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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

May 10, 1968
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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 Q1 of Shakespeare's Richard II:

290 Augusti./.

Andrew Wise./.Entered for his Copie by appoyntment from master Warden man / The Tragedye of RICHARD the SECOND. vjd

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. There are four surviving copies of the 1597

---

1Edward Arber (ed.), A Transcript of the Register of the Company of Stationers of London, III, 23. Leo Kischbaum, 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).

2Charlton 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


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. Actually, the Elizabethan method of press correction is fairly simple. 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. 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. 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. The four extant copies of Q1 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.

10McKerrow, 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 (A1r, that is the recto side of the first leaf), page 2 (A1v, the verso side of the first leaf), page 3 (A2r), page 4 (A2v), page 5 (A3r), page 6 (A3v), page 7 (A4r), and page 8 (A4v). Then, the next gathering begins with page 9 (B1r), and so on. The purpose of the signatures is to make certain that the sheets are folded properly. It should be remembered that A1r 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\textsubscript{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:

\textbf{DCP}
(1) Ah but ere I last receiued the Sacrament, (I.i.139) A4\textsuperscript{r}.11
\textbf{H}
But ere . . . .
(I.i.139) A4\textsuperscript{f}.

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

\textsuperscript{11}As the first variant occurring in the Q\textsubscript{1} copies, Black, \textit{A New Variorum}, p. 359, has strangely listed, under "misprints are corrected," the following: "A2\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 dicta-
ting 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

12McKerrow, op. cit., p. 343. Cf. Samuel A.
Both men give extensive accounts of Elizabethan hand-
writing.

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

14Loc. cit.
an assistant might have taken the copy near a window to read a few lines of obscure handwriting to the printer. However, F. J. Hall, Controller of the Oxford University Press, doubts Pollard's theory. Hall suggests that the copyist of the MS from which Q1 was printed might have begun line 139 by starting to write the word, And. Having written the An, the copyist may have realized his mistake and, thus, altered the n, changing it to an h. If one assumes that Ah was an error in the MS copy, he must also assume that the printer of Q1 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

15There are paintings showing printers reading their MSS and setting type at the same time, loc. cit.
17Loc. cit.
18Loc. 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. Moreover, there are other lines in the play with extra syllables, for example, the next line:

P
(2) Shall I see me Crest-fallen
in my fathers sight?
Or with pale beggar-feare
impeach my height?
Before this out-Darde
Dastarde, . . .
(I.i.188-190) A4V.

DCH

. . . impeach my height,
Before this out-Darde
Dastarde? . . .
(I.i.188-190) A4V.

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.

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

The line preceding 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.

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
(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) Blv.

DP
And what heare there . . .
(I.ii.67-70) Blv.

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. However, Daniel, Wilson, Pollard, and Sisson all prefer heare. In this sequence, the Dutchess is lamenting her husband's death. Because of the empty house, one assumes that everything about Plashy would be


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

HC
(7) A traitor to God, his kins, A traitorto his God...
and him, (I.iii.108) B3v.

DP
(I.iii.108) B3v.

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
(8) Of cruell wounds plowd vp
with neighbours sword,
(I.iii.128) B3v.

DP
Of ciuill wounds...
(I.iii.128) B3v.

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. However, King Richard here is speaking, it seems, about strife

22Loc. cit.

23Pollard, 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.

24Malone, op. cit., XVI, 30-31, fn. 4.
among fellow citizens that has made the country weak and susceptible 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HC</th>
<th>DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With riuall hating enuy set on you (I.iii.131) B3V.</td>
<td>With riuall-hating enuy on you (I.iii.131) B3V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HC</th>
<th>DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10) Draw the sweet infant breath of gentle sleep, (I.iii.133) B3V.</td>
<td>Drawes ... (I.iii.133) B3V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11) Which so rouzde vp with boistrous vtunde drummes, With harsh resounding trumpets dreadfull bray, And grating shocke of harsh wrathful yron armes, resounding armes, (I.iii.134-36) B3V.

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.

HC
(12) Doubly portcullist with my teeth and lippes, (I.iii.167) B4r.

DP
Doubly portcullist . . . (I.iii.167) B4r.

This line refers to the tongue's being closed off behind the lips and teeth as if behind gates. 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 B1v, B3v, and B4r. 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.

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

28McKerrow, 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 Q1 in corrections to which he must have given at least some consideration. No other evidence is available, since F1 also reads _heare_ and _ciuill_, and, therefore, one must assume that the printer of Q1 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.
(13) A partiall slander ought A partial slander sought
I to auoide, ... (I.iii.241) C1r.
(I.iii.241) C1r.

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

(14) [missing] (I.iii.248) C1r. Exit. (I.iii.248) C1r.

(15) With reuerence he did throw What reuerence ••.
away on slaues, (I.iv.27) C2v.
(I.iv.27) C2v.

Possibly, there was confusion about the Elizabethan abbre­
viation, wth (with) and w+ (what), or perhaps the printer
picked up With from the previous line, 26. 30

(16) A brace of draimen bid bid, God speed him
God speed him well, wel, (I.iv.32) C2v.
(I.iv.32) C2v.

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

30Pollard, 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 Q1 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
(17) We must supplant those rough rugheaded kerne, (II.i.156) Dl  \textsuperscript{r}.
H

... kernes, (II.i.156) Dl  \textsuperscript{r}.

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

The rest of the variants in Q1 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
(18) The plate, coines, reuenews, ... coine, ...
and moueables (II.i.161) Dl  \textsuperscript{v}.

DCH
(II.i.161) Dl  \textsuperscript{v}.
(19) About his marriage, nor his owne disgrace,

(II.i.168) D1v.

The printer probably repeated the first his by mistake.

(20) [missing] (II.i.186) D1v. Why Vncle whats the matter?

(II.i.186) D1v.

(21) At nothing trembles, at something it grieues,

(II.ii.12) D3v.

(22) Sorrowes eyes . .

Shews nothing but confusion; eyde awry,

(II.ii.19) D3v.

(23) [missing] (II.ii.33) D3v. Tis nothing but conceit my gracious Lady.

(II.ii.33) D3v.

(24) The lord of Rosse, The lords of . .

Beaumond, and Willoughby,

(II.ii.54) D4r.

(II.ii.54) D4r.

(25) Comfort's in heaven, and we are in the earth, . .

. . . on the earth, . . .

(II.ii.78) D4r.

(II.ii.78) D4r.

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.
(26) He is as like three as any . . . as a man may be
Not like me or a of my Not like me or any of my
Possibly because of the handwriting of the MS, the printer
confused a and any of lines 108-109.

(27) Or in this piteous heart Or in thy . . .
plant thou thine eare, (V.iii.126) I3r.

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 Q1 variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant(s)</th>
<th>Signature(s)</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Copies with corrected reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A4r</td>
<td>inner</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A4v</td>
<td>outer</td>
<td>DCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>B1v, B3v, B4r</td>
<td>inner</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>C1r, C2v</td>
<td>outer</td>
<td>DH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>D1r</td>
<td>outer</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>D1v, D3v, D4r</td>
<td>inner</td>
<td>DCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>Ilr, I3r</td>
<td>outer</td>
<td>DCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following Q1 of Richard II, there appeared four more
quarto editions, printed before the appearance of the 1623
Each of these subsequent quartos, two through five, was printed from the immediately preceding edition. 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 Q5 being much less accurate than Q1.

Shakespeare's name does not appear on the title page of Q1, but does appear on that of Q2 and on all the other quartos. Both Q2 and Q3 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 Q3 refer to the 1608 quarto as Q3 and to the 1615 quarto as Q4.


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.

25 Junii [1603]

Mathew Lawe Entered for his copies in full courte Holden this Day. These ffyve copies following... is vjd viz

iij enterludes or playes.
The ffirst is of RICHARD the .3.
The second of RICHARD the .2.
The Third of HENRY the .4. the firste Part. all Kingses

all whiche by consent of the Company are sett over to him from Andrew Wyse.35

Law published Q4 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

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

36Charles 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.

earlier quartos, because it would have been offensive to Elizabeth, noting that the omission "... leaves an obvious scar."\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{39} Harrison, among others, has pointed out that the Q4 Deposition scene is grossly inferior to the same sequence in the folio.\textsuperscript{40} In Q4, the printer has omitted parts of lines and has continued these lines with parts of following lines.\textsuperscript{41} Hence, the meter is often completely obliterated. Most editors agree that the Deposition scene of Q4 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

\textsuperscript{38}Hinman and Greg, \textit{op. cit.}, p. viii.

\textsuperscript{39}Griggs and Daniel, \textit{op. cit.}, p. x.


\textsuperscript{41}Black, \textit{A New Variorum}, p. 370, finds that "thirty-six of the added verses are mislined, ... ."
of a few shillings. Ure agrees that reporting was probably the means through which Law obtained the Parliament scene. It is doubtful that Elizabethan shorthand could have produced a text even as good as that of the Parliament scene in Q₄. However, Daniel thinks that Law might have obtained from Wise a copy of Q₃ made over with the Deposition scene added in MS. 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.

---

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 Q₄ 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 Q₄ 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).


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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Errors</th>
<th>First Corrected by</th>
<th>Left Uncorrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$Q_2$</td>
<td>$Q_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_1$</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_2$</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_3$</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_4$</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_5$</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Q5 or, possibly, from Q3.\(^ {53}\) The traditional view is that Q5 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.

errors introduced by Q5. Pollard, the first to raise the idea that Q3 might have been the copy behind the folio, thinks that the few errors of Q4 and Q5 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. Pollard ultimately rejects the hypothesis that Q3 might have been the source, but his initial proposal has been revived by Hasker. Hasker attempts to prove that a damaged copy of Q3, with the last few leaves supplied from Q5, served as the source for the folio. Hasker's theory, though complex and unprovable, is fairly strong. One

57 Loc. cit.
58 Pollard, op. cit., p. 89, considers the case for Q3 only a little less strong than the generally accepted theory that Q5 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 Q₃, Q₄, or Q₅ was the folio's quarto source. Where the folio differs from Q₁, 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 Q₁ 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 Q₁'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 Q₁, 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 Q₁ 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 Q1 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 Q1, which fact would explain the sporadic folio restorations of some Q1 readings.


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. 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. The evidence presented thus far strongly suggests that Q1 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. 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

67Malone, 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.
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.\(^7^1\) Pollard notes that the passage is dramatically improved by the omission.\(^7^2\) 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.\(^7^3\) 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.

\(^7^1\)Cited in Munro, ibid., p. 578.

\(^7^2\)Pollard, op. cit., p. 92.

\(^7^3\)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.i.ii.28-34)

The *if* of 1. 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). 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." One thinks, however, that

---

74 Malone, op. cit., XVI, 93, fn. 4.
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 Q₁ and the folio. Greg believes that Q₁ 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 influenced 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, Q₁, 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 Q₅, which they had taken to the theatre and had imperfectly corrected by means of the Q₁ prompt book.⁷⁸ Hasker, with a theory similar to

---


⁷⁷ Loc. cit.

⁷⁸ Loc. cit.
that of Pollard, thinks that the MS prompt copy became worn and was replaced by Q₃, which, after serving as the prompt copy, became a source for the folio. 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. Wilson concludes that a copy of Q₅, after it had been corrected by means of a prompt book MS, was the source from which the folio was printed. Greg also believes that the corrections of the folio were supplied from a MS prompt copy.

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. 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.
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. . . . 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. The two copies described by Wilson would have been authoritative enough to have served as sources for Q1 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. 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.

Consequently, one may be fairly certain that the prompt

85 Loc. cit.
86 Bowers, op. cit., pp. 11-12.
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 Q1 as closely as possible. 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. Generally speaking, the folio does not differ from Q1 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:

230 Die Octobris./.

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


89 Henry Newbolt (ed.), The Life and Death of King Richard II, pp. xlvii-xlviii.
lyfe and death of JACK STRAWE . . vjd

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. 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. 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. 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

90Arber, 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 (Q1) 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.

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

92Loc. cit.

93Ibid., 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).  

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.  

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. Muir has pointed out that Q2 of Jack Straw is a poorly done reprint of Q1 without any textual value. 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.

Muir's introduction to his edition of the play represents the brief extent to which textual studies of this work have been pursued. 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.


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. 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. 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. 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. Schütt strongly agrees with Fleay and gives several supporting pages of parallels between *Jack Straw* and the works of Peele. 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. Nothing is known about the play's possible stage history or about the company with which this drama may have been associated. Possibly, the play was never acted, and, in order to salvage what he could for his work,

106 Hazlitt, *op. cit.*, III-IV, 376.


108 Schütt, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-42.

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

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

111Wilhelmina 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. Boas names the work Thomas of Woodstock, since the Duke of Gloucester, Thomas of Woodstock, is the protagonist in the drama. Rossiter shortens Boas's title to Woodstock.

There are fifteen plays in the BM Egerton MS 1994 of which Woodstock is the eighth. 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. Finally,

112Sir E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, IV, 42.
113Frederick S. Boas, Shakespeare & the Universities, p. 143.
115Boas, op. cit., p. 144.
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{120} The credit for pointing out the importance of the Egerton MS, Boas feels, must be

\textsuperscript{117}Bullen, op. cit., I, 417.

\textsuperscript{118}Boas, op. cit., p. 108.

\textsuperscript{119}Bullen, op. cit., I. 417.

\textsuperscript{120}Ibid., I. 418.
accorded to Bullen, who has printed five plays from this valuable collection.\textsuperscript{121}

There are five editions of \textit{Woodstock}. Halliwell printed eleven copies of the play in 1870 and entitled it \textit{A Tragedy of Richard the Second, concluding with the murder of the Duke of Gloucester at Calis. A composition anterior to Shakespeare's tragedy}.\textsuperscript{122} Halliwell's edition retains original spelling and punctuation but is inaccurate regarding the interpretation of many words, and it is inaccessible.\textsuperscript{123} Keller also has edited \textit{Woodstock}; his work was published in the yearbook of the German Shakespeare Society in 1899.\textsuperscript{124} Keller has included an explanatory introduction and entitled the drama \textit{Richard II. Erster Teil. Ein Drama aus Shakespeares Zeit}.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{121}Boas, op. cit., p. 96.

\textsuperscript{122}Cited in Frijlinck, op. cit., p. xxx.

\textsuperscript{123}Rossiter, op. cit., p. 170.


\textsuperscript{125}Loc. cit.
poorly to an Elizabethan text and, consequently, often mis-represents the meaning. Carpenter has seen fit, therefore, to make quite a number of corrections on Keller's edition. In 1929, the Malone Society published Frijlinck's typescript edition with an extensive introduction, thoroughly accounting for the Woodstock MS and its condition. However, Frijlinck's text is designed primarily for textual scholars. Rossiter provides the first modern text of the play and follows the original whenever possible, supplementing it with textual notes to indicate his emendations. Armstrong bases his edition on Rossiter's text but claims to have employed a more modern system of punctuation. 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.


130 Ibid., p. 171.

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

¹³³Rossiter, op. cit., p. 27.
¹³⁴Geoffrey Bullough, Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, III, 359-360.
¹³⁵Boas, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hand</th>
<th>Ink</th>
<th>How the Ink Was Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The scribe has used:</td>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>for the body of the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>for most of the speaker's names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>for a few corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>for deletions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A has used:</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>for a few names and the correction of a few names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>for one stage direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>for speaker's names and marginal directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>for one stage direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B has used:</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>for a few speaker's names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C has used:</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>for numbering four of the acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D has used:</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>for corrections, prompt notes, and the filling in of a line left blank by the scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>for prompt notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E has used:</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>for prompt notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 | for prompt notes
 | or III |

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.\(^{136}\)

\(^{136}\) 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{140} A chemical test, Rossiter insists, would be required to determine decisively the similarity or difference of some of the ink tints.\textsuperscript{141} Furthermore, one must keep in mind that the labeling of the inks (as in the chart) rests only on the basis of appearance.\textsuperscript{142} In some instances, Frijlinck's identification of the inks seems improbable. For example, she observes that the prompt note, "Shreys Ready," (IV.ii.216) is by hand D in ink VII, one of the inks also used by the scribe.\textsuperscript{143} Is it very likely that a prompter

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{138}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 174.
\textsuperscript{139}\textit{Frijlinck, op. cit.}, pp. vi-vii; xv-xvi.
\textsuperscript{140}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. xi; xiv.
\textsuperscript{141}\textit{Rossiter, op. cit.}, p. 174.
\textsuperscript{142}\textit{Frijlinck, op. cit.}, p. xi.
\textsuperscript{143}\textit{Ibid.}, p. xviii.
\end{flushright}
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 con­
tains 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

144Ibid., p. xv.


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

147Boas, 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.


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.


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

---

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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{167}

\textsuperscript{165}Frijlinck, \textit{op. cit.}, p. v.

\textsuperscript{166}Rossiter, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 71-72.

\textsuperscript{167}\textit{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. Schütz, 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.), Oeuvres 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 Richard Deux Roy Déné-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 chronicle of John Bourchier (Lord Berners) is an English translation of Froissart's work and a highly significant source for the plays under investigation.\footnote{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.} With the exceptions of Créton and the author of Traisiom, all the historians named above borrowed a great amount from Froissart's massive work.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 58-59, passim.} 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...
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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Annales}, but nowhere else: "But when \textit{Adam} deleued, and \textit{Eue} span, / Who was then a Gentleman" (\textit{Jack Straw}, I.i.82-83).\textsuperscript{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 . . . ."\textsuperscript{179} The play reads, "Proud Rebel wert

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{ibid.}, pp. 103-114.


\textsuperscript{179}Grafton, \textit{op. cit.}, I, 421. Quoted in Smith, \textit{ibid.}, p. 112.
but thou and I alone, / Thou durst not ask 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 Traison 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

---


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 Duchess 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.  

185Loc. cit.


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

188Ure, 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 portrait 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.


¹⁹¹ Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. liii.


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. 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. 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. 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).

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.


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

202 Law, op. cit., pp. 94-95.
Reyher suggests that two minor French chronicles, Traison and that of Créton, may have been Shakespeare's sources for Richard II. Ure, however, doubts the strength of any verbal parallels between the play and these histories. Nevertheless, Muir points out, that although the parallels are weak, Créton's work and Traison 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 Traison and in Créton's history. Muir concludes that there is a strong probability that Shakespeare was acquainted with the work of Créton and Traison.

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


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


206 Ibid., p. 59.
work and, probably, acquainted with Traison, 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,


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

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.

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.

with the aforementioned option, would have provided all the information needed to write the play.\textsuperscript{218}

Exactly how the author of \textit{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.\textsuperscript{219} Elson points out, however, that these misrepresentations of history were deliberate in order to create a popular hero and to defame royalty.\textsuperscript{220} Smith thinks that the author's ignoring of history has resulted in a finely balanced plot.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{222} However,

\textsuperscript{218}Ibid., pp. 116-117; 130.

\textsuperscript{219}Keller, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 7-9.


\textsuperscript{221}Smith, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 130.

\textsuperscript{222}Rossiter, \textit{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. 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

224Mabel 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] 
werried be west on pe wilde 
Yrisshe, / Henrri was entrid 
on pe est half, / Whom all 
pe londe loued in lenghe 
and in brede, / And rosse 
with him rapely to ri3tyn 
his wronge, / For he shulld 
em serue of pe 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 sylffulnesses 
lest wondris arise. (Mum, 
Prologue 52)

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

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

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

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 *pil*.

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. This symbolic eagle is a triumphant force:

Thus hawkyd þis egle and houed aboue,
Dat, as God wolde þat gouerneth all þingis,
Ber nas kyte ne krowe þat kareyne hantid,
Dat 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

---


229 Day and Steele, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
an eagle. However, a line in *Woodstock* bears a slightly stronger resemblance to the metaphor in the poem. For example, the flatterers of Richard have received some rich booty of war, and Gloucester laments "that kynes 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 pey rayed arith pey If Thus I iett in pryd. I recchith no forther, / But still shall loose (*Woodstock*, I.iii.462).

studied all in stroutynge
and stireth amys euere;
(Mum, III.120-121).

Be leesinge so Iikyde
ladies and opher / Dat pey joied of pe jette and
gyside hem per-vnder; (Mum, III.158-159).

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

---

2301. 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

we held a counsell to deuise these suits ---- Sr henry Greene. deuised this fashione shooe bussy 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 Judgments, like ther frosty beards / would blast the bloomeing
bayed on him euere, / And
schorne him, for his
slauyne was of pe 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 extravaga-
tance of Richard's household, and Woodstock contains the
idea as illustrated in a speech by Richard:

For where was euere ony
cristen kynge pat 3e euere
knewe, / Dat helde swiche
an household pe halfdelle/
As Richard in pis rewme
... . (Mum, IV.1-3)

not all or cronicles shall
poynt a king / to match or
bountye, state & Royalltye /
or lett or successors 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


²³³Lily 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 portrayal 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:

And for to avoyde the shedding of our bloode, / with shame and death, which one must nedes haue had / The king through counsaile of the lorde thought good / To banysh both, whiche judgement 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 / wittilyngly 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, forfeiture of all ther goods
the subject was not sure / & lands: (Woodstock, III.i.
O lyfe lande, nor goods, 1265-67)
. . . . (MFM, 85-86)

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

\[\text{\footnotesize 235} \text{Rossiter, op. cit., o, 25.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 236} \text{Bullough, op. cit., III, 367.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 237} \text{Loc. cit.}\]
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. 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. Campbell indicates the popular menaphorical use of the word mirror during Elizabethan times and cites Hamlet III.iii.25-28. 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, I, 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.

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 therein 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


243Ure, 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). 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. 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. The evidence slightly favors the theory that


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 altogether 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 themselves 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 observed 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

---


251Wilson, 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 argu­
ments 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 indica­
tion 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 dis­
tribution 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.
255 Ibid., p. 192.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act and Scene</th>
<th>Rhyme Used as Cue</th>
<th>Rhyme not Used as Cue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.i</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.ii</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.iii</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.iv</td>
<td>(no rhyme at all)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.i</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.ii</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.iii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.iv</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.i</td>
<td>(no rhyme at all)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.ii</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.iii</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.iv</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.i</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.i</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.ii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.iii</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.iv</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.v</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.vi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Rhyme Used as Cue</th>
<th>Rhyme not Used as Cue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolingbroke</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaunt</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowbray</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchess Y.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchess G.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aumerle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Others)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. This

256Boas, 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. 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 givng 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.


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


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. 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. 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. 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. 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. In general, Tannembaum directs his argument against Collier's history of the MS and his account of finding this document. 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. 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. Finally, none of the dramatic material that Collier claims to have discovered has been mentioned by scholars, Joseph Ritson and Philip


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


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. 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. 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). 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. 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. Schelling has noted that Jack Straw had been a character in pageantry as early as 1519. However, it may be


275 "In an order of the Inner Temple, 1519, we learn that the king of Cockneys should sit and have due service on Chidermas 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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{2 Henry VI} has much in common with the rebellion described in Jack Straw.\textsuperscript{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 (\textit{Jack Straw}, IV.i.1177-79; \textit{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\textit{ 2 Henry VI} and the anonymous work would be very close.\textsuperscript{278}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{276}Bullough, \textit{op. cit.}, III, 91.
\textsuperscript{277}Ibid., pp. 91-92.
\textsuperscript{278}Hardin Craig (ed.), \textit{The Complete Works of Shakespeare}, p. 206, thinks that the date of composition for \textit{2 Henry VI} is 1591-92. Bullough, \textit{op. cit.}, III, 89, thinks that Shakespeare wrote the play near the end of 1591.
\end{flushright}
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. 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. 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.
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. 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. 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

---


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

283 Loc. cit.
which are the marks of earlier drama.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{285}

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

\begin{enumerate}
\item Frijlinck, \textit{op. cit.}, p. xxiii.
\item A. C. Partridge, \textit{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 \textit{Woodstock} is a scribal transcript made in the early seventeenth century; but he is certain that the date of composition is around 1591-92.
\item Frijlinck, \textit{op. cit.}, p. xxiii.
\item Keller, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 38-40.
\end{enumerate}
We, Richard rent out or kingdom like a pelting ffarme / that erst was held, as fair as Babilon / the maiden conqueris 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. 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. 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. 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.

---

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. The verbal parallels between the two plays always involve Tresilian of Woodstock and Shakespeare's Falstaff, two characters with much in common. 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.\textsuperscript{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 native country / but here at CaIlys 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, 

\textsuperscript{293} Schelling, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 107.
contrast of wisdom of age against the foolishness of youth) are the same in all three works.\textsuperscript{294} Keller cites some parallels from \textit{Edward II} and \textit{Woodstock}, which Rossiter thinks are verbally very weak.\textsuperscript{295} Furthermore, the characters of \textit{Woodstock} have counterparts in \textit{Edward II}: Anne, Richard, and Woodstock of the anonymous play are respectively similar to Isabelle, Edward, and Mortimer of \textit{Edward II}.\textsuperscript{296} The murders of Edward and Woodstock are both highly dramatic, and the murderers in both cases are killed, immediately following the crimes.\textsuperscript{297} In the same general way as shown above, one could also relate \textit{Richard II} to \textit{Edward II}.

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

\textsuperscript{294} Ibid., pp. 96; 102.
\textsuperscript{295} Keller, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 22-26. Rossiter, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 56.
\textsuperscript{296} Smith, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 97.
\textsuperscript{297} Schelling, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 107.
\textsuperscript{298} Keller, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 22-40.
preceded Marlowe's play.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{299}Rossiter, \textit{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, \textit{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. As already mentioned, people living during the Tudor age regarded Henry IV as a usurper, and they understood his seizure 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. 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. 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. 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. 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 exhausted position than others (an


302 *Loc. cit.*

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

304 *Loc. cit.*
idea sometimes known as "the chain of being"). 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. Indeed, the people regarded the king as a mortal God, a superman of superior faculties. 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. For example, if the king might order a subject to commit murder, that subject was bound in conscience to disobey.

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.


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 inglevyng 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

310Loc. cit.

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

312Quoted 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. 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. 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, 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 reference 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.


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 noble 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.


political values. 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. It does seem that the taxes levied by Richard in the play are oppressive. 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.


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.\textsuperscript{331} There can be little

\textsuperscript{331}Rossiter, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{333} Also, the character, Nimble, like Nobs in \textit{Jack Straw}, is a shifty, clownish individual, much like the characters of vice in the morality plays.\textsuperscript{334} The similarity of Nobs and Nimble, perhaps, indicates that the author of \textit{Woodstock} was familiar with \textit{Jack Straw}. Both characters are parasites, willing to switch allegiances when such a move will serve their selfish personal needs (\textit{Jack Straw}, I.i.158-162; \textit{Woodstock}, V.v-V.vi). One is also tempted to suggest that \textit{Jack Straw} inspired the author of \textit{Woodstock} to elaborate upon the contemporary moral implications of Richard's reign.

Armstrong's suggestion that \textit{Woodstock} is in keeping with orthodox political theories of Elizabethan times is only partly correct.\textsuperscript{335} The anonymous author does denounce

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{332}Ibid., pp. 8; 17-23. \\
\textsuperscript{333}Ibid., p. 24. \\
\textsuperscript{334}Creizenach, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 304-305. \\
\textsuperscript{335}Armstrong, \textit{op. cit.}, p. xi. Tillyard, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 118, says that the play is completely orthodox, because the protagonist, Woodstock, offers the traditional condemnation of rebellion. However, Woodstock's position
\end{flushright}
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 favour
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 orthodoxy, are impeccable." Cf. the two speeches by Woodstock cited below.
speech alluded to escaped censorship. Not a great many pas-
sages 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.ii.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.

Both reasons probably explain the failure of the drama to have been published.\footnote{Smith, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 97-98.} 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.\footnote{Ashly H. Thorndike, \textit{Shakespeare's Theater}, p. 220.} 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.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 221.} 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, \textit{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 \textit{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.\footnote{Talbert, \textit{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. 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. 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


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. 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.\(^\text{347}\) 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.\(^\text{348}\) One does not doubt that Shakespeare took an interest in politics, as pointed out by Albright and Elder.\(^\text{349}\) However, it seems highly unlikely that Shakespeare had any seditious intentions in writing *Richard II*.\(^\text{350}\) 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.


and he presented that topic impartially.\textsuperscript{351} Campbell doubts that Shakespeare had any foreknowledge that Richard II was to become a subject of political sensitivity.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{351}Lily B. Campbell, Shakespeare's "Histories," pp. 193; 212.

\textsuperscript{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.
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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 Treasurer, Lord Archbishop, and Secretarie, with others.

212  Messenger.*

241  Exeunt.
I.iii.242-43
Enter Jacke 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
Treasurer.*

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 leve 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... flown 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, Jacke 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, Treasurer, Secretarie, Sir John 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 Jacke 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 John Newton, two Sargants, with Gard and Gentlemen.

682-83

Enter Jacke 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 Jacke 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.]