

THE CHRONICLE PAGEANT

SAMUEL JOHNSON wrote in his *General Observations on Shakespeare's Plays*: "Shakespeare seems to have designed that the whole series of actions from the beginning of *Richard the Second* to the end of *Henry the Fifth* should be considered by the reader as one work, upon one plan, only broken into parts by the necessity of exhibition." It may be that Shakespeare had no thought of a reader while he furnished these Plays; but his intention to unite them is evident, and this is a justification of the Folio Order. He may have written them as separate Scenes and united them later according to the different Reigns. The Plays from *King Richard the Second* to *King Henry the Sixth* are a Pageant of the Contest between the Houses of York and Lancaster called the Wars of the Roses. The two other Histories, the *Life and Death of King John* and the *Famous History of King Henry the Eighth*, may have been planned as part of another Pageant of the Contest between the Crown and the Church. Though they are apart they are linked with all the others as Scenes of a Chronicle Pageant of the Annals of England.

Every Scene in this Pageant, except the second part of *King Richard the Second* and a lost form of *King Henry the Eighth*, was openly founded on older Plays such as *The Troublesome Reign of King John* and *The Famous Victories of King Henry the Fifth* and *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York and the Death of Good King Henry the Sixth*, which were probably made from the stock of the Traditional Stage by Robert Greene and Thomas Kyd and George Peele and others under the influence of Christopher Marlowe or with his help. And the second part of *King Richard the Second* was an open imitation of Marlowe's *Edward the Second*, which was entered in the Stationers' Register in 1593 and printed in 1594.

We know little about Christopher Marlowe except that

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

he was a shoemaker's son and was born in Canterbury in 1564, a couple of months before Shakespeare's birth, and was educated at a Grammar-School there and at Benet College at Cambridge (now called Corpus Christi) and wrote some Poems and Plays and perished in 1593. He seems to have left Cambridge in 1583, and at some time between 1585 and 1588 he won sudden renown with his magnificent Poem, *Tamburlaine*.

Swinburne wrote of him: "He first, and he alone, guided Shakespeare into the right way of work. His music, in which there is no echo of any man's before, found an echo in the more prolonged, but hardly more exalted, harmony of Milton. He was the greatest, the most daring and inspired pioneer in all our Poetic Literature."

The dates of all Marlowe's Works are uncertain. He may have begun with his translations from Ovid's *Amores* and from Lucan's *Pharsalia* and the first form of *Dido Queen of Carthage* at Cambridge, and may have written the two Parts of *Tamburlaine* next and *The Massacre at Paris* with Kyd and then the beginning of *The Jew of Malta* and then *Edward the Second* and then the two first Sestiads of *Hero and Leander* and then part of the *Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*. It is probable that he took some share in writing *Lust's Dominion or the Lascivious Queen*, which was printed as his in 1657, and *The Troublesome Reign of King John* and other Chronicle Histories; but if so this was hack-work and only written for bread. And he may have helped others to write a version of *Pericles*. Only *Tamburlaine* and *Edward the Second* have survived as he wrote them: only the first Act and the first Scene of the second Act of *The Jew of Malta* are his, and *Doctor Faustus* was degraded by others.

In his part of *The Jew of Malta* Barabas stands as a conqueror, like Faustus and Tamburlaine. He is a Merchant-King, sending his Argosies to ransack the World for him, and he is a noble Jew, scorning the Christians. He says of them,

I can see no fruits in all their faith
But malice, falsehood, and excessive pride;

when he is robbed by them he says,

CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE

The man that dealeth righteously shall live;
And which of you can charge me otherwise?

and in the first Scene of the second Act he is shown praying for help,

Oh Thou that with a fiery pillar led'st
The Sons of Israel through the dismal shades,
Light Abraham's offspring, and direct the hand
Of Abigail this night.

Then Marlowe cast the beginning of this Tragical Poem aside and allowed others to tack a childish Melodrama to it when he saw that no Company would dare to perform it, or he finished it and others destroyed the rest of it and added the part adapted to the popular taste. In the third Scene of the second Act another Barabas, the villainous Jew of the Traditional Stage, proclaims his enormity,

As for myself, I walk abroad o' nights,
And kill sick people groaning under walls;
Sometimes I go about and poison wells.

We know that *Doctor Faustus* was maimed. Philip Henslowe, after recording in his Diary that it had been acted in 1594, wrote, "paid unto Thomas Dekker, the 20th December, 1597, for additions to *Faustus* 20 shillings, and five shillings for a Prologue to *Tamburlaine*," and recorded a loan "unto the Company, the 22nd of November, 1602, to pay unto William Birde and Samuel Rowley for their additions to *Doctor Faustus*." We can infer that all these additions were in the Play when it was printed in 1604. Marlowe may have left it unfinished when he was killed, or his form of it may have been degraded to gratify the taste of the Pit. I think that his version was a Tragical Poem, and that all the Comical Scenes and the Prose were added to it, mainly by Dekker whose rhythm is seen, for instance, when Faustus says, "Though my heart pants and quivers to remember that I have been a Student here these thirty years, Oh! would that I had never seen Wirtemberg, never read book."

When the second edition of *Tamburlaine* was printed in

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

1592 it had an Address to the Reader which said, "I have purposely omitted and left out certain fond and frivolous gestures, disguising and in my opinion far unmeet for the matter, which I thought might prove more tedious unto the wise than any way else to be regarded, though haply they have been of some vain conceited fondlings greatly gaped at, what time they were showed upon the Stage in their graced deformities: nevertheless now to be mixtured in print with such matters of worth, it would prove a great disaster to so honourable and stately a history." This statement agrees with the first lines of the Prologue,

From jiggling veins of rhyming mother wits,
And such conceits as Clownage keeps in pay,
We'll lead you to the stately tent of War,

and it is a proof that *Tamburlaine* was degraded with Clownage when it was first seen.

Marlowe seems to have founded *Tamburlaine the Great* on two Spanish Books, *Vida y Hazañas Del Gran Tamerlan*, printed in 1582 (an account of a journey made in the East between 1403 and 1406 by Ruy Gonzales de Clavigo) and Pedro Mexia's *Life of Timur* printed in 1543. And he may have founded *The Jew of Malta* on a Spanish Romance, as Mr. Addington Symonds suggested. His Barabas appears to be a proud Spanish Jew, one of the many exiles from Spain, and leaves the Stage saying,

Hermoso placer de los dineros.

The Spanish nature of *Tamburlaine* (which Robert Greene recognized when he mocked that proud Poem in his *Comical History of Alphonsus King of Arragon*) is seen in the beginning, but the Spanish pride vanishes and only the Spanish cruelty of the story is left. Marlowe's heart went to the Spaniards because they were a Nation of conquerors, and his Poetry thrilled with the dignity and splendour of Spain. He lived in days when the English began to rival the Spaniards: the men in the Pit appreciated the greatness of *Tamburlaine* because they were conscious that their Country was great; they rejoiced in heroic tales of old Wars and

CHRISTOPHER MARLOWE

exulted with King Henry the Fifth because they were conquerors.

Mr. Tucker Brooke says in his *Tudor Drama*: "*Tamburlaine* is, more than any other Drama, the source and original of the English History Plays." But he also says that the English Heroic Plays were coeval with the Religious Stage. Marlowe transmuted the immemorial Chronicle Plays, and he was the first to write English Tragedies as passionate Poems.

Marlowe himself is obscured like his Barabas and Faustus. There is no portrait or description of him, and we only know that he was called Haughty Tamerlane and Kind Kit. An enemy's insult and the accident of death in a brawl have left him defamed.

Robert Greene, who had already attacked him in his *Perimedes*, printed in 1588, saying that two Gentlemen-Poets had his Poetry in derision, "for that I could not make my verses jet upon the Stage in Tragical buskins, every word filling the mouth like the faburden of Bowbell, daring God out of Heaven, with that Atheist, Tamburlaine," wrote on his death-bed in *A Groat'sworth of Wit bought with a Million of Repentance*: "Wonder not (for with thee will I first begin) thou famous gracer of tragedians, that Greene, who hath said with thee, like the fool in his heart, 'there is no God,' should now give glory unto His greatness. Why should thy excellent wit, His gift, be so blinded that thou should'st give no glory to the giver? . . . Defer not (with me) till the last point of extremity, for little knowest thou how in the end thou shalt be visited."

If Marlowe had been convicted of Atheism he would have been burnt at the Stake, like Francis Kett, who may have taught him at Cambridge (for he was a Fellow of Benet) and was executed in 1589 for interpreting the Bible heretically. This public accusation was printed in 1592, and on the eighteenth of May, 1593, the Privy Council issued a warrant for his arrest. He was killed on the first of June in that year, but his friend Thomas Kyd was arrested on a suspicion of Atheism and is said to have been tortured to extract an avowal. We know nothing more of Kyd except that he died in poverty in 1595. Neither do we know how Marlowe was killed.

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

One version says that he was stabbed on the deck of the *Golden Hind*, which was moored then near Deptford as a show and a drinking-booth, as it was when Paul Hentzner wrote in 1598, "before taking the air down the River, the first thing that struck us was the ship of that noble Pirate, Sir Francis Drake," and when Ben Jonson wrote in *Every Man in His Humour*, "Drake's old ship at Deptford may sooner circle the World again." Another account says that he was killed in a fight in the dark in the little village of Deptford. Francis Meres wrote in *Palladis Tamia*: "As the Poet Lycophron was shot to death by a certain rival of his, so Christopher Marlowe was stabbed to death by a bawdy serving-man, a rival in his lewd love." Somewhere in that riverside village and in some obscure fray a fugitive from Justice had perished, and though he was mourned by some friends (as by Edward Blunt, for instance, who wrote of him when he dedicated *Hero and Leander* to Thomas Walsingham in 1598, "the impression of the man that hath been dear to us living an after life in our memory") no one knew England's irreparable loss when he died.

Marlowe may have been only guilty of doubt. According to the Harleian Manuscripts, a few days before he died an informer, Richard Bame or Baine, charged him with saying that "if there is any God or good Religion it is in the Papists, and that all Protestants are Hypocritical Asses." The drift of his share of *Faustus* is profoundly religious. This I take to be his last Play, and this, I think, was why some one added to it,

Terminat hora diem, terminat auctor opus.

This play and *Edward the Second* lack the young glory of *Tamburlaine*, the pride of the song and the intoxicating joy of the singer; his voice is older in them, but it is still noble and great. If (as most students have thought) *Edward the Second* was written just before he was killed, its severe concentration is not compatible with a riotous life.

The fact that the two Thomas Walsinghams of Scadbury at Chislehurst (cousins of the more famous Sir Francis) were his intimate friends and often his hosts in his last days, as when the warrant was issued, is enough to throw doubt

MARLOWE AND SHAKESPEARE

on the legend that he fell in a drunken brawl. Even according to Greene he was a Gentleman-Poet, though (apart from his character) his claim to that rank depended on his education at Cambridge.

The issue of the warrant against him seems to have been a part of an attempt to destroy Sir Walter Raleigh, who was accused of Atheism too, but succeeded in defending himself. This would explain why the Queen's Ministers took the trouble to persecute two writers of Plays who cannot have been of any importance in the eyes of the State though they were the two men who taught Shakespeare how to write Tragedies. Marlowe may have been killed while he was resisting an attempt to arrest him. The man who killed him alleged that he had been attacked without cause and that Marlowe's brain had been pierced by his own dagger, and the acceptance of this improbable story may be a sign that it was advisable to cover the truth.

Marlowe died before he was thirty,

Cut is the branch that might have grown full straight,
And burned is Apollo's laurel bough,

and even to these last verses of *Faustus* somebody added a ridiculous close,

That sometime grew within this learned man.

Faustus is gone : regard his hellish fall

Whose fiendful fortune may exhort the wise.

Mr. Havelock Ellis says of *Edward the Second* in his *Christopher Marlowe*, printed in the Mermaid Series, "it was not till ten years later that Shakespeare came near to this severe reticence, these deep and solemn tones." During those ten years between 1593 and 1603 Shakespeare, who (though he was of about the same age) was only a beginner when Marlowe was supreme as a dramatist, learnt from him how to fashion his Tragedies through the long pupilage of his Chronicle Pageant.

When in *Edward the Second* the King said to the Abbot,

Father, this life contemplative is Heaven :

Oh ! that I might this life in quiet lead !

But we, alas, are chased,

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

he spoke in the mood of Shakespeare's sorrowful Kings. And Shakespeare's explanatory villains resembled Mortimer in *Edward the Second* and Guise, who said in the *Massacre at Paris*,

Now Guise begin thy deep-engendered thoughts,
and Gloster, who said in the *True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*,

I will go clad my body in gay ornaments,
And lull myself within a lady's lap,
And witch sweet ladies with my words and looks.
Oh monstrous man to harbour such a thought!
Why Love did scorn me in my mother's womb. . . .
Tut! I can smile and murder when I smile.

The confessions of wickedness must have survived from the Traditional Stage, for a child writing a Play would make a villain proclaim his iniquity as Aaron the Moor did in *Titus Andronicus*,

Oh how this villainy
Doth fat me with the very thoughts of it!
Let fools do good, and fair men call for Grace,
Aaron will have his soul black like his face,

or as Barabas did in the Scenes added to Marlowe's share of *The Jew of Malta*. But Marlowe employed them with a Tragical dignity which Shakespeare repeated in *King Lear* and *Othello*. And Shakespeare's sorrowful Kings were imitated from Marlowe's *Edward the Second*, for though he wrote a form of *King Henry the Sixth* before that Play was written, he added the melancholy meditations to it after 1595.

Shakespeare drew his knowledge of History from the Chronicle Plays and from popular legends and from such Chronicles as came to his hand. It may be that he thought most of the legends, as the Prince does in *King Richard the Third* when he asks whether the Tower of London was built by Julius Cæsar and says,

Is it upon record? or else reported
Successively from Age to Age he built it?

CHRONICLE HISTORIES

and replies to Buckingham's answer,

But say, my lord, it was not registered,
Methinks the truth should live from Age to Age
As 'twere retailed to all posterity,
Even to the general all-ending day.

The natural result was that his picture of the events of the Past was wildly inaccurate; but this was nothing to him for his chief aim was to please the men in the Pit. He had to agree with their inherited notions and to introduce fighting and din to split the ears of the groundlings, who (as Hamlet says) were, for the most part, capable of nothing but inexplicable dumb-shows and noise. If he had laboured to polish beautiful verses he would have wasted his time and would have damaged the success of his Pageant by separating it from his hearers. He had to write scores of passages of deliberate fustian, long recitations whose only merit was eloquence, because these were the main stuff of the Traditional Pageants; and his Kings and Queens and great Lords had to talk and behave in the old impossible way.

Only two of these History Plays, *King Henry the Fourth* and *King Henry the Fifth*, are mentioned as performed at the Court in Queen Elizabeth's time, and this may have meant only that Episodes from them were exhibited. And we have no evidence that any of them were provided for the students of Law. The Queen knew too much about Kings to take any delight in these conventional Monarchs, and the young students were supposed to have learnt a little knowledge of History. When Thomas Heywood edited the barbarous Play founded on a fragment of Marlowe's *Jew of Malta* in 1633 he printed a Prologue and Epilogue "spoken at Court" and others "to the Stage at the Cock Pit." The Prologues and Epilogues of this Pageant are all addressed to the Pit.

Shakespeare found his own Tragical voice while he was writing this Pageant from time to time during the years of 1593 to 1603, when Plays of this nature were required by his Company, and so his Tragedies sprang directly from a national root. I think that he set little value on these Chronicle Plays, for they have few signs of revision after 1603.

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

He may have looked on them as apart from all the rest of his work, for indeed they are not properly his, except the last Acts of *King Richard the Second* and the Comical Interlude of Falstaff's adventures in *King Henry the Fourth*. Shakespeare gave life to many of the Traditional puppets and sometimes ennobled the old stories, but Marlowe showed him the way.

According to Henslowe's Diary, Lord Strange's Men acted a new Play called *Henry the Sixth* at the Rose Theatre on the third of March, 1591-1592. It must have scored a startling success if it was the Play cited by Nashe in his *Pierce Penniless* which was licensed in August 1592. Nashe wrote, "how would it have joyed brave Talbot, the terror of the French, to think that after he had been two hundred years in his tomb he should triumph again on the Stage and have his bones embalmed with the tears of ten thousand spectators (at least, at several times) who in the tragedian that represented his person, beheld him fresh bleeding."

The First Part of King Henry the Sixth is vivid and crude. Mr. Masefield writes of it: "the work as a whole is one of the old formless Chronicle Plays which inspired the remark that if an English Dramatist were to make a Play of St. George he would begin with the birth of the Dragon." He adds: "Shakespeare's mind could never at any stage of his career have sunk to conceive the disgusting scene in which Joan of Arc pleads."

This Part deals mainly with the fighting in France and depicts it with a reckless confusion. Talbot, for instance, dies lamenting his son,

Where is my other life? mine own is gone:

Oh, where's young Talbot? Where is valiant John?

before Joan of Arc is burnt in Anjou. The real Talbot fell fighting about twenty-two years after she had suffered in Rouen. Of course, there is no historic foundation for the Scene in the Temple Garden when the roses are plucked. The Wars of the Roses were not known by that name till they were ending or over, and the Red Rose appears to have been borne first as a badge by Owen Tudor in Wales. This

KING HENRY THE SIXTH

Scene and the next, in which Mortimer (as he dies in the Tower) explains his right to the Throne to Richard Plantagenet, who knew all about it already, may have been added by Shakespeare in a revision when he wished to connect this Part with the others. In the Second Part Richard Plantagenet is called Richard, Duke of York. He explains the rights of his House over again, and this would not have been necessary if the First Part had then belonged to the Play.

The First Part does not seem to have been printed before 1623. Forms of the two other Parts were printed as the *First Part of the Contention betwixt the two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster* in 1594 and *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York and the Death of Good King Henry the Sixth* in 1595. These were reprinted separately in 1600 and together in 1619 as the *Whole Contention between the two famous Houses, Lancaster and York, divided into two parts and newly corrected and enlarged*. These two Plays seem to have been acted before September 1592, for Robert Greene, who died in that month, parodied a verse in the Third Part,

Oh, Tiger's heart wrapt in a woman's hide

in his *Groat'sworth of Wit*.

The title-page of the Quarto edition of the *True Tragedy* said that it was "sundry times acted by the Right Honourable the Earl of Pembroke his Servants." Henslowe's Diary stated that the new *Henry the Sixth* was acted fifteen times in 1592, and Nashe cannot have written *Pierce Penniless* later than July in that year. If Henslowe's Play was the First Part of *King Henry the Sixth* it is improbable that ten thousand spectators could have seen it at the Rose when Nashe wrote, and since that Play succeeded and was shown through the year it is not likely that the two other Parts would have followed it before the month of September. Neither is it likely that if Shakespeare had written the three Parts a rival Company would have acted the Third while the First was being shown on the Stage.

It may be that the Second Part (the *Contention*) was Henslowe's *Henry the Sixth* and Pembroke's Men may have performed the Third Part (the *True Tragedy*) competing

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

with it. Greene may have parodied a popular line written by Marlowe in the *True Tragedy*, meaning to indicate that he was one of the men who wrote the *Contention*. The verse

Oh, Tiger's heart wrapt in a woman's hide,
is in the speech beginning

She-wolf of France, but worse than wolves of France,
which was written either by Marlowe (as many students have thought) or as a deliberate imitation of him. When Nashe, writing a few months after Lord Strange's Men had produced "*Henry the Sixth*," said that ten thousand spectators (at least, at several times) had embalmed Talbot with tears he may have meant that the Pageant of the fighting in France had been acted several times before 1592. Indeed, he may not have referred to Shakespeare's Pageant at all, for this theme must have been a popular one and often shown on the Stage, as was asserted in the Epilogue to *King Henry the Fifth*,

Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crowned King
Of France and England, did this King succeed ;
Whose state so many had the managing
That they lost France, and made his England bleed,
Which oft our Stage hath shown.

It may be that Shakespeare founded his Pageant of the fighting in France on an old Chronicle History when he was beginning to write. Marlowe and Greene and Peele may have written a form of *The Contention* about 1591, and may have sold it to Strange's Men, who may have employed Shakespeare to alter it. Greene's complaint proved that Shakespeare had not been working with him and the other Dramatists whose feathers were taken. Marlowe and Greene and Peele may have written *The True Tragedy* meanwhile and may have sold it to Pembroke's Men because they resented the fact that a mere Player had improved *The Contention* and had been given all the credit of it. This would explain not only why Greene raged against Shake-scene in 1592 and why Pembroke's Men may have performed the *True Tragedy* while "*Henry the Sixth*" was shown at the Rose but also

KING HENRY THE SIXTH

why Francis Meres did not cite *King Henry the Sixth* among Shakespeare's Tragedies in *Palladis Tamia* in 1598 and why the three Parts are dissimilar.

The First Part is a primitive Pageant which seems made from the stock of the Traditional Stage. It may have ended with the fourth Scene of the fifth Act—

So now dismiss your army when ye please,
For here we entertain a solemn peace,

before Shakespeare revised it, introducing the King (who was aged about ten when Joan of Arc suffered) when he wished to connect it with the two other Parts. The Second Part, *The Contention*, is a Rhetorical Pageant in Blank Verse, which seems to have been written mainly by Marlowe and Greene and Peele, combined with Comical Scenes in Prose which were probably inserted by Shakespeare. The Third Part, *The True Tragedy*, is the most mature of the three, a masculine Pageant in Blank Verse, and it seems to have been written mainly by Marlowe with some assistance from Greene and Peele. In this Part, the King's title to the Throne is debated in the first Scene of the first Act, as it is in the second Scene of the second Act of the Second Part, and this and a comparison of the lists of the Characters would be enough to suggest that these two are separate Plays.

Shakespeare may have bought the *True Tragedy* after 1595, and linked it with the two other Parts when he was shaping his Pageant. In it there is a pause in the fighting: the Stage direction says "alarms still, and then enter Henry solus," and the King in a speech of thirteen lines laments the Wars, saying

Would God that I were dead, so all were well!
Or would my crown suffice, I were content
To yield it them and lead a private life.

Then the man who has killed his father in ignorance and the other who has killed his son enter, and the King grieves with them. In the Third Part, as we have it, this glimpse of pity becomes the core of the Play. In the fifth Scene of the second Act the King's long meditation, beginning,

This battle fares like to the morning war

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

closely resembles King Richard the Second's in the third Scene of the third Act of the Play called by his name, beginning

What must the King do now? Must he submit?
and his exclamation

Oh, piteous spectacle! Oh bloody times!
resembles the Abbot's in *King Richard the Second*,

A woeful Pageant have we here beheld.

This Scene clashes with the mood of this Part. If Shakespeare bought the *True Tragedy* after he had written the last part of *Richard the Second* he may have added this Scene to make the Kings similar and to show the same weakness and kindness fatal when his Pageant began and when it drew to a close. And this meditation seems his own comment on the Wars of his Pageant.

When Samuel Johnson wrote that Shakespeare had intended the Plays from *King Richard the Second* to *King Henry the Fifth* to be considered one work he observed that the three Parts of *King Henry the Sixth* and *King Richard the Third* have scant connection with them. These four separate Plays are closely united: *King Richard the Third* has more in common with the First Part of *King Henry the Sixth* than with the others, but it is the Third Part of the Contention between the Houses of York and Lancaster. The King's prophetic denunciation of Gloster and Gloster's soliloquy, beginning,

What will the aspiring blood of Lancaster
Sink into the ground? I thought it would have mounted,
in the sixth Scene of the fifth Act of the Third Part of *King Henry the Sixth* (which were in the *True Tragedy*, and seem to have been written by Marlowe) are the real beginning of the *Tragedy of King Richard the Third*. But since King Henry has no part in this Play Queen Margaret is brought back from France to speak in his stead. In the last lines of *King Henry the Sixth* (as in the *True Tragedy*) she was banished to France, where in fact she took refuge and died poor and

KING RICHARD THE THIRD

forgotten. In the third Scene of the first Act of this Play she appears without explanation of her presence among her enemies and curses them freely. Hastings says,

My hair doth stand on end to hear her curses,
and Rivers replies

And so doth mine, I muse why she is at liberty.

She appears again in the fourth Act and says,

So now prosperity begins to mellow
And drop into the rotten mouth of Death,
Here, in these confines, silyly have I lurked
To watch the waning of my adversaries :
A dire induction am I witness to,
And will to France.

Queen Margaret is employed in this Play like a Senecan ghost demanding revenge. The Duchess of York says to her in this Scene,

Blind sight, dead life, poor mortal-living ghost,
Rest thy unrest on England's fruitful earth,

and Queen Elizabeth says to her,

Oh thou did'st prophesy the time would come
When I should wish for thee to help me curse
That bottled spider, that foul, bunch-backed toad.

Queen Margaret exults in her knowledge of their sorrow and says,

Fare-well, York's wife, and Queen of sad mischance,
These English woes will make me smile in France,

and Queen Elizabeth says,

Oh thou, well-skilled in curses, stay awhile
And teach me how to curse mine enemies.

There would have been no need to employ Queen Margaret if this part of the Pageant had been already controlled by King Henry the Sixth's final prophecy. Neither would there have been any need for Gloucester to proclaim his enormity

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

if he had done this already in *King Henry the Sixth*. The fact that the speech at the beginning of this Play seems an echo of his other soliloquy may be a sign that Shakespeare wrote it after 1592 and before he had annexed the *True Tragedy*.

King Richard the Third was printed in Quartos in 1597, 1598, 1602, 1605, 1612, 1622, 1629 and 1634. All these editions except the first were ascribed to Shakespeare. The Folio has many small changes and omits some lines and adds some two hundred. There had been other Plays on this theme, for instance, a Latin imitation of Seneca which was acted at Cambridge before 1583 and the *True Tragedy of King Richard the Third*, which was printed in 1594; and we have no reason to doubt that the Hunch-back had gnashed his teeth often on the Traditional Stage. I think that the Scenes in which the hideous King fascinates the Lady Anne first and Queen Elizabeth later (like the similar one in the *Third Part of King Henry the Sixth*, in which Lady Grey subjugates King Edward the Fourth) survive from old Plays because I do not believe that Shakespeare or any man of his time was primitive enough to imagine them. The Scene before the battle of Bosworth is frankly preposterous. After this the Play is hurriedly finished. The King appears in a Scene thirteen lines long and shouts for a horse and disappears and then (according to the Stage-direction) he enters again with Richmond and fights with him and is killed, and the victor goes out, "retreat and flourish," but this is not in the Play. Then in a last Scene Richmond enters and says,

The days is ours; the bloody dog is dead,
and Derby brings him the Crown, saying,

Lo, here, this long usurped royalty,
From the dead temples of this bloody wretch
Have I plucked off,

and Richmond says,

We will unite the white rose and the red.
Smile Heaven upon this fair conjunction,
That long have frowned upon their enmity!
What traitor hears me and says not Amen?

KING RICHARD THE THIRD

England hath long been mad, and scarred herself. . . .
Now civil wounds are stopped, peace lives again :
That she may long live here, God say Amen !

This is the end of an old Chronicle Pageant not of a Tragedy.

I think that in Shakespeare's first version Clarence was drowned in the traditional butt of malmsey and that this was seen to be ludicrous and the First Murderer compromised in a revision, saying,

Take that and that : if all this will not do,
I'll drown you in the malmsey butt within.

The Second Murderer thinks that Clarence is dead when he is carried away ; he says,

A bloody deed, and desperately dispatched !
How fain, like Pilate, would I wash my hands
Of this most grievous, guilty murder done.

But Clarence's Ghost appears to have forgotten the stabbing : it says,

I, that was washed to death with fulsome wine,
Poor Clarence by thy guile betrayed to death.

I think that the Stage-direction "enter Richard and Richmond ; they fight ; Richard is slain" refers to a spectacle introduced by the Players. The last Scene does not suggest that the sickly youth Richmond had been able to kill his terrible enemy. As a matter of fact, the King could not reach him at Bosworth and was killed by the troopers in the thick of the fight, and his Crown was brought to one of the Stanleys (either Lord Stanley, afterwards the first Earl of Derby, or his brother Sir William), who gave it to Richmond. The last Scene, as we have it, is consistent with this.

Shakespeare must have been a beginner when he first wrote this Play. There was to be a time when he was able to take North's version of Plutarch's *Life of Antonius* and found a noble Tragedy on it. Now he used Sir Thomas More's *Life of King Richard the Third* or Holinshed's repetition of

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

it, for instance, in the Scene in the Tower, in the third Act, and if that Scene is compared with More's narrative it sounds like a child's echo of a Tragical story told by a man.

The Latin version of More's *Life of King Richard* may have been based on one by Cardinal Morton. Though Morton's view may have been distorted by hatred the picture of King Richard is life-like. He is shown repenting the murder of the two little Princes. Here is More's English version: "I have heard by credible report of such as were secret with his chamberers that he never had quiet in his mind, never thought himself sure. When he went abroad, his eyes whirled about, his body privily fenced, his hand ever on his dagger, his countenance and his manner like one always ready to strike again. He took ill rests at night, lay long waiting and musing, sore wearied with care and watch, rather slumbered than slept, troubled with fearful dreams, suddenly sometimes started up, leapt out of bed and ran about the chamber; so was his restless heart continually tossed and tumbled with the tedious impression and stormy remembrance of this abominable deed." This picture is possible but Shakespeare's is not.

It may be that Shakespeare's first form of this Pageant and the *True Tragedy of King Richard the Third* and the *True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York* were all based on a Chronicle History performed by the Strolling Players soon after the Hunch-back had been seen on the Throne. Shakespeare, I think, wrote his first form as a Revenge-play when he was beginning to write and revised it about 1596 before he meant to use the *True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York* in this Pageant. The primitive work in this Play has the vigour and crudity of the *First Part of King Henry the Sixth*, and its effect is transformed by the note struck in the noble beginning and by the beauty and dignity of a few other passages, such as Clarence's dream. By these changes a Play as young as *Titus Andronicus* was ennobled to one which foretold the supremacy of *Macbeth* and *Othello*.

The Tragedy of King Richard the Second was printed in Quartos twice in 1597 and again in 1608, "with new additions of the Parliament Scene and the deposing of King Richard,"

KING RICHARD THE SECOND

and in 1615 and 1634. The First Folio edition is the Quarto of 1608 expanded a little and corrected in places.

There were other Plays dealing with this unfortunate King. One, *The Life and Death of Jack Straw*, was written about 1587 and printed in 1593; another, which is in the Egerton Manuscripts in the British Museum, does not seem to have been printed before 1870, and a third, which Simon Forman saw acted in 1611, is lost.

There are two separate Plays or Scenes of the Pageant in *King Richard the Second*. In the first of these King Richard is drawn as a detestable tyrant; he is suspicious and crafty, he distrusts Norfolk and Bolingbroke and banishes both. When he hears of John of Gaunt's illness, he says,

Now put it, God, in the physician's mind,
To help him to his grave immediately!
The lining of his coffers shall make coats
To deck our soldiers for these Irish Wars.

He insults the dying man, calls him,

A lunatic, lean-witted fool,
Presuming on an ague's privilege,

and says,

And let them die, that age and sullens have:
For both hast thou and both become the grave.

And when his uncle is dead he seizes all his belongings, saying,

Think what you will, we seize into our hands,
His plate, his goods, his money and his lands.

Meanwhile John of Gaunt has been shown as a patriot, and so has Bolingbroke who goes into exile, saying,

Where'er I wander, boast of this I can,
Though banished, yet a true-born Englishman.

This part, I think, was fashioned by others from an old rhyming Chronicle History. Here is a sample of it in the first Act,

This we prescribe, though no physician,
Deep malice makes too deep incision:

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

Forget, forgive, conclude and be agreed ;
Our Doctors say this is no month to bleed.
Good Uncle, let this end where it begun :
We'll calm the Duke of Norfolk, you your son.

This is worthy of the Poet who wrote,

Oh where's young Talbot ? Where is valiant John ?

I think that Shakespeare did little to this vigorous part.

When the King reappears in the third Act he is totally changed. When he is asked "How brooks your Grace this air ?" he replies,

Needs must I like it well : I weep for joy
To stand upon my kingdom once again.
Dear earth, I do salute thee with my hand,
Though rebels wound thee with their horses' hoofs :
As a long-parted mother with her child,
Plays fondly with her tears and smiles in meeting,
So weeping, smiling, greet I thee, my earth.

Like Queen Margaret, he thinks of his enemies as spiders and toads and invokes curses on them, and he adds

Mock not my senseless conjuration, lords :
This earth shall have a feeling, and these stones
Prove armed soldiers, ere her native King
Shall falter under foul Rebellion's arms.

He says,

Not all the water in the rough rude sea
Can wash the balm off from an anointed King ;
The breath of worldly men cannot depose
The deputy elected by the Lord.

I think that with the second Scene in the third Act Shakespeare began his *Tragedy of King Richard the Second*. The King is tender and sorrowful ; he says to Aumerle,

For God's sake let us sit upon the ground
And tell sad stories of the death of Kings,

and when he is about to surrender he says,

KING RICHARD THE SECOND

What must the King do now? Must he submit?
The King shall do it: must he be deposed?
The King shall be contented: must he lose
The name of King? of God's name, let it go:
I'll give my jewels for a set of beads,
My gorgeous Palace for a hermitage,
And my large Kingdom for a little grave,
A little little grave, an obscure grave.

It is no wonder that the Queen says in the fifth Act,

What, is my Richard both in shape and mind
Transformed and weakened?

He replies,

In winter's tedious nights sit by the fire
With good old folks, and let them tell thee tales
Of woeful ages long ago betid:
And ere thou bid good-night, to quit their griefs,
Tell thou the lamentable tale of me.
And send the hearers weeping to their beds.

York describes how the King enters London:

Men's eyes

Did scowl on gentle Richard; no man cried "God save him!"
No joyful tongue gave him his welcome home:
But dust was thrown upon his sacred head;
Which with such gentle sorrow he shook off,
His face still combating with tears and smiles,
The badges of his grief and patience.

This might have been written of King Henry the Sixth, and when the King meditates at Pomfret he speaks in Hamlet's vein,

Thoughts tending to content flatter themselves
That they are not the first of fortune's slaves
Nor shall not be the last. . . .
This music mads me; let it sound no more;
For though it have help mad-men to their wits,
In me it seems it will make wise men mad.

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

In the first part Bolingbroke and Norfolk are noble and the King is rapacious and the curses are invoked on his head. In the second part Bolingbroke is a treacherous rebel and a murderer who betrays his own tool. When Exton says to him,

From your own mouth, my lord, did I this deed,
he replies,

They love not poison, that do poison need,
Nor do I thee, though I did wish him dead,

and now the curses which are destined to bring so many calamities are due to his crimes.

The fifth Act and the end of the fourth seem founded on an old rhyming Chronicle which survives in such couplets as

Speak it in French, King, say "Pardonne moi."
Dost thou teach pardon pardon to destroy?

but most of the second part of the Play is a mild imitation of Marlowe's *Edward the Second*.

If the two parts were taken as composing one Play there would be no defence for these changes; but they are explained by the treatment of King Richard's calamity as a different theme. I think that the second Part was written by Shakespeare in 1593 as a separate Tragedy or Tragical Poem. While he imitated *Edward the Second* he had *The Massacre at Paris* in mind. Guise says in that Play,

Set me to scale the high Pyramides,
And thereon set the diadem of France,
I'll either rend it with my nails to naught,
Or mount the top with my aspiring wings,
Although my downfall be the deepest hell.

And King Richard says,

Thoughts tending to ambition, they do plot
Unlikely wonders; how these vain weak nails
May tear a passage through the flinty ribs
Of this hard world, my ragged prison-walls
And for they cannot, die in their own pride.

KING HENRY THE FOURTH

It may be that Shakespeare wrote the second part of this Play as the beginning of the Contest which ended in the Wars of the Roses and that he made the King plaintive and innocent because the calamities entailed by his doom would not have been merited if his fate had been just. This part may have failed on the Stage because the spectators were accustomed to see a different picture of King Richard the Second. This would account for the facts that he seems to have turned from his Pageant to other work for three years and that he spoilt this Play by prefixing a careless revision of the first part which showed the usual King.

I think that he revised it about 1596 to make it a part of the Pageant and tacked it to *King Henry the Fourth* in the fifth Act where Bolingbroke says,

Can no man tell of my unthrifty son ?

'Tis full three months since I did see him last. . . .

Inquire at London 'mongst the Taverns there,

For there, they say, he daily doth frequent

With unrestrainèd loose companions.

Prince Hal was about twelve when King Richard died, so according to this he began his revelling early. Another link which connects this Play with *King Henry the Fourth* and *King Henry the Fifth* is the fact that the two later Kings remember the doom entailed on their House and pray to be delivered from it. This doom was invoked when the pious King Richard foretold the Wars of the Roses :

Tell Bolingbroke—for yond methinks he stands—

That every stride he makes upon my land

Is dangerous treason: he is come to open

The purple testament of bleeding war ;

But ere the Crown he looks for live in peace,

Ten thousand bloody crowns of mother's sons

Shall ill become the flower of England's face.

The *First Part of King Henry the Fourth* was printed in a Quarto edition early in 1598 as *The History of Henry the Fourth ; with the battle at Shrewsbury, between the King and Lord Henry Percy, surnamed Henry Hotspur of the North.*

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

With the humorous conceits of Sir John Falstaff. There were other Quarto editions in 1599, 1604, 1608, 1613, 1622, 1632 and 1639. The Stationers' Register has an entry dated August the fourth, 1600, "*Henry the Fifth*, a book to be stayed"; and one dated August the twenty-third of the same year, "two books, one called *Much Ado About Nothing*, the other *The Second Part of King Henry the Fourth with the Humours of Sir John Falstaff.*" This may mean that the *First Part of King Henry the Fourth* was printed as if the Play was complete, and that *King Henry the Fifth* was prepared for the press before the *Second Part of King Henry the Fourth* and then postponed till the other Play had been published in 1600.

We do not know when the *First Part of King Henry the Fourth* was written. Mr. Chalmers contended that the opening lines plainly allude to the fighting in Spain in 1596. But they plainly allude to King Henry's hope to lead a Crusade "in stronds afar remote." And Sir Israel Gollancz thinks that the words in *The Return from Parnassus*, "I shall no sooner open this pint-pot, but the word like a knave tapster will cry, 'Anon, anon, Sir!'" seem to be obvious reminiscences of the tapster's reply "Anon, anon, Sir!" But they only mean that the old tapsters said this in the same way as their successors were accustomed to answer "Coming, Sir, coming!"

There were allusions in 1598 when Meres in *Palladis Tamia* wrote, "There is nothing but roguery in villainous man," and when Toby Mathew wrote to Dudley Carleton, "Honour pricks them on, and the World thinks that Honour will quickly prick them off again." And there may have been one in 1599 when Ben Jonson's *Every Man Out of His Humour*, which was acted first in that year, ended with the words, "You may (in time) make lean Macilente as fat as Sir John Fal-Staffe." But these allusions merely support the First Quarto's evidence that this Part was performed about 1598.

The curious construction seems to indicate that this Play was compounded from two opposite parts. Two contrasted stories are told in it. In the first Scene in a Palace in London the King hears of Hotspur's triumph at Holmedon and regrets that his own son is so different,

KING HENRY THE FOURTH

Whilst I, by looking on the praise of him,
See riot and dishonour stain the brow
Of my young Harry.

In the second Scene Prince Hal is shown living in riot and dishonour with Falstaff. In the third Scene, in the Palace, Hotspur meets and defies the King and plans a rebellion. Throughout the Play, Scenes of a Rhetorical Pageant in Blank Verse are in conflict with others of vulgar humour in Prose, and Hotspur is contrasted with Falstaff. This contrast was found in the *Famous Victories of King Henry the Fifth*, which was written by men who worked carelessly in different moods and made a patchwork between them. But the Falstaff Scenes are not patches. The opposite Plays in the *First Part of King Henry the Fourth* are too admirable to have been written together. Shakespeare could not have turned from Falstaff's loud laughter to Hotspur's proud eloquence again and again any more than Cervantes could have written *Don Quixote* with a fantastic Romance.

Cervantes intended to ridicule the Spanish and Portuguese Romances of Chivalry; but he wrote one more chivalrous than any of these: he set out to tell the adventures of a farcical Knight; but he found that his own sad heart rode with Don Quixote. He was guided by the Italian travesties, such as Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato*, begun about 1482, in which the hero Renaud of *Les Quatre Fils Aymon* became the lovelorn Rinaldo, and Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, in which the hero of the *Chanson de Roland* became Orlando and went out of his mind and massacred sheep, thinking them Saracens. Their fantastic mood had been natural, for Italy had never been chivalrous; but his echo of it derided things he had loved. Still, he did not mock Chivalry, but only the wild Romances dealing with it, and the two which were praised first by Don Quixote in the first Chapter of the Second Part (when he said "Quién mas honesto y mas valiente que el famoso *Amadis de Gaula*? quién mas discreto que *Palmerin de Inglaterra*?") were spared when all the rest were condemned. The third praised by Don Quixote (when he said "Quién mas acomodado y manual que *Tirante el Blanco*?") may have founded the fashion, for it was printed as *Tirant lo Blanch* in

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

1490 while *Amadis de Gaula* does not seem to have been printed before 1508. All three were linked with the English home of Romance of which Boiardo wrote in his *Orlando Innamorato*,

Fu gloriosa Bertagna la grande
Una stagion per l'arme e per l'amore. . . .
Ed or sua fama al nostro tempo dura.

Johannot Martorell, who began *Tirant lo Blanch* in 1460 and wrote three of its Parts, said that he had translated them from English into Portuguese and then into Catalan, and though this may have been only a conventional statement he copied *Guy of Warwick* and set some of the story in England.

Garci or Garcia de Montalvo, who wrote the first books of *Amadis de Gaula* between 1492 and 1504, set his story mainly in England, using, for instance, the name Vindilisorra for Windsor. And when Francisco de Moraes wrote *Palmerin de Inglaterra* about 1544 he chose an English hero and drew the romantic City of London. Like *Tirant lo Blanch*, these two later Romances may have been Portuguese before they were Spanish, for Montalvo seems to have founded *Amadis* on a Portuguese version written by Joham de Lobeira, and *Palmerin de Inglaterra* seems to have been written in Portuguese first. In any case they were compounded from International stories, including the French and Celtic Romances. When *Primaleon*, which was printed in 1512, was described as translated from Greek to Castilian this may have been an admission that this school of stories revived the mood of such Greek Romances as *Apollonius of Tyre*.

The conquering spirit of Portugal and Spain in the days when those Countries led the World in discoveries chimed with the old tales of adventure. These books were loved by the wanderers who named California after an Island described in *Las Sergas de Esplandian*, printed in 1508; and *Amadis* is said to have been printed in some thirty editions before 1587. Mr. Henry Thomas writes in his *Spanish and Portuguese Romances of Chivalry*: "During the hundred years following the publication of *Amadis of Gaul*, some fifty new chivalresque Romances appeared in Spain and Portugal. They were published at an average rate of almost one a year

KING HENRY THE FIFTH

between 1508 and 1550; nine were added between 1550 and the year of the Armada; only three more came out before the publication of *Don Quixote*." Their vogue ended with Spain's conquering mood when the Invincible Armada was shattered.

When the First Part of *Don Quixote* was printed in 1605 Cervantes was about fifty-eight and he had known many miseries and many adventures: he wrote as a man, already old and despairing, who had been maimed on the glorious day of Lepanto when he was young and had seen the supremacy of his Nation depart. But even now, though he derided the dead Romances, he did not dream of insulting the Chivalry which had governed his life and is immortal in the nature of Spain.

Shakespeare was some twenty years younger when the *First Part of King Henry the Fourth* was printed in 1598, and his life had been tame and his position was servile. There is no sign in his Plays that Malory or Froissart attracted him or that he had any belief in the old visions of Chivalry. It is probable that he was in London in 1588, and he may have shared England's conquering mood then; but it had faded in 1598, and the old popularity of the Chronicle Histories was departing with it when he contrasted them with a picture of the everyday World. Falstaff lives in his Pageant like Sancho Panza in the tale of *Don Quixote*, or like Bottom in Fairyland, and his laughter (like Sancho's) announced that an immemorial fashion was dead.

Shakespeare wrote in this Play with his accustomed neglect of the historical facts, for though the real Prince fought at Shrewsbury, he was only sixteen then and did not kill the fierce Hotspur who was then about forty. And the tale ends in laughter when Falstaff rises up from feigned death to stab the dead hero and pretends to have killed him and carries him off to claim the reward. Hotspur's great dreams have ended in the derision of fools.

The two Parts of *King Henry the Fourth* and the *Life of King Henry the Fifth* could have been printed as the Three Parts of *King Henry the Fifth*, and they were all founded on the *Famous Victories of King Henry the Fifth, containing the*

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

Honourable Battle of Agincourt which was licensed in 1594 and printed in 1598. The King, who had appeared as Bolingbroke in *King Richard the Second*, is changed in the same way as King Richard is in that Pageant. He begins,

So shaken as we are, so wan with care,
Find we a time for frightened peace to pant.

He is as melancholy as the later King Richard and King Henry the Sixth and Hamlet. He meditates, in the Second Part :

Oh God ! that one might read the book of fate
And see the revolution of the times ! . . .

Oh, if this were seen
The happiest youth, viewing his progress through,
What perils past, what crosses to ensue
Would shut the book, and sit him down and die.

In the First Part of the Play called by his name because it dealt with his Reign, he is in the background and Hotspur is the Tragical figure. In the Play called *King Henry the Fifth*, Prince Hal has been changed to a repetition of Hotspur. Indeed, we might take the picture of Hotspur as the first sketch of King Henry the Fifth. This Play or Dramatic Recitation was meant to be a pæan of patriotism : it is the climax of all the praises of England in the rest of the Pageant and it is an echo of Marlowe's conquering mood.

King Henry the Fifth was England's national hero, the last King who had conquered in France, and he must have been often seen on the Traditional Stage. Nashe wrote in *Pierce Penniless* : " If you tell them what a glorious thing it is to have Henry the Fifth represented on the Stage, leading the French King prisoner, and forcing both him and the Dauphin to swear fealty." This Play, which is linked with the Traditional Stage by the *Famous Victories of King Henry the Fifth*, keeps a great deal of the old Traditional stuff, for instance, the Scene in which the French Lords begin in French to explain who they are and then continue their conversation in English and the Scenes in which a Scot and a Welshman and an Irishman talk and those in which Katharine attempts to speak English. This was the fashion which Philip Sidney had condemned in his *Apology for Poesy*, written

KING HENRY THE FIFTH

about 1581, as "against the law of hospitality to jest at strangers, because they speak not English as well as we do." This obsolete stuff and the Comedy of Pistol are blended with Shakespeare's only Poem of Conquest.

One clue to the date of *King Henry the Fifth* is in the Prologue to the fifth Act:

Were now the general of our gracious Empress,
As in good time he may, from Ireland coming,
Bringing rebellion broached on his sword,
How many would the peaceful city quit,
To welcome him!

Though there was constant fighting in Ireland it seems safe to conclude that this general was Essex, who went to his disastrous command there in March, 1599, and returned in September of that year in disgrace, and we can infer that these lines were written while there was hope of his triumph. This passage is one of the signs that the Prologues in this Play were written before 1600 though they were not printed in the Quarto editions. Even this clue tells us little, for Shakespeare might have added these verses in a revision in 1599.

There would be another clue if we could be certain that John Marston was drawn as Pistol, as Mr. George Wyndham and Mr. Seccombe and Mr. Allen suggested. Shakespeare may have applied the name Pistol to Marston, who seems to have carried a pistol and to have been accustomed to beatings, for Jonson told Drummond of Hawthornden that he had many quarrels with Marston and beat him and took his pistol from him. This clue would agree with the other, for the War of the Poets began about 1598, and the picture of Marston may have been part of Shakespeare's share in that feud.

Nicholas Breton wrote in his *Post with a Packet of Mad Letters*, printed in 1603, "I saw the Play of Ancient Pistol where a craking coward was well cudgelled for his knavery." This suggests that the Play of Ancient Pistol was written and acted as a separate Interlude since he could hardly have used this name for the *History of King Henry the Fifth*. If so, Shakespeare may have combined a shortened version of it with his Rhetorical Pageant in the same way as he seems

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

to have blended Falstaff's Comedy with *King Henry the Fourth*, and this would explain why the Quarto edition, printed in 1600 and 1602, and either in 1608 or 1613, was called the *Chronicle History of Henry the Fifth with his battle at Agincourt in France. Together with Ancient Pistol.*

Pistol does not appear in the *First Part of King Henry the Fourth*. In the *Second Part* he appears in the second Act after Doll Tearsheet has said of him that he is "a swaggerer and the foul-mouthedst rogue in England" (which resembles the account of Thersites in *Troilus and Cressida*), and after a little ranting in a parody of Marlowe and Peele, he is driven out of the room by Falstaff, and he is seen again in the fifth Act when in the same vein he announces the King's death and again at the end when he only says a few words. This use of Pistol, which seems a mere repetition of a Character already familiar, may be one of the signs that the *Second Part of King Henry the Fourth* was written after *King Henry the Fifth*. Pistol is seen in a similar subordinate way in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. If Marston was drawn as Pistol in the War of the Poets, it is probable that the chief picture of him, the one in which he is cudgelled, was the first and that the others were mere reappearances of a popular butt. That picture seems drawn from life: Coleridge said in his seventh Lecture on Shakespeare, "I know no Character in the Plays (unless indeed Pistol be an exception) which can be called the mere portrait of an individual."

In the Epilogue to the *Second Part of King Henry the Fourth* the Dancer says: "Be it known to you, as it is very well, I was lately here in the end of a displeasing Play, to pray your patience for it, and to promise you a better. I meant indeed to pay you with this; which, if like an ill venture it come unluckily home, I break and you, my gentle creditors, lose." It seems reasonable to conclude that the Dancer referred to a Play written by Shakespeare. The Folio of 1623 prints no Epilogue admitting a failure and promising a popular Play; but it seems to omit many Epilogues, for we have reason to think that one was always spoken before the dancing began. And it may be that this lost Epilogue admitting a failure was at the end of *King John*.

KING JOHN

All we know about the date of *King John* is that Meres mentioned it in *Palladis Tamia* in 1598. It is possible that he was referring to *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, which was printed in 1591 without a writer's name, and in 1611 as written by W. Sh., and in 1622 as by W. Shakespeare; but it is more probable that he had in mind a recent revision of it now represented by *The Life and Death of King John*, which seems to have appeared first in the Folio of 1623. This would explain why he cited it at the end of his list of Chronicle Histories—*King Richard the Second, King Richard the Third, King Henry the Fourth and King John*.

The two Parts of *The Troublesome Reign* seem to have been roughly shaped by Marlowe and others from a Traditional Play written while King Henry the Eighth was making War on the Monks. Shakespeare struck out the ribald scenes about Monks, though he still made the King speak in the attitude of King Henry the Eighth,

Thou canst not, Cardinal, devise a name
So slight, unworthy and ridiculous,
To charge me to an answer as the Pope.
Tell him this tale; and from the mouth of England
Add this much more, that no Italian priest
Shall tithe or toll in our dominions;
But as we under Heaven are Supreme Head,
So under Him that great supremacy
Where we do reign, we will alone uphold.

In this he followed the authors of *The Troublesome Reign* who held that King John was a forerunner of King Henry the Eighth,

Whose arms shall reach unto the Gates of Rome,
And with his foot tread down the strumpet's pride,
That sits upon the chair of Babylon.

The same view of King John's defiance of Rome was held by John Bale, a belligerent Protestant who had been a Carmelite Friar when he was young, and was Bishop of Ossory in King Edward the Sixth's time. We do not know when Bale wrote his *King Johan*, which does not seem to have been printed before 1838, but it was probably before 1540, the year in

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

which he first fled to Germany after Cromwell had fallen, for after that time he must have doubted the piety of King Henry the Eighth. The "Interlude concerning King John," which (according to the *Calendar of State Papers*) was acted for Cranmer in 1538, may have been a form of this play.

The fact that Shakespeare's *King John* does not seem to have been printed before 1623 may be a sign that it was unpopular, and this may have been due to the fact that the ribaldry was omitted from it.

The Life and Death of King John is openly founded on *The Troublesome Reign*. It begins with a Scene in which King John defies France and says,

Our Abbeyes and our Priories shall pay
This expedition's charge.

Then the Bastard Faulconbridge enters as a young hero of old-fashioned Romance and immediately proves his royal descent. Then come the usual arguments and the usual curses: Constance says,

Oh lawful let it be
That I have room with Rome to curse awhile.

The Play ends with the King dying of poison after surrendering his Crown to the Pope, and Pembroke says that he is singing and the Prince replies,

I am the cygnet to this pale faint swan,
Who chants a doleful hymn to his own death,
And from the organ-pipe of frailty sings
His soul and body to their lasting rest.

Then King John is brought on the Stage, dying in agony, and he says,

I am a scribbled form, drawn with a pen
Upon a parchment, and against this fire
Do I shrink up. . . .
And none of you will bid the winter come
To thrust his icy fingers in my maw,
Nor let my Kingdom's rivers take their course
Through my burned bosom, nor entreat the North
To make his bleak winds kiss my parched lips

KING HENRY THE FOURTH

And comfort me with cold. I do not ask you much,
I beg cold comfort.

Here is Shakespeare's own music coming after the false pathos about the pale faint swan singing. The fierce King dies like Lucrece, of whom it was said,

And now this pale swan in her watery nest
Begins the sad dirge of her certain ending,

or like Emilia in *Othello* who said

I will play the swan
And die in music.

And even these last verses echo others in *Lust's Dominion*,

Oh, I grow dull, and the cold hand of sleep
Hath thrust his icy fingers in my breast.

In this Pageant false Pathos (as in the Scene between Arthur and Hubert) and conventional ranting are blended with the dawning supremacy of his Tragical mood.

Mr. Tucker Brooke in his *Tudor Drama* says: "Virtually everything necessary to fit the *Henry the Fourth* Plays for their original purpose as preliminary to a drama on the Reign of Henry the Fifth is accomplished in the *First Part*. . . . The Play needs only Scenes indicating the King's death and the final dismissal of Falstaff to stand forth, as we may suspect it was first designed, perfect in itself and a full induction to the treatment of the hero's triumphant reign." And he says, "the *Second Part of Henry the Fourth*, like the *Second Part of Tamburlaine*, seems to be an originally unpremeditated addition, occasioned by the enormous effectiveness of the by-figure of Falstaff." He adds that "much of it is a mere variation of material already used in the *First*: and the effect of the two Parts when taken together is less that of steady dramatic progress than of a march and counter-march." While agreeing with all this, I think that it is one of the signs that *King Henry the Fifth* was written before the *Second Part of King Henry the Fourth*.

It may be that Shakespeare wrote *Hotspur's Tragedy* and

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

the battle of Shrewsbury as a Scene in his Pageant, and then *King Henry the Fifth* and the battle of Agincourt as another, and then (having completed the Pageant of the Wars of the Roses by filling up the gaps between *King Richard the Second* and *King Richard the Third*) wrote the Comedy of Falstaff suggested by the Comical patches in the old *Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth*, and then blended this with Hotspur's Tragedy as *King Henry the Fourth* and then wrote an Interlude about Ancient Pistol as a caricature of Marston in the War of the Poets and then used part of this to provide Comical Scenes for *King Henry the Fifth*, and then rewrote *The Troublesome Reign* as a Prelude to a different Pageant of the Contest between the Crown and the Church, which was to include the *History of King Henry the Eighth*, and then after *King John* failed on the Stage (partly because he had taught his audience to look for Comical Scenes in his Pageant) yielded to a demand for a reappearance of Falstaff in the *Second Part of King Henry the Fourth*.

The Epilogue to that *Second Part* ended as follows : " One word more, I beseech you. If you be not too much cloyed with fat meat, our humble author will continue the story, with Sir John in it, and make you merry with fair Katharine of France : where, for anything I know, Falstaff shall die of a sweat, unless already a' be killed with your hard opinions, for Oldcastle died a martyr and this is not the man. My tongue is weary : when my legs are too, I will bid you good night : and so kneel down before you ; but, indeed, to pray for the Queen."

This passage seems to have been added by somebody else as a reluctant apology for the use of Oldcastle's name after the Play had been produced on the Stage, for in the Quarto edition the first paragraph of the Epilogue ended with the words " and so kneel down before you, but, indeed, to pray for the Queen." It seems to me that this passage could not have referred to the Pageant of the Triumph of Agincourt, and was a conditional promise of a Comedy " with Sir John in it," bringing Queen Katharine again on the Stage, and I infer that she had already caused merriment in *King Henry the Fifth*. It may be that this promise was left unfulfilled because the *Second Part* was tepidly welcomed. This Part

KING HENRY THE FOURTH

is much the more admirable and mature of the two, but (perhaps for that reason) it does not seem to have been liked as well as the other, for we have only one Quarto edition of it while we have seven of the First. Indeed, it has never been popular, for it has been seldom performed. And I infer that the announcement of Falstaff's death was inserted in *King Henry the Fifth* after the second part of the Epilogue was heard on the Stage.

The words "Oldcastle died a martyr, and this is not the man," referred to the fact that the Comical Knight was called Sir John Oldcastle first, as is shown by the Prince's words in the *First Part*, "as the honey of Hybla, my old lad of the Castle." Nicholas Rowe in his *Account of the Life of Shakespeare* explained this alteration: "It may not be improper to observe that this part of Falstaff is said to have been written originally under the name of Oldcastle: some of that family being then remaining, the Queen was pleased to command him to alter it, upon which he made use of Falstaff." This statement may have been based on the one made by William James in his dedication of *The Life and Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle*, printed in 1625, "offence being worthily taken by personages descended from his title, as peradventure by many others who ought to have him in honourable memory."

Sir Sidney Lee is inaccurate when he writes, "Influential objection was taken by Henry Brooke, eighth Lord Cobham, who succeeded to the title on March the fifth, 1596-1597, and claimed descent in the female line from the historical Sir John Oldcastle, the Lollard leader, who sat in the House of Lords as Lord Cobham." This Lord Cobham was not descended from Oldcastle. Joan De la Pole, who was Baroness Cobham in her own right, married five times and left an only child, Joan, by her second husband, Sir Reginald Braybrooke. Her fourth marriage made her Oldcastle's third wife, and her title descended to the Brookes through her daughter, who married Sir Thomas Brooke. Sir John Oldcastle sat in the House of Lords as Lord Cobham, in his wife's right, from 1409, the year when he married her, till 1413, the year when he was arrested, but he was not known by that title: his followers in 1413 used the watchword "for Sir John

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

Oldcastle," and the King's proclamation stated that one of their aims was "to divide the realm into confederate districts and to appoint Sir John Oldcastle President of the Commonwealth."

According to all the contemporary authorities Oldcastle led a profligate life till he became the chief of the Lollards; but in later times this was denied by some Protestant writers who thought that he had shared their Religion though if they had read his defence they would have seen their mistake. Still, even Fuller had his doubts about Oldcastle. He wrote of him in his *Worthies of England*, printed in 1662: "It is easily known out of what purse this black penny came, the Papists railing on him for a heretic, and therefore he must also be a coward, though indeed he was a man of arms, every inch of him, and as valiant as any in his Age"; but in his *Church History*, printed in 1655, he says: "Let Mr. Foxe be his compurgator, I dare not, and if my hand were on the book, I would take it back again. Yet so that as I will not acquit, I will not condemn him, but leave all to the revelation of the righteous judgment of God."

If we could be certain that one of the Cobhams intervened in this matter this would give us a clue to the date when the Comedy of Falstaff was first seen on the Stage. William Brooke, seventh Lord Cobham, was Lord Chamberlain for about seven months beginning in August, 1596. Since he seems to have been inclined to Puritanism and was linked through his title with Oldcastle he may have forbidden his Servants to use Oldcastle's name. This would agree with the date commonly accepted by students: Sir Israel Gollancz says, "there is almost unanimity among scholars in assigning the *First Part of Henry the Fourth* to the year 1596-1597." The eighth Lord Cobham (Henry Brooke) had no power over the Chamberlain's Servants and he was in disfavour at Court because he was a Puritan leader, and George Carey, the second Lord Hunsdon, who was Lord Chamberlain after the seventh Lord Cobham (as his father had been before him from 1583 to 1596), disliked the Puritans as much as the Queen did, and would not have intervened in this way any more than she would have done if she had stooped to give the matter a thought.

KING HENRY THE FOURTH

The change may have been merely due to the fact that the use of Oldcastle's name had given offence as the Epilogue to the *Second Part* indicates. In 1599 Philip Henslowe employed four of his Dramatists, Anthony Munday, Michael Drayton, Robert Wilson and Richard Hathaway, to compile a Play called the *First Part of the True and Honourable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the good Lord Cobham*. This Play, which was printed in 1600 or 1619, may have been an answer to Shakespeare's picture of Oldcastle. This seems shown by its Prologue :

It is no pampered glutton we present,
Nor aged councillor to youthful sin,
But one whose virtue shone above the rest,
A valiant martyr and a virtuous Peer.

This was followed in 1601 by John Weever's *Mirror of Martyrs, or the Life and Death of the Valiant Captain and most godly martyr, Sir John Oldcastle, Knight, Lord Cobham*, in which there were quotations from the *Second Part of King Henry the Fourth*. *Sir John Oldcastle* and this Poem seem proofs that there was an outcry against the Comical picture of Oldcastle, which had nothing to do with the fact that Baroness Cobham had been one of his wives.

Anthony Munday was famous for his zeal as a Protestant. He had first become prominent in 1581 when he gave evidence against Father Campion, the Jesuit, who was tortured on the Rack in the Tower by another dramatist, Thomas Norton, one of the authors of the *Tragedy of Gorboduc*, acted in 1561 and printed in 1565. Munday wrote the *English Roman Life* and an attack on Father Campion, which was afterwards used in Holinshed's *Chronicle*, probably either by John Hooker or John Stow, since Holinshed seems to have died about 1580. The Catholic view of him is expressed, for instance, in the *True Account of the Death and Martyrdom of M. Campion* (which was probably written by Thomas Pound), in which he was called Cogging Munday, "who was first a Stage-Player, no doubt a calling of some credit, after an apprenticeship, which time he well served with deceiving of his master, then wandering towards Italy, became by his own account a cozener in his journey. Coming to Rome, he

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

was charitably received there, but never admitted into the Seminary, as he pleaseth to lie." This view may have been just, for even Topcliffe, who employed him to harry the Catholics, accused him of theft. He may have borne a private grudge against Shakespeare in the same way as Greene did, for he seems to have been the author of *Fidele and Fortunio*, which was one of the sources of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*; but his Protestant zeal would have been enough to account for his taking the chief part in writing *Sir John Oldcastle* as he seems to have done. The fact that this Play was written in 1599 or 1600 may show that Oldcastle's name was still retained on the Stage though it had been changed in the Quarto of 1598.

According to the Sidney Papers, Rowland Whyte wrote to Sir Robert Sidney in March, 1599-1600, about a feast given by the Lord Chamberlain, the second Lord Hunsdon, to the Flemish Envoy Verreiken: "upon Thursday my Lord Chamberlain feasted him, and made him a very great and delicate dinner, and there in the afternoon his Players acted before Sir John Oldcastle to his great contentment." Since the Chamberlain's Servants would not have acted a rival play belonging to Henslowe they may have performed the separate Comedy of Falstaff as an Interlude then, still using the name of Oldcastle.

In *A Meeting of Gallants at an Ordinary*, printed in 1604, it was said, "How like you, mine host? Did I not tell you he was a mad round knave and a merry one, too? And if you talk of fat Sir John Oldcastle, he will tell you he was his great-grandfather." Nathaniel Field wrote in *Amends for Ladies*, printed in 1618, "Did you not see the piece in which the fat Knight, hight Oldcastle, told you plainly what was honour?" In the *Wandering Jew Telling Fortunes for Englishmen*, printed in 1640, Glutton says, "I am a fat man. . . . I do not live by the sweat of my brow, but am almost dead by sweating. I eat much but can talk little: Sir John Oldcastle was my great-grandfather's father's uncle: I come of a huge kindred."

William Bagwell in *The Merchant Distressed*, printed in 1644, wrote "they have no skill in martial discipline, yet they begin as if they durst to fight, with Sir John Oldcastle, that

KING HENRY THE FOURTH

high-flown Knight." And Fuller wrote in his *Church History of Britain*, that the Stage-Poets "having made themselves very bold and others very merry at the memory of Sir John Oldcastle, whom they have fancied a boon companion, a jovial roysterer, and yet a coward to boot: the best is Sir John Falstaff hath relieved the memory of Sir John Oldcastle and of late is substituted buffoon in his place." It is not likely that Fuller would have written about 1654 that the change had been made "of late" if the name had been altered about 1597.

The name Falstaff was borrowed from the cowardly Knight who is now called Sir John Fastolfe in the *First Part of King Henry the Sixth*. Heminge and Condell printed his name as Falstaff, and this was changed to Fastolfe by Theobald. And this form of the name may have been the traditional one, for Sir John Fastolfe was called Falstaff in Rymer's *Fœdera* and Falstolf in the French Chronicles. The picture of him in *King Henry the Sixth* was as unjust as traditional ones commonly are, for though Talbot accused him of showing cowardice at the Rout of Patay in 1428, Bedford decided that the charge was untrue. Mr. Gairdner suggested in his *Lollardy and the Reformation in England* that Shakespeare used Falstaff's name because it was believed that he had been a Lollard like Oldcastle. But we know a good deal about Fastolfe or Falstaff (through the *Paston Letters*, for instance) and there is no proof that he took sides with the Lollards. It is possible that the fact that he owned the Boar's Head Tavern in Southwark may have led the Players to link Falstaff's adventures with the Boar's Head in Eastcheap; but nothing recorded of him shows any resemblance to the Comical Knight.

Shakespeare found Oldcastle named as one of Prince Hal's riotous friends in the *Famous Victories of King Henry the Fifth*. Oldcastle seems to have been one of the figures of the Traditional Plays. Father Robert Parsons, for instance, writing about 1603, spoke of him as "that Ruffian Knight, as all England knows, commonly brought in by the Comedians on their Stage." If Oldcastle was a traditional butt as a fat and cowardly Knight (an English Miles Gloriosus) this would explain why the Players used his name or reverted to

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

it after it had been changed in the printed versions of *King Henry the Fourth*.

The change may have been made when the Puritans seemed rising to power and may have been undone while they suffered and restored in the days when they were beginning to triumph. Meanwhile the Quartos may have kept it because it was enforced by their licence. But it was observed in a performance at Court in February 1612-1613 when (according to the Treasurers' Accounts) *Sir John Falstaff*, which may have been the Comedy part from the Pageant, was twice acted by His Majesty's Servants.

It may be that while Shakespeare drew Oldcastle-Falstaff partly from some men of his time (such as Ben Jonson) and partly from his own heart he was faithful to the traditional build, for he could not have drawn a familiar Character strangely. This may help to explain why Falstaff seems to be out of place in Shakespeare's shadowy World and to belong to a more primitive time. Though his philosophy belongs to no Country (for he would have agreed with Omar Khayyam's maxim in the twenty-third Quatrain in Mr. Heron Allen's edition, "Drink, rob on the highway, and be benevolent") he was essentially English; but he sinned and rejoiced with a Mediæval simplicity: he could have ridden with Chaucer's Pilgrims or sung the old verses ascribed to Walter Map,

Meum est propositum in tabernâ mori:
Vinum sit appositum morientis ori,
Ut dicant cum venerint Angelorum chori,
"Deus sit propitius huic peccatori!"

Falstaff seems to belong to Rabelais' World rather than Shakespeare's, but this does not make him less English. Rabelais' loud mirth was not limited by the borders of France, and indeed it might be contended that he drew his Gargantua from King Henry the Eighth. He published the first books of *La Vie du Grand Gargantua* in 1532, about twelve years after France had rung with the doings of the huge English King at the Field of the Cloth of Gold when (according to Hall's Chronicle of England) the motto, "Faicte bonne chere quy voudra," was written over the entrance of the English Pavilion. And King Henry the Eighth (of whom it was recorded that

KING HENRY THE EIGHTH

the three next fattest men in England could fit into his waistcoat) was a Falstaff compounded with an English Othello.

Chaucer or Rabelais would have left Falstaff rollicking and immortally young, and it may be that Shakespeare had intended to spare him and (though he hanged Bardolph and Nym in *King Henry the Fifth*) had first written that Play without "Sir John in it" partly because he would have spoiled it if he had followed the historical truth by making his hero send him to death. He avoided that risk when he made Falstaff die of disease, and he may have mentioned his death partly because the nature of a Pageant required that the end of the chief people in it should be recorded. Perhaps he made his English Silenus die in despair because he was turning from the glamour of Pageants and the laughter of Comedies to the darkness of truth.

The Prologue to *King Henry the Eighth* begins—

I come no more to make you laugh : things now
That bear a weighty and a serious brow,
Sad, high and working, full of state and woe,
Such noble scenes as draw the eye to flow,
We now present. Those that can pity, here
May, if they think it well, let fall a tear :
The subject will deserve it. Such as give
Their money out of hope they may believe,
May here find truth too. . . .

Only they
That come to hear a merry bawdy play,
A noise of targets, or to see a fellow
In a long motley coat guarded with yellow,
Will be deceived, for, gentle hearers, know
To rank our chosen truth with such a show
As fool and fight is, besides forfeiting
Our own brains and the opinion that we bring
To make that only true we now intend,
Will leave us never an understanding friend.

Sir Henry Wotton wrote in 1613 (in a letter preserved in

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

Reliquiæ Wottonianæ) about the burning of the Globe Theatre in that year during "a new Play called *All is True*, representing some principal pieces in the reign of Henry the Eighth." The title *All is True* agrees with the Prologue, but this Pageant, as we have it, does not. This does not seem to have been printed before the Folio of 1623 and there it was called *The Famous History of the Life of King Henry the Eighth*, and was the last of the Histories.

Coleridge, in his *Classifications* of 1802 and 1819 put this Play in his Third Epoch after *Henry the Fifth*, calling it (in 1819) "a sort of Historical Masque or Show Play." This would be a natural place for it if Shakespeare had planned another Pageant of the Contest between the Crown and the Church which had been introduced by *King John*. But while this Play has the structure of his Chronicle Pageant its manner does not seem to be his.

Some students suggest that he had Fletcher's help in this Play while others contend that Fletcher and Massinger founded it on their recollections of one written by him and lost when the Globe was burnt in 1613. But the Play would not have been lost even if every copy had been burnt with the Globe, for the Players could have remembered their parts, and even if Shakespeare had sought Fletcher's assistance (for once and for no visible reason) he would not have asked him to rewrite the whole Play.

This Pageant has two opposite versions of the historical truth, a Catholic and a Protestant one, and this may explain why a Play partly written by Shakespeare was rewritten and completed by others, perhaps Fletcher and Massinger.

The first three Acts and the second Scene of the fourth are mainly written from a Catholic standpoint: Queen Katharine, another Hermione, is the heroine, the King's scruples and Anne Bullen's reluctance are hypocritical, and Wolsey is shown as he was seen by the Catholics. The picture of Wolsey was copied from Holinshed who had relied mainly on two Catholic books, George Cavendish's *Life of Cardinal Wolsey* (which he probably read in manuscript, for it does not seem to have been printed before the garbled edition of 1641), and Father Campion's account of Wolsey, which was written in 1569 about the time when he was reconciled to

KING HENRY THE EIGHTH

the Catholic Church. In those days the Catholics ascribed their calamities to Wolsey's ambition and to King Henry the Eighth's amorous nature. So do these three Acts, but in this they differ from Holinshed and from Edward Hall's *Triumphant Reign of Henry the Eighth*, printed in 1542 or 1548, which had also been used in them. All this is changed in the first Scene of the fourth Act and in the fifth Act: Anne Bullen and Cranmer are praised and the story is the Protestant version and seems based on John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments of the Church*, commonly called the Book of Martyrs, printed in Latin in 1559 and in English in 1563. And this part ruins the Play by contradicting the rest.

If the Catholic version of the story was true Queen Katharine was wronged and the King's marriage to Anne Bullen was void and Queen Elizabeth was born illegitimate. Here was reason enough why most of this Play could not have been acted while Queen Elizabeth lived, and besides she could not have wished her father and mother to be shown on the Stage by her own Company, the Chamberlain's Servants. During her life they acted two Plays dealing with King Henry the Eighth's Troublesome Reign, *Sir Thomas More*, printed in 1834, and *Thomas, Lord Cromwell*, printed in 1602, and though the King was important in each he was not shown in either of them. It is probable that the Admiral's Men, who acted Plays concerned with Cardinal Wolsey in 1601 and 1602, were equally cautious; but this is not certain, for these Plays have been lost. But about two years after her death Prince Henry's Company of Players performed Samuel Rowley's *When you See me, you Know me, or the Famous Chronicle of King Henry the Eighth*, and this was rivalled by a Chronicle History of her own early days written by Thomas Heywood and called *If you Know not Me, you Know Nobody*.

In the days when the Queen was nearing her end the Catholics hoped that the new King would show kindness to them for his mother's sake. And many of them thought then that his wife Anne of Denmark shared their religion. They were probably wrong in this, for though Mr. Gardiner in his *History of England* says that she was a Catholic, Father Richard Blount, who succeeded Father Garnet as the head of the English Jesuits, doubted this in a report sent to Rome.

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

In any case, she did nothing for them, and King James blighted their hopes, mainly because he needed their fines, and in 1605 the crazy Gunpowder Plot made him their enemy.

If Shakespeare wrote or sketched a form of this Play during the old Queen's last years he must have intended to postpone its performance and may well have supposed that the employment of the Catholic version would not be a drawback when King James had come to the Throne. The first three Acts differ from all the other Scenes of his Pageant except the second part of *King Richard the Second*, and this may be due to the fact that they were not founded on a Chronicle History. It may be that when he had finished his form of the Contest between the Houses of Lancaster and York he turned to the theme chosen by Hall, *The Union of the two noble and illustre families of Lancaster and York and the Reign of the High and Prudent Prince, King Henry the Eighth, the Indubitate Flower and Heir of both the said Lineages*. If so, he no longer depended on the views of the Chronicles, for that Prudent Prince was still distinctly remembered. It may be that when he had written part of a new Pageant, the Scenes showing Buckingham's doom and the Cardinal's fall and Queen Katharine's desertion and death, he turned to Tragical work and (instead of re-writing them in a Protestant version to suit the taste of the times after the Gunpowder Plot) abandoned the task, but allowed his Company to profit by them. And his Company may have employed Fletcher and Massinger to write a Play founded on his Catholic version. This would explain why only the structure of the Catholic part seems to be his and why Heminge and Condell printed the Play as his after his death.

If (as Elze contended) he wrote this Pageant in 1603 the old Queen's death in that year would account for his selecting a theme which would have been banned during her life. This seems a more probable date, for it is not likely that he would have written such a Play at a time when it could not have been acted. And in this case he may have laid this Pageant aside when the Bye-Plot of 1603 aroused ill-feeling against the Catholics and may have abandoned it after the Gunpowder Plot of 1605.

KING HENRY THE EIGHTH

In 1613 he had nearly finished his life-work and had (according to most students) written the last form of *The Tempest*; he had only three years of life left, and it seems certain that he was spending them in Stratford-on-Avon. I do not think that he would have written a Play then with Fletcher or with any one else who was living in London or would have reverted to his old Pageants then or could have planned this one (which is rhetorical and much less dramatic than the real events) after his Tragedies.

In 1613 John Fletcher was at the height of his fame: he had finished the Plays which he had written with Francis Beaumont and probably with others whose names have not been recorded. If Shakespeare's associates had wished to employ somebody to refashion a derelict abandoned by him ten years before this, the choice of Fletcher would have been natural. And since in that year Fletcher, who was then aged thirty-four, began working with Philip Massinger, then aged about thirty, he might well have chosen him to help in his task.

There is no sign that Fletcher was ranked as a friend or an admirer of Shakespeare's: he seems to have belonged to the school who regarded Ben Jonson as the Lord of the Theatre. This may be enough to explain why *King Henry the Eighth* appears to have been re-written throughout, or it may be that Shakespeare stipulated for this when he allowed his old Catholic Pageant to be altered to a Protestant one. I think that Massinger re-wrote the first four Acts and that Fletcher added some passages and wrote the first Scene of the fourth Act and the fifth Act hastily.

Some students have argued that this Play is not Fletcher's because it is unlike his Romantic ones; but it does not differ from *Valentinian*, written before 1619, more than John Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*, written about 1634, does from his *Broken Heart*, written about 1633. Ford's *Perkin Warbeck* imitated *Edward the Second* in an attempt to revive the Chronicle Pageants, and its Prologue repudiated the "unnecessary mirth" of such Histories as *King Henry the Fourth*. *King Henry the Eighth* had the same model and aim, and its Prologue repudiated Shakespeare's fool and fight and clatter of targets. I do not think that Shakespeare would have turned to denounce

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

his own methods or to imitate Marlowe again as he had done when he wrote the second part of *King Richard the Second*; but two younger writers might have done this (as Ford afterwards did) when they attempted to show how a Chronicle Pageant ought to be written.

Some students have argued that the popular speeches in *King Henry the Eighth*, for instance, Wolsey's good-bye to Cromwell in the third Act, are too admirable to have been written by Fletcher. Even if we were prepared to admit that Fletcher did not attain this level or pass it at other times this would not prove that he did not soar to it once, and I do not believe that Shakespeare would have seen any reason for copying him in 1613. It seems plain that such verses as

And, when I am forgotten, as I shall be . . .
Say, Wolsey, that once trod the ways of glory,
And sounded all the depths and shoals of honour
Found thee a way, out of his wreck, to rise in;
A sure and safe one, though thy master missed it. . . .
Cromwell, I charge thee, fling away ambition,

or those in Wolsey's soliloquy,

Like little wanton boys that swim on bladders,
This many summers in a sea of glory,

were written by the poet who wrote in *Valentinian*,

Call in your lady-bawds and gilded pandars,
And let them triumph too and sing to Cæsar,

and in *Bonduca*

See that huge battle moving from the mountains.

This lilting rhythm is like the Sapphics of Horace, such as,

Integer vitæ, scelerisque purus,

and Fletcher may have learnt it from him. Shakespeare's different mind could not have liked the accurate composure of Horace, and besides, the odds are that he knew little about him, for his knowledge of Latin Poetry seems to have been limited to a schoolboy's acquaintance with Ovid and Mantuanus and Virgil. And Fletcher's favourite lilt would have been alien

KING HENRY THE EIGHTH

to him even in his lyrical days and repellent when his Verse had acquired a solemn maturity.

Most of this Play is written with Massinger's contented monotony, and his apparent share in the task suggests another possible reason for the acceptance of the Catholic story, since he seems to have been a Catholic during most of his life. Mr. Arthur Symons, for instance, writes in his *Philip Massinger*, printed in the Mermaid Series, "It is conjectured by Gifford that Massinger, during his residence in the University, had 'exchanged the Religion of his father for one at that time the object of terror, persecution and hatred.' . . . In support of this hypothesis, Gifford points particularly to the *Virgin Martyr*, *The Renegado* and *The Maid of Honour*. I cannot think the evidence of these Plays conclusive, but such as it is, it certainly goes a long way in favour of the supposition." He adds that the Catholic religion would have attracted a man of Massinger's temperament, "and he would certainly have every opportunity of association with it in a University of such Catholic and Conservative principles as Oxford." This seems supported by the little we know of Massinger's life, for instance, by the fact that he was forsaken by his first patron, the third Earl of Pembroke (of whom Clarendon wrote that he was "a great lover of his Country and of the Religion and Justice which he believed could only support it, and his friendships were only with men of these principles") and by the fact that Queen Henrietta Maria showed him a particular favour.

It seems to me that if Heminge and Condell had not printed this Play as Shakespeare's, we could conclude that Massinger wrote the Catholic Scenes about 1613 and that Fletcher retouched them with his lyrical eloquence and added the contradictory Act to suit the mood of that time. This would not be disproved by its structure since that was based on Marlowe's *Edward the Second*. And this Play's resemblance to *King Richard the Second* may be due to the fact that (like that early Pageant) it echoes *Edward the Second*, for instance, in Wolsey's farewell, for its first verses,

Cromwell, I did not think to shed a tear
In all my miseries; but thou hast forced me,
Out of thy honest truth to play the woman

AN IMAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

seem derived from King Edward's parting from Leicester,

Leicester, if gentle words might comfort me,
Thy speeches long ago had eased my sorrows,
For kind and loving hast thou always been.

It seems to me that Heminge and Condell's inclusion of this Play in the Folio of 1623 can only be explained by inferring that Shakespeare had written a form of it which was rewritten afterwards by Fletcher and Massinger. In that case this Play should be ascribed to Fletcher and Massinger in the same way as, for instance, *King Henry the Sixth* is given to Shakespeare. If he called his sketch of this Pageant *All Is True*, he may have meant this to show that he was turning from Plays which could be fitly named *As You Like It*. He may have intended his last Pageant to be his first mature Tragedy. Perhaps he could have said as Fletcher did in the Prologue,

I come no more to make you laugh : things now
That bear a weighty and a serious brow,
Sad, high and working, full of state and woe,
Such noble scenes as draw the eye to flow,
We now present.

THE TRAGEDIES

I

SHAKESPEARE lived in passionate times, and they grew darker as he came to maturity. During those years he watched the fantastic boys whom he had admired in his Youth grow to heroic men and struggle and fall and he saw Queen Elizabeth yield to Old Age at last and die broken-hearted.

During the years between 1593 and 1603 the third Earl of Southampton, for instance, triumphed at Court and cast the Royal favour away for Elizabeth Vernon and became linked in passionate friendship with her cousin, the second Earl of Essex, fought under him at the capture of Cadiz in 1596, sailed with him as a Vice-Admiral in command of a Ship-Royal, *The Garland*, in 1597 and was knighted by him when Villa Franca was taken "ere he could dry the sweat from his brows or put his sword in his scabbard" (according to Markham) and went with him to more fighting in Ireland in 1599, returned with him to help his fatal Revolt, rode with him to call London to arms in 1601 and was sentenced to death for this in the Guildhall and was kept in the Tower till Queen Elizabeth died. The effeminate boy to whom Shakespeare had dedicated his Poems of Love had changed to the reckless soldier who stood on the leads of Essex House, saying: "Let his Lordship do his pleasure. If he blow us up, we shall be the nearer Heaven. We purpose not to yield without hostages, for we have made our choice rather to die like men with swords in our hands."

There is no reason to doubt that one of Shakespeare's feigned Tragedies, *King Richard the Second*, was set in the true one of the Essex Revolt as the Murder Play was in *Hamlet*. Bacon recorded in his *Account of the Arraignment of Merrick*, one of the leaders of that Revolt: "And farther to prove him privy to the Plot . . . it was given in evidence that the afternoon before the Rebellion, Merrick, with a great company of others that afterwards were all in the action, had procured to be played before them the Play of deposing