

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TROUBLESOME REIGN OF JOHN
KING OF ENGLAND AND SHAKESPEARE'S KING JOHN

by

Suzanne Tumblin Gary

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 1

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my direction by Suzanne Tumblin Gary entitled The Relationship Between The Troublesome Reign of John King of England and Shakespeare's King John be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Richard Hosley
Dissertation Director

6/21/71
Date

After inspection of the final copy of the dissertation, the following members of the Final Examination Committee concur in its approval and recommend its acceptance:*

Richard Hosley
Richard Piper
William L. ...
John ...
Harry F. Robbins

6/21/71
21 June '71
6/21/71
6/21/71
6/21/71

*This approval and acceptance is contingent on the candidate's adequate performance and defense of this dissertation at the final oral examination. The inclusion of this sheet bound into the library copy of the dissertation is evidence of satisfactory performance at the final examination.

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Suzanne Tumblin Gary

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I express my sincere appreciation to Professor Richard Hosley, who has willingly given time, encouragement, and indispensable criticism during all phases of the research and writing of this dissertation. I also wish to thank the members of my committee--Professors Sigmund Eisner, George Holland, Peter Medine, and Harry Robins. Their suggestions were most helpful in preparing the final copy. I am grateful to members of the Henry E. Huntington Library staff for permitting me to use their facilities. And I wish to record a debt to my son, whose sacrifices for this project were greater than he is yet aware.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER	
1. THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
A Review of Opinions About Priority	5
Classification of "Indebted" Texts	13
2. GENERAL TEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS	29
<u>The Troublesome Reign</u>	29
<u>King John</u>	35
3. A COMPARISON OF THE TWO TEXTS (1): NON-VERBAL FEATURES	44
The Two-Part Structure of <u>The Troublesome Reign</u>	45
Non-Parallel Actions in <u>The Troublesome Reign</u>	49
Dramaturgy	69
4. A COMPARISON OF THE TWO TEXTS (2): VERBAL FEATURES	80
Fused Borrowings	83
Non-Rhetorical Repetitions	101
5. THE SHAKESPEARIAN CHARACTERISTICS OF <u>KING JOHN</u>	115
Shakespeare's Borrowing of Plots	116
Character Types in <u>King John</u>	121
Shakespeare's Use of Historical Materials	134
6. CONCLUSION	141

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
APPENDIX A. PARALLEL PLOT SUMMARIES OF <u>KING JOHN AND THE TROUBLESOME REIGN</u>	144
APPENDIX B. EXACT AND NEARLY EXACT VERBAL PARALLELS BETWEEN <u>THE TROUBLESOME REIGN AND KING JOHN</u>	155
LIST OF WORKS CITED	158

ABSTRACT

In 1954, E. A. J. Honigmann presented a case for the priority of Shakespeare's King John to The Troublesome Reign of John King of England. Since that time only William H. Matchett (1966) has supported the theory. In this dissertation I have attempted to demonstrate the acceptability of this theory of the relationship between the two texts by showing that some previous objections to the priority of King John are unfounded.

An objection to the theory is that The Troublesome Reign, since clearly not a memorial reconstruction of King John, cannot be indebted to that play. To counter this objection, I give evidence for a hitherto unrecognized class of Elizabethan dramatic texts: the plot-based adaptation--i.e., an adaptation based on a "plot outline" of the original (possibly based on shorthand notes taken during a performance of the play). I then argue that The Troublesome Reign has characteristics which suggest that it is based on a plot outline of King John, the anonymous author expanding Shakespeare's play, substituting his own language for Shakespeare's language, and giving emphasis to the anti-Catholic potential of the material.

General bibliographical and textual considerations are treated in Chapter 2.

The "indebted nature" of The Troublesome Reign is demonstrated in Chapters 3 and 4, where I show that the non-parallel actions of The Troublesome Reign may be interpreted as expansions of references in King John rather than as actions which Shakespeare excised from his version of the play. In addition, I show that the dramaturgical techniques and the verbal features of The Troublesome Reign resemble standard characteristics of memorial reconstructions. Although The Troublesome Reign is clearly not a memorial reconstruction of King John, a comparison of the language of the two texts shows that the anonymous author is memorially indebted to Shakespeare's play.

Finally, I argue that Shakespeare never borrowed from sources so many elements of construction as he would have to be said to have done if The Troublesome Reign were indeed the source of King John. Moreover, it is unlikely that another dramatist could have anticipated Shakespeare's customary treatment of historical sources by writing a play which already included several of Shakespeare's favorite character types and which employed Shakespeare's characteristic technique of compression and elaboration of historical data.

CHAPTER 1

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Arguments regarding the relationship between the anonymous The Troublesome Reign of John King of England and Shakespeare's The Life and Death of King John have reached an apparent impasse. Scholars have used numerous textual parallels to support alternative theories about the priority of the one play or the other, but most such parallels testify only ambiguously to the direction of indebtedness. Hence, for nearly every argument a counter-argument has been posed, and nearly every parallel has been as well explained by one theory of priority as by the other.

A disproportionate amount of the critical attention which King John has received focuses upon the priority question. Such emphasis reflects an understandable reluctance of scholars to credit Shakespeare with more than his due since he is usually believed to have adopted much of the thematic design for King John from The Troublesome Reign. On the other hand, scholars have been reluctant to discuss the relationship of King John to Shakespeare's other work because they must acknowledge that if King John is

actually prior to The Troublesome Reign it has been post-dated by a good five years in the accepted chronology.¹

There are at the outset two compelling reasons for attempting to clarify the relationship between these two plays. A valid critical assessment of Shakespeare's work in King John depends upon knowing whether the basic structural design of the play is actually his or one which he adapted with little alteration from a source-play. And the accepted chronology of the Shakespeare canon may require revision if this play is indeed an early work rather than a product of the so-called "middle period" as has often been claimed.² Despite the plethora of chapters and articles dealing with the priority question, there has never been a monograph on the subject, and none of the shorter treatments of it has offered a full analysis of the relationship between the plays. What has been lacking in these discussions of the

1. As J. Dover Wilson says, "every year between 1591 and 1598 has been favoured by one critic or another": King John, New Cambridge edition (1936), p. li. Wilson cites Furness' table of suggested dates, King John, Variorum edition (1919), pp. 443-4. The date 1596 was proposed by Malone, however, and has been accepted by E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems (1930), 1:270, 366; by W. W. Greg, The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History (1955), pp. 248-55; and by Alfred Harbage, Annals of English Drama, rev. S. Schoenbaum (1964), p. 62.

2. Although Peter Alexander, in Shakespeare's Life and Art (1939), pp. 85-6, treated the play as a product of the "first period," the usual practice is to assign the play to the "middle period" of Shakespeare's career. Alexander, it should be noted, believed that King John is prior to The Troublesome Reign.

relationship between King John and The Troublesome Reign is a full exposition of similarities and dissimilarities between the texts in respect of language, plot, characterization, and theme. The resolution of the priority question, however, requires such an exposition. Therefore, a new study of the two plays should both furnish an answer to the priority question and clarify the relationship between the plays by bringing to light for the first time all relevant details of that relationship.

In this study three approaches have been adduced to the question of priority: bibliographical analysis, textual comparison, and literary analysis. The bibliographical analysis is largely descriptive, serving to eliminate irrelevant bibliographical issues from consideration. However, some useful inferences may be drawn from this analysis concerning the relationship between the two plays.

The textual analysis which I have undertaken strongly suggests the priority of King John to The Troublesome Reign; however, I have been receptive at all points in the discussion to the possible reversibility of the evidence. If I have not succeeded, by reason of that possible reversibility, in establishing the priority of King John beyond any possible doubt, I have at least given cause to question the opposed view. Scholars have sometimes argued that because The Troublesome Reign is clearly not a memorial reconstruction, it cannot be an "indebted" text. But I have

demonstrated the existence of another class of "indebted" texts to which The Troublesome Reign may well belong.

The literary argument of this study is directed primarily toward the question of what kinds of elements Shakespeare is likely to have borrowed from a single source. Virgil K. Whitaker, on the assumption of the priority of The Troublesome Reign, has said that the existence of these two related plays offers a unique opportunity to study Shakespeare's method of treating a single source. He suggests that by studying what Shakespeare uses and what he ignores in this presumed source we may learn "what importance he [Shakespeare] attached to the study of historical sources--that is, [we may learn the extent of] his interest in history as well as his knowledge of it."³ The difficulty in generalizing from the study of these two plays in the manner that Whitaker suggests is that Shakespeare seems to have used this presumed source differently from the way in which he seems to have used every other known source. Shakespeare did not normally incorporate in his plays so much of the structural design of a single source as he would have to be understood as having done if The Troublesome Reign were indeed a principal source of King John.

Furthermore, there are features of theme, construction, characterization, and historical concern in both plays

3. Shakespeare's Use of Learning: An Inquiry into the Growth of his Mind and Art (1953), p. 123.

which appear to be uniquely "Shakespearian" and which, therefore, seem more likely to have originated with Shakespeare than with the anonymous author. Although King John treats different historical material than do Shakespeare's other history plays, this play does nevertheless treat the same themes as do the other plays and does also follow a method of exposition similar to that which Shakespeare used in other history plays. Unless we assume that Shakespeare learned all of the basic craft of history-play writing from The Troublesome Reign, we may assume, since Shakespeare's history plays have unique characteristics shared by King John, that he and not the anonymous author developed the thematic design of King John.

A Review of Opinions About Priority

Before 1936 two views of the relationship between The Troublesome Reign and King John had been held in succession: (1) that Shakespeare wrote The Troublesome Reign, as the title-pages of Q2 (1611) and Q3 (1622) declare; and (2) that Shakespeare used The Troublesome Reign as his principal source for King John. Either view presupposed the priority of The Troublesome Reign, an understandable assumption in view of the sparse external evidence for dating the plays.

Whereas The Troublesome Reign was published in 1591 with the note that it had been "sundry times publickely acted by the Queenes Maiesties Players," Shakespeare's King

John did not, so far as we know, appear in print until the publication of the Shakespeare First Folio in 1623. There are no references to the performance of either play, and there are no entries for either play in the Stationers' Register. Francis Meres' reference of 1598 to King John as one of Shakespeare's "tragedies" permits us to fix the later limit of composition of that play. The earlier limit, 1588, is indicated by universally accepted allusions in the play to the destruction of the Spanish Armada. An example occurs at 3.2.1-3:

So by a roaring Tempest on the flood,
A whole Armado of conuicted saile
Is scattered and dis-ioin'd from fellowship.

The date for King John, usually agreed to be about 1596, is assigned on the basis of alleged topical allusions and stylistic comparisons to the style of other of Shakespeare's plays.

Several eighteenth-century scholars accepted the attribution to Shakespeare on the title-pages of the 1611 and 1622 quartos of The Troublesome Reign. This play, therefore, was believed to have been an early draft of King John. Pope (1723) thought that Rowley had collaborated with Shakespeare on the play;⁴ Johnson (1765) questioned Rowley's

4. The Works of Shakespear (1723), 3:115: "The troublesom reign of K. John was written in two parts by W. Shakespeare and W. Rowley, and printed 1611. But the present Play is entirely different, and infinitely superior to it."

connection with the play but not Shakespeare's.⁵ Edward Capell (1767) suggested both the "early draft" theory and an alternative to it. The suggestion was made as part of an attempt to explain the origin of four of the quartos published during Shakespeare's lifetime:

Some others, that came out in the same period, bear indeed the titles of--"Henry V, King John [i.e., The Troublesome Reign], Merry Wives of Windsor [i.e., Sir John Falstaff], and Taming of the Shrew [i.e., A Shrew]," but are no other than either first draughts, or mutilated and perhaps surreptitious impressions of those plays, but whether of the two is not easy to determine: "King John" is certainly a first draught, and in two parts; and so much another play, that only one line of it is retain'd in the second: there is also a first draught of the "Second and third parts of Henry VI," publish'd in his life-time under the following title,--"The Whole Contention between the two famous Houses, Lancaster and Yorke:" and to these plays, six in number, may be added--the first impression of "Romeo and Juliet," being a play of the same stamp.⁶

Capell did not pursue his suggestion that these quartos are "mutilations" of Shakespeare's originals, nor did he consider the suggestion applicable to King John. Nevertheless, he anticipated twentieth-century textual scholarship, for in this century the quarto Henry V and Sir John Falstaff, the

5. The Plays of William Shakespeare (1765), 3:403, n. 1. Following a quotation of Pope's note, Johnson says, "the edition of 1611 has no mention of Rowley, nor in the account of Rowley's works is any mention made of his conjunction with Shakespeare in any play. King John was reprinted in two parts in 1622. The first edition that I have found of this play in its present form, is that of 1623 in fol. The edition of 1591 I have not seen."

6. Mr. William Shakespeare: His Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies (1767), 1:2-3.

two parts of The Contention, and the first quarto of Romeo and Juliet have been proved to be "mutilations" or memorial reconstructions of Shakespeare's originals,⁷ and a strong case has been made for the indebtedness of The Taming of a Shrew to Shakespeare's The Taming of the Shrew.⁸

The "early draft" theory of the relationship of The Troublesome Reign to King John, which Capell preferred, did not survive the eighteenth century. Edmond Malone, by 1790, formulated the basis for the second theory of relationship between these plays--that is, that Shakespeare used The Troublesome Reign as his principal source for King John. Malone proposed Greene or Peele as a candidate for the authorship of The Troublesome Reign, and he suggested the date 1596 for King John.⁹ The majority of subsequent

7. Principal works in which these texts have been established as memorial reconstructions are as follows: Hereward T. Price, The Text of Henry V (1920); W. W. Greg, ed., The Merry Wives of Windsor (1910); Peter Alexander, Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III (1929); and Harry R. Hoppe, The Bad Quarto of Romeo and Juliet: A Bibliographical and Textual Study (1948).

8. Notably by Peter Alexander, TLS, 16 September 1926, p. 614; J. Dover Wilson, ed., The Taming of the Shrew, New Cambridge edition (1928), pp. 104 ff.; E. A. J. Honigmann, "Shakespeare's 'Lost Source Plays'," MLR 49 (1959):302-4; Richard Hosley, "Sources and Analogues of The Taming of the Shrew," HLQ 27 (1963-4):289-308.

9. The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare (1790), 4:445, n. 1: "A play entitled The troublesome raigne of John King of England, in two parts, was printed in 1591, without the writer's name. It was written, I believe, either by Robert Greene, or George Peele; and certainly preceded this of our author. . . . Our author's King John was written, I imagine, in 1596."

critics have regarded Shakespeare as the adapter of The Troublesome Reign, arguing that King John is a scene-by-scene revision of the older play and that Shakespeare probably neither needed nor used any other source.¹⁰

This second view--here regarded as "the traditional view"--was unchallenged for nearly a century and a half. In 1936, A. S. Cairncross, in The Problem of Hamlet, offered the first substantial opposition to the view, arguing that The Troublesome Reign was actually a "loose piracy" of King John. Pointing to the scattered echoes in the anonymous play not only of Shakespeare's plays but of plays by other dramatists, he concluded:

It is difficult to imagine Shakespeare, Peele, and the author of Alphonsus each coming to draw distinct phrases from any single play, especially of the calibre of The Troublesome Raigne. (p. 142)

Cairncross also discussed four details of word-choice in which it could be seen that King John was closer to Holinshed than was The Troublesome Reign. He acknowledged a debt for his method to Peter Alexander, who, he believed, had exposed a comparable "piracy" in his article on The Taming of the Shrew and The Taming of a Shrew (above, p. 8 n. 8).

However, Cairncross's evidence for the priority of King John

10. E. K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, 1:367; Robert Adger Law, "On the Date of King John," SP 54 (1957): 119-27, and "King John and King Leir," Texas Studies in Literature and Language 1 (1960):473-6; C. A. Greer, "Shakespeare a Researcher?" N & Q, 200 (1955):479-80; and Whitaker, Shakespeare's Use of Learning, pp. 123-42.

was largely ignored, apparently for three reasons: (1) the evidence, since presented in a book on Hamlet, seems to have gone unnoticed by King John scholars; (2) the evidence was produced as part of an elaborate and for the most part untenable argument for a drastic reconstruction of the chronology of the Shakespeare canon, involving the ante-dating of Hamlet and King Lear by nearly ten years; and (3) J. Dover Wilson, in the same year, presented an extended and forceful argument for the traditional view of the relationship between the King John plays.

Wilson, similarly prompted by Alexander's precedent and convinced by his evidence for the priority of The Shrew, admitted that, because many much-argued assumptions about priority had been overturned, no such assumption could be taken for granted. He set out to prove beyond doubt, however, that the alternative theory could not be held in the case of the King John plays; and, in the opinion of most subsequent writers on the subject, he succeeded. Wilson produced more verbal parallels between the texts than had previously been observed, several of which he cited in support of his argument that Shakespeare was the borrower. In addition, Wilson found in The Troublesome Reign several examples of actions which are more intelligibly motivated than are corresponding actions in King John.

Despite Wilson's arguments against the priority of King John, contrary opinions occasionally were given. In

1939 Peter Alexander indicated a suspicion that the traditional view was inaccurate (Shakespeare's Life and Art, p. 85); then, in 1951, he seemed to accept without question the priority of King John, for he included The Troublesome Reign in a table of quarto editions of Shakespeare's plays.¹¹ The first detailed argument for the priority of King John did not appear until 1954, when E. A. J. Honigmann discussed the question in his introduction to the New Arden King John. Honigmann supported his position by a comparison of the two texts and by a demonstration of sources which Shakespeare can be shown to have consulted in writing his play--this demonstration being a major contribution of Honigmann's study. Proof that Shakespeare consulted chronicle sources in writing King John does not, of course, prove that he did not also use The Troublesome Reign; however, the demonstration does answer the arguments that Shakespeare did not use any other source and that he could never have written a play about King John without The Troublesome Reign (Wilson, p. xxxix). On the basis of verbal similarity between King John and chronicle sources, Honigmann showed that Shakespeare used not only Holinshed, Foxe, and Matthew of Paris,

11. A Shakespeare Primer (1951), pp. 164-5. Alexander's description of the textual relationship is implied in the following passage: "King John had never been entered in the Register as anyone's property, and the pirated edition was merely replaced by a good text" (pp. 155-6).

but also possibly the manuscript Wakefield Chronicle and the Coggeshall Chronicle.

In 1966 additional support for Honigmann's position came from William H. Matchett, who, in the Signet edition of King John, gave further textual evidence for that position and pointed out two more instances in which Shakespeare referred directly to Holinshed. These arguments notwithstanding, the theory that King John was written earlier than The Troublesome Reign has received little support.

Honigmann's arguments encountered three specific objections. The first objection was that if he were correct, his theory would require an adjustment in the chronology of the Shakespeare canon, involving a rearrangement of the accepted order of the early plays to include King John. It is questionable, however, whether there is indeed anything so sacrosanct about an orthodox chronology that it can be used as an objection to a new theory when the weight of evidence suggests that the chronology rather than the theory is wrong. For this reason I shall confine the present argument to the evidence and let the orthodox chronology stand or fall as it may.

The second objection was to Honigmann's demonstration that Shakespeare had consulted at least four sources other than The Troublesome Reign and that he would not have needed to use the anonymous play at all. At least one

reviewer was favorably impressed by this evidence.¹² T. M. Parrott, however, thought that four chronicle sources were far too many for Shakespeare to have consulted in writing a single play, and he showed that in at least one instance Honigmann's search for sources had been overzealous.¹³

The third objection, and the greatest impediment to accepting Honigmann's view or any part of his argument, was posed by certain prejudicial assumptions about the nature of indebted texts.

This problem is so fundamental that the present study must begin with a reassessment of those assumptions to determine whether a new view of the textual relationship may be accepted.

Classification of "Indebted" Texts

The theory that The Troublesome Reign is posterior to King John challenges many received opinions about the nature of relationships between texts because The Troublesome Reign does not seem to be readily classifiable with

12. Franklin B. Williams, SQ 6 (1955):339-40. Nevertheless, he concludes: "Mr. Honigmann has failed to shake Professor Wilson's case, yet he has raised points that need to be answered. Further study is in order. In short, one has an uneasy feeling that the evidence has not all been collected."

13. JEGP 55 (1956):297-305. Parrott pointed out that Shakespeare's unusual spelling, Swinsted (for Swinshed Abbey) is also to be found in The Troublesome Reign and therefore cannot be used, as Honigmann tried to do, to prove that Shakespeare had read Foxe's Acts and Monuments, where the spelling also occurs.

either of the two acknowledged categories of play-texts which are indebted to or derived from other texts.¹⁴ The two kinds of indebted texts are full-text-based adaptations (or literary adaptations) and memorial reconstructions (or bad quartos). The full-text-based adaptation is a result of using the full text of a source as the basis for an independent literary creation. Such an adaptation involves no intention to reproduce the source; instead, it constitutes an attempt to use the materials of the source--especially the general outline of the plot--as a major element in a new work. The author adapts the original actions, characterization, and theme according to his own intention. Shakespeare's Measure for Measure, for example, can be said to be a full-text-based adaptation of Promos and Cassandra, just as The Comedy of Errors is a full-text-based adaptation of Plautus' Menaechmi. And, in the traditional view, King John is a full-text-based adaptation of The Troublesome Reign. Use of the term full-text-based adaptation¹⁵ implies two conditions: that the adapting author had a full text of the original in hand as he wrote his play and that though he adapted the original he did not intend to reproduce it

14. I am using the term indebted rather than the term derived to describe a text which relies in any degree upon another for content.

15. This admittedly clumsy term has been chosen for reasons that will be made clear below.

exactly. His work, therefore, is to be regarded not as a version of the original but as an independent work.

A memorial reconstruction, on the other hand, differs in both conditions from a full-text-based adaptation. A memorial reconstruction does not seem to have been based upon a full-text transcription of the original, and it does appear to involve the intention of reproducing the original, line-for-line and scene-for-scene. The resulting text, therefore, may be regarded as a version of the original text. In the absence of a copy of the original text, the compilers of the reconstruction, presumably actors who had performed in the play it represents, collaborated in recalling their own parts as well as the parts of the other players. The result of this procedure is an uneven text because the quality of imitation in a scene often seems to depend upon how well one or another of the collaborators knew the scene.

The probable reason for the compilation of memorial reconstructions is that actors who were out of work in London or whose companies were floundering sought to make money by performing in the provinces plays which had been popular in the city. Subsequently, they sold texts of these plays to publishers. There is, then, a clear-cut dishonesty in this practice in that actors with demonstrably slight literary skill set out to profit by reconstructing the

apparently well-known plays of Greene, Peele, Marlowe, Shakespeare, and Heywood.

One of the major objections to the posteriority of The Troublesome Reign is that it does not, at first glance, seem to resemble a memorial reconstruction. And, to be sure, The Troublesome Reign does not stand in the same relation to King John as do the six clearly acknowledged Shakespearian bad quartos to their corresponding originals--The First Part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of York and Lancaster (2 Henry VI), The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York (3 Henry VI), Romeo and Juliet, Henry V, Sir John Falstaff (The Merry Wives of Windsor), and Hamlet.¹⁶ Indeed, the very features which mark these six texts as bad quartos or memorial reconstructions establish concrete differences between them and The Troublesome Reign: they are shorter, not longer, than their parallel texts; they contain, in general, duplicate speeches of the good text, except for occasional abridgments and frequent errors owing to mishearing, misplacement, or omission of words, phrases, and speeches of the original; and, in general, they follow the action of the good text, scene-by-scene, usually

16. The principal work in which the first quarto of Hamlet was established as a memorial reconstruction is G. I. Duthie, The "Bad" Quarto of Hamlet: A Critical Study (1941). For principal works in which the other five texts have been established as memorial reconstructions see above, n. 7.

deteriorating in the last third of the play without introducing significant additions to the original.

Measured against these features of memorial reconstructions, The Troublesome Reign fails the classification on all three counts: The Troublesome Reign is longer than King John (by 375 lines); it contains few exact verbal parallels to King John, echoing with precision only about two dozen lines and half-lines; and, although its episode-sequence is nearly identical to that in King John, there are in The Troublesome Reign eight additional scenes not found in King John. Another difficulty with the view that The Troublesome Reign is a memorial reconstruction of King John is the additional historical and quasi-historical information found in The Troublesome Reign, suggestive of independent consultation of sources by the unknown author.¹⁷ The Troublesome Reign, therefore, may not be considered a memorial reconstruction even though it may be indebted to King John.

Because most of the arguments against the posteriority of the anonymous play center upon the fact that it is

17. Independent chronicle sources for passages in The Troublesome Reign seem indisputable as a result of John Elson's "Studies in the King John Plays," in Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies, ed. James G. McManaway et al. (1948), pp. 183-97. Although Elson's attempt to show Bale as a source was not convincing (since all elements which appear to have been taken from Bale can also be found in Foxe), he leaves little doubt of the unknown author's consultation of Holinshed, Foxe, and Matthew of Paris.

not a memorial reconstruction, very little attention has been given the alternative possibility that it may be a full-text-based adaptation of King John. Robert Law, alone, seems to have considered and rejected such an alternative when he argued that if the author had been reading Shakespeare's superior speeches, he would not have substituted his own inferior ones for them ("King John and King Leir," pp. 121-2). In any case, the unlikelihood of the unknown author's having had a text of Shakespeare's unpublished play from which to work argues substantially against considering The Troublesome Reign as a full-text-based adaptation of Shakespeare's play.

The posteriority of The Troublesome Reign to King John would mean that The Troublesome Reign is both more heavily indebted to King John than full-text-based adaptations tend to be indebted to their sources and less heavily indebted to King John than memorial reconstructions tend to be indebted to their corresponding originals. Nevertheless The Troublesome Reign has characteristics of both classes of indebted texts. Four features of The Troublesome Reign suggest that it is a full-text-based adaptation of King John: (1) The Troublesome Reign includes a fuller characterization of Peter of Pomfret than does King John; (2) it introduces five other characters not found in King John; (3) the introduction of these characters strengthens the anti-papal theme which is explicit in The Troublesome Reign,

but which is relatively unimportant in King John; and (4) the play shows, as I have said, independent consultation of chronicle sources. It contains features, in other words, which we might expect to find in a full-text-based adaptation of King John.

On the other hand, there are three features that suggest that The Troublesome Reign is a memorial reconstruction of King John: (1) The Troublesome Reign contains dramatizations of events which are merely alluded to or reported in the original; (2) it contains passages which appear to be "mosaics" of parallel passages in King John; and (3) despite the paucity of the kind of verbal imitation we normally find in memorial reconstructions, nearly all of the speeches in The Troublesome Reign follow the logical run of the parallel speeches in King John. Indeed, the most startling feature of the textual comparison is that, although the import of dialogue is very nearly the same in each play, the verbal echoes are relatively few.

This seemingly paradoxical characteristic was described by William H. Matchett; and he regarded it as a perplexing obstacle to considering The Troublesome Reign as a memorial reconstruction of King John:

And yet, if the author of TR was remembering performances of KJ--if, however he may have misunderstood it, he is reproducing the action as well as he is--how is it possible that he remembered so few of its words, and those few so flat, so peripheral? Why are there no traces of the metaphors or of the forceful lines which

strike us as the most obviously Shakespearean element in KJ? The absence of all trace of Shakespeare's characteristic language is surely the strongest of arguments against TR's having been based upon KJ. To counter it, one is forced to invent a man with no ear for poetry, no memory for lines, who has at the same time a surprisingly good memory for the scene-by-scene progress of the plot. It is possible to conceive such a man, working perhaps some weeks later from a plot outline made immediately after a performance, but he is an unlikely combination, and it is on the basis of this difficulty that one must say that the source question remains open. (Signet KJ, p. 156)

Matchett's tentative suggestion that the unknown author worked from a plot outline of King John offers a third alternative which may permit us to regard The Troublesome Reign as indebted to King John, without regarding it as either a memorial reconstruction or a full-text-based adaptation. The Troublesome Reign contains characteristics which we might expect to find if the play were a "plot-based" adaptation of King John--that is, an adaptation based on a "plot" or plot outline of King John rather than on a full text of King John. It can be demonstrated that the possibility of the unknown author's working from a plot outline in the manner Matchett suggested is much more likely than he supposed. In order to define this third class of indebted text--the plot-based adaptation--we must understand more fully the special senses of the Elizabethan word, plot.

Perhaps the best known passage in which the word is used (but in which its use is generally ignored) is Heywood's accusation that stenographers had stolen his If

You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part 1:

Some by stenography drew
The plot; put it in print: (scarce one word
trew:) . . .¹⁸

Textual scholars have tended to consider stenography to be the crucial word in these lines, and on the basis of information about Elizabethan stenographic shorthand systems they have determined that no such system was adequate to account for the relative completeness of the bad quartos. On that ground Madeleine Doran, G. I. Duthie, and Alfred Hart concluded that Heywood either did not know or was not accurately describing the method used to steal the text of his play.¹⁹ What has generally been unrecognized, however, is that Heywood did not accuse stenographers of stealing either the text or language of his play--for if they had done so the language would presumably have been truer to the original--but only "the plot."²⁰

18. Dialogues and Dramas (1637); see W. W. Greg, The Library, 4th series, 17 (1936-7):173.

19. Doran, ed., If you Know not Me, You Know Nobody, Part 1 (1934-5), p. xvi; Duthie, The "Bad" Quarto of Hamlet, pp. 12-26; Hart, Stolne and Surreptitious Copies: A Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos (1942), pp. 328-29.

20. I. A. Shapiro discusses the meaning of Heywood's use of plot, concluding that Heywood meant a scenario-like outline from which a bad-quarto text could have been written. Shapiro does not, however, see this method of play theft as an alternative to memorial reconstruction; instead, he sees it as a better explanation of the origin of bad quartos: "The expansion and rewriting of a 'stenographic' scenario would explain more convincingly than the theory of memorial reconstruction certain characteristics of 'bad quartos'" ("Stenography' and 'Bad Quartos'," TLS, 13 May 1960, p. 305).

This distinction assumes significance when we realize that plot had specialized meanings in the sixteenth century. There were actually two special senses in which the word was used: there were both theatre plots and authors' plots. The theatre plots are described by Greg in Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouse (1931; Ch. 1). From the seven extant examples, theatre plots are known to have been plot summaries showing entrances, exits, necessary properties, and backstage noises, and they seem to have been posted prominently backstage to help cue performers. Because the evidence for authorial plots is less clear, Greg seems unwilling to acknowledge them as part of normal authorial planning. Nonetheless, there seem to have been authors' scenarios for plays which they would later write or which they would turn over to the company, which would, in turn, commission someone else to write the text on the basis of the submitted plot. The existence of such scenarios or "plots" is verified by at least two entries in Henslowe's Diary.

The relevant entries, which Greg cites, run as follows:

"Lent vnto Bengemen Iohnson the 3 of desemb³ 1597 vpon a boocke w^{ch} he showed the plotte vnto the company w^{ch} he promysed to dd[i.e., add] vnto the company at cryssmas next the some of--xx^s," and "Lent vnto Robart shawe & Iewbey the 23 of octob³ 1598 to lend vnto m^r Chapmane one his playe boocke & ij ectes of a tragedie of benge- mens plotte the some of--iiij^{ll}." (Documents, p. 1, n. 2)

From the first entry we may determine that a playwright could be paid for a "plot" of a play which he intended to write, and from the second, that a playwright could and did sometimes write a play from another playwright's "plot." Of these entries Greg says:

In these cases we must suppose that the plot meant a written sketch of the play. It is possible that the drawing up of such plots, as a recognized branch of the playwright's profession, may be implied in Nashe's claim of Green "subscribing to me in any thing but plotting Plaies, wherein he was his crafts master" (ed. McKerrow, iii. 132), and in Meres's well-known description of Munday as "our best plotter," though it is unlikely that anything more is meant than that their plays were well-constructed. (Documents, p. 1, n. 2)

Despite Greg's disclaimer, there exists an example of a plot which seems to have been used as a scenario-like sketch of The Faithful Friends (Beaumont and Fletcher, ca. 1630), and he in fact cited it:

The Plott of a Scene of mirth
to conclude this fourth Acte.

Enter S^r Pergamus the foolish knight like a Bride-groome leading Flauia his Bride, Bellario the singing Soldier, Black Snout the Smith, Snipp Snapp the Tayler and Cauleskin [sic] the shomaker. An Altar to be sett forth with the Image of Mars·Dindinus [sic] the Dwarfe bearing S^r Per: Launce and Sheild w^{ch} are hung vp for trophees·and S^r Perg·Vowes for the loue of Flauia neuer to beare Armes agen, the like does Bla: snout who hangs vp his Sword and takes his hammer vowing to God Vulcan neuer to Vse other Weapon, The Taylor and the Shoomaker to vowe the like to God Mercury. Then Bellario [to] Sings a songe how they will fall to there old Trades, a clapp of Thunder and all run of/ finis 4 Act. (Dyce MS. 10, p. 69; Documents, p. 2, n. 1)

This "plot" outlines the essential matter of a full scene, giving detailed descriptions of actors' entrances, descriptions of their actions, and summaries of their lines, including some of the allusions which might be used in them. On the basis of such an outline, the author of the play or a second author could easily write a complete text of the scene.

A plot outline such as that for The Faithful Friends might conceivably have been used in the normal process of writing a play, especially if the play were to be written by someone other than the person who "plotted" it. Such a plot outline may serve also to explain what Heywood meant when he said that stenographers had drawn his plot from his play. If by "plot" he meant neither a full text of the play (for which no shorthand system known in his time would have been adequate) nor a mere sketch of entrances and exits (for which shorthand stenography would have been unnecessary), but rather a scenario of the sort we have just considered, we may begin to see how such a theft might have occurred during a performance of the play. Working from such notes at some later time, the stenographer himself, or another writer hired for the purpose, could reconstruct a play in which scarcely one word could be expected to be true to Heywood's original although the general drift of the play would be the same.

If Part 1 of If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody were stolen in this manner, as Heywood's accusation indicates it may well have been, the resulting text could be regarded as a plot-based adaptation. In other words, this type of posterior and indebted text apparently meets one condition of the memorial reconstruction in that there is supposed to have been no transcriptional link between this text and the original, the plot outline having been used instead. On the other hand, this type of text apparently meets one condition of the full-text-based adaptation in that there was apparently no intention to duplicate the original. Since we do not have a text of the original with which to compare this particular text, however, the second condition is difficult to assess.

These two conditions can be seen to have been met in The Troublesome Reign if that play is posterior to King John. The innovations of language, the expansions, and the alterations of plot suggest that mere reconstruction of King John cannot have been an objective of the unknown author. On the other hand, the echoes of King John which are retained in The Troublesome Reign suggest that the unknown author, despite the fact that he was not trying to reconstruct the text of Shakespeare's play, nevertheless inadvertently did remember some of those lines. But he could not have been reading from a text of Shakespeare's play. In other words, the seeming paradox of the difference

in language combined with closeness of plot may be accounted for if we assume that The Troublesome Reign is a plot-based adaptation of King John.

At this point it is convenient to consider one of the arguments occasionally raised against the indebtedness of The Troublesome Reign--that its greater length makes it unlike memorial reconstructions. This argument would have force if The Troublesome Reign were to be understood as a memorial reconstruction of King John. However, if we hypothesize that The Troublesome Reign is a plot-based adaptation of King John, the greater length of The Troublesome Reign has no particular significance since an adaptation may just as well amplify as condense the material of its original. Some 2200 lines of The Troublesome Reign correspond approximately to the 2500 lines of King John. The remaining 700 lines of The Troublesome Reign are essentially amplifications--that is, dramatizations of events alluded to in King John.

An analogue to the relationship between The Troublesome Reign and King John may exist in The Taming of a Shrew and Shakespeare's Taming of The Shrew. The peculiarities of A Shrew may be explained if it is assumed to be a plot-based adaptation of The Shrew. Although the case for the posteriority of A Shrew does not yet have universal acceptance, it does have very strong support from textual scholars. Like The Troublesome Reign, however, A Shrew has characteristics

which have made it hitherto unclassifiable either as a memorial reconstruction or as a full-text-based adaptation. Although A Shrew does have frequent errors of evident mislining, such as we might expect in a memorial reconstruction, it also shows some deliberate rewriting from Shakespeare's original. The author of A Shrew simplified the underplot, added one character while excising two others, changed nearly all of the names, including place-names, and interpolated some choice interludes and a "dramatic epilogue" in which Sly appears. The author of A Shrew did not alter the tone of his original though he did partially reproduce a great deal of the dialogue in parallel scenes of The Shrew. Like the analogous The Troublesome Reign, A Shrew shows, in all speeches which correspond to speeches of The Shrew, a consistent echo of the intention of the original. Again, these features may be accounted for if we see A Shrew as a plot-based adaptation of The Shrew--that is, an adaptation based upon a plot outline of the original which included much information about dialogue. In this case great care seems to have been employed to make the structure of the indebted play different from its original.

The creation of a third class of indebted texts fills a need which Honigmann clearly saw but only casually considered. He described A Shrew and The Troublesome Reign as derivative plays, implying a distinction between them and memorial reconstructions, or reported texts:

Faults such as these, common in reported texts, can obviously be expected even in derivative plays such as we suppose A Shrew and the T. R. to be. (Arden KJ, p. lvi)²¹

The term plot-based adaptation has two advantages over the term derivative play: (1) it is more fully descriptive, in that it contains one of the terms upon which the distinction is based; and (2) it is not liable to confusion with Greg's term, derived text, which is now regularly used in textual scholarship to distinguish between "substantive" texts and those texts which are derived from them.²²

Having established a class of indebted texts to which The Troublesome Reign may be said to belong, I shall now turn to the principal task of this study, namely to describe the relationship between The Troublesome Reign and King John in order to determine whether we may legitimately classify The Troublesome Reign as an indebted text.

21. Honigmann uses the term in the same way in "Shakespeare's 'Lost Source Plays'," p. 390.

22. "The Rationale of Copy-Text," SB 3 (1950-1): 19-36.

CHAPTER 2

GENERAL TEXTUAL CONSIDERATIONS

Although complete bibliographical analyses of King John and The Troublesome Reign cannot fully explicate the relationship between the two texts, there are some bibliographical data as well as some general textual observations from which useful inferences may be drawn. This chapter will describe the relevant bibliographical and textual features of each text.

The Troublesome Reign

Because The Troublesome Reign was not entered in the Stationers' Register, there is no external evidence regarding the identity of either the printer or the publisher of the play. However, the title-pages of the 1591 quartos declare that they were "Imprinted at London for Sampson Clarke, and are to be solde at his shop." The printer's ornament on the title-page of Part 1 belonged to Thomas Orwin (McKerrow, No. 273);¹ the ornament on the title-page of Part 2 is not sufficiently distinctive to be traced to

1. The ornament is described as follows: "clasped hands holding two cornucopias and a caduceus with initials TO below and motto encircling--By wisdom peace. By peace plenty; 43x39 mm."

a particular printer.² There is no reason to doubt that Orwin printed both parts of the play and that Sampson Clarke was the publisher.³

The quartos of Parts 1 and 2 of The Troublesome Reign are printed in blackletter with roman stage-directions. Proper names in both stage-directions and the body of the text are set in distinguishing italic, although generic titles are not set in distinguishing type. There is an insignificant variation in the treatment of designations for the Bastard Falconbridge--Bastard is sometimes printed in italic, as if it were a proper name, and sometimes in stage-directions it is printed in roman, as if it were a generic title. Speech-prefixes are in italic and are, as a rule, unabbreviated and unpointed unless abbreviated. The treatment of all accessories is substantially the same in both parts.

W. W. Greg states that the two parts of the 1591 edition of The Troublesome Reign are bibliographically

2. The ornament resembles one used frequently by John Wolfe: a diamond-shaped fleuron working into an arabesque design (Plomer, tail-piece No. 89). The design seems to have been a popular one, however, and versions of it can be found in many Elizabethan books.

3. Both Wilson (New Cambridge KJ, p. xvii) and Honigmann (New Arden KJ, p. lvi) have attempted to infer from the records whether Orwin and Clarke could be regarded as reputable stationers and whether The Troublesome Reign was regularly or surreptitiously printed. The evidence about these stationers seems especially vulnerable to misinterpretation, however, and does not, in any case, illuminate the textual issues.

independent.⁴ By this statement, presumably, he means that they are independently signed--their collations are A-G⁴ and A-E⁴. However, two pieces of evidence suggest that the two parts are in fact a bibliographical unit, printed at substantially the same time and treated in the printing-house as a single book. The title-pages of the two parts provide the first kind of evidence indicating this conclusion. The setting of type for the advertisement and the imprint was the same for both title-pages. This fact has perhaps been obscured by two alterations on the second title page. Because the title of Part 2 was rewritten to emphasize the specific action of that part, and because this second title is longer than the first, the advertisement was moved lower on the type-page. And the ornament used on the first title-page was removed from the standing type and a slightly larger ornament was substituted. The second kind of evidence that the two parts are a bibliographical unit is provided by a running-title analysis. The analysis reveals that the single skeleton which was used to print all of Part 1 (except sheet A) was used to print sheets B and D of Part 2 (with one substitution in the upper right quadrant). Moreover, a single skeleton was used to print sheet A of each part, and the title of the upper right quadrant of that skeleton was also used in the printing of sheets C and E of

4. A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration (1939), 1:178.

Part 2. This evidence suggests that there was no delay in presswork between the printing of Part 1 and Part 2 long enough to require that the type for the running-titles or for the advertisement and imprint be distributed. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that in the Huntington Library copy the same water-mark appears in sheets F and G of Part 1 as in sheet A of Part 2, indicating that paper from one lot was used in both parts of the book. It seems likely, therefore, that the two parts of the play were printed as a single book even though they have separate title-pages and signatures.

There has been no study of the composers of The Troublesome Reign, and the results of my own study are inconclusive. For the most part, the spelling preferences as well as the treatment of accessories throughout both quartos are regular. In Part 2 there are variants of spelling preferences established in Part 1, but these variants do not seem to be distributed according to a significant bibliographical pattern and cannot, without further study, be used to prove that there was a second compositor. In any case, the study of composition does not seem to suggest any irregularity in the printing of The Troublesome Reign which would clarify its relationship to King John.

Similarly, study of the copy for The Troublesome Reign provides little evidence to suggest its indebtedness or independence. There are errors, omissions, and

confusions in the text which seem to indicate foul papers copy--that is, copy in the author's hand, "representing the play more or less as the author intended it to stand, but not itself clear or tidy enough to serve as a prompt-book" (Greg, First Folio, p. 106). Errors in The Troublesome Reign do not occur in sufficient number, however, to justify Honigmann's assertion that the text is generally shoddy (p. lvi).

Evidence that the copy was foul papers rests almost entirely upon characteristics of the stage-directions. The omission of thirteen exit-directions, out of a total of thirty-eight necessary exits, suggests that the text had not been annotated for performance. There are at least three other errors or omissions in stage-directions which would have required correction before the manuscript could have been used as a promptbook. One such error is an apparent double entry for Constance. She is included in the massed entrance-direction at 1:1134, but she does not have any lines in the first part of this scene until after the direction at 1:1149: "Enter Constance alone."⁵ In

5. All quotations from The Troublesome Reign are taken from the Huntington Library copy of Parts 1 and 2, Q1 (1591). For clarity of exposition I have normalized the original type-faces of the text. In this study, all stage-directions will be in italic, all speech-prefixes in full capitals, and all text proper in roman. I have not reproduced the long s. These principles of normalization will also be used for all other Elizabethan texts to which I refer. In no other way, however, have I edited spellings, abbreviations, or punctuation in stage-directions, speech-prefixes, or text proper.

addition, information necessary to performance is twice omitted. There is no stage-direction to indicate whether Hubert or Arthur is to read aloud the text of John's order at 1:1363, and the text proper is ambiguous on the question. And Hubert is not named in the entrance at 2:109, "Enter Iohn with two or three and the Propnet," although he speaks in that scene at line 147; he seems too important a character to be listed as one of the "two or three" auxiliaries of the stage-direction. There are, moreover, five stage-directions which imply lines of dialogue or which are informally descriptive: (1) "Enter Philip leading a Frier, charging him to show where the Abbots golde lay" (1:1181); (2) "Enter the Nobles and crowne King Iohn, and then crie God saue the King" (1:1537); (3) "He [Arthur] leapes, and bruising his bones, after he was from his traunce, speakes thus" (2:11); (4) "All the English Lords Sweare" (2:571); and (5) "The French Lords Sweare" (2:619).

These discursive stage-directions suggest the theory of foul papers as copy for The Troublesome Reign. The speech-prefixes, however, are surprisingly regular, showing variations for only three characters. Falconbridge is "PHILIP" in the first scene and usually "BASTARD" thereafter, but he is "PHILIP" again in two of the three monastery-scenes--1:1181-1288 and 2:799-856. The Duke of Austria is "LYMOGES" in all speech-prefixes despite his being "Austria" or "the Austrich Duke" in all references to

him in the text proper and in one of the four stage-directions containing his name (1:1043 SD). Finally, Pandulph is "CARD." in Part 1 but is "PAND." in most of Part 2.

Although these variations in speech-prefixes are really very few, they are sufficiently confusing to preclude the possibility that the text had been edited or annotated for performance. Certainly there is no other evidence in the text to suggest such annotation and there is nothing in the text which is inconsistent with the theory that the copy behind the quartos of The Troublesome Reign was foul papers.

King John

King John is one of three plays of the Folio--together with Titus Andronicus and A Midsummer Night's Dream--for which there are no earlier records of copyright and over which there appears to have been no conflict of copyright when the Folio publishers were collecting copy for their edition. According to Greg and Hinman, King John was probably treated in matters of copyright as identical to The Troublesome Reign, and the copyright for that play, never formally established, was derelict in 1623.⁶

King John (a-b5^V) and the first part of Richard II (b6-c6^V) were printed consecutively during a delay in the

6. Greg, First Folio, p. 61; Charlton Hinman, The Printing and Proof-Reading of The First Folio of Shakespeare (1963), 1:27.

printing of the comedies--that is, between the printing of quires X and Y. Of the printing of quires a to c, Hinman reports that "in no other part of the book did the course of actual printing run so smooth a course" (2:522). One of the reasons for this steady progress seems to be that these quires were subject only to very casual proofreading. There is only one press-variant in quire a, showing correction of a minor error; yet the obvious misspelling of a3 as Aa3 went unnoticed in the proofreading. Quire b shows no evidence of proof correction whatsoever (Hinman, 2:166-8). The text of King John was set by Compositors B and C, one or the other of whom was responsible for omitting two lines of dialogue from the last page of Richard II (Hinman, 1:267-8). One admittedly minor error in the treatment of an act-heading in King John is traceable to Compositor C--on b3^v Actus Quartus, is given for Actus Quintus.

A seemingly minor compositorial error of this kind may also explain, in part, the most perplexing peculiarity of the text--i.e., the anomalous divisions of the first two acts. The first act, as designated in the Folio, contains two scenes, one consisting of 290 lines, the other of 598 lines.⁷ The second act, as marked in the Folio, consists of

7. "Through line numbering" (TLN for short) is provided by Hinman in The First Folio of Shakespeare: The Norton Facsimile (1968). The count indicated by the TLN includes every line of type; however, TLN has been used in this study to calculate the lengths of acts and scenes in King John. It will not be used in making comparisons of

only a single scene of 75 lines in which Constance laments her fate and then sits upon the ground. When the kings enter at the beginning of the next scene, they seem to be entering to her, in apparently continuous action; nevertheless, the new scene is headed, Actus Tertius, Scaena prima. There are, then, three irregularities in the divisions for the first four scenes designated by the Folio: (1) the second scene (F 1.2) is extraordinarily long, about the same length as each of the last three acts of the play;⁸ (2) the second act as designated by the Folio is extraordinarily short (75 lines); and (3) the action of F Act 2 and F 3.1 seems to be continuous and therefore most inappropriately divided by an act-heading.

Because of these irregularities, all modern editorial treatments of the act- and scene-headings for the first four scenes of King John are based on the premise that the Folio headings are incorrect.⁹ Greg summarizes the generally accepted explanation for the confusion as follows:

length between King John or any part of that play and The Troublesome Reign or any part of that play.

8. The 598 lines of F 1.2 make that scene comparable in length to Act 3 (576 lines), Act 4 (594 lines), or Act 5 (564 lines).

9. Unless otherwise indicated, the act- and scene-numbers used for reference in this study are those of the Globe edition. The Folio designations and their Globe equivalents are as follows: F 1.1=Act 1; F 1.2=Act 2; F Act 2 = 3.1; F 3.1 is treated as a continuation of Globe 3.1.

If this [i.e., that the compositors made an error in the process of correcting an error in copy] is what happened, the anomalous division sprang from a simple blunder, there is no reason to suppose that the division was not introduced with a view to printing, and no reason to suppose that the play underwent any revision at all. (First Folio, p. 250)

This explanation includes two assumptions: (1) that the compositors may have introduced the errors in the heading-numbers; and (2) that the headings are late and possibly erroneous additions to the text, perhaps made at the time the manuscript was being prepared for printing. The assumption of compositorial error is consistent with the evidence cited above of Compositor C's erroneous treatment of the heading for Act 5. Since the suspected error--Scaena Secunda for Actus Secundus--occurs on a2, which was set by Compositor C (Hinman 2:473), it may be that he introduced the error. The second assumption--of late interpolation of headings--may exclude the first assumption. In other words, the error in the heading may have been introduced before the compositor set the copy into type. However, it cannot be determined whether the compositor or an editor introduced the error. A corollary to the assumption that the headings are late interpolations to the text is that the curious divisions in the first two acts need be attributed neither to mutilation of the manuscript by revision nor to loss of part of a scene. There is, indeed, nothing in the text from which an hiatus in the manuscript

may be inferred. Since these divisions do not seem to reflect distinctions in the text proper, we can only conclude that they were interpolated in it, perhaps to prepare the copy for the printer.

The nature of the printer's copy remains in doubt. Whether that copy is regarded as foul papers depends in part upon whether the speech-prefixes are considered to be regular, and there is no agreement on that point. McKerrow regarded this play as one of seven examples of plays in which speakers' names are essentially unvaried and which could therefore be considered to have been printed from fair copy.¹⁰ Greg was undecided about the nature of the copy, but he conceded that McKerrow had been overly hasty in regarding the speech-prefixes as unvaried (First Folio, pp. 252-3).

The problem seems to be that although there is some variation of speech-prefixes, there is not enough for McKerrow, at least, to have considered it significant. In order to conclude from the variation of speech-prefixes that the copy was foul papers, the variations ought to represent obvious sources of confusion for a prompter so that they can be assumed not to have been permitted to stand in the prompt-copy. Moreover, they ought to show the mind of the author at work. In other words, the variations occur,

10. "A Suggestion Regarding Shakespeare's Manuscripts," RES 11 (1935):459-65.

according to McKerrow, in part because the author is thinking of his characters in terms of their salient characteristics in the scene he is writing, not in terms of consistent designations for them.

In King John the five characters' names which show variations in speech-prefixes support the theory that the printer's copy was foul papers. One of these changes in designation has been discussed by other critics--the Citizen of Angiers in Act 2 begins to be consistently designated as "HUBERT" from line 325.¹¹ Such a shift of designation in the scene certainly would represent confusion in the prompt-book. Three of the other variations of speech-prefix occur in positions which suggest why they occurred: Eleanor is designated only by her proper name in Act 1, but in Act 2, where she confronts Constance and her imperiousness is her most salient characteristic, she is "QUEEN," "OLD QU." or "QU. MO."; Philip Falconbridge is "PHILIP" early in the first scene but becomes "BAST." at line 138 where he responds to Eleanor's choice between the Falconbridge lands and the Plantagenet reputation, and he continues to be designated as "BAST." throughout the play; King Philip is "KING," in Act 2 until King John appears, when he becomes

11. Wilson attributes the change to doubling of the parts of the Citizen and Hubert (pp. xlv-vi, 121). Honigmann sees the shift as showing Shakespeare in the act of extending the relationship between John and Hubert to the parley before Angiers (pp. xxxvi-vii). The problem seems insoluble.

"FRA."; the Dauphin is sometimes "LEWIS" but is usually "DOL.", though there is no apparent reason for the variation. Even though the variations of character designation are not so frequent in King John as in more clearly demonstrable foul-papers texts--Romeo and Juliet, The Comedy of Errors, Love's Labour's Lost, or Much Ado About Nothing--they do nonetheless seem to represent sources of confusion which would not have been permitted to stand in the prompt-copy and which therefore lead us to suppose that the printer's copy was foul papers (or a faithful transcript of foul papers).

There is one further inference to be made from the variations of speech-prefixes: that Shakespeare was not using The Troublesome Reign as a principal source for his play. Two considerations suggest this conclusion. In the first place the other plays for which there was foul-papers copy, as verified by speech-prefix variations, are plays in which Shakespeare was compressing several sources. In these cases, he used the sources for various plot and character details; however, as he worked through the play his choice of speech-prefixes was influenced not by those sources but by dominant characteristics of his characters in the scene at hand. The speech-prefix variation in King John would therefore indicate a variety of sources rather than a single source with clear and fairly consistent speech-prefix designations.

The second consideration involves the lack of apparent influence of speech designations in The Troublesome Reign upon King John. Although we have no analogous case of Shakespeare's working from a single source, it would appear that if he were indeed working from a principal source so close to his own developing play, he would have been more strongly influenced by the speech-prefix spellings in the source play. Where the speech-prefixes in King John vary, however, the variation does not seem to have been at all influenced by the presumed source. Eleanor's name in The Troublesome Reign is nearly always spelled Q. Elianor, or Q. Elinor, but the abbreviations for her name in King John show that Shakespeare usually spelled it Eleanor or Elenor and that in only five out of fifteen instances, so far as can be determined from the abbreviations, did he spell it Elinor. Additionally, he never uses the title Queen Eleanor which he would have found everywhere in his presumed source. Falconbridge is "PHILIP" throughout the entire first scene of The Troublesome Reign, and the designation "PHILIP" occurs in two other scenes later in the play. In King John, however, the character becomes "BAST." as soon as he begins to acknowledge his birth (1.1.138) and remains so throughout the play. In The Troublesome Reign the Dauphin of France is unvaryingly designated as "LEWES", whereas in King John he is usually "DOL.", being only three times designated as "LEWIS" or

"LEW.". The argument is less strong than one could wish, because of the absence of an analogous case in which Shakespeare can be said to have worked from a single-play source. Nevertheless, the speech-prefix variation suggests a combination of sources and not, as the critics have generally supposed, a single source.

CHAPTER 3

A COMPARISON OF THE TWO TEXTS (1): NON-VERBAL FEATURES

In order to assess the nature of the relationship between The Troublesome Reign and King John it is necessary to consider the non-verbal as well as the verbal aspects of that relationship. T. M. Parrott, one of Honigmann's reviewers, argued that in order to prove the priority of King John one would have to demonstrate how The Troublesome Reign could have been rewritten from King John.¹ His implication clearly was that such a demonstration could not be made. Parrott's skepticism seems to be symptomatic of the failure of scholars who accept the priority of King John to discuss the non-verbal aspects of the relationship between the two plays. The verbal parallels which scholars have discussed are admittedly useful in explicating the relationship, and such parallels will be considered in Chapter 4. This chapter, however, will examine the relationship between the plays in respect of such non-verbal features as structure, additions and omissions of action, and scene-construction. Analysis of these non-verbal features will show that The Troublesome Reign has some heretofore

1. JEGP 55 (1956):298.

unnoticed characteristics in common with memorial reconstructions.

The Two-Part Structure of The
Troublesome Reign

The question which inevitably arises with respect to the two-part structure of The Troublesome Reign is whether the division is inherent in the play or whether it is a publication device quite unrelated to literary design or circumstances of performance. It must be admitted that, although Clifford Leech attempted to treat The Troublesome Reign as a conventional two-part play, the play does not seem to conform technically to the type as he describes it.² In an authentic two-part play, according to Leech, the first part leads to an illusory but effectively dramatized sense of triumph; the second, to the final tragedy. In other words, in Part 1 Fortune's wheel turns half-way; in Part 2 it completes the circle. In The Troublesome Reign, however, there is no sense of triumph at the end of Part 1 except that which is so pathetically expressed by the badly deluded King John when he learns that his order to blind Arthur has not been carried out. There is an important difference between the audience's perception of John's situation at the end of Part 1 and his own perception of it. The play has made abundantly clear that, although Arthur lives, the

2. "The Two-Part Play: Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare," SJ 94 (1958):90-106.

problems of title to the throne, the threatened rebellion, and the pending invasion by the French are unresolved. These issues will have to be confronted whether Arthur is alive or not, and for that reason all of the supporting English characters except Hubert are demoralized by the end of Part 1. Fortune's wheel does not actually make the second half of its turn in Part 2, then, because it has already made almost the complete circle. Nor is the last arc slowly described, for Part 2 begins with the climactic action of the two parts--Arthur's leap from the castle walls which kills him and thus destroys all chance of restoring the rebel Barons' loyalties to John. The progressively declining movement of the plot through the two parts of the play distinguishes The Troublesome Reign from other two-part plays. We are obliged, therefore, to seek an explanation for the division outside the play.

A clue to an external explanation is provided by the address to the readers of The Troublesome Reign. This address reminds the readers of the pleasure they took in the adventures of Tamburlaine, an infidel and a Scythian, and requests that they regard with like approval the adventures of John, a Christian and an Englishman. The expectations presumably aroused by the comparison with Tamburlaine are not met in the course of the play; still, the publisher seems to have tried to make the analogy good by dividing

The Troublesome Reign into two parts just as Tamburlaine had been divided in the quartos of 1590.³

The question is sometimes raised whether the two-part division of Bale's King Johan (1538; revised and expanded 1558) may have influenced the two-part division of The Troublesome Reign. However, such influence seems unlikely since there is no reason to suppose that such a manuscript play (not printed until 1838) would have come to the attention of the author of The Troublesome Reign.⁴

A final consideration militates against the likelihood that The Troublesome Reign was conceived as a true two-part play--that is, the effectiveness of Part 2 as a second part. Each part of a two-part play would have been intended for performance on a different day, and judging from the records in Henslowe's Diary the parts would not normally have been performed on consecutive days. Viewed at a

3. A coincidence which supports the opinion that the two-part printing of The Troublesome Reign was a commercial gambit is that Thomas Orwin, who printed the play, may also have been the printer of Tamburlaine, Parts 1 and 2, 1590. This identification has recently been made by Robert Ford Welsh, "The Printing of the Early Editions of Marlowe's Plays," Ph. D. dissertation, Duke University (1964); DA 25 (1965):2968-9.

4. Elson's single cited piece of evidence to the effect that the author of The Troublesome Reign used Bale's play is that in both plays there is a comparison of King John with King David (pp. 191-4). However, since that comparison is also made by Matthew of Paris, a readily acknowledged source for The Troublesome Reign, the argument is unconvincing. Elson's evidence and his theory of relationship are discounted by Barry B. Adams, the most recent editor of King Johan (1969), pp. 55-7.

separate performance, Part 2, with only 1,196 lines, would have been disappointingly short, and it would also have been unintelligible to an audience which had not recently seen Part 1. A brief comparison of The Troublesome Reign, Part 2, with Tamburlaine, Part 2, will show why this difficulty might have arisen. The initial action of Part 2 of Tamburlaine occurs after a twenty-year time-lapse since the end of Part 1; therefore Part 2 begins with different plot problems from those of Part 1, and understanding Part 2 depends on no knowledge of Part 1. By contrast, the initial action of Part 2 of The Troublesome Reign follows immediately upon the action of Part 1. Furthermore the disaster with which Part 2 begins makes little sense unless the audience is aware of all that has happened in Part 1. Indeed, virtually all the major elements of the dénouement have been introduced before Part 2 begins. Because of this continuity no one would ever suspect that The Troublesome Reign were a two-part play if it had not been printed as such; whereas if Tamburlaine had not been printed as a two-part play, it would nevertheless inevitably occur to a modern director that it could be divided into two parts for performance. Because the continuity of the two parts of The Troublesome Reign obliges us to treat it as a single play, the two-part printing of the play does not have any significant effect upon our analysis of the relationship between King John and The Troublesome Reign. Moreover, the

conclusion that the two-part printing is extraneous to the play is confirmed by the bibliographical evidence that the two parts were printed at substantially the same time and that they were treated in the printing-house as a single book (above, pp. 30-2).

Non-Parallel Actions in The
Troublesome Reign

Despite an overall similarity in the episode-sequences of The Troublesome Reign and King John,⁵ there are 700 lines in The Troublesome Reign which comprise eight scenes containing nine actions not paralleled in King John. In addition, there are three actions in The Troublesome Reign which do not appear in King John but which are part of scenes that are paralleled by scenes in King John. These additional twelve actions in The Troublesome Reign deserve special analysis because they are sometimes cited as reasons for objecting to a theory of the priority of King John. We are told that it is easier to explain why Shakespeare would have omitted these actions from his own play than to understand why the anonymous author would have added them if the basic episode-sequence were provided by King John (Parrott, p. 298). A simple answer is that the anonymous writer wanted to make his play appreciably different from

5. A parallel plot summary is given in Appendix A.

Shakespeare's play. But there are definite reasons for the additional actions in The Troublesome Reign.

Of the five scenes or actions in Part 1 which are not paralleled in King John, one, the monastery scene, clearly represents either an afterthought or an interpolation. Metrical evidence suggests this conclusion. Most of Part 1 contains a mixture of strong blank verse, halting blank verse, and prose. The monastery scene, however, contains an anomalous display of metrical versatility. Philip speaks in rhymed fourteeners, some of which are printed as ballad lines, and the First Friar speaks in intricate skeltonics which include many four-syllable feminine endings. The Second Friar chimes in with more fourteeners, and the rhymed exchange continues among this Friar, Philip, and the Nun. The rhyming continues for a few lines after Peter of Pomfret enters speaking iambic pentameter couplets, but when he reverts to prose in direct conversation, all of the other characters also begin to speak prose.

The metrical variety which distinguishes this scene from the rest of the play suggests that the scene, so far as literary composition is concerned, is not of a piece with the rest of the play. The conclusion is confirmed by bibliographical evidence: this scene is one of only two full scenes in which the speech-prefixes for Falconbridge are

"PHILIP" as opposed to the normal designation "BASTARD" used elsewhere (above, p. 34).

There are two explanations for the addition of this scene as well as the two less obviously interpolated monastery scenes of Part 2: they were written to reinforce the anti-Catholicism of the play; and they were so constructed as to please a lowbrow audience. Such a motive as the second for adding scenes to reported texts is documented by W. W. Greg's demonstration that not all "corruptions" shorten text. Greg deduced from the evidence of the extant player's "part" for Orlando that comic material was surely interpolated into the demonstrably "bad" text of Orlando Furioso.⁶ Like these interpolations, the three monastery scenes in The Troublesome Reign might have appealed to a taste for either the comic or the macabre: the first scene in the monastery is a traditional exposure of avarice, lust, and cowardice among the clergy; the second monastery scene dramatizes the demonic plotting between the Monk and the Abbott and their tedious attempt to justify murdering the King; the third monastery scene dramatizes John's accepting his fatal toast and his agony under the effect of the poison.

There is still another explanation for the existence of these three actions--an explanation which also applies to six other actions of The Troublesome Reign which are not

6. Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgments: The Battle of Alcazar and Orlando Furioso (1923), p. 134.

paralleled in King John. All nine actions may be said to fulfill an amplifying function--that is, they dramatize episodes which are merely alluded to or reported in King John. The tendency of a memorial reconstruction to dramatize a report or allusion in its original is a rather frequent but seldom discussed phenomenon. In The Contention, for example, the murder of the Duke of Gloucester is dramatized (Q 1594, sig. E2.17 SD) although that murder is only reported in 2 Henry VI (3.2.1-4). In this case the dramatization of The Contention involves action without dialogue, as summarized in a stage direction. In the memorial reconstruction of Hamlet (Q1) Horatio reports to Gertrude the content of Hamlet's letter (sig. H2^V, 5 ff.), which includes an account of how Hamlet discovered the plot against his life. This scene, which is unparalleled in either of the good texts of Hamlet (Q2 or F), has the effect of giving Gertrude a motive for doubting Claudius which she does not have in the good texts. Yet another example of such amplification is afforded by an indebted text which is not a memorial reconstruction, The Taming of a Shrew. In this text the scene between Kate and the disguised Valeria (Q 1594, sig. C1^V-C2^V), in which Kate ends her music lesson by breaking a lute over Valeria's head, is clearly a dramatization of Hortensio's report in The Shrew (2.1.145 ff.) of a similar episode involving himself and Kate. The difference between the corresponding actions is that the dramatization

in A Shrew includes dialogue in which Kate becomes enraged at the supposed lute teacher's criticism of her playing.

In The Troublesome Reign, correspondingly, nine of the twelve actions not found in King John may be explained as dramatizations of actions that had been reported or alluded to in King John.

1. The capture of Eleanor by the French, including an angry dialogue with Constance (TR 1:1057-88), may well be based on John's expression of fear that Eleanor may have been captured (KJ 3.2.5-6).
2. The stage direction describing Eleanor's rescue by John and Arthur's capture (TR 1:1088 SD) corresponds to the events discussed by John and the Bastard (KJ 3.2.4-10).
3. The raid on the monastery (TR 1:1181-1313) shows the Bastard carrying out an order he is only given in King John (3.3.6-11), and the scene at the monastery ends with Philip's encountering Peter of Pomfret much as he reports having done in King John (4.2.143 ff).
4. The appearance of the five moons after John's coronation, as indicated by a stage direction (TR 1:1583 SD), corresponds to Hubert's report of such a sighting in the parallel scene of King John (4.2.182-4).
5. Lewis' oath with his retainers at Bury St. Edmunds to execute the English allies if they win a victory

- over John (TR 2:584-623) enacts a ritual reported to the Barons by Melun (KJ 5.4.10-20).
6. The scene which dramatizes the Monk's plot and his Abbott's promise of absolution for the murder (TR 2:851-929) supplies a motive for the unmotivated assassination in King John, reported briefly by Hubert (5.6.23).
 7. The poisoning of the King (TR 2:983-1032) dramatizes another part of the report in King John (5.6.29-31).
 8. The reconciliation of the rebel Barons to King John in which Pandulph asks for and apparently receives a sign from the dying King that he accepts their reparation (TR 2:1111-16) dramatizes approximately the last part of Hubert's report to the Bastard in which he explains that Prince Henry has interceded for the Barons and obtained a pardon for them (KJ 5.6.33-6).
 9. Lewis' appearance and offer of peace (TR 2:1158-77) dramatizes Lewis' peace proposal which Salisbury says Pandulph has brought (KJ 5.7.81-6).

Of all these actions one or the other of two views may be taken: either the actions in The Troublesome Reign are expansions and dramatizations of references in King John or, assuming the contrary theory, the references in King John are condensations of the actions in The

Troublesome Reign.⁷ However, the presence of similar expansions and dramatizations in the memorial reconstructions provides a precedent for supposing that these actions in The Troublesome Reign are based on reports or allusions in King John.

The remaining three actions of The Troublesome Reign not paralleled in King John are contained in scenes which seem to duplicate the action and function of scenes found elsewhere in The Troublesome Reign. Apparent superfluosity of these "doubled" scenes is especially useful to this study because it tends to suggest the direction of priority. The first such pair of doubled scenes involves the premature fight between the Bastard and the Duke of Austria (TR 1:656-69) during which the Bastard takes the "lion's case" and lets Austria escape. This scene is essentially duplicated by the later scene in which the Bastard kills Austria (TR 1:1044 SD-1056) because in both scenes the Bastard is fighting to avenge his father's murder. What is directly relevant to the priority issue is that there is no justification in The Troublesome Reign for the earlier fight, and its position at that point in the play takes much of the urgency away from the Bastard's continued bickering with

7. Matchett suggests that the alleged "better plotting" of The Troublesome Reign is in fact "an expansion and cheapening of Shakespeare's implications." He cites as examples of such expansion the scenes in the monastery and the Bastard's capturing the lion-skin (Signet KJ, p. 154 and n. 3).

Austria and renders pointless his plea for a combat with him. If we assume the priority of King John, we have a possible explanation for the redundant scene in The Troublesome Reign. It is that the unknown author, in writing from his plot outline, may not have had a note which clearly showed whether the confrontation of the Bastard and Austria came during the first skirmish between the English and the French (KJ 2.1) or during the second (KJ 3.2). Remembering that Austria was still alive during the action between those two scenes, the author may have resolved his uncertainty by writing two fights, the first of which Austria escaped alive although without the "lion's case." It is admittedly difficult to explain such confusion if the plot outline which the author presumably used was as full as such outlines seem to have been; however, it is even more difficult to understand why the unknown author should have originated the redundancy if he had no source for his plot or for the possible confusion of episodes.

The other two doubled actions occur together in a single scene (TR 2:110-348). The duplicate actions are the appearance of the Prophet, Peter of Pomfret, before King John and the submission of John to Pandulph. John has two interviews with Peter of Pomfret in The Troublesome Reign--the first during the coronation scene (TR 1:1604-59), the second following Arthur's death (TR 2:110-59). In King John Peter appears once during the coronation scene, and then only

briefly (KJ 4.2.132-58). Nevertheless, the circumstances of that brief appearance in King John may help to explain the duplicate confrontations between Peter and the King in The Troublesome Reign.

In the coronation scene of King John, Peter's prophecy is only one of five calamities reported or discussed. Before Peter is brought in, John learns that the French are beginning to invade England, that his mother has died, and that Arthur has supposedly died; then the Bastard brings Peter in to reiterate the prophecy with which he has been frightening the people--i.e., that before Ascension Day at noon John will lose his crown. After Peter is taken away, John hears about the mysterious five moons (the meaning of which is never interpreted in the play) and endures the threat of baronial rebellion. After the next scene of King John (4.3), in which Arthur does in fact die, the earlier warnings and signs are seen to have been foreshadowings of a tragic conclusion. Peter, with his prophecy, then, is associated in King John with calamitous news, including the false report of Arthur's death. Similarly, in The Troublesome Reign the association of Peter with such news is maintained. Peter is rushed in after the coronation to explain the mysterious appearance of the five moons, and he adds the prophecy of John's losing his crown; then, as if to bear out this gloomy prediction, Hubert brings the false report of Arthur's death and this

report causes the Barons to leave angrily. During the second appearance of Peter, John tries to force him to retract his prophecy. While Peter is still on stage, Hubert reports that Arthur is now really dead--a message which prompts John to order the Prophet's immediate execution. Then the Bastard warns John of the French invasion and of the Barons' resolution to join the French. Peter's presence is irrelevant to the action of the scene because he has no dramatic function at this point. In the earlier scene Peter functioned as a forecaster of doom; in this scene he is little more than a witness to the partial fulfillment of his prophecy, becoming a sacrificial victim when John recognizes the validity of the prophecy.

The conclusion of this same scene (TR 2:285-348) involves doubling John's submission to Pandulph (finally enacted at TR 2:632-49). In King John there is only one very brief scene showing Pandulph returning John's crown as "holding of the Pope" (5.1.1-29). The effect of the scene is to demonstrate the apparent expediency of John's obtaining papal support once it seems clear that his Barons are irretrievably against him. In The Troublesome Reign, however, the earlier encounter begins as John attempts to dissemble with Pandulph, then is forced to concede to Pandulph's terms. Like the second appearance of the Prophet, this first appearance of Pandulph in this part of the play seems to have no dramatic function except to

clarify the terms under which John may hope to gain the Pope's support against France and the rebel Barons. There is, however, no information in this earlier scene which is not also stated or implied in the later scene wherein John receives his crown from Pandulph.

Another puzzling fact seems related to this duplication of action. The duplication and the attendant separation of various messengers' reports in The Troublesome Reign create the only major disruption of parallel action in the two plays. The disruption occurs in The Troublesome Reign in the last 287 lines of Part 1 and the first 348 lines of Part 2. Contained in these lines are three scenes: (1) the coronation scene (TR 1:1604-59), corresponding to King John 4.2, but omitting some of the information in that scene; (2) the death of Arthur (TR 2:1-109), corresponding exactly to King John 4.3; and (3) the interviews with Peter of Pomfret and Pandulph (TR 2:110-348), not paralleled by King John but duplicating action of 4.2 and 5.1. The scene following the doubled interviews in The Troublesome Reign (i.e., Lewis' meeting with the Barons) roughly corresponds to King John 5.2, and from that point the action of the two plays continues in nearly parallel sequence. Either view of priority may account for this disruption of parallel episode-sequence and the duplications which seem to be the source of the disruption. Assuming the priority of The Troublesome Reign, it must be supposed that Shakespeare

combined the two scenes in which Peter of Pomfret originally appeared and drew all of the six calamitous warnings into a single scene and that he simply omitted the appearance of Pandulph which concluded the second Prophet scene. Assuming the priority of King John, on the other hand, the author of The Troublesome Reign postponed the report of the French invasion until after John has learned of Arthur's accidental death and then created a second scene in which the Prophet appears, the invasion is reported, and Pandulph delineates the Pope's demands. The superfluosness of the Prophet in The Troublesome Reign during the second series of announcements suggests the second alternative and therefore the priority of King John. Since the Prophet has no dramatic function in that sequence of The Troublesome Reign, his presence in the scene may be accounted for by his association in King John with the series of calamitous reports.

The considerable independence of organization and of action evident in some scenes of The Troublesome Reign in no way weakens the case for the indebtedness of that play to King John. The postulated scene-by-scene revision of the materials of King John involved expanding individual references and reports into entire scenes. There is further evidence which allows us to prefer the theory of the priority of King John over the alternative theory: five scenes of The Troublesome Reign contain information which is used in ways that seem to presuppose the existence of King John.

The first example is the explanation given for bringing Peter of Pomfret to Court. In King John the Bastard reports the fearful state of the people whom he has seen wherever he has traveled in England. He says that he has brought with him a prophet who has been frightening the people:

With many hundreds treading on his heeles:
 To whom he sung in rude harsh sounding rimes,
 That ere the next Ascension day at noone,
 Your Highnes should deliuer vp your Crowne.
 (4.2.149-52)

In The Troublesome Reign the Bastard's first meeting with the Prophet is dramatized. The Bastard has been seeking the Prophet, he says, but no reason is given to explain why he might have been doing so, for as yet there has been no mention of a prophecy concerning John. When the Bastard brings the Prophet to Court, then, he announces him as one "whose diuination volleys wonders foorth" (1:1519). With this introduction, Peter is presented to the Court as a curiosity. Only coincidentally does he become useful when the five moons appear and he is able to explicate the sign. After making the explication, he adds what is almost an afterthought:

But on some other knowledge that I haue.
 By my prescience, ere Ascension day
 Haue brought the Sunne vnto his vsuall height,
 Of Crowne, Estate, and Royall dignitie,
 Thou shalt be cleane dispoyld and dispossesst.
 (1:1637-40)

Whereas in King John the prophecy about the King with which Peter has been frightening the people is the reason he was brought to Court, there is in The Troublesome Reign no reason for his being brought there. It may be hypothesized, therefore, that the anonymous author took for granted the reason supplied in King John for bringing the Prophet into the action of the play, but that he failed or forgot to make that reason clear.

The second example of a scene in The Troublesome Reign which is difficult to understand without reference to King John is the scene in which the Barons discover Arthur's corpse (2:27-109). This scene has no chronicle source, for according to the chronicles Arthur simply disappeared, leaving only rumor and speculation to account for his death. Therefore we can be reasonably certain that the scene was conceived either by Shakespeare or by the unknown author and that the reason for inventing such a scene was that it would have great dramatic impact. In King John (4.3.11-159) the scene does have such impact, for it is pivotal in the development of the Bastard's character and in the development of major themes in the play. In The Troublesome Reign, on the other hand, the scene adds nothing to the development of the play. A brief summary of each scene will illustrate this difference in effectiveness.

In King John the Barons stumble upon Arthur's corpse and assume that they are viewing the result of the murder

about which they believe they have just heard (4.2.82-5). When Hubert appears they accuse him of Arthur's murder, they refuse to believe his plea of innocence, and they threaten to kill him but are prevented from doing so by the Bastard. At this point the Bastard intervenes, even though he too suspects that Hubert has killed Arthur. This scene is crucial to the development of the play because its action gives the Barons an apparent justification for rebelling and obliges the Bastard to decide, in the face of conflicting claims of right, whether he will remain loyal to John. Thus the scene focuses on the ambiguities inherent in the questions of loyalty and honor.⁸

In The Troublesome Reign, on the other hand, the corresponding scene lacks such impact. Because the Bastard is not present in the scene, the action has nothing to do with his decision and contains no ambiguity of issues. The Barons, looking for Arthur's grave, find instead his body, and they confront Hubert with what they believe to be evidence of his guilt. He protests his innocence, but they abruptly send him away. Then the Barons determine that, because Arthur's body is still warm, he must have been killed too recently for Hubert to have committed the murder:

Some in this place appoynted by the King,
 Haue throwne him from this lodging here aboue,

8. Matchett cites this scene as one in which "TR is elementary; KJ is morally complex and interesting" (Signet KJ, p. 155).

And sure the murther hath bin newly done,
 For yet the body is not fully colde.
 (2:77-80)

The Barons know that Hubert is innocent of Arthur's murder, but they are convinced that John is ultimately responsible for it, as indeed, indirectly, he is. The effect of the Barons' reasoning is to neutralize Hubert's role, thereby isolating John as the villain. The scene loses impact because the issues it raises are so unambiguously presented. Even the Barons ascribe little significance to the incident by the time they list their grievances against John (TR 2:380-419); for Arthur's death is only the second of three grievances, listed after Chester's unjust exile, about which the audience has never heard.

Since the scene over Arthur's corpse is so great a failure in The Troublesome Reign, it is difficult to imagine that the author of that play originally conceived it. The other scenes which this author might be thought to have created without chronicle or literary sources--the raid on the monastery, the fight for the lion's skin--fulfill dramatic and thematic purposes, but this scene does not fulfill such purposes. The best explanation for its being included in the play is that the author of The Troublesome Reign remembered its impact in King John although he did not understand the reasons for that impact. As a result, he included the scene but neutralized the issues it originally dramatized.

A third example of information in The Troublesome Reign which requires reference to King John for clarification is contained in the Bastard's report to John of the rebels' alliance with Lewis. In King John, the King has submitted to the Pope's demands and expects soon to be reconciled with his Barons. At this point the Bastard reports to him that Arthur has been found dead and that the angry Barons have gone "to offer service to your enemy" (5.1.34). The Bastard's report is credible because he had been present with the Barons when they agreed to meet with Lewis at Bury St. Edmunds. And, in the immediately following scene, the Barons do in fact confirm their new alliance with Lewis.

In The Troublesome Reign, however, the Bastard, who has been absent from all of the action since the first scene with the Prophet--for over 300 lines--reports that "the nobles haue elected Lewes King" (2:183). He has learned of this, he says, by the improbable means of "letters to me from your Nobilitie, /To be a partie in this action" (2:191-2). But only after another 238 lines do we finally come upon a scene in which Lewis may be said to be "elected" as King. In other words, the "election" which the Bastard reports in The Troublesome Reign has not yet occurred in that play. But in the corresponding scene of King John the Bastard merely reports the defection of the Barons. It is this report, taken together with the knowledge that the

Barons would join Lewis, which seems to have prompted premature report of an "election" in The Troublesome Reign.

A fourth example of information revealed in The Troublesome Reign which requires reference to King John to be fully intelligible is the report of Eleanor's death. In King John the report is given at 4.2.119-21, coming as one of the series of troubles about which John learns in that scene. Although in The Troublesome Reign Eleanor's death is never reported to John, he unaccountably laments her death at 2:226-8, in a scene which roughly corresponds to the last part of King John 5.2. John's knowing about Eleanor's death in this scene may best be accounted for as a recollection of the correspondingly earlier report of her death in King John. The omission of such a report in The Troublesome Reign may have occurred when the reports of the original coronation scene were being divided between the two Prophet scenes. The report of Eleanor's death may simply have been forgotten or overlooked in the process of re-arrangement.

The fifth example which suggests the prior existence of King John is the discrepancy in the anonymous play about whether John was with the English forces at Lincoln Wash. In King John the King has given up his authority to the Bastard--"Haue thou the ordering of this present time" (5.1.77)--so that the Bastard is the principal agent of the King in the military action of the final scenes. It is

consistent with this important role of the Bastard in the last part of the play that Shakespeare should deviate from the chronicles in making the Bastard rather than John the leader of the forces which are lost at Lincoln Wash. The Bastard reports this loss to Hubert:

Ile tell thee Hubert, halfe my power this night
 Passing these Flats, are taken by the Tide,
 These Lincolne-Washes haue deuored them,
 Myself, well mounted, hardly haue escap'd.
 (5.6.39-42)

His next report is directed to the dying King and resembles his first one:

For in a night the best part of my powre,
 As I vpon aduantage did remoue,
 Were in the Washes all vnwarily,
 Deuoured by the vnexpected flood.
 (5.7.61-4)

King John has had to be told about this catastrophe because he was not present when it occurred.

In The Troublesome Reign, on the other hand, the Bastard is a much less important character than his counterpart in King John, for he is portrayed merely as a retainer who stands beside John as he dies rather than as a man of independent leadership. At no time in The Troublesome Reign is he given military authority and at no time does he speak as if he had such authority; nevertheless, there are two contradictory reports in The Troublesome Reign about the loss at Lincoln Wash, one of which indicates that John was not leading his force at the time it was lost and that the Bastard probably was. In the first of these reports, the

Bastard tells John about the catastrophe and about his own escape:

When in the morning our troupes did gather head,
 Passing the washes with our carriages,
 The impartiall tyde deadly and inexorable,
 Came raging in with billowes threatning death,
 And swallowed vp the most of all our men,
 My self vpon a Galloway right free, well pacde,
 Out stript the flouds that followed waue by waue,
 I so escapt to tell this tragick tale.

(2:831-8)

Although the report does not say whether the Bastard actually commanded the drowned forces, it does make clear that John was not with them at the time they were drowned. When the same event is later reported to Lewis, however, John clearly is described as the leader of the lost forces, as the chronicles also indicate:

MESSEN.

John (my Lord) with all his scattered troupes,
 Flying the fury of your conquering sword,
 As Pharoah earst within the bloody sea,
 So he and his environed with the tyde,
 On Lincolne washes all were ouerwhelmed, . . .

(2:965-9)

It is difficult to understand why the anonymous author should have created this discrepancy between the two reports --that John was not present at Lincoln Wash according to the first report of the catastrophe, and that he clearly was at Lincoln Wash according to the second report. Why, indeed, would the anonymous author have created a deviation from the sources in the first report since his second report shows that he knew and tried to follow the chronicle source? The difficulty can be answered by the assumption of the priority

of King John. Shakespeare intended to show that the Bastard grew in stature as John declined, and he deviated substantially from his sources in order to do so. The anonymous author had no similar intention to give the Bastard prominence in the final action; however, in writing the scene which includes the first report of Lincoln Wash, the author inadvertently followed Shakespeare rather than the chronicles in giving the Bastard the account and excluding John from the catastrophe.

Dramaturgy

The general clarity of The Troublesome Reign is sometimes cited in support of the priority of that play to King John (e.g., Wilson, pp. xxi and ff.).⁹ This characteristic is manifested by less complex scene construction and by a method of exposition which involves less affective presentation and more rapid "polarization" of issues--that is, conflicts between characters tend to be brought abruptly into the open and are introduced without the intervention of other issues or characters. In the tendency of The Troublesome Reign to exhibit polarization that play resembles

9. Matchett answers Wilson's argument that some sequences are unintelligible in King John without reference to The Troublesome Reign. He explains that some of the examples of such sequences are in fact examples of oversimplification by the anonymous author of action which is more complex and thematically interesting in King John (Signet KJ, pp. 153-6).

some of the memorial reconstructions of Shakespeare's texts.

Polarization in an indebted text may be illustrated by an example from 2 Henry VI¹⁰ and The Contention.¹¹ In the first scene of 2 Henry VI, Gloucester begins to read aloud the marriage contract between Henry and Margaret of Anjou, but he is overcome with anger when he learns that two hard-won provinces in France are to be given over to her father. The Cardinal finishes reading the terms of the contract for him; then Henry goes off with his Queen to prepare for her coronation. At this point Gloucester addresses the other attendant nobles, asking whether they do not also regret that the provinces they fought so hard to win and hold for England are being returned to a French vassal. Salisbury, Warwick, and York indicate, in turn, their private reasons for opposing the marriage contract, but the Cardinal tries to appease Gloucester, pleading the King's right to dispose of the French territories as he will. Gloucester turns on his uncle with, "'Tis not my speeches that you do mislike:/But 'tis my presence that doth trouble ye"; then he leaves in order to avoid reopening "our ancient bickerings" (1.1.140-1, 144). Not until Gloucester

10. All references to 2 Henry VI are taken from The First Folio of Shakespeare: The Norton Facsimile. Act-, scene-, and line-numbers are those of the Globe edition.

11. All references to The Contention are taken from The Folger Library copy of Q1 (1594).

has gone does Cardinal Beaufort speak directly of his enmity toward Gloucester, insinuating that Gloucester's real motive for anger is his love of power. This first part of the scene, up to the Cardinal's exit, is 179 lines long. It gives a gradual introduction to the issue of dissatisfaction with the marriage contract, and it allows the noblemen who agree with Gloucester and who will later oppose Suffolk to express their attitudes toward this first issue of the conflict. The purpose of the scene, then, is not to open the conflict but to introduce a source of the conflict which will govern the subsequent action of the play. The audience is introduced to one of the issues, to its potential impact, and to members of the gathering factions.

No such leisurely technique is observable in the corresponding text of The Contention (sig. A2-A3^V). In this scene 75 lines are omitted, including the first speeches of Salisbury, Warwick, and York. As a result, the whole first part of the scene focuses directly upon the eruption of enmity between the Cardinal and Gloucester--indeed, none of the other attendant lords speaks until after the Cardinal is gone. The Cardinal makes no attempt to be conciliatory with Gloucester; moreover, lines are missing from Gloucester's speech in which he charitably includes the Cardinal among the wronged soldiers in France. Thus these two opponents of the subsequent conflict have already begun their battle before the introductory scene is half over. The immediate

cause of such polarization may have been the need to abridge the scene for performance, but the effect of the abridgment is to oversimplify the first conflict of the play, to denude it of complication, and to reduce its emotional impact on the audience.

Polarization in an indebted text may also be illustrated from the texts of Romeo and Juliet. In 3.2 of Q2-- the original or "good" text of the play--Juliet learns that in the few hours since her marriage to Romeo he has been banished from Verona for murdering her cousin Tybalt. During the first 35 lines of dialogue with the grief-stricken Nurse, however, Juliet is under the impression that Romeo is dead. Neither overwrought woman really listens to the other --the Nurse does not at first answer Juliet's question whether Romeo is dead, and because Juliet is herself susceptible to emotional imbalance she assumes the Nurse's continued lament to be an affirmative answer. When Juliet finally hears that it is Tybalt who is dead, she continues talking for another five lines before the Nurse can tell her that Romeo is alive. Then Juliet begins to struggle with the emotions aroused by the information--alternatively she curses Romeo, mourns the death of Tybalt, deploras her sense of divided loyalty, and resolves at last to support Romeo. The scene dramatizes the excessive or displaced sentimentalism which is in one sense the cause of the tragedy--the cause of the conflict between the houses of Capulet and

Montague as well as the cause of the hasty marriage and rash suicides of Romeo and Juliet.

The complexity of misunderstanding and of conflicting emotions in this scene of Q2 is almost entirely lacking from the corresponding dialogue in Q1--the memorially reconstructed text of the play. The Q1 text of this scene is less than half as long as its Q2 version. As a result, Juliet suffers the misapprehension that Romeo is dead for only ten lines before learning what has actually happened. There are no lines to correspond to the lines of Q2 in which she curses Romeo and tries to determine the attitude she must take toward her circumstances. Because of these omissions, the scene conveys nothing of the conflict of loyalties Juliet feels or of the emotional impact of that conflict. The effect of the omissions and memorial lapses in the scene is to focus directly upon the basic issues and to ignore emotional nuances--the author or authors of Q1 were not concerned with how Juliet feels about Romeo's banishment and her cousin's death but only with what she intends to do.

Such an interest in focusing on basic issues rather than emotions is also evident in The Troublesome Reign. Indeed, there are in that play instances of what may be regarded as polarization of issues which are complexly presented in King John. According to the traditional view of the relationship between The Troublesome Reign and King

John, the simpler scenes of the anonymous play were elaborated by Shakespeare. However, the alternative view--that the anonymous author simplified and polarized the issues of Shakespeare's play--harmonizes with at least one imaginable situation. The plot outline which we may suppose to have been used in adapting The Troublesome Reign from King John would probably not have included subtleties of characterization or of dramatic situation, although it would, of course presumably have recorded the basic issues closely.

One scene in which such polarization seems to occur is that in which Pandulph interrupts the wedding festivities in honor of Blanche and Lewis. In this scene of King John (3.1.135-346), Pandulph delivers an ultimatum from the Pope and concludes by excommunicating John, thus reopening the recently resolved conflict between France and England. The exposition of the scene requires 212 lines during which Constance appeals to the Cardinal for justice in her cause, the Bastard and Austria renew their temporarily stilled bickerings, Blanche and Lewis quarrel over her sense of divided loyalty and his refusal to acknowledge it, and King Philip seeks Pandulph's advice in resolving his moral uncertainty about the relative force of his conflicting vows to John and to the Pope. The disruptive impact of these counterpointed quarrels effectively changes the prevailing

mood from the potential gaiety of the wedding celebration to the anger of pending battle. On the other hand, relative calm attends the corresponding scene of The Troublesome Reign (1:966-1043), which is only one third as long. John defies Pandulph and the Pope, then dissolves his recent alliance with Philip and begins preparations for war. The turn of events represented by John's excommunication is presented concisely and without confusion, but also without emotion. Although the corresponding scene in King John dramatizes the theme of loyalty and honor by presenting five separate arguments in which there are conflicting claims on loyalty, the scene in The Troublesome Reign presents only the cause-and-effect sequence: John is excommunicated; therefore he returns to war against the French.

Another scene involving polarization is that in which Hubert attempts to burn out Arthur's eyes but finds that he is unable to carry out his intention. In this scene of King John (4.1), Arthur enters expressing his concern over Hubert's apparent preoccupation. His growing suspicion about the cause of Hubert's mood is verbalized as a childlike eagerness to please. After 60 lines of such exposition, Hubert calls in the torturers, apparently to put an end to Arthur's protestations of love. Even after Arthur knows what Hubert intends to do, he does not change

tactics but tries to dissuade Hubert from his intention by appeals for mercy, reminders of their friendship, and admonitions about the conflict between one's obligation to God and to King. The arguments are subtle, calculated, with apparent innocence, to make Hubert sensible of Arthur's utter dependence upon him. This approach makes Hubert realize the unnaturalness of harming someone who stands in an almost filial relation to him. Once this realization has impressed itself on him, he becomes receptive to the negative theological and moral implications of carrying out the King's order. The striking difference between this long exposition and the corresponding scene in The Troublesome Reign (1:1314-1452) is a difference in affective power. In that text Hubert calls for the executioners immediately after greeting Arthur. As a result, Arthur is frightened early in the scene and reacts throughout the scene to this reasoned fear rather than to suspicion. Arthur attempts to dissuade Hubert from compliance with John's orders by terse invective, assuring Hubert that eternal damnation will be the consequence of carrying them out. He does not invoke love or friendship, only fear. The scene comes rapidly to the point, thus eradicating sympathy for Arthur. The polarization of this scene may well have occurred because the author of The Troublesome Reign was insensitive to the nuances of the original--he apparently understood the

effectiveness of Arthur's persuasion, but he could not duplicate its affective power.

A third example of polarization, in The Troublesome Reign, of issues presented more ambiguously in King John is afforded by the scene in which the English barons meet with Lewis of France. In King John the reason for Lewis' intended betrayal of the Barons is not given. Therefore when Melun later reveals Lewis' intention to the Barons (KJ 5.4.10-20), the news is as surprising to the audience as to them. In retrospect it can be seen that in the initial meeting (KJ 5.2.1-64) Salisbury did give Lewis cause for distrusting the English barons. In 5.2.8-38 he greeted Lewis with expressions of regret that the times required Englishmen to ally themselves with a foreign invader. On that occasion, however, Lewis responded understandingly, in no way indicating that he had planned or was beginning to plan the betrayal of the Barons. Indeed, were it not for Melun's description (5.4.16-19) of the counter-swearing on the altar at Bury St. Edmunds, it would be impossible to determine when Lewis had entered into the plot. By contrast, the oath-taking and the reason for it are explicitly dramatized in The Troublesome Reign (2:503-623), with the result that the play gives a melodramatic portrayal of hardened French villains. The oath which Lewis swears with the French lords draws immediate attention to

the futility of the English lords' alliance with them, thus eradicating suspense and the emotional impact of Melun's later confession (TR 2:721-65).

The observable differences in dramaturgy in the two plays, then, may be explained at least as well by the theory that The Troublesome Reign is based on King John as by the alternative theory. The differences may be said to reflect the anonymous author's interest in the basic issues of a given exposition rather than in the potential affective appeal of the exposition. When he came to write his play from the plot outline of King John, he presented the issues succinctly, without the complicating subtleties of character and incident which are to be found in King John.

If the more straightforward presentation of issues in The Troublesome Reign may be said to harmonize with a theory of the priority of King John, the other three non-verbal characteristics of the relationship between these two plays harmonize even better with a theory of the priority of King John than with the alternative theory. The two-part division of The Troublesome Reign has been shown on the basis of bibliographical evidence and literary argument to be irrelevant to the actual structure of the play and therefore irrelevant to the comparison with King John. And the additional scenes in The Troublesome Reign have been explained as expansions and dramatizations of

references in King John, such an explanation being supported by analogy with similar expansions in memorial reconstructions.

CHAPTER 4

A COMPARISON OF THE TWO TEXTS (2): VERBAL FEATURES

Studies which have identified and described memorial reconstructions have established precedents for determining the direction of indebtedness from verbal similarities. There is, to be sure, a difficulty in using the conclusions of such studies to describe a looser textual relationship than the relationship between memorial reconstructions and their corresponding originals. If in a supposed plot-based adaptation there was no intention to duplicate the exact run of the language of the original text, the linguistic borrowings in the indebted text might be expected to show fewer systematically identifiable reflections of the original language. However, the borrowings which do occur in such a text should show at least some of the same "memory components" as do the borrowings of memorial reconstructions.

The general verbal independence of The Troublesome Reign from King John distinguishes it from memorial reconstructions. In such indebted texts there are countless exact verbal parallels to the original texts.¹ Exact

1. Hart calculated that memorial reconstructions retain more than 60% of Shakespeare's original vocabulary (Surreptitious Copies, pp. 21-7).

parallels indicate the strength of a relationship between texts, but only in isolated instances do they indicate the direction of indebtedness. The few exact or nearly exact parallels which occur in The Troublesome Reign and King John indicate that the relationship between the texts is much stronger than has been thought, but they indicate nothing about the direction of indebtedness. Wilson listed sixteen exact parallels between the texts (pp. xxvi-vii), and I have added to the list eight more lines and half-lines (see Appendix B).

Because of the difficulty of determining the direction of indebtedness from exact verbal parallels, the analyses of verbal features of memorial reconstructions normally concentrate upon the inexact or erroneous echoes in the indebted text. F. P. Wilson has a convenient summary of the errors which may be said to be characteristic of memorial reconstructions. These are errors which occur as a result of memorial lapses in attempting to recall the exact language of the original. They are as follows:

substitution and omission of words and phrases, mislinings and mishearings; echoes from other plays; the presence of lines or passages before or after their right places; passages which are mosaics of the original lines or are patched up from phrases in different parts of the play; general vulgarization.²

2. "Shakespeare and the 'New Bibliography'," The Bibliographical Society 1892-1942: Studies in Retrospect (1945), p. 98.

"Mosaic passages" such as those Wilson describes appear also in The Troublesome Reign--that is, there are passages in the play which seem to be constructed around key words or images of Shakespeare's corresponding lines. Apparently there is a similarity between the occurrence of this phenomenon in The Troublesome Reign and its occurrence in the memorial reconstructions. In the following analysis I shall attempt to determine whether the relationship between passages of The Troublesome Reign and King John can be accepted as analogous to the relationship of parallel passages in pairs of plays where the direction of priority has been determined. Such a procedure may establish criteria for determining from verbal evidence whether it was Shakespeare or the unknown author who borrowed the principal elements of the parallel passages.

Such use of conclusions from studies of memorial reconstructions does not imply that The Troublesome Reign is itself a memorial reconstruction. The appropriateness of these studies to the present study is that the plot-based adaptation, relying heavily as it does upon the plot of the original, tends to call forth verbal echoes of the original which show similarities to memorial reconstructions in their "memory components"--that is, in characteristic results of memory lapse and reinterpretation of the original. Examples cited from memorial reconstructions are used solely to illustrate the similarity between "memory components" of

verbal borrowings in other indebted texts and in The Troublesome Reign. Indeed, it is precisely because this play is not a memorial reconstruction that, for the most part, only the looser kinds of verbal parallels which occur in such texts resemble verbal parallels between The Troublesome Reign and King John. This study will emphasize two of these loose verbal relationships--"fused borrowings" and "non-rhetorical repetitions."

Fused Borrowings

One characteristic of memorial reconstructions which Leo Kirschbaum described but which has not otherwise been discussed has special relevance to this study. It is an error which Kirschbaum identified as resulting from a "mnemonic phenomenon." This phenomenon produced omissions of text owing to "telescoping," or the skipping of memory over a part of one passage to another because of similar phraseology in both parts, or because of the repetition of similar introductory phrases.³ The following parallel passages (not cited by Kirschbaum) from 2 Henry VI and The Contention will illustrate this kind of telescoping:

3. "A Census of Bad Quartos," RES 14 (1938):22-3.

2 Henry VI⁴

SAL. . . .
 Oft haue I seene the
 haughty Cardinall.
More like a Souldier then
a man o' th' Church,
 As stout and proud as he
 were Lord of all,
Sweare like a Ruffian, and
demeane himself
 (1.1.185-90)

The Contention

SAL. . . .
 Oft haue I seene this
 haughtie Cardinall
Sweare, and forswear him-
selfe, and braue it out,
More like a Ruffin then a
a man of Church.
 (sig. A4.2-4)

The passage in 2 Henry VI contains two similes, assigning two related, non-clerical attributes to the cardinal. First he is said to be "more like a Souldier then a man o' th' Church" because of his haughty pride; then he is said to "sweare like a Ruffian." In the corresponding passage of The Contention, the two similes have been "telescoped"--the soldier and the ruffian have, apparently, been so closely identified that the soldier has been dropped from the passage along with the description of the cardinal's vaunting pride. The syntax of the soldier simile has been transferred to the ruffian simile; the characteristic of swearing is more emphatically placed in a separate line, and the repetitive words "forswear himself" are added. Presumably the associative link--or linking idea--which prompted the error in the borrowed passage is the association of swearing with both soldiers and ruffians.

4. An explanation of the treatment of all quotations in this study is given on p. 33, n. 5. In this chapter I have added underlinings in the text to emphasize parallels.

Unfortunately, an example such as this does not in itself indicate the direction of indebtedness--we can infer only from considerable investigation of the relationship between the texts in question that the example here reflects telescoping by the authors of The Contention rather than expansion by Shakespeare. Another example, however, from the parallel texts of 3 Henry VI and The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York, contains the associative word which prompted the telescoping and therefore helps to demonstrate the priority of 3 Henry VI:

3 Henry VI⁵

QUEENE. Who can be patient
in such extreames?
Ah wretched man, would I
had dy'de a Maid? . . .
I shame to heare thee
speake: ah timorous
Wretch, . . .
(1.1.215-16, 231)

The True Tragedy⁶

QUEE. What patience can
there? ah timorous
man, . . . (sig. A6.5)

In this example the association of wretch and wretched has apparently prompted the telescoping of timorous and man, each of which was paired with one of the two forms of wretch in the original passage. In the indebted passage, however, the associative links, wretch and wretched, were

5. Quotations from 3 Henry VI are from The First Folio of Shakespeare: The Norton Facsimile.

6. Quotations are from The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of Yorke (Henry the Sixth, Part III) 1595, Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 11 (1958).

dropped out entirely, leaving only the originally separated components timerous man.

It should be observed that each of the cited examples illustrates telescoping as a result of a slightly different associative process. In The Contention telescoping presumably occurred because of the association of swearing with both soldiers and ruffians, an association prompted by, but not explicit in, the original text. In the example from The True Tragedy the associative links, being present in the text, apparently prompted the conjunction of the two words with which they were paired.

Telescoping as illustrated by these examples is only one result of a mnemonic phenomenon which I shall call "fused borrowing." This phenomenon involves the borrowing from the original passage of discrete elements--words, word clusters, or phrases--fusing them in the indebted passage because of an unconscious association among them. That is, the borrowed words are fused because of some principle of association other than their appearance in the same passage of the original. In the 2 Henry VI passage above, for example, the associative link was a concept; whereas in the 3 Henry VI passage the associative link was a word in the passage. However, associative links often are not so explicit in the original as in these examples. A further characteristic of fused borrowings evident in these two examples is that the associative links apparently prompt

omission of elements which are not directly related to the fused elements. Therefore, when fused borrowings occur, words or ideas of the original may be missing from the new passage; or the fused borrowings may appear in a passage which is totally different from the original one, but which nonetheless fulfills the same approximate function as does the original passage.

The unconscious aspect of fused borrowings makes their analysis difficult. Discrete words which are fused and borrowed because of unconscious association may not have any special prominence in the original passage; yet an unconscious mental process of some sort reproduces in a verbal environment similar to the original either the words themselves, cognates, or synonyms of them. Fortunately for the seeker of fused borrowings, words are borrowed in pairs or clusters, so that if one word of an original passage is found in a corresponding indebted passage, a second word which had originally appeared in close conjunction with the first will usually appear in the second passage.

An excellent example of several fused borrowings caught up in a much altered passage is afforded by scene 2.6 of Romeo and Juliet.⁷ In order to show all of the

7. This scene is discussed by Hoppe in "The First Quarto Version of Romeo and Juliet, II.vi. and IV.v.43 ff.," RES 14 (1938):271-84; he refers to the scene and to his article but does not discuss it in The Bad Quarto of Romeo and Juliet, pp. 185 ff.

borrowings by which the reported passage of Q1 reveals its debt to the original text represented by Q2, as well as the substantial difference between the two passages, it seems desirable to reprint the entire scene (some 35 lines) with the fused borrowings designated by alphabetical designators in order of their appearance in Q2:

Q2 Romeo and Juliet⁸Q1 Romeo and Juliet⁹

FRI. So smile the heauens
vpon this holy act, (a)
That after houres, with sor-
row chide vs not.
RO. Amen, amen, but come
what sorrow can,
It cannot counteruaile the
exchange of ioy
That one short minute
giues me in her sight: 5
Do thou but close our (b)
hands with holy words,
Then loue-deuouring death
do what he dare,
It is inough I may but
call her mine.
FRI. These violent
delights haue violent
endes,
And in their triumph die
like fier and powder: 10
Which as they kisse con-
sume. The sweetest
honey
Is loathsome in his owne
deliciousnesse,
And in the taste confoundes
the appetite.
Therefore loue moderately,
long loue doth so,

ROM: Now Father Laurence,
in thy holy grant (a)
Consists the good of me and
Iuliet.
FR: Without more words
I will doo all I may,
To make you happie if in
me it lye.
ROM: This morning here
she pointed we should
meet, 5
And consumate those
neuer parting bands,
Witnes of our harts loue
by ioyning hands, (b)
And come she will.

FR: I gesse she will
indeed,
Youths loue is quicke,

8. Quotations are from Romeo and Juliet: The Second Quarto 1599, Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 6 (1949).

9. Quotations are from Romeo and Juliet: The First Quarto, 1594, Praetorius Facsimile (1886).

Too swift arriues, as
tardie as too slowe. (c) 15

swifter than the
swiftest speed. (c)

Enter Iuliet.

Enter Iuliet somewhat faste,
and embraceth Romeo.

Here comes the Lady, Oh so
light a foote

See where she comes. 10

Will nere weare out the
euerlasting flint, (d)

So light of foote nere
hurts the troden
flower: (d)

A louer may bestride the
gossamours,

Of loue and ioy, see see
the soueraigne power.

That ydeles in the wanton
sommer ayre,

IUL: Romeo.

And yet not fall, so
light is vanitie. 20

ROM: My Iuliet welcome..

IU. Good euen to my
ghostly confessor.

As doo waking eyes
(Cloased in Nights
mysts) attend the 15
frolicke Day,

FRI. Romeo shall thanke
thee daughter for vs
both.

So Romeo hath expected
Iuliet,
And thou art come.

IU. As much to him, else
is his thankes too
much.

IUL: I am (if I be Day)
Come to my Sunne: shine
foorth, and make me
faire.

RO. Ah Iuliet, if the
measure of thy ioy
Be heapt like mine, and
that thy skill be more 25

ROM: All beauteous
fairnes dwelleth in
thine eyes.

To blason it, then sweeten
with thy breath

IUL: Romeo from thine
all brightnes doth
arise. 20

This neighbour ayre and
let rich musicke
tongue,

Vnfold the imagind happi-
nes that both

Receiue in either, by this
deare encounter.

IU. Conceit more rich in
matter then in words, 30

Braggs of his substance,
not of ornament,

They are but beggers that
can count their worth,

But my true loue is growne
to such excesse,

I cannot sum vp sum of
halfe my wealth.

FRI. Come, come with me, (e)
and we will make short
worke, 35

FR: Come wantons, come, (e)
the stealing houres
do passe

For by your leaues, you
shall not stay alone,
 Till holy Church incorpor-
ate two in one. (f)

Defer imbracements till
 some fitter time,
 Part for a while, you
shall not be alone,
 Till holy Church haue
ioyned ye both in one. (f)

RO: Lead holy Father,
 all delay seemes long. 25

IUL: Make hast, make hast,
 this lingring doth vs
 wrong.

FR: O, soft and faire make
 sweetest worke they say.
 Haste is a common hinderer
 in crosse way.

(sig. E4-E4^V)

The relationship between these passages can be treated in terms of three distinct, parallel units of thought: (1) the dialogue between Romeo and the Friar, in which Romeo shows his impatience for Juliet's arrival (Q2, lines 1-15; Q1, lines 16-34); (2) the dialogue of greeting between Romeo and Juliet (Q2, lines 16-34; Q1, lines 10-20); and (3) the Friar's suggestion that they proceed immediately with the ceremony (Q2, lines 35-7; Q1, lines 21-8). In the first unit there are three verbal parallels: the first (a) is a simple substitution of a synonym, "holy grant" for "holy act"; the second (b) retains the image of Q2 but changes the context and the agent--the Friar of Q2 is asked to "close our hands," whereas Juliet in Q1 is said to be coming to bear witness to her love for Romeo "by joyning hands"; the third (c) is in Q1 a nonsensical play on the "swiftness" of young love, echoing the Friar's "Too swift arriues as tardie as too slow," but only vaguely echoing the

warning against immoderate love which the Friar gives in the corresponding speech of Q2.

In the second unit only the Friar's description of Juliet's approach (d) is retained. In Q1 the "troden flower" may have resulted from an association of the idea of "gossamours" in line 18 of Q2--an association which resulted not only in substituting delicate imagery for the "euer-lasting flint," but also in omitting the remainder of the original passage. The remaining lines of this unit in Q1 contain no echoes of the lines in Q2. They are, instead, a patchwork of fused borrowings from scenes 2.2 and 3.5. The dialogues of those two scenes, and the dialogue between Romeo and Juliet at Capulet's feast (1.5), are the only other dialogues between Romeo and Juliet in the play. All four dialogues between the two characters resemble each other in that they express similar romantic sentiment. The two dialogues from which the lines of Q1 2.6 show borrowings, however, resemble each other further in that they both contain imagery or allusions to the sun and the opposition of night and day. The imagery of two scenes of the original was apparently borrowed by Q1 in scene 2.6 not because that scene in the original had similar imagery but because it communicated similar feeling.

The two parallels (e and f) in the third unit, are the only two nearly exact parallels of the entire scene; however, this unit in Q1, is longer than the corresponding

unit in Q2 because of the addition of lines in which Romeo and Juliet express their impatience and the Friar delivers an admonition against immoderate love vaguely resembling the admonition of the Friar (c) in the first unit of Q2.

Scene 2.6 of Q1 Romeo and Juliet is especially useful to this study because it appears to be a close analogue to the whole of The Troublesome Reign--that is, it contains the same essential action and the same logical run of dialogue as the original, but it contains very little of the language of the original except for some fused borrowings and two nearly exact parallels (e and f). In this scene, therefore, we may discern a looser kind of indebtedness to the original than is normal in memorial reconstructions. Indeed, the relationship of this scene to its original resembles the relationship which Matchett thought might well exist between The Troublesome Reign and its posited original, King John, but which he nevertheless believed to be unlikely. However unlikely the relationship, the question of priority between the two texts of Romeo and Juliet 2.6 has already been established in favor of Q2.¹⁰ That such a scene can and does occur in an indebted text, albeit in a memorial reconstruction, ought finally to satisfy Matchett's

10. Hoppe, in the article cited makes the plausible suggestion that in the two non-Shakespearian scenes we have evidence of "our reporter turned versifier," to which he adds the evidence of independent versification from other parts of the text (pp. 278, 284).

only objection to the priority of King John--namely, that if the unknown author were familiar enough with King John to reproduce so much of its plot he could not have failed to reproduce some of the language. In Q1 Romeo and Juliet we have an example of a reporter who reproduced not only the action but most of the language of most of the original play; yet in two scenes (2.6 and 4.5.43 ff.) he seems deliberately to have departed from that language.

There is in The Troublesome Reign one scene in particular which, in its relationship to the corresponding scene of King John, affords an analogue to the two versions of Romeo and Juliet 2.6. This is the scene in which Hubert attempts to carry out the order to blind Arthur but finally relents and fails to do so. That this scene and the corresponding scene in King John (4.1) are related is attested to not only by similarity in the general run of the action, but also by a pair of nearly exact parallel lines in the two scenes. The parallel half-line is Arthur's outcry when he sees the torturers:

<u>King John</u>	<u>The Troublesome Reign</u>
ART. <u>O saue me Hubert, saue</u> <u>me:</u> . . . (4.1.73)	ARTHUR . . . <u>O helpe me Hubert, gentle</u> keeper <u>helpe:</u> . . . (1:1338)

Despite this strong echo, the two scenes are strikingly different from one another in terms of construction, as I have indicated above (pp. 75-7). Another difference

between the two scenes is in their different use of the same controlling imagery--in King John Arthur's appeals are couched in pathetic terms, whereas in The Troublesome Reign similar vocabulary is used to formulate Arthur's curses.

This pair of passages is often cited to show how Shakespeare rewrote The Troublesome Reign, changing the emphasis of Hubert's appeal from a theological point to a personal one. A presentation of the passages here, considered as an analogue to the variant passages of Romeo and Juliet 2.6, will suggest that the alternative view may be taken of the direction of indebtedness:

King John

ART. Haue you the heart?
 When your head did but
 ake,
 I knit my hand-kercher
 about your browes . . .
 And with my hand, at mid-
 night held your
head; . . . (a)
 If heauen be pleas'd that (b)
 you must vse me ill,
 Why then you must. Will
 you put out mine eyes?
 These eyes, that neuer did,
 nor neuer shall
 So much as frowne on (c)
 you. . . .
 The Iron of it selfe,
 though heate red hot,
 Approaching neere these
 eyes, would drinke my
teares, . . .
 And if an Angell should (d)
 haue come to me,
 And told me Hubert should
 put out mine eyes,
 I would not haue beleeu'd

The Troublesome Reign

HUBERT I will not chaunt
 such dolour with my
tongue, (e)
 Yet must I act the outrage
 with my hand. (a)
 My heart my head, and all (a)
 my powers beside,
 To aide the office haue at
 once denide. . . .
 ARTHUR . . .
Heauen weepes, (b) (d)
 the Saints doo shed
 celestiall teares, . . . (d)
 You rowling eyes, whose (c)
 superficies yet
 I doo behold with eyes (c)
 that Nature lent:
 Send foorth the terror of
 your moovers
frowne, . . . (c)
 (1:1357-60, 1375,
 1417-19)

him: no tongue but (e)
 Huberts.
 (4.1.41-2, 45, 55-8,
 61-2, 68-70)

On the strength of the associated word clusters in these passages, there can be no doubt that the passages are related. They defy conclusive analysis to determine priority, however, possibly because the words borrowed are so well adapted to each verbal environment. Two word clusters fused with two single words make up the borrowings which are illustrated by these passages. In The Troublesome Reign the word tongue (e) appears in conjunction with group (a), and the word heauen (b) appears in conjunction with group (d); whereas, in King John the single words appear at a distance of several lines from the clusters in question. The word clusters with which the discrete words are fused in The Troublesome Reign are: (a) heart, head, hand; (d) teares and Angell (or Saint). A third cluster appears in both passages: (c) eyes, eyes, and frowne. In the passage of King John the word clusters are part of four appeals which Arthur makes to dissuade Hubert. The first appeal is made directly to Hubert ("Haue you the heart?"), and the word cluster is used to inquire whether Arthur's past attention to Hubert's slight headache is being repaid by this monstrous offense to Arthur's eyes. The second is an indirect appeal to heaven in which Arthur ironically accepts heaven's clearly unjust decree that Hubert should put out the eyes

which never offended him by so much as a frown. The third appeal contains a pathetic fallacy, attributing greater compassion to the hot iron, which "would drinke my teares," than to Hubert. The fourth appeal is similar to the second in that it invokes heaven, ironically suggesting heavenly approval for the deed and reminding Hubert of the unholiness of his intention.

In the parallel passage of The Troublesome Reign, Hubert fuses tongue (e) with the word cluster, heart, head, and hand (b). He admits to Arthur that none of these organs are willing to offend against Arthur's eyes, and yet they must. The fusion in these lines may have resulted from the unconscious association of all four organs involving expression or feeling. In Arthur's subsequent response, another word-group, (c), becomes fused with heaven (b) though it is not so associated in King John. Finally, Arthur invokes heaven's anger, more than pity, and begs the "rowling eyes" to communicate their "moouer's frowne."

The differences between these passages are what we might expect to find if the unknown author were recalling in nearly parallel sequence some of the vividly pathetic language of King John but substituting for it his own more concretely vengeful dialogue. To be sure, the difference between these two particular passages is also what we would expect if Shakespeare were transforming the relatively prosaic version of the anonymous author into his own more

poetically suggestive version. However, the occurrence of apparent fused borrowings in the passage of The Troublesome Reign suggests the indebtedness of that play to King John.

In other instances of fused borrowing, the inappropriate use of the newly fused metaphor suggests the indebtedness of the passage in which it is contained. One such example occurs in the scene in which the English barons meet with Lewis. In this example synonyms will be given alphabetical designators to show the apparent compression of elements in The Troublesome Reign:

King John

SAL. . . .
 I am not glad that such
 a sore of Time (a)
 Should seeke a plaster by (b)
 contemn'd reuolt,
 And heale (c) the inueterate
Canker of one wound, (a)
 By making many: . . .
 But such is the infection (a)
 of the time,
 That for the health (d) and
Physicke of our right, (b)
 We cannot deale but with the
 very hand
 Of sterne Iniustice, and
 confused wrong: . . .
 (5.2.12-15, 20-3)

The Troublesome Reign

SALISBURY Welcome the
balme (b) that closeth
vp (c) our wounds, (a)
 The soueraigne medicine (b)
for our quick recure. (d)
 The anchor of our hope, the
 onely prop,
 Whereon depends our liues,
 our lands, our weale,
 Without the which, as sheepe
 without their heard,
 (Except a shepheard winking
 at the wolfe)
 We stray, we pine, we run to
 thousand harmes. (2:535-41)

In King John Salisbury points to the dilemma of committing wrong to enforce right. The metaphor of diseased time extends throughout his speech and, in fact, occurs elsewhere in King John. In 5.1 John says "the time's so sick" (14). As the diseased-time metaphor always suggests in this play, there is really no cure for the time's ills. In The

Troublesome Reign, on the other hand, the metaphor is one of medical cure, being one of three metaphors which explain the relation of the Barons to Lewis--he is an anchor of hope, they are sheep with neither a flock nor a shepherd. There is no logical connection in the sequence of these metaphors except that they contribute to a description of Lewis as "him that beateth woes away" (543). The disjunctive effect of this sequence of metaphors tends to suggest that they have been forced together in order to fill out a long passage, in which the significance of the original is never captured. Moreover, the first of the three metaphors appears to be a fused borrowing from the extended metaphor of King John. The discrete elements of the King John passage are: (a) sore, wound, infection; (b) plaster, Physicke; (c) heale; (d) health. In the corresponding passage of The Troublesome Reign, synonyms for most of these words are substituted: (a) wounds; (b) balme, medcine; (c) closeth vp; (d) recure. These synonyms are fused in a single two-line metaphor which misses the point of the extended metaphor of King John. In other words, the medical metaphor of The Troublesome Reign appears to be a condensation of the diseased-time metaphor of King John, but in the more simple composition of the anonymous author it is transformed into an expression of hope rather than an expression of dilemma.

Another example of fused borrowing appears to involve a misunderstanding of several references in King

John. Although the borrowing itself appears in only a pair of lines, it seems desirable in this case to cite other lines in King John which presumably prompted the borrowing in The Troublesome Reign:

King John

K. JOHN. [to Chattilion] . . .
 Be thou as lightning in the
 eies of France;
 For ere thou canst report,
 I will be there:
 The thunder of my Cannon
 shall be heard.
 So hence: be thou the trum-
 pet of our wrath,
 And sullen presage of your
 owne decay: . . .
 (1.1.24-8)
 CHAT. [to King Philip] . . .
 England impatient of your
 iust demands,
 Hath put himsele in Armes,
 the aduerse windes
 Whose leisure I haue staid,
 haue giuen him time
 To land his Legions all as
 soone as I: . . .
 In briefe, a brauer choyse
 of dauntlesse spirits
 Then now the English bottomes
 haue waft o're,
 Did neuer flote vpon the
 swelling tide, . . .
 (2.1.56-9, 72-4)

The Troublesome Reign

IOHN Pembroke, conuay him
 safely to the sea,
 But not in hast: for as we
 are aduisde,
 We meane to be in Fraunce as
 soone as he, . . .
 CHATTILION [to King Philip]
 Be I not briefe to tell
 your Highnes all,
 He will approach to inter-
 rupt my tale:
 For one selfe bottome
brought us both to
Fraunce.
 (1:61-3, 469-71)

In both plays explanations are given for the reason that John arrives in France immediately after Chattilion reports to the French King.

In Shakespeare's play John assures Chattilion that he means to follow closely after him, and Chattilion later explains that his own delay was caused by adverse winds.

The imagery of John's words to Chattilion suggests that John had expected to arrive immediately after Chattilion--i.e., as quickly as thunder follows lightning, or as quickly as attack follows the trumpeter's charge--but not, of course, at the same moment. The sequence in which Chatillion and John actually arrive is made clear in a messenger's later reference to the invasion of France, at KJ 4.2.113-15:

The Copie of your speede is learn'd by them:
For when you should be told they do prepare,
The tydings comes, that they are all arriu'd.

In other words, the first message that has reached John since the French began preparation for the invasions has arrived just as the French are landing in England.

In The Troublesome Reign a different sequence of arrivals is given a different explanation. John plans with Pembroke to delay Chattilion in a deliberate maneuver to gain advantage over the French, with the improbable result that Chattilion had to travel to France in the same ship with John. The borrowing of "selfe bottome" from "the English bottoms" creates an absurdity from the standpoint of Chattilion's travel arrangements. The absurdity appears to have arisen in part from a misunderstanding about what Shakespeare meant by "ere thou canst report, I will be there" and "land his legions all as soon as I." Otherwise we should be assuming that the unknown author created this absurdity from clear chronicle sources. Probability favors the assumption that the confusion in The Troublesome Reign

resulted from the apparent ambiguity in King John. Moreover, in this, as in the other two examples of apparent fused borrowing in The Troublesome Reign, the indebtedness of that play to King John is suggested by an analogous "memory component" observable in memorial reconstructions.

Non-Rhetorical Repetitions

A second phenomenon which occurs in memorial reconstructions is also useful in this study because of an apparently analogous occurrence in the plot-based adaptation. The phenomenon is "non-rhetorical repetition." By this I mean repetition of words used in the indebted text as fillers rather than as rhetorically effective figures of speech. In some cases the repeated words or phrases are not drawn from the corresponding passage of the original, but more often the repeated words seem to have been remembered from an emphatic figure of speech in which they originally occurred. When the non-rhetorical repetitions have been borrowed from the original, they tend to appear in clusters, apparently borrowed as a result of the associative mechanism which I have discussed above. In The Troublesome Reign the clusters often appear to be repetitive reworkings of some vaguely remembered words of King John. It could be argued, of course, that the repetitions originated with the unknown author and that Shakespeare remembered and used these words because they had been so

often repeated in the original; however, we may appeal again for a decision between these alternatives to the precedent of memorial reconstructions. The following example from Romeo and Juliet illustrates the simplest manifestation of non-rhetorical repetition--progression of thought in the original text is obscured in the indebted text owing to repetition of a striking word or phrase:

Romeo and Juliet Q2

CA. . . .
 What is my daughter gone
 to Frier Lawrence?
 NUR. I forsooth.
 CAP. Well, he may chance to
 do some good on her,
 A peeuish selfewield
harlottry it is.
Enter Iuliet.
 NUR. See where she comes
 from shrift with merie
 looke.
 CA. How now my headstrong,
 where haue you bin gad-
 ding?

(4.2.8-13)

Romeo and Juliet Q1

CAPO:
 But wheres this Headstrong?
 MOTH: Shees gone (my Lord)
 to Frier Laurence Cell
 To be confest.
 CAPO: Ah, he may hap to doo
 some good of her,
 A headstrong selfewild har-
lotrie it is.
Enter Iuliet.
 MOTH: See here she commeth
 from Confession,
 CAPO: How now my Headstrong,
 where haue you bin gad-
 ding?

(sig. H3^V-H4)

In this example from Q1 the term headstrong occurs three times: once instead of daughter; once instead of peeuish; and once in an exact parallel with Q2. The apparently striking expression used once in Q2 seems to have prompted so close an association between Iuliet and headstrong, that every time she is mentioned in these lines the expression is used.

An example of non-rhetorical repetition from 2 Henry VI and The Contention illustrates a more complicated

repetition which occurs as a result of association with similar introductory phrases:

2 Henry VI

CAR. . . .
 What though the common
people fauour him,
 Calling him, Humfrey the
good Duke of Gloster,
 Clapping their hands, and
crying with loud voyce,
Iesu maintaine your Royall
Excellence,
With God preserue the good
Duke Humfrey:

(1.1.158-62)

2. PET. Marry the Lord pro-
 tect him, for hee's a
 good man, Iesu blesse him.

(1.3.5-6)

QUEENE. . . .
 By flatterie hath he wonne
the Commons hearts:
 And when he please to make
 Commotion,
 'Tis to be fear'd they all
 will follow him.

(3.1.28-30)

The Contention

CARD. . . .
 The common people swarme
 about him straight,
Crying Iesus bless your
royall excellence,
 With God preserue the Good
Duke Humphrey.
 (sig. A3^v:17-19)

2. PETI. I pray God saue the
Good Duke Humphries
life,

(sig. B2.7)

QUEENE. . . .
 See you not how the Commons
follow him
 In troupes, crying, God saue
the good Duke Humphrey,
 And with long life, Iesus
preserue his grace,
 (sig. D3^v:12-14)

In 2 Henry VI the same essential idea is repeated in three different scenes. There are, however, only two repetitions of words in the three passages: common or commons, and

Iesu. Moreover, there is a progression of thought in the three scenes--in the first passage, Humphrey's popularity with the common people is described by the Cardinal; in the second that popularity is dramatized by two petitioners' hoping to see him along the road; in the third the probable effects of that popularity are explained by the Queen.

Despite this progression of thought the repetitiveness in

these scenes of 2 Henry VI seems to have prompted the intricate pattern of phrase repetition in the corresponding passages of The Contention. Examples of repetition include three occurrences of "God saue (preserue) the good Duke Humphrey" and a variant form, "with long life, Iesus preserue his grace." There are also two occurrences of crying. However, no progression of ideas is shown in these passages of The Contention, and as a result the Queen in the middle of the play still repeats what the people say about Humphrey but does not explain, as she does in 2 Henry VI, the threat such loyalty represents to her.

The preceding example illustrates an attendant characteristic of non-rhetorical repetitions: namely, a telescoping and a dilution of meaning of the original passage. Presumably the word or words borrowed from the original text and repeated in the indebted text were so striking to the mind of the borrower that he forgot some of the original content of the lines which he was borrowing; or perhaps in his attempt to remember something he knew he had forgotten, he repeated striking words which had appeared in the same context with the forgotten element.

In The Troublesome Reign passages in which non-rhetorical repetition seems to have occurred also show evidence of telescoping. The characteristic may be illustrated in the following example of non-rhetorical repetition from the scene in which Pandulph excommunicates John:

King John

BLANCH. Vpon thy wedding day?
 Against the blood that thou
 hast married?
 What, shall our feast be
 kept with slaughtered
 men?
Shall braying trumpets,
and loud churlish drums
Clamors of hell, be measures
to our pomp? . . .

(3.1.300-4)

The Troublesome Reign

BLANCHE And will your Grace
vpon your wedding day
 Forsake your Bride and follow
dreadfull drums:
 Nay, good my Lord, stay you
 at home with mee.
 LEWES Sweete heart content
 thee, and we shall agree.
 PHILIP Follow me Lords,
 Lord Cardynall lead the
 way,
Drums shalbe musique to this
wedding day.

(1:1038-43)

In King John the metaphor of the war drums as "measures to our pomp" is one of a series of war images by which Blanche's speech illustrates the unnaturalness of Lewis' going to war against John. The effect of the passage is to evoke horror by juxtaposing the ideas of bloodshed and marriage: "Against the blood that thou hast married?"; "shall our feast be kept with slaughtered men?"; and "shall braying trumpets, and loud churlish drums, clamors of hell, be measures of our pomp?" Blanche's expression of her dilemma emphasizes the central action of the scene. The scene dramatizes the conflicts created by several feudal and personal obligations, all clamoring for recognition. In the corresponding scene of The Troublesome Reign, however, the complexity of action and of Blanche's role are missing. In that scene Blanche is portrayed as petulant, if not shrewish, and her role in the scene is perfunctory. Her complaint is brief (only four lines) and it contains only one figure of

speech, the personification of dreadfull drums. Lewis responds with an ineffectual line, "content thee, and we shall agree," and King Philip concludes the scene with the announcement that "drums shalbe the musique to this wedding day." The line repeats both drums and wedding day, fusing them in the inappropriately bouyant conclusion. The juxtaposition of the ideas of bloodshed and weddings is maintained but without the horror aroused by the original passage. Presumably the effective juxtaposition of these ideas in the original prompted the juxtaposition and repetition of key words here, but the emotional content is not communicated by the passage in The Troublesome Reign.

In another example of non-rhetorical repetition in The Troublesome Reign very little essential content seems to have been lost; nevertheless, the scene as given in that text has the appearance of being a mosaic of the corresponding scene in King John. These parallel scenes occur before the walls at Angiers, and the dialogue follows the Bastard's suggestion that the two Kings unite to raze the city before continuing their own battle:

King John

IOHN. . . .
 I like it well. France,
shall we knit our
powres (a), . . . 398
 HUB. Heare vs great kings,
 vouchsafe awhile to stay
 And I shall shew you
peace, and faire- (b)
 fac'd league: (c) 417

The Troublesome Reign

CITIZEN Kings, Princes, Lords
 & Knights assembled here,
 The Citizens of Angiers all
 by me
 Entreate your Maiestie to
 heare them speake:
 And as you like the motion
 they shall make,
 So to account and follow

Win you this Citie
 without stroke, or
 wound,
 Rescue those breathing
 liues to dye in beds,
 That heere come sacrifices
 for the field.
 Perseuer not, but heare me
 mighty kings.
 IOHN. Speake on with fauor,
 we are bent to heare.
 HUB. That daughter there
of Spaine, the Lady
Blanch (d)
 Is neere to England, look
 vpon the yeeres
 Of Lewes the Dolphin, (e)
 and that louely
maid, (f)
 If lustie love should (g)(h)
 go in quest of beautie, 427
 Where should he finde it
 fairer, then in Blanch:
 If zealous loue should (h)
 go in search of vertue,
 Where should he finde it
 purer then in Blanch?
 If loue ambitious, sought (h)
 a match of birth,
 Whose veines bound richer
 blood then Lady Blanch?
 Such as she is, in beautie,
 vertue, birth,
 Is the yong Dolphin (i)
 euery way compleat, . . .
 (4.2.398, 416-33)

their aduice.
 IOHN, PHILIP. Speake on, we
 giue thee leaue.
 CITIZEN Then thus: whereas
 that yong & lustie (i) (g)
 knight 737
 Incites you on to knit (a)
your kingly strengths:
 The motion cannot choose
 but please the good,
 And such as loue the (h)
quiet of the State. (b) 740
 But how my Lords, how
should your strengths
be knit? (a) 741
 Not to oppresse your sub-
 iects and your friends,
 And fill the world with
 brawls and mutinies:
 But vnto peace your (b)
forces should be
knit (a) 744
 To liue in Princely
league and amitie: (c) (h)
 Doo this, the gates of
 Angiers shall giue way
 And stand wide open to
 your harts content.
 To make this peace a (b)
 lasting bond of loue, (c)
 Remains one onely honorable
 meanes,
 Which by your pardon I shall
 here display.
Lewes the Dolphin and (e)
 the heire of Fraunce,
 A man of noted valor
 through the world,
 Is yet vnmarried: let him
 take to wife
 The beauteous daughter of
the King of Spaine, (d) 752
 Neece to K. Iohn, the
louely Ladie
Blanche, . . . (f)(d) 753
 ARTHUR A proper peace, (b)
 if such a motion
 hold; . . . 765
 Q. ELIANOR Sonne Iohn, follow
 this motion, as thou
louest thy mother, (h)

Make league with Philip, (c)
 yeeld to anything: 769
 (1:730-53, 765, 768-9)

The passage in King John is an example of rhetorical mastery. The Citizen first explains the advantages of peace by allusion to the innocent people who will die if war continues; then he proposes the marriage which could bring about peace. The proposal consists of three rhetorical questions in parallel syntax and a summation: "If lustie loue . . .," "If zealous loue . . .," "If loue ambitious" The summation, "Such as she is in beautie, vertue, birth," leads to the conclusion, "Is the yong Dolphin euey way compleat." The effect of the rhetorical questions, or erotema, as Sister Miriam Joseph explains, is that each affirms the assertion it makes, inducing agreement because of its emotional appeal.¹¹

The repetition in The Troublesome Reign, on the other hand, does not appear to have any particularly effective rhetorical function. The passage contains a repetition of motion, a word which does not appear in the corresponding passage of King John. The idea of "knitting powers," is transformed into two questions, neither of which adds to the effectiveness of the speech since neither contains the proposition it intends to confirm. Similarly ineffective is

11. Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language (1966), p. 246. Sr. Miriam's discussion of this phenomenon does not include this example.

the repetition of what appears to be a fused cluster from King John. The cluster includes peace (or "the quiet of the State"), and league (or "bond of loue"), conjoined with loue (or amitie). Each time one of these words appears in the passage of The Troublesome Reign, the other two appear in near conjunction with it (excepting only the occurrence of peace alone in line 765).

If we assume the priority of The Troublesome Reign, we would have to assume further that from the bad poet's lines Shakespeare picked up the three repeated words, peace, league, and loue, using them in his corresponding passage but separating lcue from the original cluster and using it in the context of the potential love between Blanche and Lewis. In addition, Shakespeare would have to have recalled the repetition of "knit your strengths," and to have constructed the marriage proposal (427 ff.) based on a series of effective rhetorical questions. But the passage of The Troublesome Reign affords examples of both fused borrowing and non-rhetorical repetition, suggestive of the indebtedness of the passage to the corresponding passage of King John.

Other evidence from the passage indicates that we may prefer the theory of the priority of King John. This evidence involves the borrowing by one passage or the other of the words yong (i) and lustie (f). Whereas in King John these words are applied separately to Lewis, in the

Citizen's effort to make the proposed match mutually appealing, in The Troublesome Reign they appear together referring to the Bastard (line 737). The adjectives were appropriate in King John but irrelevant in The Troublesome Reign. Therefore, it is more likely that they were borrowed by the unknown author, who vaguely remembered them from a context in which they were meaningful, than that they were borrowed by Shakespeare who vaguely remembered them from a context in which they were irrelevant.

Two other general considerations suggest the priority of King John: this passage in The Troublesome Reign seems to be indicative of something more than bad poetry--i.e., that the unknown author is struggling to work remembered words into intelligible lines which make a point similar to the original point; and the comparison of these lines of text with similar lines in memorial reconstructions indicates that these lines may illustrate a roughly comparable textual relationship.

The analysis of these parallel passages has involved distinguishing between rhetorical and non-rhetorical repetition--a characteristic of memorial reconstructions and, occasionally it seems, of The Troublesome Reign. The distinction between these two kinds of repetition requires clarification. To be sure, Shakespeare used a great deal of repetition, as Sister Miriam Joseph points out, especially in his early work (p. 79). The rhetorical figures

Shakespeare used, however, are justified by their contexts; whereas the non-rhetorical repetitions of The Troublesome Reign appear gratuitous in context. Therefore, the analysis of repetition to determine the direction of indebtedness actually involves two considerations. A striking word or phrase in the original text may prompt several repetitions of the word in the indebted text. And a strikingly used rhetorical figure of repetition in the original text emphasizes the repeated word or phrase, thereby prompting at least one echo of the word or phrase in the indebted text.

An example of rhetorical repetition in Shakespeare's text which seems to have prompted only one borrowed echo in the corresponding passage of The Troublesome Reign occurs during Pandulph's excommunication of John:

King John

PAND. Philip of France, on
perill of a curse,
Let goe the hand of that
Arch-heretique,
And raise the power of
France vpon his head,
Vnlesse he doe submit him-
self to Rome.
ELEA. Look'st thou pale
France? do not let go
thy hand.
CON. Looke to that Deuill,
lest that France repent,
And by disioyning hands hell
lose a soul. . . .
FRA. . . .
This royall hand and mine
are newly knit,
And the coniunction of our
inward soules

The Troublesome Reign

CARD. Stay King of France,
I charge thee ioyne not
hands
With him that stands accurst
of God and men.
(1:966-7)

Married in league, coupled,
 and link'd together
 With all religious strength
 of sacred vowes,
 The latest breath that gaue
 the sound of words
 Was deep-sworne faith, peace,
 amity, true loue
 Between our kingdomes and our
 royall selues, . . .
 And shall these hands so
 lately purg'd of bloud?
 So newly ioyn'd in loue? So
 strong in both,
Vnyoke this seysure, and
 this kinde regret?
 Play fast and loose with
 faith? so iest with
 heuen,
 Make such vnconstant children
 of our selues
 As now againe to snatch our
palme from palme: . . .
 (3.1.195-6, 226-32, 239-
 44)

If simple repetition were the criterion by which to judge an indebted text, this example would invalidate the example from the treaty proposal speeches (above, pp. 106-8). However, this is a much different kind of example from that one because there is no corresponding passage in which King Philip wrestles with his conscience in The Troublesome Reign. Moreover, the rhetorical skill of the passage seems more likely to have prompted the single borrowing in The Troublesome Reign than to have been inspired by it. The passage shows compression of several key words from the earlier treaty-proposal speech, emphasizing the attempt that Philip successfully makes to reverse the values he has recently upheld. The repeated image of joining hands as symbolic of

the recent treaty differs each time it occurs. "Let goe the hand" yields to "disioyning hands" and then changes to the "coniunction" of souls. Finally the image returns to hands in the figure, "purg'd of blood," and then concludes in the phrase, "to snatch palme from palme." Pandulph replies to Philip's speech with a syllogistic answer in the lines that follow, convincing King Philip that he must indeed break his truce with John. The problem with a passage such as this is that once again either theory of priority would seem to account for the difference and the echo. Either Shakespeare elaborated the single phrase in The Troublesome Reign, weaving it into a full speech, or the unknown author, remembering the vivid use of imagery in that passage, echoed it in Pandulph's abrupt demand.

In this instance, however, the priority of Shakespeare's rhetorically effective version is confirmed by non-verbal evidence. In Shakespeare's play Pandulph enters challenging John to give cause for rejecting Stephen Langton as Archbishop (3.1.136-46). Not until John openly defies the Pope and his power of investiture does Pandulph excommunicate him (171-9). In The Troublesome Reign, on the other hand, Pandulph's opening lines include the description of John as "accurst" (1:997). If John is indeed accurst--or excommunicated--at this point, there is no reason for Pandulph to carry out the ritual of excommunication, as he does a few lines later (993-1000). This passage affords a

compressed example of the characteristic of doubling action which we have already noted in The Troublesome Reign (above, pp. 55-60). The superfluity of the duplication suggests the priority of King John, in which John was excommunicated only after an exchange of disputation between himself and Pandulph.

The recurring problem of ambiguity in analyzing repetitions in corresponding passages of related plays reminds us again of this most difficult problem of attempting to prove the direction of indebtedness from verbal evidence. The few seemingly irreversible examples of verbal indebtedness of The Troublesome Reign to King John are nearly counterbalanced by examples which may yield to different interpretations. Although much of the verbal evidence is inconclusive, it suggests that the alternative to the traditional theory of priority should be preferred.

CHAPTER 5

THE SHAKESPEARIAN CHARACTERISTICS OF KING JOHN

Textual evidence indicating that The Troublesome Reign is a plot-based adaptation of King John is confirmed by the literary consideration that in King John the characterization and the compression of historical data are peculiarly characteristic of Shakespeare. This consideration is often overlooked because of misconceptions about Shakespeare's use of sources. In this chapter, therefore, I shall begin by reviewing some opinions about Shakespeare's borrowing which are inadequate because they fail to account for elements (either invented or derived from other sources) which Shakespeare added to his principal source or substituted for elements found in that source. Then I shall attempt to demonstrate the uniquely Shakespearian treatment of the King John story. The purpose of this chapter is to establish the unlikelihood of Shakespeare's having found a single source so well-suited to his taste that he could adopt virtually all of it, merely omitting a few scenes, rearranging a few episodes, and emphasizing details of characterization, in order to create the thematic design of King John.

Shakespeare's Borrowing of Plots

There is no universal agreement upon the way in which Shakespeare is supposed to have used his sources. As a result scholars sometimes disagree strenuously, each believing his own conception of Shakespeare's borrowing to be fact rather than opinion. Virgil K. Whitaker, for example, summarizes what he believes to be a generally acceptable account of Shakespeare's method of borrowing:

We know that he habitually followed his sources as closely as possible--plot structure, characterization, even whole passages that he merely versified. (Shakespeare's Use of Learning, p. 4)

This statement is open to dispute on every point: (1) Shakespeare normally used several sources for "plot structure" and could not, therefore, follow any one source "as closely as possible"; (2) some of his most interesting characters, such as Mercutio, Falstaff, Touchstone, and Enobarbus, are barely suggested by his sources or are not present in the sources at all; and (3) when Shakespeare on occasion "merely versified" passages of narrative, he created his own emphasis, his own imagery, and his own distillation of the ideas contained in the original passage. Not only does Whitaker not acknowledge such reservations, but he also goes on to expand his point in stating the governing principle of his study of "Shakespeare's learning":

The following investigation rests on the principle that Shakespeare tended to follow a main source or sources and to deviate from them only for a very

good reason. . . . During the first two periods mentioned Shakespeare, in general, followed the sequence of events--the narrative--of his sources as closely as possible, making only such changes as were necessary to produce a dramatic plot or plausible characters. Often he was content with an almost slovenly plot. His best efforts he lavished increasingly upon the construction of his wonderful characters, but those characters, be it noted, were always developed to make acceptable and interesting the original source action, imperfect as that might be. (pp. 9-11)

Indeed, Whitaker is so convinced of Shakespeare's close adherence to his sources--especially during the earlier two periods of his career--that he omits from his discussion of the romantic comedies both A Midsummer Night's Dream and The Merry Wives of Windsor. He explains that because the sources for these two plays are fragmentary, they are to be regarded as "exceptions to Shakespeare's usual method" (p. 179), resembling in this respect The Tempest, which he also finds convenient to omit from discussion. Shakespeare's usual method, according to Whitaker, is exemplified by his use of The Troublesome Reign--a play which he considers to be the only extant example of many old plays from which Shakespeare drew his own works (p. 7).

In making the assumption that Shakespeare often worked from "lost source plays," Whitaker follows an outmoded tradition of scholarship. At one time or another, "lost source plays" have been suggested for at least

eighteen Shakespearian plays.¹ These suggestions appear to have resulted, in general, from three different motives: (1) the desire to elaborate theories about text--that is, to offer explanations of the complex relationship between such plays as The Shrew and A Shrew by proposing a third play as the source of both; (2) the inability to establish a principal source for a given play; and (3) a reluctance to concede Shakespeare's originality. This third motive is a residual corollary to now abandoned theories which interpreted as sources those plays which we now know to be memorial reconstructions of Shakespeare's plays. Of all of these suggested "lost source plays," however, only one, the Ur-Hamlet, is based on factual evidence. In other words, the assumption that Shakespeare closely followed source plays rests primarily upon speculation which is borne out by facts in only one case out of eighteen.

Kenneth Muir's study of Shakespeare's use of sources has revealed the weakness of Whitaker's position. Muir frequently alludes to the difficulty of making generalizations about Shakespeare's borrowing techniques. At one

1. The Comedy of Errors, Love's Labour's Lost, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Tempest, Henry IV Parts 1 and 2, Henry V, Richard III, King John, The Two Gentlemen of Verona, The Taming of the Shrew, Titus Andronicus, Much Ado About Nothing, The Merry Wives of Windsor, Timon of Athens, Pericles, and Hamlet. The last eight plays in this list are cited in Kenneth Muir's summary in Shakespeare's Sources, vol. 1 (1957), pp. 255-7. In this table, Muir questions lost source plays as main sources for all but Hamlet, for which he regards the lost source play as certain.

point, for example, he says:

We cannot hope to track down more than a small fraction of the passages which Shakespeare made use of. . . . We are on surer ground when we attempt to trace the sources of his plots, though even here there are obstacles in the way. . . .

Shakespeare's method of composition differed from play to play. For one or two no direct source has been discovered. . . . For several of his plots Shakespeare appears to have used only one source. (pp. 16-17)

Whether Shakespeare used one source or several, Muir's work demonstrates, he always elaborates the materials of his principal source, adding characters, themes, and plot elements either drawn from other sources or invented by him. Thus Shakespeare's plays, including King John, contain a number of elements drawn from various sources.

Scholars who formulate theories of Shakespeare's borrowing sometimes overlook his characteristic modifications of sources. The characters, situations, and arrangement of episodes contribute to what may be called the construction of Shakespeare's plays. And, as Hereward T. Price argues, Shakespeare did not borrow the elements of his construction from sources. Equating plot with construction, Price says:

Let us once and for all get rid of the idea that Shakespeare borrowed his plots. In construction he was both daring and original.²

2. Construction in Shakespeare, University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology, No. 17 (1951), p. 12.

This argument actually involves three distinctions, not two--that is, the distinctions among story, plot, and construction. Story is the narration of a temporal sequence of events; plot involves the addition to story of causal relationships among events; construction involves the interweaving of imagery, theme, characterization, and symbolic action with plot so that all elements contribute to the artistically satisfying design of the whole.³ Shakespeare often borrowed stories, he sometimes borrowed plots, but he never borrowed construction. Price summarizes Shakespeare's method of adapting source stories to the demands of his construction as follows:

When Shakespeare takes over an old story, he is not bound by it. He alters, cuts, adds, interweaves new stories, devises new characters and situations; in short, his invention is busily at work transforming his raw material into something new and strange. (p. 12)

Although Shakespeare generally used sources for his stories, his construction was based on his own arrangement of episodes and his thematic balancing of characters and actions. Whitaker's discussion of Shakespeare's borrowing virtually ignores this originality of construction. If King John were truly based upon The Troublesome Reign, the relationship between the two works would have to be regarded as more unusual than Whitaker, or his ally J. Dover

3. E. M. Forster seems to be explaining the same phenomenon in his discussion of pattern. (Aspects of the Novel, 1957, p. 152.)

Wilson, intended to suggest.⁴ That is, in this single case Shakespeare would have to be thought of as having borrowed his arrangement of episodes, his use of characters, and his presentation of themes from a single source. The unlikelihood that Shakespeare would have borrowed his construction from The Troublesome Reign will be argued in the following sections of this chapter.

Character Types in King John

The only credit for originality which Whitaker concedes Shakespeare's early plays is for "the construction of his wonderful characters" (above p. 117). The excellence of Shakespeare's characterization is not to be denied. Examples of Shakespeare's fascinating character types appear in nearly all of his plays, and three of his favorite types appear in King John: the roguish commentator, the precocious child, and the wronged, lamenting female. It may be observed, however, that these three typically Shakespearian characters--the Bastard, Arthur, and Constance--also occur in The Troublesome Reign. According to the traditional view of the relationship between these plays, Shakespeare

4. Whitaker cites with approval Wilson's statement: "King John, being the only Shakespearian play the non-Shakespearian original for which has survived, offers a unique opportunity of studying the way in which Shakespeare handled the material given him, and thence of inferring to some extent his method of dealing in other plays with sources that are now lost" (New Cambridge KJ, p. xxxiv).

developed the characters in King John from models provided by The Troublesome Reign. In this case we should have to assume that some unknown dramatist, writing sometime around 1590, constructed a history play using characters which resemble three of Shakespeare's favorite character types and which do not occur in the work of any other dramatist of the period. Such an assumption is surely untenable. To counter it, I shall demonstrate how Shakespeare could have developed these characters from chronicle sources, how he used them in his construction, and how at least two of them --the Bastard and Arthur--may be thought to have been misunderstood by the author of The Troublesome Reign.

The first of these typically Shakespearian characters is the Bastard, representing one of Shakespeare's frequent additions to the basic plot materials of his sources. The Bastard resembles other roguish but astute commentators in Shakespeare's plays, based on bare suggestions in the sources. Falstaff, for example, is sometimes thought to have been based on Jockey in The Famous Victories of Henry V, but he is very little like that character. Ned, another character in The Famous Victories, suffers rejection by Hal, but he is not in any other way much like Falstaff. Mercutio is based on a single brief reference in the source (Muir, p. 25). Enobarbus, similarly, is based on two brief references in Plutarch's Lives; he has no speeches in the source. It seems unlikely, therefore, that the Bastard

Falconbridge, one of these Shakespearian "commentator" characters, could be based on so full a characterization as is given in The Troublesome Reign. Like other such characters in Shakespeare, he could easily have been developed from a single reference, such as that provided by Holinshed.

The same yere, Philip bastard sonne to King Richard, to whom his father had giuen the castell and honor of Coinacke, killed the viscount of Limoges, in reuenge of his fathers death, who was slaine (as yee haue heard) in besieging the castell of Chalus Cheuerell.
(ed. 1587, 3:160)

Shakespeare seems to have relied on several other sources as well as his own imagination in creating the individualized character of the Bastard of King John. The Bastard's name, Falconbridge, apparently comes from the name of Thomas Neville, the Bastard of Lord Falconbridge, to whom Shakespeare refers in 3 Henry VI (1.1.239). In the Bastard's assignment to collect ransom from the monasteries, the character recalls Faukes de Brent, another bastard, who conducted raids on the monasteries for King John. Indeed, the similarity between the names "Faukes" and "Falconbridge" may have provided a link which caused Shakespeare to conflate the two characters. To introduce the Bastard to the play, Shakespeare referred to a story of still another famous bastard about whom he would have read in writing the Henry VI plays--Dunois, the Bastard of Orleans. According to Edward Hall's narration, Dunois had, in the presence of King and Court, renounced his birthright as the heir to his

mother's husband in favor of honor as the acknowledged Bastard of the Duke of Orleans.⁵ Indeed, as J. Dover Wilson says, the Bastard Falconbridge "appears to be compounded of the most valiant bastards in English history" (p. xli). But Wilson is on questionable grounds in crediting the author of The Troublesome Reign with this remarkable achievement of characterization.

Not only is the compression of sources in creating the Bastard typical of Shakespeare's work, but also the embellishment of the sources with thematically relevant detail is characteristic. Shakespeare apparently added a younger legitimate brother to Hall's story of the legitimacy hearing, thereby dramatizing in the first act of King John a parallel, on small scale, to the rival claims of John and Arthur. In addition, Shakespeare dramatized an interview (1.1.220 ff.) between the Bastard and his mother, Lady Falconbridge, to suggest a contrast with the scene between Arthur and Constance in 3.1--both sons have lost a birth-right; both mothers experience a sense of personal loss, but in her relative composure Lady Falconbridge contrasts with Constance, and in his relative strength of determination the Bastard contrasts with Arthur.

Moreover, the function of the Bastard in King John evinces Shakespeare's typical skill in adapting character to

5. Sources cited in Geoffrey Bullough, Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare (1966), 4:25-60.

is determined not by the intrinsic merit of any course of action but by the merit of the motive for action.

In his role as a testing figure, the Bastard is compared with John, Arthur, and Lewis by inferences from language and action. The Bastard exposes the weakness, especially the self-interest, of nearly all of the other characters in the play, both because he lacks the flaws they demonstrate and because he comments on those flaws. As contrasted with John, the Bastard becomes strong under threat of opposition whereas John weakens to the point that he gives over his responsibility to the Bastard ("Haue thou the ordering of this present time," 5.1.76). As a foil to Arthur, the Bastard, another nephew to John, exemplifies the qualities of loyalty in a subject and strength of character which are lacking in Arthur. As a foil to Lewis, another contender for the English throne, the Bastard shares Lewis' eagerness for battle but lacks his self-interest. The Bastard, in contrast to nearly all of the other characters in the play, is motivated by a kind of cynical idealism throughout.

So striking is the characterization of the Bastard and so dynamic is his action that some critics interpret the Bastard as another contender for the throne and as the

protagonist of the play.⁶ The Bastard's role is certainly important, but events in the play do not support such a reading. J. L. Simmons' simpler view seems a more nearly accurate assessment of the Bastard's significance: "the Bastard is not the essence of the true king but of the loyal subject with a vision of the true king."⁷ Two further considerations (not mentioned by Simmons) support this view of the Bastard's role. In the first place, illegitimate sons are not chosen to rule, either in history or in literature, even if, as sometimes happens in both history and literature, they appear to be more suited to rule than the legitimate king. This fact could not for a moment have eluded the author of the Henry VI plays, in which the illegitimate Beauforts are important antagonists. And, secondly, the Bastard of King John never makes a point of

6. Adrien Bonjour, "The Road to Swinstead Abbey: A Study of the Sense and Structure of King John," ELH 18 (1951):253-74. Bonjour sees the Bastard and John as two panels "in a great Diptych"; the pattern of the play is balanced between the fall of John and the rise of the Bastard. Bonjour is supported by James L. Calderwood, "Commodity and Honour in King John," University of Toronto Quarterly 29 (1960):341-56; reprinted in Shakespeare: The Histories; A Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Eugene M. Waith (1965), pp. 85-101, and by William H. Matchett, "Richard's Divided Heritage in King John," Essays in Criticism 12 (1962):231-53. Both Calderwood and Matchett see Hubert as suggesting that the Bastard may seize the throne in 5.6, and they interpret the Bastard's rejection of the opportunity as a renunciation of commodity.

7. "Shakespeare's King John and Its Source: Coherence, Pattern, and Vision," Tulane Studies in English 17 (1969):70.

being Richard's son; in fact, he sometimes seems to belittle the fact, as in his reminder to Eleanor that he is her grandson, "by chance but not by truth, . . . /And I am I, howe'er I was begot" (1.1.169 ff.). He does not speak of himself as a scourge to avenge his father's death on Austria, and he behaves toward John only as a loyal friend and subject, not as a potential king.

To be sure, the Bastard is the only English character in the play who (after 4.3) attempts to assume control of events, rather than be controlled by them. However, since the action he takes does not materially affect the outcome of the play, his emergence in the last act does not imply that he is the protagonist of the play.⁸ Although the Bastard endures and survives the action of the play, his position at the end is like Horatio's position at the end of Hamlet. He is a commentator on the action, not the protagonist of the action. As a commentator, the Bastard of King John bears the unmistakable stamp of Shakespeare's imagination. He is created from several historical models; he is used as a foil to Arthur and an instructive contrast

8. The Bastard's attempted actions are marked by failure. John gives up the crown (5.1) before the Bastard can discourage him from doing so; Lewis declares that he will not withdraw (5.2) before the Bastard has a chance to declare war on him; the French are defeated because of their loss of supplies rather than because of English might (5.5); most of the English force is lost at Lincoln Wash (5.6); and the Bastard loses his opportunity to carry out the revenge he promised John (5.7).

to other characters as well; and he is an ironic but undaunted commentator on the action of the play.

The same qualities of the Bastard which may have prompted some critics to consider him the protagonist of King John may also have contributed to the inconsistent portrayal of the Bastard in The Troublesome Reign. Although in the beginning of The Troublesome Reign the Bastard is the personified "spirit of Plantagenet," he has no particularly ennobling characteristics at that point, with the possible exception of his hatred of Austria's cowardice.⁹ Moreover, he does not participate in any significant action until he is sent to dissemble with the Barons at Bury St. Edmunds in order to learn their plans. In this encounter he becomes not a dissembler but a surprisingly eloquent and respected spokesman for obedience. What is striking in this scene, however, is not so much what the Bastard says as how he is treated by the Barons--up to this point he has done nothing in the play to warrant the obvious deference he is shown here. Subsequently, the Bastard's only action is in the ignominious retreat before the Lincoln Wash episode; yet he supports and encourages John as if he were the same dynamic figure as is the Bastard in King John. Whereas the audience

9. He seems motivated entirely by self-interest when he decides that Richard I is his father. He cruelly threatens his mother, and he objects to the compromise marriage between Lewis and Blanche because he has wanted to make his fortune by marrying Blanche himself.

of King John is prepared for the Bastard's emergence to prominence at the end of the play because of his expressions of maturing insight throughout; the audience of The Troublesome Reign is not so prepared for the Bastard's emergence--he seems to surface and submerge at random. Since there is no historical source for the characterization of the Bastard, it seems justifiable to attribute the inconsistencies of his portrayal in The Troublesome Reign to the unknown author's failure to understand the Bastard's peculiar combination of cynicism and dynamism in King John.

Arthur represents another of Shakespeare's typical characterizations--the precocious child. Other precocious children in the Shakespeare canon are Rutland of 3 Henry VI, Edward V and young York of Richard III, young Macduff of Macbeth, and Mamillius of The Winter's Tale. These children have three features in common: they are not characterized in the sources; they are victimized by jealous and powerful adults who are usually related to them; and they are remarkably perceptive about the weaknesses of the adult with whom they have to deal. Shakespeare's continuing interest in the type is suggested by his use of it throughout his career--as early as 3 Henry VI and as late as The Winter's Tale.

The Arthur of King John is apparently based on the single descriptive reference to him in Holinshed's Chronicles as "a babe to speake of" (3:157). In 2.1 of Shakespeare's

play he is represented as unable to speak for himself, being dominated almost entirely by his mother and her allies. Even when he occasionally rebukes his mother, he uses a passive appeal. In one example of such a rebuke, he virtually abdicates his claim to the throne:

Good my mother peace,
I would that I were low laid in my graue,
I am not worth this coyle that's made for me.
(163-5)

Nevertheless in 4.1, when Arthur pleads with Hubert for his eyes, his pathetic helplessness is combined with sensitivity and skillful manipulation of Hubert's emotions. Arthur, using his helplessness as part of his appeal, succeeds in influencing Hubert.

Not only is the characterization of Arthur typical of Shakespeare, but the function of the child in the play is typical of Shakespeare's use of children in construction. Arthur is presented as an alternative to John, but because he is a child dominated by essentially self-seeking adults he is clearly an unattractive choice. Despite Arthur's powerlessness, he is a threat to John and must be destroyed; and John, like Richard III or Leontes, shows his utter depravity in issuing a command to murder the child.¹⁰ The child-like perceptions shown by the precocious children in

10. Bonjour discusses this point, p. 260.

Shakespeare's plays inevitably point out the frightening opposition of innocence and evil.

As in the case of the Bastard, some inconsistencies of the portrayal of Arthur in The Troublesome Reign may be attributed to the anonymous author's misunderstanding of the character in King John. Arthur in The Troublesome Reign is more assertive than his counterpart in King John, giving at least one scholar the opinion that he is meant to be an older child in The Troublesome Reign.¹¹ He rebukes his mother more decisively and he openly defies his uncle John. However, after he has died, the Barons refer to him as "that sweete vnguilty childe" (2:406). Since Holinshed indicates only that Arthur was a very young child, the author of The Troublesome Reign would not have been likely to have made him so old a child if he had been following the chronicles only. The portrayal of Arthur in The Troublesome Reign may be explained as a mishandling and misunderstanding of Shakespeare's precocious child. Unable to capture this mixture of helplessness and precocious insight, the anonymous author created an older and more generally powerful character but referred to him as a "child."

The third character type common to these plays is the wronged and lamenting female. In Constance of the King

11. Bullough (4:26 n. 1) says, "In TR Arthur is about fourteen, in KJ only eight or ten." The historical Arthur was fifteen when he died, but Holinshed gives no specific age for him.

John story, Shakespeare seems to have found an opportunity to portray a female character type which was also enormously successful in Queen Margaret of Richard III. Constance and Queen Margaret share three characteristics: they are both estranged from majesty; they both call down vengeance on those responsible for their estrangement; and they both lose sympathy because of the hysteria of their invective. They are at one and the same time both justified and wrong. Like Margaret, Constance justifiably curses her oppressors though she does not live to see them punished for their wrongs.

Whereas Queen Margaret's judgment of Richard is validated by his open profession of evil, Constance's judgments of both John and King Philip are validated because she echoes the Bastard's dispassionate commentary. In her distracted railing in 3.1 against the "perjur'd Kings" and adulterous "Fortune," for example, Constance echoes the sentiment and the language of the Bastard's speech on commodity at the end of 2.1 in which he remarks on "fickle Kings" and the "bawd" commodity.

Constance and Queen Margaret exemplify a character type which Shakespeare seems to have abandoned fairly early in his career. From the melodramatic characterization of the ambitious but wronged widow, he seems to have progressed to the more sympathetic portrayal of the wronged wife, exemplified by Hermione of The Winter's Tale and Queen Katherine of Henry VIII. Nevertheless, Constance's close

resemblance to Queen Margaret and her more general resemblance to those later female characters marks her as a typically Shakespearian character.

Three of the major characterizations of King John--the Bastard, Arthur, and Constance--may be said to be typically Shakespearian; yet they occur, albeit in elementary form, in The Troublesome Reign. It is most unlikely, however, that the anonymous author originally created these three Shakespearian character types and used them in The Troublesome Reign approximately as Shakespeare normally used such characters in his own plays. Probability favors the theory of Shakespeare's having developed the characters for King John in the same way he developed the characters for most of his other history plays--by imaginatively elaborating suggestions for characters which he found in narrative sources.

Shakespeare's Use of Historical Materials

Another consideration follows from the recognition of Shakespeare's unique achievement in the genre of the history play. Shakespeare is the only Elizabethan dramatist who wrote more than five extant English history plays. This fact substantially undercuts the assertion that Shakespeare "would never, perhaps could never, have written a King John play unless the ground had first been thus prepared for him [by The Troublesome Reign]" (Wilson, p. xxxix). The

historical accounts of King John offered Shakespeare an array of materials for character, situation, and theme which he also used in writing his other history plays. Moreover, Shakespeare's history plays show unique characteristics of construction not found in the work of any other writer of history plays. Brief reflection on the construction of non-Shakespearian examples of the history play will demonstrate Shakespeare's originality of construction. All of the non-Shakespearian history plays are constructed upon an essentially Marlovian plan--that is, they revolve around the weak or badly flawed King and the problems caused by his weakness. Lust, wantonness, or greed is the usual explanation for the King's permanent or temporary inability to repel a foreign threat. Of all of the non-Shakespearian Elizabethan history plays, only Woodstock resembles Shakespeare's plays in introducing domestic political issues. Another resemblance between Woodstock and Shakespeare's plays, as A. P. Rossiter has pointed out, is that both prefer "moral pattern to temporal sequence" and both include "varying types of humour"--humor, that is, which is appropriate to the theme of the play.¹²

If preferring moral pattern to temporal sequence results in violating historical cause and effect, it does create a more complex historical drama than does drama

12. Woodstock, A Moral History (1946), p. 70.

constructed on the Marlovian central-character pattern. Shakespeare's history plays raise several questions about the nature of kingship, both as this relates to the person of the King and as it relates to the national welfare. A principal theme of his history plays is the foundation of kingship--the question of legitimate succession to the throne. In nine of his ten history plays--that is, in all but Richard II--the question of legitimacy is raised; in nine of those plays--that is, in all but Henry V--the question of fitness to rule is raised. In Richard II we are introduced to an unfit king who virtually gives up his throne to Bolingbroke, thereby offering a kind of dramatic justification for his own deposition. In Henry V we meet a king whose fitness was questioned but proved before his ascension (in the Henry IV plays) and who seems to justify by might his title to the throne. Thus, King John is one of eight of Shakespeare's ten history plays in which both the King's fitness and his right to reign are questioned. And the questions are dramatized as they affect the welfare of the country. In each play the problems of the plot are resolved to satisfy the dramatic exigencies of the play. Yet in each play Shakespeare controls the emotional response of the audience to both the challengers and the King; so that although the specific dramatic action of the play is resolved by the end, no simple answer is given to the problems raised in the play. The resolutions of one play

in a tetralogy are inadequate to answer the issues raised in the next.

Similarly, in King John the issues raised by the action of the play are not fully resolved by the end. The play provides a study of the bases for making appropriate political decisions in the face of ambiguous and conflicting claims--an especially pressing issue when the King's title to rule is in question and when the King acknowledges himself to be unfit. In the play, commodity is rejected as a basis for political choices. Instead, the reliable characters--the Bastard and Hubert--act in accord with an ideal of kingship and loyalty which is actually unattainable in temporal affairs. In King John Shakespeare neither vindicates John nor accuses the rebels--he exposes the weakness of both sides.

Considering the typicality of the theme afforded by the King John story, it seems most unlikely that on this one occasion Shakespeare would have been able to find a source which had already compressed historical data along the lines of his own historical interests. The point may be confirmed by considering the usual method Shakespeare employed in writing the many plays for which sources are known, rather than by speculating on the method he might have employed in writing from alleged source plays. It ought to be remembered that, if Shakespeare relied principally upon The Troublesome Reign as a source, King John would be the only history play

for which he did not consult at least two chronicle sources and several literary sources and for which he did not construct his own thematic design from such sources.

Even in Shakespeare's earliest non-historical plays he did not use only one source--indeed, he seldom ever did. For the Comedy of Errors, for example, he might, if he had wished, have used only the story from Plautus' Menaechmi; however, he added materials from the Amphitruo and from Apollonius of Tyre. He complicated the basic plot of the Menaechmi, in other words, by the addition of a second pair of twins and separated parents.

In all of his plays Shakespeare altered the episode-sequences and invented situations and character detail in order to meet the requirements of construction of the play in question. When the sources are historical ones, the construction is built up by the addition of non-historical materials and by the interpretation of historical events which is suggested in the episode sequence. A summary of the major non-historical elements common to both King John and The Troublesome Reign will demonstrate how greatly Shakespeare, if King John were the indebted text, would have to be supposed to have relied upon The Troublesome Reign for details which were essential to his theme.

1. The introduction of the Falconbridge quarrel immediately after the French declaration of war in the first scene. And the subsequent use of the

Bastard as testing figure and spokesman of the theme.

2. The massing of all of the characters of the play in 2.1 and 3.1 and the use of paired antagonists to interrupt the public confrontation, emphasizing the theme of conflicting loyalty.
3. The suggestion of a marriage agreement made by the Citizen of Angiers after his city is threatened.
4. The disruption of the wedding festivities by Pandulph's excommunication of John.
5. The written warrant for dealing with Arthur.
6. The confrontation at court between Peter of Pomfret and John.
7. The dramatization of Arthur's death and of the Barons' finding his corpse.
8. The reconciliation and death scene dramatized before the war with France is ended.

These of course are only the larger details which Shakespeare or the anonymous author must be said to have invented in order to dramatize the chronicle materials. Many other selections of episodes, and arrangements of episodes could be added to the list.

Since most of these larger elements of construction are crucial to Shakespeare's thematic presentation, and since these adaptations from narrative sources resemble the changes Shakespeare normally made in such sources, it seems

unlikely (if not impossible) that he could have found a single source which already contained them. In view of this consideration of negative probability, we may prefer the theory of the priority of King John.

The credibility of conclusions based on the literary analysis of King John and The Troublesome Reign is liable to attack because of a limitation inherent in the materials of the investigation. When we are attempting to describe, for example, what Shakespeare may or may not have borrowed from a source, we can point to no systematic tabulation of various elements which he can be shown to have borrowed from sources. We may infer from a general acquaintance with Shakespeare's sources and his characteristic use of them that there are no sources which stand in so close a relation to any of his plays as would The Troublesome Reign to King John if it were indeed a source of that play. We are on firmer ground in being able to point to specific ways in which the author of The Troublesome Reign may be said to have misunderstood a given point made in King John. To be sure, it is impossible to deny that if Shakespeare had found a play like The Troublesome Reign he would probably have used it as a convenient source. It seems unlikely, however, that Shakespeare could have found a source which contained so many characteristically Shakespearian elements as are to be found in The Troublesome Reign.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

In this study I have attempted to demonstrate, on the basis of textual evidence and literary argument, the priority of Shakespeare's King John to The Troublesome Reign of John King of England.

Bibliographical study of The Troublesome Reign indicates that the two parts of that play were printed at substantially the same time and that, although independently signed, they were treated in the printing-house as if a single book. This fact of printing accords with the conclusion, based on literary analysis, that The Troublesome Reign is really a single play rather than a two-part play. Thus the two-part division of The Troublesome Reign does not bear upon the question of the relationship between that play and King John.

A major difficulty in accepting The Troublesome Reign as indebted to King John has been that The Troublesome Reign is clearly not a memorial reconstruction of Shakespeare's play. Establishment, therefore, of a new class of indebted texts--the plot-based adaptation--makes it possible to understand how The Troublesome Reign can be indebted to King John despite the apparent originality of language and

action in the anonymous play. The existence of plot-based adaptations is attested to by contemporary references to "plots" which were evidently plot outlines from which plays were to be written. Thus, a plot-based adaptation, being based on a plot outline of the original play, would include the same general run of action and dialogue as the original, but need not show any specific attempt to reproduce the exact language of the original.

A comparison of the texts of the two plays reveals characteristics of The Troublesome Reign which are consistent with the view that The Troublesome Reign is a plot-based adaptation of King John. That is, the general run of the action and dialogue is the same in both plays. Non-parallel actions or episodes in The Troublesome Reign may be explained as having an ultimate origin in King John--they appear to be dramatizations of reports or allusions in King John. Although there was clearly no attempt to duplicate the exact language of King John, many parallel speeches in The Troublesome Reign nevertheless do contain memory components similar to the verbal echoes of original texts that are found in memorial reconstructions. The analogy provided by memorial reconstructions in respect of these memory components suggests the indebtedness of The Troublesome Reign to King John.

The textual evidence suggesting that The Troublesome Reign is a plot-based adaptation of King John is supported

by the argument, based on literary grounds, that Shakespeare is unlikely to have found a source containing so many typically "Shakespearian" elements as are to be found in The Troublesome Reign.

The proposition that Shakespeare's King John is prior to The Troublesome Reign has two general implications. The first involves the antedating of some half a dozen of Shakespeare's early plays. If the proposition is accepted, King John must be antedated five years, from 1596 to 1591 (the date of publication of The Troublesome Reign) or earlier. In addition, other of Shakespeare's plays which are echoed in The Troublesome Reign--such as Titus Andronicus and Richard III--must be re-dated from about 1593 to 1591 or earlier. Such re-dating would be in harmony with a modern tendency to antedate Shakespeare's early plays.¹

The other general implication of the proposition that King John is prior to The Troublesome Reign is that there is no longer even a single piece of evidence to support the theory that Shakespeare closely followed the structure of any one of his sources. Thus The Troublesome Reign, a plot-based adaptation, may be grouped with other indebted texts--the so-called bad quartos--formerly thought to have been early drafts or sources of Shakespeare's plays.

1. Alfred Harbage, for example, has proposed a date of 1588/9 for Love's Labor's Lost: "Love's Labor's Lost and the Early Shakespeare," PQ 41 (1962):18-36.

APPENDIX A

PARALLEL PLOT SUMMARIES OF KING JOHN
AND THE TROUBLESOME REIGN

The summaries given below have been arranged from the point of view of King John. In the left-hand column, under the act-scene designation of the Globe edition, is given a summary of principal actions in each scene of King John. In the right-hand column, under scene designations determined by apparent cleared stages, is given a summary of the parallel and non-parallel actions in The Troublesome Reign. Where actions in The Troublesome Reign must appear out of order so as to correspond to actions in King John, scene numbers will indicate their correct order in The Troublesome Reign. Actions unique to either play are designated by an asterisk. Square brackets designate second references to scenes of The Troublesome Reign.

King John

The Troublesome Reign

Act 1

Scene 1

(1) Chattilion delivers challenge from France and is sent back to convey John's declaration of war.

(2) Falconbridge brothers ask for judgment on Bastard's inheritance rights.

(1) After introductory remarks by Eleanor and John,* Chattilion delivers challenge from France and is sent back to convey John's declaration of war.

(2) Falconbridge brothers are brought in for having caused a disturbance over their inheritance dispute.

King John

- a. John gives legal argument for Bastard's legitimacy.
- b. Eleanor gives Bastard the alternative of honor as Richard's base son and he accepts.*
- c. Lady Falconbridge arrives, hoping to forestall the scandal, but, after hearing that she is too late, she admits to Philip that Richard I was his father.

Act 2

- (1) Chattilion reports to King Philip and allies, saying John is arriving at once.
- (2) John arrives and disputes legitimacy of his claim with King Philip.
 - a. They are interrupted by arguments between Eleanor and Constance, the Bastard and Austria.
 - b. They are all interrupted by the Citizen on the walls who says the city will accept neither King until right is proved.

- (3) Excursions.

The Troublesome Reign

- a. John decides to settle dispute by asking Bastard and his mother three times each. The second time the Bastard is asked, he is inspired to say that he is Richard's son.*
- b. Eleanor and John accept the Bastard because of his likeness to Richard.
- c. When the Bastard is alone with his mother, he threatens to make her tell him who his father is, and she finally confesses it is Richard I.

Scene 2

- (1) Chattilion reports to King Philip and allies, saying John is arriving at once.
- (2) John arrives and disputes legitimacy of his claim with King Philip.
 - a. They are interrupted by arguments between Eleanor and Constance, the Bastard and Austria.
 - b. They are all interrupted by the Citizen on the walls who says the city will accept neither King until right is proved.

Scene 3

- (1) Excursions. Bastard pursues Austria and wins lion's skin from him, then curses the fleeing Duke as a coward.*

King John

(4) Heralds of both countries summon Citizen to the walls again, but he tells them the city is still waiting for proof of right by victory.

- a. Bastard suggests that they raze the city before determining who is ruler of it.
- b. Citizen makes a counter-suggestion that Kings make peace based on marriage between Blanche and Lewis, which proposal the Kings accept.
- c. Bastard gives soliloquy on commodity.*

Act 3 scene 1

(1) Constance, having been told of the treaty,* decries King Philip's abandonment of her cause and refuses to join the wedding party.*

(2) When the Kings come to her Constance dominates the celebration by calling for revenge; Austria and Bastard also exchange insults.

(3) Pandulph arrives, demanding of John why he has refused the Pope's election of Stephen Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury; ends

The Troublesome ReignScene 4

(1) Heralds of both countries summon Citizen to the walls again, but he tells them the city is still waiting for proof of right by victory.

- a. Bastard suggests that they raze the city before determining who is ruler of it.
- b. Citizen makes a counter-suggestion that Kings make peace based on marriage between Blanche and Lewis, which proposal the Kings accept. Constance is present during the negotiation.*

Scene 5

(1) Constance, with Arthur, berates King Philip for abandoning her; commiserates with Arthur, who, she says, cannot appreciate how bad the treaty is for him.

Scene 6

(1) Constance dominates celebration by calling for revenge; the Bastard asks for a fight with Austria, is given a dukedom so that he will have equal rank, but Austria refuses to fight.*

(2) Pandulph arrives, declaring John accurst, then asks why he has refused the Pope's election of Stephen Langton to

King John

by excommunicating John and threatening King Philip with same curse if he does not oppose John.

- a. King Philip is uncertain about whether to keep his vow to John or the Pope.*
- b. Pandulph explains that the oath to John was an oath against God and is therefore void.*
- c. Blanche protests that her new husband should fight against her uncle.
- d. Both Kings take to arms.

Act 3 scene 2

(1) The Bastard has beheaded Austria; John has captured Arthur but fears his mother may have been taken by the French until Bastard reports that he has already rescued her.

Act 3 scene 3

(1) Having won a victory, John assigns duties to retainers: (a) gives Eleanor regency of French territories; (b) sends the Bastard to ransack the monasteries; (c) gives Hubert charge of Arthur, tacitly commanding that Arthur be killed. Hubert agrees.

The Troublesome Reign

archbishopric; excommunicates John and tells King Philip he must also oppose John.

- a. John goes off to prepare for battle.
- b. Blanche remonstrates with Lewis for leaving her on their wedding day.
- c. King Philip makes call to arms.

Scene 7

(1) The Bastard has killed Austria.

(2) The French take Eleanor prisoner.*

(3) Excursions during which Eleanor is rescued by John and Arthur is captured.*

Scene 8

(1) Having won a victory, John assigns duties to retainers: (b) gives Eleanor regency of French territories; (a) sends the Bastard to ransack the monasteries; (c) gives Hubert charge of Arthur and suggests that he will order Arthur to be killed.

King JohnThe Troublesome ReignAct 3 scene 4

(1) King Philip mourns losses with Lewis and Pandulph, and all attempt to appease Constance's frenzy.

(2) Lewis, in despair, is cheered by Pandulph who explains that all will work to his advantage because John will have to kill Arthur, inciting rebellion among his people. Thus Lewis will have next legal claim and the support of citizens and clergy in England.

Act 4 scene 1

(1) Hubert shows a written order to put out Arthur's eyes but, persuaded by Arthur's pleas, is unable to carry them out.

Act 4 scene 2Scene 9

(1) King Philip mourns loss, especially of Austria. He, Lewis, and Pandulph try to console Constance.

(2) Pandulph tells Lewis that all will work to his advantage because John will have to kill Arthur and Lewis will have next legal claim to England.

Scene 10*

(1) The Bastard ransacks the monastery, finding a nun in the Friar's treasure chest and a Friar in the Nun's. They promise to pay well if he will not take action.

(2) Peter of Pomfret is followed by crowds asking for prophecies. The Bastard says he has been seeking the Prophet and wants him to come to court with him.

Scene 11

(1) Hubert shows a written order to put out Arthur's eyes but, persuaded by Arthur's remonstrances, is unable to carry them out.

Scene 12

(1) John suggests that his second coronation will be a reaffirmation of subjects'

King JohnThe Troublesome Reign

faith after he has defeated Pope and squelched Arthur's attempt to claim title.

(1) John's retainers object to his having had a second coronation but urge a boon which they believe will ease peoples' fears--namely, to free Arthur.

(3) John says again that he wants a reaffirmation now that he has answered the challenge to his title; Barons ask that he free Arthur. John says he will.

(2) Hubert brings false report that Arthur is dead, and Barons leave in anger.

(6) Hubert brings false report that Arthur is dead, of langor; he says that Arthur's eyes were put out by John's command.* Barons leave in anger.

(3) A messenger reports that the French have arrived in England and that both Eleanor and Constance have died.

(4) Bastard, returning from the monasteries, says he has a prophet with him, who has been saying that John will give up his crown before Ascension Day at noon.

(2) Bastard, returning from the monasteries, says he has brought a prophet with him, but John wants to go on with coronation proceedings (3) before he sees the Prophet.

(5) Prophet confirms this directly to John; John sends him away to be imprisoned and hanged on Ascension Day at noon.

(5) Prophet is brought out to explicate the sign of the five moons which has appeared at the coronation (4)*. Next the Prophet announces that John will lose his crown before Ascension Day at noon.

(6) Bastard says he has heard of French landing and has met the Barons on their way to join Lewis. John sends Bastard away to try to win back their loyalty again.*

King John

- (7) Hubert reports the portent of the five moons and the people frightened by it.
- a. John accuses Hubert of responsibility for killing Arthur.
 - b. Hubert tells him that Arthur is really alive, and John sends Hubert to tell the Barons.

Act 4 scene 3

- (1) Arthur, attempting to escape from the castle (disguised as a ship-boy),* leaps over the walls and is killed.
- a. The Barons, going to meet Lewis, encounter the Bastard.*
 - b. They all notice Arthur's body.
 - c. Hubert comes to report that Arthur is alive, and they accuse him of Arthur's murder. He pleads innocence, but they continue to challenge him.
 - d. The Bastard intervenes to save Hubert.*
 - e. The Barons go on to Bury St. Edmunds.
 - f. The Bastard confronts Hubert, but begins to be convinced that he is innocent; then closes scene with soliloquy on ambiguity.

The Troublesome Reign

- (4) Just after the coronation, the Bastard sees the five moons, and calls in the prophet.
- (6) a. John accuses Hubert of responsibility for killing Arthur.
 - (6) b. Hubert tells him that Arthur is really alive, and John sends Hubert to tell the Barons.

Scene 13

- (1) Arthur, attempting to escape from the castle, leaps over the walls and is killed.
- a. The Barons, looking for Arthur's grave, find his body.
 - b. Hubert comes to report that Arthur is alive, and they accuse him of Arthur's murder. He pleads innocence, but they threaten him and send him away.*
 - c.* The Barons decide that Arthur has been killed too recently for Hubert to have committed the murder.*
 - d. The Barons plan to go to Bury St. Edmunds (disguised as pilgrims)* to join with Lewis.

King JohnThe Troublesome ReignScene 14*

(1) King John awaits mid-night (Ascension Day) so that he can hang the Prophet. He asks the Prophet to retract the prophecy but the Prophet refuses.

(4) John pretends to be repentant with Pandulph, but at first is not believed. When Pandulph does believe John, he explains conditions John must meet.

- a. Messenger reports that French have been seen off the coast of Kent.
- b. John agrees to terms but delays the ceremony.

Act 5 scene 1

(1) John has given Pandulph his crown and receives it from him.

- a. Pandulph goes off to make the French lay down their arms.
- b. John acknowledges that Peter's prophecy has been fulfilled.*

(2) Bastard reports to John:

- a. That all Kent but Dover Castle has yielded to Lewis.
- b. That Barons have gone to offer services to Lewis.

Scene 16

(1) John has submitted to Pandulph.

- a. Messenger reports that the French have subdued all lands in path of the invasion except Dover Castle.

[Sc. 14(3)] Bastard reports:

- a. That Peter has died cursing John and that the churchmen seek revenge.*
- b. That Barons have elected Lewis King.

King John

- c. That the Barons have found Arthur's body.

Act 5 scene 2

- (1) Agreement concluded between Barons and Lewis is copied out so that each side will remember oath.
- (2) Pandulph tries to send Lewis away, but Lewis refuses to go.
 - a. Bastard arrives to learn outcome of negotiation, and issues the English challenge.

Act 5 scene 3

- (1) John leaves the field.
 - a. Hubert reports that the English are losing the day.*
- (2) Messenger reports:
 - a. That Bastard sends to know where John will take refuge.*

The Troublesome Reign

- c. That Lewis' landing is expected.*
- d. That the Bastard has been asked to join rebels.*
- e. John grows angry, sending Bastard away and calling him back again; finally asks him to dissemble with the Barons to learn their plans.*

- [Sc. 14(2)] Hubert reports that Arthur has died (trying to escape).*
- a. John orders Peter of Pomfret hanged.

Scene 15

- (1) Barons list their grievances; Bastard remonstrates with them and leaves.*
- (2) Lewis arrives.
 - a. Swears mutual faith with English on the altar.*
 - b. French swear to execute English barons after the battle is won.*

- [Sc. 16(2)] Pandulph tries to send Lewis away, but Lewis refuses to go.
 - a. Bastard remonstrates with the rebels again.

Scene 18

- (1) John leaves the field.
 - a. Meets with Bastard who reports his loss at Lincoln Wash and the retreat which preceded it.*

King John

- b. That French supply ships are lost on Godwin Sands.

Act 5 scene 4

- (1) Melun confesses to the Barons that Lewis means to have them executed if they win a victory.
- (2) They decide to return to John.

Act 5 scene 5

- (1) Lewis feels as though he is winning. Messenger reports:
- a. That Melun is dead;
- b. That English barons have returned to John;
- c. That supply ships have been wrecked on Godwin Sands.
- d. Lewis asks whether it is true that John has fled the field; the Messenger answers that it is.

The Troublesome Reign

- (2) The Abbot and Monk of Swinstead Abbey greet John.*
- a. The Monk, left alone, plans to poison John.*
- b. The Abbot, overhearing, at first thinks the Monk means to murder him, but when he learns the truth, he approves the plan.*

Scene 17

- (1) Melun confesses to the Barons that Lewis means to have them executed if they win a victory.
- (2) They decide to return to John.

Scene 19

- (1) Lewis feels as though he is winning.
- a. Says he regrets that Melun has died;
- b. Also regrets that Dover Castle is holding out against him.*
- c. First Messenger reports that the English barons have returned to John.
- d. Second Messenger reports that the supply ships have been wrecked on Godwin Sands.
- e. Third Messenger reports that King John has lost his force in Lincoln Wash (implying that John himself is drowned).

King JohnAct 5 scene 6

- (1) Hubert and Bastard encounter each other in the dark.*
- a. Hubert reports that a monk has poisoned John and has died.
- b. Also reports that the Barons have come back to John with Prince Henry.
- c. Bastard tells Hubert of his loss in Lincoln Wash.

Act 5 scene 6

- (1) John is brought into the cool air of the orchard and makes his final speeches.
- a. Bastard arrives in time to report to John before he dies.
- b. Bastard assigns funeral arrangements to Prince and plans to return to battle.
- c. Salisbury tells him that Lewis has already made an offer of peace communicated by Pandulph.
- (2) Bastard and others kneel to Prince Henry, acknowledging him as the new King.

The Troublesome ReignScene 20

- (1) Friars prepare dinner in the orchard.*
- a. Monk toasts John and dies.*
- (2) Barons return with Prince and ask forgiveness of John. Pandulph intercedes for them.*
[Sc. 18(1)a.]
- (1) b. John recites his "cattalogue of sinne."
[Sc. 18(1) a.]
- (2) Lewis approaches and is met by Pandulph who demands in Henry's name why he is trespassing. Lewis agrees to a treaty.*
- (4) Henry is crowned.*

APPENDIX B

EXACT AND NEARLY EXACT VERBAL PARALLELS BETWEEN
THE TROUBLESOME REIGN AND KING JOHN

Most of the verbal parallels given here between The Troublesome Reign and King John appear also in Wilson's New Cambridge King John, pp. xxvi-xxvii. Starred parallels have not previously been noted.

<u>King John</u>	<u>The Troublesome Reign</u>
To Ireland, Poyctiers, Aniowe, Torayne, Maine (1.1.11)	of Ireland, Poitiers, Aniow, Torain, Main, (1:33-4)
With them a Bastard of the Kings deceast . . . (2.1.65)	Next them a Bastard of the Kings deceast, . . . (1:490)
QUE. Thou vnaduised scold, I can produce A Will, that barres the title of thy sonne. CON. I who doubts that, a Will: a wicked will, A womans will, a cankred Grandams will. (2.1.191-4)	For prooffe whereof, I can inferre a Will, That barres the way he vrgeth by discent. CONSTANCE. A Will indeede, a crabbed Womans will, (1:519-21)
You men of Angiers, and my louing subiects . . . (2.1.203)	You men of Angiers, and as I take it my loyall Subiects . . . [prose] (1:613-14)
IOHN. Speake on with fauor, we are bent to heare . . . (2.1.422)	IOHN. PHILIP. Speake on, we giue thee leaue. (1:735)

That daughter there of
 Spaine, the Lady Blanch
 Is neere¹ to England . . .
 (2.1.423)

Full thirty thousand Markes
 of English coyne . . .
 (2.1.530)

*FRA. Let in that amitie
 which you haue
 made, . . .
 (2.1.537)

For at Saint Maries
 Chappell presently,
 The rights of marriage
 shallbe solemniz'd.
 (2.1.538-9)

*Brother of England, how
 may we content
 This widow lady?
 (2.1.547-8)

*. . . that no Italian
 priest
 Shall tythe or toll in our
 dominions:
 But as we, vnder heaven,
 are supream head,
 So vnder him that great
 supremacy,
 Where we doe reigne, we
 will alone vphold
 (3.1.153-7)

*Though you, and all the
 Kings of Christendom
 Are led so grossly by
 this medling
 Priest . . .
 (3.1.162-3)

Philip, what saist thou
 to the Cardinall?
 (3.1.202)

The beauteous daughter of
 the King of Spaine,
 Neece to K. Iohn . . .
 (1:752-3)

And thirtie thousand markes
 of stipend coyne . . .
 (1:841)

JOHN. Lets in and there
 prepare the mariage
 rytes, . . .
 (1:856)

Which in S. Maries Chappell
 presently
 Shalbe performed ere this
 Presence part.
 (1:857-9)

Brother of England, what
 dowrie wilt thou give.
 (1:820)

that neuer an Italian Priest
 of them all, shall either
 haue tythe, tole, or poling
 penie out of England, but
 as I am King, so wil I raigne
 next vnder God, supream
 head both ouer spirituall
 and temrall, . . . [prose]
 (1:879-83)

Philip, though thou and
 all the Princes of Christen-
 dom suffer themselves to
 be abusde by a Prelates
 slauerie . . . [prose]
 (1:887-8)

Brother of Fraunce, what
 say you to the Cardinall?
 (1:1010)

1. Wilson emends to neece.

DAUL. Father, to Armes (3.1.300)	PHILIP. Nobles, to armes (1:1033)
*BLANCH. Vpon thy wedding day? (3.1.300)	BLANCHE. And will your Grace vpon your wedding day . . . (1:1038)
I prethee Lady goe away with me (3.4.20)	come Constance, goe with me (1:1168)
If you say I (3.4.183)	The Pope sayes I (1:1174)
*O saue me Hubert, saue me . . . (4.1.73)	O helpe me Hubert, gentle Keeper helpe: (1:1338)
Hubert, what newes with you? (4.2.68)	How now, what newes with thee . . . (1:1660)
*BAST. . . . That ere the next Ascension day at noone, (4.2.151)	PETER. By my presience, ere Ascension day Haue brought the Sunne vnto his vsual height, (1:1637-8)
Heere is your hand and Seale for what I did (4.2.215)	Why heres my Lord your Highness hand & seale (1:1715)
. . . nothing there holds out But Douer Castle . . . (5.1.30-31)	. . . not a foote holds out But Douer Castle . . . (2:645-6)
If Lewis by your assistance win the day . . . (5.4.39)	This I auerre, if Lewes win the day . . . (2:738)
*For that my grandsire was an Englishman . . . (5.4.42)	For that my Grandsire was an Englishman (2:748) ²

2. The omission of this parallel from Wilson's list was undoubtedly an oversight, since it is one of the three generally acknowledged exact parallels between the plays.

LIST OF WORKS CITED

- Alexander, Peter, A Shakespeare Primer, 1951.
- , Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III, 1929.
- , Shakespeare's Life and Art, 1939 (reprinted, 1961).
- , "The Taming of a Shrew," TLS 16 September 1926, p. 614.
- Bale, John, King Johan, ed. Barry B. Adams, 1969.
- Bonjour, Adrien, "The Road to Swinstead Abbey: A Study of the Sense and Structure of King John," ELH 18 (1951):253-74.
- Bullough, Geoffrey, Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, 6 vols., 1957-66.
- Cairncross, A. S., The Problem of Hamlet, 1936.
- Calderwood, James L., "Commodity and Honour in King John," University of Toronto Quarterly 29 (1960):341-56 (reprinted in Shakespeare: The Histories; A Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Eugene M. Waith, 1965, pp. 85-101).
- Chambers, E. K., William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems, 2 vols., 1930.
- Duthie, G. I., The "Bad" Quarto of Hamlet: A Critical Study, 1941.
- Elson, John, "Studies in the King John Plays," Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies, ed. James G. McManaway et al., 1948, pp. 183-97.
- The First Part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the death of the good Duke Humphrey: And the banishment and death of the Duke of Suffolke, and the Tragical end of the proud Cardinall of Winchester, with the notable Rebellion of Jacke Cade: And the Duke of Yorkes first claime vnto the Crowne, 1594 (University Microfilms).
- Forster, E. M., Aspects of the Novel, 1957.

- Greer, C. A., "Shakespeare a Researcher?" N&Q 200 (1955): 479-80.
- Greg, W. W., A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration, vol. 1, 1939.
- _____, Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses: Stage Plots, Actors Parts, Prompt Books, 2 vols., 1931.
- _____, "King Lear--Mislineation and Stenography," The Library, 4th series 17 (1936-7):172-83.
- _____, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," SB 3 (1950-1): 19-36.
- _____, The Shakespeare First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History, 1955.
- _____, Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgments: The Battle of Alcazar and Orlando Furioso, 1923.
- Hamlet: First Quarto 1603 (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 7, 1965).
- Harbage, Alfred, Annals of English Drama, rev. S. Schoenbaum, 1964.
- _____, "Love's Labor's Lost and the Early Shakespeare," PQ 41 (1962):18-36.
- Hart, Alfred, Stolne and Surreptitious Copies: A Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos, 1942.
- Heywood, Thomas, If you Know not Me, You Know Nobody, Parts 1 and 2, 1605, 1606, ed. Madeleine Doran (Malone Society Reprint, 1934-5).
- Hinman, Charlton, The Printing and Proof-Reading of The First Folio of Shakespeare, 2 vols., 1963.
- Holinshed, Raphael, The Third Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande . . ., 1587.
- Honigmann, E. A. J., "Shakespeare's 'Lost Source Plays'," MLR 49 (1959):293-307.
- Hoppe, Harry R., The Bad Quarto of Romeo and Juliet: A Bibliographical and Textual Study, 1948.

- _____, "The First Quarto Version of Romeo and Juliet, II.vi. and IV.v.43 ff.," RES 14 (1938):271-84.
- Hosley, Richard, "Sources and Analogues of The Taming of the Shrew," HLQ 27 (1963-4):289-308.
- Joseph, Sister Miriam, Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language, 1966.
- Kirschbaum, Leo, "A Census of Bad Quartos," RES 14 (1938):20-43.
- Law, Robert Adger, "King John and King Leir," Texas Studies in Literature and Language 1 (1960):473-6.
- _____, "On the Date of King John," SP 54 (1957):119-27.
- Leech, Clifford, "The Two-Part Play: Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare," SJ 94 (1958):90-106.
- McKerrow, R. B., Printers' and Publishers' Devices 1485-1640, 1949.
- _____, "A Suggestion Regarding Shakespeare's Manuscripts," RES 11 (1935):459-65.
- Matchett, William H., "Richard's Divided Heritage in King John," Essays in Criticism 12 (1962):231-53.
- Muir, Kenneth, Shakespeare's Sources, vol. 1, 1957.
- Parrott, T. M., review of the New Arden King John, JEGP 55 (1956):297-305.
- Plomer, Henry R., English Printers' Ornaments, 1924.
- Price, Hereward T., Construction in Shakespeare, University of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology No. 17 (1951).
- _____, The Text of Henry V, 1920.
- Romeo and Juliet: The First Quarto, 1594 (Praetorius Facsimile, 1886).
- Rossiter, A. P., ed., Woodstock, A Moral History, 1946.

Shakespeare, William, The First Folio of Shakespeare: The Norton Facsimile, ed. Charlton Hinman, 1968.

_____, Hamlet: The Second Quarto 1604-5 (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 4, 1964).

_____, King John (New Arden Shakespeare), ed. E. A. J. Honigmann, 1954.

_____, King John (New Cambridge Shakespeare), ed. J. Dover Wilson, 1936.

_____, The Life and Death of King John (Signet Shakespeare), ed. William H. Matchett, 1966.

_____, The Merry Wives of Windsor, ed. W. W. Greg, 1910.

_____, Mr. William Shakespeare: His Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, ed. Edward Capell, vol. 1, 1767 (AMS Facsimile, 1968).

_____, Romeo and Juliet: The Second Quarto 1599 (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 6, 1949).

_____, The Taming of the Shrew (New Cambridge Shakespeare), ed. J. Dover Wilson, 1928.

_____, The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare, ed. Edmond Malone, vol. 4, 1790 (AMS Facsimile, 1968).

_____, The Plays of William Shakespeare, ed. Samuel Johnson, vol. 3, 1765 (AMS Facsimile, 1968).

_____, The Works of Shakespear, ed. Alexander Pope, vol. 3, 1723 (AMS Facsimile, 1969).

Shapiro, I. A., "'Stenography' and 'Bad Quartos'," TLS, 13 May 1960, p. 305.

Simmons, J. L., "Shakespeare's King John and Its Source: Coherence, Pattern, and Vision," Tulane Studies in English 17 (1969):53-72.

The Taming of A Shrew: The First Quarto, 1594 (Praetorius Facsimile, 1886).

- The Troublesome Raigne of Iohn King of England, 1591. The Second part of the troublesome Raigne of King Iohn, conteining the death of Arthur Plantaginet, the landing of Lewes, and the poysning of King Iohn at Swinstead Abbey, 1591. (Huntington Library copy, xerox; Folger Library copy, photocopy.)
- The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of Yorke: (Henry the Sixth, Part III) 1595 (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 2, 1958).
- Welsh, Robert Ford, The Printing of the Early Editions of Marlowe's Plays: Tamburlaine (1590), Massacre at Paris (1592?), Edward II (1594), Dido (1594), Doctor Faustus (1604, 1616), The Jew of Malta (1633), Ph. D. Dissertation, Duke University, 1964 (DA 25 (1964): 2968-9).
- Whitaker, Virgil K., Shakespeare's Use of Learning: An Inquiry into the Growth of his Mind and Art, 1953.
- Williams, Franklin B., review of the Arden King John, SQ 6 (1955):339-40.
- Wilson, F. P., "Shakespeare and the 'New Bibliography'," The Bibliographical Society 1892-1942: Studies in Retrospect, 1945, pp. 76-135.

