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ABSTRACT

Recent attempts to psychoanalyze William Shakespeare have resulted in the "image cluster theory" by which C. H. Hobday has tried to assign scenes of Edward III and The Two Noble Kinsmen to Shakespeare's hand. The "melting" imagery, upon which Hobday bases his case, was drawn from Ovid's tale of Narcissus. The mirror imagery was taken from Guillaume de Lorris adaptation of that tale from Ovid for The Romance of the Rose. Edward A. Armstrong's uniqueness proposition cannot be satisfied because the "cluster" appears in Cynthia's Revels, Narcissus, Midsummer Night's Merryment, and Philaster (Fletcher's part). Shakespeare cited Ovid's tale in Venus and Adonis and Lucrece. He used its imagery to form Proteus's character in The Two Gentlemen of Verona. He borrowed from Guillaume to form Julia's. The character of Richard II is in part a fusion of these two treatments. The use of these two sources is seen best in the Garden and Mirror scenes. Shakespeare also appears to have been familiar with Ovid's De Medicamine Facie Libre. Edward III does not exhibit Shakespeare's Ovidian concern, moreover, Hobday's cluster is not internally substantiated within the play. Edward III appears to be a pastiche by at least two hands, the final one hostile to the purposes of the preceding one, as demonstrated by the absurdities and obscenities inserted in the Countess scenes and the carelessness with chronological history of a sort not to be found in Shakespeare.
CHAPTER 1

SCHOLARS AT CROSS PURPOSES

If ever scholarly attributions are to be made of external works to the Shakespeare canon, scholars proposing new additions shall have to confine themselves within areas describable and communicable to scholars at large. In this connection, there is a book which should be read before any understanding of the significance, other than the most superficial, of the objects described in C. H. Hobday's article, "Why the Sweets Melted, a Study in Shakespeare's Imagery." The book, The Mirror of Narcissus in the Courtly Love Lyric, by Frederic Goldin, on

1. Two Noble Kinsmen, because it is a collaborative effort, is generally left out of editions of The Complete Works of William Shakespeare. Here, with the exception of the text of Two Noble Kinsmen, William Shakespeare and John Fletcher, ed. Clifford Leach (New York, 1966), Peter Alexander's edition of The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (New York, 1952) is used throughout, hereafter cited as Works; all quotations of Shakespeare's plays and poems are from this source and will be cited immediately following the quotations according to abbreviations recommended in The MLA Style Sheet, comp. William Riley Parker (New York, 1969), p. 16.

2. SQ, XVI (Winter 1965), 3-17. Also see Richard Harrier's "A Further Note on 'Why the Sweets Melted,'" SQ, XVIII (Winter 1967), furnishes an interesting sidelight on Hobday's article, but it is largely irrelevant to the present study. An earlier article, "Imagery as a Test of Authorship," by Moody E. Prior, SQ, VI (Autumn 1955), 282-283, is of particular interest to those interested in authorship questions and offers an interesting insight into the uniqueness of imagery in relation to Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy in the hands of a revisor.

3. (Ithaca, 1967). Goldin's "Introduction" is particularly to be recommended for a general recitation of the traditions surrounding the mirror as a device for metaphor, also the section on "The Romance of The Rose", as it was this poem which was the purveyor of the Ovidian tradition into English with its translation from the French.
the one hand unintentionally invalidates Hobday's thesis that the "flattering-glass" cluster is necessarily of origin in the "unconscious processes" of Shakespeare's mind, while on the other Goldin opens up and illuminates a tradition to which Shakespeare and the anonymous author of the second act of Edward III were indebted and shows a ground upon which the difference of dramatic style between the two writers contrast so vividly as to make little doubt as to their separate identities.

The tradition of the Ovidian story of Narcissus, according to Golding, starts with Ovid's Metamorphoses and proceeds through such respectable channels as the multi-authored Le Roman de la Rose and through


5. This poem by Guillaume de Lorris was translated at least in part by Chaucer. A translation of this poem appeared for the first time in Thynne's edition of 1532 and was reprinted in later folios, 1542, and 1561. The authority for this inclusion seems to have been Chaucer's indictment by Sainte Valentine in The Legend of Good Women, "Thou hast translated the Romanaunce of the Rose/ That is an heresy ageins my lawe/ And makest wise folk for me withdrawe," (Text F, The Complete Works of Chaucer, ed. Fred N. Robinson (Cambridge, Mass., 1933). There is some modern doubt as to whether the translation printed is actually Chaucer's. No such doubt seems to have hampered Chaucer's Tudor editors who printed Romance right after The Canterbury Tales without even a notation that the poem was a translation from another language. The part of the text which is possibly Chaucer's (A) ends at line 1705. The 1561 edition, however, continues for approximately 5000 lines, and for a part of the way apparently on different textual authority than more modern editions.

Kenneth Muir's Shakespeare's Sources (London, 1957) gives a partial account of Shakespeare's use of Chaucer particularly in relation to A Midsummer-Night's Dream. Muir does not give any really sound evidence for his inclusion of The Legend of Good Women, other than he considers it the best of the treatments of the Pyramus-Thysbe legend, among Shakespeare's sources but, of course, that does not mean that Shakespeare had not read it. Muir neglects The Rape of Lucrece (London, 1594), which Geoffrey Bullough shows is probably indebted to Legend in Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare (New York, 1957) I, 179-199. As "Romance" lies between "The Knight's Tale" and Legend in the edition of 1561, which more or less follows the sequence of the edition of 1532, it is unlikely that he could have missed Lorris's treatment of "Narcissus."
In this thesis, we shall further trace the trail of Ovid's Narcissus through the Shakespeare canon as related to the development of character, noting Shakespeare's preparation and motivation of his characters and his involvement with his source as found in Arthur Golding's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The mirror which we will trace makes its appearance in the first English translation of the *Romance of the Rose*, and may be traced ultimately to Plotinus:

> As in a mirror the semblance is in one place, the substance in another, so Matter seems to be full when it is empty, and contains nothing while seeming to contain all things. The copies and shadows of real things which pass in and out of it, come into it as into a formless shadow. They are seen in it because it has no form of its own.

Shakespeare, as we shall see, uses a similar vocabulary and a somewhat similar conception in relation to his Narcissus-like characters in their isolated situations on stage.

The evidence that we shall use in our excursion is that most peculiar of all beasts in modern Shakesperian criticism, the "image cluster," the discovery of which prompted Edward Armstrong to his book, *Shakespeare's Imagination: A Study in the Psychology of Association and*...
Inspiration. An offspring of the old vocabulary tests, the "image cluster" has never been properly defined, taking instead a working definition from the scholars who have proposed its existence. A concise existential definition of the object must include both the mundane incident and the ideal prototype with which these researchers are working. Now, it is noticed in practice that not all images appearing in the separate passages of a certain type of cluster are accounted for in the compilation of the researcher's "image cluster," the excuse sometimes being given that the "usual" associations of images are not interesting.

8. 1st rev. ed. (Lincoln, Neb., 1963), Armstrong assigns the quality of "unconscious process" of this nature could come about. He leaves us with a Shakespeare who is obsessed with the oddest things, Armstrong's clusters, without any truly informative theory to account for them. It might be suggested to Armstrong that "death, bed and creeping" were initially Holinshed's obsession, not Shakespeare's and proving dramatically successful were consciously employed in numbers of Elizabethan history plays. One property that Armstrong does not attribute to his "clusters" is that the images are quoted out of their dramatic context, thereby losing the natural association that Shakespeare's vision and his own adaptation of Elizabethan rhetoric had invested them with in favor of Armstrong's neo-Jungianism.

Hobday (see n. 2 above) would have done well to have paid attention to Armstrong's "Appendix to Part II," and to the two "exceptions" to Armstrong's "As no two poets employ the same image clusters . . . characteristic of writings known to be authentic," (cf. Prior, "Imagery as a Test of Authorship," n. 2 above) under which he postulates the necessary condition (he leaves the "sufficiency" of these conditions in doubt) for "image clusters" attribution of anonymous works to an author the characteristics of whose works is known; to wit: "Firstly, a forger or plagiarist, having discovered the clusters in a writer's work might set himself deliberately to reproduce them." (Having tried this technique, I find it an easy way of increasing the image density of a poem while decreasing the concentration on the mundane and the hyperpersonal.) "Secondly, an image cluster of a Shakespearian type might appear in a work which was not his through the influence of a common source such as the utilization of some current expression of proverbial phrase." (The notion of a common theme is not considered.) Armstrong, an ornithologist, does not appear to have heard of the Ovidian tradition in English literature, or of Shakespeare's ascendancy as a leader of the "Ovidian revival" of Elizabeth's last years.
However, for the purposes of this study, we shall give the name "image cluster" to any aggregation of arbitrary images, X, Y, Z,..., P, if all of those images appear in two or more passages of the "Works" of a certain author; the images, X, Y, P, will be called an "image cluster incident" if and only if the images X, Y, P are members of an "image cluster" substantiated by repetitive aggregation in works by that author.

Having defined the "image cluster," it is necessary to make a quick divorce between the "image cluster" as an existential object and "image cluster criticism," which to date has been fraught with neo-Jungian interpretations. The type of "image cluster" we will be examining here will be the residue in dialogue of staged metaphor, a metaphor of personality types and situational introspection. It carries with it the force of the story of Narcissus, an arch-typical catatonic schizophrenic, and the psycho-pathology of his own peculiar personality difficulties. We shall see that it more than accounts for Hobday's imagery.

**Origins of the Psychological Approach**

Hobday did not come to the end of his own peculiar limb entirely unaided. The history of the psychological approach to Shakespeare's

9. Those interested in a simple, logical refutation of Hobday's thesis (see n. 2 above) need proceed no further; Hobday's cluster in Edward III is not substantiated. It receives its substantiation in his paper only upon the assumption that it is by Shakespeare and therefore co-measureable with his works under Armstrong's postulates (see n. 7), it lacks another "cluster incident" to elevate it to "cluster" status and Hobday's demonstration is quickly seen to reduce to the absurdity of a vocabulary test.
personality through his Works seems to start with Caroline Spurgeon's neo-Jungian Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us\(^{10}\) in which Shakespeare, lays bare his soul through his characters' opinions. John Dover Wilson cut this study down to size in his "Introduction" to Wolfgang Clemen's The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery\(^{11}\). Wilson's message apparently was a little too late for Edward A. Armstrong who, following Spurgeon, produced his Shakespeare's Imagination (see n. 8 above), a book in two parts. The first part announces the discovery of image clusters and examines the content of those clusters that Armstrong was able to discover. In the second part, the wanted neo-Jungianism takes over. For the most part, Armstrong's commentary on Shakespeare's compositional techniques is fairly innocuous.

However, over those same passages of Caroline Spurgeon's book that convinced John Dover Wilson that her psychological interpretation of Shakespeare through an examination of his words was perhaps a little simplistic for his taste, Armstrong finds his wings:

Probably Dr. Caroline Spurgeon was right in suggesting that the cluster [one connecting fawning dogs to sweets and flattery] arose in connection with the revulsion which the poet felt at the sight of dogs fawning about the dinner-table, begging for and devouring fragments of sweetmeats with slobbering mouths. Shakespeare detested dogs, as any reader who cares to look up his references to them can easily verify indeed the curs which ran wild in Tudor streets were not very lovable. Moreover there is not much doubt that his experience of literary patronage made him loathe a relationship which sometimes forced an author into feeling little better than a lickspittle. Thus fawning dogs embodied a great deal that Shakespeare hated. Obviously, then, the

\(^{10}\) (Cambridge, Engl., 1935).

\(^{11}\) (Cambridge, Mass., 1951).
emotional bond in the dog-candy-flattery cluster is not far to seek.\textsuperscript{12} (Italics mine.)

There is something essentially naive about someone who requires that a writer's characters hold exactly the same opinions as the writer does; for example, Jonathan Swift and the narrator of \textit{A Modest Proposal} can hardly be said to do so. There is something even more naive about connecting Shakespeare directly with the statements his characters make. Shakespeare sometimes found it dramatically expedient for his characters to express their revulsion with other characters or character types by means of the use of the simple uncomplimentary epitaph, "dog," is beyond doubt; but, that it is only in \textit{Timon of Athens}'s (Tim, I,i,) mouth that all the elements of the "dog-candy-flattery" cluster meet makes one wonder whether Shakespeare was recording a normal form of expressing contempt or whether he was expressing his inner self as Armstrong would have us believe; in which case, we are free to treat that passage of \textit{Timon of Athens} in which the cluster appears as an unintentional psychological autobiography!

We have only to read through Armstrong's evidence (see n. 8 above) to assure ourselves that fawning dogs were beasts that Shakespeare associated with the nobility's verbal reaction towards lick-spittles, rather than Shakespeare's reaction to his own actions in the relationship of "patronage."

It is over these same passages and over Shakespeare's associations with the notion of flattery that Hobday bases a case for

\textsuperscript{12} Armstrong, \textit{Shakespeare's Imagination}, p. 169.
Shakespeare's hand in *Edward III* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, two entirely different kinds of problems. Hobday's quarrels with Spurgeon and Armstrong are dialectical; they are not methodological. Hobday is attempting to bring Spurgeon and Armstrong's work to its logical conclusion.

**The Question of Unconsciousness**

In the attempt to attribute Act II, *Edward III* to Shakespeare, Hobday examined the "flattering-glass" cluster. To the two principal "images," flattery and glass (as in mirror or looking-glass), Hobday noted the "unusual" association of the images, "eyes," "face," and "knee."

Unfortunately, it appears that in his haste Hobday overlooked continued similarities of imagery between *Richard II* and *Two Gentlemen of Verona*; to wit, Richard and Julia's summation of their experience with their separate stage properties, the mirror and the portrait, both take place using the notion "shadow" to mean "image" and both expressions of encounter are described in terms of "substance" as contrasted to "shadow," and the image "sun" may be added from continued comparison

13. For those interested in the dead question of Shakespeare's hand in this play, Leech's "Introduction" is recommended. For those unfamiliar with this play's debt to Chaucer, Fletcher's "Prologue" is recommended.

14. As this image is unsubstantiated (see definition in text p. 5 above, and n. 9 to this chapter.), it will hereafter be deleted in discussion of Hobday's cluster "B."

15. Richard III's "Shine out, fair sun, till I have bought a glass,/ That I may see my shadow as I pass." (R. III, I, i, 262-263) is the earliest clear association of this material.
of these scenes. Therefore, an improved version of Hobday's cluster "B" may be formed as so: flattery, glass, looking-glass or mirror, substance, shadow (image), sun, face, hair, and eye(s), the which, when coupled with Hobday's cluster "C," sweet or candy (used as a verb); poison or venom; winter, ice or hail; cold; melt or thaw; sun; brook or stream; drop; tears; and stone, particularly when the connection is made between "flattery" and Narcissus's self-flattery is examined, is more than accounted for in Ovid's tale of Narcissus as it came down through Golding's translation and The Romance of the Rose.¹⁷

Hobday, however, postulates the unconsciousness of image cluster production: "In this case, and doubtless in others, the connection of ideas was completely accidental; having mentioned ice cold brooks and stones in a speech which contained a reference to flattery, henceforward he unconsciously linked them in his mind."¹⁸ Later Hobday has Shakespeare borrowing from himself for his part in Two Noble Kinsmen from Richard II, "unconsciously," over a space of fifteen years (!),

16. Hobday qualifies this, "The antithesis between sweet and poison is found several times apart from other items in this cluster, and might almost be said to form a sub-group of its own" ("Why the Sweets Melted," p. 3, n. 3.), to which one might add that the authors of Gorbéduc were not unmindful of the association of poison and flattery (see Armstrong's second objection, n. 7 above):

Woe to the prince that pliant ear inclines,
And yields his ear to poisonous tale that floweth
From flattering mouth; . . .
Lo, thus it is poison in gold to take,
And wholesome drink in homely cup forsake

17. See pp. 23-29 and 41-44 below.

Equally clearly, the borrowing was unconscious; wrinkles became marks on pebbles, and glass is transformed into an adjective describing stream. It is not uncommon for one author to unconsciously draw on another, as I have suggested that Shakespeare drew on Marlowe when writing this scene of Richard II.¹⁹

Indeed, but it is more unusual for one writer to draw upon another consciously when working from a source. With respect to Hobday's lead in, "equally clearly . . .," if the condition of unconsciousness is repealed the observation seems a reasonable critical appraisal of the situation described in the pseudo (?) Chaucerian treatment of The Romance of the Rose lines 15-16.

While it is necessary for the sake of brevity only to allude to the monumental studies of Bullough (see n. 4 above) and Muir (see n. 4 above) in Shakespeare's use of sources, suffice it to say that neither suggests that Shakespeare's borrowings were unconscious. Nor is it suggested here that Shakespeare's usage, "melt," is the result of an unconscious borrowing as Hobday suggests in his title, but fails to show in his text; rather the reader is directed to page 27 below, where Narcissus "melts" quite admirably. It is here suggested that Shakespeare, seized by this powerful image of the melting Narcissus, devotedly reworked a vision of Ovid's Narcissus and Guillaume de Lorris's lover for the stage in the characters of Proteus and Richard II, respectively.

Prior's warning (see n. 2 above) is of interest here. Prior noticed the tendency of investigators of imagery to attempt to "axiomatize" their findings, going on to say, "If these principles are granted, there can be little quarrel with the argument, and hence with

¹⁹. Ibid., p. 16.
the conclusions." But he goes on to show that assumptions made in studies of such academic questions as the authenticity of *The Taming of the Shrew* are not necessarily well founded. So it would appear to be with Hobday when Shakespeare's sources are taken into account; and, while we may safely use some of his researches into the existential nature of Shakespeare's image clusters associated with the notion of flattery, his theory to account for them should be dismissed on the grounds of completeness if not on the grounds of accuracy. Borrowings from source can be considered no more "unconscious" than the creative recitation of a good joke.

CHAPTER 2

MIRRORS AND NARCISSUS IN THE ELIZABETHAN AGE

It would be pointless to rehearse the medieval tradition of Narcissus and the mirror so adequately covered by Goldin. Suffice it to say that the mirror-like qualities of Narcissus's stream together with Narcissus's destruction through his own vanity, probably entering the world of medieval England through the vehicle of The Romance of the Rose, Ovide Moralise, and the Latin Ovid(s) of the continent affected even painting during the latter part of Richard II's reign, and thereafter continued as an emblem of man's relationship to his own vanity and his own investigations into his identity.

In the 1570's George Gascoigne used the mirror notion twice in relation to politics: in The Glass of Government and in The Steel Glass, a treatise on listening to advice. The moral "mirror" following

1. Gervase Mathews, in his The Court of Richard II (London, 1968), p. 25, describes two 'superbia' (from Latin "superbius" meaning justifiable pride): "In the 1390's vanity in dress was recognized as the expression of 'superbia.' On the south wall of the church of Brooke in Norfolk there is a painting of Superbia as a young man with waved hair and crowned with roses; he is elaborately dressed and girdled, and is gazing at a looking-glass which he holds in his right hand while in his left hand he holds a double comb. On the north side of the nave at Hoxne in Suffolk, Superbia is a richly dressed young man with bell-mouthed sleeves, holding in one hand a sceptre and in the other a looking-glass. Both wall-paintings have been dated between 1390 and 1400."


3. George Gascoigne, The Steel Glass (London, 1576), University Microfilms, STC 1, Carton 295.
the tradition of Baldwin's *The Mirror for Magistrates*, was indebted to
the "mirror" as "encyclopaedia" stemming from Vincent de Beauvais' *Speculum majus*,
other French *Mirroirs* of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, from *Imago Mundi* and William Caxton's *Mirror of the World* (1483?),
but with the new evangelical emphasis of Baldwin's *Mirror for Magistrates* as expressed in his epistolary introduction: "For here as
in a looking glass, you shall see (if any vice be in you) how the like


5. These works lying somewhat outside of the scope of this study, the writer has relied upon Emile Male's work on French religious
Special attention should be given to Male's citation of *Miroir de vie et de mort* (Mirror of Life and Death) and his description a miniature in it:
In the *Miroir de vie et de mort* in the Bibliotheque de Sainte Genevieve
a curious miniature represents a great tree with spreading roots. The
roots have the peculiarity of ending in the form of a serpent with a
woman's head. "Most of these women hold some emblem or make some gesture
which would permit of recognition even were their names not written near
them. The first (Radix luxuriae) looks at herself in her mirror, the
second (Radix gulae) holds a glass in her hand, the third (Radix avari-
tiae) closes a strong box, the fourth (Radix acidae) turns away from
the altar, the fifth (Radix iracundiae) tears out her hair, the sixth
(Radix invidiae) bears an animal in her bosom, while the seventh (Radix
superbiae) has no special attribute" (italics mine) (pp. 107-108). This
passage leads the writer to suspect that Mathews' (see n. 1 above) identi-
ification of the two "superbiae" in Norfolk and Suffolk may be in error
unless those icons are identified "Superbia" by name in writing beside
them. For this reason, the Renaissance vice Vanitas has been chosen to
epitomize the "mirror-staring" vice for our purposes, even though Guil-
laume de Lorris probably did not think precisely in this term while com-
posing the passages of *Le Roman de la Rose* of interest to this study.

Crotch (London, 1956) in "Biographical Introduction" by W. J. B. Crotch
see p. xxiii, but see Caxton's *Mirror of the World*, ed. O. H. Prior,
"Introduction" pp. v-xxv. *Mirror* is not the only type of treatment of
natural and moral philosophy. It is merely the first of these in print
from Caxton's press (1483).
hath been punished heretofore," dramatized a moralistically desperate pair of brothers, showing the rewards of good and evil.

Fifteen years before Gascoigne's work, in 1560, an anonymous translator brought forth Fable of Ovid Treating of Narcissus, moralized. Golding's translation of The First Four Books of the Metamorphoses (1565) and the completed translation (1567), partially dependent on the earlier translation, superseded it. While it may be said that Ovid was never dead to the Middle Ages or the early Renaissance, this book was to spur a wider interest among the more elderly poets and playwrights who had less desire to plod through Latin than schoolboys and among ladies unschooled in the rigors of a classical education. Easily one of the most popular books of the period, Golding's translation was to precipitate an Ovidian revival, which, while of short duration, has left behind an outpouring of poems and imitative drama. By 1602, the

7. The effect of this book, ed. Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge, Engl., 1938) on the Works of Shakespeare is usually over-estimated; doubtless that Shakespeare was familiar with it; however, we may be sure that it was the end of a tradition rather than the beginning of one, becoming a self-perpetuating effort in itself. The quotation is reproduced in Parts Added to The Mirror for Magistrates, ed. Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge, Engl., 1946) in a truncated version (1571). University Microfilms reproduces the entire original epistle from the same edition, of interest for its moralistic tone.

8. London, University Microfilms (STC 1, Carton 514). A critical evaluation is available in Henry Burrows Lathrop's Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman 1477-1620 (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature Madison, 1933), Professor Lathrop gives a detailed account of Ovid's fate in Elizabethan hands, adding a letter from Golding to Leicester (Golding's patron) on the subject of his book, pp. 125-143. XXXV, 130-32 (not indexed) and The Narcissus Theme in Western European Literature by Louise Vinge, tr. Robert Dewsnup, et al. (Lund, 1967), pp. 134-37, a fine scholarly work treating the Narcissus myth exclusive of Goldin's concerns in The Mirror of Narcissus.

9. See Chapter 1, n. 5 above.
vogue had spread to the schools, _Narcissus: A Twelfe Night Merriment_, being perhaps the dying gasp of this revival.

John Lyly's _Endymion_ appears to have the first mirror used as a stage property on the Elizabethan stage. It is used as a symbol of Vanity in the "dumb show" in II, iii, and allegorized in V, i. Lyly's mirror appears to be similar in intention to Baldwin's. Endymion interprets it for Lyly:

Methought I say a lady passing fair, but very mischievous, who in one hand carried a knife with which she offered to cut my throat, and in the other a looking-glass, wherein, seeing how ill anger became ladies, she refrained from intended violence.

Apparently, seeing "the vice within," her good nature overcame her mischievous disposition thereby sparing Endymion's life. But it stands only as one symbol among many and, as the majority of Lyly's easy metaphors, it is not dramatically particularly convincing.

George Gascoigne contrasts two types of looking glasses in his

10. Anon., ed. Margaret L. Lee (London, 1893) from a Bodleian manuscript representing a production at The College of St. John The Baptist, Oxford, 1602. Perhaps Hobday would like to argue that this play is by Shakespeare on the grounds that these lines: "Why sir, this is the matter,/ To be plain with you and not to flatter;/ I am the stately river height Cephise,/ Smoother than glass and softer far than ice;/ This niphm before you here whom you do see/ Is my own wife, yclipt Lyrope. / . . . ./ The purple hue on this our jolly stripling/ I would not have you think was got with tipling;/ He is our son Narcisse, no common varlet,/ Nature in graine hath died his face in skarlet./ Speak then, I pray you, speak, for we you portune/ that you would tell our sunfac't son his fortune (204-220)," contain the flattering-glass cluster. If so, he might have some problem convincing scholars at large that, "the swain yclipt Endymion,/ Who, being cald Endymion the drowsy,/ Slept fifty years, and for want of shift was lousy" (279-281), sped from the same pen that not two years before wrote _Hamlet_. Vinge comments on this play in _Narcissus Theme_, pp. 233-236.

The Steel Glass\textsuperscript{12} for his readers. The "steel" glass shows things as they are (in their true moral proportion); the "crystal" glass as we would most like to see them. Gascoigne's intent was moralistic, and his conceit may have influenced Shakespeare's use of the mirror in Richard II with Northumberland's list of crimes standing for the "steel" glass and Richard's mirror standing for the "crystal" one. But this does not explain why Richard should prefer the "crystal" glass to the "steel" one.

Michael Drayton's Idea's Mirror (1594)\textsuperscript{13} re-established the mirror motif in love poetry. Drayton's "Idea," while hailed as "sweet Maid" in "Amour I," is clearly more abstract than the personifications of The Romance of the Rose. His central conceit contrasts the "mortal glass," the living being as an image of the divine "Idea," a mutable human frame, with "the Celestial glass," apparently the vehicle of poetry showing forth an immutable "Idea" (Amour 7). The elaboration of this theme (Amours 12 through 14) displays one of the largest unsubstantiated

\textsuperscript{12} Peter Ure in "The Looking Glass of Richard II," PQ, XXXIV (1955), 220, says: "For Gascoigne in The Steel Glass, the new-fangled glass mirror stands for worldly luxury, the old-fashioned metal one for decent and godly living." But this is only the literal level of Gascoigne's advice. We may see in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1965, XV, 567, that a guild of glass mirror makers existed in Nuremberg as early as 1373. Gervase Mathews' historical treatment of Richard II suggests that glass mirrors were known in England by 1400 (see n. 22 above). Thus Gascoigne is speaking figuratively and in elaborate metaphor when he abjures the reader to abjure the crystal glass for the steel one in precisely the same metaphor that Sackville had used with Norton in Corbeduc substituting mirrors for drinking cups (see n. 17 above). Ure's third note in his article supplies a world of flattering-glasses and some interesting historical notes.

"flattering-glass" clusters to be found anywhere. About 1595, a poem called *Narcissus* reached the press, of interest because it alludes to several Neo-Ovidian poets of the time, apparently including Shakespeare as "Adon deftly masking through," and repaying the compliment Shakespeare paid the Ovidian story by including it as a rhetorical allusion in *Venus and Adonis* (1593):

Is thine own heart to thine own face affected?  
Can thy right hand seize love upon thy left?  
Then woo thyself, be of thyself rejected;  
Steal thine own freedom, and complain upon the theft.  
Narcissus so himself himself forsook,  
And died to kiss his shadow in the brook (*Venus*, 157-162).

There is no mistaking it. Shakespeare is alluding to Narcissus as he appears in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, but with different surroundings than appear in any translation before or after Shakespeare. "Fons erat," Ovid had written, which was transformed to "a welle" in *Romaunt of the Rose*, and to "A spring there was" in Golding's translation, but nowhere

14. Are we to assume that Drayton was imitating Shakespeare? Here in *Idea's Mirror* is the Elizabethan fruition of ideas first explored in the courtly love lyric, used in their proper context with the new "voice" of the Renaissance. On the other hand, there is no apparent dependence of Shakespeare on Drayton. Rather, it appears that both writers were dependent independently on the same tradition.

15. This poem, appended to Thomas Edwards' *Cephalus and Procris* in the 1595 edition of that poem. A reliable text according to Vinge, *Narcissus Theme*, pp. 378-379, n. 65 f. is provided by W. E. Buckley's edition for the Roxburghe Club, *Cephalus and Procris*, Narcissus, (London, 1882). The writer is indebted to the libraries of Ohio State University who have repeatedly entrusted their copy to the mails that he might use it.

16. *Publius Ovidius Naso, Metamorphoses*, ed. Frank Justus Miller (London, 1929), Vol. I, Book III, p. 152, l. 407. As the University Library had no available Latin text of this work, the writer is indebted to Dr. Laurence A. Muir of the English Department who very kindly lent him his copy.
as "the brook." Apparently Shakespeare either seized upon the notion of "fountain," as "fons" may be translated, or upon the notion of the flowing of a "spring" as Golding's word choice suggested; but most likely the necessities of his rhyme scheme forced themselves upon him to produce this new picture of Narcissus. Most importantly, we need not suppose that Shakespeare "mis-remembered" his Ovid to account for this; rather it is clear that Golding's translation of this phrase was insufficient for his poetic purposes and that he felt comfortable enough to depart from Golding's reading for a new (if slightly more questionable) one. It is this striking out in a new direction that appears to be preserved in Hobday's clusterings.

Echo, apparently overlooked by Vinge, appears in Juliet's apostrophe:

Jul. Hist! Romeo, hist!--0 a falconer's voice, 
To lure this tassel-gentle back again!


19. If Shakespeare's creativity may be said to be mirrored in this translation, he was reasonably consistent to the new reading of Ovid the following year in his Rape of Lucrece: "Whereat she smiled with so sweet a cheer/ That had Narcissus seen her as she stood/ Self-love had never drown'd him in the flood" (Lucr., 264-266).

Bondage is hoarse, and may not speak aloud; Else would I tear the cave where Echo lies, And make her airy tongue more hoarse than mine With repetition of my Romeo's name (Romeo, II, ii, 158-163).

And Echo, the victim of Narcissus and unrequited love, is later given the flattering-glass in Ben Jonson's Cynthia's Revels (1601).21 She appears again (by allusion) with Narcissus in Two Noble Kinsmen in the portion usually credited to Fletcher.22

Of all the "mirror" makers, Robert Greene appears to have been the most prolific. While still at Cambridge he wrote Mamillia: A Mirror of Looking-glass for the Ladies of England (1583),23 the second part of which appeared in 1593 together with "The Anatomie of Lovers Flatteries." The Mirror of Modesty appeared in 1584 with a title page proclaiming, "Wherein appeareth as in a perfect Glasse howe the/ Lorde delivereth the innocent/ from all imminent perils, and/ plagueth the bloodthirstie hipo-/ crites with deserved punishments,"24 a biblical fable. In 1594, Greene's collaboration with Thomas Lodge brought forth the play, A Looking Glasse for London and England, by its title a moral glass of the Mirror for Magistrates type, but actually an episodic dramatization of abuses hung together with the character of Rasni, King of Ninivie, in


22. Two Noble Kinsmen, II, i, 173-84. This play, being little read by other than scholars interested in authorship questions, is understandably overlooked in Vinge's study.


24. Ibid., III, 3.
which is intertwined the prophecies of Jonas concluding with:

London awake, for fear the Lord do frowne.
I set a looking Glasse before thine eyes,
O turne, O turne, with weeping to the Lord,
And thinke the praiers and vertues of thy Queene,
Defers the plague which otherwise would fall.\textsuperscript{25}

Thus, we may group these "mirrors" into three clear groups: the first comprised of political and moral "mirrors," holding within them the form of immorality, which once displayed should turn the reader from known sins; the second, of physical mirrors as the apparatus of \textit{Vanitas},\textsuperscript{26} which we shall see is involved in Ovid's Narcissus by way of the Latin language and in the pseudo-Chaucerian translation of \textit{The Romance of the Rose} by way of Guillaume de Lorris's allegorical imagination; and the third, the medieval equivalent of the encyclopaedia, dealing with scientific, philosophical and theological matters.

\textbf{Ovid's Narcissus}

In what must surely be one of Ovid's three most popular tales, the character of Narcissus is unfolded to us both in his conflict with Echo and his conflict with Nature. Narcissus, the son of Lyrope and the stream, Cephisus, was the subject of a prophecy by Tiresias, the one by which, if Ovid is to be believed, made Tiresias famous throughout the ancient world, Lyrope, having given birth to him asked for a prophecy:

\begin{quote}
\textquote{25. Ibid., XIV, 113.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textquote{26. Some mirrors, such as Lily's (see p. 15 above) and Shakespeare's (see Chap. III, "Richard II") obviously are more than simple physical mirrors. In effect, they become symbol laden stage properties in the function described above, and Lily's, under this transformation, clearly is meant to show forth sin under the moral "mirror" function mentioned above. However, these mirrors have a physical existence qua mirrors independent of their moral sententia. Gascoigne's "steel glass"}
\end{quote}
Enixa est utero pulcherrima pleno
infantem nympha, iam tunc qui posset amari,
Narcissumque vocat. de quo consultus, an esset
tempora maturae visurus longa senectae,
fatidicus vates "si se non noverit" inquit.27

This lady bare a sonne
Whose beauty at his verie birth might justly have love wonne.
Narcissus she did call his name. Of whom the Prophet sage
Demaunded if the childe should live to many years of age,
Made aunswere, yea full long, so that himselfe he doe not know.28

The boy of this strange parentage and stranger augury was beloved of
Echo, a nymph cursed by Juno into her reclusive behavior, being unable
to initiate conversation but only to repeat what had been said before.

Narcissus had been wandering in the fields when Echo spied him.
The sight set her on fire with love, He had been separated from his
friends and called out to them, allowing Echo to reply but Narcissus had

is clearly of the former type, while his "crystal glass" is clearly of
the latter.

argues persuasively in Small Latin and Less Greek, (Urbana, 1944), Vol.
II, ch. 42, "Upper Grammer School: Shakespeare's Latin Poets; Ovid," that Shakespeare was anything but Golding's dupe in his use of Ovid in Temp. (pp. 443-448), and that Shakespeare was anything but unscholarly in his use of the Ariadne myth from Fasti and Heroides in Julia's pas
sage in T.G.V. although it is possible that he knew this piece from Chaucer or some other source. For this reason, where ever it is
necessary to display Ovid as used in Shakespeare both Golding and the
Latin text should be cited.

translation is in error here: Tiresias's prophesy reads, "If he does not
revolt against himself," or "If he does not invent [innovate] of himself," or, finally, "If he does not change himself," i.e. if he remains con
stant and untransformed; but Narcissus does not remain untransformed. He
ages; and the condition that Tiresias speaks of is seen to be an impos
sibility. Narcissus, by his act of innovation with Echo and the acqui
escence of Nemesis to be the prayres against him, by dying young, proves
Tiresias's condition prophetic in that he fulfills all the conditions
implicit in the notion, "se noverit."
grown up proud:

Namque ter ad quinos unum Cephisius annum
addiderat poteratque puer iuvenisique videri;
multi illum iuvenes, multae cupiere puellae;
sed fuit in tenera tam dura superbia forma,
nulli illum iuvenes, nullae tigere puellae.29

For when yeares three times five and one he fully lyved had,
So that he seemde to stande betweene the state of man and Lad,
The hearts of divers trim yong men his beautie gan to move
And many a Ladie fresh and faire was taken in his love.
But in that grace of Nature's gift such passing pride did raigne,
That to be toucht of man or Mayde he wholy did raigne.30

He was not to be had. First mocking her, then fleeing her Nar-
cissus left Echo alone with her sorrow:

Spreta latet silvis pudibundaque frondibus ora
protegit ex solis ex illo vivit in antris;
sed tamen haeret amor crescitque dolore repulsae
et tenuant vigiles corpus miserabile curae
adducitque cutem macies ex in aera sucus
corpors omnis abit; vox tantum atque ossa supersunt
Vox manet, ossa ferunt lapidis traxisse figuram.31

Now when she saw herselfe thus mokt, she gate her to the Woods,
And hid her head for verie shame among the leaves and buddes.
And ever sence she lyves alone in dennes and hollow Caves
Yet stake her love still to her heart, through which she dayly
raves
The more for sorrowe of repulse. Through restless carke and care
Her body pynes to skinne and bone, and waxeth wonderous bare.
The bloud doth vanish into ayre from out of all her veynes,
And nought is left but voyce and bones: the voyce yet still
remaynes:
Her bones they say were turnde to stones.32


30. Shakespeare's Ovid, ed. Rouse, pp. 71, 437-442. Golding's transposition of "trim" and soft rendering of "dura superbia" should be marked.


32. Shakespeare's Ovid, ed. Rouse, pp. 72, 489-497. It should be marked that line 495 (The bloud ... Veynes) has no classical au-
thority, being derived from the Narcissus of 1560 which misreads
Had Narcissus restricted his mockery to Echo, he would have been spared his fate. However, he mocked others, one of whom prayed to Rhamnusia (Retribution or Nemésis) that "sic amet ipse licet, sic non potiatur amato,"33 (So might he love himself, so might he not gain the beloved), a direct contradiction of Tiresias's condition for Narcissus's longevity. "Adsensit precibus Rhamnusia iustis"34 (Nemesis approved the request for justice).

Fons erat inlimis, nitidis argenteus undis, quemnque pastores neque pastae monte capellae contingerrant aliudve pecus, quem nulla volucris nec fera turbarat nec lapsus ab arbo rae ramus;35

There was a Spring withouten mudde as silver cleare and still, Which nether shepheirds, nor the Goates that fed upon the hill, Nor other cattell troubled had, nor savage beast had styrd, Nor braunch, nor sticke, nor leafe of tree, nor any foul nor byrd.36

"adducitque . . . . in aera sucus" as "and to eare/ her blood consumeth" (Aiii) Univ, Micro, whereas study of the examples in both Harper's Latin Dictionary and Dictionnaire Latin-Francais show that Latin authors distinguished sharply between "sanguis" (blood), "cruor-oris" m. (a stream of blood as from a wound), "cura-curae" f. (care) and "succus-i" m. (sap, juice, energy, essence, spirit, etc.). Apparently, the anonymous translator of Narcissus (1560) knowing that he had to translate "succus" glanced away from his text and glancing back saw "curaie" which he mistook for "cruae," mistaking the declension and transposing the letters, a non-word which he thereupon translated as "crurus" into "blood". It is inconceivable that he did not thereupon see his error as he prepared to translate the next line, but allowing that "blood" was close enough to "juice", he let his misreading stand. Golding seized upon this (in Professor Kittredge's words) canonized the mistake and added the spurious "veynes," line 397.


34. Ibid., p. 406. Rhamnusia refers to the name of the island where Nemesis's principal temple was situated.

35. Ibid., pp. 407-410.

36. Shakespeare's Ovid, pp. 73, 509-512.
In short, a place of isolation to which Narcissus came from hunting.

Hic puer et studio venandi iassus et aestu
procubuit faciemque loci fontemque secutus,
dumque sitim sedare cupit, sitis altera crevit,
dumque bibit, visae correptus imagine formae
spem sine corpore amat, corpus putat esse, quod umbria est.37

The stripling wearie with the heate and hunting in the chace,
And much delighted with the spring and coolness of the place,
Did lay him down upon the brimme: and as he stooped lowe
To staunch his thurst of worse effect did grow,
For as he drank, he chaunst to spie the Image of his face.38

Adstumpet ipse sibi vultuque imotus eodem
haeret, ut e Pario formatum mamore signum;39

The which he did immediately with fervent love embrace.
He feedes a hope without cause why. For like a foolish noddie
He thinks the shadow that he sees, to be a lively body.
Astraught like an ymage made of Marble stone he lyes,
There gazing on his shadow still with fixed staring eyes.40

Having brought Narcissus to this confrontation with his "shadow" in the water, Ovid's narrator steps back to comment on Narcissus's foolishness in being so deluded:

Inrita flalaci quotiens vissum captantia collum
brachia mersit aquas nec se deprendit in illis!

37. *Metamorphoses*, ed. Miller, pp. 152, 413-417. That the rhetorical period may be appreciated, these lines should be spoken aloud.

38. *Shakespeare's Ovid*, ed. Rouse, p. 73, 515-519. The reader should notice that where Ovid has made the reader vicariously relive Narcissus's experience in the discovery, "quod umbria est" (417), Golding maintains his aesthetic distance as a reported "he chaunced to spie the Image of his face," (519) missing the rhetorical content entirely, which may suggest why Shakespeare appears to have preferred his Ovid in the original where the shadow takes over the poet's vision (see nn. 27, 37 above).


40. *Shakespeare's Ovid*, ed. Rouse, pp. 73, 520-524. The reader may do well to wonder where the additional detail comes from Golding, without apparent independent authority, has jumbled Ovid's lines. Even Caxton, following his moralized French original, manages to preserve
quid vidat, nescit; sed quod videt, uritur illo,
atque oculos idem, qui decipit, incitat error.
credule, quid frustra simulacræ fugacia capitæ?
quod petis, est nusquam; quod amas, avertere, perdes!
ista repercussae, quam cernis, imaginís umbria est:
nil habet ista sui; tecum venitque manetque;
tecum biscedet, si tu discedere possis!\textsuperscript{41}

O Lord how often did he kisse that false deceitful thing?
How often did he thrust his armes midway into the spring,
to have embraste the necke he saw and could not catch himself?
He knowes not what it was he sawe. And yet the foolish elfe
Doth burn with ardent love thereof. The verie selfe sane thing
That doth bewich and blinde his eyes, encreathest all his ting,
Thou fondling thou, why doest thou raught the fickle image so?
The thing thou seekest is not there. And if a side thou go,
The thing thou loves straight is gone. It is none other matter
That thou dost see, than of thyself the shadow in the water.
The thing is sorting of it self: with thee it doth abide,
With thee it would depart if thou withdrew thy self aside.\textsuperscript{42}

Caught up in that image, unaware of its identity, Narcissus laments his
condition, being mocked by the image in the pool:

Paullumque levatus
ad circumstantes tendens sua bracchia silvas
"ecquis, io silvae, crudelius" inquit "amavit?"
scitis enim et multis latebra opportuna fustis
ecquem, cum vestrae tot agantur saecula vitae,
qui sic tabuerit, longo mensistis in aevo?
et placet et video; sed quod videoque placetque,
non tamen invenio: tantus tenet error amantem
quoque magis doleam, nec nos mare sparat ingens
 nec via nec montes nec clausis moenia portis;
exigua prohibemur aqua!\textsuperscript{43}

Yet for a little space
He turns and settes himselfe upright, and holding up his hands
With piteious voyce unto the wood that round about his stands,
Cryes out and ses: alas ye Woods, and was there ever any,

\textsuperscript{42}Metamorphoses, ed. Miller, pp. 154, 427-436.
\textsuperscript{43}Shakespeare's Ovid, ed. Rouse, pp. 73- 536-548.
That loovde so cruelly as I? you know: for unto many
A place of harbrough have you beene, and fort of refuge strong.
Can you remember any one in all your time so long,
That hath so pinde away as I? I see and am full faine,
How beit that I like and see I cannot yet attaine:
So great a blindnesse in my heart through doting love dorth raigne.
And for to spight me more withall, it is no journey farre,
No drenching Sea, no Mountain hie, no wall, no lock, no barre,
It is but even a little droppe that keeps us two assunder.44

Slowly as his powers of observation win out over his passion, he notices
that every movement that he makes is mirrored by the shadow. After some
comment on this phenomenon, it dawns on Narcissus that the shadow is his
own image:

Spem mihi nescio quam vultu promittis amico,
cumque ego porrexi tibi brachia, porrigis ulter,
cum risi, adides; cactimas quoque saepe notavi
me lacrimante tuas; nutu quoque signa remittis
et, quantum motu formosi suspicor oris,
verba refers aures non pervenientia nostras!
iste ego sum: sensi, nec me mea fallit imago;
uror amore me.45

And yet (as should appeere)
Thou dost pretend some kinde of hope of friendship by the cheere.
For when I strech mine armes to thee, thou stretches tine likewise,
And if I smile thou smiles too: And when that from mine eyes
The teares doe drop, I well perceyve the water stands in thine.
Like gesture also dost thou make to everie becke of mine.
And as by moving of thy sweet and lovely lippes I weene,
Thou speakest words although mine eares conceive not what they beene.
It is my selfe I well perceyve, it is mine Image sure,
That in this sort deluding me, this furie doth procure.46

Having realized that he has fallen in love with his own image, Narcissus
falls into despair and gives voice to the wish "O utinam a nostro sece-
dere corpore possem!"47 ("O would to God I for a while might from my

44. Shakespeare's Ovid, ed. Rouse, pp. 73-74, 552-564.
46. Shakespeare's Ovid, ed. Rouse, pp. 74, 574-583.
47. Metamorphoses, ed. Miller, pp. 156, 467.
bodie part").


49. Metamorphoses, ed. Miller, pp. 156, 469-473.

50. Shakespeare's Ovid, ed. Rouse, pp. 74, 591-595; "delay" (595) sic: "decay" (suspect wrong font).

51. Metamorphoses, ed. Miller, pp. 158, 486-490. Narcissus melts here, "intabescere flavae/ igne levi cerae" (lines 487-488), as wax on a writing tablet melts to erase previous writing or figures drawn thereon, that is he achieves a state of forgetfulness on earth prior to his transportation to Lethe. The desire to melt in Shakespeare (see chs. 3, 5 below) is the desire to find forgetfulness.

52. Shakespeare's Ovid, ed. Rouse, p. 75.

As soon as he gives voice to this wish, Narcissus discovers that he has decreed death on both the shadow and himself:

Iamque dolor vires adimit, nec tempora vitae
longa meae superant, primoque exstinguor in aevo.
nec mihi mors gravis est posituro morte dolores,
nunc duo concordes anima moriemur in una.

My sorrow takes away my strength. I have not long to live,
But in the floure of youth must die. To die it doth not grieve,
For that by death shall come the ende of all my griefe and paine.
I woulde this yongling whome I love migh lenger life obtaine:
For in one sould shall now delay we stedfast Lovers twaine.

Lamenting his condition, he begins to cry. His tears disturb the surface of the water. Fearing that he is being mocked as he mocked Echo, he rages, beating his stomach until it is bruised the color of ripe grapes:

Quae simul adspexit liquefacta rursus in unda,
non tulit ulterior, sed ut inabescere flavae
igne levi cerae matutinaequae pruinae
sole tepente solent, sic attenuatus amore
liquidatur et tacto paullatim carpitur igni.

Which things assoone as in the spring he did behold againe,
He could no longer beare it out. But fainting straight for paine,
As 11th and supple waxe doth melt against the burning flame,
Or morning dew against the Sunne that glareth on the same,
Even so by piecemalle being spent and wasted through desire.
Did he consume and waste away through Cupids secret fire.
Echo, though still angry, returns to Narcissus who is quickly wasting away:

Quae tamen ut vidit quamvis irata memorque indoluit, quotiensque puer miserabilis "eheu" dixerat, haec resonis iterabat vocibus "eheu" cumque suos manibus percusserat ille lacertos, haec quoque reddebat sonitum plangoris eundem.53

As often as he cryed
Alas, she cryed alas likewise with shirle redoubled sound.
And when he beate his breast, or strake his feete against the ground She made like noyse of clapping too.54

Lamenting his image to the end, Narcissus dies; whereupon, as soon as

Echo acquiesces to his fate, Ovid delivers the metamorphosis:

tum quoque se, postquam est inferna sede receptus,
ub Stygia spectabat aqua. planxere sorores naides et sectos fratri posuere capillos,
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
nusquam corpus erat; croceum pro corpore florem inveniunt filii medium cingentibus albis.55

And afterward when into Hell recyved was his spright,
He goes me to the Well of Styx, and there both day and night Standes tooting on his shadow still as fondeley as before.
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
But as for bodies non remaind: In stead there of they found A yellow flour with milke white leaves new sprong upon the ground.56

And so the boy who was subject to Tiresias's prophecy fulfills its tragic irony; the subject of error, the dupe of Nemesis, the scourge of his own "dura superbia" visited upon himself, he melts into forgetfulness basking in the image in the pool. For Ovid, the sense of tragedy is sufficient grounds for the telling of the story, though not for later ages.

Ranting Echos fill the medieval imagination and Knight Narcissuses fall into a variety of wells, fountains, and pools, enraptured exempla of Superbia and cruelty towards proffered love; until the story itself was lost amid the conventions of its retelling, and citation of the story more common than any in literature.

Guillaume de Lorris's Narcissus

The second generation of these Narcissus borrowings produces a poem which in translation becomes a problem for scholars of the Tudor age as well as of the thirteenth century to which the poem belongs. William Thynne, Chaucer's Tudor editor (1532), added a version of The Romance of the Rose to his edition of Chaucer, which has spurred controversy ever since. The poem, a conflation of three separate fragments, apparently was translated by three separate persons from non-overlapping sections of the 20,000 line original. The translation, 7698 lines in length, apparently in Chaucer's words in The Legend of Good Women (see n. 4 above), was added to the 1532 edition directly after The Canterbury Tales. One would suspect to its claim to authenticity. It appears in this position in the Folio of 1561, and not until Skeat's edition (1880) is the authenticity of the whole called persuasively into question.57 Skeat argues (1894) that while fragment "A" is possibly Chaucer's, that is lines 1-1705, fragment "B" is written in a Northern dialect, and that fragment "C" is not. After some little discussion of rhyme habits of Chaucer and rhyme as practiced in fragments "B" and "C", Skeat

concludes, "We may provisionally accept fragment A as genuine; and the more closely we examine it, the more probable does its genuineness become."58 "Fragment C . . . is neither by the author of fragment B, nor by Chaucer, but is not so glaringly unlike Chaucer's work as in the case of fragment B."59 "Fragment B . . . is not Chaucer's but was composed by an author who, to say the least, frequently employed Northern English forms and phrases. Moreover, his translation is too diffuse; and, though spirited, it is not always accurate."60

As the materials we shall use fall within the transcription of fragment "A" in Thynne's edition, we shall on Skeat's authority call it provisionally Chaucerian, noting that our expression of doubt is modern, but possible to a sensitive reader. Furnivall's edition of Thynne, when errata are noted, provides a handy text for the Renaissance transcriptions of this poem;61 and when we speak of the Romaunt, we shall be speaking about Lorris as he appears by Chaucer's (?) hand as edited by Thynne.

It has been the practice among English speaking commentators to consider Le Roman de la Rose as an Artis Amatoriae in the Ovidian sense. Alan Gunn in his Mirror of Love states "Guillaume's theme, then, is love,  

58. Ibid., I, 10. Skeat furnishes the French original to this fragment.
59. Ibid., I, 6.
60. Ibid., I, 8.
and his purpose the teaching of its theory and practice."62 And to be sure Guillaume does say:

Or ueil cel songe rimeer
Por ’uos cuers plus feire agaeer,
Qu'Amours le me prie e commande.
E se nule ne nus demande
Comant ie ueil que le romanz
Soit apelez que ie comanz
Ce est li Romanz ed la Rose,
Ou l' art d'amours est tot cenclose.63

Which Chaucer (?) translates:

Nowe this dream wol I ryme aright,
To make your hertes gaye and lyght;
For love it prayeth, and also
Commaundeth me that it be so.
And if there any aske me,
Whether it be he or she,
How this book which is here
Shal hatte, that I rede you here;
It is the Romance of the Rose,
In whiche al the arte of loue I close.64

But to reduce the poem to this level, as John V. Fleming fails to suggest in his Roman de la Rose: A Study in Allegory and Iconography,65 is absurd. To begin with, every character met with in the course of Guillaume's poem other than the Amant is a moral personification, and almost

62. (Lubbock, 1952).
64. Ibid., p. 1.
65. (Princeton, 1969), p. 5: "What seemed at first with Wellek and Warren the modest beginnings of another attack on Geistesgeschichte thus reveals an audacious yet valid claim: that the literary critic as creator, a modern Resurrection man, who deals in old bones but rather makes all things new. Quite rightly did Alan Gunn subtitle his ambitious and exacting modernist reconstruction of Roman a 'Reinterpretation of the Romance of The Rose.'" Fleming fails to note that Resurrection men often took to creating "bones" from otherwise living beings to satisfy their clientele's demands.
all of them negative. The non-negative, for instance the good bow and the fair arrows, are dismissed without great commentary, and the reader made to follow the Amant from one moral lapse to the next until, we suspect, he might well come to the Desespoir suggested by Morot's 1538 edition, or even worse, to loving dotage. What Gunn has failed to do, and C. S. Lewis before him, is to distinguish between the poet, Guillaume de Lorris, and Amant, a character in his poem upon whom the other characters as personifications are incident. This is the same mistake as confusing the poet, William Shakespeare, with Proteus, a character in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* whose duplicities are a source of amusement to Shakespeare. As Fleming suggests, Amant's wandering in dream is a sort of "intellectual rake's progress" rather than an medieval Artis Amatoria; for, if we examine the sources of this poem, we find that Guillaume has chosen his materials from *Metamorphoses* and possibly *Amores* as exempla of *Vanity* into which Amant lapses through Sloth. That it is in this "Mirror of Narcissus" that Amant sees the image of *La Rose* (the object of projected love) suggests that Amant's worldly search for love is as pagan and heretical as any gnostic sect. But this is not to say that Amant does not enjoy his search through the wonderful garden of the world with all its easy pitfalls, or that Lorris does not get caught up in his narration.

In following the French, particularly Robert Bossaut, we must

66. See p. 36 below.


be careful to recall that the "Ovide" that he talks of to the middle ages
was a moralist, one who showed forth both the ostentation and the vanity
of an earlier age as the food of the retribution of the gods. And we are
forced to question any assumption that Guillaume de Lorris follows Artis
Amatoriae, which he says to "enclose" in the Roman de la Rose. He "en­
closes" it in the same manner he "encloses" the rose as an image in the
well of Narcissus; that is, he places it within the framework of his nar­
rative as an example of what he is talking about, the production and the
worship of an idolatrous pastime, courtly love as symbolized in the Rose
(also a symbol of Mary), possibly the idolatry of Mary, the worship of
images as the product of self-love (Superbia), and the helplessness of
the slothful Amant to combat these depredations. Thus, while we acknowl­
edge that he is no slavish follower of Ovid's brand of sensuality, and
secondly that his treatment is to be Christian allegory rather than
amatory advice.

For, while Guillaume never sermonizes directly, at times he sug­
gests that his dream was the product of Sloth, lines 21-30, and that the
lady Ydleness who admits Amant to the garden, while delightful in appear­
ance, is substantially an allegorical symbol of his state:

Tyl that the dore of thylke entre
A mayden curteus opened me
Her heere was as yelowe of hewe

d'aimer, soit; il le pouvait et le devait d'autant mieux qu'il etait plus
sur de trouver des lectures et que le matiere repondait a ses preoccupa­
tions; mais il fallait briser le cadre impose par Ovide et qu'il avait
encore retreci la scolastique du Chapelain."

Recourse to the Langlois edition of Le Roman de la Rose (Paris 1914­
21), II, "Notes," which follows the text, shows debt to both Amores and
Metamorphoses but not to Artis Amatoriae. One is forced to the conclu­
sion that Guillaume is being figurative in mentioning the "art of love."
As any basen scoured newe
Her fleshe tender as a chyke
With bent browes/ smothe and slyke
And by measure large were
The openyng of her eyen clere
Her nose of good proportion
Her eyen gray/ as a faucon

And fayre aboue that chapelet
A rose garland had she set
She with a ryche golde tressour
Her heed was tressed queyntly

She tells him that Sir Myrthe is "lorde of this gardyne" (601), and having been so instructed he enters:

For wel wene I there with him be
A fayre and ioly companye
Fulfylled of all curtesye
And forthe without wordes mo
In at the wicket went I thro
That Ydelness had opened me
In to that garden fayre to se.

Having come into "paradye erthy" (648), the lover, remarking the natural surroundings, the singing birds, walks down a little path and right to Sir Myrthe, whom he describes. Sir Myrthe is accompanied by Dame Gladnesse, who is accompanied by "the god of love" (878) and he by "a bachelere" (918) "Swete Lokyng" (920) who holds "bowes two" (923) and "ten brode arowes" (939) while watching "the daunce" (922). The first five arrows are called: Beauty (925), Symplesse (954), Fraunchyse (955), Companye (958), and Fayre Semblaunt (963). Guillaume continues:

Five arowes were of other gyse
That ben ful four to duyse
For shaft and ende/ soth for to tell
Were blacke as any fende in hell
The first of hem is called Pride

70. Ibid., pp. 638-644.
That other arowe next hym besyde
It was cleped Vylanye
That arowe was/ as with felonye
Enuemymed/ and with spytous blame
The thirde of hem was cleped Shame
The fourthe Wanhope cleped is
The fythe the Newe thought iwys.71

This is a precarious batch of arrows at best, and Guillaume breaks his
narration to promise of the fair bow (?):

Hereafter shall I tellen right
The sothe/ and eke signyfyaunce
As fere as I have rememb raunce
All shal be sayd I vndertake
Er of this booke an ende I make.72

Guillaume's intentional break of the narrative stream near line 1000
strengthens the impression that his poem was intended for a court read-
ing. There is no other reason why he would "reundrai a ma parole"73
(Come back to my speech), so that the Chaucerian (?) translation of "le
roman" as "this book . . . that I rede you here" is actually a clarifi-
cation of Guillaume for the Chaucerian(?) audience, rather than "New-
thought," the deadly arrow of the crooked bow.74

71. Ibid., pp. 971-982.
72. Ibid., pp. 974-998.
73. Romaunt and Roman, ed. Sutherland, p. 20.
74. Romaunt, ed. Furnivall, l. 982. It must be remembered that
the "science of history" to the Middle Ages did not represent "New
thought," in that the imitation of events as they had happened repre-
sented the imitation of original (or God's) thought. "New thought," the
product of Satan's temptation, was synonymous to pride. The physical
sciences, history, philosophy, theology, logic, all represented the at-
tempt of medieval man to "imitate" God's thought rather than to form
"New thought" of his own. Thus in clarifying this point Chaucer (?) was
clarifying what he believed to be buried in his manuscript instead of
newly adapting it for a court reading himself or asserting what was not
a possibly consequence of his text.
Recommencing his tale, Guillaume introduces us to Beaute, a lady of similar appearance to Ydernelness, and Richesse whose "court hath many a losengere [lick-spittle?] / And many a traytour envious."75 She wears a "robe of purple" (1072) richly embroidered with gold and decorated with gold ribbons, a "girdle" (1085) buckeled with "a ston/ Of virtue great" (1086-1087), and a "circle for noblesse" (1108) on "the tresses of rychesse" (1107), set with "Rubyes," "Saphirs/ Ragounces/ and Emer-audes" (1117-1118) and "A fine Charboncle" (1120). Then he introduces us to a nameless young man:

Dame Rychesse on her haond gan lede
A yonge man full of semelyhede
That she best loued of any thyng
His luste was moche in housholdyng
In clothing was he ful fetyse
And loued wel to haue horse of priye
He wende to haue reproued be
Of thefte or murdre/ if that he
Had in his stable an hackenay
And therefore he desyred aye
To ben aqueynted with Richesse76

Beauty, Richess, and the "yonge man" whose "purpose/ as I gesse/ Was for to make great dispence" (1140-1141); that is: "to squander," are accumulated into the next personified abstraction, "Largesse" (1150), is a reversal of Aristotelian logical processes. Largesse (Generosity) is described:

And after on the daunce went
Largesse/ that sette al her entent
For to ben honorable and free
Of Alexanders kynne was she
Her most ioye was ywis

75. Romaunt, ed. Furnivall, pp. 1050-1051. This material is important in Shakespeare's conception of Richard's court.

76. Ibid., pp. 1129-1139.
Whan that she yafe/ and said: haue this  
Nat Auarice the fould caytife

While one might be tempted to argue that Guillaume praises "Largesse," she is clearly the personification of the desires of the "yonge man" whose description precedes hers. One suggestion in Guillaume's Amant's dream leads on another until a completed picture is achieved. In this case, Guillaume's portrait of the "yonge man" accompanying Beauty, Richesse, and Largesse at the "daunce" is morally entirely negative, and the attributes attached to him rather than Amant, although they may represent a projection of Amant's moral and physical state.

Fraunchise, from a simple arrow, now becomes a full personification in herself (1238), and Curtesy (1251); Fraunchise is accompanied:

By her daunced a Bachelere  
I can nat tellen you what hyght  
But fayre he was and of good hyght  
Al had he ben / I say no more  
The lordes sonne of Wyndesore.

And, likewise, Curtesy:

And by her wen a knyght dauncyng  
That worthy was and wel spekyng  
And ful wel coude he done honour  
That knyght was fayte and styffe in stour  
And in armure a semely man  
And welbeloued of his leman.

Thus, we are presented with not one but three young men, and none of them Amant, being perhaps projections of his potentialities, or choices available to him. But Amant, a lover of Sloth, seeks none of these

77. Ibid., pp. 1149-1155.
78. Ibid., pp. 1246-1250.
79. Ibid., pp. 1267-1272.
ladies: neither the menage a quatre of the first, the ambiguous relationship of the second, nor the courtly virtue of the third; instead:

Fayre Idelnesse than saught I
That alwaye was me fast by.
Of her haue I without fayle
Told you the shappe and apparyle
For (as I sayd) Lo/ that was she
That did to me so great bounte
She the gate of that gardyn
Vndyd/ and let me passen in
And after daunced as I gesse. 80

Clearly, Amant is suggesting that Sloth allowed him the time to contemplate the moral abstractions and the relationships which he describes, calling her "Fayre Idelnesse," but Guillaume is not so sure: everything so far described is morally negative in value. Throughout the beautiful descriptions, the spirit of non-involvement has prevailed. Thus, when Guillaume breaks Amant away from the dance, we might expect something less worldly for him to discuss.

Guillaume is not one to disappoint our courtly expectations. Because his Amant is, as himself, a poetically inclined individual, he allows him to break away from the dance and leave Ydelenesse to her bachelor (1299):

Whan I had sene the countenaunces
Of hem that ladden thus these daunces
That had I wyl to gon and se
The gardyn that so lyked me
And loken on these fayre Laurellses
On Pyne tres/ Cedres/ and Omeres (sic)
The daunce that enden were
For many of hem that daunced there
Where with her loues went away
Under the trees to haue her play.

A Lorde they lyved lustely

80. Ibid., pp. 1273-1281.
A great foole were he sykerly
That nolde his thankes suche lyfe lede
And in that gardyn gan I go
Playing a longe ful merily
The god of Loue ful hastely
Unto him Swete Lokyng clepte
No lenger wolde he that she kept
His bow of golde/  
And toke him of his arowes fyve
Ful sharpe and redy for to drive

If Guillaume were content to let those "arowes fyve" fly before he was
fully ready and his Amant was fully prepared to receive the deadly stroke,
literature on the continent, in Medieval England, Tudor England, and
three continents since, would have been much the poorer, Guillaume allows
his Amant a Christian respite:

No we-god that sytteth in maieste
Fro deadly woundes he kepe me
If so be that he had me shete
For if I with his arowe mete
It had me greued sore ywis
But I that nothyng wyste for this
Went up and downe / ful many a way
And he me folowed faste alway
But no where would I rest me
Tyll I had in al the gardyn be.

There is a clear contrast here between "god that sytteth in
maieste," Guillaume's God, and "the god of Love" that hunts Amant through
the garden; but, because Guillaume puts awareness of "god that sytteth in
maieste" in Amant's cognizance, Amant's subsequent vulnerability after
looking into the Well of Narcissus, having previously been under the
Christian God's protection, even though he has toured the garden, suggests

81. Ibid., pp. 1309-1321, 1328-1333, 1337-1338.
82. Ibid., pp. 1339-1348.
a kind of moral fall, like Satan's fall, through Pride (dura superbia) of which that Well is the symbol.

Amant's respite is temporary. Having earlier had the choice of the three "bacheleres," and having chosen "Ydelenesse," Amant has chosen the role of the fence sitter. Given the choice of free will, he has chosen to will nothing. Fate has been suspended. Seeing the sign, "Here starfe the fayre Narcissus" (1468), on the "Pyne," oddly missing in all of Fleming's illuminations, he is given the choice of abstaining or of looking into the pagan symbol of pride, knowing full well the import of the story in courtly terms: it is the focal point of uncourtly behavior in classical literature and the exemplum of "Superbia" to his age. Even so, clearly aware of the Well of Narcissus's courtly significance:

Narcissus was a bachelere
That love had caught in his dangere
And in his nette gan hym so strayne
And dyd hym so to wepe and playne
That nede him must his lyfe forgo
For a fayre lady that height Echo
Him loued ouer any creature
And gan for hym suche payne endure
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
. . . she without more respite
Was deed anon: but ere she deyde
Ful pitously to foe she prayde
That proud herted Narcissus
Might on a day ben hampered so
For loue / and ben so hote for wo
That neuer he myght to ioye attayne
Than shulde he fele in euery vayne
What sorrowe trewe louers maken
That ben so vilaynously forsaken. 83

And equally clearly aware of the dangerous nature of it as the confrontation to which Nemesis brought Narcissus, a snare to be deluded in as

83. Ibid., pp. 1469-1476, 1481-1484, 1488-1498. N. B. "vayne" here is quite different in usage from Golding's mistranslation (n. 50 above).
well as the mirror of his "dangere,"

This prayer was but resonable
Therefore god helde it ferme & stable
For Narcissus shortly to tel
By auenture came to that wel
To rest him in the shadowyng
A day / whan he come from huntyng
  This Narcissus had suffred paynes
And was for thurst in great distresse

When he was to that wel ycomen
That shadowed was with braunches grene
He thought of thilke water shene
To drinke / and fresshe hym wele withal
And downe on knees he gan to fal
And forthe his necke and heed out straught
To drynke of that wel a draught
And in the water anon was sene
His nose / his mouthe / his eyen shene
And he therof was al abasshed
His wone shadowe had him betrasshed
For wel wende he the forme se
Of a chylde of great beaute
Well couthe loue him wreke tho
Of daunger and of pride also
That Narcissus somtyme him bere
He quytte him wel his guerdon there
For he mused so in the well
That shortely the sothe to tell
He loued his owne shadowe so
That at laste he starfe for wo84

To which Guillaume tags on a strange moral:

Ladyes I praye ensample taketh
Ye that ayenst your loue mistaketh
For if her deth be you to wyte
God can ful wel your whyle quyte.85

The sense of this moral seems to be that if you understand Narcissus's (?) or Echo's (?) death ("if her death be to you wyte") God will repay your pains. However, it is hardly in this spirit that Amant approaches the

84. Ibid., pp. 1499-1507, 1509-1530.

85. Ibid., pp. 1539-1542.
Well and, after hesitation, looks in:

When that this lettre of whiche I tell
Had taught me that it was the welle
Of Narcissus in his beaute
I gan anon withdrawe me
When it fell in my remembraunce
That him betyd suche mischaunce
But at the laste than thought I
That scathlesse / ful sykerly
I myght vnto the welle go
And downe I louted for to se
The clere water in the stone
And eke the grauel / whiche that shon
Downe in the botome as syluer fyne
For of the welle / this is the fyne
In worlde is none so clere of hewe
The water is euer fresshe and newe
That welmeth up / with wawes bright

Fleming has shown that Guillaume's illuminators have tended to chose a literal depiction of Amant or Narcissus peering into the Well. Certainly there is no justification for C. S. Lewis's highly impressionistic reading of, "Downe at the botomn set saw I/ To cristall stones crafely/ In thilke fresshe and fayre well" (1567-1569) as:

"Love", we know, is "first learned at a lady's eyes", and among the many ladies whom he meets there is one into whose eyes he looks both long and close. Those eyes seem to him to contain in themselves, or to sum up, the whole of that vague delight in which he has lived the last few months. . . .

This important step in the story is allegorized in a manner which quite intelligent readers have been found capable of misunderstanding or of simply overlooking. . . . In the bottom of the fountain lie two crystal stones, in which the whole garden can be seen reflected. This is the mirror perilous and the well of love, whereof many have told "in romans and in boke." As soon as he looks into the crystals he sees in them, a little way off, a garden of roses, and among them one bud not yet unclosed.87

86. Ibid., pp. 1543-1561.

87. Lewis, The Allegory of Love, pp. 128-129. Unless I greatly misread Lewis here, he seems to be suggesting that the Mirror of
Unfortunately, there is better reason, by Fleming's researches into iconography associated with this poem, albeit a century to two centuries later, to equate the "two crystal stones" with Amant's eyes as he bends Narcissus had its origins in the Lover's infatuation with the Lady, centering on her eyes, and that this infatuation preexisted the Lover's encounter with the Rose Tree.

If this pool indeed represents the lady's eye, or the film there on, then why is there only one of them? Is the lady a Cyclops? If this is the lady's eye, then what are we to do with the pine tree rising over it? Is the lady likewise a unicorn? Perhaps then notions of the eye being synonomous to the pool are patently absurd. Then, what are we to do with the mirror of Narcissus, and what moreover with the crystal stones therein? Erich Kohler, in his "Narcisse, La Fontaine D'Amour et Guil-laume de Lorris," in L'Humanisme Medieval Dans Les Litteratures Romanes du XIIe au XIVe Siecle, (Paris, 1964), took the tack that the crystals in the well represented the lady's eyes, and, through Dante, attempted to draw a parallel between those eyes, Amant's eyes and Narcissus; unfortunately, Koehler's appreciation of Ovid's story is suspect because he does not seem to have been working with a text of Ovid when he wrote his article, or, trusting to his memory, has misread Tiresias's prophesy in the same manner that Golding did (see Ch. 2, n. 28 above). The fact of the matter is that if we wish to consider the crystal stones the lady's eyes, we are left at odds with what to do with the pool. Has the poor woman drowned?

The problem seems to be that both Lewis and Koehler, knowing what is to come, jump the gun to discover forshadowings of her in the early part in which she does not appear. Their readings are excellent illustrations of the intentional fallacy, and, while ingenuous, are in error because it is not until after the Lover has gazed in the pool of self-love for a long while that he catches sight of the rose tree, and not until he has left it entirely that he catches sight of the single rose to whom he pawns himself. We may however offer other readings, which, because they do work on the physical level, translate well into literal and from there into the moral levels. First, we may consider Ovid's Metamorphoses a Speculum of myths in which Amant (qua Guillaume) has been browsing, but more likely Guillaume has been browsing and Amant has misread (Guillaume's dig at lovers pretensions as would be poets) and therefore misconstrues; for, Amant's reading of Ovid is purely comic to those familiar with Ovid's story. Second, we may consider the allegory that of the glass mirror, whence the references to Leisure (bronze mirrors had to be polished). Third, we may suppose, and rightly, that Guillaume's pool is what it appears to be with the overtones just mentioned. If, for the sake of argument, we grant that neither of these is correct, nor in combination are they correct, this in no way can be construed to support Lewis's reading of Kohler's following him; for, good post-romantics that we may be, absurdities remain when Lewis and Koehler's allegorical arguments are reduced to the literal and physical levels.
over the Well. Likewise, when Lewis declares, "The Rose, in Guillaume, is clearly the Lady's love," we marvel first at Lewis's confusion of roles, and then at the notion that the Rose is not the projection of Amant's self-love upon an external image. In short, the manifest birth of Amant's idolatry of the Rose is given such short shrift in favor of a romantic interpretation of the thematic, and often all too well disguised, love story from the point of view of an autobiographical approach, that the meaning of the poem is obscured under a type of reading possible only after 1660 in the works of Dryden and other proponents of the "Heroic" notion of love, itself based upon a misinterpretation of the earlier materials by those who wished to celebrate that which earlier had been the food of satire and comedy.

"The mirror perilous" is not, as Lewis would seem to suggest, the reflecting surface of the Lady's eyes, but the surface of the Well and the reflection of Amant's eyes from that surface:

C'est li miroers perilleus
Ou Narcissus li orguelleus
Mira sa face e ses ieuz uers,
Dont il iut puis morz toz envers.
Qui en ce miroer se mire
Ne puett auoir garant ne mire
Que tel chose as ieuz ne uoie.89

This is the myrrour perillus
In whiche the proude Narcissus
Sey al his fayre face bright
That made hym sithe to lye vpright
For whoso loke in that myrrour
There may nothyng ben his socuor

88. Ibid., p. 129.

89. Romaunt and Roman, ed. Sutherland, p. 32.
That he ne shal there se som thyng
That shal hym lede into laughyng.90

Where Guillaume plays across the image of "li miroers perilleus," his translator prefers the lineal reading of "the myrrour perillus," meaning the Well, rather than the eyes as Guillaume has it. This shift in reading may be due to the nongrammatical "c'est," although the translator has not been so finicky heretofore. The play of eyes and mirrors, though, is clearly a recitation of the Narcissus myth as it appears in Ovid, not as it might appear in Dryden or as Lewis would have it.

Speaking of the dangers of this "Well," Guillaume's Amant frequents it:

Alway me lyked for to dwell
To sene the christall in the well
That showed me ful openly
A thousand thynges faste by
But I may say in sory houre
Stode I to loken or to powre
For sythen I sore syghed
That Myrrour hath me nowe entriked
But I had first knownen in my wyt
The vertue and strengths of it
I nolde not haue mused there
Me had bette ben els where
For in the snare I fel anon
That had bytresshed many one

    In thylke Myrrour sawe I tho
    Amonge a thousande thyngs mo
    A Roser charged ful of rosis
    That with an hedge about enclosis
    Thous had I suche lust and enuye
    That for Parys ne for Pauye
    Nolde I haue lefte to gone and se
    There greatest heape of roses be.
    When I was with this rage hente
    That caught hath many a man and shente
Towarde the Roser gan I go

And when I was not ferre therfro
The savour of the roses swote
Me smote right to the herte rote
As I had al enbaumed me.\(^9\)

That it is in the "myrrour perillus" that Amant sees the "Roser," a whole tree of roses, suggests that Guillaume conceived the longing of Amant, who perhaps represents some reflection of his own personality at an earlier age, in terms of self-love and, for he adheres so closely to Ovid, superbia. But, this "myrrour" in which he sees that "Roser" is also the reflection of "the christall in the well," his own eye off of which the image of the "Roser" reflects into the reflection of himself in the well, which he perceives. Amant, although the very picture of Narcissus leaning over the Well, is saved from Narcissus's fate of self-idolatry by projecting his love, or inclination to love, upon the image that reflects from his own being, the illusiory image of the "Roser" reflecting off the moist surface of his own eye into the "Welle of Love."

That it is this illusory reflection that saves him from the fate of Narcissus, from falling into the well of his own eyes, is of course part of the sport but, that it is in the same well of idolatry that Amant conceives his longing for the "Roser" suggests the moral peril of his choice. Thus, while Guillaume obviously enjoys the excursion of the garden through which he leads Amant, he clearly points out the morally negative aspects of Amant's lapsarian attitude, the ease with which he falls, and his ignorance in so falling.

It is not until Amant approaches the tree itself and carefully looks over the available selection that he choses out a single one:

Among the knoppes I chese one
So fayre / that ot the remenaunt none
Ne preyse I halfe so wel as it
When I auyse in my wyt
For it so wel was enlumyned
With colour reed / as fyned
As nature could it make fayre
..............
Ne durste I to the Rose bede
For thystels sharpe of many maners
Netles / thornes / and hoked briers.
For moche they distourbld me
For sore I dradlle to harmed be.92

Fleming, however, misreads the poem, though more rightly than Lewis:

Amant's eyes within the mirreour perillous become themselves
the revolving mirrors which impress upon his mind the
fantastic beauty of deduitfs garden. Peering at himself in
the well of self-love, Amant experiences a transformation,
by the strategems of art, worthy of the great Ovid himself;
after a time he no longer sees those ocular crystals, but
a rose. Like Narcissus, he becomes a flower as the images
within the pool become confused. Frappier must be correct
to say that Guillaume here suggests that in Amant the idea
of love precedes love itself.93

The Rose, the projection of Amant's ability to love a lady which the
flower symbolizes, is not seen until Amant has risen and started toward
the "Roser," "Vers le rosier tantost me tres,"94 And not until he has
looked over the whole Rose tree does he chose one. It is quite clear
then that it is Fleming, rather than the images within the pool, who
becomes confused. Amant's choice of the Rose, as his choice of entering
the garden and as his choice of looking into the pool, is the expression
of his exercise of free-will by falling, falling into idolatry of his
lady as earlier he had fallen into sloth by his acceding to his desire
to dream and into self-idolatry by his infatuation with the reflections

92. Ibid., pp. 1691-1697, 1710-1714.

93. Fleming, The Roman de la Rose, pp. 94-95.

94. Romaunt and Roman, ed. Sutherland, p. 32.
of his own eyes. Amant's infatuation with his lady, Guillaume suggests, come to pass primarily because Amant has nothing better to do than spend his time idolizing her. A strict moralist of a puritan persuasion might point out that Amant should be turning his eyes toward Guillaume's God. Guillaume, being French, medieval, and tasteful does not, nor can this be considered a flaw in the poem: Guillaume is not trying to sell his poem but only to tell it. His method of presentation is unique up to the point at which the god of Love loses his arrows, whereupon Guillaume gives a very long allegory of Amant's moral state and hopes of success; the remainder of the poem, however, seems to have little to do with the problem at hand, and therefore we leave it, noting the difference between Ovid's Narcissus and Guillaume's use of Narcissus allegorized and applied to Amant. Guillaume's Narcissus does not melt, nor does his Amant. However, Guillaume makes explicit what Ovid left to metaphor; Guillaume's "Welle of Love," where "starft the fayre Narcissus," is quite definitely a mirror, and apparently a glass one; for it requires no polishing on Amant's part to gaze into it. He sits there reflecting images for anyone with the leisure to look into it. This is Gascoigne's "crystal Glass," it remained for Shakespeare to create the "steel" one.

95. See illustrations in Appendix.
CHAPTER 3

SHAKESPEARE'S EARLY MIRRORS

Goldin cites three different types of mirrors used in medieval literature: "The Mirror of the Ideal," derived from St. Augustine, which considers the mirror as showing forth a true spiritual image.1 "The Mirror of Matter," derived from Plotinus and Augustine, a passive reflector of images and "shadows," and in Neoplatonic philosophy a purveyor of false images,2 and "The Ambivalent Mirror," the Pauline speculum or substitute for vision.3 Goldin continues on the image that fills this ambivalent mirror:

The image is equally ambivalent. Having no independent existence, it is by its very nature inferior to what it reflects. Every image is a degradation. But it is therefore a vision of something, of an ideal reality. The idea of the image and the mirror is essential to the idea of the chain of being: all existence is a system of yearning images standing at every degree in distance from the one reality they all reflect; and the love that drives every image to perfect its resemblance to its origin is the energy that holds together all creation.4

But none of these quite cover Shakespeare's conceit in Sonnet 3:

Look in thy glass, and tell the face thou viewest
Now is the time that face should form another;
Whose fresh repair if now thou not renewest,

1. Mirror of Narcissus, pp. 5-6.
2. Ibid., pp. 6-7.
3. Ibid., pp. 8-15.
Thou dost beguile the world, unbless some mother.
For where is she so fair whose unear'd womb
Distains the tillage of thy husbandry?
Or who is he so fond will be the tomb
Of his self-love, to stop posterity?
Thou art thy mother's glass, and she in thee
Calls back the lovely april of her prime;
So thou through windows of thine age shall see,
Despite of wrinkles, this thy golden time.
But if thou live rememb'red not to be,
Die single, and thine image dies with thee.5

This notion of the child as image of the parent also appears in Richard III.

Richard III

A good deal is made in Richard III about the true and false issue of the House of York as being the images of their parents. The Duchess begins, picking up the thought of Richard's ambivalence to his own image:

Duch. I have bewept a worthy husband's death
And liv'd with looking on his images;
But now two mirrors of his princely semblance
Are crack'd in pieces by malignant death,
And I for comfort have but one false glass,
That grieves me when I see my shame in him (R. III, II, ii, 49-54).

From such a "false glass," one would expect false images. Richard, carrying forward this theme, tells Buckingham:

Infer the bastardy of Edward's children
Tell them how Edward put to death a citizen
Only for saying that he would make his son
Heir to the crown—meaning indeed his house,
Which by the sign thereof was termed so.
Moreover, urge his hateful luxury
And bestial appetite in change of lust,
Which stretch'd unto their servants, daughters, wives,
Even where his raging eye or savage heart
Without control lusted to make a prey.
Nay, for a need, thus far come near to my person:
Tell them, that when my mother went with child

5. Works, p. 1308.
Of that insatiate Edward, noble York,
My princely father then had wars in France
And, by true computation of the time,
Found that the issue was not his begot;
Which well appeared in his lineaments,
Being nothing like the noble Duke my father.
Yet touch on this sparingly, as 'twere far off;
Because, my lord, you know my mother lives (R. III, III, v, 75-94).

Richard's reticence here is not that he fears to alienate his mother, who, the audience knows, does not trust him, but fear that she might give such a story the lie. And, if we may draw a long inference from the lady's "shame" (R. III, II, ii, 54), it is Richard's, not Edward's legitimacy which may be called into question. Here, then, we have the "false" glass showing back false images of the true issue, a complete reversal of the idea given forth in Sonnet 3.6

This is in keeping with Shakespeare's portrayal of Richard as the man who partially hates himself, if you will, Richard as the anti-narcissist, one given to strong self-criticism. In his opening soliloquy, having cited the pleasures that the later years of the reign of York might have afforded him, Richard set himself in contrast to the image of the times:

But I—that am not shap'd for sportive tricks,
Nor made to court an amorous looking glass—
I—that am rudely stamp'd, and want love's majesty
To strut before a wanton ambling nymph—
I—that am curtail'd of this fair proportion,

6. By this we may offer a tentative date for Sonnet 3. Allowing that a statement should precede its negation, or in neo-Hegalian terms, that the Thesis precedes the Antithesis, one would suppose that Sonnet 3 precedes the composition of Richard III, 1593-4. Noticing that the sonnet also makes use of the notion of "self-love" and self-affection very much in the manner of Venus and Adonis, being here developed as a full conceit, where before it had been cited for metaphor (see p. 15 above), one would suppose the evolution of the theme to follow this path: Venus and Adonis (1592-3), Sonnet 3, Richard III (1593-4).
Cheated of feature by dissembling nature,
Deform'd, unfinish'd, sent before my time
Into this breathing world scarce half made up,
And that so lamely and unfashionable
That dogs bark at me as I halt by them—
Why, I, in this weak piping time of peace,
Have no delight to pass away the time,
Unless to spy my shadow in the sun
And descant on mine own deformity (R. III, I, i, 14-25).

Yet, having won Anne by dissembling at the very game he describes in his opening soliloquy, Richard burlesques his new-found favour:

Upon my life, she finds, although I cannot,
Myself to be a marv'llous proper man.
I'll be at charges for a looking-glass
And entertain a score or two of tailors
To study fashions to adorn my body.
Since I am crept in favour with myself,
I will maintain it with some little cost.
But first I'll turn you fellow in his grave,
And then return lamenting to my love.
Shine out, fair sun, till I have bought a glass,
That I may see my shadow as I pass (R. III, I, ii, 253-263).

Richard's view of himself despite his success has not changed. The heavy irony in his voice at the last line still descants on his deformity. His shadow in the sun, the black image of a man that walks out before him, is clearly contrasted with the one which he expects he might see in the mirror, his "amorous looking glass" or on waiting film on a maiden's eye whom he might sue for favor, as he had Anne, begging her, "Vouchsafe to wear this ring" (R. III, I, ii, 201). Richard's glass is clearly a physical one, while his mother's is a metaphorical one like that of Sonnet 3, standing for the child's genetically inherited fidelity to the parent's image or semblance. The notion that Richard is as false in semblance leads to the notion that he may be false in substance too.

Richard's insistence on the physical interpretation of the mirror appears to be intentional on Shakespeare's part to build irony and a sort of grim comedy in the dream sequence the night before the Battle of
Bosworth Field, where the Ghosts: Richard's victims, affect him deeply:

By the apostle Paul, shadows to-night
Have struck more terror to the soul of Richard
Than can the substance of ten thousand soldiers
Armed in proof and led by shallow Richmond (Italics mine.)

(R. III, V, iii, 216-229).

Only in Richard's dream and in the Mirrour for Magistrates do all
the personages whom Richard murdered meet to his condemnation. Here,
cursing him, they are in part the complaining ghosts of the Mirrour, in
part one heralds of a new day. The ghosts of Richard's dream recall the
ghosts of Clarence's dream, who were the product of "perjured" Clarence's
guilty conscience pouring out indictments against him.

Out of Richard, dreams call forth nothing but dread and despair;
for, with all Richard's consistent interpretation of the mirror as a
physical object, his neglect of the spiritual interpretation of the
mirror from Baldwin's and St. Paul's points of view has led him to a
rebellion of dreams and prophecies which strike terror to Richard's bones.
Paul, Richard's favorite apostle, had written in his First Letter to the
Corinthians, "Videamus nunc per speculum in aenigamate; tunc autem facie
ad faciem." Shakespeare's intention with these troublesome ghosts,
then, appears to have been to hold up a "speculum", in the sense of
visual "encyclopedia," to Richard's reign for the benefit of his audience.
And it is in them that the hidden irony of Judgment Day lies for Richard.
How shall it be when no longer cloaked with dissembling Richard sees the
harvest of his life not in a Mirrour, but "facie ad faciem?"

7. This distinction between substance and shadow as later pre­
ceived in T. G. V. and R. II, where it appears along with the expanded
notion of the mirror.

Two Gentlemen of Verona

Slightly earlier than Richard III, Shakespeare's Two Gentlemen of Verona put on stage two distinct types of characters: Proteus, the Narcissus-like dissembler of love, similar to Narcissus prior to looking in the pool, and Julia who is brought to the portrait, as Amant had been brought to the pool, where in one incredibly still moment Shakespeare fulfills Guillaume de Lorris's narrative imagination of nearly 350 years earlier.

By means of this play and Richard III we may fairly well date the "glass" sonnets, arriving at a date similar to that suggested by A. L. Rowse in Shakespeare's Sonnets; however, taking into account the recent work by Brents Stirling in The Shakespeare Sonnet Order and the neo-Hegelian theory of increasing complexity in poetic composition glanced at above, we may offer sets of orders differing from those of Stirling. The position of this play as the first in which Shakespeare explored the looking-glass as a potent symbol of vanity suggests that the


10. (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968). In this important book, Stirling makes the point that the order as well as the text of the sonnets is a "bad" one. In his attempt to re-establish the received "order" of Thorp's manuscript, however, he neglects both the mathematical "size" of the problem he is facing and possible evidence of the chronological order of composition. To the first point, there are 156 x 155 x 154 x . . . 3 x 2 x 1 ways of ordering the sonnets one at a time, and decreasing the number of orderings by rearranging the sonnets into "N" groups leaves N x (N-1) x (N-2) x . . . x 3 x 2 x 1 ways of ordering the separate groups, presupposing that they are correctly compounded. To the second see n. 130 below. To hit upon the correct order the first or second time would require excellent external dating and ordering principles as well as a non-phenominal amount of luck.

11. It is important to note that none of the possible sets differing from that of Stirling are necessarily more "valid" than his.
earliest "glass" sonnets are of contemporary composition to Two Gentlemen, a conclusion that should not be displeasing to Rowse; though, by examining the newly suggested order, one may see that the proximity of Shakespeare's relationship to Southampton might not be as close as Rowse might like to make that it was.12

12. Stirling's remarks on Sonnet 77, "Thy glass will show thee how thy beauties wear," must be correct in essence; the poem was written to accompany a notebook, a gift for one of Shakespeare's friends (Shakespeare Sonnet Order, p. 119). However, from the poem, we may only infer that the notebook was blank after the poem, not necessarily before it. There being as obvious invitation to write in the book conveyed through the poem, it may be, as some have wished to construe, that Shakespeare was with this poem inviting someone to begin with him a "friendship" book, a book composed by two friends comprised of sonnets and the like commemorating their friendship.

In attempting to establish the simplest sort of "ordering" principal, as alluded to in n. 10 above, we start with the hypothesis that simplicity precedes metaphor, precedes elaboration of metaphor precedes negation of the elaborated metaphor. To this sort of "ordering" principal, Shakespeare's glass imagery and the developing glass metaphor allow a good deal of internal relative dating, much in the manner of seriology in archaeology. To this end, Stirling's groups IV A, I A, "Poem 6," and Sonnet 77 may be strung together, starting with the simplest presentation of the glass image, group IV A, and working towards the most complex, "Time's fickle glass," Sonnet 126. (cf. Amour 7, Idea's Mirror, p. 16 above, text and note.) First, then, we look towards the glass as a simple physical object giving back what is projected into it:

"My glass shall not persuade me I am old" Sonnet 22 (Works, p. 1311): "Sin of self-love possesseth all mine eye, / . . . / But when my glass shows me myself indeed," Sonnet 62 (Works, p. 1318); "Look in thy glass and there appears a face," Sonnet 103 (Works, p. 1325); all of which lack metaphorical elaboration and might, therefore, precede Sonnet 77 in a friendship book. The suggested "notebook" of Rowse and Stirling shows an interesting analogue to Ovid: "The wrinkles which thy glass will truly show," Sonnet 77 (Works, p. 1321), might easily be derived from Ovid's De Medicamine Faciei Liber, "Tempus erit, quo vos speculum vidisse pigebat/ Et veniet rugis altera causa dolor," Ovid, The Art of Love and Other Poems, ed. I. H. Mozley (London, 1929) p. 4, 47-48. (cf. R. II, "Give me the glass, and therein will I read./ No deeper wrinkles yet?" IV, i, 276-277), which also appear in Sonnet 22, "My glass shall not persuade me I am old./ . . . / But when in thee time's furrows I behold," and again in Sonnet 3 (See below).

The continuity of imagery and the development of metaphor in Sonnet 77 lead to the speculation that Stirling's group IV A chronologically
In this first of the romantic comedies, Shakespeare makes a sharp
distinction between the narcissist, Proteus, and the Amant, Julia. Pro­
teus's narcissism is conveyed by the way he changes his mind upon hearing
Valentine's praise of Silvia:

preceded Sonnet 77, in which the notion of the book as mirror of the
intended receiver of the "notebook's" mind is developed and recorded
ideas as "children" of the receiver's mind are suggested:

Thy glass will show thee how thy beauties wear,
Thy dial how thy precious minutes waste;
These vacant leaves thy mind's imprint will bear,
And of this book this learning mayst thou taste.
The wrinkles which thy glass will truly show
Of mouthed graves will give thee memory;
Thou by thy dial's shady stealth mayst know
Time's theivish progress to eternity.
Look what thy memory cannot contain
Commit to these waste blanks, and thou shalt find
Those children nursed delivered from thy brain,
To take a new acquaintance of thy mind.

These offices, so oft as thou shalt look,
Shall profit thee and much enrich thy book (Works, p. 1321).
The notion that the book is to be the mirror of the receiver's youth is
inescapable, a mirror showing forth the impress of his mind rather than
his physical form. Thus, when we come to Sonnet 3, there may already be
quite some sonneting behind Shakespeare's invention: the metaphor of man
as the mirror (rather than the image of) his parents:

Look in thy glass, and tell the face thou viewest
Now is the time that face should form another;
Whose fresh repair if now thou not renewest,
Dost beguile the world, un bless some mother.
For who is she so fair whose un ear'd womb
Distains the tillage of thy husbandry?
Or who is he so fond will be the tomb
Of his self-love to stop posterity?
Thou art thy mother's glass and she in thee
Calls back the lovely April of her prime;
So thou through windows of thine age shalt see,
Despite of wrinkles this thy golden time.
But if thou livest remembered not to be
Die single, and thine image dies with thee (Works, p. 1308).
It will always remain a matter of conjecture whether the recipient of the
book proved, for a time at least, as disdainful of the proffered friend­
ship as he apparently did of procreation. It is doubtful that Shake­
speare's advice that the young man, his mother's "glass," should form an
image of himself (by so advising himself in the Mirror) could have been
Even as one heat another heat expels
Or one nail by strength drives out another,
So the remembrance of my former love
Is by a newer object quite forgotten.
Is it my mind, or Valentinus' praise,
Her true perfection, or my false transgression,
That makes me reasonless to reason thus?
She is fair; and so is Julia that I love—
That I did love, for now my love is thaw'd;
Which like a waxen image against a fire
Bears no impression of the thing it was (T.G.V., II, iv, 188-198).

Shakespeare does not suggest that Proteus is dissembling love, rather
that he has changed his mind, forgetting Julia solely on the basis of
Valentine's suggestion. When we compare the manner of melting, we see
that Shakespeare has given the matter some thought. However, he does not
restrict himself to this single interpretation. Proteus reports Silvia's
despair on Valentine's exile:

A sea of melting pearl, which some call tears;
Those at her father's churlish feet she tender'd;
With them, upon her knees, her humble self,
Wringing her hands, whose whiteness became them
As if but now they waxed pale for woe (T.G.V., III, i, 223-226).

The retention of the earlier "waxed image" in the form of a verb, "waxed,"
further emphasizes how deeply Shakespeare had been struck by Ovid's image
formed in so elaborate a conceit without earlier exploration, nor denied
the efficacy of "wrinkles" without first postulating their effect. Thus,
if there is granted any internal "order" to the sonnets at all, the "son-
nets," while they demonstrate the "badness" of the received text, also
point to the necessary inadequacy of Stirling's study.

"Time's fickle glass" of Stirling's "poem" opens up new vistas of
undecidability: if indebted to Drayton's expostulation in Amour 7, Idea's
Mirror, p. 101, then its date of composition probably exceeds that of
the Dutchess's passage in R. III; on the other hand, if Drayton knew
Shakespeare's poem, Sonnet 126, in manuscript the debt may be the other
way around (Drayton's expansion?/ Shakespeare's contraction?) and as no
common source readily springs to mind, we seem left on the horns of a
three pronged dilemma because "coincidence" cannot be entirely discounted.

and in the original, Chapter 2, p. 27 above, text and notes.
of forgetfulness. The Duke, having had council with Proteus, adopts his way of thinking:

This weak impress of love is as a figure
Trenched in ice, which with an hour's heat
Dissolves to water and doth lose his form.
A little time will melt her frozen thoughts,
And worthless Valentine shall be forgot (T.G.V., III, ii, 6-10).

Shakespeare has formed a new metaphor in the Duke's prediction above. He considers Silvia's love as a seal in wax bearing the image or signet of Valentine, which heated should lose its old form and be prepared for a new seal to be stamped into it. The melting of the "figure," preceded by the melting of the image that she holds of Valentine. The "figure in wax," first broached by Proteus as the thawing of his old resolve, and the "melting sea of pearl, which some call tears," his description of her sorrows, are synthesized into the Duke's prediction which, couched in euphuism, acknowledges the necessity of Silvia's sorrows to expel the image of Valentine from her mind. This is a neo-Ovidianism rather than a copy of Ovid himself.

While Julia is preparing herself for her journey in search of Proteus, Shakespeare has a good deal of ironic fun in store for his audience. Julia still believes Proteus to be true; the audience knows him to be false. The depth of his new found depravity, while not fully unfolded to the audience, has been suggested and opened up for further study. Thus, as Julia adopts the protective disguise, complete with codpiece, the duplicity of her deception is to some degree overshadowed by Proteus's, while the dramatic irony of her search is an open book to all.

Julia's intrigue begins with her realization of her changed status in Proteus's heart, no secret to Shakespeare's audience. Proteus,
however, seems truly affected by Silvia's beauty as well as by her disdain:

When to her beauty I commend my vows,
She bids me think how I have been forsworn
In breaking faith with Julia whom I lov'd;
And notwithstanding all her sudden quips,
The least whereof would quell a lover's hope,
Yet, spaniel-like, the more she spurns my love
The more it grows and fawneth on her still (T.G.V., IV, ii, 9-15).14

As Proteus and Thurio move back to tune their instruments, Julia, disguised as Sebastian, and the Host enter; while Julia inquires of him, Proteus breaks into song, "Who is Silvia? What is she, / That all the swains commend her?" (T.G.V., IV, ii, 38-39). And before her eyes, Proteus sues Silvia and declares Julia dead, Valentine dead; whereupon Silvia declares herself dead:

Pro. I grant, sweet love, that I did love a lady;
But she is dead.

Jul. [Aside] 'Twere false, if I should speak it;
For I am sure she is not buried.

Sil. Say that she be; yet Valentine, thy friend,
Survives, to whom, thyself art witness,
I am betroth'd; and art thou not asham'd
To wrong him with thy importunacy?

Pro. I likewise hear that Valentine is dead.

Sil. And so suppose am I; for in his grave
Assure thyself my love is buried.

Pro. Sweet lady, let me rake it from the earth.

Sil. Go to thy lady's grave, and call hers thence;
Or, at the least, in hers sepulchure thine (T.G.V., IV, ii, 101-113).

But Proteus is not to be moved from his suit:

Pro. Madam, if your heart be so obdurate,
Vouchsafe me yet your picture for my love,
The picture that is hanging in thy chamber;
To that I'll speak, to that I'll sigh and weep;

14. Shakespeare did not invent the "fawning dog." The animal is to be found both in Latin and English in John Withal's A Small Dictionarie for Children (London, 1584).
For, since the substance of your perfect self
Is else devoted, I am but a shadow;
And to your shadow will I make true love.

Jul. [Aside] If 'twere a substance, you would, sure, deceive it
And make it but a shadow, as I am.

Sil. I am very loath to be your idol, sir;
But since your falsehood shall become you well
To worship shadows and adore false shapes,
Send to me in the morning, and I'll send it;
And so, good rest.

Pro. As wretches have o'ernight
That wait for execution in the morn

[Exeunt Proteus and Silvia] (T.G.V., IV, ii, 115-129).

Thus, Shakespeare prepares his audience for the introduction of a stage property, a portrait of Silvia. Silvia's observations on the falsity of the image which he will be worshiping bear a strong resemblance to those of both Kings Richard, Richard II's explication of the shattering of the mirror (see p. 104 below), and Richard III's expressed reaction to his dream (see p. 53 above). "Shadow" here means "image" or "representation," and Julia comments on the falsity of her "image" as being a "shadow," which her earlier business about codpiece was clearly meant to emphasize.

From this, we may draw the inference that Shakespeare clearly imagined his stage picture during the act of composition, uniting the visual element of the falsity of Julia's disguise, the thematic element of Proteus's duplicity, and the philosophical element of the idea that "representations" through "shadows" or "images" might bear a non-correspondence with the observable physical phenomenon,15 or, shortly, that he was conscious of what he was doing when he brought Silvia's portrait on stage.

15. The final joke, of course, was that in this case the disguise was closer to the truth than the character who was being disguised, the use of boy actors being the inspiration for this non-natural
Between the bargaining and the delivery of the portrait, two important and one highly comical piece of business transpire. First, Silvia plots to make good her escape. Second, Launce and his dog make it perfectly obvious why she should wish to escape. Finally, Julia enters Proteus's service disguised; whereupon she is immediately put to work to secure the portrait from Silvia. In exchange for the portrait, Proteus sends by Julia the ring she had given him as a true love token to Silvia. Obdurate despite Sebastian's reminders, he sends him as his page to Silvia's chamber. Julia, having been chosen in favor of Launce, one would suppose on account of his longing, enters the chamber of her own free will resolving to serve herself as well as her master:

I am my master's true confirmed love,
But cannot be a true servant to my master
Unless I prove false traitor to myself.
Yet will I woo for him, but yet so coldly
As, heaven it knows, I would not have him speed (T.G.V., IV, iv, 99-103).16

With Silvia's entrance, Shakespeare begins to play both the pathos and the irony of Julia's position. Silvia orders the portrait delivered to Julia with the message, "One Julia, that his changing thoughts forget,/ Would better fit his chamber than this shadow" (T.G.V., IV, iv, 114-115). Dutifully Julia delivers the letter, which Silvia is pleased to tear up. Finally, she delivers up the ring. Silvia's indignation is aroused:

counter-disguising of female characters. In the age of Baconian empiricism, the disguised stage-lady would test out truer to form than the "true lady," so far as the stage was concerned.

16. Cf. R. II, "Nay if I turn my eyes upon myself,/ I find myself a traitor with the rest" IV, i, 247-249.
Sil. The more shame for him that sends it me;
For I have heard him say a thousand times
His Julia gave it him at his departure.
Through his false finger hath profan’d the ring,
Mine shall not do his Julia so much wrong.

Jul. She thanks you.

Sil. What say’st thou?

Jul. I thank you, madam, that you tender her.
Poor gentlewoman, my master wrongs her much.

Sil. Dost thou know her?

Jul. Almost as well as I know myself (T.G.V., IV, iv, 128-139).

A lesser dramatist would probably not have allowed Julia to be so imperfect
an actress as to slip out of character for Silvia's confusion. Shake-
speare does so in order to remind his audience that the boy actor on stage
is impersonating a woman impersonating a man; so that, when "Sebastian"
begins to talk about "Julia," the audience will remember that this is
Julia talking about herself. In answer to Silvia's question, "Is she
not passing fair?", Julia replies:

She hath been fairer, madam, than she is.
When she did think my master lov'd her well,
She, in my judgment, was as fair as you;
But since she did neglect her looking-glass
And threw her sun-expelling mask away,
The air hath starved the roses in her cheeks
And pich'd the lily-tincture of her face,
That now she has become as black as I (T.G.V., IV, iv,
144-152).\(^17\)

The association of the roses and the looking-glass with a central
character happens again in Richard II, with the abdication scene (IV, i)

---

17. This passage should be a matter of acute embarrassment to
Hobday. In "Why The Sweets Melted," pp. 6-7, Hobday holds forth: "Per-
haps the earliest example of Group B is that in Two Gentlemen of Verona
IV, iv:

If I had such a tire, this face of mine
Were full as lovely as is this of hers:
And yet the painter flattered her a little,
Unless I flatter with myself too much.
Her hair is auburn, mine is perfect yellow . . .
Her eyes are grey as glass, and so are mine.
and 1 Henry IV, wherein Richard becomes "That sweet and lovely rose" (H. IV, I, iii, 175), to Hotspur's way of thinking. Julia, however, suggests that at an earlier date she was not one to neglect her looking-glass an allusion to the pleasing vanity of young ladies. But with the next four lines, we are put into an odd place by the early "glass" sonnets, particularly Sonnet 62:

But when my glass showes me myself indeed,
Beated and chopt with tann'd antiquity,
Mine own self-love quite contrary I read;
Self so self-loving were iniquity. 18

Julia, then, applies a similar amount of self-awareness to her own appearance in this passage as Shakespeare does of himself in his Sonnet. Whether or not, of course, Shakespeare really meant that he looked into a mirror and saw a tanned face is quite as moot as whether or not Julia is really "black." The elaborate figuration of Shakespeare's language admits wide variance with "reality."

This variance is perhaps strained to the utmost by the next passage in which Julia invents a "play" so fitting to the theme of

This image-cluster appears again in the non-canonical Edward III, which of all the plays written before Richard II contains the largest number of typically Shakespearian images associated with Flattery."

The fact is that in his haste to prove Shakespeare's hand in Edward III, Hobday overlooked the very element upon which his cluster is built, the looking-glass, the emblem of self-flattery. (See reference to Drayton, Ch. 2, pp. 16-17, above; see also n. 28). Indeed, when one studies how Hobday has excised the clusters from the Works, it is difficult to see how anyone could come to any other conclusion than that they were the product of the unconscious processes of Shakespeare's mind because they are absolutely devoid of their original dramatic context. What we have, then, is the assumption proving the proof by exercising undue influence on the manner of presentation and excision.

perjury that an incautious scholar might look for a lost play rather than credit Shakespeare's invention:

Sil.  How tall was she?
Jul.  About my stature; for at Pentecost,
     When all our pageants of delight were play'd,
     Our youth got me to play the woman's part,
     And I was trimm'd in Madam Julia's gown;
     Which served me as fit, by all men's judgments,
     As if the garment had been made for me;
     Therefore I know she is about my height.
     And at that time I made her weep agood,
     For I did play a lamentable part.
     Madam, 'twas Ariadne passioning
     For Theseus' perjury and unjust flight;
     Which I so lively acted with my tears
     That my poor mistress, moved therewithal,
     Wept bitterly; and would I might be dead
     If I in thought felt not her very sorrow (T.G.V., IV, iv, 153-168). 19

Julia's invention of a scene that is never dramatized (because the major actor would also have been the most important spectator), is the nicest touch that Shakespeare adds to her deceit before Silvia, and Silvia is moved:

Sil.  She is beholding to thee, gentle youth.
     Alas, poor lady, desolate and left!
     I weep myself, to think upon thy words.
     Here, youth, there is my purse; I give thee this
     For thy sweet mistress' sake, because thou lovest her.
     Farewell [Exit Silvia with attendants] (T.G.V., IV, iv, 169-174).

19. Baldwin concludes that Shakespeare knew the Theseus-Ariadne story from Ovid rather than from Chaucer, borrowing "Perjure et perfide Theseu" for this passage, Small Latin and Less Greek, II, 423-424, the story being a part of the fodder of his grammar school training. Baldwin does not remark that Ariadne is not specifically named as Theseus's victim in the same passage of Fasti in which he is called "perjure et perfide," III, 459-516, but rather is identified by her connection to Baccus in both III, 459-516, and V, 345-346, the latter being the only place where she is named, "Baccho paucisse coronam/ ex Ariadneo sidere nosse potes." Whether Shakespeare made the connection of the two separate
Wiping a tear as she goes, with all the violated probability in the world blithely accepted and passed on, Silvia leaves the stage to Julia and to Julia the portrait and purse. The portrait carries an image, however lamentable, of Silvia, as Julia carries an image of the pageboy (Sebastien) whose part she has been playing. Now, with the stage empty but for her, she breaks character for the audience again as she had earlier with the line, "She thanks you." This time, however, she is forced into her "psychological" moment by Silvia's exit line, which she suggests that she loves herself, by the portrait, which suggests to her the picture that she holds of herself, a picture at some variance with the picture she painted for Silvia, and by the evidence, true and compounded, that the suit that she has been sent on was entirely her lover's doing and none of Madam Silvia's.

Julia watches Silvia go off:

Jul. And She shall thank you for't, if e'er you know her.
A virtuous gentlewoman, mild and beautiful!
I hope my master's suit will be but cold,
Since she respects my mistress' love so much (T.G.V., IV, iv, 175-178).

The first line is obviously to Silvia departing. The next three can only be to herself and to the audience, because there is no one else on stage. Then Shakespeare breaks even that string giving Julia a line of cryptic irony, "Alas, how love can trifle with itself" (T.G.V., IV, iv, 179). And it is thus that Julia becomes the first of Shakespeare's lonely characters holding a dialogue not with another character, not giving forth pieces of the same story or whether his school master made it for him, will never be known; suffice it to say that this borrowing cannot be "unconscious." Ovid, Fasti, ed. James George Frazer (London, 1931) cited throughout.
an aside or a soliloquy, but entering a scene with a physical property in which a facet of the character is opened to view for the audience by means of the character's exposition of personal memories as called forth by the observed reality in the human image preserved in the stage property. The character's side reactions to this confrontation with an image, a "shadow," hold a great potential store for irony. Still, the stage picture can remind us of nothing so much as Narcissus at his Well, or Amant at his, while those two strange eyes stare back.

The examining of the image one holds of one's self might be called secondary narcissism, being somewhat distinct from the type Richard II practices in his mirror. The portrait does not give back an image of him; rather, Julia confronted with the absurdity of Proteus's idolatry looks deeply into the irony of her own love for him by looking at the portrait and comparing the image it holds for him with the image that she holds of herself:

Here is her picture; let me see. I think,
If I had such a tire, this face of mine
Were full as lovely as is this of hers;
And yet the painter flatter'd her a little,
Unless I flatter with myself too much.
Her hair is auburn, mine is perfect yellow;
If that be all the difference in his love,
I'll get me such a colour'd periwig.
Her eyes are grey as glass, and so are mine;
Ay, but her forehead's low, and mine's as high.
What should it be that he respects in her.
But I can make respective in myself,
If this fond Love were not a blinded god? (T.G.V., IV, iv, 180-192).

The picture that Julia holds of herself is almost exactly the one that Guillaume gives of Ydeliness (see p. 33, 34, above). The one of Silvia presumably drawn in part from the use of the wig on the boy actor, giving
him a low forehead, whereas the boy who played Julia could wear his own natural "pageboy" without stepping out of character. The picture that she holds of herself is not half so interesting as her reaction to it. She starts by musing, "Let me see," and after a pause begins her comparison in which she is quite as critical of herself as she is of the artist's representation of Silvia. Her appraisal of herself, held as an image in her mind's eye, "this face of mine," is compared directly to Silvia's, "this of hers," held in the portrait; but, the possibility of misrepresentation is held in the notion, "And yet the painter flattered her a little," in the case of Silvia's portrait and "Unless I flatter with myself too much," in the case of Julia's image of herself.

It is extremely important to notice that Shakespeare has intentionally set up the dramatic situation in which this comparison cannot only take place, but also seem natural. The portrait has been introduced largely because it holds a physical image of Silvia, being emblematic of Proteus's idolization of images. We have also been prepared for the comparison by Julia's picture of herself as painted for Silvia, particularly in relation to her "looking-glass," from which we have deduced that Julia is very well aware of what she looks like. Although the image that she gives of the appearance which her "looking-glass" has given her is tinged with hyperbole, we may be quite certain from her opening scenes with Lucetta that she was not one want to "neglect her looking-glass."

Thus with all Julia's deliberate falsification before Silvia to protect her disguise, Shakespeare manages to convey sufficient image of Julia as seen through her own eyes to make the comparison with the portrait
credible. Still, there is a sense of personal irony or suggested self
criticism in Julia's, "Unless I flatter with myself too much." This
second sense, beyond the descriptive sense, is carried on in Julia's
picking up of the portrait for delivery:

Come, shadow, come, and take this shadow up,
For 'tis thy rival. O thou senseless form,
Thou shalt be worship'd, kiss'd, lov'd, and ador'd!
And were there sense in his idolatry
My substance should be statue in thy stead.
I'll use thee kindly for thy mistress' sake,
That us'd me so; or else, by Jove I vow,
I should have scratch'd out your unseeing eyes,
To make my master out of love with thee (T.G.V., IV, iv, 193-201).

By the word "shadow," Julia signifies herself, meaning "representation,"
an epithet by which she also calls the painting. In this way, the lady
Julia motivates the pageboy Sebastian [Julia disguised] to pick up the
portrait and fetch it to the forgetful Proteus, an office which she must
personally detest. Her estrangement from her own purpose is carried in
her depersonalization of her own image, making it a "shadow." Her
estrangement to Proteus's purpose is carried by her allusion to the
Pygmalion myth, "And were there sense in his idolatry/ My substance
should be statue in thy stead," Shakespeare could have taken this material
from either Roman de la Rose, where Pygmalion appears at the end of Jean
de Muen's part, or from Metamorphoses, Book 10, from whence Jean took the
myth.20 His earlier use of the Ariadne myth makes any claim for Jean's
part indecisive while strengthening the notion that Shakespeare is mixing

20. The myth does not appear in Thynne's edition or in the
Glasgow manuscript, both of which leave off translation at line 12360,
while Jean did not treat the myth until after line 20,000. Anyone, there-
fore, wishing to argue Shakespeare's debt to Jean de Muen at this point
would have to suggest that he read Roman de la Rose in the original old
French.
of themes from the *Metamorphoses*, where Narcissus's statue like quality makes the allusion to Pygmalion meaningful (see p. 24 above).

With the comparison of the separate "shadow," the contrast of Julia's desire to play the statue to Proteus's Pygmalion with the abomination of his present affection takes place in the substance-shadow terminology which is later to come to both Kings Richard with their relation to their separate mirrorings, the first, the dream vision of a political reign, and the second, the physical property carrying both the political history and the psychology of a disastrous reign. Richard III is more afraid of his dream vision of the ghostly "shadows" than "The substance of ten thousand soldiers/ Armed in proof and led by shallow Richmond" (*R. III*, V, iii, 218-219). Richard II, informed that "The shadow of your sorrow hath destroy'd/ The shadow of your face," agrees:

> Say that again.
> The shadow of my sorrow? Ha! let's see.
> 'Tis very true: my grief lies all within;
> And these external manner of laments
> Are merely shadows to the unseen grief
> That swells in silence in the tortur'd soul.
> There lies the substance; and I thank thee king (*R. II*, IV, i, 292-299).

Both Richard II and Julia begin their neo-platonic musings and comparisons with a dramatically identical direction, the introspective "let us see," meant to include the audience in their musings. And, while one waxes by allusion and the other wanes philosophically, the dramatization of an introspection emphasizes the loneliness of the role in which they are cast.

In answer to the question "Who is Silvia? What is she/ That all our swains commend her?" we find Proteus "melts" into forgetfulness as Narcissus had at the mention of just her name. We find, moreover, that
Julia describes her eye as "grey as glass," suggesting its reflective quality. For as much as Speed found of Valentine before her first entrance that then he was is "metamorphis'd with a mistress" (T.G.V., II, i, 27-28), it is hard to think of her eye as anything less than the Well of Love as put forth in Guillaume's poem, wherein Amant, Valentine, and Proteus find themselves changed, the latter two conceiving in her eye both love and the love of appearances,21 whence Julia gives her exposition of the theme of deceptive and changeable appearances with the immutable portrait by as a visual aid to her discussion.

Thus, when Julia points at the eye on the portrait declaring that had Silvia not used her kindly she "should have scratch'd out your unseeing eyes,/ To make my master out of love with thee," we look back to find out how she came to this strange confrontation with the shadow of Julia (Sebastian) at odds with the shadow of Silvia on the portrait, and immediately we see that neither Ovid's tale of Narcissus as it appears in Golding or in the original is sufficient. What is necessary to supplement the materials found there is a theory of love predicated on the narcissism of the lover as found in Roman de La Rose.

Of course, it is not immediately clear that Shakespeare took his material from Roman de La Rose. However, no other source so completely recommends itself on the theme of narcissism as related to love, or for the image of the glassy surface of the eye reflecting the visible appearance of the lover, making Shakespeare's usage "her eye is grey as glass" particularly effective for its conveyance of the image of the eye as

mirror, or the respective searches of Amant and Julia coming to their ends through confrontations with their own reflections, both interior and exterior, and the motivational "eyes" that move them both. Moreover, it appears to have been Shakespeare's purpose in this play to explore a theory of romantic love and the negativity of audience effect is introduced by Proteus's horrific changeability to some extent in order to introduce an alienation of audience interest to the entire treatment of the love theme, making it possible for Shakespeare to explore the ramifications of the boy actor conventions rather than the romantic stream of thought. So, while Shakespeare, in Two Gentlemen of Verona, makes use of the materials and themes available in Roman de La Rose, he changes the spirit which moves the original by exposing the theories found there to the necessities of dramatic conflict and exposition.

**Richard II**

If the treatment of the material from Roman de La Rose does not find its most faithful expression in Two Gentlemen of Verona and is almost entirely missing from the intervening Richard III, where introspection on the part of any of the characters would spoil the melodramatic resolution of the plot, it does find its new expression in Richard II, wherein are preserved the mirror, the well, the garden, and the dancing ladies, as well as the Ovidian characteristics of the king taken over from Proteus: Richard wants to melt.

The difficulty in interpreting Richard II without recourse to Woodstock and the Narcissus material from both Guillaume de Lorris and Ovid as well as the Glendower, Thomas Duke of Gloucester, Henry of
Northumberland, and Lord Mowbray complaints from The Myrrour for Magistrates, led J. Dover Wilson in 1939 to postulate a lost play to account for certain details from the script which do not appear to have come from any known chronicle. Unfortunately, in his 1951 edition of the play he follows Dr. Samuel Johnson in one of that learned gentleman's rare mistakes, and for all the credit that he gives to Daniel's Civil Wars, only R. II, V, i and R. II, V, ii, 1-45 seem related to Daniel at all. Matthew Black, rejecting the notion "that Bagot was really dead to the audience," misses the fact that Bagot has stated that he is going to Ireland to join with Richard (R. II, II, ii, 1414), which makes both Johnson's misunderstanding and Wilson's absurd. It is Richard who is confused, not Shakespeare, and he is confused because Bagot landed too late to meet him, Richard already having set sail for England, having heard of Bolingbroke's rebellion through Carlisle and Aumerle who have gone to meet him on the coast of Wales.

C. A. Greer, in reopening the controversy over the "lost play," retorts:

And surely Professor Black is not right when he says that there is not "one scrap" of external evidence that there might have been a lost source play. Richard Knollys on Jan. 9, 1578, wrote that he would not "play the partes of King Richard the Second's men to the Queen," and Henry Hundson, sometime before 1588, declared he "never was one of Richard II's men."


23. Ibid., p. 186.


Unfortunately, Greer's willingness to do combat for the notion of the lost play has led him to misrepresent what Matthew W. Black had to say:

In face of all the probabilities in its favor, I have endeavored to base a rejection of it on grounds more relative than a simple challenge to the proper to show one scrap of external proof that the "old play" existed. Certainly one wishes for something concrete to which it might be referred. Yet to show that it unnecessary and unsupported is not enough. Its fatal weakness lies in its derogatory implications concerning Shakespeare as a man and artist.26

The fact is that Greer has referred us to nothing "concrete." If we look closely at Greer's references to plays concerning Richard II, we find that in both cases the persons decline to perform or disclaim ever having performed in such a play. The second should strike us as a little odd. Henry Hundson was later Shakespeare's patron, not simply Henry Hamsdon, but Henry Carey, the first Lord Hunsdon, Lord High Chamberlain of England.27 Indeed, if we look back to Edmund K. Chambers, whom Greer cites, we find that matters are quite different than what Greer reports:

There are many indications of an analogy present to the Elizabethan political imagination between the reign of Richard II and that of Elizabeth herself. A letter of Sir Francis Knollys on 9 January 1578 excuses himself for giving unwelcome council to the queen. He will not "play the parties of King Richard the Second's men;" will not be a courtly and unstatesmanlike flatterer. Clearly the phrase is familiar. Henry Lord Hundson similarly wrote at some date before 1588, "I never was one of Richard II's men" (italics mine).28

The men whose letters Chambers cites were clearly noblemen, not actors as Greer would lead one to believe. What they were disclaiming, according

to Chambers, was not having played in a "lost play" but to being flatterers to the Queen. Peter Alexander in *Shakespeare* points out.

Not long after his appointment as custodian of the records kept in the Tower, Lambarde, in August 1601, was giving to the Queen at Greenwich an account of the documents in his charge. When they came to those dealing with the reign of Richard II, the Queen exclaimed "I am Richard II, know ye not that!" 29

So, it seems that in the case of Greer, we are dealing with deliberate misrepresentation in an attempt to discredit Black, while attempting to further Wilson. With such friends, does Wilson's theory need enemies? However, upon checking Greer's reference to Robert Metcalf Smith's Dissertation, 30 one is tempted to allow that, in the matter of Shakespeare's debt to Daniel, Greer is more correct than Wilson. It is a difficult debt to see even if one reads the material following the text in Wilson's edition.

In all, the case for a lost play in the sources of *Richard II*, as Black suggested is a bad one. Not only have no plays been brought forward or shown to exist, but also one is forced to acknowledge that the theory upon which the search for the "lost play" is based is one that supposes that Shakespeare at the late date of 1595-1596 was incapable of writing his own scenario, demonstrably false in the next history play he wrote, *1 H IV*. It is rather Shakespeare's departures from chronicle history that distinguish the second tetralogy than that his adherence to Holinshed and Hall ennobles the first. Principal among these departures


30. *Froissart and the English Chronicle Play* (New York, 1915). Smith has much to say in relation to *Edward III*, ch. 4 below, little of it, however, has much to do with the problem at hand.
in Richard II are the "Garden Scene" and the "Abdication Scene," in which the "Mirror Scene" becomes the primary emblem of the King Richard's most obvious problem, Vanity.

Four lines of the "Garden Scene" have yielded to Harry J. Leon's investigations in "Classical Sources for the Garden Scene in Richard II." Both Livy's History and Ovid's Fasti contain the story of Tarquin's advice to his youngest son, Sextus, once the young man had gained the confidence and the leadership of the Gabians, which Shakespeare mirrors in the gardener's directions:

> Go thou and, like an executioner,  
> Cut off the heads of too fast growing spreys  
> That look too lofty in our commonwealth.  
> All must be even in our government.  

But a line of Buckingham's in Richard III suggests a comparison to such a notion of the over-grown nobility:

> Marry, my lord, lest by a multitude  
> The new-heal'd wound of malice should break out,  
> Which would be the more dangerous  
> By how much the estate is green and yet ungovern'd;  
> Where every horse bears his commanding rein  
> And may direct his course as please himself,  
> As well the fear of harm as harm apparent,  
> In mine opinion, ought to be presented (Italics mine.) (R. III, II, 124-131).

So, unless we are willing to discount earlier Shakespeare as a source of Shakespeare, it is a little difficult to maintain that Shakespeare in

31. For a full discussion of this matter see Leon's article "Classical Sources of the Garden Scene in Richard II," PQ, XXIX (1950), pp. 65-70.

32. R. II, III, iv, 33-38. The Queen's "pins," ten lines earlier probably refer to the line in Romaunt of the Rose, "which tree in Fraunce men call a pyn," 1: 1449, and refer to her starvation for good news of Richard.
Richard II is not indebted to Shakespeare in both Two Gentlemen of Verona and Richard III, as much as to any outside source. Indeed, when the melting is examined in Richard II, the desire to melt is seen to be the manifest desire to forget the process of abdication, and it becomes quite clear that Proteus's actual melting and Narcissus's before him, finding forgetfulness, were the models towards which Shakespeare must cast back for his metaphor to explain Richard's emotional state. Therefore, while acknowledging Shakespeare's debt to the Tarquin materials in Ovid and Livy, we must be careful to notice that the Tarquin materials neither account for the entire "Garden Scene" nor for the dramaturgy of the scene within the framework of the play. Instead they draw a long parallel by which the Gardener's fine hindsight, alluding to Tarquin's advice, forms a criticism of Richard's odd benevolence of I, iii, where, by allowing the culling of the realm of his lieutenant, Mowbray, he brought havoc on himself.

The non-historical treatment of Richard II in Richard II, as the non-historical treatment of Richard III in Richard III, has led to a confusion among scholars as to who deposes who. In opposition to E. M. W. Tillyard's view, A. L. French trying to come to grips with the question, "Who Deposed Richard the Second?" concludes, "He has capitulated not to force (as he says) not to persuasion, not to York or Northumberland or Bolingbroke, but to himself. No 'force' is necessary."34


34. A. L. French, "Who Deposed Richard II?" EC, XVII (October 1967), p. 425. French's title and theme are slightly in error, the actual
Then, recalling the dying John O'Gaunt's summation of Richard's murder of his uncle, Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester:

O, had thy grandsire with a prophet's eye
Seen how his son's son should destroy his sons,
From forththy reach he would have laid thy shame,
Deposing thee before thou wert possess'd,
Which art possess'd now to depose thyself (Italics mine.)
(R. II, II, i, 104-108).

French concludes, "Richard has done just that: at no-one's prompting but his own, he has deposed himself." 35 French further points out that it is the crowning of Bolingbroke, not the deposing of Richard, against which Carlisle raises his voice:

What is remarkable about this well known speech [Carlisle's "If you raise this house against this house"] is that it contains no reference to the deposing of Richard (though it does mention the dire consequences of crowning Bolingbroke); its emphasis is on judging him ... This is a baffling speech, because at this stage no-one has proposed to judge Richard. Nobody has publicly suggested that he is unfit to reign; no-one but himself has proposed that he step down. 36

Recalling Richard III's "unwillingness" to obtain the crown offered him by Buckingham, it is a little difficult to agree with French that the speech is baffling: as Richard III sent Buckingham to stir up support for his crowning, even so Richard II sends Carlisle to stir up support for his maintenance; the difference is that Richard II is already king and, rather than seeking to fill his power, he is seeking to assuage his injured vanity by making his subjects overturn his resignation and reinstate his monarchy as absolute.

"deposition" is not dramatized. Richard abdicates (deposes himself), but the self-deposition is not final until passed upon by the Commons.

36. Ibid., p. 423.
So far as who deposes who, French is right but, having taken his notion of the "deposition" from a performance, vestiges of Tillyard cloud French's appreciation of what he sees, particularly in trying to understand why Richard has chosen this long involved way of committing political suicide:

Perhaps the safest explanation here is that Richard has a strong streak of the masochist in him, and that he gets a positive pleasure from making his plight appear worse than it really is—though we do not even know what it "really" is, since we have no idea what is in Bolingbroke's mind and his motives remain utterly obscure. It is hindsight that makes us guess he wanted the crown.  

If it is safe, it leads French into trouble: he has to dismiss the majority of the "Mirror Scene" as an "imaginative blur." The "blur" is in French, not Shakespeare. French's largest contribution is in opening his eyes at the performance that he saw, remembering the criticism that he read, and finding that the two were incompatible. His courage is opening his mouth in opposition to so formidable an authority as Tillyard is to be commended: even giants sometimes take a fall.

The major problem with people who watch Richard II is that they refuse to believe their own eyes: Richard gives his own crown away; Richard stares in the mirror; Richard is guilty of the murder of his own uncle and Richard is guilty of the theft of his cousin's property; Richard breaks down on stage; and unlike Lear, Hamlet or MacBeth, Richard never achieves tragic enlightenment. He wants so badly to be unique that he cannot objectify his predicament; moreover, could he do so, the dramatic effect of his emotional breakdown on stage would be destroyed. Richard cultivates flattery. Richard is vain and, rather than seeking

37. Ibid., p. 423.
into the causes of his downfall, Richard only wants to escape into forgetfulness, to put off inquiry and quash judgment, lest his guilt be weighed by Northumberland's Commons.

The figure that looks in the glass is called Vanitas, and the term is preserved in the modern notion of a vanity-table, a small make-up table with a mirror. Gervase Mathews informs us that two "Superbia" with looking-glasses, one of them holding a sceptre, survive from the latter part of Richard's reign (see n. 22 above). Chambers (above) documents the vision of Richard's men as flatterers in common metaphor. But there was another side to Richard's character, as summed up by Harold F. Hutchinson, some of which seems to be preserved in Richard II:

Of Richard's love of the arts and of the culture of his time we have excellent evidence. He was the patron of Chaucer, of Gower, and of Froissart, and we have Froissart's word that he was a charming conversationalist in perfect English. He was the employer of Henry Yevele, the greatest of English medieval architects; his reign is the golden age of the arts of the brass engraver, the mural painter, the glazier, and the sculptor of effigies in the round. Three small sidelights on Richard, the man, enable us to imagine a pleasing picture of the whole: Richard was the first King of England to sign his own letters. He was probably the inventor of the handkerchief; and the first English cookery book was specially compiled for him.38

This vision of Richard, the innovator, is carried over not only into Richard II, but also into Woodstock, the anonymous manuscript play, wherein Richard's friends first innovation is the attempted poisoning of his uncles, a fashion which presumably was imported from Italy.39


39. Woodstock: A Moral History, ed. A. P. Rossiter (London 1946). Even "the proud Castillian," according to Lancaster, "would not throw off their viel and servile yoke/ By treachery so base" (Woodstock,
Richard's importations of expensive fashions, so effectively dramatized in *Woodstock*, become the subject of gentle lampoon in *Richard II*, when York speaks of "plume-pluck'd Richard" (*R. II*, IV, i, 108), but the vilification of Richard's followers in *Woodstock* starts immediately with Cheney's speech:

Tis certainly made known, my reverend lords,
To your loved brother, and the good Protector
That not King Richard but his flatterers
Sir Harry Greene, joined with Sir Edward Bagot,
And that sly machiavel Tresilian,
(Whom now the king elects for Lord Chief Justice)
Had all great hands in this conspiracy 
(*Woodstock*, I, i, 60-65).

Plain Thomas, Richard's Uncle Woodstock, gives voice to the cost of his "bravery" on Richard's wedding day; Richard, speaking of Woodstock's tired horse, says:

---

I, i, 51-54). All quotations from *Woodstock* are from this source and are cited immediately following the quotation.

40. *Woodstock*, I, i, 60-65. Rossiter notes that Gloucester was never Lord Protector (n. 23) and that the poison plot is fictitious (n. 1, 5 f.) p. 209. The use of machiavel, to some horrified Elizabethans the epitome of the "fine Italian hand" cloaking a dagger or dispensing poison with the fluid finesse of italic script, is significant in the anonymous author's political conception of Richard's reign, particularly in dealing with Chief Justice Tresilian.

41. *Woodstock*, I, iii, 88-92. Bucephalus was Alexander's horse, an unridable beast won from his father, Philip of Macedon, when Alexander proved the only man in the kingdom who could ride on his back and not be thrown. The metaphor comes from Holinshed, where the house of Gloucester is likened to Sejan's horse, another unridable beast belonging in turn to Gnius Sejus, Cassius, Anthony and Cassius. See Holinshed's *Chronicles* (London, 1808) III, p. 211, "Dukes of Gloucester unfortunate," and Oxford Companion to Classical Literature, ed. Paul Harvey (Oxford, 1966), "Sejus, Horse of." Woodstock's business with the courtier's horse (in so far as it was Woodstock's inability to be a courtier and flatter Richard that was his downfall), *R. II*, III, ii, 130-196, probably reflects the metaphor from the *Chronicles*. 
Methought your horse, that's wont to tread the ground
And pace as if he kicked it, scornfully,
Mount and curvet, like strong Bucephalus,
Today he trod as slow and melancholy
As if his legs had failed to bear his load (Woodstock, I, iii, 88-92).

Whereupon, Woodstock grows instructive to his young charge on the "facts of life":

And can you blame the beast? Afore my God,
He was not wont to bear such loads! Indeed,
A hundred oaks upon these shoulders hand
To make me brave upon your wedding day;
And more than that: --to make my horse more tire--
Ten acres of good land are stiched up here.
You know, good coz, this was not wont to be.

In your tother hose, uncle?

(aside) No, nor his frieze coat neither!

Aye, Aye, mock on. My tother hose, say thee?

There's honest plain dealing in my tother hose.
Should this fashion last, I must raise new rents,
Undo my poor tenants, turn away my servants,
And guard myself with lace; nay, sell more land
And lordships too by th' rood. Hear me, King Richard,
If thus I jet [strut] in pride, I still shall lowse,
But I'll build castles in my tother hose.

The king but jests, my lord, and you grow angry.

Tother hose! Did some here wear that fashion,
They would not tax and pil the Commons so! (Woodstock, I, iii, 93-112).42

42. The text of Woodstock does not appear to be a "good" one in the sense of the text of the Folio Richard III or Richard II, both of which contain numerous problems. Rossiter has "canonized the errors of a careless scribe" in some places and committed some of his own in others: Tresilian's speech, I, ii, 29-38 is rendered in un-metrical verse because the original was in prose. The quoted passage (I, iii, 93-112), has required repunctuation and two re-spellings. Rossiter renders "loose" as "lose," presumably in the spelling of the obscure word meaning "to praise;" however, this spelling neglects the primitive homonymic pun "louse"--"louse" (i.e., "praise" -- "delouse") suggested by the scribe's rendition and the earlier homonymic pun "tire" -- "tire" ("exhaust" -- "clothe"); therefore, the spelling "lowse," an obscure spelling for both words, has been chosen, above, to preserve the meaning against careless and inaccurate reading.

Rossiter's remarks on the date of the play fail to take into account the most obvious parallel to Shakespeare's works:
Woodstock's complaints become a theme of Richard II, finding voice particularly in John O'Gaunt but also in York and Northumberland. However upset at the cost of his finery Woodstock may be, he is able to flatter a pretty young queen, when the interests of state are not at stake:

Afore my God, sweet queen, our English ladies
And all the women that this isle contains
Shall sing in praise of this your memory
And keep records of virtuous Anne a Beame,
Whose discipline hath taught them womanhood;
What erst seemed well by custom now looks rude:
Our women, till your coming, fairest cousin—
Did use like men to straddle when thy ride;
But you have taught them now to sit aside;
Yet, by your leave, young practice often reels:
I have seen some of your scholars kick up both their heels

(Woodstock, I, iii, 53-63).43

The difficulties of riding side-saddle prompt Plain Thomas to his extra-metrical jesting; however it is this matter of innovation and importation of custom and learning which Woodstock comments on here, which turn into

Wood: But had he known
That kites should have enjoyed the eagle's prize
The fraught [freyght] had swum unto thine enemies

(Woodstock, I, iii, 178-180).

Hast: More pity that eagles should be mew'd
While kites and buzzards prey at liberty

(R. III, I, 1, 132-133).

Moreover, Rossiter fails to note that it is extremely unlikely that this play was intended for a public theatre: the horse required for III, ii, could probably not have entered any of the public theatre doors. It could have entered a bull-baiting pit or an inn-yard, and it probably for the latter that this play in its present form was written.

"Frey 'tad" - "Freight," this is probably another of Plain Thomas's primitive puns; if so, he seems to be straining it a bit. The alternate reading is from the Malone Society edition.

43. Again, the appropriateness of the riding theme to an inn-yard performance should be noted.
serious matter in the next scene. Richard's new mathematics forms a vehicle whereby the anonymous author dramatizes Richard's basic deceitfulness:

Bush. Here is set down, my princely sovereign,
The certain time and day when you were born.
King. Our Birthday sayst thou? Is it noted there?
Bush. It is, my lord.
King. Prithee let me hear it,
For thereby hangs a secret mystery
Which yet our uncle strangely keeps from us.
On Bushy!

Bush. Upon the third of April, 1365, was Lord Richard,
son to the Black Prince, born at Bordeaux.
King. Stay! Let me think awhile. (pause) Read it again.
Bush. Upon the third of April, 1365, was Lord Richard,
son to the Black Prince, born at Bordeaux.
King. 1365, ... What year is this?
Green. 'Tis now, my lord, 1387.
King. By that account, the third of April next
Our age is numbered two and twenty years.
O treacherous men that have delued us,
We might have claimed our right a twelvemonth since!
Shut up thy book, good Bushy. Bagot, Green,
King Richard on his throne will now be seen.
This day I'll claim my right; my kingdom's due.
Our uncles well shall know they but intrude;
For which we'll smite their base ingratitude (Woodstock, II, i, 97-119).44

One would expect that either Bagot or Green would be counting out Richard's age on his fingers while Richard makes his mathematical "error."

As these catch on to what Richard and Bushy are up to, a secret smile or handshake between the flatterers passes the message to the audience that the counting is not on the up and up. And Woodstock correctly reckons:

44. Rossiter notes (p. 216), Richard was really born in January 1367, but Stowe and Holinshde give the third of April. Stowe (267, 1) has 1366 at the top of the column. The date 1365 is gotten by taking it to cover the second column in Hol. III, 397, without noticing that this would give the Black Prince one child in February and another in April!

This is an example of Richard being "misled" by his followers.
The right I hold, even with my heart I render
And wish your grace had claimed it long ago;
Thou had'st rid my age of care and mickle woe.
And yet I think I have not wronged your birthright:
For if the times were searched, I guess your grace
Is not so full of years till April next.
But be it as it will. Lo, here King Richard,
I thus yield up my sad protectorship.

(Gives up Mace)

A heavy burden hast thou ta'en from me;
Long may'st thou live in peace to keep thine own:
That truth and justice may attend thy throne (Woodstock, II, ii, 93-105).45

Richard's Queen, neglected by her King, hears this report of him:

**Queen.** Saw'ist thou King Richard, Cheyney? Pirthee tell me
What revels keep his flattering minions?

**Chey.** They sit in council to devise strange fashions,
And suit themselves in wild and antic habits
Such as this kingdom never yet beheld:
French hose, Italian cloaks and Spanish hats,
Polonian shoes with peaks a hand full long,
Tied to their knees with chains of pearl and gold.
Their plumed tops fly waving in the air
A cubit high above their wanton heads.
Tresilian with King Richard likewise sits,
Devising taxes and strange shifts for money
To build again the hall at Westminster
To feast and revel in (Woodstock, II, iii, 86-99).46

However, it is Tresilian who (although historically long since hanged)
invents the "Blank Charters," and it is Woodstock's opposition to these
instruments in the manuscript play which leads to his estrangement from
the court, and thereafter, through Richard's suspicions, to his death.

These, we should expect are the source of Richard's "Blank Charters" in

45. The irony here is intentional. The audience is witness to
Richard's "truth," and his "justice" first lights on his well-wishing
uncle.

46. Woodstock, II, iii, 86-99. The brilliance of this descrip-
tion of the flatterers and the king may go a long way towards ex-
plaining why no such description appears in Richard II. The "plumes"
for a "plume-plucked" Richard are very much in evidence here.
Richard's speech, *Richard II* (I, iii, 45-51) and Gaunt's speech, II, (R. II, II, i, 31-68), "Methinks I am a prophet new inspired;" however this cannot possibly be the case.

It is doubtful that Shakespeare ever saw the promptbook of Woodstock as it presently stands. It is equally unlikely that he ever saw the manuscript from which the promptbook was copied. He may have seen a performance of the play but that also is unlikely. The manuscript of Woodstock represents a revised (if not revived) performance, somewhat after the fact as to what Shakespeare was likely to have seen. The "Blanks" show up again in the manuscript, in a reference to the farming of the realm:

King. So, sir, The love of thee and these, my dearest Greene, Hath won King Richard to consent to that For which all foreign kings will point to us; And, of the meanest subject of our land, We shall be censured strangely, when they tell How our great father toiled his royal person, Spending his blood to purchase towns in France; And we, his son, to ease our wanton youth, Become a landlord to this warlike realm, Rent out our kingdom like a pelting farm That erst was held as fair as Babylon, The maiden conqueress to all the world (Italics mine.) (Woodstock, IV, i, 138-149).

All of which was cut by the prompter during his third operation of preparing the promptbook for his production. As the passage was cut for performance it never appeared on stage, the actor's parts being copied

---

47. Edward, the Black Prince.


49. Woodstock, pp. 172-173.
directly from the promptbook; but, as it is so closely related to Gaunt's speech, the influence of one upon the other is unquestionable:

**Gaunt.** This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England. Is now leas'd out—I die pronouncing it—Like to a tenement or pelting farm. England, bound in by the triumphant sea, Whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege Of wat'ry Neptune, is now bound in with shame, With inky blots and rotten parchment bonds; That England, that was wont to conquer others, Hath made a shameful conquest of itself. Ah, would the scandal vanish with my life, How happy then were my ensuing death! (Italics mine.) (R. II, II, i, 59-68).

The spirit of dark prophesy in Richard's speech, and particularly its tone of moral didacticism, is closest to York's speech after Gaunt's death:

I am the last of noble Edward's sons, Of whom thy father, Prince of Wales, was first. In war was never lion rag'd more fierce, In peace was never gentle lamb more mild, Than was that young and princely gentleman. His face thou hast, for even so look'd he, Accomplish'd with the number of thy hours; But when he frown'd, it was against the French And not against his friends. His noble hand Did win what he did spend, and spent not that Which his triumphant father's noble hand had won. His hands were guilty of no kindred blood, But bloody with the enemies of his kin. O Richard! York is too far gone with grief, Or else he never would compare between (Italics mine.) (R. II, II, i, 171-186).

That the borrowing is on the part of the revisor of Woodstock is made clear by the prompter's cutting of the line. There are two reasons why the prompter would have made this particular cut: first, the speech

is out of character; second, the scenes from which it is taken were so well known that Woodstock would be playing second fiddle to Shakespeare even on the inn-yard stage. Thus, either we are to have Shakespeare adapting what the prompter cut and fleshing it out in two separate speeches, or have the revisor compose the revision partially from a Quarto of Richard II, lifting what he could from the speeches in question. Considering how badly Richard's speech is out of character, we must accept the second explanation. Woodstock is a revised script, dating in its manuscript form from after Richard II. In all probability, however, it represents the revision of a script with which Shakespeare was familiar, either in its manuscript or production form, this primitive (or Ur) Woodstock being a source of Richard II and the source of the manuscript from which our promptbook of Woodstock was made.

Not having the manuscript of the Ur Woodstock presents the scholarly world with some interesting problems. It is clear that the script drew in part on Richard III, Woodstock being conceived in verbal echos of Hastings (the eagle-kite parallel being just one example) and as a rather primitive punster, one schooled in the vagaries of the English language. The conception of Woodstock as Lord Protector was probably stolen directly from Richard III, where Richard's protectorship usurps the inheritance of Edward's sons. Peculiarly, in Woodstock (in the revised if not the Ur versions) Richard usurps his own throne, in that he seizes it from his Uncle Woodstock before his majority is reached. The most pressing (and therefore most unanswerable) question is whether the Ur Woodstock contained this peculiarity or not. Surely, there was some vilification of Richard in the manuscript, but did it go this deeply?
Recognizing the debt of our promptbook to *Richard II*, the question remains, to what in the original was *Richard II* indebted: the plumes? A new edition of the manuscript seems in order, and the editor might bear in mind that the prompter's rejection of "new thought" in Richard's speech may mirror a similar rejection in the Queen's scene (*Woodstock*, II, iii).

The case which can be made out then is for an *Ur Woodstock* not an *Ur Richard II*. One suspects that the plumes, the flattery, the murder were all part of the original. The death of Greene (the character, though the death of the writer may have inspired the death of the character) was not, nor was the business of Woodstock and the horse. In all, one would expect that the *Ur Woodstock* was a chronicle history which dealt with Richard II up to and including the death of his flatterers (which is reflected in the sensationalism of Greene's death) but not his own abdication. An epilogue, at most, may have stated that he resigned, but not much more than that; otherwise it would be preserved in *Woodstock* as it has come down to us.

In *Richard II*, however, Richard does resign. He does so openly and in plain view of everyone. The actual event of his "abdication," according to Hutchinson,51 was a fabrication on the part of the post-Richard Lancastrian "historians," propagandists of the same ink as Raphael Holinshed. As political and historical point of fact, Richard was probably deposed by force of and murdered by order of Harry

Bolingbroke in precisely the manner that Tillyard would like to read the play. However, as French pointed out, Tillyard's view does not at all hold with the dramatic structure of the play: Shakespeare was not simply another Lancastrian apologist or the dupe of Lancastrian propaganda. His treatment, unlike Holinshed's, Baldwin's, or any other heretofore explained, shows a Richard who destroys himself. Why he does so lies deeply buried in the British notion of politics, in the dramaturgy of his earlier play Richard III. There, Buckingham devises to offer the kingdom to Richard Duke of Gloucester; Richard refuses it that Buckingham may entreat harder. Finally acquiescing to the "public will," Richard III accepts the crown and appoints his own coronation day, having drawn forth the public sentiment he desired to make it look as if he reigned by reason of the public will.

Richard II, returning from Ireland and finding Bolingbroke in possession of the country, in Shakespeare's play, tries much the same thing. However, the upsurge on behalf of the "rightful" king that he expects never takes place. Indeed, so different is his "abdication" from that presented in Holinshed that the "abdication scene" may be said to be staged in spite of Holinshed, rather than because of him. Raphael Holinshed's Richard II signs the articles of abdication. Shakespeare has moved up two events from after the coronation of Henry IV (and therefore appearing under the reign of Henry IV in Holinshed) to positions surrounding the abdication: Bagot's confession and the Abbott's conspiracy (pace Greer), and made it perfectly clear that Richard never signed Northumberland's paper while in London. Why has he done so?
The first and most obvious reason is that he did not believe that Richard would cut his own throat in so obvious a manner. Any paper or papers signed by Richard could be used against him. Another, and less obvious reason, lies in the basic concept of Richard's character. Richard, while not Narcissus, at times wants to be, and like Amant comes close at times to being Ovid's vain boy. When Richard returns from Ireland, having heard that rebels are afield, he makes an apostrophe to the land and its stewardship that is essentially blasphemous:

Discomfortable cousin! know'st thou not
That when the searching eye of heaven is hid,
Behind the globe, that lights the lower world,
Then thieves and robbers range abroad unseen
In murders and in outrage boldly here;
But when from under this terestial ball
He fires the proud tops of eastern pines
And darts his light through every guilty hole,
Then murders, treasons, and detested sins,
The cloak of night being pluck'd from off their backs,
Stand bare and naked, trembling at themselves?
So when this thief . . . (R. II, III, ii, 36-46).

Richard is the only thief, the only murderer so far in the play. So it is when Narcissus calls out against his own "shadow" (see p. 24-26, above). The irony is intentional, as is Richard's wrongful vilification of Bolingbroke:

So when this thief, this traitor, Bolingbroke,
Who all this while hath revell'd in the night,
Whilst we were wand'ring in the Antipodes,
Shall see us rising in the throne, the east,
His treason shall sit blushing in his face,
Not able to endure the sight of day,

The false condition in Richard's logic leads directly to the false consequence: Richard, not Bolingbroke, is the thief and murderer; therefore it is Richard who sits with his treason's blushing in his face (R. II,
IV, i, 245-288). The irony of the false accusation by the perpetrator of the mentioned crimes leads directly and forcibly to the dramatic irony of his prophecy; but, along the way, he seems to become in his own mind "the eye of heaven," the sun, and fit, therefore, to sit in judgment on Bolingbroke. It has sometimes been argued that this speech reflects Shakespeare's belief in the doctrine of "The Divine Right of Kings," a doctrine Richard II historically appeared to hold; however, when the "doctrine" is so introduced as it is above, one is forced to wonder if the following really reflects Shakespeare's belief:

Not all the water in the rough rude sea
Can wash the balm off from an anointed king;
The breath of worldly men can not depose
The deputy elected by the Lord.
For every man that Bolingbroke hath press'd
To lift shrewd steel against our golden crown,
God for Richard hath in heavenly pay
A glorious angel. Then, if angels fight
Weak men must fall; for heaven still guards the right (R. II, III, ii, 54-62).

If so, why does he dramatize the reverse. Heaven has no angels in pay for Richard; instead it is Richard himself who wipes away his balm (R. II, IV, i, 203-220). The answer can be found in an earlier scene. The dying Gaunt sums up Richard as he sees him to his brother York:

Methinks I am a prophet new inspir'd,
And thus expiring do foretell of him;
His rash fierce blaze of riot cannot last;
For violent fires soon burn out themselves;
.................
Light vanity, insatiate cormorant,
Consuming means, soon preys upon itself (Italics mine.)
(R. II, ii, i, 31-34, 39-40).

Richard is vain. His vanity reaches even to the doctrine of the "Divine Right of Kings," and beyond: within a hundred lines he is nine times more betrayed than Christ, clearly a blasphemous presumption:
O villians, vipers, damn'd without redemption!
Dogs, easily won to fawn upon any man!
Snakes, in my heart-blood warm'd, that sting my heart!
Three Judases, each one thrice worse than Judas!
Upon their spotted souls for this offence! (R. II, III, ii, 129-134).

His flatterers, Bushy, Wiltshire, and Greene, he is informed, have made
their peace with their "heads, and not with hands" (R. II, III, ii, 138).
Thus, rather than look for obscure doctrines which were not popularized
until long after the event of the play, we should and do look for hubris,
anticlimax, and irony which are very much in evidence as an underlying
structure to Shakespeare's play.

It is sometimes allowed that Richard is misled by his flatterers
in both Woodstock and Richard II. Indeed, the characters who hold this
view seem to be willing to forgive Richard almost anything so long as he
separates himself from them. This repetition of his opposition's non-
agressive stance towards him may reflect a condition in the Ur Woodstock.
On the other hand, it is so clearly presented in the birthday scene that
Bushy only suggests what Richard later constructs for himself that the
impression which the revisor of Woodstock must have wanted to carry away
was that Richard did a good deal of the misleading himself. Moreover,
for a leader to be misled by a follower seems to be no more logical than
a cart preceding a horse; it seems far more likely that the author in-
tended that the "misled leader" excuse gentle the characterizations of
Richard's opponents than that they intended such an absurd rationalization
to excuse Richard from his moral responsibilities. Bolingbroke's exe-
cution of the flatterers, then, is somewhat an outgrowth of this excuse:
if the flatterers are gone, there will be no one to mislead Richard and
the kingdom will prosper as under Richard's grandfather. This seems to be the tenor of Bolingbroke's pledge to York on being received before Berkeley Castle, formerly in the suzerain of Thomas of Woodstock, where he puts aside York's objections to his return saying that he has come but for his own:

**Bol.** An offer, uncle, that we will accept.
But we must win your Grace to go with us
To Bristow Castle, which they say is held
By Bushy, Bagot, and their complices,
The caterpillars of the commonwealth,
Which I have sworn to weed and pluck away.

**York.** It may be that I will go with you; but yet I'll pause,
For I am loath to break our country's laws.
Nor friends, nor foes, to me you welcome are.
Things past redress are now with me past care [Exeunt]

(R. II, II, iii, 162-171).

York does accompany Bolingbroke to Bristow Castle. There Bolingbroke arrests Bushy, Greene, and Wiltshire and tells the former two why they are to die:

I will unfold to you some causes of your deaths:
You have misled a prince, a royal king,
A happy gentlemen in blood and lineaments,
By you unhappied and disfigured clean;
You have in manner with your sinful hours
Made a divorce betwixt his queen and him;
Broke the possession of a royal bed,
And stain'd the beauty of a fair queen's cheeks
With tears drawn from her eyes by your foul wrongs;
Myself—a prince by fortune of my birth,
Near to the King in blood, and near in love
Till you did make him misinterpret me—
Have stoop'd my neck under your injuries
And sigh'd my English breath in foreign clouds,
Easting the bitter bread of banishment,
Whilst you have fed upon my signories,
Dispark'd my parks and fell'd my forest woods,
From my own windows torn my household coat,
Raz'd out my imprese, leaving me no sign
Save men's opinions and my living blood
To show the world I am a gentleman.
This and much more, much more than twice all this, Condemns you to the death. See them delivered over To execution and the hand of death (Italics mine.)

(R. II, III, i, 6-30).

It might be argued that Bolingbroke makes this speech for York's benefit but this really does not seem to be the case. Bolingbroke does not at this point or ever until the abdication forget who the King is: Richard is king, Bolingbroke, by virtue of his descent from the second son of Edward III, is indeed a royal prince and, through Richard's failure to produce offspring, heir apparent to the throne (Richard's older brother pre-deceased his father). Being so descended, and being heir to the largest dukedom in England, Bolingbroke is by fortune the second most powerful man in the kingdom. Followed by the third and accompanied by the fourth, York and Northumberland, both intent on preserving their progeny's right to inherit, Bolingbroke exercises his right to arraign and try thieves. That he is not the most impartial of judges is irrelevant; so far as an Elizabethan audience is concerned, justice is being done. Nor can he be accused of usurping Richard's power because York, Richard's regent, is standing by, and on the finest point of English law: York's silence argues the king's consent. York's hand could extend the King's mercy to Bushy and Greene; whereafter their execution would be an act of treason; however, he does not; whereby, we must judge that he consents to the process of law as put forward by Bolingbroke. That Bushy and Greene do not appeal to the mercy of the King through the office of the regent, argues that they either through guilty conscience or through political analysis know that the jig is over. They have been caught, and it is doubtful that any of the
audience, if we remember Lord Hunsdon's letter (see n. 28 above), shed any tears for them.

Those who look for a Machiavellian Bolingbroke prior to his accession to the throne have a very difficult time of it with both Bolingbroke's intent at the end of this scene and his surprise at the beginning of the courtyard scene, when he discovers that Richard is in Flint Castle. Having fulfilled his sworn oath by rooting out Bushy and Greene, he makes an extremely chivalrous gesture towards the Queen:

Uncle, you say the Queen is at your house;  
For God's sake, fairly let her be entreated.  
Tell her I send to her my kind commends;  
Take special care my greetings be delivered.  

_Bol._ A gentleman of mine I have dispatch'd  
With letters of your love to her at large.  

_York._ Thanks, gentle uncle. Come, lords, away,  
To flight with Glendower and his complices.  
A while to work, and after holiday (R. II, III, i, 36-44).  

Henry Bolingbroke simply does not sound like a ruthless usurper. It is Northumberland, perhaps modeled on Shakespeare's earlier Warwick, who sounds like the potential usurper:

_Enter, with drum and colours, Bolingbroke, York, Northumberland and Forces._

_Bol._ So that by this intelligence we learn  
The Welshmen are dispers'd; and Salisbury  
Is gone to meet the King, who lately landed  
With some private friends upon this coast.  

_North._ The news is fair and good, my lord.  
Richard not far from hence hath hid his head.  

_York._ It would be seem the Lord Northumberland  
To say "King Richard." Alack the heavy day  
When such a sacred king should hid his head!  

_North._ Your Grace mistakes; only to be brief,  
left I his title out.  

_York._ The time hath been,  
Would you have been so brief with him, he would  
Have been so brief with you to shorten you,  
For taking so the head, your whole head's length (R. II, III, iii, 1-14).
As is pointed out in 2 Henry IV, one must choose which rumor one wishes to believe. At this point, however, Northumberland's rumor seems a little more likely than Salisbury's: "For all the Welshmen, hearing thou wert dead,/ Are going to Bolingbroke, dispers'd, and fled" (R. II, III, ii, 73-74). The Welshmen never do show up in Bolingbroke's camp. They have given up and gone home because they lack a leader. Salisbury, misinterpreting their departure, one would expect because he will not accept his personal failure to lead them, invents their defection to Bolingbroke:

Cap. These signs forerun the death or fall of kings. Farewell. Our countrymen are gone and fled, As well assur'd Richard their King is dead. [Exit.]

Sal. Ah, Richard, with the eyes of heavy mind, I see thy glory like a shooting star Fall to the base earth from the firmament! The sun sets weeping in the lowly west, Witnessing storms to come, woe, and unrest; Thy friends are fled, to wait upon thy foes; And crossly to thy good all fortune goes (italics mine.) (R. II, II, iv, 15-24).

The maxim goes: "Red sky at night, sailors delight; Red sky in the morning, sailors take warning." Salisbury's adeptness at reading the auguries of the weather by the maxim suit him perfectly to deliver the news of the Welshmen's defection. It is wrong simply because he will not recognize that he does not know what is right. No sailor, though as charming a trafficker in woe as he may be, it is his incompetence both as a leader and a reporter that begins the erosion of Richard's self-confidence, and we expect as we watch him that it was his charming manners rather than his natural abilities in the field that got him his position as one of Richard's lieutenants.
To those who believe in the cohesion of the second tetralogy, this is Shakespeare's way of motivating Glendower and his Welchmen for their sequestering of Mortimer, Hotspur and more general opposition to Bolingbroke and the Lancastrian accession. Those who do not believe that Shakespeare could have been so far-sighted begin to look for lost plays.

If Richard is receptive to Salisbury's news, Bolingbroke is not to Northumberland's. Having been told that Richard has landed, "by this intelligence," apparently meaning news from Northumberland, for it is he who qualifies Bolingbroke's announcement with further news that "Richard not far from hence hath hid his head," or not paying attention to the qualification, he is surprised by Percy's entrance:

York. For taking so the head, your whole head's length.
Bol. Mistake not\(^5^2\) uncle, further than you should.
York. Take not, good cousin, further than you should,
Lest you mistake.\(^5^3\) The heavens are over our heads.
Bol. I know it, uncle; and oppose not myself
Against their will. But who comes here?

Enter Percy.

Welcome, Harry. What, will not this castle yield?
Percy. The castle is royally man'sd, my lord,
Against thy entrance.
Bol. Royally!
Why, it contains no king?\(^5^4\)
Percy. Yes, my good lord,
It doth contain a king; King Richard lies
Within the limits of yon lime and stone;
And with him are the Lord Aumerle, Lord Salisbury,
Sir Stephen Scroop, Besides a clergyman
Of holy reverence; who, I cannot learn.

North. O, belike it is the Bishop of Carlisle.
Bol. [To Northumberland] Noble Lord,
Go to the rude ribs of that ancient castle;

\(^{52}\) This is the Ovidian device of echoing.

\(^{53}\) Mistake: usurp, a quibble.

\(^{54}\) Kittredge punctuates this passage: "Royally?/ Why, it contains no king?"
Through brazen trumpet send the breath of parley
Into his ruin'd ears, and thus deliver:
Henry Bolingbroke
On both his knees doth kiss King Richard's hand,
And send allegiance and true faith of heart
To his most royal person; hither come
Even at his feet to lay my arms and power,
Provided that my banishment is repeal'd
And lands restor'd again be freely granted;
If not, I'll use the advantage of my power
And lay the summer's dust with showers of blood
Rain'd from the wounds of slaughtered Englishmen;
The which how far off from the mind of Bolingbroke
It is such crimson tempest should bedrench
The fresh green lap of fair King Richard's land,
My stooping duty tenderly shall show.
Go signify as much, while here we march
Upon the grassy carpet\textsuperscript{55} of this plain (Italics mine.)
\textsuperscript{(R. II, III, iii, 14-50)}.

Now, at this point it must be remarked that while Bolingbroke's threat
and immediate recantation can remind the reader of no other character so
much as Richard III, Bolingbroke faces a very real threat. Richard has
murdered his uncle, Thomas of Woodstock, outright. It is the talk of all
the elders of the Plantagenet family from the outset of the play. Gaunt,
York, and Bolingbroke seem to want to sweep it under the rug: hence the
story of the misled leader. However, one uncle is dead by Richard's
order. Another has had his estate plundered at Richard's order. And
unless he defends himself, Bolingbroke is liable to wind up either a
dispossessed nobleman or an appealed traitor in jeopardy of his head;
moreover, if he does not stand up to Richard, no man's life or property
is safe so long as Richard and kings who rule form like policy hold the
throne. He has to make it clear that he means business; therefore he
threatens the king.

\textsuperscript{55}. Does this suggest a green stage cloth?
In all, Bolingbroke never takes more than he is given by Richard. Yet, it is important that he should not accept the throne in Richard's name; for, if it is Richard who has made him king, Richard can un-king him again. Therefore, when York comes in with news, "From plume-pluck'd Richard, who with willing soul/ Adopts thee heir" (R. II, IV, i, 108-109), Bolingbroke politely replies, "In God's name, I'll ascend the regal throne" (R. II, IV, i, 113). Moreover, there does not seem to be much doubt on York's part that Richard can resign. The man who criticized Northumberland for dropping the King's title, drops it himself from the first moment of Richard's abdication.

What we are watching in Richard II, from II, iii, onwards, is the filling of a classic power-vacuum. Richard has created the vacuum himself by preferring the inept, such as Salisbury, and by alienating the holders of power, the well-landed uncles and Bolingbroke. Because feudalism is basically a system of land-tenture, and because land-title is inherited rather than elected in feudal law, the king's dispossession of a titled man is the single most important political event possible in a feudal state. Treason, if acknowledged by the peers, is a reasonable ground of dispossession. However, feudal societies made one allowance whereby a man appealed a traitor by any man other than the king might still pass on his inheritance: this is the custom of "trial by combat." Because it was advantageous to the king to insure that the family of a man fallen in battle would inherit the man's lands, usually the son inherits the father's, an accused man had the right to appeal any "plaintiff" (complainer) to prove his case on the field of battle. If the "defendant" fell, conceded, or abdicated this right, his lands went
immediately to the king, who usually dispensed a part of them to the plaintiff and part to some favorite and the defendant's body to the hangman. If, on the other hand, he stood and fought, lived or died on the field of combat, his family's right to inherit was insured by feudal law, regardless of the nature of his crime. The king was always exempt from this kind of appeal but even if a man were arraigned by the king, so long as he were the holder of real-inheritable property, he had the right to demand that the king appoint a champion against whom he should stand to trial, in order that his family should inherit the estate he held. By murdering Woodstock, rather than appealing him a traitor (Holinshed), Richard put the lands of the House of Gloucester in doubt and, according to the Duchess, caterpillars have already descended on that garden:

Duch. . . Bid him--ah, what?—
With all good speed at Plashy visit me.
Alack, and what shall good old York there see
But empty lodging and unfurnish'd walls,
Unpeopled offices, untrodden stones?
And what hear there for welcome but my groans (Italics mine.)


But, Woodstock left no issue. Even so, the Duchess prays for retribution for Mowbray's part in the murder (Myrrour for Magistrates): "O, sit my husband's wrongs on Hereford's spear,/ That it may enter butcher Mowbray's breast" (R. II, I, ii, 47-48), while still allowing that "Grief" as her "champion" (R. II, I, ii, 55).

This suggested pillage of Woodstock's property, the news that "the Earl of Wiltshire hath the realm in farm" (R. II, II, i, 256), and the well dramatized pillage of Bolingbroke's inheritance, show King Richard to be at odds with the feudal law by which he holds his lands. York says as much to Richard:
See you seize and gripe into your hands
The royalties and rights of bannish'd Hereford?
Is not Gaunt dead? and doth not Hereford live?
Was not Gaunt just? and is not Harry true?  
Did not the one deserve to have an heir?
Is not his heir a well-deserving son?
Take Hereford's rights away, and take from Time
His charters and his customary rights;
Let not tomorrow then ensue to-day;
Be not thyself—for how art thou a king
But by fair sequence and succession?
Now, afore God—God forbid I say true!—
If you do wrongfully seize Hereford's rights,
Call in the letters patents that he hath
By his attorney's-general to sue
His livery, and deny his off'red homage,
You pluck a thousand danger on your head,
You lose a thousand well-disposed hearts,
And prick my tender patience to those thoughts
Which honour and allegiance cannot thing (Italics mine.)
(R. II, II, i, 189-208).

If that my cousin king be King in England,
It must be granted I am Duke of Lancaster.
You have a son, Aumerle, my noble cousin;
Had you first died, and he been thus trod down,
He should have found his uncle Gaunt a father
To rouse his wrongs and chase them to the bay.
I am denied to sue my livery here,
And yet my letters patents give me leave.
My father's goods are all distrain'd and sold;
And these and all are all amiss employ'd.
What would you have me do? I am a subject,
And I challenge law—attorneys are denied me;
And therefore personally I lay my claim
To my inheritance of free descent (Italics mine.) (R. II, II, iii, 122-136).

56. True begotten.

57. Whereby he would be invested with the lands of Lancaster.

58. Letters of patent are the primitive legal document certifying
rights to royalty and control, in this case to the lands and title of
Lancaster.

59. Does Bolingbroke carry these documents on his person?
Bolingbroke's argument is that he was banished of his title Henry of Hereford, and that the title of Lancaster, descending to him through his father, has been denied to him. Yet, by every known feudal law, these lands are justly his; except for one: he has not yet done fealty to the King to be invested with the title, Lancaster, to these lands and, until he kneels to the king, the king must hold them in escrow for him. Upon his kneeling, however, his full lands and goods must be yielded up to him. Bolingbroke's only course of action, then, is appeal to the king and so long as the king can keep him from kneeling to him, he does not have to give up the lands; however he is still obliged to keep those lands and goods intact.

What Richard has done is to break the form of escrow; the lands and goods he had stolen are still technically under his control, and conceivably he could still get them back; however, in practice, the inheritance left into his care (Shakespeare uses this word in the technical sense) are spread uniformly throughout the kingdom by this point; thus, when Bolingbroke kneels to claim his own, Richard cannot deliver, because their properties by Richard's carelessness have become intricably intermingled, and Richard, obliged to give back all of Bolingbroke's estate, cannot perform.

In practice, Richard could simply make payment of the equivalent value of the estate in restitution, either in full or in installments; but Richard is bankrupt. This is why he had to pillage the estate in the first place. Therefore, he must either submit to management by his uncle or Bolingbroke or to a coalition of the two, if he is to maintain the crown. This is the best that he can hope for.
Bolingbroke, on the other hand, comes armed with his letters of patent to appeal his case to the king. He has the right to throw himself on the king's mercy, precisely as York says he would have him do, to have his case heard, and to plead his case before his peers (Magna Carta). The moment he does so, the moment he appeals to common law before the king, he must kneel for the king's judgment. Thus, in the act of calling on the king's mercy he is enfranchised Lancaster and Richard must deliver his holdings before any further proceedings take place between the two of them. This is the dilemma that Richard has built for himself.

Shakespeare's point, then, and this is perhaps why he differs so vastly from his sources, is that Richard is king by virtue of the law, which in England was common law. Richard received his title through the law, and by that title he was obliged to uphold the law. Had he upheld it, Bolingbroke, though still in exile, would have had no cause to come to England before his time was up. His lands and rents would have been guaranteed. Thus, in seizing Bolingbroke's lands Richard crossed himself: he opened up to Bolingbroke an avenue of appeal which he could not under the law, by which he reigned, refuse to hear the case, or once hearing it, withhold the property. Gentlemen, like Tillyard, who forget that Richard was king over a feudal society ruled under common law, do not recognize the Base-Court scene for what it is: it is the reflection of the origin of the "Jury System of Justice." For, while no one can argue that Northumberland, Percy, and York constitute a jury in themselves, all the lords there present do.
Bolingbroke has asked for judgment and Richard, under common law, cannot refuse him. Bolingbroke has shielded himself from the tyrannic power of the king by calling the Percies from Northumberland and his own men from his own seigniories, as is his right under the concept of self-defense in common law. And he has bagged the pillars of his wealth along the way. Yet, never does he raise his voice against the king or carelessly forget, as Northumberland does, that Richard is still King, because it is in this fact that his safety rests. Were he going about any other business but securing his land from pillage, did he hesitate to go before the King, his claim would be no good, because he was not willing to fight for it. Bolingbroke was willing to fight for his land; he had demonstrated this before Richard in the lists, where Mowbray, apparently at the King's direction, came "champion" to the king's cause, while Bolingbroke came "knight." Moreover, when the mutual accusations were read (I, i), Bolingbroke's rang surprisingly true because it comes directly from Thomas Mowbray's complaint in Mirrour for Magistrates. And the closer one looks, the more one is likely to see that Richard had his eye on the house of Lancaster to fill his treasury long before he gave the orders on Gaunt's death. When it becomes obvious that Bolingbroke will stand and fight to preserve his feudal holdings for his progeny, Richard throws down the warder and tries another track. It is the other track which leads to the confrontation in the Base-Court, and eventually to the abdication: Richard gives away his crown and Bolingbroke accepts.

The question which remained current for the next two hundred years was whether a King could legitimately be deposed; but, this is not the question which Shakespeare's play asks. The principal question
raised by Shakespeare's play is whether a king may legitimately abdicate, rather than face up to his responsibilities and obligations. Bolingbroke, Richard, York, and Northumberland apparently believe that the answer is that he may if it is in the public interest. However, Shakespeare's continuation of the English histories suggests that the question is not answerable in the context of the histories alone. Rather than point to a solution in terms of political theory, he points to a cause in the personality of the King.

Guillaume's Amant was portrayed as a young man who followed Ydelness, one of Richard's most disturbing qualities. We note from the outset Richard's inability to come to any reasonable course of action within the medieval framework of his society, his unwillingness to allow the combat to purge the kingdom of envy, his dismissal of his remaining troops (III, ii), his total lack of preparation prior to Bolingbroke's arrival at Flint Castle, and his immediate suggestion that Bolingbroke take over the throne, with the implicit suggestion that this is what Bolingbroke wants to do in the first place. Always he choses not to act.

Guillaume's Amant loved a lady, but Shakespeare's Richard puts a good deal before his love of the Queen; we cannot therefore suggest that Richard is drawn strictly from the courtly love tradition; he is, however a lover of sorts, but his love is for kingship in-so-far as it will reflect his personal glory. He is patently not interested in real military affairs. His Irish expedition, while a foreign war of sorts, could hardly be expected to fill the treasury. Ireland was not a rich land. There were no major battles fought in this war; rather the war only served to get Richard out of England so that Bolingbroke could
return. To finance this war, for which Richard had to appropriate Bolingbroke's inheritance, can be understood on no political or economic ground which does not immediately subordinate itself to Richard's desire for self-aggrandizement.

Richard's vanity, however, does seem to have some purpose: it covers up his fear of mortality. This fear becomes apparent when in III, ii, his glory is stripped from him.

Richard's security seems to lie in the adulation of other men, in this he is more narcissist than courtly lover. Like Narcissus, as soon as the adulation is no longer forthcoming, or as soon as the flattery no longer feeds his ego, he is likely to prove treacherous to his flatterers. Mowbray is the first in the play to feel Richard's ice. Gaunt on being conveyed to his deathbed hears from his nephew: "And let them die that age and sullens have;/ For both hast thou, and both become the grave" (R. II, II, i, 139-140). York's advice is thrown away, and by report, Richard has neglected his wife. But, one whisper of false news from Salisbury punctures Richard's bubble, and he who argued on the theme of the Divine Right of Kings and the unique station of God's deputy elect on earth is thrown into the most heavily ambivalent emotional state imaginable. For a moment, it looks as if Richard may wake up. But the possible falsity of the report goes unnoticed by Richard, when Scroop's news of Bushy, Greene, and the Earle of Wiltshire's deaths throws Richard into the wildest of despair, into a maudlin frame of mind seen before only when Narcissus realized that he could not gain the image in the water. Here, Richard, seeing the image of his reign shattered in one ghastly execution by Bolingbroke, like Narcissus watching the dissolving of the
image realizes that the very thing that he loves lies forever outside his reach, the flattery and companionship of Bushy and Greene. But these men, decked in their fancy attire, are only the image of Richard's reign. The king and his power are still maintained. Carlisle urges Richard to use that power (R. II, III, ii, 177-185). All that is required is that Richard act.

It is sometimes suggested that the reason that Richard decides not to act is that it would be an accounting job on the order of a task of Heracles to set the kingdom back in order, and that it is Richard's desire to avoid the paper work that forces him to resign his crown. While this argument may have its merits, it seems to be rather that the inaccessibility of the flatterers, far beyond care of their finery, reminds Richard of his own mortality. His farewell to Gaunt (II, i) suggests a recognition of the inevitability of the grave, but in such a way as that it may be thought of as a disease, affecting Gaunt but not Richard. The death of his flatterers, however, spurs from him such a tirade on the "antic," Death, and the mortality of kings, that it is quite apparent that these matters have been on his mind and that they have been made real to him on a personal level only when those in whom he had personal interest are destroyed.

It is clear to all who study the play that Richard loses his grip when the news of the deaths are broken to him. In the end Richard dismisses his followers:

He does me double wrong
That wounds me with the flatteries of his tongue.
Discharge my followers; let them hence away,
From Richard's night to Bolingbroke's fair day (R. II, III, ii, 215-218).
These followers, Aumerle's men and a part of Richard's Irish army, would have stood Richard in good stead in the "Base Court Scene." But Richard, shorn of his flatterers, prefers to sulk:

By heaven, I'll hate him everlastingly
That bids me be of comfort any more.
Go to Flint Castle; there I'll pine away;
A king, woe's slave, shall kingly woe obey.
That power that I have, discharge; and let them go
To ear the land that hath some hope to grow,
For I have none. Let no man speak again
To alter this, for counsel is but vain (R. II, III, ii, 207-214).60

There is the implicit suggestion in this that, as French observed, Richard seems to take perverse pleasure in making his situation appear worse than it is. He revels in over-emotional maudlinism. He delights in playing little scenes. But the audience who appreciated Richard's dramatic abilities are dead, and his new audience, York, Bolingbroke, and Northumberland, could not care less. And where a hurt look or a slight sign of disfavor might elicit reassurances from Bushy, Bagot, or Greene, from the courtiers, of such a man as Bolingbroke such little nuances are not likely to bring forth anything more than puzzlement.

Apparently during his stay at Flint Castle, Richard hatches a sort of a plan. His one hope of maintenance will be that if he can make it appear that Bolingbroke is trying to usurp his throne, patriotic love of kings and kingship will move his nobles to remove Harry Bolingbroke

60. Rowse in Shakespeare's Sonnets, p. 9, would have "Whose unear'd womb" mean "unploughed womb," which does carry the baudy implications of Shakespeare's intention; however, here the word obviously means "sow," that is put "ears of wheat" in the land that they may take seed and grow. Thus, in Sonnet 3, if Rowse's reading is followed, Shakespeare is being redundant in saying "Whose 'unploughed' womb distains the tillage of thy husbandry," where by the above reading he is not.
and replant him. In short, he hopes to make all England his flatterer by resigning very much in the manner that Shakespeare had portrayed Richard III putting aside questions of his acceptance of the crown. Unfortunately for this earlier Richard, Carlisle is no Buckingham. The problem is that the court has never to this date heard of a "vote of confidence," and if Richard wants to step down, most of them, oppressed by his hard taxes, are quite willing to let him. This hope, this plot which lead to Carlisle's "baffling" speech, is balanced by Richard's desire to resign the crown outright now that he can no longer reign in the fashion to which he has become accustomed. The death of Richard's flatterers had led to a classic avoid-approach conflict, which can be resolved only by the execution of Bolingbroke as a traitor (unlikely) or by Richard's abdication under pressure, by which, if he can delude himself into thinking that he has been deposed by wrongful force, he may salvage his vanity. It is this that is the paradox of Richard's personality: he wants the crown, but he wants it only on his own terms, absolute monarchy glorying in worldly wealth provided by his adulatory subjects, and he is too spoiled, too vain, to accept it on any other grounds.

This waning of his political strength as measured in armies of Richard's is much like that of Ovid's Narcissus after his encounter with his image in the pool: both pine away. Like Narcissus's predicament, Richard's is forerun by a call for vengeance by the Dutchess of Gloucester (Thomas of Woodstock's wife), a call which Gaunt turns aside:

62. See p. 21, above (n. 62 and text).
God's is the quarrel; for God's a substitute,
His deputy anointed in His sight,
Hath caus'd his death; the which if wrongfully,
Let heaven revenge; for I may never lift
An angry arm against His minister (R. II, I, ii, 37-41).

Remembering Narcissus, one wonders if the goddess Ramanuse (Retribution) has not decided to hear the old Duchess's prayer. Gaunt's son, Bolingbroke, seems to have inherited if nothing else his father's policy; having sent his offer and his warning to Richard, Bolingbroke gives peculiar marching orders to his troops:

Let's march without the noise of threat'ning drum,
That from this castle's tottered battlements
Our fair appointments may be well persu'd.
Methinks King Richard and myself should meet
With no less terror than the elements
Of fire and water, when their thund'ring shock
At meeting tears the cloudy cheeks of heaven.
Be he the fire, I'll be the yielding water;
The rage be his, whilst on the earth I rain
My waters—you the earth and not—on him.
March on, and mark King Richard how he looks (R. II, III, ii, 51-61).

Here, reminded that water puts fire out, and remembering the primitive quibble "rain" -- "reign," we have the only sign in the play of Bolingbroke's ambition. The ambition, of course, is unconscious on Bolingbroke's part but, if Richard is to rage like Narcissus over the pool, it is to be inwardly not outwardly in the manner that Bolingbroke apparently expects. Richard is not Narcissus in the way in which Bolingbroke makes his allusion. Richard is Narcissus as a lover of kingship and personal glory in the manner of Guillaume de Lorris's Amant but, rather than having a lady as the object of his love, it appears to be himself in a certain style of life, an image of himself, upon which his eyes are fixed.

Bolingbroke is neither Narcissus nor Amant, himself, but hopes to benefit
from those qualities in Richard. Thus, while it is too much to style Bolingbroke as a Machiavellian opportunist, his ambition is a visible characteristic on stage. And, while he is not the conscious hypocrite that Shakespeare's Richard III was, Bolingbroke is not about to put aside any promotion, enfeoffment, or new honors offered him, nor is he moved by any scruples about his just deserts. He will take any gain that comes his way in any way short of open treason and defend his right to that gain to the death. In short, Bolingbroke is the model of the medieval baron, jealous of his house and lands, while Richard is the model of the pre-Renaissance autocrat. That the two are mutually incompatible is the point of the play. The autocrat always seeks to enlarge his hold on his realm to secure his power-base and finance his own interests, while the baron seeks to extend his own autocracy in the shadow of the king. Such a system built on the greed and vanity favored men whose ambition to gain titles and land was nearly insatiable, and whose "honor" consisted in recognizing that others had right to land and title under the same customary conventions upon which their claim to such rights were based.

Modern readers have failed to remark that a successful king by medieval and Renaissance standards was not one who placated everyone, forestalled treason in his barons, and increased the treasury of the realm, although these were certainly elements of a good regency, but rather one who by hook or crook managed to pass the throne on to his son. Richard, then, had failed the land in failing to produce an heir apparent to his throne. To whatever failing we wish to attribute this, the consequence was far more damaging than the aberrations of his
great-grandfather, Edward II. Edward, although deposed and assassinated, did manage to produce a single son, Edward III, who reigned for nearly fifty years, siring the Black Prince, John of Gaunt, and Edmund Langly, Duke of York, as well as the unfortunate Thomas of Woodstock. This oversight as to the very nature and necessity of succession in a feudal society was Richard's as well and has tended to obscure the fact that Henry Bolingbroke under the strict law of primogeniture is in fact heir to Richard of Bordeaux, King of England, by virtue of his birth. The question that Shakespeare's play asks is not whether Bolingbroke has a right to the throne, for as Hal is to be, he is heir apparent; rather, it is whether or not he may ascend to that throne prior to Richard's death, i.e., as Edward III had ascended Edward II's throne: whether or not he may, in the exact parallel to the Prodigal Son, come into this inheritance before the demise of his benefactor. Shakespeare does not answer this question. A dramatist rather than a determinist, Shakespeare puts on stage a series of causes and effects with thematic elaborations by the various characters without a simple didactic narrative stream. This is most clearly seen in the "divine rights" speech in which Richard undercuts his own position by accusing Bolingbroke of those very crimes of which he is himself guilty. Bolingbroke is so far innocent, and in his speech, while saying that he is coming to take his own peacefully, if possible, from the king's hand, he shows forward his unconscious ambition in the quibble, "I rain" -- "I reign" (R. II, III, iii, 59). The very ambiguity as to what he should reign as, "Lancaster" or "England" foreshadows his prodigality, and at the same time denies it: the biblical Prodigal Son came into his inheritance by asking for it before the death of his sire;
Bolingbroke comes into the wrong inheritance by the death of the right sire, and should come into the kingship on the death of its present holder as heir apparent to Edward III. So the question truly is not whether Bolingbroke can accede to the throne but whether or not Richard can resign it. The answer appears to be that he can, provided that someone will fill the vacuum that he leaves. The logical and legitimate heir is Bolingbroke, who fills the vacuum bit by bit as Richard makes it.

The rage that Harry Bolingbroke expects to take place at the meeting of King and subject contrary to the King's wishes never is fulfilled. In truth, Richard seems to have come a bit unhinged in III, ii, upon the news of the death of his flatterers, a fact to which Bolingbroke is not privy. Richard's rage is vented instead on his flatterers first, whom he feels have betrayed him, then on the antic "Death," and finally on Northumberland, whose discourtesy stands in direct contrast to Bolingbroke's offer of allegiance. Indeed, if waiting seems to have given temporary remission to Richard's melancholic disposition, the sight of Bolingbroke appears to raise his anger to an unstable height, which reached he loses on Northumberland rather than on Bolingbroke to whom it most nearly pertains. After this transference of affect, Richard appears to be unable to come to grips with Bolingbroke at all. The notion of doing so throws him into profound despair; Holinshed suggests, as Richard does later, that he submits to Bolingbroke in order to save his own life. However, soon after Richard asks Aumerle, "Shall we call back Northumberland, and send/ Defiance to the traitor, and so die?" his own mind begins to buckle again, as it had in III, ii, and the king makes
his decision to abdicate, though cloaked under the connotations of the
word "deposed" to assage his vanity:

Rich. O God, Oh God! that e'er this tongue of mine
That laid the sentence of dread banishment
On you proud man should take it off again
With words of sooth! that I were as great
As is my grief, or lesser than my name!
Or that I could forget what I have been!
Swell'st thou, proud heart? I'll give thee scope to beat,
Since foes have scope to beat both thee and me (R. II, III, iii, 133-141).

But Richard has not any real foes beyond the adventurous Percies. Bolingbroke, while ambitious, seems always ready to excuse his cousin even in
the presence of Richard's severest critics, particularly Northumberland.
Richard's desire to forget what he has been finds fulfillment in IV, i,
where he reasserts the totally unsupported accusation that he is being
deposed, first stated, as French suggests, by him:

What must the King do now? Must he submit?
The King shall do it. Must he be depos'd?
The King shall be contented. Must he lose
The name of king? A God's name, let it go.
I'll give my jewels for a set of beads,
My gorgeous palace for a hermitage,
And my large kingdom for a little grave,

And buried once, why not upon my head (R. II, III, iii, 143-157).

The notion of deposition, then, seems to spring right out of Richard's
morbidity, which itself springs from the limitation of his autocratic
power by the landed barons of his realm, Bolingbroke and Northumberland
in particular. This projection of his own deposition goes against the

63. A God's name? Let it go (?).
entire production up to this point. Even Northumberland has reassured Richard: "The King of Heaven forbid our lord the King/ Should so with civil and uncivil arms/ Be rush'd upon" (R. II, III, iii, 101-103). But, Richard's vanity, once injured, proves more powerful than all the promises of his rebelling nobles. French is right when he says that Richard enjoys making things appear blacker than they are. And his jump into this talk of deposition, into the negative thinking that led to the dissolution of his forces on landing, makes Aumerle hide his head; for, unlike his forerunners, Bushy and Greene, Aumerle believes in legitimate action and loyalty to Richard, so long as Richard holds the possibility of kingship. Richard's inability to see the curbing action of Bolingbroke's return as anything but "a blot" on his pride (R. II, III, ii, 81), despite Northumberland's reassurances, prompts Aumerle's frustration and Richard's poeticising:

Aumerle, thou weep'st, my tender hearted cousin! We'll make foul weather with despised tears; Our sighs and they shall lodge the summer corn And make a dearth in this revolting land. Or shall we play the wantons with our woes And make some pretty match with shedding tears? As thus: to drop them still upon one place Till they have fretted us a pair of graves Within the earth; and, therein laid—there lies Two kinsmen digg'd their graves with weeping eyes. Would not this ill do well? Well, well, I see I talk but idly, and you laugh at me (R. II, III, iii, 159-171).

Richard's ridiculous attitudes in this piece of hyperbole delivered in all earnestness would not serve to comfort any loyal supporter, nor would Richard's petulance immediately following:

These are not the words of a king but those of a naughty schoolboy, caught out by a more powerful player. In Richard's mind, he is already deposed, Bolingbroke is already crowned, and the question of Richard's fate hanging in the balance. Bolingbroke, on the other hand, is not aware of the state of the king's mind, and rather than playing power against Richard at their meeting, he kneels, enfranchising himself to the house and seigneuries of Lancaster, and through that house to the station of heir apparent to the throne.

It is possible, if we read deeply into Richard's characterization and his bitterness at acquiring this heir, that Shakespeare is suggesting that the reason that Richard did not have an heir to this date and tried to disenfranchise Bolingbroke as his possible heir was that to have an heir would remind him of his own mortality, an insufferable affront to his vanity. In a sense, then, the remainder of the scene and the final resolution in IV, i, can be seen as a separate resolution to the problem afforded in the glass sonnets, where the problem of self-love and procreation receives its treatment in terms of a Narcissus figuration (see n. 12 above).

There is no question that Richard has completely slipped his hinges in the last half of III, iii. Driven by grief and rage into melancholic resignation, he is clearly incompetent to rule the realm. It is impossible to tell whether or not he realizes this himself. If he does, his pride would never let him admit it but, simply to dismiss Richard as a weak man, or a weak king is totally misleading: Richard's problem is that his emotions are too strong for his reason or the law to subdue them. For it is between the poles of his desire for glory and
his fear of mortality that the strength which should be spent on mastering Bolingbroke is spent. In Shakespeare's dialogue, if Richard does realize that he is not the equal of the war that is going on inside him, he manages to hide it fairly well in the well of his own self-pity. He also masks it with innuendo, as he suggests that Bolingbroke wishes to play the prodigal with his newly acquired position of heir to the throne:

**Bol.** Stand all apart And show fair duty to his Majesty. [He kneels down.]

**King.** My gracious lord—

Fair cousin, you debase your princely knee
To make the base earth proud with kissing it.
Me rather had my heart might feel your love
Than my unpleas'd eye see your courtesy.
Up, cousin, up; your heart is up, I know,

[Touching his own head] Thus high at least, although your knee be low.

**Bol.** My gracious lord, I come but for my own.

**King.** Your own is yours, and I am yours, and all.

**Bol.** So far be mine, my most redoubted lord,
As my true service shall deserve your love (R. II, III, iii, 188-199).

No one, up to this time as in Northumberland's disclaimer, has "rush'd upon" Richard with "civil and uncivil arms." No one appears to intend to. Bolingbroke offers service in a way in which it is suggested that he is earnestly seeking the king's plaisance; but, Richard will not have it:

**King.** Well you deserve. They well deserve to have
That know the strong'st and surest way to get.
Uncle, give me your hands; nay, dry your eyes:
Tears show their love, but want their remedies.
Cousin, I am too young to be your father,
Though you are old enough to be my heir.
What you will have, I'll give, and willing too;
For do we must what force will have us do.
Set on towards London, Cousin, is it so?
Only the "force" used upon Bushy and Greene have any relevance to Richard's innuendo here. No force has been used upon him personally, and apparently none is intended. What has been paraded before him is the shadow of force, Bolingbroke's power, the ability to apply force, but not force in use. Bolingbroke's restraint rather than his "force" is what is truly amazing about Richard II. And it is that restraint that rules him here.

Perhaps Bolingbroke pities Richard in III, iii, when he has come down from his wall. For Northumberland cautions Bolingbroke about Richard:

Sorrow and grief of heart
Makes him speak fondly, like a frantic man;
Yet he is come (R. II, III, ii, 184-186).

And Bolingbroke is immediately so obsequious, so reassuring that, ulterior motives aside, it appears that he is trying to calm Richard under his earlier plan as stated, "Be he the fire, I'll be the yielding water; The rage be his, whilst on the earth I rain." And, while Richard's reaction is "sorrow" rather than the expected rage, Bolingbroke seems more silenced by surprise than Machiavellian concerns as he follows Richard's lead to London.

Richard's rage is there, but it is rage at Death. Richard's depersonalized "antic," rather than at Bolingbroke who is to be the instrument of Richard's death. This allegorizing characteristic of Richard's personality, his inability to come to grips with the realities of his political situation, his refusal to take action on landing, and
his abstraction of his sorrows in the ill conceived metaphor of himself and Christ have led to the modern interpretation of his character as that of the poet, full of imagination and abstract reasoning power but deficient in concrete ability. But this is to make Richard more intelligent than he really is. Rather, he is an appreciator of poetry, one who draws parallels between "poetic" experience and his own emotional life, a neophyte attempting to initiate his circle to the poetic truths of kingship and loss, so that all his "poetry" falls on deaf ears as soon as his flatterers are gone. His lack of genuine creativity shows through in what he borrows, and where he borrows it from. Why he finds it necessary to borrow, however, is entirely due to his failure as a political strategist.

With Julia, it had not been apparent from the outset that her choice to go off in search of Proteus was a moral error if a dramatic necessity. Richard's choice, however, to deprive Bolingbroke of his inheritance is quite clearly intended to appear as choices. This element directly parallels Guillaume's portrayal of Amant, the moral negativity of Amant's choice is shown on the walls of the garden, in the nature of the abstract personages he meets in the garden and the architecture of the inner garden itself, the central element of which, the pool of Narcissus, is the epitome of folly to each succeeding age. But, whereas Amant came to the well more by sloth than by design, Shakespeare's Richard backs himself up to it, and looks in only when forced to by Northumberland's bullying. Shakespeare, however, leads his audience first through the unweeded garden (III, iv) very much the image of Richard's reign from the point of view of the Gardener, then
to the well, in the "buckets" simile, and finally to the mirror itself; wherein, the opposition to Northumberland's list of crimes, the steel glass of Richard's government, Richard reads his follies from his pursuit of worldly glories. The point of Shakespeare's dramaturgy is that it is by his own choice that Richard comes to this position. His paralleling of the events in the early part of the Roman de la Rose serves the double function of supporting the analysis of lapsarianism to be found thereby a concrete example and of supplying a meta-poetic in which Richard's ignorance can show forth as vanity, Northumberland's baiting as self-righteousness, and Bolingbroke's accession as the unintentional fulfillment of his ambitious venture. The element of choice, then, becomes the driving mechanism in Richard's tragedy, because given the basis of his character, Vanitas, it is impossible for him to choose correctly.

Richard's great-grandfather, Edward II, had been deposed, according to a theory to which Marlowe apparently subscribed, largely on account of his sexual preferences. The motivations of Mortimer's deposition of Edward notwithstanding, the historical Richard went to some trouble to have Edward canonized as well as to disseminate the theory of the "Divine Right of Kings." All this suggests a deeply rooted fear in the historical Richard that someone might try to depose him. Shakespeare's Richard, upon receiving Salisbury and Scroop's misinformation, jumps directly to the conclusion that Bolingbroke is going to depose him, a conclusion which Bolingbroke goes at some lengths to dispel, kneeling at Richard's foot. Richard, however, leading the ambitious Bolingbroke by innuendos towards London, has other plans.

64. See Mathews, The Court of Richard II, p. 139.
His vanity injured by the death of his flatterers, Richard attempts to make the entire kingdom his flatterer. He is king by divine right. If he attempts to abdicate, the kingdom will see that this is wrong and will reinstate him as absolute monarch. This will serve two purposes: it will establish his doctrine and permit him to punish the malefactors, Bolingbroke and Northumberland. Reinstated, he will have quashed a dangerous rebellion and enhanced his glory, all because the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings, the deputyship of God, is God's law.

If the reasoning seems somewhat circular to a modern audience, it is little wonder. Richard's reasoning, obvious for what it is, obvious for its doctrinal mistake: Richard is king by grace of God, not as grace of God, obvious for its falsity, is put to the test, where it fails with such devastating completeness that modern readers have found it difficult to understand the function that Richard's abdication and the Abbot's plot are supposed to play in the drama. When Richard gives Bolingbroke the throne so easily, he intends to play the part of the Indian-giver. His best hope is that he will never have to give up the throne at all. That the announcement of his abdication will raise such protest that he will enter in glory. If this is not the case, he has an alternate plan, rather unfledged but presumably workable. But, in order to make it work so that he may reascend the throne, there is a pitfall that he must avoid: he must sign nothing that might be mistaken for a confession or an abdication; moreover, there is one idea that he must plant in everybody's mind: that is, he is being deposed by Bolingbroke and Northumberland by force and coercion. Richard has been so successful
in creating this illusion for modern critics that French appears to have written with genuine trepidation of stepping on the toes of some of our most noted scholars that such is not at all the case.

It appears to be with genuine surprise that York announces Richard's decision to abdicate to the assembled court. Kings have been deposed before, but none have abdicated in England except under the most extreme duress. Richard, under the least of privations, has given up that which it was his right to keep by force of arms:

**York.** Great Duke of Lancaster, I come to thee
From plume-pluck'd Richard, who with willing soul
Adopts thee heir, and his high sceptre yields
To the possession of thy royal hand.
Ascend his throne, descending now from him—
And long live Henry, fourth of that name!

**Bol.** In God's name, I'll ascend the regal throne.
**Car.** Marry, God forbid! (R. II, IV, i, 107-114).

Carlisle's objection that no one in the kingdom is fit to judge Richard has been seized upon by critics to show that Bolingbroke's accession is usurpation, but Carlisle's doctrine is not from the church doctrine of either Rome or England: it is Richard's doctrine, presumably explained by Richard to the Bishop at Flint Castle:

Worst in this royal presence may I speak,
Yet best beseeming me to speak the truth.
Would God that any in this noble presence
Were enough noble to be upright judge
Of noble Richard! Then true noblesse would
Learn him forbearance from so foul a wrong.
What subject can give sentence on his king?65
And who sits here that is not Richard's subject?
Thieves are not judg'd but they are by to hear,
Although apparent guilt be seen in them;

---

65. Mortimer in Marlowe's Edward II had effectively sentenced Edward to death with the unpunctuated equivocation, "Edwardum occidere nolite timere bonum est."
And shall the figure of God's majesty, 66
His captain, steward, deputy elect,
Anointed, crowned, planted many years,
Be judg'd by subject and interior breath,
And he himself not present? O, forfend it, God,
That in a Christian climate souls refin'd
Should show so heinous, black, obscene a deed!
I speak to subjects, and a subject speaks
Stirr'd up by God, thus boldly for his king.
My Lord of Hereford, here, whom you call king,
Is a foul traitor to proud Hereford's king;
And if your crown him, let me prophesy—
The blood of English shall manure the ground,
And future ages groan for this foul act;
Peace shall go sleep with Turks and infidels,
And in this seat of peace tumultuous wars
Shall kin with kin and kind with kind confound;
Disorder, horror, fear, and mutiny,
Shall here inhabit, and this place be call'd
The field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls (R. II, IV, i, 115-144). 67

Here, Carlisle, although standing by throughout III, ii, first addresses
the assembled nobles. As he does so, Shakespeare again puts in the mouth
of the apologist the crime which he has dramatized, Richard's thievery,
as he had put it into Richard's mouth upon landing. If a thief is allowed
to be present at his arraignment, Carlisle reasons, how much more should
a king be allowed to be present at his? The problem is, as French
observed, that no one has suggested that Richard should be arraigned,
judged, tried or sentenced. 68 The suggestion that he should be comes
from Richard himself through the agency of Carlisle.

66. This oddity of doctrine would certainly have been challenged
by Carlisle's Pope as transgressing on his prerogatives, particularly his
stewardship through the doctrine of the apostolic succession.


68. Ibid., p. 427. French suggests that the notion for judging
Richard must "come from outside the play." A source is suggested below
p. 148,
This is not the first time that Shakespeare had used the incompetent cleric as a doctrinal spokesman to have him overruled by an ambitious courtier. Cardinal Bourchier, loath to break the Queen's sanctuary in Richard III, was overruled by Buckingham, III, i. Here, despite Carlisle's prophesy, a restatement of Richard's prophesy in III, ii, to Northumberland, whence Carlisle presumably got it, Northumberland arrests him for treason, a little prematurely:

\[
\text{O, if you raise this house against this house,}
\text{It will the woefullest division prove}
\text{That ever fell upon this cursed earth.}
\text{Prevent it, resist it, let it not be so,}
\text{Lest child, child's children, cry against you woe.}
\]

\text{North. Well have you argued, sir; and for your pains,}
\text{Of capital treason we arrest you here.}
\text{My Lord of Westminster,}^{69} \text{ be it your charge}
\text{To keep him safely till his day of trial (R. II, IV, i, 145-153).}

The throngs which lined the roads to hail Bolingbroke and throw "dust and rubbish on King Richard's head,"\(^{70}\) apparently also held sway in the Commons; for, immediately upon Carlisle's arrest, Northumberland presses for the assembled lords "to grant the common's suit" (R. II, IV, i, 154); that is: show cause why Richard should be deposed and depose him. This is probably the result of Northumberland's politicking against Richard, Northumberland's continued efforts to get Richard to read the bill of crimes and, one imagines, to sign them, he being the first king able to do so, show him to lack the political \textit{savoir faire} of the more lenient Bolingbroke. The fact that Richard will neither read nor sign Northumberland's list of crimes should be remarkable to students

\(^{69}\) The Abbot of Westminster, a cleric.

\(^{70}\) This appears in York's speech to the Duchess of York (R. II, V, ii, 6).
of Holinshed, where an apocryphal confession appears together with the list of crimes drawn against him.

In the matter of Richard's abdication, it was to Bolingbroke's advantage to proceed openly. If Richard were willing to step down without a struggle, Bolingbroke would not appear the usurper. On the other hand, if Richard were unwilling to step down, someone would have to rule the country, and leadership would eventually devolve to Bolingbroke, heir to the throne; for Richard was obviously incompetent to rule. Therefore, Bolingbroke calls Richard in:

Bol. "Fetch hither Richard, that in common view He may surrender; so we shall proceed Without suspicion" (R. II, IV, i, 155-157).

Bolingbroke has nothing to lose by his magnanimity; indeed, to all but the most romantic viewers of Richard's abdication, his gesture can only purchase him opinion.

What follows Richard's entrance makes no sense if Richard did not expect the nobles to rise up on his behalf when Bolingbroke announced that he would ascend the throne. It is possible that Richard, entering with the regalia, is unaware that his plot has failed; if so, a modern director might want to have him do a "take" at Carlisle to register his surprise when he realizes that, if he offers to abdicate, no one has the slightest intention of stopping him. This is the final affront to his vanity:

King. Alack, why am I sent for to a king, Before I have shook off the regal thoughts Wherewith I reign'd? I hardly yet have learn'd To insinuate, flatter, bow, and bend my knee. Give sorrow leave a while to tutor me To this submission. Yet I well remember The favours of these men. Were they not mine?
Did they not sometime cry "All Hail" to me?
So Judas did to Christ! but he, in twelve,
Found truth in all but one; I, in twelve thousand, none

(R. II, IV, i, 162-171).

This is a little unfair to Carlisle who has just been arrested for his
pains on Richard's behalf, as it is to Aumerle, who is also standing by.
Yet this is lost on Richard who wishes to feel betrayed. The question
is: who has betrayed Richard? If God, through divine retribution as
called for by the Duchess of Gloucester, it is justice and not betrayal.
If the nobles, the question immediately arises: how have they betrayed
him, except by bringing him face to face with the regal obligations and
his regal promises? He has suggested that he abdicate in Bolingbroke's
favor, why should they stop him? Certainly not for a doctrine that none
of them believe. The only possible answer is that Richard has betrayed
himself against council from the beginning of the play through the
abdication to the last act in which he is killed. And though he has seen
every step of the journey, from his landing in Wales to his murder in
Pomfret Castle, he is unable to prevent his going thither because he will
not recognize the agent which is defeating him; he is the victim of
himself, pandering to his own vanity, his inflated notion of his position
in the world and his importance in all creation. Now, apparently betrayed
beyond recantation, lest he appear foolish for having given his
word to a vain enterprise, Richard must make good his promise to enfran-
chise Bolingbroke. His only hope of regaining the crown after he
abdicates, however, rests in his ability to make the abdication appear
to be a usurpation; if he can accomplish this, he affords his supporters
a rallying point for an attempt to regain the throne. Richard does this
by avoiding Northumberland's list of crimes, which avoided the Abbot, Carlisle and Aumerle set about a plot to replant Richard; however, Richard avoids Northumberland's list only by the most extreme behavior, which in a way mirrors his attitudes and actions throughout the play.

Having again compared himself to Christ to his own advantage, an obvious sign of hubris, Richard sets out to steal the stage from Bolingbroke:

*King.* God save the King! Will no man say amen?
Am I both priest and clerk? Well then, amen.
God save the King! although I am not he;
And yet, amen, if heave do think him me.
To do what service am I sent for hither?

*York.* To do that office of thine own good will
Which tired majesty did make thee offer—
The resignation of thy state and crown
To Henry Bolingbroke.

*King.* Give me the crown. Here, cousin, seize the crown (R. II, IV, 172-181).

Richard is commanding Bolingbroke to usurp the crown. Bolingbroke will not do it. Richard orders again:

Here, cousin,
On this side my hand, and on that side thine. 71
Now is this golden crown like a deep well
That owes two buckets, filling one another;
The emptier ever dancing in the air, 72
The other down, unseen, and full of water,
That bucket down and full of tears am I,
Drinking my griefs, whilst thou mount on high.

*Bol.* I thought you had been willing to resign.

*King.* My crown I am; but still my griefs are mine (R. II, IV, i, 182-191).

Richard's choice of metaphor is significant. The well, an undeveloped

71. Bolingbroke responds here by placing his hand where directed.

72. Is this a fair description of Bolingbroke? Richard is suggesting that Bolingbroke is a rather ignorant sort, given to senseless action.
image in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*,\(^73\) becomes the first of Richard's unusual images for the kingship; for, while it is easy to see how a gardener used to weeding and trimming a garden might see his occupation as an exercise in government, it is far more difficult to see where Richard could have gotten the image of the well. John Dover Wilson would have the buckets as Fortune's buckets and cites a poem by Guillaume de Machaut as an example;\(^74\) however the medieval buckets by this example are clearly buckets which give of their contents to men, while Richard's buckets are men at their stations of high or low fortune, partaking of the emotions which these stations may bestow, and Fortune takes a decidedly second seat to Emotion in the metaphor.

By making Bolingbroke look in the well, Richard confuses the role of Amant and Poet; for he has had to bring himself to look in the well in his mind's eye before leading Bolingbroke to the same experience. In this much, we may see him as poet, the creator of the illusion of the kingdom through the metaphor of the crown as well; but, the metaphor of the two as buckets is equivocal, if Wilson is correct. Richard suggests that Bolingbroke seeks Fortune; Bolingbroke counters that Richard had informed him that he sought to lose his. The implication is clear that Bolingbroke seeks only that which falls to him by right of birth. He will fill vacuums which it is his right to fill, provided that they are vacuums first. In this, Bolingbroke shows himself an apter critic of Richard's design than Johnson whom Wilson quotes as saying, "This is a

\(^{73}\) TGV, IV, ii, 80, "St. Gregory's Well."

comparison not easily accommodated to the subject, nor very naturally introduced. The best part is this line, in which he makes the usurper the empty bucket."\(^{75}\) For, while Bolingbroke can in no way be absolved for his part in Richard's death, he is at least quite aware that he has no intention of usurping anything. Johnson has fallen for Richard's side of the story hook, line, and sinker.

However, Richard's side of the story is not the case. The basic conflict of the scene is Richard demanding that Bolingbroke usurp the crown, on the one hand, and Bolingbroke adamantly refusing, on the other. Moreover, those critics who feel that Shakespeare has treated Richard so harshly in the first acts to treat him with sympathy here fail to notice that Richard is currying sympathy with every trick at his disposal, including poetry which he uses here. Thus, if Johnson can find fault with Richard's choice of metaphor, it is important to realize that Shakespeare is suggesting that (perhaps like Nero) Richard's poetry is not all that it might be, nor Richard's powers of description accurate.

After some verbal fencing, Bolingbroke asks Richard outright, "Are you contented to resign the crown?" (R. \(II\), IV, i, 200).\(^{76}\) And Richard, having sent his offer to resign, is forced to reply: Bolingbroke has called his bluff.

Richard still has two choices. He may decline his earlier offer, stand against Bolingbroke, and fight for what is his with all the political acumen at his disposal or he may abdicate his responsibility,\(^{75}\)

\(^{75}\) Ibid., p. 209, n. 186. As the throne has not yet been usurped, how can there be a "usurper" in Johnson's sense?

\(^{76}\) Is a direct question usurpation? See n. 34, above.
and seek idleness, letting others carry on his fight for him. He chooses the latter. He will not accept the humiliation of having his plan backfire on him.

Richard's action at this point is in complete accord with his earlier actions. He shrinks from the violence of political confrontation at the lists, on the field of battle, and in the court chambers. Unlike his bloody namesake, Richard III, this Richard is a physical coward; therefore, though with more hesitation than that with which he drew down his warder or dismissed his troops, Richard's answer is inevitable:

Ay, no; no, ay; for I must nothing be, Therefore no no, for I resign to thee. Now mark me how I will undo myself: I give this heavy weight from off my head, And this unwieldy sceptre from out my hand, The pride of kingly sway from out my heart; With mine own tears I wash away my balm, With mine own hands I give away my crown, With mine own tongue deny my sacred state, With mine own breath release all duteous oaths; All pomp and majesty I do forswear; My manors, rents, revenues, I forgo; My acts, decrees, and statutes, I deny (Italics mine.) (R. II, IV, i, 201-213).

Anyone witness to this speech, recalling that Richard indirectly ordered Bolingbroke to London, who can say that Bolingbroke has usurped the crown, state, or throne from Richard, defies both reason and experience. Richard gives away his crown. Richard denies his state. Richard frees all his vassals from his rule. And finally, Richard repeals his decrees. This last frees Bolingbroke from his sentence of exile. Yet, the question remains, can he do it?

The answer appears to be that he can. Neither York, Aumerle, Carlisle, nor any of the courtiers raise the slightest objection to the
proceedings. Richard has said what he is going to do and has done it. And all this suggests that in the bottom of his soul Richard has not believed his doctrine of the "Divine Right of Kings," their captaincy nor their stewardship on earth.

Now, this sets up an interesting situation: either Richard's formulation of the doctrine is blasphemy, or his cowardly abdication is lack of moral courage in the light of true doctrine. Either way, Richard's vanity, as prophesied by Gaunt, is what has gotten him into trouble, and his unwillingness to accept the shame for what he has done is what has kept him from getting out of it.

If there is anyone on stage who doubts the legality of Richard's abdication, it is not Northumberland, who has prepared a list of crimes which he apparently wishes for Richard to confess to. Richard, unwittingly, by abdicating title, has freed Northumberland's tongue to do more damage than recanting his offer to abdicate could ever have done. And Northumberland is not one to spare Richard's feelings for the sake of appearances.

If Richard ever wishes to regain his throne, he must avoid signing the list of crimes. The most effective way to avoid this is not to see the list at all. In this way, he cannot be tempted to put his signature on anything permanent which might be brought forward at a later date. He manages to do this, but only at some expense to his own person and pride. Having abdicated, and having hailed the new king in the most ironic of terms, Richard asks, "What more remains?" Northumberland seizes the stage:
No more; but that you read
These accusations, and these grievous crimes
Committed by your person and your followers
Against the state and profit of this land;
That, by confessing them, the souls of men
May deem that you are worthily depos'd (italics mine.) (R. II, IV, i, 222-227).

Northumberland's choice of words here is unfortunate both for
his cause and over-literal scholars. As French points out, Richard has
been deposed but, as he also points out, the agency of his deposition
has been himself. Northumberland in his eagerness to secure Richard's
confession makes a slip of the tongue as both Richard and Bolingbroke had
earlier, the former talking of "thieves" and the latter of "raining."
Here, it is Northumberland's turn for an unconscious confession: it was
he who sought Richard's deposition not Bolingbroke as the literal might
like to have it. His choice of words, however, is dramatically expedient
in that it gives Richard an escape route by which he may lay the founda-
tion for the loyalist propaganda which must precede his return, Richard
counters:

Must I do so? And must I ravel out
My weav'd up follies? Gentle Northumberland,
If thy offenses were upon record,
Would it not shame thee in so fair a troop
To read a lecture of them? If thou wouldst,
There shouldst thou find one heinous article,
Containing the deposing of a king
And cracking the strong warrant of an oath,
Mark'd with a blot, damn'd in the book of heaven (Italics mine.)
(R. II, IV, i, 228-236).77

This, unfortunately, is not true. It is Richard who has deposed Richard.

77. It would be interesting if someone could dip up the doctrine
that it was "sinful" to depose a king, or the canonization of a deposed
king to satisfy this assertion. Richard sounds as though he is whistling
in the dark in order to scare off Northumberland. He is singularly
unsuccessful.
It has been unnecessary for Northumberland to act in the matter and, if Richard were to stop here, he might get away with the lie, were we not two minutes earlier witness to his abdication without force. But Richard does not stop:

Nay, all of you that stand and look upon me
Whilst that my wretchedness doth bait myself,
Though some of you, with Pilate, wash your hands,
Showing an outward pity—yet you Pilates
Have here deliver'd me to my sour cross,
And water cannot wash away your sin (R. II, IV, i, 237-242).

This is the third time that Richard has alluded to himself as more sinned against than Christ (R. II, III, ii, 132; IV, i, 170-171; IV, i, 239-242). The third time, of course, is the charm. Moreover, this is the second time that this sinful arrogance has been prefaced by the argument of the Divine Right of Kings. Isn't it possible that Shakespeare's dramatization shows beyond doubt that he believed that the doctrine led to sin and in that much was morally false? If not, why then should he preserve the structure together with the dramatically ironic "His treasons shall sit blushing in his face" (R. II, III, ii, 51) and "Mark'd with a blot, damn'd in the book of heaven" (R. II, IV, i, 236).^8 For, if we are to credit Carlisle's admonition on Judgment, how are we to deal with Richard, who, even having abdicated, continues to judge Northumberland in a manner fitting only to the Pope. If anything, this picture is even more morally negative than that Guillaume gives Amant. Amant was merely apostate; Richard is blasphemous in vanity and in the words of vanity and one would assume that it is a critical response that

78. Richard rapidly alters: "Fiend, thou torments me ere I come to hell!" (R. II, IV, i, 270).
the speech is intended to arouse in Richard's stage audience; whereupon, Northumberland, sensing his position strengthened by Richard's alienation of the court, is positively insulting in his demand, "My lord, dispatch; read o'er these articles" (R. II, IV, i, 243).

Richard has made a tactical blunder. The uncommitted cannot protest that Richard is Christ or that he is Christ-like. In truth, he appears more like an anti-Christ in word and deed than a Christian, which make his blasphemous parade of his sufferings less than totally convincing. The court can only react with astonishment to Richard's comparisons of them to Pilate. Richard, therefore, has backed himself into a bit of a corner by his arrogance and he must quickly make amends if he is to avoid reading the articles:

Mine eyes are full of tears; I cannot see.
And yet salt water blinds them no so much
But they can see a sort of traitors here.
Nay, if I turn my eyes upon myself, 79
I find myself a traitor with the rest;
For I have given here my soul's consent
To undock the pompous body of a king;
Made glory base, and sovereignty a slave,
Proud majesty a subject, state a peasant (Italics mine.) (R. II, IV, i, 244-252):

If, with Peter Ure, we are to say that Richard reaches tragic enlightenment, 80 then we must assume that he comes to a private conclusion other than the one he voices in public. Richard's argument is that when he beholds himself (the narcissistic proposition) he sees that he

79. This is to be Richard's nemesis in Act V. He cannot stop turning his eyes upon himself.

has fallen (the lapsarian proposition) with the rest of the court into a sin (the doctrinal proposition), his own deposing. It is absolutely transparent that Richard is trying to spread the blame for his action. He appeases his injured vanity by diffusing the shame he has incurred through moral cowardice over the field of the entire court; second, by appealing for sympathy ("See how I'm crying for my misdeeds, the heinous deposing of a king," he directs attention away from Northumberland's list. Thus, by admitting his guilt in a crime, treason to the king, a highly abstract crime seeing that his treason was against himself, he attempts to distract attention from the very real crimes he has committed, the murder of his uncle, the theft of his cousin's property, and the violation of the feudal code. Northumberland is not so easily put off:

North. My lord--
King. No lord of thine, thou haught insulting man, Nor no man's lord; I have no name, no title--
No, not that name was given me at the font--
But tis usurp'd. Alack the heavy day,
That I have worn so many winters out,
And know not what name to call myself!82 (Italics mine.)

(R. II, IV, i, 253-259).

Dover Wilson, suggested that this passage was due to the suggestion in Froissart or Chronicque de la Traison et Mort de Richart Deux roy Dangleterre, that Richard was not the son of a priest of Bordeaux and that his real name was Jehan.83 But, there appears to be a more salient point available in Ovid: after Narcissus had "turned his


82. See above, p. 16, "Fons erat."

eyes upon himself,"84 "He could no longer bear it out. But fainting straight for paine/ As lith and supple waxe doth melt against the burning flame,/ Or morning dew against the Sunne that glareth on the same,/.../ Did he consume and waste away through Cupid's secret fire,"85 finding eventually his place, nodding over the river Styx, the river of forgetfulness. Presumably, he no longer knew himself, his name, nor the history of his life. And Richard furthers the impression that he is alluding to Narcissus immediately thereafter:

O that I were a mockery king of snow,
Standing in the sun of Bolingbroke
To melt myself away in water drops! (R. II, IV, i, 260-262).

This, Wilson suggests, was due to Marlowe's Doctor Faustus, V, ii, 189-190, "O soul, be changed into little waterdrops,/ And fall into the Ocean, ne'er to be found;" while in turn it probably suggested Hamlet, I, ii, 129-130: "O that this too sullied flesh would melt,/ Thaw and resolve into a dew."86 But, there is a clear difference between Shakespeare's usage and Marlowe's, which probably is due to the same source in Ovid. In Shakespeare, as in Ovid, it is the flesh that is to melt. In Marlowe, it is the soul. Now, Marlowe's, if it is due to Ovid at all, is due to a neo-platonic interpretation of this passage into the world of intellectual ideas, wherein Faustus's sin rests: to wit, intellectual vanity, and wherein it is relevant; however, as we may be sure that Shakespeare had read and been influenced by Ovid's Narcissus by this time and as we

84. See p. 23 above; Cf. "quae simul a dispesit liquefacta rursus in unda," Narcissus returning his gaze upon the image in the spring that now he knows to be his own.
85. Shakespeare's Ovid, ed. Rouse, p. 75.
find distinct differences between Shakespeare and Marlowe's treatments of the same image, it would probably be prudent to discount Marlowe's influence at this particular point, while acknowledging that it is probable that the passage in Richard II probably did influence the later one in Hamlet.

What Richard is asking for, and Hamlet who follows him, is forgetfulness, that he may not remember the fall from what he would have as his ideal of how the world should operate, with himself in the position of omnipotence. This is the suggestion that the desire to melt should bring forth, and it is due in part to Proteus, in part to the Duke, in Two Gentlemen of Verona, and in part to Narcissus in Ovid's Metamorphoses, to which both the Duke and Proteus are indebted. Moreover, there is no guarantee that Marlowe's Faustus was not in debt to Two Gentlemen rather than the other way around.

There is one more reason why Richard cannot look at the list of crimes which he has committed: they represent the "steel glass" of his reign, as put forward in Gascoigne's Steel Glass. Characterized as Vanitas, with elements of Narcissus and Amant to complete the picture, Richard can no more accept the image of his shame, as dramatized in the flaunting of York's good counsel, than he can the shame itself, his deposition of himself. Richard's self-destructive nature prefers to dwell on his glory, Gascoigne's "crystal glass," avoiding the issues that are to destroy him.

Peter Ure, differing in his interpretation, wrote:

- For what Richard sees in the mirror and the way he reacts to it do not fit any of the usual patterns as they are found in the

87. See p. 14, and n. 30 above.
iconography. If he were simply Vanity (so far as a vain person can be assimilated to the hypostasis) we might expect him to see a skull or an ape in the glass; if he were merely the ordinary vain man he would be pleased because the glass represents him as having such a flourishing outside. But surely this is incorrect: Narcissus saw his own image in the water to such devastating clarity that he fell in love with it as though it were another man; Amant saw his own eyes, and though he did not fall in love with those eyes, the reflection of them led him to the Roser where he did see the thing he was to love, the Rose. Neither saw skulls nor apes but both saw the things they were to love vainly. Moreover, Richard's vanity is not just a surface vanity; it is through and through. His anger with the glass lies in the fact that it mirror only his outside, not the totality of his being, which he assures us is in torment by the injuries done to it by Bolingbroke's return.

It is fitting that following Richard's statement of his desire to melt, metaphorically his desire to find forgetfulness like Narcissus, that he should seize upon the very reason that he cannot forget, the image of his glory that has possessed him and for which he has committed the crimes that Northumberland would have him confess to has been too satisfying to him to let go. Yet, Northumberland's persistence as Richard's nemesis, continually confronting him with the evidence of his crimes, drives Richard to a statement of his reign which is almost as damaging as the list of crimes and is the sine qua non of their commission. In effect, Richard confesses why he has committed the crimes, rather than to their actual fact: in the mirror, he confesses to the pomp, the

grandeur and the vanity in support of which the crimes were committed. Yet, he does not call into question his right to commit the crimes or his right to assume a style of life which might make them necessary; nor do those crimes find any mention in his dialogue with the glass. Rather, it is to the glory and languor of those days that he appeals, to "follies" that he confesses, and to the state of his own "face" that he addresses his remarks. What Richard sees in the mirror is what he loves: regal pomp, shows of glory, the essence of vain kingship and in this, he belongs to a tradition that is Ovidian rather than Platonic in origin. It is a love-object that is seen in the "mirror-perilous" that Richard sees himself:

Good King, great King, and yet not greatly good,
And if my word be sterling yet in England,
Let it command a mirror hither straight,
That it may show me what a face I have
Since it is bankrupt of his majesty.

Bol. Go some of you and fetch a looking-glass [Exit an Attendant]
North. Read o'er this paper while the glass doth come.
King. Fiend, thou torments me ere I come to hell.
Bol. Urge it no more, my lord Northumberland.
North. The commons will not, then, be satisfied.
King. 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.

Re-enter attendant with a glass. 89
Give me that glass, and therein will I read.
No deeper wrinkles yet? 90 Hath sorrow struck
So many blows upon this face of mine
And made no deeper wounds? (R. II, IV, i, 263-279).

Peter Ure's interpretation of these lines again makes use of the notion that Richard has reached some sort of self-knowledge:

89. Is it possible to write an "unconscious" stage direction?

90. Cf. Sonnets, n. 130, above, and Ovidius De Medicame Faciei Liber. Is it not likely that Shakespeare had a glass by as he composed these lines?
This mirror, in fact, shows the outward semblance but not the inward truth. It is another of those "flattering glasses," and in using the phrase Richard ignores the claims of the mirror to reveal the truth in favor of a catch phrase about mirrors familiar to Shakespeare's contemporaries, which has the additional function of bringing the general dramatic and immediate political situation within the field of reference: The flattering mirror is like the flattering followers. More importantly for our understanding of Richard's own change, his disappointment with the mirror is a measure of his newly acquired self-recognition, which proceeds from his own realization that the mirror is betraying him. Yet the mirror is still performing none of the less one of its ancient functions—paradoxically, through the very quality of deceit, it induces self-knowledge: it is his recognition of the mirror's falsity that enables Richard to perceive the truth about himself.91

Few, one would hope, would be entirely sure that Richard achieves self-recognition: nowhere does he mention the murder of his uncle nor does he mention anywhere his violation of escrow. "Follies" are a good deal less severe than "mortal sins" and even in the mirror Richard gives away to one of the seven deadly sins, this time it is anger:

Was this face the face
That every day under his household roof
Did keep ten thousand men? Was this the face
That like the sun did make beholders wink?
Is this the face which fac'd so many follies92
That was at last out-fac'd by Bolingbroke?93
A brittle glory shineth in this face;
As brittle as the glory is the face;
[Dashes the glass against the ground.]
For there it lies cracked in a hundred shivers (R. II, IV, i, 281-289).


92. This is as close as Richard ever comes to "self-recognition."

93. The actor playing Richard must build to the point where the word Bolingbroke bursts out full of anger and frustration, then immediately turn to ice, if the moment is to carry. It is possible that Shakespeare intended for Richard to catch Bolingbroke's reflection in the mirror with the outburst of the word; if so, Bolingbroke should react to carry the action to the audience.
What Shakespeare has done here as in the ghost scenes of *Richard III* is to provide us with a speculum of Richard's reign. Richard, who called for the glass in the first place, is not responsible for the misleading image it casts; again, he is being misled by a flatterer, but this time it is an *inanimate* follower; it has neither "form," as a neoplatonic mirror would, nor "spirit," as a Pauline mirror might, nor lack of clarity. Looking into it, Richard declares that it is misleading him and yet how can it? Is it not more likely that Richard is misleading himself? Is it not more likely that all along he has chosen as a matter of course those people to be his followers from out of that same body of the population that would be most likely to mislead him? What is there of the "follies" that Richard sees there in the mirror? Is there a wasteful war in Ireland? Is there the murder of his uncle, the theft of his cousin's properties? Does he see the stolen finery of his noble relatives given to his flatterers, Bushy and Greene?

No. What Richard sees at most is the reflection of Northumberland's list of crimes in the mirror he holds in his hand. This he almost flippantly dismisses as "follies." No more; he sees nothing of the thing that he really is. He cannot recognize himself; he does not dare for he is the fulfillment of Tiresias's prophecy "that he should live full long so long as he never know himself" (see p. 18 and n. 46 above), and it is to this prophecy that Richard's "amnesia" over the name that he received at the "font" (from Ovid's Latin, "fons") is directed. For in Holinshed, Richard's motivation for abdicating was his cowardly desire to live a
What says King Bolingbroke? Will his Majesty
Give Richard leave to live till Richard die?
You make a leg, and Bolingbroke says ay (R. II, III, ii, 173-175).

So, from the start of the mirror scene, it is essential that Richard be ignorant of his true identity as legitimate king of England if he is to survive: his alternate identity as Vanity (which implies effeminacy on his part) has brought him to abdicate. Looking into the well (Narcissus's spring, Amant's Welle of Narcissus) he sees the two buckets and misinterprets them: he is the light one, Vanitas ever dancing in the air, Bolingbroke the one full of cares. In answer, he resigns rather than admit his mistake in bringing both himself and Bolingbroke to stand over it. Then, standing over the crown, and only then, is he completely "out-fac'd" by Bolingbroke who has called his bluff. Then it is Northumberland's turn. With the list of "crimes" he drives Richard to the "font," where Richard in the terms of Narcissus's forgetfulness commits the lie that he has forgotten his name, and one would assume that Shakespeare wished to imply that he has done so that he may preserve his life. Finally, Richard calls for the symbol of himself, the looking-glass, and in that glass he sees darkly in the Pauline sense, "Videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate; tunc autem facie ad faciem." His mirror is a symbol beyond Guillaume's "miroers perilleus" in scope; it is more like it than Narcissus's pool. Narcissus realized that the pool had betrayed him to himself and died with his struggle to forget that fact. Richard cannot forget that he was king. Amant, on the other hand, does not

appear to be aware that the pool betrays him as foolhardy. But, none of his sins exceed the venial. Richard's do; thus in a sense the Bishop of Carlisle's warning about judging Richard adds the moral light necessary for the interpretation of the scene. By giving Richard a real mirror on stage, Shakespeare was quite aware that he was opening up a Pandora's Box of symbolism; that was precisely his intention. Each poem in the Mirror for Magistrates had been intended to provide a moral speculum of the persona of the poem's life; where, stabbed full of holes, Richard's corpse confesses all his sins while lying on a marble slab. Unfortunately, Baldwin's treatment had not been any more convincing than Holinshed's: it strains the credulity that Richard, twenty-two years King of England, would give in so easily when overcome by "sorrows" and melancholy, confessing to all he had done. It simply was not in character any more than the subsequent prophetic passage in Woodstock was in character. A man capable of such astute prophesy would have avoided the business that led to his downfall.

It is difficult for us in an age that has given up the study of Latin in the Church and in the schools to understand how deeply it affected the Renaissance. One of the reasons for studying it was that the oldest canons of the New Testament were best known in the Latin Vulgate; Greek being the language of scholars. Any lettered man of that period could not only read Latin but could make a good stab at speaking it; that was the purpose of going to school. Even Baldwin tends to discount the importance of the Bible as a teaching aid and as an end of

---

95. Baldwin, Small Latin and Less Greek, I, 480.
learning in itself. The Bible, however, was the most important book of
the age, and of it the New Testament the most pervasively known. It has
been argued that Shakespeare knew both the Bishop's and the Geneva Bibles,
that it is very likely that he "latined" them, that is reconstructed the
original Latin phrasing from the English translation; yet Baldwin doubts
that he knew the Bible in Latin, preferring that he should have learned
it in Greek in the upper forms of Stratford's Free School. Still, if he
"latined" them, how would he know that his reconstruction was correct if
he had not an original on hand in the vulgar Latin, or a schoolmaster
present who had memorized it faultlessly? Thus, if Shakespeare was
unfamiliar with the Latin version of the Bible, it was because he never
"latined" it, which would make his study of it in Greek even more unlikely.
On the other hand, the passage to which we may refer in St. Paul's Letter
to the Corinthians forms such an excellent gloss in the Latin that it is
hard to conceive that Shakespeare's usage and dramaturgy unintentionally
alludes to Paul, while it entirely misses in the English of the Geneva
Bible:

Ex parte inim cognoscimus, et ex parte prophetamus; cum autem
venerit quod perfectum est, evacuabitur quod ex parte est.
Cum essem parvulus, locuebar ut parvulus, sapiebam ut parvulus,
cogitabam ut parvulus; quando autem factus sum vir, evacuavi
quae parvuli. Videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate; tunc
autem facie ad faciem. Nunc cognosco ex parte; tunc autem
cognoscam, sicut et cognitus sum. Nunc autem manet fides, spes,
charatas, tria haec; major autem horum est charitas. 96

For we knowe in parte, and we prophescie in parte. But when
that which is perfite, is come, then that which is in parte,
shalbe abolished. When I was a childe, I spake as a childe,
I understode as a childe, I thought as a childe; but when I

---

96. Biblia Sacra: Tuxta Vulgatum Clementinam (Rome, 1956), I
Cor: 13, 9-13.
became a man, I put away childish things. For now we see through a glass darkly; but then shall we see face to face. Now I know in part: but then shall I know even as I am known. And now abideth faith, hope and love, even these three: but the chiefest of these love.  

This, of course, is Paul's famous definition of "charitas," usually translated "love" or "charity." Thinking of charity, one might be tempted to see Richard as a sort of Royal Robin Hood, stealing from the rich Bolingbroke and giving to the poor, Bushy and Greene; but, if so, one must ignore the material which precedes Paul's metaphor:

Charitas patiens est, benigna est. Charitas non aemulatur, non agit perperam, non inflatur; non est ambitiosa, non quae stir quae sua sunt, non irritatur, non cogitat malum; non gaudet super iniquitate, congaudet autem veritati; omnia suferet, omnia credit, omnia sperat, omnia sustinet.

Charitas nunquam excidit, sive prophetiae evacuabuntur, sive linguae cessabunt, sive scientia destruetur.

Love suffereth long: it is bountiful: love envieth not: love doth not boast itself: it is not puffed up. It disdaineth not: it seeketh not her own things: it is not provoked to anger: it thinketh not evil: it rejoiceth not in iniquitie, but rejoiceth in the truth: it believeth all things: it hopeth all things: it endureth all things.

Love doeth never fall away, though that prophecyings be abolished, or the tongues cease, or knowledge vanish away. And so it is with Richard: he cannot stop loving kingship even though he has given it away; but, that love is not charitable. It is the cupidity of Vanity that pays out that it may be repaid in adulation. And so we finally reach Richard's enigma; and if his prophecies be true, Northumberland shall be the fiend who will torment him in hell (see p. 132 and n. 89, above).

98. Biblia Sacra, I Cor: 13, 4-8.
And yet, Richard does not realize that there may be a surprise waiting for him on Judgment Day. Even in the moment of his death, his confidence is undaunted: "Mount, mount, my soul! thy seat is up on high;/ Whilst my gross flesh sinks downward here to die (R. II, V, v, 111-112). How can he be so blind?

All Richard's truths are inner truths, another "poetic" quality of his soul. The point of the play is that those "inner truths" are desperately at odds with the outer world and with church doctrine, that they drive him into a position in which he is so isolated from the reality of his situation and so ignorant of the precariousness of his state that he collapses in front of the audience. By hook and by crook, Richard unpuffs himself and yet he cannot forget the puffed-up state because that is the very thing he loves, though he cannot endure it. And Richard is blind even with Piers of Exton standing at the door, Richard, declaring, "Patience is stale, and I am weary of it" (R. II, V, v, 103), beats the keeper in anger because he will not taste Richard's meal.

Although an Elizabethan audience might think first of Paul when trying to unravel the enigma of Richard's abdication and his resort to the mirror, the picture painted of Richard is not entirely black. We get the feeling that Aumerle is genuinely fond of Richard, otherwise he would not engage himself to the plot to reestablish Richard on the throne. Likewise, sitting alone in his cell, Richard blesses a man he cannot know:

This music mads me. Let it sound no more;
For though it have help madmen to their wits,
In me it seems it will make wise men mad.
Yet blessing on his heart that gives it me!
For 'tis a sign of love; and love to Richard
Is a strange brooch in this all-hating world (R. II, V, v, 61-66).
This is Charitas in the Pauline sense; Richard can derive no possible benefit from it, save one: like Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, once having breathed a blessing on something external to himself even after the most willful impiety, Richard no longer is necessarily reprobate. This appears to be the impression that Shakespeare is trying to build as he leads us through the interview with the groom; Richard does have his good side, but it is unavailable whenever he must show forth the face of the king.

So, while on the one hand, judged by the standards that Richard draws for himself, apparently out of the poetry he has read; like Ovid's *Narcissus*, Richard is bound for hell; on the other, having brought forth the mirror, thereby introducing the Pauline world of symbolism of vision, prophesy and Charitas, Shakespeare allows Richard three acts of Christian charity, culminating in the odd blessing on his horse:

```
So proud that Bolingbroke was on his back!
That jade hath eat bread from my royal hand;
This hand hath made him proud with clapping him.
Would he not stumble? would he not fall down,
Since pride must have a fall, and break the neck
Of that proud man that did usurp his back?
Forgiveness, horse! Why do I rail on thee,
Since thou, created to be aw'd by man,
Wast born to bear? I wan not made a horse;
And yet I bear a burden like an ass,
Spurr'd gall'd, and tir'd by jouncing Bolingbroke (Italics mine)
(R. II, V, v, 84-94).
```

Two blessings, though, are preceded by a curse. What Shakespeare appears to be trying to show is that Richard may be the greatest of sinners and still not reprobate; it was simply his misfortune to become a king rather than remaining the second surviving son, and England's misfortune to

100. Richard still refuses to realize that he was the instrument of his own downfall.
have him king; he might otherwise have been a decent man. Thus, the Bishop of Carlisle's warning, while apparently politically motivated, holds in it the seeds of truth: it is not Richard's function to be judged by either the stage or the real audience; it is his function to be their moral enigma. Although Carlisle does not allude directly to it, his speech on judging Richard recalls the one great admonition of the New Testament, "Nolite judicare, ut non judicemini,"101 "Judge not, that you be not judged."102 That is, we are warned to observe but not to judge. So, as The Myrrour for Magistrates may be said to hold up a steel glass to Richard's reign, and Richard's vision in his glass on stage, a crystal glass of the same reign, Shakespeare's Richard II appears to be intended to hold up a speculum of enigma in very much the same way that Bosch's "Allegory of Avarice" does so pictorially.103

101. Biblia Sacra, Matt: 7, 1.
102. Geneva Bible, Matt: 7, 1.
103. A reproduction of this appears in Flemish Painters, Catalogue to the Belgian Exhibition (New York, 1942). Many of the same motifs are employed: Bosch's miser has been a soldier (armor in foreground), a money hoarder who apparently has used the knife (emblem of murder), which props open his money chest (in the middle ground), and at the point of death (a figure carrying an arrow entering at door) he is offered money by a very stupid looking demon, on the one hand, while he is abjured by the good angel to look towards the crucifix hanging in an upper window with light streaming through it, on the other. The miser's eyes are fixed on Death and his expression gives no clue as to which direction he will turn. To complete the picture, in the near foreground there is a self-portrait of Bosch as a small demon with the wings of a butterfly. The expression on his face is one of ironic enigma: he is posing the question, "which way will the miser turn?" and the answer is up to the viewer. But, on closer inspection, the profiles of all three figures, the demon Bosch, the hoarding miser, and the dying miser all have the same profile. It appears likely that Bosch, being the first viewer, was posing the question not to a patron, not to a casual viewer, but to himself. The painting in all likelihood was a private painting, not intended for sale, something that Bosch kept in his own home and
But to return to Richard's glass, Ure comments on its smashing as follows:

For the breaking of the glass follows logically from Shakespeare's counterpointing of the personifications with the person and the mirror that tells lies with the mirror that tells the truth. Because Richard is only partially assimilated to Vanitas, he is quite free to depart from her unrilike self-consistance: Vanitas could never smash her glass, any more than Sloth could cease to be sloathful. There are thus no allegorical or symbolical analogues of the smashing.104

There is an analogue in Narcissus's disturbing of the pool's surface in such a manner that the image he longs for is dispersed, at such a time as he knows the image to be just that and nothing more (see p. 23, above).

Ure continues:

In breaking the flattering glass the king rejects that part of him which belongs to Vanity along with its attribute. Unlike the vain man, he does not wish for a glass which lies to him about his inner self by ostensibly representing his outward beauty.105

But this is not the case. Richard breaks the glass because the image that it holds is mortal:

A brittle glory shineth in this face;  
As brittle as the glory is the face;  
[Dashes the glass against the ground]  
For there it is, cracked in a hundred shivers.106  
Mark, silent king, the moral of this sport—  
How soon my sorrow hath destroy'd my face.

debated whether to sell or not. The two portraits of the miser are most likely self-portraits drawn by imaginatively ageing the vision of Bosch's own face. Which way the miser turned? Videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate; tunc autem facie ad faciem; yet, Nolite judicare.


105. Ibid., pp. 223-224.

106. At this point Richard turns back to Bolingbroke, presenting him with a fait accompli.
The shadow of your sorrow hath destroy'd
The shadow of your face.

Say that again.

The shadow of my sorrow? Ha! Let's see
'Tis very true: my grief lies all within;
And these external manner of laments
Are merely shadows to the unseen grief
That swells in silence in the tortur'd soul.
There lies the substance; and I thank thee, king,
For thy great bounty, that not only giv' st
Me cause to wail, but teachest me the way
How to lament the cause (R. II, IV, i, 287-302).

Perhaps Bolingbroke's is the best criticism that can be made of Richard's mirror scene. In the looking-glass Richard has acted out the entire subjective history of his reign from prosperity to ruin. He has acted out both his love of adulation and his extreme displeasure at having his bluff called. But his quarrel is not entirely with Bolingbroke; it is with God who has made him mortal, who has made his glorious reign temporary, and who has set Death upon him:

Aum. Is Bushy, Greene, and the Earl of Wiltshire dead?
Scroop. Ay, all of them at Bristow lost their heads.

For God's sake let us sit upon the ground
And tell sad stories of the death of kings:
How some have been depos'd, some slain in war,
Some haunted by the ghosts they have depos'd,
Some poison'd by their wives, some sleeping kill'd,
All murder'd--for within the hollow crown
That rounds the mortal temples of a king
Keeps Death his court; and there the antic sits,
Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp;
Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
To monarchize, be fear'd, and kill with looks;
Infusing him with self and vain conceit
As if this flesh which wall about our life
Were brass impregnable; and, humur'd thus,
Comes at last, and with a little pin
Bores through his castle wall, and farewell, king (italics mine) (R. II, III, ii, 141-142, 155-170)!
This is why he has smashed the glass. The glorious reign which it represents is temporary, a fact brought home to him only by the death of his flatterers.

And so, his deposition got in motion by his own hand, perhaps for fear that God depose him, Richard draws a characteristically wrong conclusion. Bolingbroke is absolutely astute in his observation: "The shadow of your sorrow hath destroy'd/ The shadow of your face," Richard's face is intact for all the audience to see. His sorrows are only the manners of sorrows that he has experienced previously. The shadow of his face, then, is the image that was held in the glass, as the shadow that picked up Silvia's portrait in Two Gentlemen was the image of a pageboy; and, again the shadow-substance distinction is drawn as it had been in Two Gentlemen, but this time there is nothing comic about it. Richard does hurt and he wants to make sure that everyone knows about it. And it is this pain that makes him a tragic situation, in Richard's his "little scene to monarchise." He never really knows himself; he understands only from part that he has fallen. He never recognizes the agent of that fall, but supposes it to be Bolingbroke, as most indirectly it is. In the end, however, he has been his own victim. The retribution that the Duchess of Gloucester has called down on him has fallen. The prophecy of the dying Gaunt has been fulfilled. And even so, Shakespeare has left us with an enigma: is Richard necessarily damned? Or has Shakespeare left him just enough Charitas, enough true faith, that in the end his dying words, "Mount, mount, my soul! thy seat is on high;/ Whilst my gross flesh sinks downward here to die," show that there is another Richard underneath the act of king, pomp, and glory who knows where he is bound?
But the center of it all, the *sine qua non* of Richard's character is the glass he calls upon because he knows it will mislead him and because he knows that it will help him to mislead others. Thus, when he declares: "O flatt'ring glass,/ Like to my followers in prosperity,/ Thou dost beguile me!" (R. II, IV, i, 279-281) it should be clear to all who behold that it is not the glass that "beguiles" him but himself, and that though Northumberland acts as his Nemesis to bring him to the mirror as Narcissus was brought to the "font," as Amant was brought to the well by Ydeliness.

Like Guillaume's Amant, Richard, "the sweet and lovely Rose" in Hotspur's romantic vision, comes to the mirror partly through his own choice, partly through his inability to take action. Richard, the man of pride (*Superbia*) in his own vision, comes to the "font" driven there by Nemesis. And so it was that Shakespeare led Richard first to the well of the crown (because he loved kingship), then to the "font" of Narcissus (because he was proud), and finally to the mirror (because he was vain). He also showed that Richard's vanity was not necessarily damning, that Richard was likeable, that he did have charitable feelings, but that they could not appear so long as he was king. Richard's tragedy, then, is that at the very time that through suffering he could have become a good man he was killed. For unlike his isolated predecessor Julia, he could not simply faint and become king again. Once he had placed Bolingbroke on his throne, his death was inevitable. And the awful truth is that Shakespeare's Richard knew it.

What was it that drove him to steal his cousin's inheritance? One is tempted to argue vanity alone. But, is it true? The only other
possible motive is that like Shakespeare's Richard III, like Clarence, Richard II suffered from a guilty conscience on account of the murder of his uncle, that what we watch in Richard II is the action of Richard's guilty conscience, something to which he cannot even give a name, destroying him. If this is so, Shakespeare has probably borrowed this motivation from the Ur Woodstock, leaving the main plot there for the revisor.

With Richard II, Shakespeare finishes his investigations into the dramatic possibilities of Guillaume de Lorris's characterization of the lover led by idleness to isolation to the vision of the resisting love object, the thing that must be won: in Julia's case it was the Pygmalion identification, in Richard the experience of true grief. As each, torn by doubts and worries, approaches the desired relationship, their separate plays end. In one case, the isolation is ended. In the other, it is made eternal.
Certainly by no later than May 1593, Christopher Marlowe had put his history play, Edward II, on stage to deal in part with that poor king's peculiar affections for members of his own sex, Gaveston and Spencer. Marlowe's Edward II appears to be unable to read (IV, iii), a state of affairs which has compromised Gaveston's message to him (I, i). This peculiar bit of antiquarianism on Marlowe's part is perhaps the inspiration for Northumberland's insistence that Richard II read over the list of crimes, Shakespeare's demonstration that the ability to read is at times not a unmitigated blessing. The theme of "reading and writing" then had some place in the development of the history play. It is in part to the discussion of this theme that Act II of Edward III is indebted.

Unlike his father, Edward III's problem was never reputed to be homosexuality. Heir to his deposed father, the lusty Edward fathered seven boys whose children, and whose children's children, disputed the possession of the kingdom, did each other mischief, conquered and lost France, and eventually planted Henry Tudor on the throne. His interest in the opposite sex, therefore, was indisputable. In the Raigne of K.

---

Edward the Third, this interest becomes the subject of savage satire in Act II, where Edward lays a vile siege on a very unwilling countess whose husband is fighting in Edward's interest in France. Yet the terms under which this siege is laid prompted Hobday to suggest the vocabulary and the associative train were peculiar only to Shakespeare, and that, therefore, the scenes must be Shakespeare's. Unfortunately, it is somewhat difficult to sort out the direction of influence between the various history plays written after Edward II because many of them show obvious signs of revision and, of the plays which show these signs, Edward III is a prime example. John de Valois succeeded to the French throne in 1350, and this fact is recorded in the first scene of Edward III (I, 21), where "Iohn, of the house of Valoys, now their king," sits, Artois tells us, on King Edward's throne in France. King Edward had defeated John's father, 2


4. The authority for this date is Yves Renouard, "France," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1965, IX, 706, who reports John-II "the Good" the successor to Philip VI in 1350. Holinshed's Chronicles (London, 1807), while reporting Philip's death in 1350, neglects to mention his successor's name, enigmatically relating a "combat fought in the lists ... betwixt the Lord John, bastard son to Philip, King of France, and a knight of Ypres in Flanders." III, 651; while Robert Grafton in Grafton's Chronicles (London, 1809), first published (London, 1569), report both Philip's death and John's accession, but in the wrong year, 1349 (the fault being possibly that of an over zealous type setter attempting to account for a year for which Grafton had no entry, or equally possible being due to a slip of Grafton's pen) I, 386. Froissart, in Lord Berners' translation of The Chronicle of Froissart (London, 1901) first published by the order of King Henry XIII (London, 1523), makes the date unequivocal: "the same year [M. CCC, I.] the xxii day of August, King Philip died at Nofeunt ... The xxvi day of September ensuing, on a Sunday, was sacred and crowned at Reyns king John, eldest son to King Philip" I, 342. Froissart gives no clue as to Holinshed's peculiar historical "fact."
Philip, in 1347 at Cressy. In Edward III, the Battle of Cressy is reported in the third act. Unlike Shakespeare's celebrated "telescoping" of time and "shrinking of time" this is a clear case of the "reversing" of time. Moreover, if we look at the English Chronicles recording Edward's reign, we find no source for the majority of the first two acts; only by recourse to Froissart's Chronicle, as translated by Lord Berners (1523), do we find a source for Edward's pursuit of the Countess of Salisbury in Edward III; furthermore we find that in the "Countess" scenes, the degree of infatuation of the King for the Countess has been greatly exaggerated and that the date of the suggested encounter, 1341, so far predates the accession of John that the reversal of time within the "Countess" scenes is even more violent than that between the first two and the last three acts. Finally, Edward's "Countess" story in Froissart is that of a tempted man whose temptation never exceeds courtly bounds; in Edward III, it is only the Countess's willingness to destroy herself that prevents Edward from seducing her; thus, in Edward III, we are dealing with a highly editorialized dramatization of a French version of Edward's reign, as far from the French intent as from the English receipt, as evidenced by Holinshed's omission of the story.

It is obvious to anyone who studies the historical dates involved in the incidents dramatized that Edward III has been revised once by a hand hostile to Edward; and to anyone who studies the poetry, it is obvious that Edward III has been revised a second time by a wit hostile

6. Ibid., pp. 190-195.
to the intent of the first revisor, who, if he was aware of where the first revisor took the story from, chose to add a devil's tail to a devil's head (Acts I and II) in the form of forty-two lines of couplets placed within a play written in blank verse in all parts other than the end of scenes. ̅

In I, ii, of Edward III, we find the Countess of Salisbury besieged at Roxborough Castle, during the reign of John de Valois; ̅ that is, after 1350. Now the question immediately arises as to what on earth the Countess is doing at Roxborough, and in 1355, if Edward is preparing to do battle with John. For indeed, Edward was at Roxborough in 1355, but he was there to receive the surrender of Scotland from Edward Bal-

io1, ̅ not to dally with any Countess. The Countess had been besieged at Wark Castle, on the river Tweed, in 1341, according to Froissart, and rescued by Edward. She was there in the company of William Montague, Salisbury's nephew, while her husband was imprisoned in France near Lyle. After Salisbury's release, John de Monfort and Joan de Monfort quarrelled over the throne of Brittany. King Edward took John's part and King Phillip de Valois took Joan's part. All this renders Edward's explanation of what the Countess of Salisbury is doing at Roxborough during the reign of John II more than a little odd:

7. The lines in question are Edward III, I, ii, 123-166, the first two of which appear to have been the first revisor's original ending couplet to this scene.

8. See above n. 4 and text.


Enter Montague

But wherefore comes Sir William Montague?
How stands the league between the Scott and us?

Mont. Cracked and dissevered, my renowned lord.
The treacherous King no sooner was informed
Of your withdrawing of your army back,
But straight, forgetting of his former oaths,
Made invasion on the bordering towns:
Barwick is won, Newcastle spoiled and lost,\textsuperscript{11}
And now the tyrant hath begirt with siege
The Castle of Roxborough, where inclosed
The Countess of Salisbury is like to perish.\textsuperscript{12}

K. Ed. That is thy daughter, Warwick, is it not,
Whose husband hath in Brittany toiled so long
About the planting of Lord Monford there?\textsuperscript{13}

War. It is, my Lord.

K. Ed. Ignoble David! Hast thou none to grieve
But silly ladies with thy threatening arms?\textsuperscript{14}
But I will make you shrink your snaily horns!  \textsuperscript{(E. III, I, i, 121-138).}\textsuperscript{15}

It should be obvious that chronology as reported in this speech is a mess! To the careful researcher the first revisor's slight of hand becomes transparent; however, this and only this, serves as a narrative justification for what is to follow, Edward's siege of the Countess of Salisbury in 1355.

\textsuperscript{11.} Chronicle of Froissart, ch. LXXIII - ch. LXXV.

\textsuperscript{12.} Particularly if her husband finds out. See the account of the siege of "Wark Castle," Froissart, ch. LXXVI.

\textsuperscript{13.} Chronicle of Froissart, ch. LXXIX. Not until 1342! (or since 1342, if John is on the throne). Moreover, Salisbury was sent to aid the Countess of Monfort, not Lord Monfort in their quarrel.

\textsuperscript{14.} Dramatic irony: Edward's amorous arms are to prove equally threatening in the first revision.

\textsuperscript{15.} Spelling in all Edward III passages has been modernized and obvious editorial emendations have been made by the writer without further note.
Edward's arrival at Roxborough drives the Scotts off. The thankful Countess invites her King into the Castle, and the King refuses very lamely:

**Count.** A little while, my gracious sovereign, stay,
And let the power of a mighty king
Honor our roof; my husband in the wars
When he hears of it, will triumph for joy;
Then dear my liege, niggard not thy state:
Being at the wall, enter our homely gate.

**K. Ed.** Pardon me, Countess, I will not come near;
I dreamed tonight of treason and I fear (E. III, I, ii, 119-126).

Why should the revisor (1) add this pointless delay, and (2) why should he start off into rhymed couplets? When we examine the passage that follows in which the Countess lures Edward into the Castle with a "mining" metaphor, it is obvious that this cannot be by the same hand that composed the remainder of the first two acts: Here and only here, the Countess of Salisbury is positively lewd in her suggestiveness:

**Count.** Let not thy presence, like the April sun,
Flatter our earth and suddenly be done.
More happy do not make our outward wall
Than thou wilt grace our inner house withall.
Our house, my liege, is like a country swain,
Whose habit rude and manners blunt and plain
Pressageth naught, yet inly beautified

---

16. Which wars? If involved in the campaigns for Brittany, he is a year too early; if involved in the preparations for Poitiers, we are twelve years too late. Salisbury at the time of his Countess's besiegement at Wark Castle, was imprisoned, probably at Lyle, by the King of France, Philip. At the time of Edward's visit to Roxborough, Salisbury appears to have been in the company of Edward, the Black Prince.

17. This is the basic construction: country, Cf. Ham. III, ii, 112, "country matters." The second revisor hereafter plays with the notion of a boy actor (pre-pubescent) playing the lady's part.

18. "Naught" as in "nothing," that is, no external sex organ, and "naught" as in "naughtiness," that is, in this case, "adultery."
With bounties, riches and fair hidden pride,\(^{19}\)
For where the golden Ore doth buried lie,
The ground undeckt with nature's tapestry\(^{20}\)
Seems barren, sere, unfertil, fruitless, dry;
And where the upper turf\(^{21}\) of earth doth boast
This pride, perfumes and party colored cost,
Delve there\(^{22}\) and find this issue and their pride
To spring there from ordure and corruption's side (E. III, I, ii, 141-155).\(^{23}\)

Not content with having suggested to the actor who plays Edward that he take the boy actor within and presumably to bed, a suggestion tantamount to saying that the show of moral danger in Act II is not only hypocritical but an entirely false alarm, the second revisor goes on to suggest in his metaphor that should the "Countess" put aside her robes, the audience would see how ridiculous the melodrama of Act II was:

But, to make up all too long compare,
These ragged walls no testimonies are: -
What is within? - But like a cloak doth hide,

19. As the female character, the naked torseau; as the boy player, the genitalia.

20. For the boy actor, whose voice had not changed, "the lack of pubic hair." For the female character, the lack of a male consort.


22. The second revisor's double vision reaches its culmination here: for the character of the Countess, this amounts to an outright suggestion that Edward take her to bed and "mine" her as he had Berwick (Holinshed, Ano Domini 1355); for the reality of the boy actor, the suggestion is obscenely lewd. The boy actor, voice unchanged, suggests to the elder actor that he take him to bed and try what the Countess would have King Edward do. This amounts to a reducio ad absurdum on the first revisor's work.

From weather's waste, the under-garnished pride.
More gracious than my terms can let thee be,
Intreat thyself to stay awhile with me (E. III, I, ii, 156-161).

But, of course, the boy actor does not put aside the robes, a piece of
solemn wisdom which Edward applauds:

K. Ed. As wise, as fair! what fond wit can be heard
When Wisdom keeps the gate as Beauty's guard?
Countess, albeit my business urgeth me,
Yet shall attend, while I attend on thee:
Come on my lords, here will I host tonight (E. III, I, ii, 162-166).

The "Countess" invites the "King" into Roxborough in a manner
fitting for Mae West fans to appreciate. "Beauty's" "homely gate" (E.
III, I, ii, 24) is the obvious motivation for this invitation. "Beauty's"
home "gate" is the one to Wark Castle. If the "Countess" has been keeping
house at Roxborough, it has not been for Salisbury. Obviously, if she
allows Edward to ride off, there is a chance that he will be indiscreet
before her husband. This would never do; she must get Edward inside
where she can work up such a scandalous situation that Edward would never
be able to say to Salisbury, "Say what was your wife doing at Roxborough
Castle? I saw her up there not long ago, when . . . I wonder where he's
off to in such a rush?" She has to get him inside the Castle, and she

24. "She is as wise as she is fair!"

25. The second revisor seems to be patting himself on the back
here for allowing his "Countess" to keep her clothes on so that the
"mining" metaphor could appear on the stage.

26. Edward is there strictly on the Countess's invitation.

27. This is the only indication that the second writer knew from
where the first revisor got his version of the story.
has to create a scandal. Edward is chivalrously willing to oblige. This is a complete reversal of the first revisor's intent: Edward is chivalrously allowing the Countess to use him to keep the word of her adultery from getting back to Salisbury, to his own ill fame, a model of Christian chivalry.

Viewed in the light that the second revisor would have us view it, Edward's stay at Roxborough is absolutely "gracious." He aids the Countess in every way to keep even her father from "spilling the beans" to Salisbury. After being sent to aid in his daughter's seduction to adultery by the invenerate King, how would the "honorable" Warwick ever be able to tell his son-in-law that the Countess had been playing around on him, and that if he wanted to have a "wife" at home, he would have to stay at home a little more often? And impute his own honor? Thus, with the attachment of the second revisor's devil's tail, the "Countess" scenes with the lustful, rapine King more accurately might be called "King Edward's Sacrifice," in which the chivalrous King rescues a fair maiden not from the murderous Scotts (were they there in protest of her affair with a knight unknown, morally prepared to avenge adultery?) but from the gossip which might arouse her husband to murderous jealousy. Much as one might like to believe that Acts I and II are the work of a single hand, the couplets so adequately point out the historical errors and the dramatic errors in the blank verse portion that it is highly unlikely that the same man wrote both, rather the second revisor seems to be suggesting of the first that, as beauty, prurience is in the eye of the beholder, and that the wise, while they may acknowledge that prurience exists, do not display it on stage inaccurately.
If the second revisor worked from the advantage of hindsight, the first revisor worked from the advantage of moral certainty so far as his portrayal of Edward goes. In Act II, the "moral" treatment of Edward is most pronounced. He is bent on the Countess's seduction by every means at his disposal, even poetry.

**Dramatic Form in Act II, Scene**

If the story of II, i, differs somewhat from that given by Froissart, the alterations have been made in deference to the form towards which the writer of the scene was struggling. Basically the form is that of a lecture introduced by wit and moralized didactically once the audience is softened up enough to accept the message. (The Second Shepherds' Play was composed in this form. It is perhaps a little less than kind to remark that this form is never truly successful as a dramatic form, however successful it may be in the classroom.)

What the first revisor of II, i, allows us to do is to see Edward in the most unfavorable light possible. He does so by introducing Lodowick, Edward's court poet, who feeds the audience a picture of the lecherous King flushed with sexual desire for the modestly blushing Countess. Edward enters, overcome by the power of the Countess's company:

*K. Ed.* She is grown more fair far since I came hither,
Her voice more silver ever word than other,
Her wit more fluent. What a strange discourse
Unfolded she of David and his Scots!
'Even thus," quoth she, 'he spake,' and then spoke broad
With epithets and accents of the Scot,
But somewhat better than the Scot could speak:
'And thus,' quoth she, and answered then herself—
For who could speak like her but she herself—
Breathes from the wall an angel's note from heaven
Of sweet defiance to her barbarous foes.
When she would talk of peace, methinks her tongue
Commanded war to prison; when of war,
It weakened Caesar from his Roman grave, 28
To hear war beautified by her discourse (E. III, II, i, 25-39).

His infatuation clearly made known by Lodowick and substantiated by himself, Edward sends Lodowick for paper and ink. During Lodowick's absence the King acquaints the audience with Lodowick's profession, poet, and his intent to use that quality to win the Countess:

This fellow is well read in poetry
And hath a lusty and persuasive spirit,
I will acquaint him with my passion,
Which he shall shadow with a veil of lawn,
Through which the Queen of Beauty's queens shall see,
Herself the grounds of my infirmity.

Enter Lodowick.

Hast thou pen, ink and paper ready, Lodowick?

Lod. Ready, my liege (E. III, II, i, 53-58).

What follows has no clear parallel in Shakespeare. Lodowick, who has opened the scene describing Edward's infatuation with the Countess, pretends ignorance of the object of his King's affections for the amusement of the audience. The King, driven to exasperation by Lodowick's affected dullness, attempts to "acquaint him" with his "passion" without revealing what Lodowick already knows of and has passed judgment upon for the purpose of directing the audience's reactions to Edward. The result of this is a brutalizing of Edwards' character for the purposes of comedy, and for the delivery of a single gag line.

Edward begins the sequence by asking Lodowick to ply his trade in a most oblique manner:

28. There appears to be a bilingual pun here, grave as the place people are buried, and grave as in gravitas, meaning seriousness, Edward presuming himself a warrior.
K. Ed. Then in the summer arber sit by me,  
Make it our council house or cabinet29  
Since green out thoughts, green be the conventicle30  
Where we will ease us by disturbing them.  
Now, Lodowick, invocate some golden muse,  
To bring thee hither an enchanted pen,  
That may for sighs set down true sighs indeed,31  
Talking of grief, to make a ready groan;  
And when thou writest of tears, encouch each word  
Before and after with such sweet laments  
That it may raise drops in a Tarter's32 eye  
And make the flint heart Scythian pitiful:  
For so much moving hath a Poet's pen;  
Then, if thou be a Poet, move thou so,  
And be enriched by thy sovereign's love.  
For, if the touch of sweet concordant strings  
Could force attendance in the ears of hell,33  
How much more shall the strains of poet's wit  
Beguile and ravish soft and human minds?

Lod. To whom, my Lord, shall I direct my style (E. III, II, i,  
61-80)?

Now Lodowick is quite aware of Edward's passion for the Countess; this,  
however, did not deter this scene's composer from having a little fun at  
Edward's expense, or this scene's compositer from inserting a few obvious  
typographical errors.34 Edward avoids answering Lodowick's question by  
flying off in praise of the Countess's finer points, again without naming  
her:

K. Ed. To one that shames the fair and sots the wise,  
Whose body as an abstract or a brief

29. Only Holofernes in Love's Labour's Lost is quite so redundant.  
30. Diminutive of "Convent?"  
31. There appear to be some fillers in this line.  
32. Tamburlane.  
33. Orpheus.  
34. Line 82 is the most obvious of these; the compositer, as  
Capell suggested (1760), has inserted "is" for "as," botching the sense  
and the meaning of the line; see Brooke, Apocrypha, p. 74.
Contains each general virtue in the world.
Better than beautiful thou must begin,
Devise for fair a fairer word than fair;
And every ornament that thou wouldst praise,
Fly it a pitch above the soar of Praise.
For flattery, fear thou not to be convicted; \[35\]
For, were thy admiration ten times more,
Ten times ten thousand more the worth exceeds
Of that thou art to praise, thy praise's worth. \[36\]
Begin. —I will to contemplate the while—
Forget not to set down how passionate,
How hear sick, and how full of languishment,
Her beauty makes me.

Lod. Write I to a woman (E. III, II, i, 81-95)?

Lodowick is quite well aware of "to whom" Edward wishes him to direct his style, to which woman in particular Edward has fastened his lusty nature, and he has already expressed his disapproval in the introductory lines, "Then, Scottish wars, farewell: I fear t'will prove/ A lingering English siege of pevish love" (E. III, II, i, 22-23). The only point of these lines, therefore, is to expose Edward's ridiculousness to the censure of the audience. But more than this, there is a gag line being set up in the best tradition of Aristophanes: having dwelt on the sublime virtues of the Countess, Edward descends to the ridiculous:

Lod. Write I to a woman?
K. Ed. What beauty else could triumph over me.
Or who, but women, do our love lays greet?
What, thinkest thou I did bid thee praise a horse?

35. Is Edward promising to rig the court?

36. It is hard to conceive this speech being delivered with conviction. If Edward believes what he is saying, he is truly "sotted" by the Countess.

37. Again we sense fillers. Froissart narrates Edward's contemplation.
Lod. Of what condition or estate she is,38
'Twere requisit that I should know (E. III, II, i, 95-100).

Having set up a good laugh, the creator of this scene could not quite
pick it up where he left off. He tries to have Edward regain composure,
but, where before he reached back to his recollection of Marlowe's
Tamburlaine to make a comparison, this time he reaches for Shakespeare's
Two Gentlemen of Verona for the elements of Edward's courtly love poem.
First Edward states what he does not want in the poem, giving voice, one
would suppose, to the author's own prejudices:

K. Ed. Of such estate that hers is as a throne
And my estate the footstool where she treads:
Then may'st thou judge what he condition is
By proportion of her mightyness:
Write on, while I peruse her in my thought,—
Her voice to music or the nightengale—
To music every summer leaping swain
Compares his sunburnt lover when she speaks:
And why should I speak of the nightengale?
The nightengale sings of adulterate wrong,39
And that compared is too satirical:
For sin, though sin, would not be so esteemed,
But rather, virtue sin, sin virtue deemed (E. III, II, i, 101-113).

Edward's preference for poetry to seduce a Countess appears to draw
directly on William Shakespeare's Two Gentlemen of Verona, as Hobday's
study might be interpreted to suggest; Edward continues:

Her hair, far softer than the silk worm's twist,
Like to a flattering glass,40 doth make more fair

38. There is an obvious preparation for a pause here between the
absurdity of the notion of Edward summoning Lodowick to praise a horse,
which was to be, the composer expected, greeted with gales of laughter
and Lodowick's "pick-up" of the scene with this line.

39. Edward has his traditions mixed: it is the Cuckoo, because
of her strange nesting habits, who sings of "adulterate wrong."

40. Julia's glass, T.G.V., IV, iv, 147.
The yellow Amber;^ like a flattering glass
Comes in too soon;^ for, writing of her eyes
I'll say that like a glass they catch the sun,
And thence the hot reflection doth rebound
Against my breast, and burns my heart within,
As, what a world of descant makes my soul
Upon this voluntary ground of love!-
Come, Lodowick, hast thou turn'd thy ink to gold?
If not, write but in letters capital
My mistress' name, and it will guild thy paper:
Read, Lord, read;^ Fill thou the empie hollows of mine ears
With the sweet hearing of thy poetry (E. III, II, i, 114-128).

The immediate question as to how Edward, who was illiterate, knew so much about poetry, not only to compose it but to criticize it, remains quite as unanswered as the question of what the Countess is doing at Roxborough Castle. The line, "read, Lord, read!" not only is extrametrical; it makes no sense. Even if we amend it to read, "Read, Lodowick, read!" we cannot stretch it out to five accents or iambics per line. This evidence of a second hand playing in the lines that Hobday would attribute to Shakespeare, even if that hand belonged to the compositor who set the lines, is sufficient to confuse the matter of authorship beyond possible

41. Julia's comparison of hair colors between herself and Silvia, TGV, IV, iv, 185. Auburn is here confused with "Amber."

42. It is possible that this line and the couplet that precedes it and the fragmentary line (See n. 43 below) that follows it were added by the same hand that added the forty-two lines to the end of Act I? Our author is careful elsewhere to avoid enjambment, which he practices here. The line preceding is extrametrical. It is not possible that the first revisor composed the line, "Like to a flattering glass, doth make more fair/ The yellow Amber. Writing of her eyes, I'll say that like a glass they catch the sun/" which was later amended to the form in which we find it.

43. This is obviously the hand of the second revisor, pointing out an obvious flaw in the first revisor's conception of the scene. If Edward was illiterate in English, he was not really capable of guessing the efficacy of Lodowick's poetry on the intended. (See n. 84, below.)
solution. There is only one line which is definitely Shakespeare in the whole scene, which is, as Edmund K. Chambers points out, "Lilies that fester smell far worse than weeds;" 44 Chambers says that "some weight" must be given to its appearance "both as ii, I, 451 and in Sonn. xciv." 45

But, the question remains whether the line "poison shows worst in a golden cup," apparently pilled from Gorbeduc, should carry as much weight? 46

The two lines are divided only by the commonplace observation that "Dark night seems darker by the lightning flash" (E. III, II, i, 450). If anything, the first revisor was ubiquitous in his borrowings; but, to return to Edward's scene Lodowick is not ready to fill Edward's ears with the "Sweet hearing of [his] poetry." (E. III, II, i, 128).

44. William Shakespeare, I (Oxford, 1930), 516. The question may be raised as to whether this is a topical reference to John Lyly's reputed sulking upon being denied a position at court.

45. Ibid. The direction of influence remains a moot point; if, as suggested above (Chapter 3, n. 12) a number of the sonnets had reached some sort of final compositional state by 1593, Edward III's revisor may have been privy to a copy. On the other hand, the line may have been a piece of cant or a folk saying, known to both Shakespeare and the anonymous revisor; finally, Shakespeare may truly be in the revisor's debt; however, few, one would hope, would state unequivocally that the revisor was Shakespeare on the basis of this line. To do so is to fall into the same error that Clavin Hoffman fell into by supposing that Shakespeare's echoes of Marlowe prove that Shakespeare and Marlowe were one and the same; see The Murder of the Man Who Was Shakespeare (N. Y., 1955). However much one may admire the gentleman from Cambridge, it defies belief to think that Shakespeare's quotation of the line from Hero and Leander, "Dead Shepherd, now I find thy say of might/ Who ever loved who loved not at first sight." AYLI, III, v, 80-81, might be thought to prove that the man who Elizabeth certified dead actually survived to "write Shakespeare" or that, conversely, Shakespeare wrote Hero and Leander.

46. Edward III, II, i, 449; see ch. 1, n. 16 above. For the Gorbeduc passage.
Lod. I have not to a period brought her praise.\textsuperscript{47}

K. Ed. Her praise is as my love, both infinite, 
Which apprehend such violent extremes 
That they distain an ending period.\textsuperscript{48}

Her beauty hath no match but my affection; 
Hers more than most, mine most and more than more: 
Hers more to praise than tell the sea by drops,\textsuperscript{49}
Nay, more than drop the massie earth by sands 
And sand by sand print them in the memory: 
Then wherefore talkest thou of a period 
To that which craves unended admiration?\textsuperscript{50}
Read, let us heare (E. III, II, i, 129–140).\textsuperscript{51}

Again we are faced with a delay in the action, and again the suggestion in that delay is apparently bawdy: Edward, bent on the seduction of the Countess, does not want Lodowick to talk of "periods," even rhetorical ones: The Countess is too fair for that. The talk of "periods" opens up the next speech to a double entendre on the word "fault" which is never quite satisfied:

Lod. "More fair and chaste than is the queen of shades;"-
K. Ed. That line has two faults, gross and palpable:

\textsuperscript{47. Q. Marg. O let me make the period to my curse! / Glo. 'Tis done by me and ends in Margaret. (R. III, I, iii, 138–139).}

\textsuperscript{48. Sensibilities to the language being what they are, it is difficult to say whether the double entendre accessible to the modern ear (period: menstrual period) was intended by the Elizabethan.}

\textsuperscript{49. "Beauty" is the antecedent of "hers" here; however the antecedent and the substantive possessive pronoun stand so far apart that the repeated "period" easily substitutes itself in the memory as the antecedent of "Hers," where the following "drops" and ending "period" further confuse the ear so that the double entendre, if not originally intentional, rings through to the modern ear. This looks like the work of the second revisor.}

\textsuperscript{50. Wonder even.}

\textsuperscript{51. We may do well to wonder how much of the remainder of the scene has seen touches of the second revisor's hand.}
Edwards other dissatisfaction is more to the point:

K. Ed. Read the line again.
Lod. "More fair and chaste . . ."
K. Ed. I did not bid thee to talk of chastity,
To ransack so the treasure of her mind;
For I had rather have her chased than chaste,
Out with the moon line,\textsuperscript{53} I will none of it;
And let me have her likened to the sun:

\begin{quote}
Bid her be free and general as the sun,
Who smiles upon the basest weed that grows
As longingly as on the fragrant rose (E. III, II, i, 149-165).
\end{quote}

Having failed to make the quibble on the two senses inherent in the Elizabethan usage of the word "fault" work, the first revisor quickly headed back to verbal comedy to regain his audience:

K. Ed. Let's see what follows that same moonlight line.
Lod. "More fair and chaste than is the queen of shades,
More bold in constancy-"
K. Ed. In constancy! Than who?
Lod. "Than Judeth was.\textsuperscript{54}
K. Ed. O monstrous line! Put in the next a sword,
And I shall woo her to cut off my head.
Blot, Blot good Lodowick! Let us hear the next.
Lod. There's all that yet is done (E. III, II, i, 166-173).

There is nothing truly comparable to the foregoing in Shakespeare's canonical works; yet, what follows capping the composition scene, is so

\begin{quote}
52. The metaphor makes clear that Edward thinks of the "queen of shades" as the moon, "the queen of night."
53. See n. 52 above; Lodowick appears to have been referring to Hecate.
54. Judeth was wooed by Holofernes, whom she slew, "Liber Judeth" Bibliorum Sacrorum (Mediolani, 1914), pp. 414-425.
\end{quote}
beyond Edward's capabilities, and prerequisite to the composition of written poetry. The second revisor asks the first revisor's character to read; thus, we must conclude that the hand which introduced the a-historical composition of poetry into the script was the same hand that Hobday would call Shakespeare.

At this point, the object of Edward's versifying enters. The plotting reverts to Froissart, only to be soon blown out of proportion by Edward's vehement suit. In Lord Berners' translation of Froissart, somewhat more damning than the original, the King's suit is pressed only a bit beyond the chivalrous:

At last he went to a window to rest him and so fell in a great study: the lady went about to make cheer to the lords and knights that were there, and commanded to dress the hall for dinner. When she had all devised and commanded, then she came to the king with a merry cheer, wo was in a great study, and said, "Dear Sir, why do you study so? for, your grace not displeased, it appertaineth not to you so to do: rather thee should make good cheer and be joyful, seeing thee have chased away your enemies; let other men study for the remant. Then the King said, "Ah, dear lady, know for truth that sith I entered into the castle there is a study come to my mind so that I cannot choose but to muse, nor I cannot tell what shall fall thereof; put it out of my heart I cannot." "Ah, sir," quoth the lady, "thee always ought to make good cheer, to comfort therewith your people ..." "Ah, fair lady," quoth the King, "Other things lyeth at my heart that thee know not of; but surely the sweet behaving, the perfect wisdom, the good grace, the nobleness and excellent beauty that I see in you: hath so sore surprised my heart that I cannot but love you, and without your love I am but dead." Then the lady said, "Ah, right noble prince, for God's sake, mock nor tempt me not: I cannot believe that it is true that thee say, nor that so noble a prince as thee be would think to dishonor me and my lord, my husband who is so valiant a knight and hath done your Grace so good a service, and yet lieth in prison for your quarrel; certainly sir, thee should in this case have but a small praise, and nothing the better thereby; I had never as yet such a thought in my heart, nor, I trust in God, never shall have for no man living; If I had any such intension, your grace
ought not all only to blame me, but also to punish my body, ye and by true justice to be dismembered. There with the lady departed from the king and went into the hall to haste the dinner.\textsuperscript{55}

When the Countess returned to the King to bring him to dinner, she did not do so unaccompanied: bringing some knights with her, she drew the despondent king after her to the hall, where the King's deposition laid to the Scott's escape. All that day and night, Froissart reports, King Edward remained locked in an internal "love-honor" debate, resolving on the morrow to go chase Scotts, though still strongly desirous of the Countess's beauty; thus, his leave taking was not entirely free of his earlier importunings to his subject, the object of his rampaging affections:

Then he took leave of the lady, saying, "My dear lady, to God I commend you till I return again, requiring you to advise you otherwise than you have said to me," "Noble prince," quoth the lady, "God the father glorious be your conduct and put you out of all villaine thoughts; sir, I am and ever shall be ready to do your grace service to your honor and to mine." Therewith the King departed all abashed.\textsuperscript{56}

This, according to Froissart, was not the last England was to hear of King Edward's affections for the Countess of Salisbury. The following year, 1342, Froissart records "The feast and jousting made at London by the King of England for the love of the Countess of Salisbury," which, he goes on to report, she attended "sore against her will."\textsuperscript{57}

This infatuation of the English king, scion to the rash Plantagenets, and father to a brood as fratricidal as that of Pelops, appears

\textsuperscript{55} Chronicle of Froissart, I, 194-195.  
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., p. 195.  
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., pp. 216-217.
blatantly a-historical that we may suspect that either the second revisor is having some fun at the expense of the first revisor or that the first revisor was unaware of a crucial point in the chief character's makeup: Edward was functionally illiterate in English and possibly in French as well; thus, which ever way we would have it, a historical error is present in the text, which no amount of neo-Jungian analysis can contain:

K. Ed. I thank thee then; thou hast done little ill, But what is done, is passing, passing ill. No, let the captain talk of boisterous war, The prisoner of immured dark constraint, The sick man bests sets down the pangs of death, The man that starves the sweetness of a feast, The frozen soul the benefit of fire, And every grief his happy opposite: Love cannot sound well but in lover's tongues; Give me the pen and paper and, I will write (E. III, II, i, 174-183).

Now, unlike the interjection, "Read, Lord, read!" (E. III, II, i, 126), there is little chance that only the last line was composed by the second revisor. The speech coherently builds to this point, that Edward, if he wishes to woo the Countess, is going to have to do the job himself. So, if we wish to attribute the last line to the second revisor, we must then attribute the whole speech to him.

The presence of the interjection, "Read, Lord, read!" is ample evidence that a hand hostile to the purposes of the hand of the first revisor inserted outright sarcasm at the end of the first revisor's flight of fancy about Edward's poetic capabilities. Much less than write, as suggested by the first revisor's composition of the scene, the second revisor asks him to perform a task apparently believed to be

58 See nn. 84, 85 below.
to go completely unnoticed by the English chroniclers, most probably for the reason that they believe it apocryphal or slanderous. Their editing of history, of course, is perfectly in character for those who were attempting to write a National History from a strongly patriotic pose partially in reaction against the French chronicler Froissart, whose objectivity could prove embarrassing to those who wished to demonstrate the rising unity of the kingdom under the Tudors as opposed to the chaos of Plantagenets. The fact that Froissart was a Norman rather than a Saxon, and that for the most part the "first book" of his Chronicles, to which this story belongs, was revised from the Chronicles of Jean le Bel, canon of St. Lambert of Liege, could only heighten their suspicions.59

Their patriotic spirit, however, did not carry over to the first revisor; his Edward, a warrior schooled in the merits of the counter-offensive, and absolutely desirous of learning how to lay a mine, is not to be put off by any petty scruples the Countess may harbor towards adultery. Only her assurances that she will suicide if he attempts to force her virtue prevents her seduction by his less than courtly "love."

Edward sees the Countess entering and immediately attempts to deceive her in the purpose of his labors with Lodowick:

K. Ed. But soft, here comes the treasurer of my spirit.—
Lodowick, thou knowest not how to draw a battle;
These wings, these flankers here, and these squadrons
Argue in thee defective discipline:
Thou should have placed this here, this other here (E. III, II, i, 184-188).

It is inconceivable that the first revisor did not have a copy of the

"poem" by, with all Lodowicks blottings, to use as he wrote this speech, the poem so cut and mutilated by black lines blotting out phrases of the poem that it looked like a battle plan, with each dark blotting standing for a platoon, squadron, or a battalion, rather than a poem with which to assault a Countess. With instructions of continue in his endeavors, Lodowick is dismissed. The Countess, then bent on the King's happiness, asks what she may do to "drive from thee/ Thy gloomy consort, solemn melancholie" (E. III, II, i, 194-196). He, seeing his opening, claims that he has been wronged, and having obtained the Countess's word that she will right the wrong and restore him to joy thereby, he advises her:

Then take thyself a little way aside
And tell thyself, "A king doth dote on thee;"
Say that within thy power it doth lie
To make him happy and that thou hast sworn
To give him all the joy within thy power:
Do this and tell me when I shall be happy (E. III, II, i, 211-216).

The Countess hears but does not obey, coming to an opposite conclusion:

Count. All this is done, my thrice dread sovereign:
That power of love that I have power to give
Thou hast with all devout obedience;
Employ me how thou wilt in proof thereof (E. III, II, i, 217-220).

Edward is not put off by this:

K. Ed. Thou hearest me say that I do dote on thee.
Count. If on my beauty, take it if thou canst;
Though little, I do prize it ten times less:
If on my virtue, take it if thou canst,
For virtue's store by giving doth augment:
Be it on what it will, that I can give
And thou canst take away, inherit it.

K. Ed. It is thy beauty that I would enjoy.
Count. 0, were it painted, I would wipe it off
And disposses my self to give it thee.
But sovereign, it is souleded to my life:
Take one and both, for like an humble shadow
It haunts the sunshine of my summer's life.

But thou mayst lend it me to sport withal.

As easy may my intellectual soul
Be lent away and yet my body live,
As lend my body, palace to my soul,
Away from her, and yet retain my soul.
My body is her bower, her court, her abby,
And she an angel, pure, divine, unspotted:
If I should leave her house, my Lord, to thee,
I kill my poor soul and my poor soul me (E. III, II, i, 221-242).

The Countess's "and my poor soul, me" is to prove foreshadowing of her final manner of escape; wherein she threatens to kill herself if Edward persists. For the meanwhile, however, she is content to hold herself to more rhetorical defenses:

But that your lips were sacred, my Lord,
You would profane the holy name of love.
That love you offer me you cannot give,
For Caesar owes that tribute to his Queen;
That love you beg of me I cannot give,
For Sarah owes that duty to her Lord.
He that doth clip or counterfeit your stamp
Shall die, my Lord; and will your sacred self
Commit high treason against the king of heaven
To stamp his Image in forbidden metal
Forgetting your allegiance and your oath?
In violating marriage, sacred law,
You break a greater honor than yourself;

60. This does not appear to be identical with Shakespeare's usage in TGV and R. II, the first revisor's "shadow" is not self-animated; whereas Shakespeare's are both capable of performing tasks, picking up a portrait (also a shadow) and "smashing a glass (a shadow of a face). That is, Shakespeare's canonical "shadows" are a part of the mental drama of his characters, while the first revisor's "shadow" is a philosophical notion used to explain the mind-body dicotomy of the Countess in Christian terms, a philosophical rather than a poetic approach to the language of drama.

61. The Countess is guilty of a small heresy here: the soul, according to church doctrine, is immortal.

62. "Even if . . ."
To be a King is of a younger house
Than to be married, your progenitor,
Sole reigning Adam on the universe,
By God was honored for a married man,
But not by him annointed for a king.
It is a penalty to break your statues
Though not enacted with your highness' hand: 63
How much more to infringe the holy act,
Made by the mouth of God, seal'd with his hand? 64
I know, my sovereign, in my husband's love,
Who now doth loyal service in his wars,
Doth but so try the wife of Salisbury
Whether she will hear a wanton's tale or no; 65
Lest being therein guilty by my stay,
From that, not from my liege, I turn away (E. III, II, i, 249-276).

Edward, however, at the first revisor's hand, is not done. He suborns
Warwick, the Countess's father, to woo her for him a task which Warwick
unwillingly performs. The Countess argues her father to her side, which,
once accomplished, allows Warwick to speak his mind on the King's conduct.

The scene which began with the announcement of the King's infat-
uation with the Countess (despite the innuendos of the closing of the pre-
vious act) ends with the Countess's resolve not to be tempted. The next
scene begins with the heralded entrance of the King who is still lan-
guishing for love of the Countess. Brought good news from France by
Derby, he puts it aside, apparently preferring his own melancholy reflec-
tions to state business. Lodowick comes in and Edward inquires of him,

63. What this means is not entirely clear; perhaps what the
Countess means is that it is a crime to break Edward's statutes even
though they were not written down or signed by him. This, however, is
not readily retrievable from the context; again, it may be that the lack
of clarity is due to a typesetter's insertion of "It is" for "There are."

64. The Countess is certainly far more certain of the sacred
nature of marriage than was St. Paul. See I Corinthians 7, N. B.
I Cor. 7, 6.

65. How if she should spread one? See above pp. 159-162.
"What says the more than Cleopatra's match/ To Caesar now?" (E. III, II, ii, 45-46). In this, Edward picks up the Countess's parallel of the previous scene, "Caesar owes that tribute to his Queen" (E. III, II, i, 252), and turns it more towards his way of thinking. A drum announces Prince Edward's arrival (!) and the young man tells his father of his preparations for the French wars. The martial spirit stirs in Edward's blood; but, its rally is short-lived:

Give me Armor of eternal steel!  
I go to conquer kings; and shall I not then  
Subdue myself? and be my enemies friend?  
It must not be. -Come, boy, forward, advance!  
Let us with our colors sweet the air of France.  

Enter Lodowick  

Lod.  My liege, the Countess with a smiling cheer  
Desires access unto your majesty.  

K. Ed.  Why there it goes! That very smile of hers  
Hath ransomed captive France and set the King,  
The Dolphin and the Peers at liberty.  
Go, leave me, Ned, and revel with thy friends.  

{Exit Prince.  

Thy mother is but black, and thou, like her,  
Dost put it in my mind how foul she is. -  
Go. Fetch the Countess hither in thy hand  
And let her chase away these winter clouds,  
For she gives beauty both to heaven and earth  


The Countess enters and promises to perform as Edward wishes if he will kill both her husband and his wife. Edward agrees. Albeit that there is

66. In this parallel of historical personages, the second revisor foreshadows and perhaps inspires Shakespeare's brilliant scene of the vascillating Caesar and the superstitious, barren Calpurnia overthrown by the outright flattery of Decius Brutus; for, the first revisor's parallel (for his it appears to be) stands little to the point: Caesar's wife, so far as is known, was barren (hence, Caesar I, ii, 1-11), while Edward's wife bore him seven sons. It is, of course, possible that the first revisor intended to show the Countess's ignorance of classical history by her inept parallel, making her virtue, rather than her intellect, the center of her character; however, as has been pointed out above (pp. 150-152), that effort was sabotaged by the second revisor's addition of the couplets.
absolutely no precedent for this proposal or for Edward's agreement in Froissart, the vilification of the King continues. This time pillaging Marlowe's Hero and Leander for his imagery, the first revisor allows the Countess to top the King again:

K. Ed. No more; thy husband and the Queen shall die, Fairer thou art by far than Hero was, Beardless Leander not so strong as I: He swam an easy current for his love, But I will through a Hellespont of blood To arrive at Cestus where my Hero lies.

Count. Nay, you'll do more; you'll make the river too With their hart bloods that keep our love assunder. Of which my husband and your wife are twain (E. III, II, ii, 152-160).

The Countess's change of heart is, of course, feigned. A moment later in an image of unbelievable theatricality, she wheels upon the King threatening to commit suicide in the manner of Lucrece if he attempts to comply with her proposal:

Count. Resolve to be dissolved; and, therefore, this: Keep but thy word, great King, and I am thine. Stand there dost, I'll part a little from thee, And see how I will yield me to thy hands. (turning suddenly upon him showing two Daggers.) Here by my side doth hand my wedding knives: Take thou the one, and with it kill thy Queen, And learn by me to find her where she lies;67 And with this other I'll dispatch my love Which now lies fast asleep within my heart. When they are gone, then I'll consent to love. Stir not, lascivious king, to hinder me; My resolution is more nimbler far Than thy prevention can be in my rescue, And if thou stir, I'll strike; therefore, stand still, And hear the choice that I will put thee to: Either swear to leave thy most unholy suit And never henceforth to solicit me; Or else by heaven this sharp pointed knife Shall stain thy earth with that which thou would stain,

67. What does this mean? Is it an addition?
My poor chaste blood. Swear, Edward, swear
Or I will strike and die before thee here (E. III, II, ii, 169-189).

While a more modern villain might be more likely to laugh and close in
for the kill, Edward repents, swears, and moves off for France, leaving
only credibility strained.

There is no doubt as to whose side the first revisor is on. From
the first moments of Act II until the last exit, the Countess still
carrying the knives, Edward is the villainous leacher pursuing the vir­
tuous Countess. The second revisor, of course, does not appear to have
seen it that way, pointing out by his couplets at the end of Act II that
the Countess is inviting Edward into the wrong Castle, and though he does
not appear to say it, during the wrong year, with the wrong king on the
throne of France. But this is not all. The first revisor borrowed some­
thing from Shakespeare's usage, remarkable both from the earliness of its
appearance, contemporary or just prior to the production of Shakespeare's
Richard II, and because he used in a way in which Shakespeare never used
it elsewhere. He borrowed the character metaphor of Narcissus, deriving
bits of action and suggestions of word from Ovid's tale and using them to
characterize Edward.

We remember that Narcissus reached into his pool to embrace the
neck of his image, and that, in doing so, he dispersed the image, causing
it to disappear. Edward, likewise, notices that however hard he pursues
the Countess, she always remains elusively beyond his grasp.

K. Ed. Oh, that I were a honey sucking bee.
To bear the comb of virtue from this flower,
And not a poison sucking envious spider
To turn the juice I take to deadly venom!
Religion is austere and beauty gentle,  
Too strict a guardian for so faire a ward!  
Oh, that she were as is the air to me!  
Why so she is, for when I would embrace her,  
This do I, and catch nothing but myself (E. III, II, i, 282-290).

Edward's complaint is that the Countess eludes him. The form of that complaint, however, is a mime: as though he imagines the image of the Countess to be immediately before him, he reaches forward to embrace that image, but his arms, passing through thin air, cross so that he clasps his own shoulders, and blows his kisses to the air. In effect, then, Edward's predicament is seen by the first revisor as the result of the type of vanity that Narcissus exhibited by reaching in the pool to embrace the image of his own neck, and, to be sure, Edward, as Julia, is isolated on stage.

Then, the issue is settled, is it not? Shakespeare must have had a hand in Edward III, must he not? Has not Hobday's case been vindicated? Shall we proceed to see that it has not.

Rebuttal

When we speak of Julia's isolation on stage, that isolation is complete. No one knows who she is or what she is after. She, as Richard II, is to later, stands on stage with a single "prop" with which she is to do her "soliloquy." With that property, she shows that she stands essentially as in an abyss, able to rely only on herself to solve her "existential" problem, how to trap Proteus into living up to his promise to her as witnessed by the exchange of rings. Her soliloquy points out

68. Is not an action of some kind called for here?
that, so long as she remains disguised, she has only one weapon with which to perform this re-transformation of Proteus's character; and, because the action of the play is to be comic, that weapon, in the form of the ring (the symbol of marriage and the image of his promise), does transform him, forcing him to renounce Silvia in favor of Julia. The image drives out the image and they embrace.

When we speak of Edward's isolation, the isolation is due to the first revisor's blocking of his action, not to the construction of his plot. Edward has allies: Warwick does his bidding, Lodowick too; only lust divorces him from his society. Once it is overcome by shame, he completes his conquests of France in the prescribed historical manner. The conclusion drawn from Edward's isolation is that sin is the isolating factor that separates the human character from the remainder of virtuous mankind, as symbolized by the Countess, or from lapsarian mankind, as symbolized by Warwick, and that when it is purged either by the application of external shame, as in Edward's case, or by the operation of instructed conscience, as in Warwick's case, re-unification of the sinner with the virtuous is possible. Gone is the dependence of dialogue on the physical properties introduced by the playwright, as quickly removed from the stage as are the properties themselves. Gone is the awareness of the environment of character, as we may witness in the misplacing of the scene in the wrong castle making the plot susceptible to the ludicrous suggestions implicit in the second revisor's couplets.

The errors in place and date and the strength of the lover, rather than the weakness exhibited by Narcissus, Amant, Julia, and Richard
make it almost impossible to credit more than the most superficial isola-
tion of the amorous character for comparison to "Ovidian" characters
found elsewhere in Shakespeare. Furthermore, the choice of the source,
Froissart, is unusual for Shakespeare. Indeed, it may have been these
scenes that prompted him to read for, until Richard II, Froissart, by the
time he composed Richard II;69 he relied on English rather than French
Chronicles for his histories.

Thus it is that we are thrown to the images themselves as the
only possible grounds for attributing any portion of the first and second
acts of Edward III to Shakespeare's hand. If in the mansuetude of our
critical judgments we wish to credit the attribution, we have two grounds
upon which we may do so: the uniqueness of the imagery and the uncon-
sciousness of the author of their production. The first is indemon-
strable,70 and the second is entirely a matter of faith. Indeed, what is
the term "unconscious" that it leads so glaringly to material fallacy?
Is it anywhere defined by Hobday, by Armstrong, by Spurgeon, by Jung, or

69. Tillyard's point, that York's "puzzling" speech, concerning
"the prevention of poor Bolingbroke/ About his marriage," Richard II, II,
i, 167-168, being a reflection of Froissart's story, Ed. cit., VI, 341-
347, "Of a treatie of maryage bytwene the erle of Derby and the duke of
Berries daughter, and howe kynge Rycharde of Englande dyde lette it by the
erle of Salisbury," "lette" is used here in its obscure form meaning "to
hinder," OED "let v^," whereby Tillyard virtually demolished Wilson's
lost play argument, see Chapter 3, pp. 63-66. See E. M. W. Tillyard,

70. See Ch. 2, nn. 10, 13 above; Vinge's citation of Ben Jon-
son's Cynthia's Revels, Narcissus Theme, pp. 220-223, may be added to
the list of extraneous "flattering-glasses" even though it deals with
Echo, Narcissus's ill starred consort, rather than with Narcissus him-
self.
by Freud that we may understand what exactly Hobday means? It is not
most often used precisely as an undefined term by observers to mask their
ignorance of the creative processes they cannot understand?

Those who are prepared to take Hobday's leap of faith are more
than welcome to the rocks upon which they land. Chronology, locus and
source argue against them; so do uniqueness, structure, and treatment.
All they are left with are the images themselves. Some twenty distinct
images appear in Hobday's summary of his case:

Three of the four image-clusters appear in these scenes.
Group A is represented in I, ii, by king, dreamed and
flatter, and Group B in II, i, by hair, flattering glass,
and eyes. The five references to flattery in the same
scene are associated with sweet (four times) and sweetness;
poison (four times) and venome (twice); winter and frozen
(for ice); cold; thaw, sun (frequently mentioned); drop
(three times); and tears - nine of eleven terms of Group
C, which here makes its first appearance. Honey, sugared
and thaw, all found in II, i, reappear in later plays when
Shakespeare is using Group D, together with or in place of
sweet and melt.

If we examine the list of images above, we find that Hobday has
indeed discovered an "image-cluster," as defined above, in Edward III.
It is composed of the images: sweet, poison and/or venom, sun, and drop,
we may add glass to the list, and if we are truly charitable, we may wish
to include flattering (which seems to present a moral criticism rather


72. See Ch. 1, p. 3, above: "The images X, Y, & P will be
called an "image cluster incident" if and only if the images X, Y, P are
members of an "image cluster" substantiated by repetitive aggregation in
the works of that author; thus allowing a single author to these scenes
of Edward III for the sake of argument, the only demonstrable "image
cluster" in the scenes are those composed of these elements, far fewer
than those claimed by Hobday unless we assume the scenes to be Shake-
speare's on some other basis and argue circularly on that basis; i.e.,
"authorship" and "unconsciousness."
than an image). Now a portion of these images appear in Gorbeduc in combination with "lust," "envie," and "flattering." The last stanza and a half of that play make an interesting gloss on Edward's plight; for in this scene, if we neglect the depredations of the second revisor, it is only Edward's own lust that leads him in pursuit of his golden-haired Countess; while we may see that the moral stand of Sackville and Norton forms a sort of a moral framework within which Edward III operates, it is only in the hands of the second revisor that the glass is fulfilled:

Wo to the prince that pliant eare enclynes
and yeldes his mind to poysnonous tale that floweth
From flattering mouth, and woe to wretched land
That wastes it-selfe with civil sworde in hand!

Loe thus it is, poyson in golde to take
And hollesome drinke in homely cuppe forsake.73

With the inclusion of the second revisor's couplets, it is the Countess who flatters Edward into believing that if he comes within the walls that she will yield herself to him (with a little persuasion of course). When she turns on him, rather than being virtuous as the first revisor had it, she is being absolutely treacherous. The prisoner of her beauty in the wrong castle, Edward makes an ass of himself for the edification of his audience. But, what then becomes of the Countess's show of virtue? The first revisor holding out for "lust" as one of the seven deadly sins, appears to have seen Man (if Edward can be so generalized) as inherently sinful, or seducible as in the case of Warwick and Lodowick; holding out to the end, and elect, the virtuous as epitomized by the Countess, in his

eyes, foresaw seduction and avoided it. The second revisor was hardly so "fundamental" in his approach to the moral problem. Probably changing the location of the castle of the Countess's defense of her honor, and perhaps monkeying with the chronology, he added just enough to change the Countess's invitation of Edward into the castle into the opening gambit of what appears to be a seduction of him by her, and her later show of virtue, beguiling hypocrisy. Entering the castle (as Freudian an image as one could want)\textsuperscript{74} to be instructed as to the inner beauties to be found there, with a dialectical double entendre of almost obscene suggestion thrown in, Edward becomes second-Adam seduced by evil speaking through the Countess, second-Eve. Man is inherently sinful says the first. Man is seduced by sin says the second. To Shakespeare, man is the seducer (see the remarks on \textit{Julius Caesar} below) as well as the seduced. Both Brutus and Cassius are sinful, and both are punished in \textit{Julius Caesar} by Error, who is closely associated with the classical Retribution. In \textit{Edward III}, there is no Retribution, only shame, on the one hand, and hypocrisy on the other. Hobday's image cluster, then, rests at the center of a moral debate on the nature of man, unwittingly begun by the first revisor, and wittingly engaged in and finished by the second (who, we may add, was sounder in his theology, see \textit{Genesis} I-III, than the first, though certainly less "moral"),. The remainder of the imagery does not constitute a cluster in that it is not substantiated within the text; that is, it is not repeated in a clustered fashion in either the part of the

\textsuperscript{74} Cf. Guillaume's Lover entering the garden, to be greeted by Dame Ydelenesse (Sloth), ch. 2, p. 29, above.
second revisor, or the parts of both. It receives substantiation only with the tacit assumption that it is by Shakespeare, and, if we were to assume that it were by Drayton (Idea's Mirror, Amours 1-14) a different set of "flattery" images would become as well substantiated in Edward III under that assumption as the one Hobday has chosen are under his.

Thus, the only unusual image-cluster in Edward III appears to be the repetition of the images: sweet, sun, drop, and glass. Substantiation of the other images is reached only by circular reasoning: if it is by Shakespeare, the image cluster incident is substantiated; if the image cluster incident is substantiated, is it by Shakespeare or Drayton, or God knows who else? For, stripped of Hobday's dialectic, four images are hardly sufficient to convince anyone that Shakespeare was either the first or the second revisor, one image of which, the glass, is so mistreated in Edward III, so reduced to the function of a gimmick, but so suggestive to Shakespeare, as to make the clearest possible demonstration that Shakespeare had no hand at all in Edward III: there is not the slightest evidence that either revisor had read any part of the Romaunt of the Rose, so necessary to the conception of Julia, the girl who forsook her "flattering glass" to seek her love in the court of the Duke of Milan, only to be challenged by the image of Silvia, which had replaced her in the "melting" of Proteus's mind, whence the glass in Edward III apparently was taken.

"The Flattering Glass" is the image and symbol of "Vanitas" and sometimes "Luxurias." Edward throws his away in two lines. Julia remembers hers after long absence. Richard plays with this as his own
personal symbol, the seduced and the seducer rolled up into one. But, literary arguments aside, we may say that neither revisor is Shakespeare simply on the way in which the "poetic" property is used in Edward III. When Shakespeare created his treatment of the theme of love and self-love in terms of Narcissus and Amant in Two Gentlemen of Verona, he chose his prop with care and used it in support of his theme. The events surrounding Julia's confrontation with the portrait comprise her education as to the character of her beloved. Foolish though she is, she achieves both her love and enlightenment through this confrontation. The portrait of Silvia, then, is central to Shakespeare's plot. A mirror of sorts, it becomes the symbol of Proteus's perjury.

Edward's poem is not central to the understanding of his character. In fact, it helps obscure his reputed ignorance of the written word. It is brought on to emphasize his longing for the Countess, but it is removed before Shakespeare would have removed it. When Edward reaches forward to catch the image of the Countess suspended in the air, he misses, and catches "nothing but" himself. The poem, the image of his longing has been carried off by Lodowick. Were Edward more literate, or were Shakespeare and the first revisor one and the same, Edward would more likely keep the poem on stage, use it in his attempt to seduce the Countess and then, in the drawing of the Narcissus parallel just after exit and just prior to Warwick's entrance, rather than wrap his arms around himself, he would find in one hand the poem to which the line "This do I, and catch nothing but myself" (E. III, II, i, 290) would add both meaning and irony. Thus, in the use of a simple stage property, we
may see that all the necessary elements for a Shakesperean treatment are present, save two: a knowledge of the Romaunt of the Rose and the designing hand of William Shakespeare.

But, to answer Hobday's contention specifically, Shakespeare's sweets melted because Shakespeare has read Froissart and united the following passage regarding Richard's greyhounds, Mathe, with the narcissistic personality of Richard to form an image of betrayal, the stoppage of flattery upon Richard and the shift of attention to Bolingbroke, the new power center:

King Richard had a greyhound named Mathe, who always waited upon the king and would know no man else; for when so ever the king did ride, he that kept the greyhound did let him loose, and he would straight run to the king and fawn upon him and leap with his fore feet upon the king's shoulders. And as the king and the earl of Derby [Bolingbroke] talked together in the court [at Flint Castle, where Bolingbroke was persuading Richard to go to London without a struggle] the greyhound, who was wont to leap upon the king, left the king and came to the earl of Derby, Duke of Lancastre, and made him friendly countenance and chere as he was wont to do to her king. The duke, who knew not the greyhound, demanded of the king what the greyhound would do. Cousin, quod the king, it is a great good token to you and an evil sign to me. Sir, how know you that? quod the duke, I know it well, quod the king, the greyhound maketh you chere this day as king of England, as you shall be, and I shall be deposed: the greyhound hath this knowledge naturally; therefore take him to you, he will follow you and forsake me. The

75. There is no mention of "candy" with "greyhounds" prior to Shakespeare's reading of Froissart; however, immediately following, presumably at the earliest convenience, Hotspur gives out his famour envious lines, "Why, what a candy deal of courtesy/ This fawning greyhound then did poffer me!" 1H IV, I, iii, 251-252. It is next to impossible to believe that Shakespeare created this passage ex-nihilo, when the following passage from Froissart appears to have been in his recent reading, as shown by Tillyard, note 345, above. It is the new note of the falsity of the greyhound's affection that should be noted here. See also, ch. 3, p. 51.
Duke understood well those words, and cherished the greyhound, who would never after follow king Richard, but followed the duke of Lancastre.\textsuperscript{76}

We can see in this passage that Froissart foreshadows Shakespeare's treatment of Richard as the prophet of his own doom. Richard, of course, does want to melt,\textsuperscript{77} in the manner of Narcissus and Proteus, while Edward has no apparent knowledge of the notion as applied flattery, the "revisor"\textsuperscript{78} preferring the verb "burn" to verb "melt" in the appropriate place in the development of Edward's change of heart.\textsuperscript{79} Froissart's greyhound stands for the rest of the kingdom, and as such is a potent symbol of disaffection, but, while potent, it is very easy to see why Shakespeare could not use him on stage: a dog, trained to defect at the proper moment, might defect to the wrong party, utterly changing history and destroying the illusion of the stage.

The crux of the authorship argument, then, would seem to be how the separate authors treated their historical sources, how widely they ranged and how skillful they were in reconciling their knowledge of the classics with the job at hand. Shakespeare, perhaps the greatest medievalist to write for the stage, was sparing in his classical allusions, even to Ovid, drawing heavily on Guillaume de Lorris through Chaucer (or pseudo-Chaucer); his classical allusions, in the main, were borrowed directly for their appropriateness to the story he was in the process of

\textsuperscript{76} Froissart's Chronicles, VI, 369.

\textsuperscript{77} Ch. 3, p. 129, above.

\textsuperscript{78} Cf. Proteus's change of heart, ch. 3, pp. 49-50, above.

\textsuperscript{79} "and burns my heart within", ch. 4, p. 15, above.
telling, Ariadne and Julia's common plight, forsaken by their perfidious and perjured lovers. However deep his reading in biblical materials, he never threw his Bible at his audience in any of his canonical plays. The anonymous first revisor of Edward III, however, not only threw his Bible but the apocrypha as well into the pit. And in doing so, he purports to be more skillful in history and myth than he actually is; for this reason: his motive for raising the story of Judith from the Bible is to advance the comic awareness of his audience by speaking through his character the very lesson that damns him, the unjust pursuit of Judith by Holofernes and his reward for his depravity. The absurdity of Edward's position is bridged by the energy of the comic actor playing his part, with very un-Shakespearian comic intensity:

King. In constancy! than who?
Lod. Than Judith was.'
King. O monstrous line! Put in the next a sword.
And I shall woo her to cut off my head! (E. III, II, i, 169-171).81

Unfortunately for the first revisor, Judith's entry into Holofernes tent is not above censure. She enters by dissembling and deceit, and it is only the powerful, overlordly, and heavily patriotic voice of the narrator that quells the reader's censure of Judith's conduct for bearing false witness, for swearing false allegiance and for seducing her drunk liege-lord, in order that she may slay him in his drunken stupor. It is this

80. The appearance of this passage in the apocrypha cannot be construed to prove Latin learning on the part of the first revisor. The passage appears in The Geneva Bible in English translation.

81. E. III, II, i, 169-171. There is a strong Samson and Delilah element to Judith's story.
two-edged quality to Judeth's sword that plays through so clearly in 
Edward III with the additions made in the script of the second revisor. 
The seduction of Edward obviously follows from the seduction of Holo-
fernes, and the tables are absolutely on the first revisor. Similarly, 
the first revisor's ignorance of classical history appears to show 
through the Countess's ignorance of Calpurnia's infertility, very pos-
sibly due to lead poisoning. Finally, in casting the scene with Edward 
composing a poem, the first revisor made his most glaring error: Edward, 
probably, could not write. His grandson, Richard II, was the first 
English king known to possess a personal library, and the first to sign 
his own letters. The friend of Froissart and the patron of Chaucer,

82. See S. C. Gilfillan, "Lead Poisoning and the Fall of Rome," 
Journal of Occupational Medicine, VII (1965), 53-60. Cassius also seems 
to show some signs of plumbism, while Brutus, Caesar and Anthony seem 
relatively free. The relationship of plumbism and insanity, plumbism 
leading to emaciation, infertility and often insomnia, may be reflected 
in Caesar's observation on "spare Cassius," and further ruminations on 
"the falling sickness" by Brutus, Cassius and Casca. Plumbism, according 
to Gilfillan, was recognized as a poisoning disease as early as 1000 A.D. 
Edward's wife (see the opening remarks to this chapter) was untroubled by 
infertility.

83. Mathews, The Court of Richard II, p. 22. Among the books 
the young King bought at the age of thirteen was a copy of The Romance 
of the Rose; he would not have needed to had his grandfather possessed 
his exquisite literary tastes.

84. In this the writer follows Harold F. Hutchinson, The Hollow 
Crown (New York, 1961), pp. 239, 240, and 268 (n. 3 to page 239). Noting 
the crudity of Richard's signature, the writer feels that William Longman, 
Edward the Third (London, 1869), may have been mistaken in his notes to 
Vol. II, p. 72, and that the letters he suggests were written by Edward 
were actually dictated to a scribe, in whose hand they are set; further 
the question of English literacy is answered definitely by Longman, 
"King Edward III, wasy hardly able even to speak English, always wrote 
his dispatches in French, and his proclamations were often made in that 
language;" Vol. II, p. 72. Edward was certainly no lover of poetry 
(see n. 84, above); however, it would be wrong to credit Hutchinson's 
view too far: King Alfred's signature to several charters survive, as 
do versions of his translations.
the last truly medieval king ushered in the first light of southern
Europe's burgeoning Renaissance through the show of munificence, culture,
and learning that all of his Plantagenet forefathers would have abhored.
Richard, not Edward, was the poet; and Richard, not Edward, in the
Renaissance view, was pilloried for his presumption. Thus, whether or
not there is any truth in Froissart's story, if it truly is Froissart's,
of Edward and the Countess, the first revisor's divergence from his source
and the ineptness of his parallels all but rule out his identity being
that of William Shakespeare. And, for the second revisor? No case has
yet been made out, and there appears to be insufficient material for any
but the most intrepid to do so:
CHAPTER 5

SHAKESPEARE'S FURTHER USE OF THE NARCISSUS THEME

Shakespeare's reputed debt to Ovid cannot be claimed to be an invention of modern scholarship. Francis Meres made the first mention of Shakespeare's affinity for the earlier poet in Palladis Tamia (1598) long before any theories of poetic innocence attached themselves to Shakespeare's name:

As the soul of Euphorbus was thought to live in Pythagoras, So the sweet witty soul of Ovid lives in mellifluous and honey-tongued Shakespeare. Witness his Venus and Adonis his Lucrece, his sugared Sonnets among his private friends.¹

We have seen, moreover, that this debt carried over into two of his early plays in particular, Richard II and Two Gentlemen of Verona. Narcissus, the non-lover, being a mainstay of Shakespeare's conception of Proteus's character, whence it enters Richard's character particularly with respect to Gaunt and Aumerle, and Guillaume's Amant being the scaffolding upon which he built the character of Julia, the searching lover, whence Richard's particular statement of his self-love/self-hate abdication and mirror scenes. We have also seen that the first two acts of Edward III in no way conform to Shakespeare's previous practices either in relation to these two sources, Metamorphoses and Romaunt of the Rose, nor to his more usual use of history from the Chronicles, nor finally to the organic

aptness of his use of classical example in allusion and comparison. But neither Proteus nor Richard are driven to the catatonic catastrophe that Narcissus experiences at the hands of Ovid. And we might do very well to ask, "Why?"

Classical New Comedy generally portrayed two young lovers thwarted by an old fool, who, through one means of influence or another, blocked the action of the primaries until outwitted by the young lovers. Such plays avoided sentimentality by concentrating on the trickery employed in overpowering the old fool rather than on the emotional plight of the lovers, while the cruelty of the young towards the old was justified largely by the audiences' appreciation of the unreasonableness of the thwarting character. Shakespeare's invention in Two Gentlemen of Verona is to remove the thwarting action of the old fool from the Julia-Proteus subplot and to place the thwarting action in the perfidious nature of Proteus's character. In doing so, he drew from a separate classical tradition of an entirely un-comical nature, the tradition of the "cruel youth," which he employed almost simultaneously in his poetic narrative Venus and Adonis. Adonis, in this classical poem, dies stupidly and cruelly, the victim of his own diffidence and possibly self-hate. The clear apotheosis of this type of character is Ovid's Narcissus who scorns himself to an early grave when confronted with his own self-love. Thus it is little wonder that Ovid's fair youth shows up as an exemplum in Venus's admonition or as a parallel to Proteus, a parallel drawn through imagery. But this does not explain why Shakespeare's Proteus escapes Narcissus's fate.
The reason seems to be that the infusion of Christian philosophy, as symbolized by Julia's assumption of role of Christian and admittedly sinful seeker of love, note the looking glass symbol of vanity, the infusion of lapsarianism over theogonism, superimposes a metaphysic of forgivable shame, a matter of Christian theological doctrine, over a field of classical tragic traditions in order to provide a comic resolution. Two Gentlemen of Verona, in the writer's judgment then, stands not as a comic failure but as a statement of the triumph of Christian values over pagan pathologies. Proteus becomes a sinner (thou shalt not bear false witness) rather than a fool; therefore capable of self-redemption, worthy of forgiveness by the other characters on stage, and of amused tolerance on the part of the audience.

Shakespeare's Richard, on the other hand, falls because he denies the Christian values in favor of his vanity and dies because there are others who hope to benefit from his death, again a denial of Christian values; but, superimposed over this vision of tragic action by the very choice of symbols, we again find the structure of a Christian metaphysic suggesting that though Richard is dead he is not necessarily damned because he has not lost his faith, the one thing necessary to give him a fighting chance on judgment day.

Richard and Proteus, Shakespeare's cruel youths, demonstrate the two facets of cruelty in a "Christian" society: that cruelty exposed leads to reconciliation; while hidden cruelty leads to dissension, disenfranchisement, and death. But that cruelty can masquerade as "franchise," as it does so effectively in the early part of Richard II is
drawn from Guillaume through Julia's masquerade, from Ovid in Narcissus's mocking of Echo, and from the morality plays as they figure in his conception of Richard III. Yet Shakespeare manages to avoid the heavily moralistic treatment that the first revisor of Edward III lapses into largely by avoiding interfering with the flow of events for the purpose of drawing heavily intellectual parallels in the dialogue without the support of stage properties in the action. And, because his choice of stage props is apt, we accept them as a part of the action and are interested in the exposition that is to be made of them.

Shakespeare's Roman Plays

Although Kenneth Muir generally seemed to seem in balance between acknowledging Shakespeare's hand in Edward III and denying it, at one point he makes a statement with which the present writer must agree wholeheartedly: "If Shakespeare had no hand in the play he was at least intimately aquainted with it, more intimately than with any known Elizabethan play."2 Indeed the writer feels that Shakespeare must have had many a good chuckle over the first revisor's gaff, "Caesar owes that tribute to his queen," before he set down the most obvious counter-example to the Countess's objection, that barrenness was looked on as the gods' disfavor visited upon a union and that Caesar's wife, in that she failed to produce a son, was barren:

Caesar. Forget not in your speed, Antonius, To touch Calpurnia; for our elders say, The barren, touched in this holy chase, Shake off their sterile curse (Caesar, I, ii, 6-8).

Are we to argue that Shakespeare so despised the Countess that he placed the Caesar line in her mouth to make her appear an obvious fool? No, there is something so desperately wrong with the theory that Shakespeare had a hand in the composition of the first two acts that it is hard to credit the notion that some critics have even read the play through once at all before launching into a "proof" of Shakespeare's authorship.

What is wrong, and what was wrong with this particular writer before he started this study, is a general ignorance among commentators on the depth of Shakespeare's learning. Until T. W. Baldwin collected all the then known examples of Shakespeare's Latin learning in Small Latin and Less Greek there was a running argument as to whether Shakespeare could read Latin at all. It is commonplace to ignore Shakespeare's debt to Froissart, and to date the writer has not read one mention of Shakespeare's acquaintance with The Romaunt of the Rose even though early Shakespeare is permeated with rose imagery! Finally, since Meres it has been commonplace to mention Shakespeare's debt to Ovid and then ignore it.

3. John Dover Wilson could have spared himself Tillyard's observation had he considered the possibility, which Geoffrey Bullough ignores in Sources of Shakespeare, III, "Richard II," listing Froissart as a "possible source" but ignoring Bolingbroke's marriage difficulties appearing only in Shakespeare and Froissart. Kenneth Muir avoids the difficulty by treating neither Richard II nor Two Gentlemen of Verona in his Shakespeare's Sources. Bullough's truncation of Golding's Narcissus in his treatment of Venus and Adonis in Volume one, deprives the uncautious of the entirety of the story so important to Shakespeare's developing imagery by excising with the meat the notion that Narcissus melts, while in no way combating the notion that Shakespeare could and most probably did read the story in Latin.
Even Robert K. Root's little book, *Classical Mythology in Shakespeare* is sadly lacking in commentary. Kenneth Muir in *Shakespeare's Sources* disposes of Ovid in three pages. But it is clear that Shakespeare did not forget his Ovid when he wrote the following:

Caesar. I could well be mov'd, if I were as you;  
If I could pray to move, prayers would move me;  
But I am constant as the northern star,  
Of whose true-fix'd and resting quality  
There is no fellow in the firmament (*Caesar*, III, i, 58-62)  
(Italics mine).

Ovid's conceit had Caesar's spirit transformed into a star in *Metamorphoses*, XV.

What is most interesting about Shakespeare's use of the materials traditionally associated with Narcissus in Ovid in *Julius Caesar* is that they in part form an anacronism: Ovid, the collector of the tales which

4. Professor Root, *Classical Mythology in Shakespeare* (Yale, 1903), even passes on the late Renaissance confusion between Diana and Luna, perhaps led on by Falstaff, *1 H IV*, I, ii, 23-28; the fact of the matter is that Shakespeare's school master, Holofernes, is not a reliable scholar, and that Root in following him canonizes the mistake while missing the joke. The relation of Diana and the moon, Selene, Apollo and the sun, Helios, can be solved by recourse to Hesiod with whom Ovid was undoubtedly familiar. In the "Glossary" to Richard Lattimore's *Hesiod* (Ann Arbor, 1959), Apollo and Artemis are the children of Zeus and Leto, while Helios and Selene are the children of Hyperion and Theia; in heaven as it is on earth, different parents different deities. Professor Root's mistake is not uncommon; his attempt to justify it, however, is: a careful reading of the sources he mentions, with due regard to Hesiod as cited above, will show the careful reader where Root's mistake is and help him to avoid it in his own work. Diana and Artemis are not now and have not ever been identifiable with Selene and Luna, except that they be mentioned in the same breath in the manner of night and day.

5. Pp. 1-3; Ovid is mentioned sometimes in passing beyond this early material. A glance at Professor Root's unfortunately inadequate little book will convince the reader that more could have been said on this matter without unduly taxing the reader.

became the *Metamorphoses* was born in 43 B.C., the year after Caesar's
death; but, as both the "thawing" and the "northern star" references are
used to show the vain pomposity of Caesar, and the "mirrors" used in
Cassius's seduction attempt on Brutus become the letters which spur his
fatal reflections, the anacronism may not be any more "ignorant" or
insulting than the "clock" "anacronism" of II, i. The fact of the matter
is that Romans did have "clocks," not the wheeled, geared, and spindled
variety so recent to Shakespeare's day, but water clocks, graduated
candles, and hour glasses of the type still used to time boiling eggs to­
day. That such a clock could mechanically be rigged to strike, or that
a slave might strike for it at the hour as appointed by the clock almost
wholly removes the stigma from this "anacronism," while Shakespeare's use
of Caesar's parallel between himself and an already existing northern
star reveal an irony in one of Ovid's flights of fancy.

Mirrors existed long before Ovid, bronze mirrors which had to be
polished by hand for each use. And Ovid knew the use of mirrors.\(^8\)
Unfortunately he also knew the use of lead, which he advocates as a
powdering for the face,\(^9\) one of the possible sources of Calpurnia's bar­
renness. There is little doubt that Shakespeare had read almost all of
Ovid by the time he wrote *Julius Caesar*, and there is less that he drew
on at least a part of that reading in constructing Brutus's peculiar

\(^7\) Oxford Classical Dictionary, ed. N. G. L. Hammond and H. H.
Scullard (2nd ed; Oxford, 1970); see: "Caesar, Gaius Julius," pp. 189–
190, and "Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso)," pp. 763-765.

\(^8\) See ch. 3, n. 12, above.

\(^9\) "De Medicamine Faciei Liber," p. 6, 73-74.
tragedy. **Julius Caesar** is a Roman tragedy as distinct from either Greek or a Senecan (pseudo-Greek) tragedy. The form of Roman tragedy as well as the spirit of Roman tragedy was poetic rather than dramatic in Augustan times. This choice of form allowed the narrative voice to intrude into and comment on the action, as Ovid does in Narcissus's tale. The choice allows full play to fancyful imagination, saving gods the indignity of mortal costume. Never does the tragic poet in narrative poetry really have to come down to earth; so, the best, Ovid among them, never quite do. Shakespeare, writing for the stage, was faced with an entirely different set of problems from those of the narrative poet, whose problem he was by this time familiar; his stage was firmly planted on earth and it was his job to get it off, to remove more than fifteen hundred years of teaching, and to plant his audience firmly back in pre-Augustan Rome. **Edward III** pointed the way, very indirectly, and by way of bad example.

Shakespeare used the first scene to set the social stage, similar to Elizabethan London, but more highly regimented. Flavius and Marullus are more like medieval beadles than tribunes of Rome. Having driven the curious from the stage, then prepare to "undeck the images," which have been decked out for Caesar's triumphant return from vanquishing Pompey, a Roman citizen and Caesar's old partner with Crassus in the first triumvirate. As the Lupercalia fell upon the fifteenth of February and Caesar was assassinated on the Ides (the fifteenth of March), the conspirators had only a month to form and execute the plan to execute Caesar.

---

10. For the intrusion of Shakespeare's voice see p. 210, below; for the intrusion of Ovid's voice see p. 25, above.
There are two separate kinds of tragedy in *Julius Caesar*. The first, Caesar's, is pure *De Cassebus* with trappings of Greek tragedy added for good measure. Caesar is vain, pompous, and ambitious. He seems almost to be suffering from delusions of grandeur above and beyond those merited by his military exploits and civic position. And, in the very opening scene, there is a suggestion of why he must fall: he comes in triumph over Pompey, a fellow citizen of Rome, thereby debasing the value of Roman citizenship of all her citizens for the purpose of his own personal glory. Marullus and Flavius, the conservative tribunes, seeing the trappings for the triumph, tear down the decorations from Caesar's images. In the next scene Casca reports, "Marullus and Flavius, for pulling scarfs off Caesar's images, are put to silence." There is tyranny in Rome; Caesar is reaching higher and higher against the rights of his fellow citizens. Something must be done: which brings us to the second type, to which Brutus and Cassius fall victim to, this type has many of the features of Narcissus's. Neither Brutus, nor Cassius, nor Narcissus are ambitious in themselves: it is their fear of the ambition of others that drives them to cruelty and Nemesis, and it is their inability to grasp the vanity of their own pretentions that betrays them to Error and Death. What Narcissus apparently fears is that in accepting the love of Echo (her ambition) he will have to give up some part of his self-love, his vanity, to her. Unwilling to make the sacrifice, he scorns her. Nemesis betrays him to both his love and his scorn; whereupon he destroys himself. Unlike Oedipus, he has crossed no incest taboo. Unlike

11. *Caesar*, I, ii, 285-287. This is a bit more pointed than Plutarch's account, where the tribunes merely lose their jobs.
Agamemnon, he has sacrificed no daughters. Unlike Theseus, he has betrayed neither son nor wife to his own ambition. He wears no coronet of Pride, neither has he set himself up as a rival to the gods. What he has done is to scorn the attentions of a nymph and his fellow men, and through Ovid's narrative technique we are made to feel that he has been made to pay an unreasonable price for his perfidy. He pays that price at his own hand, largely because he cannot step aside and see his own vanity; that is, he lacks a sense of humor. Caesar notes this lack in Cassius:

Caesar. He reads much.
He is a great observer, and he looks
Quite through the deeds of men. He loves no plays
As thou dost, Antony; he hears no music.
Seldom he smiles, and smiles in such a sort
As if he mock'd himself, and scorn'd his spirit
That could be mov'd to smile at anything.
Such men as he be never at heart's ease
Whiles they behold a greater than themselves,
And therefore are they very dangerous.
I rather tell thee what is to be fear'd
Than what I fear; for always I am Caesar (Caesar, I, ii, 201-212).

There is then, a real basis for Cassius's fear. Should Caesar for one minute forget that, being Caesar, he cannot be afraid of Cassius, Cassius's life would be in real danger. Cassius, who is shrewd enough to know the precariousness of his position, and perhaps scared enough to do something about it, approaches Brutus, which leads them down the path towards self-destruction à la Narcissus.

After a moment in which Brutus confesses his preoccupation, Cassius begins:

Cass. Well me, good Brutus, can you see your face?
Brutus. No, Cassius; for the eye sees not itself
But by reflection, by some other things.
Cass. 'Tis just;
And it is very much lamented, Brutus,
That you have no such mirrors as will turn
Your hidden worthiness into your eye,
That you might see your shadow (Caesar, I, ii, 51-58).

What Cassius seems to lament is that Brutus has no pool such as Narcissus
had to seduce himself to foolishness in! Brutus, on the other hand, has
set up Cassius's lamentation by an analysis drawing upon the medieval
conceit of Guillaume de Lorris, wherein the lover studies his own eye ad
nauseam before he notices the reflection of the rose tree off its surface:

Down at the botome set sawe I
Two crystal stones set craftely
In think fresshe and fayre well.

For when the sonne, clere in sight,
Cast in that welle his bernes bright
And that the heete discenèd is,
That taketh the cristall stone, ïwis,
Agayne the sonne an hundred hewes
Blewē, yellowe, and reed, that fressh and newe is.¹²

And from that jewel like eye is the rest of the garden visible, but by
and only by the reflective action of the surface of the pool:

Allway me lyked for to dwell,
To sene the christall in the well,
That shewed me ful openly
A thousand thyngs faste by.¹³

Brutus's analysis, then, far from representing a commonplace, represents
and intelligent reading of Guillaume de Lorris's pool-mirror/ eye-jewel/
eye-mirror metaphor centering on Ovid's Narcissus tale from the Metamor-
phoses on Shakespeare's part. Not all readings have been equally intel-
ligent.¹⁴ Cassius continues:

¹². Romaunt and Roman, ed. Sutherland, p. 32.
¹³. Cited p. 46, above.
¹⁴. C. S. Lewis's romanticism prevented him from a simple straightforward reading in The Allegory of Love, see p. 44 above.
I have heard,
Where many of the best respect in Rome—
Except immortal Caesar—speaking of Brutus,
And groaning underneath this age's yoke,
Have wish'd that noble Brutus had his eyes (Caesar, I, ii, 58-62).15

Clearly, what Cassius has been proposing is that Brutus should study the thoughts of rebellion in himself. The terms that he uses, however, are chosen by Shakespeare to be those of flattery and seduction, an observation mirrored in Brutus's reply. But Cassius's attempt at temptation is deeper than that. We are reminded of Shakespeare's own analysis of Narcissus in this speech, "Narcissus so himself himself forsook/ And died to kiss his shadow in the brook."16 For it is not to either Cassius's nor History's purposes that requires that he see his shadow (spirit), instead of his face, arisen in the cause of Rome, but Shakespeare's mutual characterization of Brutus and the seductive Cassius. Brutus defends himself immediately:

Into what dangers would you lead me, Cassius,
That you would have me seek into myself
For that which is not in me?

Cass. Therefore, good Brutus, be prepared to hear;
And since you know you cannot see yourself
So well as by reflection, I, your glass,
Will modestly discover to yourself
That of yourself which you yet know not of (Caesar, I, ii, 63-70).

Brutus's defense must be quite quiet, for Cassius proceeds as though he

15. Can Shakespeare possibly been thinking back to what he had already dramatized in Richard II and Two Gentlemen of Verona and to Guillaume de Lorris' Roman de la Rose to compose this scene?

16. It is of course by other means that Cassius gets Brutus to forsake himself so drastically as in this citation of Venus and Adonis, 161-162. Cassius letters replace the "brook" as the reflecting medium.
had not heard it. His speech follows directly out of his preceding speech without the slightest reaction to Brutus's remark. Brutus then is quite aware that Cassius may require something of him for which he is not prepared.

Cassius, unaware of his friend's reservations, or deliberately unmindful of them, continues, protesting himself not a common flatterer. He is interrupted by a shout and a flourish, and Brutus, who has apparently been musing all the while Cassius ran on, is the first to breach the subject:

What means this shouting? I do fear the people Choose Caesar for their king.

Cass. Ay, do you fear it?

Brutus. I would not, Cassius; yet I love him well. But wherefore do you hold me here so long? What is it that you would impart to me? If it be aught toward the general good, Set honour in the one eye and death i' th' other, And I will look on both indifferently; For let the gods so speed me as I love The name of honour more than I fear death (Caesar, I, ii, 79-89).

Brutus's defense of himself "Into what dangers, etc." seems unfair in that he is the one who appears to start speaking of death for the general good. In that much, Cassius really does appear to have provided the mirror for Brutus's soul, allowing Cassius in turn to express his rebellious animadversions. It would be pure folly for Cassius to do so to one of Caesar's chief lieutenants if he did not hold the same distaste for Caesar's rise somewhere within himself that Cassius does so visibly. In this manner Cassius really does act as mirror to Brutus's inner soul, bringing out his interior adversion to Caesar's vain quest for more power.
The exposure of vanity is the proper subject for satire and comedy, according to one theory: but, here, in *Julius Caesar*, the exposure of vanity by Cassius's exposition, Casca's observations, and Brutus's cogitations, serve no comic purpose, but rather to point out the tragic vanity of the conspirators in thinking that they would replace Caesar's power with a power vacuum, for the "general good," and not have the ambitious try to fill it immediately. So, while Caesar's vanity is pointed out by the conspirators and dramatized on stage, particularly in the scenes with Decius Brutus, the effect of the satire is chilling rather than funny; and, because humor is lacking in the conspirators themselves, as opposed to the comedy of the opening scene which is sadly overpowered by Flavius and Marullus's *gravitas*, we sense the irony rather than the comedy implicit in Caesar's vasclilations, and the tragic irony of the choice of Brutus to lead the conspiracy against Caesar's ambition.

What Shakespeare appears to be trying to point out is that the Roman virtue of *gravitas* in some instances was responsible for some of the greatest of Roman tragedies and the destruction of some of her most noble citizens. Had Brutus possessed a modicum of *levitas*, he would have realized that Caesar was old and likely to die, that force would beget force, and that he was prey to his own pretensions and absurdities to the same degree that Caesar was. And so reasoning, he might have left Caesar to his pretensions with a bemused air and the certain knowledge that such pretensions would not last long. But together with Brutus's lack of a sense of humor went the concomitant lack of insight to allow him to see the absurdities of his own pretensions, and the vanity of his own intellectual reasoning; for if the gods speed Brutus as he loves, it is his
own intellect that he loves above and beyond his love of Caesar, and it
is to that intellect that he sells out his love of Caesar and Caesar's
blind love of him. How fitting it is that the fate of the conspirators
should be doomed by Brutus's errors of judgment made in the name of higher
principles; for, however honorable we may feel that Brutus is by his own
code of conduct, the idealistic nature of that code is sadly at odds with
the political realities of Rome. Brutus's intellectuality serves to iso-
late him much in the way that Narcissus's dura superbia isolated him.
And not long after his presumptuous murder of Caesar, like Narcissus, he
falls prey to Nemesis, until, pursued by Caesar's ghost, he falls by
his own hand at Philippi. The essential feature, though, is the iso-
lation, a product of his intellect; for it is this feature that permits
Cassius to work on him, and it is this feature at the same time, that
prevents him from gaining that minimal amount of objectivity obtainable
by consulting divergent opinions. Error, then, in Julius Caesar, is an
inherent characteristic in the human intellect; the point and promise of
the play is to expose human error in the manner of the self-destruction
of the chief antagonists of the play, Brutus and Cassius.

The opening of the second act finds Brutus isolated in his orchard
mulling over Caesar's fate, and it is clear from the outset that Brutus
has already decided that Caesar must die, "It must be by his death," he
begins, ending with the statement of what he has already decided:

17. This feature is from North's Plutarch; it is not Shake-
speare's invention. See: Plutarch, Selected Lives from the Lives of
the Noble Greeks and Romans, ed. Paul Turner (Carbondale, 1963), II, 45.
And therefore, think him as a serpent's egg,
Which, hatch'd, would as his kind grow mischievous,
And kill him in the shell (Caesar, II, i, 32-34).

Meanwhile, Lucius, who has been sent to light a taper, returns with a letter discovered by a window.18 The letter is Cassius's doing and no surprise to Shakespeare's audience, Cassius having warned them of his intention shortly after having sounded out Brutus for their benefit:

I will this night,
In several hands, in at his windows throw,
As if they came from several citizens,
Writings, all tending to the great opinion
That Rome holds of his name; wherein obscurely
Caesar's ambition shall be glanced at.
And, after this, let Caesar seat him sure;
For we will shake him, or worse days endure (Caesar, I, ii, 314-321).

As it is night, and the taper has been left in the study, Brutus explains to his audience how he is able to read the letter: "The exhalations, whizzing in the air,/ Give as much light that I may read by them" Caesar II, i, 44-45.19 Albeit that this is somewhat prepared for by Cicero and Casca's meeting and Casca's report:

A common slave--you know him well by sight--
Held up his left hand, which did flame and burn
Like twenty torches join'd; and yet his hand,
No sensible to flame, remain'd unscorch'd

..... and there were drawn

Upon a heap a hundred ghastly women,
Transformed with their fear, who swore they saw
Men, all in fire, walk up and down the streets (Caesar, I, iii, 15-25).

18. This is a departure from Plutarch, who has the letters thrust on statues, particularly that of the elder Brutus who drove the Tarquin out of Rome, Plutarch, II, p. 167. It is doubtful that Brutus's house would have had exterior windows and certainly no shutters would be open at night.

19. Plutarch is also responsible for this unnatural imagery.
Brutus's assertion that he reads by the effect of the lightning would seem a little farfetched. And even though one might be tempted to bring up the theme of unnaturalness in this play to justify this odd bit of staging, it must have seemed a little bit forced in London on a Wednesday afternoon on a thrust stage lit by the familiar sun. Why should Shakespeare go to such trouble to explain? Why, moreover, must Brutus read the letter on stage at all? Would it not be sufficient for him to report the contents of such a letter, or the receipt of such letters in his ruminations? To Shakespeare, it would not. Brutus, like Julia and Richard, must be confronted with the image of their state of being and their rivalry in the same single symbolic object, the cogent stage property. The letter, brings out both Brutus's vanity in his ancestry and his new found sense of purpose:

My ancestors did from the streets of Rome
The Tarquin drive, when he was call'd a king.
"Speak, strike, redress!" Am I entreated
To speak and strike? O Rome, I make thee promise,
If the redress will follow, thou receivest
Thy full petition at the hand of Brutus! (Caesar, II, i, 53-58).

The immense irony in the promise is that, in payment for the butchery of Caesar, Brutus is driven to mete out redress to himself with his own hand at Philippi. One doubts that a statement such as his could escape the notice of the lady of errors, Nemesis.

Here, then, Brutus finds the image of his own ambition, to be hailed as his forebear (if the earlier Brutus actually was his forebear) by posterity for expelling the new, would be Tarquin from the city. Unfortunately, for Rome, Brutus has sadly mistaken the nature of Rome's trouble: Caesar is a native son, not a foreign oppressor; and,
while his rule has become oppressive, particularly for such as Marullus and Flavius, most Romans are hardly aware of the new state of affairs, far less, worried about it. The letter, then, has performed the same function for Brutus that the portrait performed for Julia: it exposes for Shakespeare's audience the inner workings of the minds of Shakespeare's lonely characters by the reflections over an externally introduced stage property carrying an image of their personal vanity, Julia's in her "neglected" physical beauty, Brutus's in his ancestral hero. The device is not a true soliloquy in either case because both presuppose a separate character, a portrait artist in Julia's case, the Machiavellian Cassius in Brutus's, has prepared the image over which they reflect; on the other hand, both are alone on stage when they discover their vanities for their audiences, both have been driven to their isolation by their own apprehensions; but, in the latter case, the operation of Nemesis is yet to come, while in the former, the isolation and the confrontation with perfidy and perjury are the payment by Nemesis for Julia's curiosity and disguise. An illusion (the portrait) becomes the reward of an illusion (the pageboy disguise); where in Julius Caesar self-destruction becomes the reward for murder (the unnatural destruction of others).

While Brutus follows the introspective pattern which has its roots in Guillaume de Lorris, Caesar shows the characteristics and the imagery that we should expect of an old Narcissus. Caesar is Superbia. His habit of referring to himself in the third person in the Commentaries is carried over into his stage character. This mannerism, beyond its simple pretension, adds an air of supercilious pomposity to Caesar's general inflation in the face of his physical limitations, deafness, and epilepsy.
Caesar's foolishness is pointed out again and again during his short span on stage. His vacillations before Decius Brutus and Calpurnia are particularly ironic when viewed in light of his claims to steadfastness.

If Brutus's judgment appears blinded by Cassius's letters and his own introspective intellect, he is not half so blind as Caesar who ignores all the many warnings, both natural and supernatural, of his impending downfall. There is something fantastic about the basic egotism that motivates him, something inhuman about the strength of his will which will admit no pity for Publius Cimber in his banishment (the same quality in Augustus Caesar later forced Ovid to end his days in banishment). But the most amazing of his blindesses is that toward Brutus, Portia, Brutus's wife, was Cato's daughter, and Cato more than Brutus was a symbol of resistance to Caesar to following generations of Romans. Moreover, though Shakespeare does not mention it in particular, Brutus had taken Pompey's part against Caesar in Spain. Caesar, having conquered Brutus, befriended him. This deed, while showing Caesar's softer side, put Brutus in an odd position: he had become a showpiece of Caesar's magnanimity, probably quite as Caesar intended, and therefore Caesar's man and Caesar's inferior. And, while it may be a bit much to say that Brutus is suffering from an inferiority complex, it is clear that he had adequate background in violent opposition to Caesar for Caesar to have taken notice of him as a possible source of danger. Caesar, however, if he is aware of the danger, chooses to ignore it.

If Caesar's ghost haunts Brutus before Philippi, Pompey's shade sees fate's vengeance on Caesar; but not before Caesar has insulted Metellus Cimber, Brutus, Cinna, Decius Brutus, and Olympus in proving
that the most constant of Caesar's attributes is his egotism. His first reproof, to Metallus Cimber, echoes but does not duplicate Shakespeare's earlier adaptations of Narcissus:

Caesar. I must prevent thee, Cimber.
These couchings and these lowly courtesies
Might fire the blood of ordinary men,
And turn pre-ordinance and first decree
Into the law of children. Be not fond
To think that Caesar bears such rebel blood
That will be thaw'd from the true quality
With that which melteth fools I mean, sweet words,
Low-crooked curtsies, and base spaniel fawning.
Thy brother by decree is banished;
If thou dost bend, and pray, and fawn for him,
I spurn thee like a cur out of my way.
Know, Caesar doth not wrong; nor without cause
Will he be satisfied (Caesar, III, i, 35-48).

Caesar claims that his blood is ice. In a few minutes, the audience sees the conspirators dip their handkerchiefs in Caesar's wet blood, the icy blood melted. But, while Caesar claims that his "blood" cannot be "thawed," he does not mean so literally. Cold blood, sang-froid in French, is a quality of adamancy and imperturbability. Something done in cold blood is done unemotionally, exactly the opposite of something done in a sanguinary mood. Caesar, then, is saying that no amount of emotionalism will dissuade him from his previous determination to exile Publius Cimber. But he goes further: he says that he cannot be dissuaded "With that which melteth fools." What he means by this appears to be made to forget his earlier resolve by simple flattery, "sweet words."

20. This is a clear citation of the Narcissus myth. The irony is that it is Narcissus's own sweet words which make him need the purgation of forgetfulness through his own scorn, whence the melting; cf. Caesar's self-praise.

21. Here is the eventual source of Hobday's "sweets." We find that when they are later discandied and melted on someone else, a shift
This claim, however, is absurd to Shakespeare's audience who have watched Decius Brutus flatter and cajole Caesar into making his appearance at the Capitol. Caesar's claim, then, is that he is immutable, incapable of transformation, incapable of metamorphosis. A moment later, with Brutus and Cassius kneeling at his feet in plea, he claims:

> If I could pray to move, prayers would move me;  
> But I am constant as the northern star  
> Of whose true-fix'd and resting quality  
> There is no fellow in the firmament (Caesar, III, i, 59-62).

But this is in contradiction to Ovid. In the *Metamorphoses*, Caesar's murder is reported, with derision for the murderers as would befit a poet writing for Augustus, and with a metamorphosis: Caesar, born aloft by Venus, is transformed into a star.¹² Shakespeare's little joke is that when he was changed into a star it was not Polaris, the unchanging star to which he compares himself here, but into some star whose position changed with the rotation of the firmament; so that rather being un-changing it is Caesar's fate to be always changing.

Finally, with all the conspirators kneeling about him, with Casca at his back, Caesar attempts to repel them with, "Hence! Wilt thou lift up Olympus?" (Caesar, III, i, 74). The last conspirator falls into place, Decius Brutus, the flatterer:

> Dec. Great Caesar!  
> Caesar. Doth not Brutus bootless kneel?

of allegiance has taken place and like Richard's dog, ch. 4, p. 38 above, they are merely possessed of the quality of fickleness, and that the "discandying" is noticeable only to one in the habit of receiving flattery as his due.

Casca. Speak, hands, for me!
They stab Caesar, Casca strikes the first.
Brutus the last blow.
Caesar. Et tu, Brute?—Then fall, Caesar! [Dies] (Caesar, III, i, 75-77).

If the story ended there, the structure could be called Greek but the story continues. Brutus, almost single-handedly, snatches defeat out of the jaws of victory. His earlier reservations, his refusal to muzzle Anthony, his quarrelsomeness with Cassius in which he displays much of the high-handedness we associate with Caesar, and his lack of control of his own troops during the battle at Philippi, strangely to be wondered at in Caesar's favorite lieutenant, all contribute to his eventual overthrow.

But Shakespeare's story does not end with Caesar's death: it ends with the death of Marcus Brutus, whose death in Shakespeare's play hinges on the death of Cassius, and Cassius's death hinges on an error. The main elements of the story are to be found in North's Plutarch, including the story of the visit of Caesar's ghost. Titinius's Apostrophe of Error, however, is Shakespeare's invention; Plutarch is far more terse.

In the main, then, Shakespeare follows the two stories in North's Plutarch. His additions are few and to the point; primarily they encompass materials he had already used in relation to vanity from both the medieval narcissistic mirror and from Ovid himself for the exposure of Caesar's "immutability." The addition of the "north star" conceit, likewise, appears to play on the Ovidian transformation of Caesar's spirit into a star; but, the Apostrophe of Error does not seem to have a classical antecedent. It may be that Shakespeare got the idea for this

short, highly charged, emotional speech from some medieval source but that does not seem likely because the use to which Shakespeare puts the word appears to be new to the language with this play.

In order to understand what Shakespeare is doing here, we must ask ourselves who Nemesis is and what she does. Nemesis (Fortuna to the Romans) was the goddess who governed human aspiration. Her machinations were many and varied. Under the Latin name Fortuna and the derivative name Fortune, she was a favorite of medieval poets as a vision of the way of the world. As such she became hackneyed and lost much of her sting. Her Greek name however was not so well known, nor the name of the principal place of her worship, Rhamnus. However, her reputation as the goddess who exacted the vengeance of the gods from the presumptuous, a goddess of retribution, does not come quite square with the way Ovid used her in the tale of Narcissus. Nemesis, like the poet, hardly seems involved in Narcissus's plight; and, if Ovid had said nothing, we would have only the slightest reason for expecting her presence and her manipulation of Narcissus. Her presence, however, is a cornerstone of Ovid's tale. It is she who betrays Narcissus. But the question remains: what does she betray him to?

It is simple to answer that she betrays him to himself but that avoids the issue. What Nemesis betrays Narcissus to is that kind of mocking pride that he had visited upon others, Echo most visibly. Her only visible method for accomplishing this end is Error. Narcissus truly believes that the image (shadow) he sees in the water is someone else, a real, corporeal body. It is his fateful error to love that image and to discover its mockery. His full tragic awakening proves too much for him.
He breaks down and becomes an object of pity, even to Echo whom he had scorned. His error, then, if to fall in love with an image which has no substance, but only his own semblance. As such, the image in the pool is equivalent to Silvia's portrait in Two Gentlemen of Verona, which Proteus loves and which proves his undoing. Nemesis, then, achieves her end by betraying men to Error, who forces them to destroy themselves by the two edged sword of their own presumptions. Cassius, quickly given to fear Caesar's threatening power, credits in his fear that Titinius has fallen to his foes, when he has actually landed among friends to be garlanded and fearing his friend taken, Cassius commits suicide. Here is an irony; for Caesar was not to be crowned, merely garlanded, at the feast of the Lupercal. Yet, because Cassius feared that Caesar wished to be crowned king, and presumed to judge his accomplishments, that is what the "colossus" speech is about (Caesar, I, ii, 135-161); he is made to fall victim to the errors of his own judgment at Philippi. Titinius's understanding of what has happened apostrophizes error, "O hateful error," but in actuality he is talking about Nemesis, the goddess of divine justice. He sees her in his despair as Error hateful and malicious to men, and so despairing joins his friend, wearing on his head the crown of victory.

Unlike Anthony, Cassius is not allowed to know the full folly of his suicide. Brutus, on the other hand, has a great deal of time to contemplate the death of his friend, the loss of his army, his own incompetence in leadership, and the defeat of his purpose in Caesar's assassination. Finally seated upon his rock, Brutus's stoicism shows itself in his final resolve. He has been brought to this end by his
dependence on Cassius from the onset. Without Cassius, his doubts, his fears, and his reservations concerning Caesar's growing power would probably never have found expression. But Cassius, as he suggested has acted as Brutus's mirror, showing forth that which Brutus wished to see: himself, as his distant forebear, the agent of expulsion of Tyranny from Roman Government. But as Richard before him in Shakespeare's tragedies, Brutus has overestimated his personal magnetism and underestimated that of his adversary. As Richard underestimated the elder Percy, so Brutus has misread the indexes of Anthony's political ability and oratory, trusting his own to suffice in bringing the conspiracy to a successful conclusion.

Brutus, Cassius, and Richard, like Narcissus, are betrayed to their fates by external circumstances, Richard by contrary winds and Brutus by Cassius's error. Cassius's error, although received from Plutarch, is fairly clearly a literary device in the same manner that the action of Nemesis at the pool is a literary rather than a theological device used to justify the outcome of Narcissus's superbia; and, even though in Julius Caesar that error proves fatal for both the seducer and the seduced, the bearer of the image and the mirror that shows it forth, it is in essence the same error that plagued Narcissus and his reflection in the pool, and the same error that plagued Richard and his ideal image of the ideal of kingship; all these tragic characters have lacked or flaunted the practices of humility in their dealings with their fellow man. They have assumed too much, and they have taken enigma and death for their pay.
Shakespeare's dependence on and concern with Narcissus is far less evident in \textit{Antony and Cleopatra}. He does mention Narcissus by name again: "Hadst thou Narcissus in thy face, to me/ Thou wouldst appear most ugly" (\textit{Antony}, II, v, 96–97), and both Antony and Cleopatra speak of melting,\textsuperscript{24} Antony at the beginning of the action and Cleopatra at his death, but the mirror imagery is entirely lacking. What is important, however, to our understanding of the imagery is that Shakespeare has not forgotten Narcissus and therefore cannot be demonstrated to be unconscious in his use of various images in the Hobday clusters at the time of the composition of this play.

\textbf{An Analogue in Fletcher}

Not long after \textit{Antony and Cleopatra} appeared on stage (ca. 1605), two young playwrights, Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, put \textit{Philaster} on stage at the Globe, Shakespeare's playhouse. In it, they placed this scene:

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Phara.} & Many fair mornings, lady. \\
\textbf{Megra.} & As many mornings bring as many days, \\
& Fair, sweet and hopeful to your grace! \\
\textbf{Phara.} & [Aside] She gives good words yet; Sure this \\
& wench is free. - \\
& If your more serious business do not call you, \\
& Let me hold quarter with you; we'll talk an hour out \\
& quickly. \\
\textbf{Megra.} & What would your grace talk of? \\
\textbf{Phara.} & Of some such pretty subject as yourself \\
& I'll go no further than your eye or lip; \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Antony}, I, i, 33: Antony, "Let Rome in Tiber melt," and II, vi, 77, "Melt Egypt into Nile!" The first apparently means, "Forget Rome," while, the second apparently means, "If Egypt's queen could forget this pain!"
There's theme enough for one man for an age.25  

**Megra.** Sir, the stand right, and my lips are yet even, 
Smoothe, young enough, ripe enough, and red enough,  
Or my glass wrongs me.

**Phara.** O, they are two twinned cherries dyed in blushes, 
With those fair suns above their bright beams 
Reflect and ripen. Sweetest beauty, 
Bow down those branches, that the longing taste 
Of the faint looker-on may meet those blessings  
and taste and live. [They kiss.]

**Megra.** [Aside.] O, delicate, sweet prince!  
She that hath snow enough about her heart  
To take the wanton spring of ten such lines off, 
May be a nun without probation.26

It may help the reader to know that Pharamond is a rake of the old school and that Megra is a young courtier of no great virtue. What we are witness to in this scene is the opening gambits of a seduction. The moves on either part are couched in flattery and the outcome is a promise to meet in Pharamond's bed. What is truly remarkable is the deal of "flattery imagery" from Hobday's clusters peppered throughout the scene. Not only the "glass" and the "eyes" but also the "suns" and the "snow." Now the question we must ask ourselves is whether we are to suppose on the basis of this imagery that the scene was necessarily composed by Shakespeare. One would hope that the absurdity of that proposition would be immediately obvious to everyone; however, on evidence equally as scanty, for eight years Hobday's argument has stood without one serious

25. One cannot help but wonder if these lines did not prompt Andrew Marvel's opening conceits in "To his Coy Mistress," the suggestion being that Pharamond is being far too niggardly in his praise.

challenge so far as the writer has been able to discover. 27 Moreover, at least one serious scholar has given Hobday's article credit in bibliography. 28 What is to be done?

**The Two Noble Kinsmen**

John Fletcher was probably the greatest collaborator of all time. With Francis Beaumont, he explored the area of tragicomedy and gave the form its first true definition. With William Shakespeare, he collaborated on *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 29 undoubtedly Shakespeare's last work. The story of the play comes directly from Chaucer, who followed Boccaccio loosely. 30 The story is that of the rival friends who fall out over the love of a woman. One died and the other, victorious, found little to celebrate in the death of his friend. It is an old story, encountered by everybody who has read Chaucer. It is also the second play in the double thrust of Hobday's article.

If we accept Hobday's enumeration of the images in I, i, *Two Noble Kinsmen*, we might be tempted to credit his case as indisputable so far as the Shakespearean authorship of that scene goes very much in the way we might be tempted to accept K. Wentersdorf's article "The

---

27. I am discounting Richard Harriër's article, p. 1 above, because I believe that it fails to meet the question head on.


29. The writer follows the majority in this and in the inclusion of *Pericles* in the canon, even though other hands are definitely at work in both.

Authenticity of *The Taming of the Shrew,*¹³¹ were it not for Moody E. Prior's article, "Imagery as a Test of Authorship."¹³² Unfortunately, Hobday's article is not quite complete in its enumeration of the images. "Glass," for instance, is used in the sense of "model," "dear glass of ladies" is a flattering apostrophe of Hippolyta, while an oddly Fletch-erian note creeps in at line 177,

First Queen, O when
Her twinning cherries shall their sweetness fall
Upon thy tasteful lips, what will thou think
Of rotten kings or blubbered queens, what care
For what thou feel'st not, what thou feel'st being able
To make Mars spurn his drum? Oh, if thou couch
But one might with her, every hour in't will
Take hostage of thee for a hundred, and
Thou shalt remember nothing more than what
That banquet bids thee to."³³

There can be no finer gloss of Pharamond's lines in *Philaster,*³⁴ no closer play of words. What is going on here?

Either we must assume that Fletcher has inserted materials into a scene that is indisputable Shakespeare's elsewhere, or we must assume that Shakespeare is twitting Fletcher for the borrowing of his narcissistic apparatus for us in *Philaster.* If the former is the case, then serious consideration must be given to the theory that the separate authors chose separate parts in the composition of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* in order to


34. Cf. "O, they are two twinned cherries dyed in blushes/. . . . / And taste and live," p. above, remarking the characters portrayed in Fletcher's scene.
preserve unity of character. If the second, it is possible that Fletcher included a counter-twit in his scene:

**Emilia.** This garden has a world of pleasures; in't. What flow'r is this?

**Woman.** 'Tis called Narcissus, madam.

**Emilia.** That was a fair boy certain, but a fool To love himself: were there not maids enough? 35

Indeed! was not Echo maid enough? This sort of vignette is the sort of thing we expect from Fletcher. This is no libidinous young Juliet about to tear Echo's cave with repetition of Romeo's name; 36 rather it is a well brought up young lady conversing in a very mannered fashion with her lady companion. Her naiveté is pointed out by her ignorance of the full myth of Narcissus, who the author of the piece apparently expected his audience to be familiar with. Its importance is that it appears in a passage usually ascribed to Fletcher. 37 Here, then, is the prime example of the most important of Armstrong's conditions under which an argument on authorship based on "image clusters" might fail. Fletcher and Shakespeare are obviously well aware of a common source, Ovid's tale of Narcissus, which colors their imagery as effectively the common source in Chaucer determines their plot. Yet, our interpretation of the Narcissus citation in II, i, is absolutely dependent on the interpretation of the "twinning cherries" of I, i. Are we watching Shakespeare and Fletcher twit each or are we merely watching Fletcher being Fletcher?

35. **Two Noble Kinsmen**, II, i, 177-180. Clifford Leech's note to these lines is in error: Narcissus did not drown, rather he starved or died of thirst in his catatonic seizures.

36. See p. 19 above.

37. See Leech's "Introduction" to The Two Noble Kinsmen, p. xxiv.
Perhaps it is bad form to end a study with only a further question mark, but the writer is definitely puzzled by the situation in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and sees no easy solution to the problem of who wrote what in that play that does not rely upon *a posteriori* reasoning. Were these two great Elizabethan playwrights joking with each other, or is there some other significance to the appearance of the "twinning cherries" and Narcissus in the last of Shakespeare's plays?

**Harmony and the Divided Self**

The Tamburlaines of this world are rare beings indeed; the majority of humanity experiences some doubt, some difficulty in projecting their future actions. If there is one thing that unites Shakespeare's lonely characters it is their desire to forget the problems that they are faced with in the manner that Narcissus forgot. This desire twice finds expression in their desire to melt. Richard’s is totally unsuccessful, and he is therefore driven to the mirror in order to distract Northumberland from his list of crimes. Hamlet’s is almost successful. Faced with an insurmountable problem he expresses his desire, while aware of its impossibility:

*Ham.*

O, that this too too solid flesh would melt,  
Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew!  
Or that the Everlasting had not fix’d  

Hamlet's desire to forget, by suicide if necessary, is obviously derivative of Shakespeare's readings in Ovid.38 It is a more complete adaptation of Narcissus than either Richard or Caesar use, and it makes perfect sense

38. We note that Hamlet's reading of Ovid corrects Golding's where "dew" thaws. See p. 27, above.
when we consider that Hamlet has been away studying just prior to his return to Elsinore. His choice of the Narcissus myth, then, is perfectly in character for a student in love with the fantasy world of Ovid. It is not in that world, however, that he has to live. And though he scorns Ophelia as effectively as Narcissus scorned Echo, we are never led to feel that he is essentially as afflicted with Superbia as Narcissus is. Hamlet's *carpe mundi* attitude, however, is quickly abridged by the appearance of the ghost of his murdered father. With that fantastic audience, his purpose is absolutely divided: On the one hand, he craves the quiet of death; on the other, he knows that death will not be quiet if he does not attempt to avenge his father. The ghost will not let him sleep. Caught in his peculiar dilemma; not knowing whether the ghost is a true apparition or a demon sent to tempt his soul to wrongful revenge, Hamlet seizes upon a troop of wandering players to act his story for him. In his instructions to them, Shakespeare gives us a glance of his divided vision of his character:

> Ham. For anything so o'erdone is from the purpose of playing, whose end, both at the first and now, was and is to hold as 'twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure (Ham., III, ii, 20-27). (Italics mine.)

"The mirror up to nature," is a good deal more to Shakespeare than it is to his character; for Shakespeare had already put Richard II on stage with his mirror, which did not show the viewer Nature in the Newtonian sense but "human nature" in the pre-Freudian sense. As Richard entirely neglected his own "natural history" as crowned cormorant in his mirror, there is little reason to suspect that Hamlet's "mirror" the theatre,
would be any more likely a purveyor of the truth than Richard's. What
Hamlet's theatre does reflect is Hamlet's doubts as to the legitimacy of
his uncle's accession upon the "natural death" of his father. Thus it is
that Hamlet's choice of a medium to resolve his doubts in, to heal the
division of his perception in, is itself a highly suspect purveyor of the
"truth." So that, while Hamlet may believe with all his heart that the
purpose of playing is "to hold . . . the mirror up to nature," Shakespeare,
by the very formation of Hamlet's first soliloquy, "O, that this too too
solid flesh would melt, etc.," suggests that the problem is far more com-
plicated than that, the image that the theatre casts before the viewer's
eyes is of a highly ambivalent nature, that its truths and falsities are
like the facets of that crystal stone that the earlier Guillaume had seen
within the "well" so long before, that images, after all, are only images
formed to fashion by the intelligence of man to do his bidding in works
of art, like portraiture and poetry, and that as such they are derived as
much from study as from pure invention. And even in this most harmonious
statement of the purpose of and art of the theatre, Shakespeare intro-
duces that most discordant note, "scorn her own image." For, if Hamlet
thinks of scorn as feminine, even though it is he who scorns Ophelia,
Shakespeare did not. For what Shakespeare has done in young Hamlet, as
much as either Oedipus or Orestes, is to add a good dash of Narcissus to
his mixture, complete with the blindness which plagued both Guillaume and
Ovid's young men. For, despite Hamlet's enthusiasms, Shakespeare was
perfectly well aware that mirrors are valued only so long as they show
the beholder what he wants to see, and that those which fail in this
basic task are discarded without thought, hesitation, or regret.

Epilogue

As a matter of further study, the melting of Narcissus in
Ovid's tale appears to be due to Ovid's reading in Plato's Timeus,\(^39\)
where "melting" is the vehicle of change. Guillaume de Lorris does not
seem to have read or been impressed by Timeus, but Jean de Meun was,
and his portion mentions the Dialogue, presumably from the specimen
preserved at Chartres or a copy therefrom. As "melting" is the
Pythagorean vehicle of change, we must be particularly impressed with
Proteus's melting in Two Gentlemen of Verona, where the melting is
emblematic of the changeable Proteus, whose name is a synonym for
changability. We may remark that Richard II and Hamlet both wish to
change from their dramatic situation into some other form, and that in
general Shakespeare uses his "unusual" desire to melt on the part of
his characters to signify change or metamorphoses. And finally we may
note that Guillaume's mirror perilous is apparently derived in part
from his ignorance of Pythagorean doctrine, as evidenced in his ignoring
of Narcissus's melting. Shakespeare, the synthesist, has taken both
strands, and as master of both, woven them together in Richard II and
elsewhere into the fabric of legend and history to form an astute,
philosophically correct, gloss to his character's actions on stage, and,
rather than unconsciously, consciously framed Richard II in an environ-
ment of poetry drawn from the Middle and Classical ages.

---

APPENDIX

ILLUSTRATIONS FROM
EARLY EDITIONS OF
ROMAN DE LA ROSE
Figure 1. The Lover Looking at Himself in the Well of Narcissus from the 1481 Lyon Edition of *Le Roman de La Rose*, by Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun.
Figure 2. The Lover Looking at Himself in the Well of Narcissus from the 1529 Paris Edition of *Le Roman de la Rose*, by Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun.
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