Richard has just ordered a halt to the duel between Bolingbroke and Mowbray. Richard is speaking:

> Draw near
> And list what with our council we have
> done.
> For that our kingdom's earth should not
> be soil'd
> With that dear blood which it hath fostered;
> And for our eyes do hate the dire aspect
> Of civil wounds plough'd up with neighbour's
> sword;
> [And for we think the eagle-winged pride
> Of sky-aspiring and ambitious thoughts,
> With rival-hating envy, set on you
> To wake our peace, which in our country's
> cradle
> Draws the sweet infant breath of gentle
> sleep;]
> Which so roused up with boisterous untuned
> drums,
> With harsh-resounding trumpets dreadful bray,
> And grating shock of wrathful iron arms,
> Might from our quiet confines fright fair
> peace
> And make us wade even in our kindred's
> blood; (I.iii.123-38)

Malone thinks that the speech is rendered unintelligible by the omission of the folio: "'Which so rous'd up,' &c. are immediately connected with 'gentle sleep,' in the preceding line, and do not afford any meaning when connected with 'civil wounds,' above."[67] However, the passage can stand

---

[67]Malone, op. cit., XVI, 31, fn. 5.

with the folio's omission, the meaning being this: " . . . with neighbour's sword;/ Which so roused up . . . Might from our quiet confines fright fair peace." The complete passage as it stands in the quarto is confusing, for the meaning would be "To wake our peace, . . . / Which so roused up . . . / Might . . . fright fair peace . . . . "[68] Wilson has suggested that Shakespeare might have written lines 129-33 and lines 134-38 as alternate drafts, forgetting to delete the one he did not want to use.[69] Wright, however, has offered the simplest explanation, arguing that the omission in the folio probably is due to lines having been cut from an acting version for the purpose of avoiding confusion.[70]

Gaunt is speaking in the next example, regretting that his own judgment has helped to banish his son, Bolingbroke:

> Things sweet to taste prove in digestion
> sour.
> You urged me as a judge; but I had rather
> You would have bid me argue like a father.
> [O, had it been a stranger, not my child,
> To smooth his fault I should have been more
> mild:

---

[68]Ure, op. cit., p. 29.

[69]Wilson, op. cit., p. 141.

[70]Cited in John Munro (ed.), The London Shakespeare, III, 576.

A partial slander sought I to avoid,
And in the sentence my own life destroyed.]
Alas I look'd when some of you should say,
I was too strict to make mine own away;
But you gave leave to my unwilling tongue
Against my will to do myself this wrong.
(I.iii.236-46)

Alfred Hart thinks that the lines were omitted because they are repetitious.[71] Pollard notes that the passage is dramatically improved by the omission.[72] The rhyme and the figurative reference to Bolingbroke as a child might be considered an overplay of sentimentality.

In the sequence in which Bolingbroke and Gaunt lament the former's banishment, the folio omits 26 lines (I.iii. 268-94). These 26 lines are not absolutely necessary, and a few are bad metrically. Pollard thinks that these lines were probably cut from an acting version, because they would have been tedious to an audience.[73] The omitted lines repeat much of what has already been said, and, had the play not been preserved in quarto, it is doubtful if they would have been missed.

---

[71]Cited in Munro, ibid., p. 578.

[72]Pollard, op. cit., p. 92.

[73]Ibid., p. 93.

Another folio omission has to do with Richard's fear of his enemies. His favorites try to comfort him:

> Carlisle: Fear not, my lord: that Power
> that made you king
> Hath power to keep you King in spite of
> all.
> [The means that heaven yields must be
> embraced,
> And not neglected; else, if heaven would,
> And we will not, heavens offer we refuse,
> The proffer'd means of succour and redress.]
> Aumerle: He means, my Lord, that we are
> to remiss;
> Whilst Bolingbroke, through our security,
> Grows strong and great in substance and
> power. (III.ii.28-34)

The *if* of l. 31, though in none of the early editions, has been supplied by modern editors, and Malones thinks that *if* was accidentally left out of the quartos (the lines are obscure without the word).[74] The four omitted lines, perhaps, help also to clarify the meaning of Carlisle's speech. However, if these lines are left in the play, Aumerle's explaining to King Richard what Carlisle means seems to be an unnecessary gesture.

Chambers has suggested that the extensive omissions of the folio were " . . . due to a desire for shortening or the removal of obscurities."[75] One thinks, however, that

---

[74]Malone, op. cit., XVI, 93, fn. 4.

[75]Sir E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, II, 351.

the editors of the folio would never have cut so much from the play on their own volition--thus, they must have had some authority from a source independent of the quarto which they apparently used.

At any rate, it is possible to define the copies used for printing Q_1 and the folio. Greg believes that Q_1 was printed from the author's foul papers (rough draft), and, on this point, all noted scholars are in agreement with Greg.[76] There is also overwhelming agreement that a prompt copy incluenced the printing of the folio, but several ideas have been given in regard to how this influence was exercised. For example, Pollard thinks that a printed copy, Q_1, replaced the MS prompt copy and was annotated and used in the theatre accordingly.[77] Then, according to Pollard, the folio editors used a copy of Q_5, which they had taken to the theatre and had imperfectly corrected by means of the Q_1 prompt book.[78] Hasker, with a theory similar to

---

[76]W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, pp. 121; 177; 184. Wilson, op. cit., pp. 108-114. Griggs and Daniel, op. cit., p. xviii. Pollard, op. cit., pp. 96-98, thinks that the punctuation of Q_1 indicates that this quarto was printed from foul papers.

[77]Loc. cit.

[78]Loc. cit.

that of Pollard, thinks that the MS prompt copy became worn and was replaced by Q_3, which, after serving as the prompt copy, became a source for the folio.[79] However, Wilson points out that probably the MS prompt copy would have been the one inscribed with the censor's approval and, consequently, would have been carefully preserved.[80] Wilson concludes that a copy of Q_5, after it had been corrected by means of a prompt book MS, was the source from which the folio was printed.[81] Greg also believes that the corrections of the folio were supplied from a MS prompt copy.[82]

It is impossible to determine exactly how many copies of Richard II existed in MS. The copy that Shakespeare presented to the theatre may have been his rough draft or a transcript he himself made of the rough draft.[83] In any case, Wilson asserts that " . . . the appearance of a good dramatic text in print is prima facie evidence for the

---

[79]Hasker, op. cit., pp. 69-71

[80]Wilson, op. cit., pp. 110-114.

[81]Loc. cit.

[82]W. W. Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, p. 121. Ure, op. cit., p. xxv, agrees with Greg.

[83]Bowers, op. cit., pp. 14-16, gives evidence proving that authors sometimes recopied their first drafts before turning them over to the theatre.

existence of at least two manuscripts . . . ."[84] These are the MS that the author gives to the theatre, which is the copy that would eventually be given to the printer, and the prompt book made from the author's copy and retained by the theatre.[85] The two copies described by Wilson would have geen authoritative enough to have served as sources for Q_1 and the folio. Additional MS copies are possibilities: for example, scribal transcripts of foul papers, of fair copy, or of the prompt book, made for private individuals.[86] However, additional copies would not have given the quartos or folio any more authority, unless, possibly, the folio was printed from a transcript of the prompt book, the transcript having been revised by Shakespeare. Yet, there is no evidence to show that there was such a revision. Not a great deal is known for certain about the play's acting history, but it seems that the popularity of Richard II was about average for a play in Elizabethan times.[87] Consequently, one may be fairly certain that the prompt

---

[84]Wilson, op. cit., pp. 108-109.

[85]Loc. cit.

[86]Bowers, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

[87]Matthew Black, A New Variorum, pp. 564-565.

copy, assumed to be a source for the folio, underwent some revision every time the play was performed. One must agree with Wilson's theory that, except for the Deposition scene, an editor of the play should follow Q_1 as closely as possible.[88] However, one cannot lightly dismiss the authority of the folio, for Shakespeare may have approved of or even have suggested some of the readings to be found there.[89] Generally speaking, the folio does not differ from Q_1 to the extent that would make the former a wholly bad text. For the most part, the folio represents what Shakespeare wrote as does the quarto.

B. Jack Straw

The textual history of Jack Straw is much less complex than that of Richard II. Jack Straw was entered in the Stationers' Register in 1593 for John Danter as follows:

> 23° Die Octobris./.
>
> John Danter./. Entered for his Copie vnder th[e h]ands of bothe the wardens an enterlude of the

---

[88] Wilson, op. cit., pp. 133-114. Cf. Feuillerat, op. cit., pp. 228-229.

[89] Henry Newbolt (ed.), The Life and Death of King Richard II, pp. xlvii-xlviii.

lyfe and death of JACK
STRAWE . . vjd[90]

It appears that Danter published Jack Straw around the turn of the year, because the title page of his edition bears the year of 1593, while the colophon has 1594.[91] The British Museum now has one copy of Danter's quarto; and the Bute copy, the only other existing copy of this first edition, is presently in the National Library of Scotland.[92] These two copies, as is the case with the Richard II quartos, exhibit a few variant readings that are due to corrections made during the process of printing, and Muir has listed these variants.[93] In all, there are only eight variant readings, none of which is very important, for they are simply the result of spelling corrections and of missing

---

[90]Arber, op. cit., II, 302. H. R. Plomer, "The Printers of Shakespeare's Plays and Poems," Library, 2nd Series, VII (1906), 152-153, attacks the integrity of the printer and publisher, Danter, who has been suspected of piracy, mainly because he published the so-called bad quarto (Q_1) of Romeo and Juliet. However, Kirschbaum, op. cit., pp. 296-299, defends Danter and points out that, although action was taken against this publisher by the Stationers' Company, the man was never severely punished or restricted in his trade.

[91]Kenneth Muir (ed.), The Life and Death of Jack Straw, p. v.

[92]Loc. cit.

[93]Ibid., p. vii.

letters because of loose type (the Bute copy has the corrected reading in two instances, while the BM copy shows the corrections for the other six variants).[94]

Danter's copyright was transferred to Thomas Pavier in 1600, as shown in the Stationers' Register:

14 Augusti

Thomas Pavyer — Entered for his Copyes by Direction of Master white Warden vnder his hand writinge. These Copies followinge beinge thinges formerlye printed and sett over to the sayd Thomas Pavyer.
An Interlude of JACK STRAWE
. . . . vjd.[95]

Pavier published the second edition of Jack Straw in 1604, and three copies are in existence: one is at the Bodleian Library, another, at the Huntington Library, and the third, in the National Library of Scotland.[96] Muir has pointed out that Q_2 of Jack Straw is a poorly done reprint of Q_1 without any textual value.[97] It is known that Pavier had

---

[94]Loc. cit.

[95]Arber, op. cit., III, 63-63a. There are fourteen items entered for Pavier, including The Spanish Tragedy and Henry V.

[96]Kenneth Muir (ed.), The Life and Death of Jack Straw, p. v.

[97]Loc. cit.

dire problems as a publisher.[98] Hazlitt produced a modern edition of Jack Straw, published in 1874.[99] Schütt's edition was published in 1901.[100] Farmer issued a facsimile of the BM copy in 1911.[101] Muir's edition is a facsimile printed from photostats of the BM copy collated with photostats of the Bute copy.[102]

Muir's introduction to his edition of the play represents the brief extent to which textual studies of this work have been pursued.[103] Perhaps, because the play is short and of rather poor literary quality, the trouble has never been taken to determine and define the kind of copy from which Danter printed the work. Yet, it seems like a

---

[98]Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, pp. 131-132, points out that it was Pavier who, in 1619, made an abortive attempt to publish a quarto collection of Shakespeare's plays and entangled himself in great difficulties by printing from bad quartos, falsely attributing works to Shakespeare, and by printing plays the copyright of which was held by some other publisher.

[99]W. Carew Hazlitt (ed.), The Life and Death of Jack Straw, in Robert Dodsley (ed.), A Select Collection of Old English Plays, III-IV, 376-414.

[100]Hugo Schütt (ed.), The Life and Death of Jack Straw.

[101]J. S. Farmer (ed.), The Life and Death of Jack Straw.

[102]Kenneth Muir (ed.), The Life and Death of Jack Straw, pp. v-vi.

[103]Ibid., pp. v-ix.

fairly simple task to identify Danter's copy source. The stage directions of his edition are very definitely the kind that would have occurred in an author's rough draft, rather than those usually found in a prompt copy.[104] It is obvious that Danter was trying to extend his edition: he used blank pages, generous leading, centered speech headings, and profuse ornamentation in order to fill out the five sheets that he used for the quarto.[105] Consequently, Danter very probably would have included every stage direction found in his MS source, for he wanted to make the play reasonably long enough for publication. If he had used a prompt copy, one could expect the quarto to have stage directions which would suffice for production on the stage. Yet, a study shows that the stage directions of this play would have been nowhere near adequate for acting purposes (See Appendix A, p. 143 for a complete study of the stage directions of Jack Straw and for all the conclusions drawn here about these directions). Early in the

---

[104]See Greg, The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare, pp. 36-38; 120-121; 177, for a description of stage directions. Also, p. 27 above.

[105]Kenneth Muir (ed.), The Life and Death of Jack Straw, p. v.

play (I.i.30-38), Jack is threatened by some gesture or assault on the part of a tax collector. Jack, in turn, kills the collector, but the means he used to slay the collector are revealed only in the text of the play and seven lines after the action takes place: "Alas Wat, I haue kild the kings officer in striking rashly." In fact, the whole sequence of action just described is not accompanied by a single stage direction. Moreover, for seven significant events, the stage directions would have been quite inadequate to remind a prompter when or how certain action was to take place (See Appendix A, p. 143 for the following lines: I.iii.289; II.i.487-89; III.ii.792-97, 877, 922-23, 950-51). Entrance directions are lacking no less than twelve times. Exit directions are missing in a few instances, and, occasionally, Exeunt is used for Exit, an error probably due to either the printer or author, but doubtfully to a prompter. Finally, names of characters are inconsistent, and superfluous titles are used, which evidence points to an author's copy as a source rather than a prompt book.

Hazlitt calls Jack Straw a " . . . not ill-written drama . . . . " and thinks it might be the early work of some later to be distinguished dramatist, because the work

shows signs of carelessness and inexperience.[106] In II and III, for example, the stage directions (II.iv.285-86, III.i.682-83) mark the entrances of several important characters who do not speak, a fact which seems to indicate that the dramatist failed, somewhat, to develop his material. Fleay ascribes the play to Peele on the basis of style.[107] Schütt strongly agrees with Fleay and gives several supporting pages of parallels between Jack Straw and the works of Peele.[108] However, Schütt's evidence is weak and inconclusive. Moreover, Muir points out that the poetry of Jack Straw is far worse than anything Peele is known ever to have written.[109] Nothing is known about the play's possible stage history or about the company with which this drama may have been associated.[110] Possibly, the play was never acted, and, in order to salvage what he could for his work,

---

[106]Hazlitt, op. cit., III-IV, 376.

[107]Frederick G. Fleay, A Chronicle History of the London Stage 1559-1642, p. 89.

[108]Schütt, op. cit., pp. 30-42.

[109]Kenneth Muir (ed.), The Life and Death of Jack Straw, p. v.

[110]Alfred Harbage, The Annals of English Drama 975-1700, pp. 56-57.

the author might have sold his copy to Danter for publication.

The following conclusions may be drawn about the existing text of Jack Straw: (1) it represents an author's rough draft, and, very possibly, his first draft; (2) there are no real indications of a prompter's hand in the stage directions; (3) there are signs of poor development and inconsistencies in the play, and these weaknesses are due either to inexperience or haste (or both) on the part of the author. Finally, the play merits textual study, because it reveals a knowledge about Elizabethan printing and copy sources.

C. Woodstock

Prior to the last century, Woodstock existed only in MS and, consequently, presents today textual problems different from those of Richard II or Jack Straw. Frijlinck calls her edition of the MS play The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second or Thomas of Woodstock (no title appears on the original).[111] It is convenient to keep

---

[111]Wilhelmina P. Frijlinck (ed.), The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second or Thomas of Woodstock, p. v.

in mind this cumbersome title, which encompasses, more or less, all other titles assigned to the play by various editors and critics. Chambers uses the title 1 Richard II.[112] Boas names the work Thomas of Woodstock, since the Duke of Gloucester, Thomas of Woodstock, is the protagonist in the drama.[113] Rossiter shortens Boas's title to Woodstock.[114]

There are fifteen plays in the BM Egerton MS 1994 of which Woodstock is the eighth.[115] The history behind the Egerton MS 1994 is a mystery. Sir George Warner, once of the MSS Department of the British Museum, had one theory concerning the Egerton MS, believing that the actor, William Cartwright, Jr., had this MS and gave it to Dulwich College, whence Edmond Malone borrowed the folio and lent it to his friend, Lord Charlemont, who never returned it.[116] Finally,

---

[112]Sir E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 42.

[113]Frederick S. Boas, Shakespeare & the Universities, p. 143.

[114]A. P. Rossiter (ed.), Woodstock: A Moral History, p. 2.

[115]Boas, op. cit., p. 144.

[116]A. H. Bullen (ed.), A Collection of Old English Plays, I, 417. Boas, op. cit., p. 97.

the Egerton MS 1994, containing 349 leaves, was purchased for £33 by the British Museum when Lord Charlemont's library was sold on August 6, 1865.[117] William Cartwright, Jr. and his father acted with some of the performers whose names are present in the margins of a number of plays found in the Egerton MS; and, because the younger Cartwright was a bookseller as well as an actor and would have had an interest in MSS, some weight is given to Warner's theory.[118] Moreover, it is also quite certain that William Cartwright, Jr. gave a number of MSS to Dulwich College around the close of the seventeenth century.[119] Warner's theory faces one significant objection: Malone, who is believed to have lent the MS to Lord Charlemont, was, of course, a meticulous scholar. It seems strange, then, that he would have let such an important document slip through his hands without calling attention to it.[120] The credit for pointing out the importance of the Egerton MS, Boas feels, must be

---

[117]Bullen, op. cit., I, 417.

[118]Boas, op. cit., p. 108.

[119]Bullen, op. cit., I. 417.

[120]Ibid., I. 418.

accorded to Bullen, who has printed five plays from this valuable collection.[121]

There are five editions of Woodstock. Halliwell printed eleven copies of the play in 1870 and entitled it A Tragedy of Richard the Second, concluding with the murder of the Duke of Gloucester at Calis. A composition anterior to Shakespeare's tragedy.[122] Halliwell's edition retains original spelling and punctuation but is inaccurate regarding the interpretation of many words, and it is inaccessible.[123] Keller also has edited Woodstock; his work was published in the yearbook of the German Shakespeare Society in 1899.[124] Keller has included an explanatory introduction and entitled the drama Richard II. Erster Teil. Ein Drama aus Shakespeares Zeit.[125] Rossiter points out that Keller's text keeps to the original words fairly well, but is punctuated on an academic system which adapts itself

---

[121]Boas, op. cit., p. 96.

[122]Cited in Frijlinck, op. cit., p. xxx.

[123]Rossiter, op. cit., p. 170.

[124]Wolfgang Keller (ed.), "Richard II. Erster Teil. Ein Drama aus Shakespeares Zeit," Shakespeare Jahrbuch, XXXV (1899), 3-121.

[125]Loc. cit.

poorly to an Elizabethan text and, consequently, often misrepresents the meaning.[126] Carpenter has seen fit, therefore, to make quite a number of corrections on Keller's edition.[127] In 1929, the Malone Society published Frijlinck's typescript edition with an extensive introduction, thoroughly accounting for the Woodstock MS and its condition.[128] However, Frijlinck's text is designed primarily for textual scholars.[129] Rossiter provides the first modern text of the play and follows the original whenever possible, supplementing it with textual notes to indicate his emendations.[130] Armstrong bases his edition on Rossiter's text but claims to have employed a more modern system of punctuation.[131] Hence, for the general reader, Armstrong's edition results in an excellent text. However,

---

[126]Rossiter, op. cit., p. 170.

[127]Frederic I. Carpenter, "Notes on the Anonymous 'Richard II'," JEGP, III (February, 1900), 138-142.

[128]Frijlinck, op. cit., pp. v-xxvi; 1-101.

[129]Rossiter, op. cit., pp. 170-171.

[130]Ibid., p. 171.

[131]William A. Armstrong (ed.), Elizabethan History Plays, p. xv.

Rossiter's work has the advantage of extensive notes affixed to nearly every passage.

The Woodstock MS has no title page, and Chambers believes that there is only one page (containing a few lines) that is missing from the end.[132] On the other hand, Rossiter argues that more than one page is missing.[133] However, scholars agree that the scenes depicting the deposition and murder of King Richard were never part of this play, because the character, Bolingbroke, is completely absent from the drama, even though this man had, in fact, several deep involvements with Thomas of Woodstock.[134] It seems unlikely that an Elizabethan dramatist would portray the removal of one king without introducing beforehand his successor. Therefore, Boas concludes that the MS is complete enough for critical study and agrees with Chambers that the first and last leaves are probably the only ones that have been lost.[135]

---

[132]Sir E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 42-43.

[133]Rossiter, op. cit., p. 27.

[134]Geoffrey Bullough, Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, III, 359-360.

[135]Boas, op. cit., p. 144.

A complex textual problem is introduced in the MS wherein are to be found nine hands apparently distinct from one another and, similarly, eleven inks which are seemingly distinguishable. The following chart summarizes the information contained in a number of charts made by Frijlinck, whose lettering and numbering are retained, here, for reference purposes:

Hand	Ink	How the Ink Was Used
The scribe has used:	S_1	for the body of the text
	I	for most of the speaker's names
	II	for a few corrections
	VII	for deletions
A has used:	VII	for a few names and the correction of a few names
	VIII	for one stage direction
	IX	for speaker's names and marginal directions
	X	for one stage direction
B has used:	VII	for a few speaker's names
C has used:	VI	for numbering four of the acts
D has used:	I	for corrections, prompt notes, and the filling in of a line left blank by the scribe
	VII	for prompt notes
E has used:	II	for prompt notes

Hand	Ink	How the Ink Was Used
F has used:	IV	for marginal entry (actor's name?), stage directions, and deletions
	V	(may be the same ink as IV) for prompt notes
G has used:	III	for prompt notes
	VII	also for prompt notes
H has used:	II or III	for prompt notes[136]

It should be noted that possibly A, B, D, E, G, and H have all used at least one ink which the scribe has also used. Considering that five or six men might have used a common ink along with the scribe, one might conclude that the scribe may have had a considerable amount of assistance in revising the MS. On the basis that the MS appears to have been extensively revised after the main part of the text had been written, and in light of the possibility that much of the revision by different hands is contained in the same ink which the scribe used, Rossiter proposes that the scribe was actually the author assisted by a team of revisers.[137]

---

[136]Frijlinck, op. cit., pp. vi-xxii. Rossiter, op. cit., pp. 171-174, is in general agreement with Frijlinck regarding the information presented in this chart.

[137]Loc. cit.

He admits, however, that his theory is only a tentative one and rather complex.[138] Frijlinck, although she thinks that two or three revisers, certainly A and B, worked closely with the scribe, believes that the nature of the corrections and the faulty line division identify the text as the work of a copyist.[139] Moreover, she concedes that statements as to whether or not two passages are in the same ink (or by the same hand) must be based, at times, on mere speculation.[140] A chemical test, Rossiter insists, would be required to determine decisively the similarity or difference of some of the ink tints.[141] Furthermore, one must keep in mind that the labeling of the inks (as in the chart) rests only on the basis of appearance.[142] In some instances, Frijlinck's identification of the inks seems improbable. For example, she observes that the prompt note, "Shrevs Ready," (IV.ii.216) is by hand D in ink VII, one of the inks also used by the scribe.[143] Is it very likely that a prompter

---

[138] Ibid., p. 174.

[139] Frijinck, op. cit., pp. vi-vii; xv-xvi.

[140] Ibid., pp. xi; xiv.

[141] Rossiter, op. cit., p. 174.

[142] Frijlinck, op. cit., p. xi.

[143] Ibid., p. xviii.

at the time of rehearsal would have used the same ink as the copyist? There are numerous entries comparable to this one, and all are obviously the work of a prompter.[144]

Three marginal entries in the Woodstock MS seem to be actors' names: these are "G.ad," with the second letter unreadable (I.i.124), "George" (III.ii.109), and "Toby" (IV.ii.95). Boas believes that the same actors' names can be read in Woodstock, The Captives, The Two Noble Ladies, and Edmond Ironside, plays contained in the Egerton MS 1994, which discovery would imply that these four works were played by the same company.[145] The Norwich List contains the names of actors of the King's Revels Company, a group that visited Norwich in 1635 and were refused leave to play.[146] It is known that George Stutfield definitely performed in The Two Noble Ladies and Edmond Ironside, and Boas identifies the "George" of Woodstock as Stutfield.[147] Since Stutfield is on the Norwich List, one assumes, as

---

[144]Ibid., p. xv.

[145]Boas, op. cit., pp. 102-103.

[146]John T. Murray, English Dramatic Companies, pp. 279-280.

[147]Boas, op. cit., p. 106.

well, that he was a member of the King's Revels Company.[148] Chambers, however, contends that to identify the George of Woodstock as Stutfield is taking too much for granted.[149] Frijlinck agrees with Chambers and further points out that the George of Woodstock might just as easily have been George Willans, whose name also appears on the Norwich List.[150] Bently thinks that it is impossible for one to identify "George" in Woodstock.[151]

Boas, pursuing his theory of the interlacing of names in the four MSS previously mentioned, thinks "G.ad" of Woodstock to be Henry Gradell, who is clearly identified Edmond Ironside.[152] Nevertheless, Frijlinck finds Boas's evidence lacking, since "G.ad" might be Christopher Goad.[153] Bently thinks that Goad, who appeared as a Queen Henrietta's man in The Friar Maid of the West and had a fairly important

---

[148]Murray, op. cit., p. 279.

[149]Sir E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 43.

[150]Frijlinck, op. cit., p. xxix.

[151]Gerald E. Bently, The Jacobean and Caroline Stage, II, 441.

[152]Boas, op. cit., p. 104.

[153]Frijlinck, op. cit., p. xxix.

role in Messalina of the King's Revels Company, also might have had an acting part in Woodstock.[154] "Toby" in Woodstock, Boas suggests is Edward Toby, an actor associated with the Children of late Queen Anne.[155] Frijlinck accepts Boas's identification of Toby in the MS, since the Children of the late Queen Anne performed during 1623-1627 throughout the provinces, and Woodstock might have been acted in a provincial performance during this period.[156]

This information links Woodstock with either the King's Revels or the Children of the late Queen Anne. However, Chambers thinks that the relationship of Woodstock to Shakespeare's Richard II is strong and, consequently, believes that the anonymous work might easily have become a Chamberlain's play, thus probably preventing its getting into the hands of either of the Revels companies mentioned above.[157] For that matter, he argues that any company might have had a George or a Toby.[158] Fleay assigns

---

[154]Bently, op. cit., II, 444.

[155]Boas, op. cit., p. 104.

[156]Frijlinck, op. cit., p. xxviii.

[157]Sir E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 43.

[158]Loc. cit.

Woodstock to the Queen's Men, but gives no reason for doing so.[159] Schelling thinks that to identify the play with the Queen's Men is a guess that is as good as any.[160] Obviously, not enough evidence exists with which to determine with any certainty the ownership of Woodstock.

Little has been written on the subject of the authorship of Woodstock. Carpenter thinks that the play is good enough to be the work of any playwright of the period, with the exception of Shakespeare or Marlowe.[161] Since the style does not seem to him to be that of either Greene or Peele, he wonders of Nashe or Lodge are possibilities.[162] All of the plays in the Egerton MS were anonymous, but the authors of some have since been identified either through a study of the initials found on the MSS or through style.[163] However, Keller thinks that any guess concerning who wrote Woodstock is without value.[164] The lost first page of the

---

[159]Frederick G. Fleay, A Biographical Chronicle of the English Printed Drama 1559-1642, II, 320.

[160]Felix E. Schelling, The Elizabethan Chronicle Play, p. 108.

[161]Carpenter, op. cit., p. 139.

[162]Loc. cit.

[163]Boas, op. cit., p. 98.

[164]Keller, op. cit., p. 42.

MS or a wrapper of some kind may indeed have shown a title and, though quite unlikely, indicated authorship or ownership.[165] Rossiter, on the basis of the play itself, attempts to sketch some of the unknown author's characteristics and arrives at the following picture: the dramatist had a broad view of history, some knowledge of the chronicles, a knowledge of law and of the royal court, a sense of humor, an interest in the common man, and an appreciation for the dramatic value to be extracted from a situation; he knew how to write prose and organize a plot, but was only a mediocre poet.[166] However, Rossiter admits that all of his own attempts to associate this anonymous writer with known plays and dramatists of the period have so far failed.[167]

---

[165]Frijlinck, op. cit., p. v.

[166]Rossiter, op. cit., pp. 71-72.

[167]Ibid., p. 72.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL SOURCES: THE CHRONICLES

Elizabethan dramatists had at their disposal an extremely large amount of historical material concerned with the reign of Richard II. Scholars have pointed to nine chronicles, three French and six English, as possible sources for the three plays, Richard II, Jack Straw, and Woodstock.[168] The three French chroniclers are Jean Froissart, Jean Créton, and an anonymous writer, whose account is preserved in MS.[169] Raphael Holinshed, Edward Hall, Richard Grafton, John Stow, and Robert Fabyan wrote

---

[168]Black, A New Variorum, pp. 405-505, lists the suggested sources of Richard II, including a lengthy discussion of each source. Schütt, op. cit., pp. 8-29, attempts to trace the sources for Jack Straw. Rossiter, op. cit., pp. 339-352, deals extensively with the sources for Woodstock. R. M. Smith, Froissart and the English Chronicle Play, pp. 101-157, provides a comprehensive account of the sources for both of the anonymous plays.

[169]Kervyn de Lettenhove (ed.), Oeures de Froissart. Jean Créton, "Histoire du Roy d'Angleterre Richard," Archaeologia, XX (1924), 182-378. Benjamin Williams (ed. and tr.), Cronicque de la Traïson et Mort de Richart Deux Roy Dengle-terre. This anonymous chronicle is usually referred to simply as Traïson, and two copies of it are extant. Petersson, op. cit., p. 158, and other scholars think that Créton's work and Traïson might be the same account. Also, Black, A New Variorum, p. 471.

the English histories which Shakespeare and his contemporaries might have referred to in writing their plays,[170] The chronicle of John Bourchier (Lord Berners) is an English translation of Froissart's work and a highly significant source for the plays under investigation.[171] With the exceptions of Créton and the author of Traïson, all the historians named above borrowed a great amount from Froissart's massive work.[172] Consequently, the dramatists who made use of the chronicles are usually found to owe a considerable debt to Froissart.

Because of the fact that the later chroniclers often used the accounts of their predecessors and sometimes quoted

---

[170]Henry Ellis (ed.), Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland. Edward Hall, The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre and York. The relevant material from Hall on Richard's reign is quoted in Bullough, op. cit., III, 383-387. Richard Grafton, A Chronicle at Large and Meere History of the Affayres of England; and Kinges of the Same. John Stow, The Annales of England, From the First Inhabitants Untill 1592. Robert Fabyan, The New Chronicles of England and France. See Bullough, op. cit., III, 500, for listings of early historical works.

[171]G. C. Macaulay (ed.), and Lord Berners (tr.), The Chronicles of Froissart. See Smith, op. cit., pp. 14-16, for a discussion of the importance of Berner's translation.

[172]Ibid., pp. 58-59, passim.

directly from the earlier works, the problem of determining exactly which chronicles a dramatist might have used is complex.[173] Fortunately, one can trace Jack Straw to its historical sources with little difficulty, and, consequently, this play provides a good example for a study of the chronicles as dramatic sources. Schütt selects passages from the drama and quotes parallels from the chronicles of Holinshed, Grafton, and Stow.[174] However, Smith points out that similarities between Jack Straw and Holinshed's account are probably accidental (because the dramatist and the historian borrowed from the same sources) and thinks that there is no need to cite Holinshed as does Schütt.[175] He argues that Grafton and Stow provide all the material necessary for the play as it stands, while Holinshed's chronicle lacks some requisite passages.[176] It is, of course, possible that the anonymous playwright first

---

[173]Smith provides a thorough account of the background, content, and relationship of the various chronicles, ibid., pp. 3-58; cf. pp. 58-59 for his table showing how some chronicles are sources for others.

[174]Schütt, op. cit., pp. 8-29.

[175]Smith, op. cit., p. 102.

[176]Ibid., pp. 102-103.

consulted Holinshed's chronicle, later filling in with additional information taken from the works of Grafton and Stow. However, since they play parallels the chronicles of Grafton and Stow more closely than it does Holinshed's, for practical purposes, there is no reason for one to assume that the playwright used Holinshed's account at all.[177] One can, however, be confident that the dramatist did consult the works of Grafton and Stow. For example, the following lines from the play are also found in Stow's Annales, but nowhere else: "But when Adam deleued, and Eue span, / Who was then a Gentleman" (Jack Straw, I.i.82-83).[178] There are also conclusive parallels between the play and Grafton's chronicle. For example, Grafton states, "And there were no mo here but thou and I, thou durst not demaund any such things of me . . . . "[179] The play reads, "Proud Rebel wert

---

[177]Cf. Smith's parallels. Smith quotes directly from the chronicles and italicizes the words or sentences which verbally match words and sentences in the play. Smith's parallels are strong, and his conclusion that Grafton was the main source and Stow the minor source is convincingly sound, ibid., pp. 103-114.

[178]Cf. Stow, op. cit., p. 294. Quoted in Smith, ibid., p. 105.

[179]Grafton, op. cit., I, 421. Quoted in Smith, ibid., p. 112.

but thou and I alone, / Thou durst not aske it thus boldly, at my hands" (III.i.929-30). Since it is certain that the anonymous dramatist read the chronicles of Grafton and Stow, which reading would have sufficed him for the writing of the play, and owing to the carelessness and haste ascribed to this playwright, it seems unlikely that he would have consulted additional and unnecessary chronicles.

Richard II, if only historical sources are considered, presents a much more intricate source problem than Jack Straw.[180] Disregarding for the moment the possibility that Richard II might have been based on an older play now lost, one may consider the chronicle sources that exist.[181] Even if Richard II represents a revision of an old play, it is necessary for one to consider historical and other sources to establish some idea as to how the dramatist (whether

---

[180]Scholars have noted that the source material for Richard II is greater in quantity and more diverse than for any other play of the period. Matthew Black, "The Sources of Shakespeare's Richard II," Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies, pp. 210-211 (hereafter, cited as Memorial Studies); Kenneth Muir, "Source Problems in the Histories," Shakespeare Jahrbuch, XCVI (1960), 51.

[181]Wilson, op. cit., pp. lxiv-lxxv, proposes that Richard II might have been based on an old play written by the author of The Troublesome Reign of King John. The old play theory is discussed in Chapter III.

Shakespeare or an earlier writer) made use of these sources. The list of suggested historical sources for Richard II includes Traïson and the chronicles of Créton, Holinshed, Hall, and Froissart (very probably Berners's translation).[182]

It is known that Shakespeare made use of Holinshed's chronicle in the writing of several of his plays, and scholars are in agreement that this chronicle served as a main source for Richard II.[183] Black estimates that it would require, at the very most, six hours to read all of the basic material on Richard II in Holinshed's chronicle, which reading Shakespeare might have done.[184] Black also points out that the marginal summaries provided in the chronicle facilitate skimming, and he notes that one could have obtained much of the material for the play from the

---

[182]Matthew Black, "The Sources for Shakespeare's Richard II," Memorial Studies, pp. 210-211.

[183]Ibid., p. 211. Cf. Morris L. Arnold, The Soliloquies of Shakespeare, p. 29; A. L. Attwater, "Shakespeare's Sources," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies, p. 229; H. B. Charlton, Shakespeare, Politics and Politicians, pp. 42-44; B. J. Fletcher, "Use of Holinshed in Richard III, Richard II, Henry IV, and Macbeth," an unpublished doctoral dissertation. Fletcher is cited in Matthew Black, A New Variorum, pp. 446-447.

[184]Matthew Black, "The Sources of Shakespeare's Richard II," Memorial Studies, pp. 212-213.

marginal entries without having read all of the text.[185] Law lists all the events of the play that the dramatist definitely extracted from Holinshed's account, and one thinks it is apparent that very little of the play is independent of that chronicle.[186] Perhaps, the most convenient approach to a source study of Richard II is a negative one. Munro lists the events of the play for which the material apparently was not supplied by Holinshed's chronicle as follows: (1) incidents of the gardener, mirror, and groom (III.iv; IV.i; V.v); (2) Gaunt's deathbed scene (II.i); (3) York's reaction to Aumerele's treason (V.ii-iii); (4) development of the parting scene between Richard and Isabel (V.i); (5) Henry's sorrow over Richard's body (V.vi).[187] Ure also mentions that Gaunt's meeting with the Dutchess of Gloucester is not covered by Holinshed (I.ii).[188] One proposes that some of these incidents may be Shakespeare's own inventions, while others seem to have definite sources.

---

[185]Loc. cit.

[186]Robert A. Law, "Deviations from Holinshed in Richard II," Texas University Studies in English, XXIX (1950), 92-93.

[187]Munro, op. cit., III, 556.

[188]Ure, op. cit., pp. xxxii-xxxiii.

Bullough is convinced that Shakespeare made some use of Hall's chronicle in writing Richard II.[189] Kingsford thinks that the portrayal of Richard's fall as being due to frailty rather than malice is a protrait that was passed on by Hall to Holinshed, and thence, to Shakespeare.[190] Because Holinshed has drawn so much verbatim material from Hall's chronicle, Wilson doubts that Shakespeare used the earlier work as a direct source for Richard II, except for the scenes relating to Aumerle's treason (V.ii-iii).[191] Hall's account, like the play, is more lively and developed and, thus, appears to be the source for these scenes.[192] Wilson thinks that Shakespeare's characterization of Richard might have come from Hall, and he also notes that Hall and Shakespeare begin exactly at the same point in Richard's reign.[193] Zeeveld has pointed out that Hall's

---

[189]Bullough, op. cit., III, 362.

[190]C. L. Kingsford, Prejudice and Promise in Fifteenth Century England, p. 5.

[191]Wilson, op. cit., p. liii.

[192]W. Gordon Zeeveld, "The Influence of Hall on Shakespeare's English Historical Plays," ELH, III (1936), 327-328. Zeeveld records the treason sequence from both Holinshed and Hall.

[193]Wilson, op. cit., p. liii.

purpose was to show the evils wrought upon England by one single act, that is, by Bolingbroke's unlawfull usurpation of the crown.[194] Moreover, Zeeveld suggests that the prophecies of doom expressed by Richard and Carlisle (III.iii.95-100; IV.i.135-49) have the same purpose as the theme presented by Hall.[195] Zeeveld points out many parallels between Hall's chronicle and Shakespeare's history plays, and, although some of his parallels are weak, he convinces one that Shakespeare had read Hall's work at one time or another.[196] Perhaps, his most convincing argument for Hall as a source for Richard II is the one in which he suggests that Hall is " . . . the sole authority that Richard had no small trust in Welshmen" (Richard II, II.iv.4; III.ii.73-77).[197]

As a source for the play, the case for Berners's translation of Froissart's chronicle is similar to the one advanced for Hall's account, and only slightly less

---

[194]Zeeveld, op. cit., p. 318.

[195]Ibid., pp. 347-348. For additional discussion of Hall's theme and his moralizing on history, see E. M. W. Tillyard, Shakespeare's History Plays, pp. 42-49.

[196]Zeeveld, op. cit., pp. 319-327.

[197]Ibid., p. 333.

convincing. Tillyard thinks " . . . it is scarcely conceivable that Shakespeare should not have read so famous a book as Berners's Froissart . . . ."[198] On the other hand, Ure points out that Berners's Froissart and Richard II have no verbal similarities.[199] Bullough feels that a few possible parallels between the chronicle and the play are weak and is inclined to conclude that Shakespeare, if he used Berners's Froissart at all, did so only in a general way.[200] Perhaps, Shakespeare's characterization of Gaunt as a wise and gentle individual comes from Froissart, since Holinshed describes Gaunt as an unsavory character.[201] Law thinks that Shakespeare may have received hints for the deathbed scene of Gaunt from Berners's Froissart, but he also notes that the development of this scene is much more extended in the play and probably belongs wholly to the dramatist.[202]

---

[198]Tillyard, op. cit., p. 253. Black, "The Sources of Shakespeare's Richard II," Memorial Studies, p. 213, also suggests that Berners's translation of Froissart's chronicle was part of Shakespeare's general reading.

[199]Ure, op. cit., pp. xxxvi-xxxvii.

[200]Bullough, op. cit., III, 367-369.

[201]Ure, op. cit., p. xxxv.

[202]Law, op. cit., pp. 94-95.

Reyher suggests that two minor French chronicles, Traïson and that of Créton, may have been Shakespeare's sources for Richard II.[203] Ure, however, doubts the strength of any verbal parallels between the play and these histories.[204] Nevertheless, Muir points out, that although the parallels are weak, Créton's work and Traïson were fairly accessible in Shakespeare's day and, moreover, explains that Shakespeare's comparison of Richard's suffering to Christ's travails (IV.i.238-242) is a portrait found in no other place except in Traïson and in Créton's history.[205] Muir concludes that there is a strong probability that Shakespeare was acquainted with the work of Créton and Traïson.[206]

In summary, scholars are certain that Shakespeare consulted Holinshed's chronicle in writing Richard II. One may also assume that Shakespeare was familiar with Hall's

---

[203]Paul Reyher, "Notes sur les Sources de Richard II," Revue de l'Enseignement des Langues Vivantes, XLI (1924), 158-168.

[204]Ure, op. cit., pp. xlv-xlix.

[205]Kenneth Muir, "Source Problems in the Histories," Shakespeare Jahrbuch, XCVI (1960), 55-59.

[206]Ibid., p. 59.

work and, probably, acquainted with Traïson, Créton's history, and Froissart's chronicle (either in the original or in Berners's translation). Grafton may be dismissed as a source for the play, inasmuch as his history is little more than a reprint of Hall's work, and Grafton's revision is undetectable in the play.[207]

There is one noteworthy similarity in the way the material of history is handled in Jack Straw and in Richard II. Both the anonymous playwright and Shakespeare follow their chronicle sources with a fairly high degree of accuracy. In the case of Jack Straw, the author has omitted some minor characters and action. Also, he has ascribed certain actions to Jack, which properly belonged to Wat Tyler (and vice versa). However, one notes that the names of Wat and Jack are often confused in the chronicles, so that one can hardly expect the dramatist to have known which of these two men was responsible for any particular action.[208] Richard II is also a relatively accurate representation of history, since Shakespeare has altered chronology only slightly and has omitted a few events (for example,

---

[207]Zeeveld, op. cit., pp. 318-319.

[208]Smith, op. cit., p. 103.

Richard's campaign into Ireland), but, in general, the play adheres to the facts as presented in the chronicles.[209]

Woodstock, because of its wild departures from historical truth, is more difficult to trace to its historical sources. Keller thinks that the anonymous author used the chronicles of Holinshed and Stow.[210] Boas, however, contends that Stow's work was consulted very little in the writing of the play.[211] Frijlinck proposes that Holinshed was the main source and probably the only one.[212] However, one may be fairly certain that Stow was at least a minor source for the play, because Queen Anne's introducing side-saddles (Woodstock, I.iii.406-414) for the noble women of England, who had always ridden astride, is a point of history to be found nowhere else except in Stow's Annales.[213] The

---

[209]Law, op. cit., pp. 93-94. H. F. Hutchison, "Shakespeare and Richard II," History Today, XI (April, 1961), 236-244, points out where Richard II deviates from history, but he tends to exaggerate the historical inaccuracy of the play, and he is in error himself about historical facts.

[210]Keller, op. cit., pp. 7-20, cites passages from the play and quotes parallels from Holinshed and Stow's chronicles.

[211]Boas, op. cit., p. 144.

[212]Frijlinck, op. cit., p. xxvi.

[213]Cf. Stow, p. 295, quoted in Smith, op. cit., pp. 118-119.

author of Woodstock also knew Grafton's work. Although Rossiter states that all the chronicles depict Thomas of Woodstock, Gloucester, as a ruthless scheming individual, which, in fact, he was,[214] yet, he quotes a passage from Grafton's chronicle which hints at the kind and gentle Gloucester in the play in which Grafton describes the murder of Thomas of Woodstock:

> And so was this honorable and good man miserable put to death, which for the honor of the King and the wealth of the realme had taken great travayles.[215]

Furthermore, the anonymous author was probably highly familiar with Berners's Froissart, for a great amount of the material in the play may be found in no other source.[216] Smith cites extensive material from the chronicles and concludes that the author of Woodstock had read Berners's Froissart, either Holinshed's or Grafton's chronicle, and a little of Stow's work.[217] The reading of these chronicles,

---

[214]Rossiter, op. cit., p. 25.

[215]Quoted in Rossiter, ibid., p. 250. Rossiter has provided an extensive source study of Woodstock, but he has failed to consider Froissart's chronicle, ibid., pp. 239-252.

[216]Cf. especially I.i-ii; also, Smith, op. cit., pp. 120-122; 127; 129-130.

[217]Ibid., p. 130.

with the aforementioned option, would have provided all the information needed to write the play.[218]

Exactly how the author of Woodstock went about the reading of the chronicles and how he incorporated his knowledge into the subsequent play are matters for debate. Keller thinks that in the play the departures from historical fact are simply the result of carelessness on the part of the author.[219] Elson points out, however, that these misrepresentations of history were deliberate in order to create a popular hero and to defame royalty.[220] Smith thinks that the author's ignoring of history has resulted in a finely balanced plot.[221] Rossiter, who agrees with Smith and Elson, sees the play as an intentional alteration of fact, the playwright's being determined to produce a work with a specific moral and political purpose.[222] However,

---

[218]Ibid., pp. 116-117; 130.

[219]Keller, op. cit., pp. 7-9.

[220]John J. Elson, "The Non-Shakespearian Richard II and Shakespeare's Henry IV, Part I," SP, XXXII (April, 1935), 168-178. Elson lists the main events in the play that deviate from the chronicles, ibid., pp. 178-180.

[221]Smith, op. cit., p. 130.

[222]Rossiter, op. cit., p. 20.

Keller's theory of carelessness in authorship as the source for error cannot be completely ignored, because there is a great deal of historical data that the author, had he cared about accuracy, could have had correct without interference to his purpose. For example, the poisoning plot (I.i) occurring out of its historical place provides a good opening scene for the play, but the fact that the dramatist names Lapoole as the captain of the castle where Gloucester was killed (Mowbray was actually the captain) serves no dramatic purpose. One concludes, therefore, that the author of Woodstock ignored history when the facts did not suit his purpose, although it also seems that his reading of the chronicles took place some time before his writing of the play, and that he was not greatly concerned about minor details.[223]

---

[223]See Elson, op. cit., pp. 178-180, for matters pertaining to the historical inaccuracies of the play.

CHAPTER III

POETIC AND DRAMATIC SOURCES AND CHRONOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS

A. Poetic Sources

There are three major poetic works which might have provided source material for Elizabethan dramatists concerned with the reign of Richard II. These works are a long Middle English poem called Mum and the Sothsegger (1400), The Mirror for Magistrates (1559), and Daniel's The First Fowre Bookes of the Ciuile Wars Between the Two Houses of Lancaster and Yorke (1594), hereafter shortened to The Civil Wars.[224] Certain segments of these poetic works have slight verbal and strong thematic connections with Richard II and Woodstock. Even though the dramatists, in writing these two plays, may have consulted these works only infrequently, one is obliged to note the overwhelming

---

[224]Mabel Day and Robert Steele (eds.), Mum and the Sothsegger. This Middle English poem remains anonymous, although some scholars think that Langland is the author; no title appears on the original MS, and the poem is sometimes called Richard the Redeless, viz, Richard without counsel, ibid., pp. ix-x. Lily B. Campbell (ed.), The Mirror for Magistrates. Alexander B. Grossart (ed.), The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Samuel Daniel, II, 3-172.

consensus in literature, both dramatic and otherwise, concerning Richard II.

No one has suggested that Mum and the Sothsegger might be a source for the Richard II plays, and, perhaps, the list of uncertain sources for these plays is already too long. Yet, this poem, which precedes all of the significant chronicles dealing with Richard II (except Froissart's work), represents the first major literary attempt to use Richard's reign as a moral and political lesson.[225] Moreover, Mum and the Sothsegger, regarding the subject of misrule during Richard's years on the throne, encompasses virtually every basic idea later to be taken up and further developed in works such as Hall's chronicle, The Mirror for Magistrates, Woodstock, Daniel's The Civil Wars, and Richard II. In attempting to trace the genesis of ideas, one can easily exceed needed limitations and find himself buried under more material than can be evaluated with meaningful objectivity. However, a study of Mum and the Sothsegger in connection with certain readings found in Woodstock and

---

[225]Day and Steele, op. cit., p. xix, point out that the poem exists in two parts or fragments. The first part, fragment R, was written before 1400, and the second part, fragment M, was probably written just after Richard's death, in 1400, loc. cit.

Richard II is more than just a glance at the origin of general concepts. It becomes a study that involves a written source for specific ideas about specific events or practices associated with one particular king. Consequently, a few selected passages from Mum and the Sothsegger are herewith presented along with a description of some of the main thoughts set forth by the anonymous author of this work, and possible verbal parallels between the play and the poem should be pointed to.

It is uncertain if Elizabeth dramatists had access to Mum and the Sothsegger. The unknown author starts his poem by describing its nature and purpose, and he states: "For 3it it is secrette and so it shall lenger, / Tyll wyser wittis han waytid it ouere," (Prologue 61-62). Of course, the poem was politically dangerous, and there is no way of knowing how many copies existed or were circulated. There can be no doubt, however, that its subject matter eventually became extremely popular.

The love shown by the common people toward Henry Bolingbroke is emphasized early in the poem when the author describes Bolingbroke's premature return from exile, and the same idea is presented in Richard II, when the King refers to the exiled Bolingbroke:

That while he [Richard] werrid be west on þe wilde Yrisshe, / Henrii was entrid on þe est half, / Whom all þe londe loued in lengþe and in brede, / And rosse with him rapely to ri3tyn his wronge, / For he shullde hem serue of þe same after. (Mum, Prologue 10-14).[226]

. . . Bagot here and Green / Observ'd his courtship to the common people; / How he did seem to dive into their hearts / With humble and familiar courtesy,
. . . . . .
A brace of draymen bid God speed him well / And had the tribute of his supple knee, / With "Thanks, my countrymen, my loving friends;" / As were our England in reversion his, / And he our subjects' next degree in hope. (Richard II, I.iv.23-36).

Both in the poem and in the play, the possibility of Bolingbroke's taking the throne is a paramount allusion.

Richard's obstinance is rebuked in Mum and the Sothsegger, and, as in Woodstock, one word stands out. The poet warns sovereigns and points out the reasons for Richard's difficulties:

To be war of sylffulnesse lest wondris arise. (Mum, Prologue 52)

And from 3oure willffull werkis 3oure will was chaungid, / And rafte was

Now headstrong Richard shallt thou reap the fruite / thy lewd lesentious willfullnes hath sowne. (Woodstock, I.iii. 597-98)

---

[226]In l. 13, the "wrong" is that Richard, after the death of Gaunt (Bolingbroke's father) confiscated all of the property that Bolingbroke should have inherited by law. Consequently, Bolingbroke returned before his time of exile (six years) had expired and demanded the return of his property.

3oure riott and rest . . . .
(Mum, I.5-6)[227]

The author of Mum and the Sothsegger next advises Richard and points out how the allegiance of the people has been lost, and the same concepts of government are also prevalent in Woodstock and Richard II:

By pillynge of 3oure peple 3oure prynces to plese, / Or þat 3oure wylle were wrou3te þou3 wisdom it nolde; / Or be tallage of 3oure townes without ony werre, (Mum, I.13-15)

Members of parliament would grant gold / By no manere wronge way but if werre were; (Mum, IV. 44-50)

tother hose, did some heere weare that fashione / they would not taxe and pyll the commons soe (Woodstock, I.iii.465-66)

Ross. The commons hath he pill'd with grievous taxes, / And quite lost their hearts: the nobles hath he fined / For ancient quarrels, and quite lost their hearts. / Willo. And daily new exactions are devised, / As blanks, benevolences, and I wot not what: / But what, o' God's name doth become of this? / North. Wars have not wasted it, for warr'd he hath not, / But basely yielded upon compromise (Richard II, II.i. 246-253)

It is probably significant that Richard II, like the poem, contains, in the same sequence, the idea of losing the favor of the people because of the levying of taxes and the

---

[227]In l. 6, "rafte was 3oure riott" means "your revelry was taken away." Also, Day and Steele, op. cit., Glossary, pp. 155-156.

concept of the grave injustice inherent in demanding these taxes during peace time. It is, of course, possible that Shakespeare borrowed from Woodstock, as Keller points out, because both plays contain the word pill.[228] However, one suggests that the poem, because of its more complete ideas, is closer to Richard II than is Woodstock as this sequence illustrates.

One discovers a number of references in the poem to an eagle, representing Bolingbroke.[229] This symbolic eagle is a triumpant force:

> Thus hawkyd þis egle and houed aboue,
> Ðat, as God wolde þat gouerneth all þingis,
> Ðer nas kyte ne krowe þat kareyne hantid,
> Ðat he ne with his lynage ne louyd full sone.
> (II.176-79)

In this passage, the poet indicates that Bolingbroke defeats Richard's favorites, called kites and crows (or birds that prey on carrion flesh). In Richard II, the King, speaking to Bolingbroke and Mowbray, refers to their ambitious thoughts as being due to "eagle-winged pride" (I.iii.129). Of course, many authors have used this kind of metaphor of

---

[228]Keller, op. cit., p. 39.

[229]Day and Steele, op. cit., p. 90.

an eagle. However, a line in Woodstock bears a slightly stronger resemblance to the mentaphor in the poem. For example, the flatterers of Richard have received some rich booty of war, and Gloucester laments "that kytes should haue Inioyed the eagles pryze" (I.iii.538). Although Bolingbroke is not a character in Woodstock, the reference to the favorites as kites is obvious.

The poet devotes much of his third passus to a condemnation of the extravagance of dress practiced by Richard and his favorites, and the author of Woodstock also denounces the extravagance:

For ben þey rayed arith þey recchith no forther, / But studied all in strouutynge and stireth amys euere; (Mum, III.120-121).

Ðe leesinge so Iikyde ladies and oþer / Ðat þey joied of þe jette and gyside hem þer-vnder; (Mum, III.158-159).

If Thus I iett in pryd. I still shall loose (Woodstock, I.iii.462).

Ime now my self, playne Thomas, & bith rood / in these playne hose, Ile doe the realme more good / then these that pill the poore. to Iett in gould. (Woodstock, II.ii.833-35).[230]

As a noun, jett means fashion; as a verb, it connotes the act of strutting or swaggering.[231] Jett is used as a verb in

---

[230] l. 834, "playne hose" refers to Gloucester's plain garments.

[231] Day and Steele, op. cit., glossary, p. 147. Cf. OED.

Woodstock in connection with extravagant fashions. The poet in Mum and the Sothsegger is enraged because of the new fashions that appear every day: "And iche day a new deuyse it dullith my wittes" (III.178). Woodstock has some remarkably close parallels to this line from the poem, and both works share the word devise (in the poem a noun in the sense of device):

> they sitt in counsell to deuise strang fashions
> & suite them selues in wyld & anticks habitts
> (II.iii.1103-4)

> we held a counsell to deuise these suits ----
> Sr henry Greene. deuised this fashione shooe
> busshy this picke. (III.i.1183-85)

In connection with the theme of wisdom and age contrasted with youth and foolishness, the poem has a character named Wit, who is an exact prototype for Gloucester in Woodstock. Wit and Gloucester dress in plain garments, and the beard is also a symbol of age in both works, as the following passages illustrate:

For he [Wit] drough him to an herne at þe halle end, / Well homelich yhelid in a holsum gyse, / Not ouerelonge, but ordeyned in þe olde schappe, / With grette browis y-bentis an a berde eke.
. . . . . .
And alle þe berdles burnes

faith my lord his mynd sutes wth his habitt homely & playne
(Woodstock, I.i.112-13)

change no more words my lord, ye doe deiect / your kingly matie. to speake to such / whose home spune Iudgments, like ther frosty beards / would blast the bloomeing

bayed on him euere, / And schorned him, for his slaueyn was of þe old schappe. (Mum, III.211-36)

hopes of all yer kingdome. (Woodstock, I.iii.548-51)

. . . it shalbe henceforth counted hye treason / for any fellow wth a gray beard, to com within (40) foote of the / court gates . . . . (Woodstock, II.iii.972-74)

One thinks it highly significant that Richard's young favorites make fun of Gloucester's plain clothing (I.iii; II.ii), just as the "berdles burnes" of the poem scorn Wit for the old fashion of dress. A reference to the beards and the conflict between youth and age also occurs in Richard II: "Whitebeards have arm'd their thin hairless scalps / Against thy majesty" (III.ii.112).

The poet opens the fourth passus of Mum and the Sothsegger with a description of the unprecedented extravagance of Richard's household, and Woodstock contains the idea as illustrated in a speech by Richard:

For where was euere ony cristen kynge þat 3e euere knewe, / Ðat helde swiche an household þe halfdelle / As Richard in þis rewme . . . . (Mum, IV.1-3)

not all or cronicles shall poynt a king / to match or bountye, state & Royalltye / or lett or successessors yett to come / striue to exceed me. & if they bidd itt / lett records say, only king Richard did itt. (Woodstock, III.i. 1220-24)

Throughout the poem, the poet alludes to injustice, emphasizing that people dare not speak up or criticize the

foolish policies of the king (especially I.56-57; III.334-37). Fragment M of the poem is basically an argument advocating freedom to tell the truth, stressing that no one should keep silent, pretending that there are no injustices. The poet, then, introduces a character called Mum (M.243) and enters into a debate with this allegorical figure. Mum proposes that it is better to remain silent rather than to tell the truth, and the poet refuses to accept this theory. The author then journeys to the colleges and monasteries, vainly seeking an answer. Later he obtains an answer from a franklin, who says that Mum is evil, but that a truth-teller is good (M.945-1215). Gloucester in Woodstock stresses the importance of telling the truth when he says: " . . . Ile speake king Richard / were I assurd this day, my head should off" (I.iii.527-28; also I.iii.376; V.i.2560-80). The danger of exposing evils in government is also present in Richard II (II.i.228-31).

One suggests that Mum and the Sothsegger might have been a source for Woodstock. However, the case for this poem as a source for Richard II is probably weak. Similarities between the anonymous play and the poem are numerous enough to be worthy of notation. For scholars interested in the ideas behind Woodstock and Richard II, a reading of

the Middle English poem is worthwhile. One concludes that the ideas from Mum and the Sothsegger were somehow passed on to the Elizabethan dramatists, perhaps by means of tradition or through other literary works, such as The Mirror for Magistrates.

The Mirror for Magistrates, first published in 1559, consists of a series of poems, each representing the imaginary confession of an English statesman who met an unfortunate death.[232] Richard II and Woodstock both contain characters whose confessions appear in The Mirror for Magistrates: in Richard II, Mowbray and King Richard; in Woodstock, Richard, Tresilian, and Gloucester (Thomas of Woodstock).[233] A few of these parallels between The Mirror for Magistrates and the two plays are cited to point out the similarity in ideas. The abbreviation MFM stands for The Mirror for Magistrates, and citations of material from this work are designated by the name of the character

---

[232]Lily B. Campbell (ed.), The Mirror for Magistrates, p. 4. Tillyard, op. cit., p. 72. Fleay, A Biographical Chronicle of the English Printed Drama 1559-1642, I, 17-20, provides an abstract of the contents of The Mirror for Magistrates.

[233]Lily B. Campbell (ed.), The Mirror for Magistrates, pp. 73-80; 91-99; 101-108; 110-118. Richard is also in Jack Straw, but, in this work, he has no similarities with Richard in The Mirror for Magistrates.

confessing and line numbers (as in the Campbell edition).

The depiction of Mowbray in The Mirror for Magistrates resembles Shakespeare's protrayal of the same man:

For I through flattery abused his wanton youth, (MFM, Mowbray.20)	Rich. We thank you both. Yet one flatters us, (Richard II, I.i.25) [Richard is referring to Mowbray.]

Bullough has noted the following parallel, which he considers significant:[234]

And for to avoyde the sheddyng of our bloode, / with shame and death, which one must nedes haue had / The king through counsaile of the lordes thought good / To banysh both, whiche iudgement strayt was rad: (MFM, Mowbray.141-144)	[Richard says:] Draw near, / And list what whith our council we have done. / For that our kingdom's earth should not be soil'd / With that dear blood which it hath fostered; . . . . . Therefore we banish you our territories. (Richard II, I.iii.123-39)

In The Mirror for Magistrates and in Woodstock, Tresilian's speeches are similar:

[I,] Who for our princes pleasure corrupt with meed and awe / wittyngly and wretchedly did wrest the sence of lawe. (MFM, 13-14)	zounes I will screw and wynd the stubborne lawe / to any fashione that shall like you . . . . (Woodstock, I.ii.270-271).
We coulde by very arte haue made black seem white. (MFM, 27)	. . . I haue a tricke in lawe / shall make king Richard sease into his hands / the

---

[234]Bullough, op. cit., III, 367.

So wurkyng lawe lyke waxe,
the subject was not sure /
O lyfe lande, nor goods,
. . . . (MFM, 85-86)

forfiture of all ther goods
& lands: (Woodstock, III.i.
1265-67)

Gloucester is portrayed as being kind and gentle in Woodstock, and, although he is dead when Richard II opens, he is referred to by Shakespeare in a speech by Gaunt as a "plain well-meaning soul" (II.i.128). Yet, Rossiter points out that the portrait of Gloucester in The Mirror for Magistrates is much less favorable than the way the Duke is characterized in both plays.[235] However, Bullough thinks that the view of Gloucester's fighting against Richard's poor practices of government, as presented by The Mirror for Magistrates, compares favorably with the portrayal of Gloucester in Woodstock.[236] Certainly, both plays, like The Mirror for Magistrates, point out the folly in Richard's extravagance, unjust taxation, employment of flattering officials, and extreme weakness.

Bullough states that "Shakespeare knew the Mirror well . . . ."[237] Schelling has noted that the subject matter for thirty-six Elizabethan plays is to be found in The Mirror

---

[235]Rossiter, op. cit., o, 25.

[236]Bullough, op. cit., III, 367.

[237]Loc. cit.

for Magistrates and thinks that this series of poems was probably no immediate source for the chronicle history plays, but that these poems had a great deal to do with the choice of subject and the type of treatment to be found in the history plays.[238] The Mirror for Magistrates is based mainly on Hall's chronicle and follows that history in regard to theme and the purpose of using history to mirror the faults of the past and, thereby, teach moral and political lessons.[239] Campbell indicates the popular menaphorical use of the word mirror during Elizabethan times and cites Hamlet III.ii.25-28.[240] There is also a noteworthy reference to a mirror in Richard II, in which Bolingbroke wants Richard to read a list of crimes supposedly committed by the latter during his reign, but Richard

---

[238]Schelling, op. cit., p. 36.

[239]Lily B. Campbell, Shakespeare's "Histories" Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy, pp. 106; 109-110. See The Mirror for Magistrates, the introduction to the section on King Richard, ls. 3-4, where it is stated " . . . maister Hall whom in this storye we chiefly folowed . . . ." It is, therefore, difficult to determine whether the dramatists used Hall's work or The Mirror for Magistrates for some passages.

[240]Lily B. Campbell, Shakespeare's "Histories" Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy, p. 107.

refuses the list and asks instead for a mirror:

> They shall be satisfied: I'll read enough
> When I do see the very book indeed
> Where all my sins are writ, and that's myself.
> Give me the glass, and therin will I read.
> (IV.i.273-276)

It seems very probable also that the great emphasis placed by Elizabethans on history as a lesson found its way into Richard II and Woodstock through The Mirror for Magistrates. The most important aspect of this series of poems as a source for the plays is its emphasis on moral order, for any historical details in The Mirror for Magistrates can be found elsewhere.[241]

Whether or not Daniel's The Civil Wars served as a source for Richard II is a matter for debate and rests on the question of composition dates. Moorman has maintained that Shakespeare and Daniel worked independently and that there is no connection between the play and the poem.[242] However, Moorman has neglected ideas and language shared by the two works and found nowhere else.[243] Ure points out

---

[241]Ure, op. cit., pp. xli-xlii.

[242]F. W. Moorman, "Shakespeare's History Plays and Daniel's Civile Wars," Shakespeare Jahrbuch, XL (1904), 73.

[243]Ure, op. cit., p. xlii, fn. 2, thinks that Moorman's study of the play and the poem is "markedly superficial."

that there are more than thirty instances of similarity in the works, and he notes that Richard II is especially close to The Civil Wars as regards the ride of Richard and Bolingbroke into London and in the treatment of Queen Isabel and her meeting with the deposed King (Richard II, III.iii, IV.i-ii; The Civil Wars, II.66-98).[244] There can be no doubt that a connection exists between the two works, and there only remains the question of who was the borrower.

The Civil Wars was entered in the Stationers' Register on October 11, 1594, and first published in 1595.[245] If Shakespeare borrowed from the published poem, then the date of composition of Richard II, entered in the Stationers' Register in 1597, was probably between late 1595 and early 1597.[246] The evidence slightly favors the theory that

---

[244] Ibid., p. xlii. Smith, op. cit., pp. 146-154.

[245] Arber, op. cit., II, 313. Smith, op. cit., p. 144.

[246] One should note that if Daniel were the borrower, this poet would have had to get his material from the play, either by watching a performance or by consulting an MS. On the other hand, it is possible that Shakespeare read the MS copy of the poem before it was published, and if he did, the composition date of Richard II could be earlier than 1594. It is not all together impossible that Shakespeare might have had access to the MS of the poem, for Smith points out that Southampton (Shakespeare's patron) was a friend of Daniel and that the dramatist might also have been a friend of this recognized poet, ibid., p. 145. At any rate, Black, A New Variorum, p. 393, shows that the most commonly accepted date of composition for Richard II is 1595.

Shakespeare did indeed borrow from The Civil Wars. In both Richard II and the poem, Queen Isabel is portrayed as an adult, although she was, in fact, only eleven years old when Richard died. Craig has pointed out that Daniel, in regard to Isabel's age, apologizes for having been free with history as if he alone were the one responsible for the discrepancy.[247] Daniel's words are the following:

> And if I haue erred somewhat in the drought of the young Q. Isabel . . . in not suting her passions to her yeares; I must craue fauour of my credulous Readers; and hope, the young Ladies of England (who peraduenture will thinke themselues of age sufficient at 14 yeares, to haue a feeling of their own estates) will excuse me in that point. For the rest . . . I haue faithfully obserued the Historie.[248]

In his preface, Daniel shows much humility, often citing his sources (for example, in the margin next to stanza 60, he cites Froissart, Virgil, and Hall). It seems probable that if he had obtained from a play the idea of presenting the child queen as a grown woman, he would have said so. It is doubtful, at least, that he would have pretended that the idea were his own if it were Shakespeare's. Moreover, Bullough has noted that Daniel, in revising The Civil Wars

---

[247]Hardin Craig (ed.), The Complete Works of Shakespeare, p. 643.

[248]Grossart, op. cit., II, 7.

for later editions (1601 and 1609), definitely borrowed from Richard II, and thinks that this borrowing indicates that the play had not been written when Daniel prepared the first edition of the poem.[249]

B. Dramatic Sources and Chronological Relationships

Wilson, Feuillerat, and Robertson support the theory that Richard II was based on an old play now lost.[250] Of course, if an older play should ever be found, existing source studies would probably undergo considerable revision. Wilson believes that Shakespeare might have relied upon an old play because he has found that Richard II contains a number of loose ends or inconsistencies.[251] Some of the "puzzling features" of Richard II which he cites are the following: (1) the announcing of Bagot's execution (III.ii. 123) and his mysterious unexplained appearance at the beginning of IV.i; (2) Shakespeare's apparent failure to

---

[249]Bullough, op. cit., III, 353; 375. Bullough describes the similarities and relationship of The Civil Wars and Richard II, ibid., III, 373-376.

[250]Wilson, op. cit., pp. lxiv-lxxv. Feuillerat, op. cit., 192-199. J. M. Robertson, The Shakespeare Cannon, II, 50-51; 72.

[251]Wilson, op. cit., lxiv-lxxiii.

identify the Lord Marshal at Coventry with the Earl of Surrey of IV.i; (3) several obscure statements, such as York's reference to "the prevention of poor Bolingbroke about his marriage" (II.i.178).[252] Robertson goes so far as to propose that the older play was one possibly written by Marlowe or Peele.[253] Both Robertson and Feuillerat have made a study of the style of Richard II, and their arguments for the play as a revision are based on their studies of versification and rhyme.[254] Certainly, the high number of rhyming lines in the play seems to be a definite indication of an older work. Feuillerat points out that over five hundred lines of the play are in rhymed verse, four hundred of which are of inferior quality; the remaining one hundred he thinks either might have been added or touched up by Shakespeare.[255] The following chart shows the distribution of the rhymed lines in regard to parts of the play and characters. The evidence reveals that the scenes in which rhyme is heavily concentrated are key ones.

---

[252] Loc. cit.

[253] Robertson, op. cit., II, 50-51.

[254] Ibid., II, 73. Feuillerat, op. cit., pp. 192-199.

[255] Ibid., p. 192.

Act and Scene	Rhyme Used as Cue	Rhyme not Used as Cue
I.i	20	44
I.ii.	4	12
I.iii.	30	46
I.iv.	(no rhyme at all)	
II.i.	18	36
II.ii.	8	2
II.iii.	2	6
II.iv.	4	2
III.i.	(no rhyme at all)	
III.ii.	20	12
III.iii.	10	14
III.iv.	10	12
IV.i.	14	31
V.i.	10	12
V.ii.	2	6
V.iii.	22	50
V.iv.	2	
V.v.	4	17
V.vi.	10	28
	190	330

The following table shows a distribution of rhymed lines by character speaking:

Character	Rhyme Used as Cue	Rhyme not Used as Cue
Richard	58	85
Bolingbroke	26	55
Gaunt	14	34
Mowbray	12	28
York	16	30
Duchess Y.	12	28
Queen	6	10
Duchess G.	4	10
Northum	6	7
Aumerle	2	10
(Others)	34	35

Even though Gaunt and Mowbray are in the play only for a short time, they appear in very important scenes, and both speak a large number of rhymed lines. If Shakespeare were revising an old play when he wrote Richard II, it seems that he would have made use of material from important scenes. Any play on Richard, if it were to follow history with reasonable accuracy, would present a few key events, such as the events that comprise the main part of Richard II. Not only the presence of the rhyme but also its distribution, therefore, indicate that Richard II may have been Shakespeare's revision of an older play. There are documents that contain allusions to Richard II plays, which some scholars think refer to a lost older play upon which Shakespeare based Richard II. The first such reference is to be found in various documents and histories describing the Essex Rebellion of 1601. Here, one learns that a play called King Harry IV and the Killing of King Richard II was performed at the Globe on February 7, 1601.[256] This

---

[256]Boas, op. cit., p. 143. The title given above may not be the title of the play. It is the designation used by one of the actors at the Essex trials. For quotations from the documents on the Essex trials, see Evelyn May Albright, "Shakespeare's Richard II and the Essex Conspiracy," PMLA, XLII (September, 1927), 687-690.

performance was paid for by the Essex conspirators (led by Sir Gilly Merick), who planned to use it to fire up rebels for an uprising, which was supposed to follow the next day.[257] Furthermore, Camden and Bacon mention this particular play in connection with the trials of the rebels. The following quotation is taken from Brown's 1629 translation of Camden's history:

> Mericke he is accused for . . . vndertaking the defence of Essex house against the Queene, for giuing mony, and causing an olde obsolete Tragedy of the deposing of Richard 2. to be acted publiquely before the Conspirators, which the Lawyers did iudge of, as if he had shewen them now that vpon the stage, which he sould haue them act the next day vpon the Queene.[258]

On the other hand, Bacon's description of the events surrounding the ill-fated rebellion is more detailed than Camden's:

> That the afternoon before the rebellion, Merick, with a great company of others that afterwards were all in the action, had procured to be played before them the play of deposing king Richard the second.

---

[257]Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Government Regulation of Elizabethan Drama, pp. 98-99.

[258]William Camden, Tomus Alter, et Idem: Or the Historie of the Life and Reigne of that Famous Princesse Elizabeth . . ., pp. 331-332.

> Neither was it casual, but a play bespoken by Merick.
>
> And not so only, but when it was told him by one of the players, that the play was old, and they should have loss in playing it, because few would come to it: there were forty shillings extraordinary given to play it, and so thereupon played it was.
>
> So earnest he was to satisfy his eyes with the sight of that tragedy, which he though soon after his lordship should being from the stage to the state, but that God turned it upon their own heads.[259]

Boas thinks that the descriptions of Bacon and Camden, especially the references to the play as "old," could hardly apply to Shakespeare's Richard II.[260] Nevertheless, one notes that Bacon refers to the drama as " . . . the play of the deposing of Richard the second." Moreover, the description of the play in the State Papers Domestic similarly gives the impression that there was only one Richard II play containing a deposition scene: " . . . [some of Lord Essex's followers] came to some of the Lord Chamberlain's players and would have them play that play of the deposing and killing of King Richard II . . . ."[261] Albright and

---

[259]Basil Montagu (ed.), The Works of Francis Bacon, VI, 363-364.

[260]Boas, op. cit., p. 143.

[261]Quoted in G. B. Harrison, (ed.), The Elizabethan Journals, III, 144.

Gildersleeve suggest that Richard II might have been considered old in 1601.[262] Schelling is almost certain that the play was Richard II, because Southampton was involved

---

[262]Gildersleeve, op. cit., pp. 98-99. E. M. Albright "Shakespeare's Richard II and the Essex Conspiracy," PMLA, XLII (September, 1927), 706, argues that Shakespeare partly based Richard II on John Hayward's history, The Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII. Hayward's book (published in 1559), for which he got into trouble at the Essex trials, has a few unhistorical details in common with Richard II, and Albright thinks that Shakespeare borrowed from Hayward's MS before the history was published, ibid., pp. 706-720. However, Hayward testified at the Essex trials, stating that he had begun " . . . this history a dozen years before, although he aquainted no man therewith," quoted in Harrison, op. cit., III, 142. R. Heffner, "Shakespeare, Hayward, and Essex: Reply to E. M. Albright," PMLA, XLV (September, 1930), 754-780, disagrees strongly with Albright in her attempt to link Richard II with Hayward's book and also accuses her of leaving out vital parts of the quotations used as evidence. Albright, "Shakespeare's Richard II, Hayward's History of Henry IV and the Essex Conspiracy Rejoinder," PMLA, XLVI (September, 1931), 694-719, counter-attacks Heffner's article and reasserts her position. E. P. Kuhl, "Shakespeare and Hayward," SP, XXV (July, 1928), 312-315, thinks that there is a connection between Richard II and Hayward's history, but that Hayward was the borrower. The similarities between Hayward's book and the play are mainly " . . . the accounts of base favorites, unjust taxation, costly and mistaken Irish policies, the unhistorical conception of Henry as popular hero . . . and making the deposition seem inevitable," ibid., pp. 312; 315. However, the parallels between the play and the history are weak and can be found elsewhere. For example, even Bolingbroke's popularity, a common factor in both works, which Kuhl suggests is unique, is found also in Mum and the Sothsegger and was probably traditional, if not historically true, ibid., p. 315.

in the conspiracy and imprisoned as a result.[263] On the other hand, one can also argue that the Essex play was not Shakespeare's. Richard II may have been old in 1601, but was this drama "obsolete" as Camden has defined the play of that year. Moreover, since the play performed at the Globe at the request of the conspirators created so much trouble, one thinks that the author would have been brought to trial, or at least would have been mentioned, unless he were dead, unknown, or so famous that the authorities were reluctant to press charges. Obviously, the authorship of the Essex play is still a matter for conjecture.

From the diary of Doctor Simon Forman, Collier quotes an entry indicating the performance of a Richard II play at the Globe on April 30, 1611.[264] He suggests that the play described by Forman and the Essex play are the same

---

[263]Schelling, op. cit., p. 110.

[264]John P. Collier, New Particulars Regarding the Works of Shakespeare, pp. 9-10. The diary entry is also quoted in Samuel A. Tannenbaum, Shakespearian Scraps and Other Elizabethan Fragments, pp. 11-12. Tannenbaum describes the diary and its contents, among which is a section called "The Bocke of Plaies" (folios 200-207b), containing descriptions of various plays allegedly attended by Forman, ibid., p. 8. Schelling, op. cit., pp. 110-11, points out that since the entry on the Richard II play shows that the play covered most of Richard's reign, this play could not have been any drama that now exists.

drama.[265] However, Tannembaum has collected evidence to indicate that the entry in Forman's diary describing the Richard II play is one of Collier's forgeries.[266] In general, Tannembaum directs his argument against Collier's history of the MS and his account of finding this document.[267] Collier states that he had heard about the existence of the diary entries on various Shakespearean plays, but he fails to identify the person or persons who supplied him with this information.[268] Moreover, according to Collier's account, someone discovered the MS quite accidentally in the Bodleian Library of Oxford; thus, Tannembaum finds it puzzling that Collier did not get help from noted librarians there.[269] Finally, none of the dramatic material that Collier claims to have discovered has been mentioned by scholars, Joseph Ritson and Philip

---

[265]Collier, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

[266]Samuel A. Tannembaum, Shakespearian Scraps and Other Elizabethan Fragments, pp. 1-35. Also, William Foster, "J. P. Collier's Fabrications," N&Q, CXCV (September 16, 1950), 414-415.

[267]Samuel A. Tannembaum, Shakespearian Scraps and Other Elizabethan Fragments, pp. 2-6.

[268]Ibid., pp. 2-3. Cf. Collier, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

[269]Loc. cit. Samuel A. Tannembaum, Shakespearian Scraps and Other Elizabethan Fragments, p. 3.

Bliss, who examined the diary before Collier got his hands on it.[270] Tannenbaum's evidence is strong, but the existence of an old Richard II play remains, nevertheless, a possibility.

One must also consider three extant dramas (Shakespeare's 2 Henry VI and 1 Henry IV and Marlowe's Edward II) in a source study of Richard II, Woodstock, and Jack Straw, in order to determine if some influenced the writing of others.[271] In the case of some of these plays, the dates of composition are so close that one can only rely upon probability in guessing at which work proceeds another.

Jack Straw is probably the earliest of the group. Fleay places its date of composition at 1587, because he notes that the play contains no mention of the Armada, and

---

[270] Ibid., pp. 5-6. Tannenbaum thinks that the fact that the antiquarian scholars have made no mention of the entries relating to the plays is the strongest evidence against the authenticity of "The Booke of Plaies." Moreover, the entry in the diary for Macbeth has several points in common with the "Perkins Folio" of that play, and this heavily annotated folio is known to be a Collier forgery, ibid., pp. 21-22; 165; 196.

[271] The relationship of the three Richard II plays is handled more fully in Chapter IV in a discussion of the moral and political significance of these dramas.

because there was an insurrection of apprentices in 1586 (an uprising that might have prompted the anonymous author to write about a rebellion).[272] However, Chambers and Bullough point out that the Peasants' Revolt was the topic for Thomas Nelson's pageant of 1590-91, when the Lord Mayor was John Allot, a Fishmonger just like Lord Mayor Walworth, who kills Jack Straw in the play.[273] Chambers and Bullough, because of the relationship of theme in this pageant to the theme of the play, are inclined to think that the composition date of Jack Straw is around 1590-91, although the frequently used four, six, and seven stress lines of the play could indicate a much earlier date.[274] Schelling has noted that Jack Straw had been a character in pageantry as early as 1519.[275] However, it may be

---

[272]Frederick G. Fleay, A Biographical Chronicle of the English Printed Drama 1559-1642, II, 153. Schütt thinks that the date of composition is 1588. Cited in E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 22.

[273]Loc. cit. Bullough, op. cit., p. 91. The subject matter of Jack Straw is the Peasants' Revolt.

[274]Loc. cit. Sir E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 22. Harbage, op. cit., p. 56, guesses that the date of composition is about 1591.

[275]"In an order of the Inner Temple, 1519, we learn that the king of Cockneys should sit and have due service on Childermas Day and 'that Jack Straw and all his adherents should be thenceforth utterly banished, and no more used in this house,'" quoted in Schelling, op. cit., p. 46.

unwise to assign an early date to Jack Straw merely on the basis of style, because it appears that the author was experimenting. For example, the nobility or upper class characters in the play, in general, speak in reasonably good blank verse. On the other hand, the speeches of the low born characters are contained in four, five, six and seven stress iambic lines (with no apparent pattern), and sometimes in prose. The first scene of the play, dealing with characters from the lower classes, with the exception of a few lines here and there, is completely in rhyme. However, after the first scene, rhyme occurs rarely, and when it does, it is usually more crude than ever. For example the following:

> Gentle Iacke Strawe, in one line let vs drawe, / And wele not leaue a man a lawe. / Nor a paper worth a hawe, / And make him worse than a dawe, / That shall stand against Iacke Strawe. (II.i.518-22)

> For God will giue you strength and might / And put your enemies to flight: / To stand against them day and night, / For of mine honestie your quarrels right. (III.i.862-65)

One suggests that the author may have set out with the intention of writing in rhyme all of the speeches of the low born characters, growing tired of the rhyme pattern after the first scene. One also notes that more and more imperfect lines creep into the speeches of the nobility as the play

progresses. Determining the exact date of composition of Jack Straw is probably impossible at the present time, but it does not seem imprudent to venture a guess and place the composition date before the dates assigned to the other five plays under consideration.

Bullough suggests that Shakespeare knew Jack Straw.[276] He proposes that Shakespeare might have wanted to draw a parallel between the reigns of Henry VI and Richard II, noting that the Jack Cade rebellion as handled in 2 Henry VI has much in common with the rebellion described in Jack Straw.[277] One similarity between the two plays, perhaps significant, is that Iden is knighted by Henry for killing Jack Cade, and William Walworth is knighted by Richard for killing Jack Straw (Jack Straw, IV.i.1177-79; 2 Henry VI, V.i.78). If Chambers and Bullough are correct in suggesting that Jack Straw has some connection with Thomas Nelson's pageant of 1590-91, one concedes that the composition dates for 2 Henry VI and the anonymous work would be very close.[278]

---

[276]Bullough, op. cit., III, 91.

[277]Ibid., pp. 91-92.

[278]Hardin Craig (ed.), The Complete Works of Shakespeare, p. 206, thinks that the date of composition for 2 Henry VI is 1591-92. Bullough, op. cit., III, 89, thinks that Shakespeare wrote the play near the end of 1591.

However, if one were to draw any conclusions, he would have to admit that the evidence slightly favors Jack Straw as being the earlier work.

Keller thinks that 2 Henry VI had some influence on the author of Woodstock.[279] Humphrey, the Lord Protector and Duke of Gloucester in Shakespeare's play, has a great deal in common with Thomas of Woodstock, the Lord Protector and Duke of Gloucester in Woodstock.[280] Both men are loved by the commons (2 Henry VI, I.i.157-65; Woodstock, III.i. 1233-35), and both are treacherously murdered in prison. In each play, the second murderer regrets the deed:

Sec. Mur. O, that it were to do! What have we done? / Didst ever hear a man so penitent? (2 Henry VI, III.ii.3-4)

2 m: tis done ye dambd slaue. pull ye dogg: & pull thy soule to hell / in doeing it. for thou hast killd the truest suiect, / that euer breathd in England. (Woodstock, V.i.2614-16)

The closeness of composition dates creates a question as to which work came first, 2 Henry VI or Woodstock. The following scholars have submitted various composition dates for Woodstock: Wells, Smith, and Fleay (1591); Harbage

---

[279]Keller, op. cit., pp. 27-29.

[280]Cf. the parallels given by Keller, loc. cit.

(1592); Bullen (1593); and Chambers and Greg (1592-95).[281] However, Boas thinks that some passages in Woodstock sound more like Jacobean than Elizabethan verse and feels that, since all the plays of known date in the Egerton MS 1994 belong to the seventeenth century (Woodstock and Edmond Ironside are the only exceptions, and they are doubtful), all attempts to assign early dates to any of the Egerton works might be a mistake.[282] Moreover, the MSS of both Woodstock and Edmond Ironside have, in marginal entries, the names of actors who belonged to the third and fourth decades of the seventeenth century.[283] However, Frijlinck reasons that Boas's suggestion about some lines that have a Jacobean ring is weak when judged against the presence of end-stopped verse and a large amount of rhyme, both of

---

[281]Henry W. Wells, Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights, p. [2]. Smith, op. cit., p. 95. Frederick G. Fleay, A Biographical Chronicle of the English Printed Drama 1559-1642, II, 320. Harbage, op. cit., pp. 57-58. Bullen, op. cit., I, 427. Sir E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 42. W. W. Greg, Dramatic Documents From the Elizabethan Playhouse, II, 251.

[282]Boas, op. cit., p. 163.

[283]Loc. cit.

which are the marks of earlier drama.[284] She also points out that the condition of the MS indicates its long and repeated use as a prompt copy and thinks that the presence of several different handwritings in marginal notes shows that the play was revived several times, which evidence would account for the names of seventeenth-century actors in the margins.[285]

There can be little doubt that Shakespeare was familiar with Woodstock, and that the anonymous play influenced the writing of Richard II. As already stated, the composition date of Richard II is circa 1595. Keller records a number of parallels between the two plays, and one of which is particularly strong.[286] The following passages refer to the renting out of the kingdom, because Richard, instead of ruling his realm, rents it for a price:

---

[284]Frijlinck, op. cit., p. xxiii. A. C. Partridge, Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama, pp. 34-42, after a detailed study of spealling, punctuation, parentheses, and contracted word forms, concludes that the MS of Woodstock is a scribal transcript made in the early seventeenth century; but he is certain that the date of composition is around 1591-92.

[285]Frijlinck, op. cit., p. xxiii.

[286]Keller, op. cit., pp. 38-40.

We, Richard rent out or kingdome like a pelting ffarme / that erst was held, as fair as Babilon / the mayden conquerris to all the world (Woodstock, IV.i.1888-90).	This land . . . / Dear for her reputation through the world, / Is now leased out, I die pronouncing it, / Like to a tenement or pelting farm: (Richard II, II.i. 57-60).

In Richard II, the references to farming of the realm and to blank charters (I.iv.48) are unclear, unless one is familiar with Woodstock, wherein these matters are extensively treated.[287] Undoubtedly, Richard II would have meant more to an Elizabethan audience that had previously witnessed Woodstock, since the first scenes of Richard II are lacking somewhat in background information.[288] Moreover, Richard II is completely void of the humor usually found in Shakespeare's historical plays, perhaps implying that he had refrained from reworking humorous incidents handled so well in Woodstock.[289] Finally, Bullough finds it hard to believe that anyone writing on Richard's reign after the appearance of Richard II would have departed so much from history as did the author of Woodstock.[290]

---

[287]Rossiter, op. cit., p. 47. Also, Bullough, op. cit., III, 360-362.

[288]Boas, op. cit., p. 162.

[289]Loc. cit. Wilson, op. cit., pp. xlix-xli, also thinks that Shakespeare knew Woodstock.

[290]Bullough, op. cit., III, 360, fn. 1.

There is further evidence to show that Shakespeare knew Woodstock. Furthermore, Elson finds several strong parallels between the anonymous play and Shakespeare's 1 Henry IV.[291] The verbal parallels between the two plays always involve Tresilian of Woodstock and Shakespeare's Falstaff, two characters with much in common.[292] Elson fails to point out, however, one other connection between the plays. Nimble, in Woodstock, although in no way as clever as Falstaff, has a speech very much like one assigned to the corpulent knight. For example, when Nimble discovers that Tresilian is to be Lord Chief Justice, he says, " . . . nay & youle stand between me & the gallowes" (Woodstock, I.ii.318). Similarly, Falstaff, seeking special privileges from his friend Prince Hal, says, " . . . shall there be gallows, standing in England when thou art king?" (1 Henry IV, I.ii.67-68).

Some more or less incidental relationships exist between Woodstock and other Shakespearean plays. For example, the murder of Clarence in Richard III resembles the killing of Gloucester in Woodstock in that both men

---

[291] Elson, op. cit., pp. 177-188.

[292] Ibid., p. 182.

suspect that they are about to be killed.[293] Clarence says to one of the murderers, "Your eyes do menace me . . ." (Richard III, I.iv.175). Woodstock, realizing his position, says, "why am I sent thus from my natiue country / but heere at Callys to be murdered." (Woodstock, V.i.2541-42). Both Clarence and Woodstock are aware of what is impending before their murderers take any action or reveal their plans. Also, in both plays, the second murderer is reluctant, but driven on when the first murderer suggests that they will be paid well, (Richard III, I.iv.124-28; Woodstock, V.i.2615-17). There is also one interesting verbal parallel between Woodstock and Antony and Cleopatra. Antony says, "To-night we'll wander through the streets and note / The qualities of people." (Antony and Cleopatra, I.i.53-54). Fleming, one of Tesilian's followers, says, " . . . we will . . . / walke through the towne, noteing the cariage of the people," (Woodstock, III.ii.1546-47). This evidence adds more weight to the theory that Shakespeare was familiar with Woodstock.

In regard to thematic influence, there must be some connection as regards Edward II, Woodstock, and Richard II. The general situations (weak monarch, flattering favorites,

---

[293]Schelling, op. cit., p. 107.

contrast of wisdom of age against the foolishness of youth) are the same in all three works.[294] Keller cites some parallels from Edward II and Woodstock, which Rossiter thinks are verbally very weak.[295] Furthermore, the characters of Woodstock have counterparts in Edward II: Anne, Richard, and Woodstock of the anonymous play are respectively similar to Isabelle, Edward, and Mortimer of Edward II.[296] The murders of Edward and Woodstock are both highly dramatic, and the murderers in both cases are killed, immediately following the crimes.[297] In the same general way as shown above, one could also relate Richard II to Edward II.

In regard to chronological order, there is some doubt as to exactly where Edward II fits in with the other dramas discussed in this section. Keller has assumed that the order is 2 Henry VI, Edward II, Woodstock, and Richard II.[298] However, Rossiter thinks that Woodstock might very well have

---

[294] Ibid., pp. 96; 102.

[295] Keller, op. cit., pp. 22-26. Rossiter, op. cit., p. 56.

[296] Smith, op. cit., p. 97.

[297] Schelling, op. cit., p. 107.

[298] Keller, op. cit., pp. 22-40.

preceded Marlowe's play.[299] It is probably pointless to debate which work is earlier when only a thematic and subject relationship is involved. More than likely both Woodstock and Edward II influenced Shakespeare in writing Richard II.

---

[299]Rossiter, op. cit., p. 17. The characteristics shared by Woodstock and Edward II might be the result of both dramatists' having borrowed from 2 Henry VI, and, of course, both writers could have borrowed from the chronicles, ibid., pp. 53-54; 60.

CHAPTER IV

MORAL AND POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS: RICHARD II PLAYS IN PERSPECTIVE

The three Richard II plays under consideration reflect a stream of Elizabethan thought generated by factions opposing absolute monarchy and the government in power. In a study of these plays, virtually every level of investigation provides information about Renaissance ethical and political principles. Jack Straw, Woodstock, and Richard II offer or describe a challenge to the status quo in Elizabethan leadership.

A view of history, which historians now refer to as "the Tudor myth," was initiated by Henry VII, who married Elizabeth of York, uniting the houses of York and Lancaster and, thereby, supporting the Tudor claim to the throne.[300] As already mentioned, people living during the Tudor age regarded Henry IV as a usurper, and they understood his siezure of the throne to be the cause of numerous rebellions

---

[300] George L. Kittredge (ed.), The Tragedy of King Richard the Second, pp. xi-xii.

and of the bloody Wars of the Roses.[301] Strife ended, however, when the Tudor kings came to power, and by the time Henry VIII became king, the people of England had generally accepted the idea that the Tudor claims to the throne were justified.[302] The Tudor theory of absolute monarchy, although based partly on old medieval concepts, was, essentially, a radical change from the thought of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[303] For example, political theorists during the fifteenth century believed that a king was subject to natural law and could be lawfully deposed if he did not live up to his oath of office.[304] Elyot (1531) describes the medieval ideas upon which the Tudors based their political theory by explaining that everything has a place in relationship to everything else in the universe and that some things have a more exhaulted position than others (an

---

[301]Charles Fish, "Henry IV: Shakespeare and Holinshed," SP, LXI (1964), 205-218.

[302]Loc. cit.

[303]Franklin Le Van Baumer, The Early Tudor Theory of Kingship, pp. 1-20. Mum and the Sothsegger (M, 205-225) shows that Henry was thought to be a good king, and there is nothing in the poem to show that his siezure of the throne was thought to be wrong.

[304]Loc. cit.

idea sometimes known as "the chain of being").[305] Therefore, one may state the final Tudor position on kingship. Order is the first law, and kings are deputies of God and must be obeyed. Often God sends a wicked king to punish the people for their sins, and this wicked king must be obeyed in the same way as a good king. Subjects must not rebel or sit in judgment on their king, for if the king is evil, God will punish him.[306] Indeed, the people regarded the king as a mortal God, a superman of superior faculties.[307] Tillyard, however, thinks that the rule of obedience did not apply if the king should order someone to perform an act contrary to God's commandments.[308] For example, if the king might order a subject to commit murder, that subject was bound in conscience to disobey.[309]

---

[305]Sir Thomas Elyot, The Book Named the Governor, pp. 3-5.

[306]Alfred Hart, Shakespeare and the Homilies, pp. 29-30. The source of these ideas on kingship is the tenth homily, quoted in Hart, ibid., p. 31. Hart's information leaves no doubt that Shakespeare and the authors of Jack Straw and Woodstock knew these homilies, ibid., pp. 26-27; passim.

[307]Ruth L. Anderson, "Kingship in Renaissance Drama," SP, XLI (1944), 136-137.

[308]Tillyard, op. cit., pp. 160; 119.

[309]Loc. cit.

However, if the king, then, should decide to punish the disobedient subject, the subject had to accept it willfully as the price to be paid for past sins.[310]

In addition to remembering these general political and moral implications, one finds it also necessary to keep in mind a specific meaning that the Richard II plays had in relationship to Elizabeth's government. For example, Sir Francis Knollys, a relative and counselor of the queen, complained in a letter to her secretary (January, 1598) that the queen would not accept good counsel, just as Richard II had not accepted good advice and had surrounded himself with flatterers.[311] The content of Knolly's letter is given as follows:

> For who woll persiste ingyvinge of safe cousayle, if her Majistie woll persiste in myslyking of safe counsayle? Nay who woll not rather shyrkingly (that I may say no worse) play the partes of King Richard the Second's men, then to enter into the odious office of crossing of her magesties wylle?[312]

As has already been pointed out, the Essex conspirators

---

[310]Loc. cit.

[311]Albright, "Shakespeare's Richard II and the Essex Conspiracy," PMLA, XLII (September, 1927), 690-691.

[312]Quoted in Albright, ibid., p. 691.

used a Richard II play to incite rebellion, but, more significant, perhaps, is the interest in these plays expressed by officials who were closely associated with the affairs of Elizabeth's court. Albright points out that a letter from Sir Edward Hoby to Sir Robert Cecil (December, 1595) probably indicates an interest of politicians in the Richard II dramas wherein Hoby states:[313]

> Sir, findinge that you wer not convenientlie to at London to morrow noght I am bold to send to knowe whether Teusdaie may be anie more in your grace to visit poore Channon rowe where as late as it may please you a gate for your supper shal be open: & K. Richard present him self to your vewe.[314]

Furthermore, Chambers contends that this letter refers to a performance of Shakespeare's Richard II.[315] However, one proposes that since the letter is not specific, the play referred to could have been Jack Straw, Woodstock, or, for that matter, a Richard III play. However, owing to the political significance of the Richard II plays, one is

---

[313] Ibid., 698-699.

[314] Hatfield MSS, XXXVI, 60. Quoted in Sir E. K. Chambers, "Elizabethan Stage Gleanings," RES, I (1925), 75-76. Black, A New Variorum, pp. 576-588, cites several documents similar to the one above.

[315] Ibid., p. 76.

inclined to think that the play mentioned by Hoby was concerned with the former Richard, although the drama involved was probably not Shakespeare's.[316] At any rate, Lewis thinks that by 1597 the general public was aware that certain analogous parallels existed between the courts of Elizabeth and Richard II.[317] Moreover, the queen herself recognized these similarities. William Lambarde, a highly renowned historian of Kent, whom Elizabeth had appointed Keeper of the Records of the Tower on January 21, 1601, presented her with his account of these records,[318] which contained MSS dealing with the reigns of various British kings, and Lambarde himself also describes as follows Elizabeth's reaction upon reading these records:

> so her Magestie fell upon the reign of King Richard II saying, "I am Richard II. know ye not that? . . . this tragedy was played 40tie times in open streets and houses."[319]

---

[316]Scholars have generally supposed the play to be Shakespeare's Richard II. See the information compiled by Black, A New Variorum, pp. 576-587.

[317]Roland B. Lewis (ed.), The Shakespeare Documents, I, 255.

[318]DNB, XI, 438-439.

[319]John Nichols (ed.), The Progresses and Public Processions of Queene Elizabeth, II, 41 (the page numbering of this volume starts over several times, and this entry is

It is apparent, therefore, that by 1601, Richard II had become for Elizabeth both a general controversial subject and a definitely annoying topic. Jack Straw, Woodstock, and Richard II clearly show how this matter of controversy developed and spread.

Jack Straw contains a sporadic mixture of tragedy and low, crude comedy.[320] Jack, in the light of Elizabethan ideals, is an extremely crass individual, while King Richard stands for right and law.[321] However, the rebels seem to have a certain amount of courage, and the play does show a little sympathy toward them.[322] Jack Straw seems to

---

(continued) near the back, following accounts of the queen's death and funeral). Wilson, op. cit., vii-x, thinks that the reference to the play as having been acted forty times is a count of the performances of Shakespeare's Richard II. Heffner, op. cit., p. 780, thinks that the feference is linked with popular demonstrations in favor of the Earl of Essex, who sought to take the throne from Elizabeth. Petersson, op. cit., pp. 155-156, suggests that the queen was exadurating or simply using a round number. One assumes that Elizabeth was referring to all existing plays on Richard II in an inclusive manner and that the reference to performances in the open streets could mean that Jack Straw was a pageant play.

[320]Frank H. Ristine, English Tragicomedy: Its Origins and History, p. 87.

[321]John B. Moore, The Comic and Realistic in English Drama, pp. 190-192.

[322]Ibid., p. 192. See also Willard Farnham, The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy, p. 380.

be a drama with a moral purpose, for partaking of some of the characteristics of the old morality plays, as revealed in Nobs, the vice-like clown character.[323] Adkins thinks that Jack Straw was written in order to point up the problems of the Elizabethan poor and by analogy to defend Elizabeth.[324] In the play, Richard assumes an attitude of mercy toward the poor, and it is well known that Elizabeth tried to make it appear that she, too, had this same attitude.[325] Moreover, there were parallels between Richard's and Elizabeth's reigns in regard to situations of poverty.[326] Again, Adkins points out that not one speech by the characters of nobel birth gives the rebels any credit for having a just cause.[327] Therefore, most scholars think that the play is in accordance with Elizabethan moral and

---

[323]Wilhelm Creizenach, The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare," pp. 304-305.

[324]Mary G. M. Adkins, "A Theory About the Life and Death of Jack Straw," Texas University Studies in English, XXVIII (1949), 63; 74.

[325]Ibid., p. 74.

[326]Ibid., pp. 67-68.

[327]Ibid., p. 63.

political values.[328] However, Albright argues that the author's real purpose, carefully concealed in a condemnation of the rebels, was to stir up resentment against high taxes.[329] It does seem that the taxes levied by Richard in the play are oppressive.[330] Perhaps, the author's purpose in writing Jack Straw was just the opposite of what scholars have often supposed: i.e., it is probable that he intended to criticize the government in power, completely contrary to Tudor ideals.

Jack Straw, although it is not the first example of a lesson to have been derived from Richard's reign, is probably the first literary attack on Elizabethan policies through an analogy between the two reigns. However, deliberate caution, haste, and lack of skill have shrouded the author's purpose. In addition, the historical accuracy of the play probably helped to exonerate its author, for it would have been difficult for officials to attack a play

---

[328] Ibid., p. 61. Tillyard, op. cit., p. 106, is in agreement with Adkins. See also Ernest W. Talbert, Elizabethan Drama and Shakespeare's Early Plays, pp. 126-128.

[329] Evelyn May Albright, Dramatic Publications in England 1580-1640, p. 104.

[330] Loc. cit.

which followed chronicles containing what was generally accepted as truth. Finally, since Jack Straw has the characteristics of a morality or pageant play, one thinks that the author may have masked his real purpose in a pretense of defending Tudor views on rebellion and kingship. Moreover, one is inclined to believe that some Elizabethan viewers of this play, especially individuals from the lower classes, would have noticed that Richard's mercy toward the rebels in no way corrects the initial problem of unjust taxation. Perhaps, the author, in condemning the rebels, "doth protest too much." At any rate, it seems strange that at the outset of the play he presents the rebels favorably only to turn completely against them. The villainous characters in the morality plays are usually clearly identified upon their initial appearance. The anonymous author, by introducing the rebels as good, common men, probably did so to enlist the sympathy of the masses and hoped to arouse resentment against Elizabeth's government.

In attacking traditional beliefs, the author of Woodstock is much less subtle than the author of Jack Straw. Rossiter argues that Woodstock is a work conceived definitely in the tradition of the morality plays.[331] There can be little

---

[331]Rossiter, op. cit., pp. 2-5; 17-20.

doubt that its author did some rearranging of history in order to permit himself to moralize on certain principles.[332] Even some of the characters of the play are of the nature of those found in the morality plays. For example, Tresilian is a symbol of the devil.[333] Also, the character, Nimble, like Nobs in Jack Straw, is a shifty, clownish individual, much like the characters of vice in the morality plays.[334] The similarity of Nobs and Nimble, perhaps, indicates that the author of Woodstock was familiar with Jack Straw. Both characters are parasites, willing to switch allegiances when such a move will serve their selfish personal needs (Jack Straw, I.i.158-162; Woodstock, V.v-V.vi). One is also tempted to suggest that Jack Straw inspired the author of Woodstock to elaborate upon the contemporary moral implications of Richard's reign.

Armstrong's suggestion that Woodstock is in keeping with orthodox political theories of Elizabethan times is only partly correct.[335] The anonymous author does denounce

---

[332] Ibid., pp. 8; 17-23.

[333] Ibid., p. 24.

[334] Creizenach, op. cit., pp. 304-305.

[335] Armstrong, op. cit., p. xi. Tillyard, op. cit., p. 118, says that the play is completely orthadox, because the protagonist, Woodstock, offers the traditional condemnation of rebellion. However, Woodstock's position

Richard's extravagances and his acceptance of wicked counsel, and Tudor monarchs certainly recognized that the king needed good counselors. However, on the other hand, the play is clearly a justification of rebellion against a wicked king. A comparison of the two following speeches by Thomas of Woodstock tells one something about the author's method and purpose:

> . . . if by fair meanes we can winne no fauor
> nor make king Richard leaue ther companyes
> wele thus resolue, for or deere countryes good
> to right hir wrongs, or for itt spend or bloods
> (I.iii.619-22).

> but hees or kinge. & gods great deputye
> & if ye hunt to haue me second ye
> in any rash attempt against his state
> a fore my god, Ile nere consent vnto it
> (IV.ii.2140-43).

The first stand taken by Woodstock is completely wrong, according to Elizabethan beliefs: i.e., subjects could not in good conscience enter into rebellion. The inconsistency on the part of Woodstock suggests that the author was being as seditious as he dared. It seems strange that the first

---

(continued) against rebellion is not entirely consistent. Irving Ribner, The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare, pp. 139-140, is also in error in saying, "Woodstock is the loyal Englishman throughout, and his political principles, by the standards of Tudor orthadoxy, are impeccable." Cf. the two speeches by Woodstock cited below.

speech alluded to escaped censorship. Not a great many passages in the play are marked for omission, and some that are deleted seem less offensive than the one quoted above.[336] Since some passages were marked for omission either before the speakers' names were written in, or marked for omission in the same ink as the speakers' names, it is apparent that the author, or someone connected with the theatre, so marked these passages while the MS was being prepared and before the censor had read it.[337] Boas thinks that deletions were made either to shorten the play or to satisfy the government.[338] Woodstock goes a long way toward glorifying rebellion. At the same time, it might have been offensive to Elizabeth.

---

[336]The passages marked for omission in the MS are as follows: (I.i.37-42) probably omitted to keep from offending the French government; (II.ii.908) probably omitted, because it would have offended the government of Scotland; (II.iii. 1142-84) this passage points out the extensive problems of the poor and indicates the strong possibility of revolution; (III.i.1201-03) in this passage, the favorites tell Richard that there is no need for him to curb his pleasures; (IV.i. 1879-88) this sequence deals with the renting out of the kingdom; (V.i.2418-19; 2424-27) Lapoole's conscience is troubled about the murdering of Woodstock; (V.i.2663-66; V. iii.2830-42) descriptions of the events of the rebellion are presented in these two sequences.

[337]Frijlinck, op. cit., p. 65, passim, gives details about the inks used to mark passages for omission.

[338]Boas, op. cit., p. 99.

Both reasons probably explain the failure of the drama to have been published.[339] However, in spite of the fact that both Tudor and Stuart governments disapproved of civil discord as a fit theme for drama, it was a theme that was certainly used more than once.[340] Thorndike reasons, therefore, that censorship had little real effect upon drama in regard to theme and language and that only personal subjects were not allowed to be staged.[341] However, as has been demonstrated, for Elizabeth, Richard II was a personal subject; hence, one is inclined to think that, from about 1597 until Elizabeth's death, Woodstock was not performed. Perhaps, the play was hardly performed at all prior to Elizabeth's death, evidence which would explain why only the names of seventeenth-century actors are to be found in the margins of the MS. In conclusion, one cannot state too strongly that Woodstock was definitely contrary to Tudor ideals, for, as Talbert points out, the evils of Richard's reign are eliminated in this play by a successful revolt.[342]

---

[339]Smith, op. cit., pp. 97-98.

[340]Ashly H. Thorndike, Shakespeare's Theater, p. 220.

[341]Ibid., p. 221.

[342]Talbert, op. cit., pp. 125-26.

The organization of Woodstock makes it clear that its author was indulging in social criticism and that he believed personally in rebellion when the situation called for such an action. On the other hand, one cannot be certain about Shakespeare's own political and moral principles in writing Richard II. Wright assumes that Shakespeare believed in a rule of divine right.[343] It is true that, in Richard II, Shakespeare in no way justifies the rebellion of Bolingbroke and the deposing of Richard. However, one thinks that his references in the play to revolt as illegal and immoral are not necessarily an ipso facto statement of Shakespeare's position. A theory by Curry is, perhaps, relevant. By contrasting the philosophical patterns of Macbeth and The Tempest (the first Medieval and Christian, the second Neo-Platonic, pagan, and classical), Curry demonstrates effectively that Shakespeare was an artist rather than a philosopher or teacher, and that he chose philosophical patterns as backgrounds for his plays

---

[343]Austin Wright, "The History Plays," "Starre of Poets": Discussions of Shakespeare, pp. 17-18. Scholars agree that Shakespeare's Richard II and his plays on Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI are orthodox as regards Elizabethan principles, see George W. Keeton, Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background, p. 265.

rather than for the purpose of expounding upon personal, philosophical ideas.[344] Shakespeare seems to have handled history in the same way he handled philosophy: he chose a topic, Richard II for example, and dramatized events as they occurred, expressing prevailing ideas and remaining independent of the work himself. To a certain extent in Richard II, Shakespeare did manipulate history, but, in doing so, he achieved dramatic effect rather than a swaying of the audience to any moral conclusions. The most important aspect of the play, namely, the personal tragedy of Richard II, far overshadows any moral lesson to be derived from the drama.[345] Shakespeare's Richard, in accordance with basic Renaissance philosophy, is responsible for his own downfall. Richard surrenders his crown, because of his own weakness: Bolingbroke takes the crown, because Richard offers it to him (III.iii.190-210; IV.i.161-220). After resigning the crown, there remains Richard's climatic

---

[344]Walter C. Curry, Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns, pp. ix-xi, passim.

[345]There are three very extensive critical and historical analyses of Richard II: Lily B. Campbell, Shakespeare's "Histories," pp. 306-334; Tillyard, op. cit., pp. 244-263; Ribner, op. cit., pp. 155-193. All three of these books deal with the history plans and contain much useful commentary on Shakespeare's historical dramas.

struggle to retain an identity. Watson points out a similarity between Lear and Richard in that both, in losing the crown, also lose part of their character and, in a sense, cease to exist.[346] In this regard, the two following passages are worthy of comparison:

> Doth any here know me? This is not Lear; / Doth Lear walk thus? Speak thus? Where are his eyes? / Either his notion weakens, his discernings / Are lethargied--Ha! waking? 'tis not so. / Who is it that can tell me who I am? (King Lear, I.iv.246-250)

> Thus play I in one person many people, / And none contented: sometimes am I king; / Then treasons make me wish myself a beggar, / And so I am: then crushing penury / Persuades me I was better when a king; / Then am I king'd again: and by and by / think that I am unking'd by Bolingbroke, / And straight am nothing: but whate'er I be, / Nor I nor any man that but man is / with nothing shall be pleased, till he be eased / With being nothing. (Richard II, V.v.31-41)

Richard's every action leads up to and is summarized in the soliloquy cited above, a passage magnifying the tragedy and typical of Richard's imagination.

The only evidence that suggests that Richard II was subject to censorship is contained in the Deposition scene that was omitted from the early quartos, a lack of evidence

---

[346]Curtis B. Watson, Shakespeare and the Renaissance Concept of Honor, p. 199.

which seems to strengthen the theory that the play, in itself, was not extremely controversial. Farjeon thinks that the Deposition scene was censored and, thereby, removed before the play was performed.[347] However, Adams, Wilson, and Chambers believe that the scene was acted during the first series of performances and that Wise, the publisher, omitted the sequence, because sensitivity about the subject matter had arisen by 1597.[348] One does not doubt that Shakespeare took an interest in politics, as pointed out by Albright and Elder.[349] However, it seems highly unlikely that Shakespeare had any seditious intentions in writing Richard II.[350] He simply selected a topic of great interest

---

[347]Herbert Farjeon, "Censored Shakespeare," New Statesman and Nation, VIII (October 20, 1934), 544-545.

[348]Adams, op. cit., p. 517. Wilson, op. cit., pp. xxxiii; 107-108. Sir E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, II, 355. The following entry is found in Harrison, op. cit., ii, 206: " August 29, 1597. Richard II is being printed without that scene of the deposing of King Richard." This quotation seems to indicate an assumption that the public knew about the deposition scene; hence, one reasons that the scene was performed. However, Harrison quotes parts of documents and sometimes paraphrases them, and one is uncertain about the authenticity of the entry cited, here.

[349]Evelyn May Albright, "Shakespeare's Richard II and the Essex Conspirary," PMLA, XLII (September, 1927), 686. Also, L. W. Elder, "Shakespeare's Political Philosophy," Poet Lore, XXI (November, 1910), 483.

[350]Sir E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, II, 355.

and he presented that topic impartially.[351] Campbell doubts that Shakespeare had any foreknowledge that Richard II was to become a subject of political sensitivity.[352]

The relationship of these Richard II plays is of great importance: the three have never before been very seriously considered as a unit, and such an investigation contributes to what one knows about any one of these dramas. Studies in textual history, in addition to helping produce the best possible text of a play, add to an overall knowledge of these three works. For example, the passages marked for omission in Woodstock, generally speaking, indicate the limits of censorship. Therefore, since nothing in Richard II (in its extant form) approaches the challenge to authority as found in Woodstock, one assumes that Shakespeare's play was not contrary to Elizabethan moral principles. Also, the later publication of Richard II (1608 and 1615) after Elizabeth's death and the seventeenth-century revivals of Woodstock indicate that these two plays probably would have presented less controversy had it not been for the direct

---

[351] Lily B. Campbell, Shakespeare's "Histories," pp. 193; 212.

[352] Loc. cit.

analogy contained in them between Elizabeth and Richard II. Certainly, the later publication of Richard II shows that this play, at least, was morally acceptable, for the idea of divine right continued to prevail under the Stuart kings.

One sees in these three plays a movement connected with a specific subject. Jack Straw, representing something less than a full scale treatment of rebellion, is a crude attempt at moralizing, with cautious hints of governmental injustices. This play, in its pointing out of a few injustices, would have been food for the minds of the peasants. Woodstock, on the other hand, contains serious, organized social criticism, so that one thinks it would have appealed predominately to the middle classes. Finally, Richard II is an artistic achievement, incorporating well known historical events and well known ideas with extensive character development and personal tragedy. Richard II attracted the attention of the learned and the nobility, and, by 1598, Shakespeare had achieved great fame.[353]

---

[353]Harrison, op. cit., II, 306, cites a passage in Meres's "Palladis Tamia," indicating that Shakespeare was regarded as the foremost English dramatist for both tragedy and comedy. Most of the plays which Shakespeare had written by 1598 (including Richard II) are praised in the passage.

Source studies of these plays also tend to reveal the moral intentions of the authors in writing the Richard II plays. Since Jack Straw and Richard II are seen to be fairly accurate reproductions of history, it is likely that they would have been less subversive that Woodstock. One thinks that the author of Woodstock risked governmental censure, because he presents all the evils of Richard's reign as if these evils had occurred within a few years. Moreover, source studies show that most of the moral and political concepts presented in these three plays date to medieval times. Certainly, these dramatists are indebted to Hall, for example, for the idea of using history as a moral lesson, but, aside from the theory of divine right, all of the basic political and religious ideas presented in the Richard II plays originated before or during the Middle Ages. Therefore, one suggests that works like Froissart's chronicle and Mum and the Sothsegger are essential to an understanding of these plays, recognizing that many medieval ideas refused to die during the Renaissance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Joseph Quincy. A Life of William Shakespeare. Boston: Constable, 1923.

Adkins, Mary Grace Muse. "A Theory About The Life and Death of Jack Straw," Texas University Studies in English, XXVIII (1949), 57-82.

Albright, Evelyn May. Dramatic Publications in England 1580-1640. New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1927.

_____. "Shakespeare's Richard II and the Essex Conspiracy," PMLA, XLII (September, 1927), 686-720.

_____. "Shakespeare's Richard II, Hayward's History of Henry IV and the Essex Conspiracy Rejoinder," PMLA, XLVI (September, 1931), 694-719.

Anderson, Ruth L. "Kingship in Renaissance Drama," SP, XLI (1924), 136-155.

Arber, Edward (ed.). A Transcript of the Register of the Company of Stationers of London. In V Vols. New York: Peter Smith, 1950.

Armstrong, William A. (ed.). Elizabethan History Plays. London: The Oxford University Press, 1965.

Arnold, Morris L. The Soliloquies of Shakespeare. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1911.

Ashbee, Edmund W. (ed.). Shakespeare's Richard the Second, Facsimiled From the Edition Printed at London in the Year 1598. London: Ashbee, 1869.

_____ (ed.). Shakespeare's Richard the Second, Facsimiled From the Edition Printed at London in the Year 1615. London: Ashbee, 1870.

Attwater, A. L. "Shakespeare's Sources," A Companion to Shakespeare Studies. Edited by Harely Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934.

Baskervill, Charles R., Virgil B. Heltzel, and Arthur H. Nethercot (eds.). Elizabethan and Stuart Plays. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962.

Bently, Gerald E. The Jacobean and Caroline Stage. In V Vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1941.

Black, Matthew W. (ed.). A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Life and Death of King Richard the Second. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1955.

_____. "The Sources of Shakespeare's Richard II," Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies. Edited by James G. McManaway, Giles E. Dawson, and Edwin E. Willoughby.

Boas, Frederick S. Shakespeare & the Universities. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1923.

Bowers, Fredson. On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Library, 1955.

Bullen, A. H. (ed.). A Collection of Old English Plays. In IV Vols. New York: Benjamin Blom Incorporated, 1964.

Bullough, Geoffrey (ed.). Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. In VI Vols. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

Camden, William. Tomus Alter, et Idem: Or the Historie of the Life and Reigne of that Famous Princesse Elizabeth: Containing a Brief Memoriall of the Chiefest Affaires of State, that haue passed in these Kingdomes of England, Scotland, France, or Ireland, since the year of the Fatall Spanish Invasion to that of her sad and euer to be deplored dissolution. London: Thomas Harper for William Web, 1629.

Campbell, Lily B. (ed.). The Mirror for Magistrates. New York: Barnes and Noble Incorporated, 1960.

_____. Shakespeare's "Histories" Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy. San Marino, California: The Huntington Library, 1947.

Carpenter, Frederic I. "Notes on the Anonymous 'Richard II'," JEGP, III (February, 1900), 138-142.

Chambers, Sir E. K. The Elizabethan Stage. In IV Vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923.

_____. "Elizabethan Stage Gleanings," RES, I (1925), 75-78.

_____. William Shakespeare: A Study in Facts and Problems. In II Vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1930.

Charlton, Henry B. Shakespeare, Politics and Politicians. The English Association Pamphlet, no. 72. Oxford: The Oxford University Press, 1929.

Collier, John P. New Particulars Regarding the Works of Shakespeare. London: Thomas Rood, 1836.

Craig, Hardin (ed.). The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1961.

_____. A New Look at Shakespeare's Quartos. Stanford, California: The Stanford University Press, 1961.

Creizenach, Wilhelm. The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare. Philadelphia: Lippincott Company, 1916.

Créton, Jean. "Histoire du Roy d'Angleterre Richard," Archaeologia, XX (1924), 182-378.

Curry, Walter C. Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns. Baton Rouge: The Louisiana State University Press, 1959.

Day, Mabel, and Robert Steele (eds.). Mum and the Sothsegger. London: The Oxford University Press, 1936.

Duthie, George I. Elizabethan Shorthand and the First Quarto of King Lear. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949.

Elder, L. W. "Shakespeare's Political Philosophy," Poet Lore, XXI (November, 1910), 483-486.

Ellis, Henry (ed.). Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland. In VI Vols. New York: AMS Press, 1965.

Elson, John J. "The Non-Shakespearian Richard II and Shakespeare's Henry IV Part I," SP, XXXII (April, 1935), 177-188.

Elyot, Sir Thomas. The Book Named the Governor. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1962.

Fabyan, Robert. The New Chronicles of England and France. Edited by Henry Ellis. In II Vols. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1811.

Farjeon, Herbert. "Censored Shakespeare," New Statesman and Nation, VIII (October 20, 1934), 544-545.

Farmer, John S. (ed.). The Life and Death of Jack Straw. London: The Tudor Facsimile Texts Publications, 1911.

Farnham, Willard. The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1936.

Feuillerat, Albert. The Composition of Shakespeare's Plays. New Haven: The Yale University Press, 1953.

Fish, Charles. "Henry IV: Shakespeare and Holinshed," SP, LXI (1964), 205-208.

Fleay, Frederick G. A Biographical Chronicle of the English Printed Drama 1559-1642. In II Vols. London: Reeves and Turner, 1891.

_____. A Chronicle History of the London Stage 1559-1642. New York: Burt Franklin, 1964.

Foster, William. "J. P. Collier's Fabrications," N&Q, CXCV (September 16, 1950), 414-415.

Frijlinck, Wilhelmina P. (ed.). The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second or Thomas of Woodstock. Oxford: For the Malone Society by John Johnson at the Oxford University Press, 1929.

Gildersleeve, Virginia C. Government Regulation of Elizabethan Drama. New York: Burt Franklin, 1961.

Grafton, Richard. A Chronicle at Large and Meere History of the Affayres of England, and Kings of the Same. Edited by Henry Ellis. In II Vols. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1809.

Greer, C. A. "Did Shakespeare Use Daniel's Civile Wars?" N&Q, CXCVI (February 3, 1951), 53-54.

_____. "More About the Deposition Scene of Richard II," N&Q, CXCVIII (February 10, 1953), 49-50.

Greg, W. W. Dramatic Documents From the Elizabethan Playhouse. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1931.

_____. The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1942.

_____. The Shakespeare First Folio. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955.

Griggs, William, and Peter A. Daniel (eds.). King Richard the Second by William Shakespeare, the First Quarto, 1597. London: W. Griggs, 1890.

Grossart, Alexander B. (ed.). The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Samuel Daniel. In V Vols. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.

Hall, Edward. The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancaster and York. Edited by Henry Ellis. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1809.

Harbage, Alfred. The Annals of English Drama 975-1700. London: Methuen and Company, 1964.

Harrison, G. B. (ed.). The Elizabethan Journals. In III Vols., as one. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1938.

Hart, Alfred. Shakespeare and the Homilies and Other Pieces of Research into Elizabethan Drama. Melbourne: The Melbourne University Press, 1934.

Hasker, Richard E. "The Copy for the First Folio Richard II," Studies in Bibliography, V (1953), 53-72.

Hazlitt, W. Carew, and Robert Dodsley (eds.). A Select Collection of Old English Plays. In VII Vols. New York: Benjamin Blom Incorporated, 1964.

Heffner, Ray. "Shakespeare, Hayward, and Essex: Reply to E. M. Albright," PMLA, XLV (September, 1930), 754-780.

Hinman, Charlton. The Printing and Proofreading of the First Folio of Shakespeare. In II Vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1963.

Hinman, Charlton, and W. W. Greg (eds.). Richard the Second 1597. Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, no. 13.

Hutchison, Harold F. "Shakespeare and Richard II," History Today, XI (April, 1961), 236-244.

Keeton, George W. Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background. London: Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1967.

Keller, Wolfgang (ed.). "Richard II. Erster Teil. Ein Drama aus Shakespeares Zeit," Shakespeare Jahrbuch, XXXV (1899), 3-121.

Kingsford, C. L. Prejudice and Promise in Fifteenth Century England. London: F. Cass, 1962.

Kirschbaum, Leo. Shakespeare and the Stationers. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1955.

Kittredge, George L. (ed.). The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1936.

_____. (ed.). The Tragedy of King Richard the Second. Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1966.

Kokeritz, Helge, and Charles T. Prouty (eds.). Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies. New Haven: The Yale University Press, 1954.

Kuhl, Earnest P. "Shakespeare and Hayward," SP, XXV (July, 1928), 312-315.

Law, Robert A. "Deviations From Holinshed in Richard II," Texas University Studies in English, XXIX (1950), 91-110.

Lewis, Roland B. (ed.). The Shakespeare Documents. In II Vols. Stanford, California: The Stanford University Press, 1940.

Lettenhove, Kervyn de (ed.). Oeures de Froissart. In XXV Vols. Osnabruck: Biblio Verlag, 1967.

Macaulay, G. C. (ed.), and Lord Berners (tr.). The Chronicles of Froissart. London: Macmillan and Company, 1895.

McKerrow, Ronald B. An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1928.

Malone, Edmond (ed.). The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. In XXI Vols. London: F. C. and J. Rivington, 1821.

Montagu, Basil (ed.). The Works of Francis Bacon. In XVI Vols. London: William Pickering, 1827.

Moore, John B. The Comic and Realistic in English Drama. New York: Russell and Russell, 1965.

Moorman, F. W. "Shakespeare's History Plays and Daniel's Civile Wars," Shakespeare Jahrbuch, XL (1904), 69-93.

Muir, Kenneth (ed.). The Life and Death of Jack Straw. Oxford: The Malone Society, 1957.

_____. "Source Problems in the Histories," Shakespeare Jahrbuch, XCVI (1960), 47-63.

Munro, John (ed.). The London Shakespeare. In VI Vols. London: Eyre and Spottiswood, 1958.

Murray, James, and Others (eds.). The Oxford English Dictionary. In XII Vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961.

Murray, John T. English Dramatic Companies. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.

Newbolt, Henry (ed.). The Life and Death of King Richard II. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1912.

Nichols, John (ed.). The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth. In II Vols. London: J. Nichols, 1788.

Partridge, Astley. Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama. Loncoln: The University of Nebraska Press, 1964.

Petersson, Robert T. (ed.). The Tragedy of King Richard the Second. New Haven: The Yale University Press, 1957.

Plomer, H. R. "The Printers of Shakespeare's Plays and Poems," Library, VII (1906), 152-153.

Pollard, Alfred W. (ed.). A New Shakespeare Quarto: The Tragedy of Richard II. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1916.

Praetorius, Charles, and W. A. Harrison (eds.). King Richard the Second. By William Shakespeare. The First Quarto, 1597.

_____. (eds.). King Richard the Second. By William Shakespeare. The Third Quarto, 1608. London: C. Praetorius, 1888.

Reyher, Paul. "Notes sur les Sources de Richard II," Revue de l'Enseignement des Langues Vivantes, XLI (1924), 158-168.

Ribner, Irving. The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. New York: Barnes and Noble Incorporated, 1965.

Ristine, Frank H. English Tragicomedy: Its Origins and History. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.

Robertson, J. M. The Shakespeare Cannon. In III Vols. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1923.

Rossiter, A. P. (ed.). Woodstock: A Moral History. London: Chatto and Windus, 1946.

Schelling, Felix E. The Elizabethan Chronicle Play. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1902.

Schütt, Hugo (ed.). The Life and Death of Jack Straw. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitatsbuchhandlung, 1901.

Sisson, Charles J. New Readings in Shakespeare. In II Vols. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1956.

Smith, Robert M. Froissart and the English Chronicle Play. New York: Benjamin Blom Incorporated, 1965.

Stephen, Leslie, and Sidney Lee (eds.). The Dictionary of National Biography. In XXII Vols., with supplements. Oxford: The Oxford University Press, 1917.

Stow, John. The Annales of England, From the First Inhabitants Untill 1592. London: R. Newberry, 1592.

Talbert, Ernest W. Elizabethan Drama and Shakespeare's Early Plays. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1963.

Tannenbaum, Samuel A. The Handwriting of the Renaissance. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1930.

_____. Shakespearian Scraps and Other Elizabethan Fragments. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1933.

Tillyard, E. M. W. Shakespeare's History Plays. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946.

Ure, Peter (ed.). King Richard II. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Van Baumer, Franklin Le. The Early Tudor Theory of Kingship. New York: Russell and Russell, 1966.

Watson, Curtis B. Shakespeare and the Renaissance Concept of Honor. Princeton: The Princeton University Press, 1960.

Wells, Henry W. Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights. Port Washington, N. Y.: Kennikat Press Incorporated, 1964.

Williams, Benjamin (ed. and tr.). Chronique de la Traïson et Mort de Richart Deux Roy Dengle-terre. London: The English Historical Society, 1846.

Wilson, John D. (ed.). King Richard II. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1939.

Wright, Austin. "The History Plays," "Starre of Poets": Discussions of Shakespeare. Carnegie Series in English, No. 10. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1966.

Zeeveld, W. Gordon. "The Influence of Hall on Shakespeare's English Historical Plays," ELH, III (1936), 317-353.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

A STUDY OF THE STAGE DIRECTIONS OF JACK STRAW

The stage directions of the play are given here in full. This material is organized as follows: (1) stage directions are in italics; (2) comment on inadequate or inconsistent stage directions is supplied, given within brackets; and (3) an asterisk following a speaker's name indicates that the specified character speaks and that his presence on stage has not been accounted for by entrance directions.

I.i.1	[There are no entrance directions at the beginning of the play.]
30-38	[The tax collector either strikes or offers to strike Jack, and Jack kills him.]
39-40	Enter Parson Ball, Wat Tyler, Nobs, Tom Miller the Clowne.
146	Exeunt all but Nobs.
163	Exeunt. [This stage direction is incorrect, for it refers only to Nobs.]
I.ii.164-65	Enter Lord Treasorer, Lord Archbishop, and Secretarie, with others.
212	Messenger.*
241	Exeunt.

I.iii.242-43 Enter Iacke Straw, Wat Tyler, Hob Carter, Tom Miller, and Nobs.

289 Exeunt. [Stage directions fail to indicate which characters should leave. Nobs remains and speaks to someone, either Wat or Jack.]

295 Exeunt.

I.iv.296-97 Enter the Queen Mother, the County of Salisburie, and a Gentleman Vsher.

337 King.*

354 Enter Messenger.

376 Morton.*

386 Bishop.*

435 Exeunt Morton. [This stage direction should be Exit.]

463 Treasorer.*

473 [There is no Exeunt or other stage directions to end the scene.]

II.i.476 Enter Tom Miller with a Goose.

487-89 Enter Nobs and cut away the Goose while he talketh, and leue the head behinde him with them & Morton. [This humorous sequence is rather puzzling. First, Tom enters carrying a goose, apparently by the head. Then, while Tom speaks, it appears in soliloquy, Nobs enters and cuts off the goose, leaving Tom with the head. Tom later discovers that his goose has " . . . flowne away without her head." However, the stage directions, with them & Morton, remain unexplained.]

497 Exeunt.

II.ii.498-99 Enter with the crew Tom Miller, Iacke Straw, Wat Tyler, and Hob Carter.

523 Morton.* [His entrance is not given specifically. He probably enters as one of the crew, see line 498 above.]

534 [There is no Exeunt to end scene.]

II.iii.535-36 Enter King, Archbishop, Treasorer, Secretarie, Sir Iohn Newton, and Spencer. [There is only one speech before the King and his train leave. It is the King who speaks, but his speech lacks a heading.]

II.iii.545 Exeunt King and his traine, saue Newton & Spencer.

584 Exeunt Ambo.

II.iv.585-86 Enter Iacke Straw, Wat Tyler, Hob Carter, Tom Miller, Nobs, Morton, and Southwarkemen. [While on stage, Jack and Hob do not speak in this scene. Possibly, the dramatist has failed to develop this scene as he intended.]

601 Exeunt all but Morton.

615 Exeunt Morton. [Incorrect]

II.v.615 Enter Nobs with a Flemming. [There is only one speech in this scene. The speaker is Nobs, but his name does not appear in a heading.]

622 Exeunt both

III.i.625-26 Enter King, Lord Maior, Sir Iohn Newton, two Sargants, with Gard and Gentlemen.

682-83 Enter Iacke Straw, Wat Tyler, Tom Miller, Pars on Ball. and Hob Carter. [Of the characters named in the last two stage directions above, the following do not

speak in this scene: Newton, the sergeant, the guard, the gentlemen, and Tom Miller.]

751 Exeunt King and his Traine.

760 Nobs.*

774 Exeunt Omnes.

III.ii.775 Enter Tom Miller to burne Papers.

776 Nobs.*

791 Exeunt Nobs. [Incorrect]

792-97 Tom Miller. Well if wee shall be hangd it is but a follie to be forrie,
But goe to it with a good stomacke.
Rydle me a ridle, whats this,
I shall be hangd, I shall not be hangd.

Here he tries it with a staffe. [It is difficult to determine what is happening here.]

III.ii.798 Enter Ladie Mother and Gentleman Vsher. [Previously, she is referred to as the Queen Mother, I.iv.296.]

844 Exeunt Queene Mother & Vsher.

845-46 Enter Iacke Strawe, Wat Tyler, Parson Ball, Nobs, Tom Miller being there. [It seems that a prompt would have indicated that Tom remains on stage before this point.]

876-77 Enter the King, Maior, and Newton bearing a sword.

922-23 The King giues him the sword. [The King giues Newton's sword to Jack, but nothing in the stage directions indicates when the King gets the sword from Newton.]