

THE ELIZABETHAN AND JACOBEAN TWO-PART PLAY

A Study of the Composition and Structure
of Dramatic Sequels

by

John Russell Sanderson

Submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of
Birmingham

October, 1975

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.



976, 594

Synopsis

This thesis examines for the first time the origin and development of the multi-part play in English between the years 1587 and 1630. After Tamburlaine, dramatic sequels become a regular feature of the professional theatre, and figure significantly in the early careers of Shakespeare and Marston as well as that of Marlowe. More than one hundred separate plays, extant and lost, are considered for evidence of composition, performance, publication, and literary and theatrical relationship. The plays are grouped according to genre, but at the same time a continuing chronological development is revealed. Many of the multi-part plays were unanticipated by the author, sequels appearing in response to popular success; others, especially among the Histories, were deliberately conceived in two or more parts. Nevertheless, in both categories, verbal and structural cross-references exist which can indicate intellectual consistency even where the original circumstances of performance made this difficult to perceive. From the general considerations, some specific conclusions emerge: many of the problems of 1 Henry VI are explained with reference to other planned sequences influenced by Tamburlaine; Munday's Huntington plays are shown to have an ingenious design in an extended rehearsal framework; new reasons are given for the derivation of 1 Hieronimo from an earlier sequel to Kyd's revenge tragedy; the structure of Chapman's Byron plays yields new evidence of their textual history; and Dekker's 2 The Honest Whore is profitably discussed in relation to Shakespeare's treatment of Hal in 2 Henry IV. In an essay comparing the composition and structure of sequels, it is suggested that they have an unrecognized significance to the growth and achievement of English Renaissance drama.

(c. 100,000 words)

Contents

Chapter I	Introduction	1
	Notes	10
Chapter II	<u>Tamburlaine the Great</u>	13
i.	Date, Authorship, Publication, and Early Stage History	13
ii.	The Structure of <u>Tamburlaine the Great</u>	21
iii.	Staging	46
iv.	Sources	51
v.	Conclusion	57
	Notes	60
Chapter III	The Influence of <u>Tamburlaine</u> on the Two-Part Play	64
i.	<u>Alphonsus, King of Aragon</u>	65
ii.	<u>Tamar Cham</u>	72
iii.	<u>Selimus</u>	75
iv.	English History Plays	81
v.	<u>John of Bordeaux</u>	84
	Notes	94
Chapter IV	Shakespeare's First Tetralogy	98
i.	Introduction	98
ii.	The Influence of <u>Tamburlaine</u> and the Composition of <u>1 Henry VI</u>	105
iii.	Links between the Plays	118
iv.	The Structure of the Individual Plays	133
v.	Conclusion	141
	Notes	150
Chapter V	Shakespeare's Second Tetralogy	156
i.	Composition and Publication; <u>Woodstock</u>	156
ii.	<u>Richard II</u>	164
iii.	The Two Parts of <u>Henry IV</u>	176
iv.	<u>Henry V</u>	191
v.	Conclusion	195
	Notes	201
Chapter VI	The English History Play	207
i.	The Huntington Plays	208
ii.	<u>Edward IV</u>	225
iii.	<u>If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody; Sir Thomas Wyatt; 1 Sir John Oldcastle</u>	238
iv.	Lost Two-Part Historical Plays	248
v.	Heywood's <u>Ages</u>	252
	Notes	262
Chapter VII	Tragedies	271
i.	<u>The First Part of Hieronimo</u>	272
ii.	<u>Antonio and Mellida</u>	286
iii.	The Byron Plays	300
iv.	<u>The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois</u>	314
	Notes	324

Chapter VIII	Comedies	330
i.	Robert Wilson's Moral Comedies; Lost Two-Part Comedies	331
ii.	Lost Comic Trilogies; The Parnassus Plays	337
iii.	<u>The Honest Whore</u>	345
iv.	<u>The Tamer Tamed</u>	353
v.	<u>The Fair Maid of the West</u>	359
	Notes	367
Chapter IX	Conclusion	372
	Notes	388
Select Bibliography		389

References and Abbreviations

Contractions and ampersands in quotations from early printed books and diplomatic editions have been silently expanded. The usual practice in respect to the normalization of u/v, i/j, and long s/s has been followed.

The titles and dates of dramatic works are based on Annals of English Drama 975-1700.

For books in the following list of abbreviations and in the Notes and Bibliography, the place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.

Abbreviations of books, series, and periodicals

Books:

- Annals Alfred Harbage, Annals of English Drama 975-1700, revised by S. Schoenbaum (1964)
- Arber A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640, edited by Edward Arber, 5 vols (1875-94)
- Bowers The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, edited by Fredson Bowers, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1953-61)
- Bullough Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, edited by Geoffrey Bullough, 8 vols (1957-75)
- Chambers, E.S. E.K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage, 4 vols (Oxford, 1923)
- Chambers, W.S. E.K. Chambers, William Shakespeare, A Study of Facts and Problems, 2 vols (Oxford, 1930)
- Dodsley A Select Collection of Old English Plays, edited by Robert Dodsley, fourth edition, edited by W. Carew Hazlitt, 15 vols (1874-6)
- Greg, Diary II Henslowe's Diary, edited by W.W. Greg 2 vols (1904-8), Commentary
- Greg, Documents I Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses, edited by W.W. Greg, 2 vols (Oxford, 1931), Reproductions and Transcripts

Greg, Documents II

Commentary

H.D.

Henslowe's Diary, edited by R.A. Foakes and R.T. Rickert (Cambridge, 1961)

Hunter (1954)

G.K. Hunter, 'Henry IV and the Elizabethan Two-Part Play', RES, n.s. 5 (1954), 236-48

McKerrow

The Works of Thomas Nashe, edited by Ronald B. McKerrow, second edition, revised by F.P. Wilson, 5 vols (Oxford, 1958)

Series:

MSR

Malone Society Reprints

RRDS

Regents Renaissance Drama Series

NCS

New Cambridge Shakespeare

References to the Arden Shakespeare are to the new or revised Arden edition of Shakespeare (1951-).

Periodicals:

E in C

Essays in Criticism

ELH

English Literary History

ELN

English Language Notes

ES

English Studies

JEGP

Journal of English and Germanic Philology

MLN

Modern Language Notes

MLQ

Modern Language Quarterly

MLR

Modern Language Review

MP

Modern Philology

N&Q

Notes and Queries

PMLA

Publications of the Modern Language Association of America

PQ

Philological Quarterly

RES

Review of English Studies

SEL

Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900

SP

Studies in Philology

SQ

Shakespeare Quarterly

SS

Shakespeare Survey

TLS

Times Literary Supplement

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The rise of professionalism in dramatic affairs in the last quarter of the sixteenth century is one of the distinguishing marks of the emergence of 'The Age of the Drama'.

G.E. Bentley¹

The milieu of the professional theatre which Bentley describes includes a particular development which he does not consider. For the first time, plays of the Elizabethan and Jacobean stage acquired sequels, usually written by the same dramatists for the companies who performed the original plays. This innovation led to the planning and composition of more than one play with the same major characters in a continuing action which exceeded the theatrical requirement of single day performance. When such plays came to be published, their title-pages often called attention to their incomplete nature if published separately, or to the division of a single title into two parts when a single volume was issued. Nearly every major dramatist of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century was involved with plays planned in two parts or sequels which develop the dramatic lives of characters beyond an original terminal point. In addition to the printing and reprinting of these dramatic works, several manuscript plays without indication of title, and three of the seven known dramatic Plots also exhibit or imply close relationships to other plays. A large number of lost plays are known to have formed two-part associations, trilogies, or tetralogies.

The plays chosen for detailed discussion in this study range in date from 1587, when Part Two of Marlowe's Tamburlaine was first performed, to 1630, the probable date of composition for Heywood's sequel to The Fair Maid of the

West. These plays may, incidentally, represent the shortest and longest intervals, respectively, between an original play and an unanticipated sequel. The continuity of myth, legend, and history with the frequent and often non-existent boundaries between them provided the encouragement for most of the extended dramatic representations. Others, however, result when self-contained tragedies and comedies are unexpectedly reopened for further narrative both before and after the original time-scheme. Assessing the relationships between linked plays has been a major object of this study and to this end the evidence employed has covered nearly every aspect of composition, performance, and publication during this period.

Both external and internal evidence are helpful in considering the relationships between plays linked by title, dramatis personae, setting, action, and almost always by common authorship. Prologues and epilogues may refer to previous dramatizations or advertise those forthcoming. A dramatist's use of sources is one indication of his planning and the way in which familiar dramatic material is redeveloped in a second play. When features of an earlier play are repeated, referred to, paralleled or contrasted, the order and extent of these links may achieve a structural dependence on an earlier play. Random repetition on the other hand can suggest a lack of inspiration which is sometimes reflected in the structure of sequels. Records of performance from the Revels accounts and Henslowe's Diary and details of composition and authorship, when available, also help to indicate the planning of multi-part plays, the relative speed with which sequels were added to successful plays, and the stimulus given to continuations from revivals. Henslowe's Diary supplies a great deal of information about such matters as the performance of two-part plays, their relative popularity on consecutive days, and the retention of at least one of the collaborators from an original play in subsequent continuations. The Stationers' Register,² title-pages, and prefatory matter offer valuable direction to the importance of the ways in which two-part plays were presented to the reading public.

More than fifty plays comprise the body of extant dramatic work representing first parts, second parts, or plays which are closely related without similar nomenclature. An equal number of relevant plays are lost and these are mentioned, usually in the notes, in respect to the lost or extant plays with which they may form an association. Many characters, especially those of historical origin, are present in more than one play and many titles, especially of comedies, echo or parallel others but unless a narrative situation is continuous they have not been examined in the detail given to extant plays in two or more parts.³ In addition to the extant two-part plays and dramatic sequels, a number of detached first parts known to have been planned with a continuation or continued with a play which is now lost are discussed. The imitations of Tamburlaine are the most important of these plays.

The sequel play is a native development of Elizabethan drama and the fact that performance is required means that it represents a more complex challenge than the composition and publication of pamphlets, prose fiction, or poetic works in two or more parts. The problems of the dramatist were not encountered by the writers of prose works who could extend their subject to a second part with new episodes or additional material. Commercial publishing was already exploiting this advantage when John Lyly's Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit (1578) Barnabe Riche's Don Simonides (1581), Philip Stubbes' The Anatomy of Abuses (1583), and Robert Greene's Mamillia (1580) and Morando (1584) were followed by successors if not narrative sequels.

The professional dramatist and the professional theatre were closely associated with the audiences who often encouraged sequels to popular plays. The successful features of original plays can be checked by their reappearance in sequels and the methods of dramatic composition can be seen in the attention given to the opening of new plays when an earlier one contains most of the background that a new audience requires. The

repertory system is especially important to the development of sequels which by necessity required a separate afternoon for their performance without the confidence that a new audience would be aware of any previous plays. Anticipations of future action, threats to temporary resolutions, and more direct promises of forthcoming plays represent advertisement as well as requests for encouragement. Literary relationships, such as subtle contacts of a structural nature or verbal allusions, while tempting to the writers of sequels, have an inherent weakness in the uncertainty of their recognition during the sequential action on the stage.

The evidence for public performance of plays by professional companies has been emphasized by M.A. Shaaber in his discussion of Henry IV.⁴ There are no recorded exceptions to the practice of performing two-part plays for separate audiences on different afternoons. Only on special and private occasions, it seems, were two plays presented on one day to the same audience. Such an occasion, on 15 February 1598, is described by Rowland Whyte although it cannot be determined whether the presentation included two linked plays:

Sir Gilley Meiricke made at Essex House yesternight a very great supper. There were at yt, my Ladys Lester, Northumberland, Bedford, Essex, Rich; and my Lordes of Essex, Rutland, Monjoy, and others. They had 2 plaies, which kept them up till 1 a clocke after midnight.⁵

During Elizabeth's reign, court records show that on 23 February 1584/5 an 'antick' play and a comedy were performed but there is no reason to suppose that these are closely associated entertainments. Two days earlier, Three Plays in One was scheduled but not shown.⁶ If this is related to Tarlton's The Seven Deadly Sins, of which the Plot for what is called Part Two survives from c. 1590,⁷ a close theatrical dependence on its putative first half could not have existed as Five Plays in One was presented by the Queen's Men more than six weeks earlier on 6 January.⁸

More endurance on the part of courtly audiences is indicated during the reign of James I. Records for 1 January 1603/4, and 6 January and 17 January 1607/8 show that the King's Men performed two plays on each occasion.⁹ The Queen's Men presented three plays on 10 December 1610 and the King's Men returned to their dual programme on 20 February and 28 February 1611/12.¹⁰ This clearly was an irregular procedure and the unknown titles of the plays may or may not have involved two parts. When a two-part play was presented at court in 1612/13 seven days intervene between 1 The Knaves and 2 The Knaves.¹¹

The theatrical conditions of short runs and single performances during the afternoon are important factors in a study of dramatic sequels. Separate critical treatments and recent editions of some of the plays considered in the present study have tended to neglect the degree of dependence or independence, the problem of exposition and reintroduction of established characters, and the often ingenious and sometimes expedient planning of dramatic families in these plays.

Comparative critical discussion of two-part plays and sequels can be found in three footnotes during examinations of the relationship between the two parts of Shakespeare's Henry IV, an article by G.K. Hunter with the same object, and an outline of the influence of Marlowe's Tamburlaine by Clifford Leech.¹² Sequel plays and dramatic sequences have also been an attractive ground for conjecture. Edmund Spenser and John Lyly have been suggested as the authors of two-part plays,¹³ Shakespeare has been associated with the revision of a Roman trilogy by Marlowe, and nine history plays in three closely linked trilogies have also been attributed to Shakespeare.¹⁵ The fusion of two-part plays, later printed as single plays, and the abridgment of printed two-part plays for the advantage of single performance are, however, significant aspects of this subject. The more likely occasions of this unusual flexibility in theatrical practice suggest that some of the inherent limitations of the two-part play did not go unrecognized.

Before Tamburlaine, with which a study of dramatic sequels properly begins, there are a number of plays which are divided into two or more parts, usually for special arrangements of production. The medieval Miracle cycles include extensive cross-reference as the component representations form larger wholes. There is evidence that participants were rising at dawn late into the sixteenth century and that comprehensiveness required from one day to one week depending on local ambitions and conditions. As the composition, though perhaps not the performance, of the outdoor religious drama declined, the development of printing allowed the newer indoor morality plays to achieve a more permanent form. Those which were printed with indications of bitartite construction may be briefly noticed along with some manuscript and lost plays whose performance was divided by long intervals.

In addition to its thematic innovations, Henry Medwall's Fulgens and Lucrece is the earliest printed play 'devyded into two ptyes to be played at ii. tymes', as its title-page instructs. Printed c. 1512-16 and performed perhaps in 1497 for a distinguished audience,¹⁶ both parts were written for the entertainment of guests at a banquet, as references in the text make clear. Discussion of the play at the end of each part anticipates similar interests a century later in Munday's two-part The Downfall and The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington where John Skelton's confusion during the exposition of the second play resembles that of A after the interval. Medwall's Nature (printed 1530-34), although about five hundred lines longer (nearly 2860 lines), was probably staged in the same area of John Morton's banquet hall and may be earlier than Fulgens and Lucrece. Its length and a reference to a three-day interval in the first speech of Part Two¹⁷ suggest separate days for performance. A duplicate structure shows Man in each part lured by Sensuality and redeemed by Repentance. Nature looks forward with its tavern and brothel interests and the relapse of Man in the second part to features of 2 Henry IV and 2 The Honest Whore.

John Rastell's The Nature of the Four Elements survives in a fragment printed c. 1526-30 and was probably written about ten years earlier. A.W. Reed has suggested that it may have been in two parts with a structural debt to Nature in addition to its evident thematic similarity.¹⁸ Gentleness and Nobility, in two parts and written and published at about the same time as The Four Elements reached print, has been claimed for Rastell although John Heywood's authorship has also been suggested. As descendants of Medwall's two plays, both later plays were also meant for private performance and a sophisticated audience receptive to learning and debate.

Several 'Anti-Catholic Interludes' in two parts by John Bale are lost¹⁹ but his King Johan with similar intentions survives in a manuscript which is unlikely to have been consulted or known by dramatists in the late sixteenth century.²⁰ It comes the closest of the two-part moralities of this period to inclusion in David Bevington's study of the growth of structure in popular plays but the manuscript contains revisions making difficult an analysis of production requirements.²¹ A performance with Bale's final revisions was intended for an audience including Queen Elizabeth in the early years of her reign, about twenty-five years after its original composition. The division of King Johan into two 'Acts' seems to be intended for a structural symmetry and it is only the subscription on the last page which calls attention to those Acts as two plays.²²

The first recorded performance of Sir David Lindsay's Satire of the Three Estates was before his monarch, James V, at Linlithgow on 6 January 1540. Its final length of 4630 lines is about two thousand more than Bale's play. Two-part division was required when later productions on 7 June 1552 and 12 August 1554 took eight or nine hours to complete.²³ Although the play was not printed until 1602 in Edinburgh, the preface by Henry Charteris to Lindsay's Works in 1568 records a well attended performance 'fra .ix. houris afoir none, till .vi. houris at evin'.²⁴

A third royal occasion was celebrated by a performance of Richard Edwards's lost Palamon and Arcite at Oxford.²⁵ Part One was played on 2 September 1566 but Part Two, scheduled for the following evening, was put off until 4 September. The delay was caused by an unusually lengthy disputation which only served to increase the suspense with which the first half ended.²⁶ Contemporary witnesses, in addition to leaving valuable accounts of the play, describe an accident which preceded Part One:

At the beginning of the play there were, by a mischance, three slain; the one a scholar of St. Mary's Hall named Walker, the other a cooke named John Gilbert, and the third a brewer named Mr. Pennie (and more hurt), by the press of the multitude, who thrust down a piece of the side wall of a stair upon them.²⁷

Edwards's play may lie behind one with the same title presented by the Admiral's and Chamberlain's Men in 1594. On the days preceding and following the second of its four recorded performances, Henslowe's Diary lists Tamburlaine,²⁸ of which an early performance of its second part in 1587 was also fatal to spectators.

At Marlowe's University a Senecan Latin play, Richardus Tertius by Thomas Legge, was so divided to allow three successive nights for its performance. Each Actio was in five acts. The English directions at the end of the first Actio call for a procession which includes 'Shore's Wife in her petticote, haveinge a taper burninge in her hand'.²⁹ The next time she and Richard of Gloucester appear on stage in the same play is in The True Tragedy of Richard III. He is in the final three plays of Shakespeare's first tetralogy and she later is given her own two-part play, Edward IV. Some resemblances between Legge's play, which Marlowe is likely to have known, and Tamburlaine have been pointed out by William A. Armstrong.³⁰ There also seems to be a general resemblance between the coronation spectacle concluding the second Actio and an elaborate procession finale indicated in the Plot of 1 Tamar Cham.

The last two-part play to be printed before Tamburlaine is George Whetstone's Promos and Cassandra (1578). Its division into ten acts and fifty-six scenes gives the impression that it is much longer than about 2600 lines. Whetstone writes in his dedication that

for the rarenesse, (and the needefull knowledge) of the necessary matter contained therein (to make the actions appeare more lively,) I devided the whole history into two Commedies: for that, Decorum used, it would not be convayde in one.³¹

The best explanation for the division is probably that offered by Thomas C. Izard who notes that the tragic ethos of the first half offers a 'temporary triumph of evil over good'.³² Whetstone has completed a short play at a point analogous to the entry of the Chorus in Shakespeare's The Winter's Tale.³³ Part Two, as the title-page emphasizes, shows 'the Ruyne and overthrowe, of dishonest practises: with the advancement of upright dealing'. Promos and Cassandra was not acted before 1582 when Whetstone admits this fact in a marginal note to his prose version of the story in An Heptameron of Civil Discourses and no record of performance after that date is known. It was published by Richard Jones who promised in a short epistle to the reader 'to procure such bookes, as may profit thee with delight'.³⁴ Marlowe's Tamburlaine was published by him twelve years later.

Notes to Chapter I

1. Gerald Eades Bentley, The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time 1590-1642 (Princeton, 1971), p. 3.
2. Two titles probably do not represent parts of plays. They are 'The ffirste parte of the famous historie of Chinan of England', entered 20 January 1596 (Arber III, 57) and 'Doctor Ffaustus the 2 parte', transferred 16 October 1609 (Arber III, 421).
3. Shakespeare's Roman plays, The Merry Wives of Windsor and Henry IV, A Midsummer Night's Dream and The Two Noble Kinsmen, and Wilkins's The Miseries of Enforced Marriage and The Yorkshire Tragedy of unknown authorship are sets of plays that were not conceived with relationships of a sequential dramatic nature.
4. M.A. Shaaber, 'The Unity of Henry IV', in Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies, edited by J.G. McManaway, G.E. Dawson, and E.E. Willoughby (Washington, 1948), pp. 223-6.
5. Chambers, E.S. I, 220 n.
6. Chambers, E.S. IV, 101.
7. The Plot is fully dealt with in Greg, Documents II, 105-22. He dates it c. 1590, adduces the evidence for authorship, and accepts the identification of the title with the productions intended for the court in 1585. He is less certain about identifying the play with an entry in Henslowe's Diary (E.D., p. 16) for Four Plays in One, listed between the first two performances of Henslowe's popular Henry VI. The titles of the composite plays, unlike that of the Plot, do not reflect incompleteness. Part Two includes three distinct plays illustrating historical manifestations of Envy, Sloth, and Lechery. An Induction with Henry VI and Lydgate, the presenter, as well as a brief and mute appearance of the four inactive Sins link it to an earlier half where they must all have been present. It is doubtful whether the framework had much interest beyond introducing the self-contained Sin episodes in a casual sequence. The preservation of the Plot for Part Two alone may also suggest its independence.
8. Chambers, E.S., IV, 101.
9. Chambers, E.S., IV, 118, 122.
10. Chambers, E.S., IV, 124, 126.
11. Chambers, E.S., IV, 127.
12. Shaaber, pp. 224-5 n; Hunter (1954), p. 237 n; The Second Part of Henry IV, edited by A.R. Humphreys, The Arden Shakespeare (1966 reprinted 1970), pp. xxii-xxiii n. Hunter (1954) examines the structure of Tamburlaine and two two-part plays written for the private theatre. Clifford Leech, 'The Two-Part Play: Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare', Shakespeare Jahrbuch, 94 (1958), 90-106.

One inaccuracy in Hunter's note may be mentioned here. Jane Shore's first appearance is in the second act, (not the fourth) of 1 Edward IV.

13. William J. Lawrence, Pre-Restoration Stage Studies (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), p. 178 quotes Gabriel Harvey's letter to Spenser of April 1580 in expectation of 'your Nine Comedies' and adds 'it is not at all improbable that Edmund Spenser wrote the first English composite play... arranged in two parts, with five plays in the one and four in the other'. It is the only recorded association of the author of The Faerie Queene with the stage. Allan Gilbert, 'Were Spenser's Nine Comedies Lost?', MLN, 73 (1958), 241-3 suggests that these works were only planned. Michael R. Best, 'A Theory of the Literary Genesis of Lyly's Midas', RES, n.s. 17 (1966), 133-140 argues that the extant text was revised from an 'urMidas I and urMidas II' (p. 134). Anne Begor Lancashire, in her edition of the play, RRDS (1970), discusses it as a more unified and consistent work than Best would allow.
14. Chambers, W.S. I, 398-9 provides a summary of 'these conflicting theories [which] may perhaps be left to cancel each other out' (I, 399).
15. Six Early Plays Related to the Shakespeare Canon, edited by E.B. Everitt and R.L. Armstrong, Anglistica XIV (Copenhagen, 1965), p. 252 gives Shakespeare 1,2, and 3 Richard II; 1,2, and 3 Henry V; and 1,2, and 3 Henry VI.
16. Henry Medwall, Fulgens and Lucres, edited by F.S. Boas and A.W. Reed (Oxford, 1926), pp. xix-xx.
17. In 'Lost' Tudor Plays, edited by John S. Farmer, Early English Dramatists (1907), p. 90.
18. A.W. Reed, Early Tudor Drama (1926), p. 105.
19. Annals, p. 24 lists them for 1537. Thora Balslev Blatt, The Plays of John Bale (Copenhagen, 1968), pp. 32-3 records the evidence that Bale's God's Promises, John Baptist's Preaching, and The Temptation of Our Lord (all 1538) were performed on the same day at Kilkenny. She remarks that these plays are usually regarded as a trilogy.
20. Blatt, p. 163.
21. David M. Bevington, From 'Mankind' to Marlowe (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), pp. 52, 132.
22. See Blatt, especially pp. 99-105, 114-16. She has a useful discussion (pp. 103-4 n) of Bale's inconsistent use of 'liber', 'act', and 'play'.
23. Anna J. Mill, 'Representations of Lyndsay's Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis', PMLA, 47 (1932), 636-51.
24. Sir David Lindsay, The Works (Edinburgh, 1568), sig. 4- 2v.
25. Jackson I. Cope, '"The Best for Comedy": Richard Edwards' Canon', Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 2 (1961), p. 518 assigns another two-part play to Edwards; this being Common Conditions of which the extant text, printed c. 1576, appears to him as part of a larger work.

26. Contemporary accounts with details of the elaborate performance are reprinted by Charles Plummer in Elizabethan Oxford, Oxford Historical Society (Oxford, 1887). W.Y. Durand, 'Palaemon and Arcyte, Progne, Marcus Geninus', and the theatre in which they were acted, as described by John Bereblock (1566)', PMLA, 20 (1905), 502-28 includes translations and some discussion of Bereblock's Latin account.
27. Plummer (ed.), p. 200.
28. H.D., pp. 24-5.
29. Richardus Tertius in Shakespeare's Library, edited by J.P. Collier, second edition, edited by William Carew Hazlitt, 6 vols (1875), V, 167. A manuscript of the play, which was not printed, bears the date 1579.
30. William A. Armstrong, Marlowe's Tamburlaine: The Image and the Stage, University of Hull Inaugural Lecture (Hull, 1966), pp. 5-6.
31. Bullough III, 443.
32. Thomas C. Izard, George Whetstone: Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters (N.Y., 1942), p. 77.
33. Emrys Jones, Scenic Form in Shakespeare (Oxford, 1971), pp. 66-88 has found the term 'two-part structure' useful in discussing single plays.
34. Bullough III, 444.

CHAPTER II

Tamburlaine the Great

i. Date, Authorship, Publication, and Stage History

The influence of 'Marlowe's mighty line' on later dramatic expression begins, as historians of the Elizabethan drama have long recognized, with Tamburlaine the Great. The Prologue to Part One is commonly taken as a manifesto which announces to the audience of the public theatre what they will and will not hear. It also introduces a young dramatist who could not have anticipated how Tamburlaine's immediate popularity, acknowledged in his second Prologue, would affect his own career. He responded to the reception of his first play for the public theatre with a sequel which continued the fortunes of his conquering protagonist without the inspiration of additional source material or the example of precedent. Tamburlaine is probably the earliest acted Elizabethan play in two full-length parts, and this was to have its own influence on the aspirations of contemporary dramatists including his exact contemporary, Shakespeare. Before considering how Marlowe developed his sequel it will be useful to review the date, authorship, printing, and early stage history of Tamburlaine.

Not much time could have elapsed between the success of Part One and the writing and production of the sequel. The dating of the Tamburlaine plays is based on two contemporary allusions which can be identified with specific incidents in Part Two. In the epistle 'To the gentlemen readers' preceding his Perimedes the Blacksmith, Robert Greene sneers at 'daring God out of heaven with that Atheist Tamburlan'.¹ Greene's romance was probably published early in 1588 after it was entered in the Stationers' Register on 29 March of that year.²

In the second piece of evidence no reference is made to the title of the play discussed by Philip Gawdy in a letter to his father dated 16 November 1587:

Yow shall understande of some accydentall newes heare in this towne though my self no wyttnesse thereof, yet I may be bold to veryfye it for an assured troth. My L. Admyrall his men and players having a devyse in ther playe to tye one of their fellowes to a poste and so to shoote him to deathe, having borrowed their callyvers one of the players handes swerved his peece being charged with bullett missed the fellowe he aymed at and killed a chyld, and a woman great with chyld forthwith, and hurt an other man in the head very soore.³

The title-page of the first edition of Tamburlaine in 1590 indicates that the play was performed 'By the right honorable the Lord Admyrall, his servantes'. Although Gawdy himself was not present at this memorable performance he recreates the incident with a vividness of detail from perhaps more than one reliable source.

Greene is probably calling attention to Tamburlaine's furious challenge to Mahomet as 'heaps of superstitious books',⁴ including the Koran, are destroyed in a fire on stage:

Now, Mahomet, if thou have any power,
Come down thyself and work a miracle.
Thou art not worthy to be worshipped
That suffers flames of fire to burn the writ
Wherein the sum of thy religion rests.

(Part Two, V.i. 186-90)

This scene is notable not only for Tamburlaine's 'daring' but also for Marlowe's daring staging of the fire to which his hero makes frequent references. Philip Gawdy's letter seems to refer to an incident in 2 Tamburlaine which immediately precedes Tamburlaine's burning of the Koran and probably prevented that fire from being lit. When the Governor of Babylon is taken prisoner Tamburlaine orders some attendants to

Hang him in chains upon the city walls,
And let my soldiers shoot the slave to death.

(V.i. 108-9)

A post evidently served as the wall where the Governor becomes the target for Theridamas. There was in the performance which Gawdy describes a grim irony in the failure of the first shot to prove fatal. Despite the Governor's final plea, Tamburlaine orders a volley of shots which the stage direction 'They shoot' (V.i. 156 f) confirms. Gawdy's source seems to have retained a vivid memory of the accident which may have occurred during the early productions of Marlowe's sequel when the players were not adequately rehearsed in this dramatic 'devyse'.

If both parts of Tamburlaine belong to 1587 Marlowe could not have been a practising professional dramatist for long as he probably left Cambridge in that year. The first part of Tamburlaine may even have been partially or wholly written before Marlowe arrived in London, as 'it was certainly the work of someone who had access to a well-stocked library'.⁵

The authorship of Tamburlaine has not been disputed although none of the numerous early references which attest to the popularity and impact of the play provides a conclusive attribution. The early octavo editions do not mention the author. The earliest clear reference to Marlowe's authorship occurs in 1631 and was first pointed out by Hallett Smith.⁶ Critics have long been content to assign sole authorship to Marlowe on the basis of style and thought, a possible pun in Greene's epistle mentioned above, Heywood's 'Prologue to the Stage at the Cock-Pit' printed with The Jew of Malta in 1633, and later statements by Anthony Wood and Gerard Langbaine.⁷

Both parts of Tamburlaine were published together in octavo editions in 1590, 1593, and 1597. In 1605, the first part alone was published in octavo. In the following year, Part Two, with its first separate title-page and independent collation was also issued in a black letter octavo. No evidence exists for supposing a publication date prior to 1590. The title-page of that edition reads: 'Now first, and newlie published'.

F.S. Boas and F.P. Wilson have suggested that Marlowe may have revised Part Two in anticipation of publication.⁸ The sequel may have acquired scientific and literary updating from Paul Ive's Practise of Fortification published in 1589 and Spenser's Faerie Queene which reached print the following year. Direct borrowings from these two works are found in 2 Tamburlaine.⁹ It is generally assumed, however, that Marlowe had access to these works well before their publication and at least in the case of The Faerie Queene, this seems the most likely explanation.

In the 1590 octavo and later editions, each part of Tamburlaine is divided into five acts. Part One includes eighteen recognizable scenes of which fifteen are specifically marked while Part Two has twenty-one scenes, nineteen of which are clearly indicated in the original edition.¹⁰ Latin is used for these headings and for flourishes at the end of most of the acts. Marlowe's authority is believed to lie behind the formal appearance of the text which 'bears no signs of the playhouse'.¹¹

Tamburlaine was published by Richard Jones who although calling himself the printer probably did not own a press.¹² The publication of both plays in one volume with continuous collation is patterned on the publication of George Whetstone's Promos and Cassandra, for which Richard Jones was responsible twelve years earlier. An echo of Jones's experience may linger in the Stationers' Register where an entry for 14 August 1590 reads: 'The twoe commicall discourses of Tomberlein the Cithian shepparde'.¹³ The entry for Whetstone's two-part play on 31 July 1578 reads: 'the famous historie of Promos and Cassandra Devided into twoe Comicall Discourses',¹⁴ a description which is retained on the title-page. For the publication of Tamburlaine, however, Jones adjusted the description to announce the play as 'divided into two tragicall discourses'. It may have been his closer inspection of the text that prompted him to offer his famous epistle 'To the Gentlemen Readers and Others that take Pleasure in Reading Histories'.

This prefatory letter, signed 'R. J. Printer' continued to appear in subsequent editions of Tamburlaine, including the 1605 octavo of Part One, although by that time the play was printed by Edward Allde for Edward White.¹⁵

Richard Jones's epistle is significant for its remarks on Marlowe's plays as they appeared on the stage and presumably, though not certainly, as he received them.¹⁶ The most often quoted portion concerns the omission of

some fond and frivolous gestures, digressing (and in my poor opinion) far unmeet for the matter, which I thought might seem 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 times they were showed upon the stage in their graced deformities.

(ll. 9-15)

There is no other source of information about these omissions and Roma Gill, in a recent edition of Marlowe's plays, writes that 'it is impossible even to guess what these "gestures" may have been'.¹⁷

It need not be assumed that Jones is referring to comic scenes. The Prologue to Part One explicitly denies 'such conceits as clownage keeps in pay' (l. 2). He may have in mind the impediment which stage directions might have to the reader or inexplicable dumb shows which the groundlings 'gaped at' and which

now to be mixtured in print with such matter of worth, it would prove a great disgrace to so honourable and stately a history.

(ll. 15-18)

Presenting the plays as 'discourses' and praising 'the eloquence of the author that writ them' (ll. 19-20) he may have in the course of preparing the text for readers found indications for staging 'tedious unto the wise' and likely to make the judicious grieve. Areas of editorial intervention may be the numerous exits to and entrances from battles, which are always held off stage. Four of the five instances where scene numbering is disturbed occur in these battle situations.¹⁸

In addition to the question of abridgement, Jones's letter is significant for other reasons. He confirms the advertising matter of the title-page which states that the 'two Tragical Discourses ... were sundrie times shewed upon Stages in the citie of London'. His letter retains the term 'tragical discourses' (ll. 2-3) to describe the plays and also emphasizes the popularity and extent of their public performance:

they have been (lately) delightful for many of you to see when the same were showed in London upon stages.

(ll. 6-8)

Tucker Brooke notes that the title-page bears 'the typical description of miscellaneous inn-yard performance'.¹⁹

Richard Jones must be given credit for promoting the two-part play as a distinct and dignified form of printed drama, as he is responsible for printing both of these early two-part dramatic works. For Whetstone's unacted comedy, Jones also wrote an epistle in which he shows a concern similar to that expressed in his remarks for Tamburlaine. He claims a literary responsibility for guiding the text of Promos and Cassandra through the press despite the difficulties presented to him by the absence of the author. He urges the reader, if a speech seems difficult, to

consider of it with judgement, before thou condemne the worke: for in many places he is driven, both to praise, and blame, with one breath, which in readinge wil seeme hard, and in action, appeare plaine.²⁰

These remarks and those with which he introduces The Princely Pleasures at the Court of Kennilworth (1576) indicate an unusual degree of editorial intervention which Jones continued to exercise for Tamburlaine. For The Princely Pleasures he obtained 'one Moral and gallant Devyce, which never came to execution';²¹ for Promos and Cassandra, in opposition to Tamburlaine, he counsels the reader on the advantage of performance and the different experience presented by the printed text. Tamburlaine is the first play to advertise the

professional company with which it was associated and Marlowe is the first English author to have more than a single publicly acted play collected within one volume.

Although the 1590 title-page speaks of Tamburlaine as 'divided', it is certain from the Prologue to Part Two and other indications that Tamburlaine's dramatic life was increased by five acts as the result of the popularity of the original five-act play. As F.P. Wilson has emphasized, 'even if Marlowe did conceive Tamburlaine as a ten-act play, Part I would still be the unit of dramatic performance'.²² The earliest audiences of Marlowe's sequel had probably taken the opportunity to see Part One and it may safely be presumed that Gaudy's informant and the victims of the accident he describes were among those whose reception of the original play had encouraged the sequel. The sequence of productions of the two plays in 1587 may bear a resemblance to the stage history recorded for them in Henslowe's Diary several years later.

Henslowe's Diary records fifteen performances of 1 Tamburlaine at the Rose Theatre during the fifteen months between 28 August 1594 and 12 November 1595.²³ The second part was performed seven times during the eleven months between 19 December 1594 and 13 November 1595.²⁴ Almost four months, and seven performances of Part One occur before the revival of Part Two. Henslowe's income for these performances is consistently high (71, 45, 31, 28, 40 and 39 shillings) until 27 November 1594 when the revenue dropped to 22 shillings. Part Two was then introduced into the repertory. The next entry for 1 Tamburlaine shows a receipt of 31 shillings on 17 December. Two days later, Henslowe records the first performance of Part Two which brought 46 shillings. The six remaining performances of 2 Tamburlaine always occur within two days of a performance of Part One and consecutive performances of both parts are listed five times. With only one exception, higher receipts are recorded for Part Two during these five two-day presentations. When both parts were performed in sequence, income averaged about 26 shillings for Part One against 34 shillings for Part Two.

The availability of Part Two may have stimulated renewed interest in Part One. More potential spectators were prepared for the sequel by showing the first part alone in advance. There is no way of knowing if this was an intentional procedure but the four month preparation may parallel the original productions of the plays seven years before. Four months would be a likely period in which Marlowe gauged the popularity of his drama and composed a sequel while his original success was causing a stir in London. The continued popularity of both plays is confirmed by the numerous contemporary allusions and literary echoes. An inventory of the properties of the Lord Admiral's Men, taken eleven years after the composition of Tamburlaine, shows for 10 March 1598 'j cage', 'Tamberlyne brydell', 'Tamberlynes cotte with coper lace', and 'Tamberlanes breches of crymson vellvet'.²⁵ A substantial investment was probably made in one of the company's most successful plays.

Very little support exists for the view that Marlowe initially planned a ten-act structure for Tamburlaine. No one has seriously questioned the Prologue which precedes Part Two:

The general welcomes Tamburlaine receiv'd,
 When he arrived last upon our stage,
 Hath made our poet pen his second part,
 Where death cuts off the progress of his pomp,
 And murderous Fates throws all his triumphs down.

(ll. 1-5)

Such a statement 'implies a definite commission to produce this sequel for a single company and theatre'.²⁶ Although no critic has challenged the words of the Prologue some have sought evidence to outweigh them. The most ambitious attempt to see a pre-designed epic of ten acts occurs in Roy Battenhouse's detailed study of the play where he concludes that 'certainly these ten acts of Tamburlaine offer one of the most grandly moral spectacles in the whole realm of English drama'.²⁷ It is of course impossible to discover Marlowe's own thoughts when he projected a drama on Tamburlaine.

In addition to the Prologue, critics have usually noted that Marlowe exhausted his historical source material in writing the first part. There is no Epilogue like those in Alphonsus King of Aragon (1587-8) or 1 Selimus (1586-93)

which promise a second part nor are there any direct anticipations of the events which Marlowe was to invent or borrow from unlikely sources to complete the sequel. Only D. J. Palmer, among modern critics, has expressed doubt concerning Marlowe's use of historical sources. In arguing for a close relationship between the plays, he notes:

Whether or not Marlowe originally conceived the two parts together (and the fact that he almost exhausts his historical sources in Part I does not prove anything), the sequel becomes in effect a moral commentary on the apparently unconfined optimism of the first part.²⁸

The unifying features of two plays on the same subject written within a few months of each other do not require the justification of a pre-planned design. The relationships between both parts of Tamburlaine, whether ethical, structural, or otherwise, are often quite close. An analysis of the elements of the two plays will enable an appreciation of Marlowe's development as a professional dramatist whose example had an immediate influence upon the two-part play.

ii. The Structure of Tamburlaine the Great

Marlowe's two-part play was an innovative publishing and theatrical event. Both in print and in performance the sequel was considered inseparable from the original play. But the structure of Part Two could not have been conceived with a view toward balancing the historical episodes of Part One or satisfying the expectations of an audience advised of the later events in Tamburlaine's life. Part One does not provide such anticipation or foreboding. To complete the sequel Marlowe borrowed incidents and ideas from disparate historical and literary sources and transferred them to the

life of his protagonist. He seems to have chosen and organized the material for Part Two with close attention to his proven method of composing Part One. Part One is therefore its most important source.

In one of the few articles directly concerned with two-part plays, G.K. Hunter has demonstrated a recurrent aspect of the most important of these linked plays. Between a discussion of two-part plays by Marlowe, Marston, and Chapman, and Shakespeare's Henry IV, he writes:

We are now in a position to see that such unity as we can find in Elizabethan two-part plays depends on a parallel setting-out of the incidents rather than on any picking-up of all the threads of Part One. The plays we have examined all use this method, with a greater or lesser degree of success, and it is the only method I have been able to find.²⁹

He includes a diagram which sets out some major parallels between both parts of Tamburlaine which are illustrated through the five acts marked in the octavo editions. An analysis of the significant parallels in the two plays will show how carefully Marlowe used these act divisions as guidelines for the construction of 2 Tamburlaine.

The first act of Part One moves from a glimpse of the weakness and uncertainty of the Persian monarchy to a contrasting scene in which Tamburlaine and Zenocrate are introduced and Theridamas is persuaded to forsake his incompetent mentors for the triumphant destiny offered by Tamburlaine. The first act of the sequel slightly turns this structure when Tamburlaine's antagonists, the Turkish vassals of Bajazeth, strengthen their numbers through an alliance with Christian powers. In the second scene of Part Two Callapine, the son of Bajazeth, escapes from Tamburlaine's control by means of a corrupt guard. When Tamburlaine's three sons are introduced later in the act, the effeminate Calyphas points to a weakening of his father's influence over men and destiny.

The second acts in each play include important battles. In Part One Tamburlaine confronts Mycetes and later defeats Cosroe, thus acquiring the Persian crown. In Part Two the Christians break oath with their pagan allies and are soon defeated in battle for their treachery. This result somewhat inverts Tamburlaine's victory in the corresponding act of Part One, where, after Cosroe has made Tamburlaine his regent of Persia, Tamburlaine overturns this compromise, achieves a victory over the new king, and gains his first crown. Cosroe is the first person to die on stage in Part One. The last scene of Act Two in the sequel shows Zenocrate's death and Tamburlaine, as a result, 'Raving, impatient, desperate, and mad' (II.iv.112) as he orders the destruction of the town in which she died.

Tamburlaine confronts the Turks in the third acts of both plays. In Part One Bajazeth's siege of Constantinople is interrupted by the news of Tamburlaine's approach. Two scenes later the battle occurs off stage while Zabina and Zenocrate taunt each other and balance the crowns for which the armies fight. Tamburlaine soon enters triumphantly with the captured Bajazeth. In the sequel, Bajazeth is replaced by his son, Callapine, who is crowned in the first scene and in the final scene taunts Tamburlaine and prepares for battle. Between Bajazeth's appearances in Part One, Zenocrate affirms her love for Tamburlaine in spite of the persuasions of Agydas, who soon realizes his mistake and commits suicide. Between Callapine's crowning in III.i and his threats in III.v of the second part, Zenocrate is buried and her sons are instructed in warfare. A brief subplot is introduced when an enemy Captain, his wife, and their son are shown during a preliminary siege led by Theridamas. He claims her for his concubine and prevents her from joining her family in death.

In Act IV of Part One Tamburlaine cruelly exhibits Bajazeth in his cage before he forces the Turkish emperor to become his footstool. Another of Tamburlaine's characteristic military tactics, the use of colour symbolism during his campaigns, is employed when he lays siege to Damascus despite

Zenocrate's plea for the preservation of the city in which she was born. Her father, the Soldan of Egypt, and her fiancé, the King of Arabia, prepare for the imminent attack. In the corresponding act of Part Two, Tamburlaine creates another spectacle of pride when he harnesses the 'pampered jades of Asia' (IV.iii. 1) to his chariot. Earlier in the same act he had stabbed his cowardly son. The subplot concerning Theridamas and Olympia is completed when, against her pleading, Theridamas refuses to grant her wish for death and is tricked into becoming the agent of that wish.

The final acts each begin with the siege of a major enemy stronghold. In Part One the Governor of Damascus sends a chorus of Virgins to plead for mercy. Their 'slaughtered carcasses' are soon reported hanging from the walls before Tamburlaine orders 'the rest to the sword' (V.ii. 71). In Part Two the Governor of Babylon refuses the advice of anonymous citizens to surrender. He is taken prisoner and shot on the walls of his city before Tamburlaine orders all of the inhabitants drowned. Also in Part One, Bajazeth, reduced to a bitter Caliban, curses his captor and then chooses his own death by braining himself on his cage. In Part Two, Callapine is shown preparing to revenge his father's death. He outlives his enemy, however, as Tamburlaine dies of natural causes and preparations are begun for his funeral. The first part had ended with the announcement of his marriage to Zenocrate and a temporary 'truce with all the world' (V.ii. 467). The sequel ironically and irrevocably confirms that truce.

The influence of the structure of Part One upon that of Part Two is readily apparent. Marlowe's use of parallel structure, however, goes deeper than the preceding outline has suggested. Several critics have explored the ways in which Marlowe treated the material which he chose to include in the sequel. Clifford Leech, for instance, has enumerated the most evident of these parallelisms: 1. the first scenes in each play introduce characters and conflicts which do not directly involve Tamburlaine; 2. the use of silence by Tamburlaine

which results in the suicide of Agydas in Part One is related to the killing of Calyphas who has no opportunity to speak before he is stabbed by his father; 3. the spectacle of Bajazeth's cage in Part One is cruelly echoed in Tamburlaine's use of the harnessed kings to illustrate his superiority over his vanquished enemies; 4. the Virgins of Damascus are almost reincarnated in the Turkish concubines of the sequel; 5. the final acts of both plays include the sieges of particularly strong cities; 6. as Bajazeth is replaced by his son, so Tamburlaine's sons are introduced and treated apart from their father (Bajazeth is reported to have three sons in Part One of which only one is heard of); and 7. the suicides of Zabina and the death of Olympia in their widowed captivity seem also to be a consciously planned parallel.³⁰

Marlowe has not, however, tried to disguise a lack of imagination or interest by using incidents similar to those of the successful original play. While these parallelisms do account for a great many incidents in Part Two, their use in the sequel is directed toward more significant purposes than filling out five acts. The resemblances emphasize Tamburlaine's weakening influence and his inability to prevent or adequately respond to crises with which he has not previously been challenged. His responses to these crises indicate his limitations. The Prologue had outlined the principal concerns of Part Two:

Where death cuts off the progress of his pomp,
And murderous Fates throws all his triumphs down.

(11. 4-5)

Marlowe, as G.K. Hunter notes, uses 'the parallel placing of incidents ... to unify a structure which reverses its direction in the second part'.³¹

In addition to the article by G.K. Hunter, the only other general study of Elizabethan two-part plays has been by Clifford Leech. Hunter is mainly concerned with the structural similarities in several two-part plays, whereas Leech observes that 'a dramatist returning to a group of characters already handled, taking up their story after a marked pause or an original terminal point, is frequently

led to consider his subject more shrewdly'.³²

It is in the changing attitudes toward Tamburlaine that the structural parallels in Part Two gain fuller significance. Marlowe uses the similarities in plot to point up the weakening control which Tamburlaine now enjoys over his earthly antagonists and the Fates which he once 'bound fast in iron chains' (Part One, I.ii. 173). No longer is the world at his command. Although his military successes conform to his self-image, a falling off is consistently though often subtly suggested throughout the sequel. The domestic crises, especially Zenocrate's death and Calyphas's cowardice, are particularly important reminders that Tamburlaine's life may not be protectively destined as he would believe. This is not to suggest that the sequel enforces the 'moral spectacle' for which Roy Battenhouse argues. That effort to 'reduce the mighty Tamburlaine to the abject level of a cautionary fable', notes Harry Levin, emphasizes 'the dogmatic background at the expense of the dramatic foreground, though the latter expressly flouts the former'.³³

Marlowe's conscious use of parallels in the sequel to events of Part One gradually questions the assumption behind 'the sweet fruition of an earthly crown'. (II.vii. 29) An extreme view of the changes in 2 Tamburlaine, supported by Una Ellis-Fermor, sees the play as 'marked by a savageness, an ever-increasing extravagance, a lack at once of inspiration and of balance'.³⁴ This view, however, does not take into account those features which a continuing play must preserve from the original. The second part does not leap inconsistently from a heroic spectacle to a chronicle of inevitable fall. The plays are not demonstrations of a simple rise and fall illustrated by the life of Tamburlaine. His military victories remain sure and 'there can be little doubt that Marlowe [still] wants us to marvel at Tamburlaine'.³⁵

There are no suggestions in the sequel that Tamburlaine has lost the qualities which brought him unmitigated martial and amatory success. A gap of about sixteen years must be imagined between the end of Part One with its preparations for

marriage and the introduction in the second part of Tamburlaine's three grown sons. His power and success during this period have remained strong. In the sequel greater attention is given to the forces which oppose him; it is rather the life of Tamburlaine the man than Tamburlaine the conqueror.

It must be emphasized that, in the words of the Prologue to Part Two, 'death cuts off the progress of his pomp'; death does not result from the progress of his pomp. The precarious nature of Tamburlaine's position is developed by Marlowe with indirect criticisms. In Part Two he turns from the monolithic impulses of Part One to create a tragedy without teaching a lesson that hubris is punished by divine punishment. Marlowe is a more experienced playwright in Part Two. J. Le Gay Brereton has remarked that 'for the interest of climax is substituted the interest of suspense'.³⁶ The audience of Part Two is asked to question rather than accept. A more detailed examination of the structure of 2 Tamburlaine than is attempted by either Hunter or Leech will show how Marlowe's principal concerns are emphasized by the numerous parallels to Part One.

The first scene of the sequel presents the preparations for a defensive alliance among Tamburlaine's antagonists. Their spokesman is the dignified Orcanes and not, as in Part One, an incompetent and foolish leader like Mycetes. Marlowe's heightening of the stature of Tamburlaine's enemies shows that, although militarily successful, Tamburlaine has not been able to crush all resistance during the long period of time separating the two plays. Orcanes and his followers realize, as the Persians of Part One did not, that success is possible only from stability and strategy. The sequel does not, however, lead directly into a revaluation of Tamburlaine's strength. Despite the assembly of wise and courageous forces, Orcanes reports that 'All Asia is in arms with Tamburlaine' (I.i. 72) and a few lines later that 'All Afric is in arms with Tamburlaine' (I.i. 76). The speakers in the second scene are likewise confident; their purposes are sanctioned

in religious vows which seal the truce between the followers of Orcanes and the Christian forces represented by Sigismund of Hungary.

Before Tamburlaine is introduced in scene iv, some doubts concerning his primacy of will and the loyalty of his followers are introduced in the short scene in which Callapine persuades Almeda, his gaoler, to release him. In Part One, Tamburlaine has no difficulty in persuading Theridamas to become his general. There, the change of loyalty was swiftly managed by Tamburlaine's promises. Theridamas can only admit to Tamburlaine that he is 'Won with thy words, and conquered with thy looks' (Part One, I.ii. 227). The position is reversed in Part Two. Wishing 'were I now but half so elequent/ To paint in words what I'll perform in deeds' (I.iii. 9-10), Callapine accomplishes in 34 lines the effect which Tamburlaine required 44 lines to do in persuading Theridamas to change loyalties. Almeda is seduced by Callapine's visions of magnificance in much the same way as Tamburlaine excited his future general. After Almeda frees Bajazeth's son, the scene ends with Callapine's vow 'to revenge my father's death' (I.iii. 78).

In the first two scenes of the sequel Marlowe seems to offer anticipations of defeat for Tamburlaine. The direction seems clear, but it is only later in the play that the audience learns of the broken oath between Tamburlaine's antagonists and the fact that Callapine never seriously threatens Tamburlaine, although he remains free throughout the play. Almeda's betrayal is the first suggestion that Tamburlaine's followers may be disillusioned with his leadership. Before Tamburlaine appears the audience is prepared for uncertainties; the stability achieved at the end of Part One is now in doubt.

Tamburlaine's first words emphasize the warlike confidence of his role in Part One, but they are unexpectedly answered by the only person who could question them. Zenocrate replies:

Sweet Tamburlaine, when wilt thou leave these arms,
And save thy sacred person free from scathe,
And dangerous chances of the wrathful war?

(I.iv. 9-11)

Tamburlaine consoles her by describing the potential destiny of his three sons. He seems not to know them well, as if his exploits have kept him a distant and unconcerned father. With words which Shakespeare may have recalled for Richard III's opening soliloquy, Tamburlaine assigns to them effeminate characteristics for what should be the first signs of heroic destiny:

Their fingers made to quaver on a lute,
Their arms to hang about a lady's neck,
Their legs to dance and caper in the air,
Would make me think them bastards, not my sons.

(I.iv. 29-32)

This directly contrasts the claims of Bajazeth for his three sons in Part One:

Zabina, mother of three braver boys
Than Hercules, that in his infancy
Did pash the jaws of serpents venomous,
Whose hands are made to gripe a warlike lance,
Their shoulders broad for complete armour fit,
Their limbs more large and of a bigger size
Than all the brats y-sprung from Typhon's loins.

(III.iii. 103-109)

The scene soon resembles that between Lear and his three daughters when Tamburlaine's three sons, Celebinus, Amyras, and Calyphas, are arranged to answer formally to their father's expectations. Celebinus and Amyrus fulfill these expectations, but Calyphas, the last to speak, unexpectedly betrays the ideals of his father and brothers:

But while my brothers follow arms, my lord,
Let me accompany my gracious mother.
They are enough to conquer all the world,
And you have won enough for me to keep.

(I.iv. 65-68)

Calyphas here ironically forecasts his own death; he follows his mother to death later in the play. The cowardice of

Calyphas, which contrasts the wily resolution of Callapine, is an additional sign of new challenges which confront Tamburlaine.

The remainder of Act I returns to the atmosphere of undisturbed success which accompanied Tamburlaine throughout the first part. His generals, now kings, remain ritually loyal as they offer their crowns to their commander. Each reports his recent conquests with the wonder of a Herodotus returned from war. Without regard to his son's unworthy behaviour, the escape of Callapine, or the growing strength of his antagonists, Tamburlaine boldly prepares to celebrate his present glory and future victories with a magnificent banquet. The greater part of Tamburlaine's first appearance in the sequel thus preserves the image which Marlowe created for him in Part One. Tamburlaine's self-image remains consistent; it is in the events of which he is unaware and the domestic problems which he does not fully recognize that the dramatist indirectly offers some reservations about his conqueror-hero.

Tamburlaine is left in the background for most of Act II. He does not participate (although he is often referred to) in the first three scenes during which the Christians break their oath, Orcanes discovers their treachery and prays to Christ, and the infidels emerge triumphant from the battle with their former allies. This is the first major battle in which Tamburlaine does not take part. Although Marlowe's hero remains in control of most of the world, his prominence is qualified by these events which his power does not affect. This episode, taken by Marlowe from later history, ends with the order that Sigismund's body be placed 'Amidst these plains for fowls to prey upon' (II.iii. 39). Tamburlaine's Turkish enemies proclaim a victorious celebration.

While Orcanes celebrates his victory, Tamburlaine mourns his dying Queen. His speech is solemn and sincere with the refrain 'to entertain divine Zenocrate' repeated five times as an incantation to heaven. On her death-bed, Zenocrate

recognizes death as a necessity; an idea which Tamburlaine cannot yet comprehend:

I fare, my lord, as other empresses,
That, when this frail and transitory flesh
Hath sucked the measure of that vital air
That feeds the body with his dated health,
Wanes with enforced and necessary change.

(II.iv. 42-46)

Zenocrate accepts limitation and time ('measure', 'dated health'), and her bond with humanity. She likens herself to other empresses in their mortality; a fact which Tamburlaine, as one whose power and striving seem to pursue immortally an ever receding zenith, can not yet know. His response to her speech repeats motifs from his earlier praise; but he does not understand her meaning as it relates to him. Instead, he erupts in anger, personifies the illness which strikes his wife, and treats it like another enemy in another battle:

Proud fury and intolerable fit,
That dares torment the body of my love,
And scourge the scourge of the immortal God?

(II.iv. 78-80)

Tamburlaine orders a military revenge as a punishment for her natural death.

Techelles, draw thy sword,
And wound the earth, that it may cleave in twain,

Raise cavalieros higher than the clouds,
And with the cannon break the frame of heaven;
Batter the shining palace of the sun,
And shiver all the starry firmament.

(II.iv. 96-7, 103-6)

With this misplacement of frustration and grief into aimless violence Marlowe offers an additional criticism of Tamburlaine. He does not realize that his powers cannot prevent death or reclaim life and he must be restrained by his more sensible followers. Unable to grasp the cogent advice of Theridamas, Tamburlaine commands the preservation of Zenocrate's body, forbidding interment until the day of

his own death. Now bordering on madness, he childishly reasons that

This cursed town will I consume with fire,
Because this place bereft me of my love.

(II.iv. 137-38)

Such embarrassing spectacles of rage could not have been included in the first part of Tamburlaine. There, his hero's success 'could be plotted as a single rising line on a graph'.³⁷ Tamburlaine's hysterical and egotistical persistence in preserving the body of Zenocrate is a morbid parallel to the fate of Sigismund's corpse which was refused burial in the previous scene. Marlowe shows something to be lacking in Tamburlaine's attitude toward death, especially when the victim is not a casualty of war.

In contrast to Tamburlaine's raging at the end of the second act, the third act begins with the ceremonial crowning of Callapine. His acceptance speech points to a realignment of power and a weakening of Tamburlaine's control of fortune:

We shall not need to nourish any doubt,
But that proud Fortune, who hath followed long
The martial sword of mighty Tamburlaine,
Will now retain her old inconstancy,
And raise our honours to as high a pitch,
In this our strong and fortunate encounter;
For so hath heaven provided my escape
From all the cruelty my soul sustained.

(III.i. 27-34)

Orcanes, Jerusalem, Trebizon, and Soria then formally catalogue their military strength as Tamburlaine and his generals had done in Act I. Almeda, ready to receive his promised kingdom, provides a parody of the man whom he betrayed. In answer to Callapine's offer to crown his former gaoler, Almeda replies:

That's no matter, sir, for being a king; for
Tamburlaine came up of nothing.

(III.i. 74-75)

The parallel reflects upon Tamburlaine who, it is implied, through methods of treachery on a larger scale acquired

power and crowns.

The following scene occurs while the town in which Zenocrate died burns. In a Lear-like ecstasy, Tamburlaine continues to proclaim his irrational need to punish the town:

Flying dragons, lightning, fearful thunder-claps,
Singe these fair plains, and make them seem as black
As is the island where the Furies mask,
Compassed with Lethe, Styx, and Phlegethon,
Because my dear Zenocrate is dead!..

(III.ii. 10-14)

In addition to these insensible ravings, Tamburlaine vows to keep a picture of Zenocrate always with him in battle; not as a memento mori, but as an inspiration for military success. Marlowe's criticism of his hero continues with the idea that Tamburlaine must now base his inspiration on memories of the past, in the realm of death. While Tamburlaine's life has been restricted to worry over his sons' future and grief over his wife's death, he has not to this point in the play achieved any of the military successes on which his fame chiefly rests. These would be expected in a sequel concerning Tamburlaine the Great. Instead, 'the inevitable sense of anticlimax becomes not an unpreventable accident but a controlled artistic device'.³⁸

In the remainder of the same scene, Tamburlaine instructs his sons in the technical aspects of warfare (based on Paul Ive's Practise of Fortification), cuts his own arm in a demonstration of fearlessness, and endures the continued whining of Calyphas. The effect of these incidents is to show a lessening of Tamburlaine's abstract qualities of leadership by his reliance on technical detail, his first wound (although self-inflicted), and his continued frustration in creating a son in his own image.

In the first battle in which Tamburlaine's forces participate, he is not present. Fearless and admirable resistance to his name comes in the Captain's defiance of Theridamas who speaks for his commander. In Tamburlaine's absence, Theridamas adopts his language and thus assumes the

role of a surrogate Tamburlaine. This is a significant introduction to an episode which serves to reflect on Tamburlaine.

Theridamas's capture of the Captain's wife, Olympia, resembles Tamburlaine's capture of Zenocrate in Part One. As Zenocrate, then betrothed to Arabia, was an unwilling prisoner to Tamburlaine so Olympia, now a loyal widow, presents a similar challenge to Theridamas. It may also be important to notice the behaviour of her son who heroically pleads for the fate of his father and courageously accepts the stab wound of his mother. Calyphas, later stabbed by his father, is the only one of the five sons in the play to remain undistinguished by actual or potential nobility.

When Olympia is captured, Techelles entirely misconstrues her intention of avoiding captivity and ironically comments:

'Twas bravely done, and like a soldier's wife.
Thou shalt with us to Tamburlaine the Great,
Who, when he hears how resolute thou wert,
Will match thee with a viceroy or a king.

(III.iv. 38-41)

A few lines later, the parallel with the capture of Zenocrate is enforced. Techelles describes Olympia's face as one

In frame of which nature hath show'd more skill
Than when she gave eternal chaos form,
Drawing from it the shining lamps of heaven.

(III.iv. 75-77)

In the third act of Part One, Tamburlaine had used similar words in extolling the beauty of Zenocrate 'Whose eyes are brighter than the lamps of heaven' (Part One, III.iii. 120). In addition to this verbal echo, Theridamas's declaration of love for Olympia is as sudden as Tamburlaine's for Zenocrate. Tamburlaine had admitted that 'this is she with whom I am in love' (Part One, I.ii. 108) while Theridamas in this scene suddenly proclaims to Olympia:

Madam, I am so far in love with you,
That you must go with us: no remedy.

(III.iv. 78-9)

The subplot involving Olympia is left in suspense while the powers led by Callapine catalogue their forces in the next scene. When Tamburlaine appears and confronts his enemies with his own forces, he announces his arrival

As Hector did into the Grecian camp,
To overdare the pride of Graecia,
And set his warlike person to the view
Of fierce Achilles, rival of his fame.

(III.v. 65-68)

Similar boasts from each camp prepare for a battle that will decide the destiny of the world. Parallels abound in this scene to events in Part One. Tamburlaine uses animal imagery and a threat of harnessing his enemies in order to taunt the son of Bajazeth. When Tamburlaine notices Almeda among his opponents, he attempts to repeat the effective means used to eliminate Agydas in Part One. Where the stage direction in the earlier episode called for Tamburlaine 'looking wrathfully on Agydas, and says nothing' (Part One, III.ii. 65 ff), he now threatens his second betrayer: 'Seest thou not death within my wrathful looks?' (III.v. 119) and twice more uses the word 'wrath' in the same speech. But an effect like Agydas's suicide does not occur; Almeda meekly accepts the crown from his new commander. A more direct reference to Part One seems to be addressed specifically to those members of the audience who had seen the first play. In chiding Almeda, Tamburlaine refers directly to an unhistorical incident in the second act of Part One:

Well now you see he is a king. Look to him,
Theridamas, when we are fighting, lest he
hide his crown as the foolish king of Persia did.

(III.v. 155-157)

The third act, however, does not include this promised battle. Marlowe again depends upon suspense to generate continuity in the sequel.

The first scene of the fourth act is the last one in which Calyphas appears. His fate seems to complete the parallel to Agydas which was begun with Almeda in the previous scene. Tamburlaine was unable to force Almeda to commit

suicide with his sinister glances. In this scene, Celebinus asks Amyras to

Call forth our lazy brother from the tent,
For, if my father miss him in the field,
Wrath, kindled in the furnace of his breast,
Will send a deadly lightning to his heart.

(IV.i. 7-10)

Tamburlaine appears unable to secure his ends with the ease he showed in Part One. Almeda accepted his crown from Callapine without fear and now Calyphas resists the warnings of his brothers and the threats of his father. He states his motives for rejecting the warrior life with pacifistic sincerity although the final line of his speech recalls the fooling of Mycetes in Part One:

I know, sir, what it is to kill a man;
It works remorse of conscience in me.
I take no pleasure to be murderous,
Nor care for blood when wine will quench my thirst.

(IV.i. 27-30)

After Calyphas has retired with a playmate for a game of cards with the prize of 'Who shall kiss the fairest of the Turks' concubines first' (IV.i. 64-5), Tamburlaine returns triumphantly to the stage with the captive Turkish kings and notices the absence of his eldest son:

But where's this coward, villain, not my son,
But traitor to my name and majesty?
Image of sloth, and picture of a slave,
The obloquy and scorn of my renown!

(IV.i. 89-92)

By extending his parallel with Agydas through Tamburlaine's confrontations with both Almeda and Calyphas, Marlowe skilfully shows the direction of his hero's thought when he is challenged by individuals whom he cannot control. To compensate for his failure in the previous scene to eliminate Almeda as he did Agydas, Tamburlaine first accuses Calyphas of being a traitor. This justifies the killing of his son as a kind of substitute for the traitor who escaped. The stabbing of Calyphas clearly recalls the Agydas episode

when Tamburlaine sent him a dagger as a tacit request for his death. The weapon from which Calyphas's death results is also a dagger, but it is Tamburlaine who delivers the fatal wound. This is the first time that Marlowe shows his hero in the act of killing. Nowhere in Part One does Tamburlaine kill on stage. Similar to one of the techniques by which Shakespeare gains his audience's sympathy for Macbeth, this absence of physical violence from Marlowe's characterization had, until this point, contributed to the admiration which he sought for his hero. The killing of Calyphas provides an important visible sign of Tamburlaine's limitations in the sequel. In place of the sureness with which he silently dispatched Agydas, Tamburlaine now resorts to sudden violence. Agydas was given a 'triple worthy burial' (Part One, III.ii. 112); his son is to be buried by Turkish concubines who will be disposed of afterwards.

There is an additional parallel between Tamburlaine's treatment of Calyphas and his treatment of Agydas. Zenocrate's disloyal confidant was eliminated when Tamburlaine's jealous wrath could not endure Agydas's suggestions that Zenocrate return to her betrothed, the King of Arabia. Jealousy is also cited as the reason for Calyphas's death. The long speech during which Tamburlaine stabs his son suggests that war has filled the void left by the death of Zenocrate. Addressing his two worthy sons before demonstrating the limits he will go to satisfy his lust for war, Tamburlaine begins:

Stand up, my boys, and I will teach ye arms,
And what the jealousy of wars must do.

(IV.i. 103-104)

Within sixteen lines Calyphas dies in silence. He is not given a final speech.

The next scene, which resumes and completes the subplot involving Theridamas's pursuit of Olympia, also recalls Zenocrate. Nothing similar to this dramatic technique was used by Marlowe in Part One. The structural parallels already noticed have for the most part shown Marlowe deepening

his portrayal of monolithic power by qualifying his enthusiasm for the Tamburlaine of Part One. The principal resemblances between the two plays have been concerned directly with Tamburlaine. In the Olympia episode, however, Marlowe uses seemingly unrelated material borrowed from Ariosto's Orlando Furioso to approach his criticism of Tamburlaine from a new direction. The subplot comments darkly on the relationship between Tamburlaine and Zenocrate.

Theridamas's infatuation with Olympia is strongly reminiscent of Tamburlaine's love for Zenocrate. This has been shown in the scenes devoted to the capture of the Captain's wife, the consequences of which were left in suspense three scenes earlier. In the second scene of Act IV, the suspense is continued with a soliloquy in which Olympia claims to hold the answer to her misery. Theridamas, with flattery similar to that used by Tamburlaine to woo Zenocrate, offers titles and riches in proportion to her enchanting beauty. When she tricks him into becoming the agent of her death, his excited language recalls the behaviour of Tamburlaine after his wife had died. The link between the two deaths suggests that Tamburlaine, despite his visible successes, cannot be a very good model when those who seek to emulate him fail. The fate of Calyphas lends support to this view of Tamburlaine's shortcomings as an exemplar. There may also be a hint in the reflection of the Olympia episode back on Tamburlaine that his hard military existence may have contributed to the natural but untimely death of Zenocrate.

True to his earlier threats, Tamburlaine enters the following scene (IV.iii) riding a chariot pulled by captive kings. This spectacle matches the treatment of Bajazeth in the corresponding act of Part One. The victims of this display of superiority now number four. After demonstrating the chariot, Tamburlaine's next act of cruelty also points to a similar episode in Part One. The concubines who have just buried Calyphas are treated like the Virgins of Damascus. Their pleas for pity are refused and Tamburlaine offers them

to his common soldiers to 'let them equally serve all your turns' (IV.iii. 73). The voice of Orcanes is a particularly strong choric comment on the fate of the women:

Injurious tyrant, wilt thou so defame
The hateful fortunes of thy victory,
To exercise upon such guiltless dames
The violence of thy common soldiers' lust?

(IV.iii. 77-80)

In the same scene Tamburlaine, although loudly defying all forces which potentially threaten his existence, includes in his speeches an anticipation of his own death. Until now, his age and aging have not received any attention. Only in his weakening control of his family, followers, and enemies has there been any hint of decline. In this scene, he admits to the captive King of Jerusalem that his son, Celebinus, is he

That must, advanced in higher pomp than this,
Rifle the kingdoms I shall leave unsacked.

(IV.iii. 58-9)

This admission of limitation, however, is quickly qualified by a conditional boast that Jove might accept him early because he is 'too good for earth' (IV.iii. 60). The scene ends in a similar claim that death may only mean an early invitation to meet the gods. As Tamburlaine marches towards Babylon, nothing seems to slow the progress of his pomp.

The siege of Babylon has already been shown to parallel the siege of Damascus in Part One. After the Governor of Babylon prepares to defend his city to the death, Tamburlaine appears on his chariot and announces the destruction of the city. The shooting of the Governor which soon follows is somewhat mitigated by his prisoner's moral surrender. He suddenly offers a quantity of gold in exchange for his life. The stature of Tamburlaine's opponent is thus suddenly reduced and recalls the pitiful opposition which faced Tamburlaine in the first acts of Part One. At this point, however, Tamburlaine takes both the gold and the Governor's life. He has the cowardly opponent shot several times, the burghers bound and drowned along with their wives and children, and the Koran

burnt. His monomania becomes confused when claiming to be the Scourge of God, he doubts 'The God that sits in heaven, if any god' (V. i. 200) and while admitting to feeling suddenly distempered, he vows 'whatsoe'er it be, / Sickness or death can never conquer me' (V. i. 220-21). Tamburlaine's sieges of Damascus and Babylon have been well contrasted by Clifford Leech:

The taking of Damascus was part of Tamburlaine's campaign against the Soldan; the taking of Babylon is an isolated incident in what appears to be indiscriminate conquest.³⁹

There may be additional significance in locating Tamburlaine's last battle in Babylon. Tamburlaine's long speech, which closes the fourth act, is a vision of return to his place of birth, Samarcanda:

For there my palace royal shall be plac'd,
Whose shining turrets shall dismay the heavens,
And cast the fame of Ilion's tower to hell;
Thorough the streets, with troops of conquered kings,
I'll ride in golden armour like the sun.

(IV.iii. 111-15)

Susan Richards has noticed the irony in Marlowe's presentation of the siege of Babylon as the next episode: 'it is not to Samarcanda that they are going now, but to Babylon, the ancient city of sin, the gateway to hell'.⁴⁰ It is in Babylon that Tamburlaine first feels distempered and it is in its environs that he dies.

In the short scene which precedes the death of Tamburlaine, the elusive Callapine prepares for his confrontation with his father's captor; an event which he promised in the second scene of the play. Unlike all of Tamburlaine's other antagonists, who have been introduced and defeated soon afterwards, Callapine has remained secure throughout the play. His tone has changed from the bitterness expressed in previous scenes and his position is thus made sympathetic as he reviews the events of his life:

When I record my parents' slavish life,
 Their cruel death, mine own captivity,
 My viceroys' bondage under Tamburlaine,
 Methinks I could sustain a thousand deaths,
 To be reveng'd of all his villany.

(V.ii. 19-23)

In contrast to Tamburlaine's excessive cruelty and bravado these lines offer the first characterization of a wronged and entitled enemy of Tamburlaine.

The final scene of 2 Tamburlaine, also the longest (the same was true of Part One), opens with three laments as Theridamas, Techelles, and Usumcasane proclaim the imminent passing of their leader. In Theridamas's speech, Tamburlaine's colour symbolism during his campaigns is invoked to refer to the crucial defensive battle which he now faces:

For hell and darkness pitch their pitchy tents,
 And Death, with armies of Cimmerian spirits,
 Gives battle 'gainst the heart of Tamburlaine.

(V.iii. 7-9)

From his chariot Tamburlaine redirects his own colour symbolism toward what he believes to be the source of his suffering:

Come, let us march against the powers of heaven,
 And set black streamers in the firmament,
 To signify the slaughter of the gods.

(V.iii. 48-50)

The single combat proposed by these speeches heightens Tamburlaine's final conflict into a cosmic event. Black is the colour of total annihilation. Against the invisible powers which threaten him, Tamburlaine's defence is words, the only weapon now at his command. In his portentous hallucinations he seems to see his final enemy revolting from his command like a disloyal servant:

See, where my slave, the ugly monster death,
 Shaking and quivering, pale and wan for fear,
 Stands aiming at me with his murdering dart,
 Who flies away at every glance I give,
 And, when I look away, comes stealing on?
 Villain, away, and hie thee to the field!

I and mine army come to load thy bark
 With souls of thousand mangled carcasses.
 Look, where he goes: but, see, he comes again,
 Because I stay!

(V.iii. 67-76)

Marlowe emphasizes the personified nature of death from the point of view of its victim. He also emphasizes the true nature of death with the lengthy speech of a physician, whose diagnosis is a detailed account of the physiological processes of disease. Some hope is given, as it almost identically was during Zenocrate's illness, that survival is possible if the day is endured. The news brought by messenger of Callapine's preparations, however, influences Tamburlaine to revert to his looks and words for defence. When he relaxes at last into thoughts of mortality, now accepted for the first time, he calls for a map, satisfies himself with the hope of his surviving sons, and vows to 'live in all your seeds immortally' (V.iii. 174).

The newly crowned Amyras speaks the final lines of the play after witnessing his father's death. His lament upholds the characteristics which Marlowe insisted on for his hero. The second part of Tamburlaine, while placing the protagonist in the context of diminishing power, at the same time emphasizes the worth of his effort. Amyras summarizes the attitudes which sustained Marlowe's insistent creativity in the sequel:

Meet heaven and earth, and here let all things end,
 For earth hath spent the pride of all her fruit,
 And heaven consum'd his choicest living fire:
 Let earth and heaven his timeless death deplore,
 For both their worths will equal him no more.

(V.iii. 249-253)

As Marlowe completed Part Two, the sense of proportion with which he may have worked seems to be indicated by a statistical analysis of the plays. No other two-part plays, including the earlier moralities, are as nearly identical in length as the two parts of Tamburlaine. The similar lengths of the first, fourth, and especially the final acts (535, 533) and consequently the aggregate of the irregular second and

third acts of each play result in a sequel which is only about a dozen lines longer than Part One. Of Marlowe's plays, many of which were published in poor texts, only The Jew of Malta comes within one hundred lines of the total of either part.

The dramatic structure of Tamburlaine has been approached by a number of critics who have sought individual emphasis concerning the development of the plays. David Bevington, with a debt to Harry Levin, argues for a tripartite construction 'upon which is superimposed the nominal division of the text into five acts'.⁴¹ The first two acts of each play contain plots and counterplots, 'the central act pits Tamburlaine against a Turkish foe', and 'the last two acts march toward the culminating siege'.⁴² This certainly describes the general movement of the plays. It does not, however, take into account the details of construction which have been shown in the preceding analysis to gain their efficacy through the act divisions. A tripartite structure neglects the important role of Zenocrate in Part One and the numerous subsidiary incidents in Part Two in order to isolate the military campaigns of Tamburlaine. Had Marlowe intended fully to devote his energies to the rise of Tamburlaine in Part One, the play would not have emphasized the presence of Zenocrate; his first words are addressed to her. The complexity of Part Two, increased by Marlowe's use of various source materials and invented incidents, is more concerned with Tamburlaine's human limitations than with the external lines of his military campaigns.

G.I. Duthie gives more attention to the importance of Zenocrate and the mental struggles of Tamburlaine. Duthie argues that Acts IV and V of Part One, although set against the siege of Damascus, are mainly concerned with a psychological crisis. Zenocrate both actively and passively instigates that crisis with her pleas for mercy and with the beauty of her presence which exerts 'a softening influence upon him'.⁴³ The crisis is resolved in a compromise between Honour and Pity. It is this dramatic conflict which provides Part One

with a coherent dramatic structure and Zenocrate is thus a vital figure in Marlowe's design. The omission of any mention of her in the title-page description and the Prologue probably occurs because the military material would be the most popular.⁴⁴

Duthie also extends his emphasis on dramatic conflict to the second part:

How was he to treat Tamburlaine dramatically this time? Does he in fact do so? I think he does. And it is by imitating to some extent the design of Part I. In Part I the most dangerous foe that Tamburlaine had to face was Zenocrate (see V.ii. 88-96). In Part II Marlowe confronts him with an even more dangerous foe - Death himself.⁴⁵

He goes on to show that the external source of conflict, Death, first attacks Tamburlaine indirectly through Zenocrate and later directly in the final act of the play. If the main theme of Part Two is 'Tamburlaine versus Death' as Duthie argues,⁴⁶ then the important criticisms which Marlowe develops through contrasts with Part One are discounted. Their placement, however, in each of the five acts shows this not to be the case. Death is the final opponent because it must be the inevitable opponent. In Part Two the human challenges were not suggested only to be set aside. They are of significant interest to the dramatist. In summary, Duthie correctly points out the additional parallel of dramatic conflict in the two plays and emphasizes its close relationship to Zenocrate. But it is one parallel among several which qualify Tamburlaine's power. Marlowe's skilful dramatic use of Zenocrate justifies his enlargement of her prototype from the historical sources where Tamburlaine's wife received only minor reference.⁴⁷

The fullest investigation of the structure of Tamburlaine is by Clifford Leech, but his conclusions demand closer scrutiny. He supports the five-act structure of Part One 'where we follow Tamburlaine's fortunes in five clearly marked stages' but in Part Two he can find 'nothing of this neatness' in the nominal division of the play into acts. The overlapping

of the Sigismund episode, the periodic appearances of Callapine throughout the play, and the delay in completing the Olympia episode seem to enforce the effects which are central to the sequel. They contribute to the formlessness of Tamburlaine's presence and uncertain control of his antagonists; no longer does he impose his own pattern on the world. The casual structure of Part Two is thus contrasted with the neatness of Part One for the purposes of emphasizing Marlowe's thematic concerns. Leech concludes:

The act division may be Marlowe's, as that of Part I was surely his; but he does not seem to have paid it much attention, does not seem to have worked with a sense of five-unit composition. In fact, that would probably have stood in the way of Part II's special effect ... And so Marlowe seems to have let the play give an impression of the haphazard, bringing in an element of surprise foreign to Part I.⁴⁸

It seems more likely, however, that the special effects pointed out by Leech are dependent upon the five-act structure. The dependence is so close that it almost requires a superimposition of Part Two onto Part One to notice the subtle distinctions and contrasts which Marlowe develops. But it can become a theatrical weakness in spite of its literary appeal; the careful setting out of parallels is a highly intellectual technique which demands the closest attention of an audience. The most important parallels are obvious enough but those which are less direct and seem to obscure the neatness of Part Two (like dividing the characteristics of Agydas of Part One between Almeda and Calyphas) preserve rather than blur the formal compositional processes with which the young playwright worked. Because so much of the detail of Part Two rests on a close acquaintance with Part One, the sequel was never distant from its predecessor in both print and in performance.

iii. Staging

The intellectually-careful composition of Tamburlaine is more precisely noticed in Marlowe's frequent use of mathematical symmetry in speeches and character grouping. His favourite number is three. The principal examples in Part One are the three lieutenants of Tamburlaine, the three contributory kings led by Bajazeth, the three-day sieges, and the three corpses of Bajazeth, Zabina, and Arabia which remain on the stage during the final lines of the play. In a central scene of Part One, the confrontation between Bajazeth and Tamburlaine, the grouping is particularly formal. John Jump's summary of this scene (III.iii. 60-200) concisely describes Marlowe's application of symmetrical grouping:

Immediately after Bajazeth's entry, he and Tamburlaine speak alternately, three times each; Bajazeth's three lieutenants address him in turn, and he replies; Tamburlaine's three lieutenants address him in turn, and he replies; Bajazeth addresses Zabina, and she replies; Tamburlaine addresses Zenocrate, and she replies; Bajazeth and Tamburlaine threaten each other and leave; Zabina and Zenocrate speak alternately, twice each; Zabina addresses her maid, Ebea, who replies; Zenocrate addresses her maid, Anippe, who replies; and Zenocrate and Zabina pray in turn for victory.⁴⁹

These prayers are each six lines long.

In Part Two, a similarly formal arrangement occurs in the scene of Zenocrate's death where she is surrounded by three physicians, Tamburlaine's three generals, and his three sons. Tamburlaine's lament, beginning 'Black is the beauty of the brightest day' (II.iv. 1), opens the scene. The second half of this speech consists of six sections of three lines and a refrain ending with the name of Zenocrate. Tamburlaine has three additional speeches before the end of the scene and in the scene of Tamburlaine's own death (V.iii), there are three laments spoken in turn by Theridamas, Techelles, and Usuncasane.⁵⁰

David Bevington's tabular presentation of casting patterns in Tamburlaine supports the symmetrical tendencies in Marlowe's composition. His investigation of the production requirements of 1 Tamburlaine shows a permanent cast of Tamburlaine, Zenocrate, Theridamas, Techelles, and Usumcasane throughout the play. The doubling pattern for the minor parts is efficiently handled: 'with each new incident in the life of his hero Marlowe suppresses one group of supporting roles in order to introduce another'.⁵¹

In Part Two the central cast is slightly larger. The technique of suppression does not apply to Orcanes or Callapine who reappear at intervals after their introduction. In addition to Tamburlaine's three lieutenants, his three sons are now frequently present on the stage. Where in Part One the central cast remained constant, in Part Two the deaths of Zenocrate in Act II and of Calyphas in Act IV gradually reduce these numbers as Tamburlaine's own death approaches.

Marlowe was very much influenced by his first Tamburlaine play when he created his characters for the sequel. To replace Bajazeth he provides his son, Callapine, with the leadership of the Turks. Tamburlaine's lieutenants assume the kingly titles of Bajazeth's former followers. To replace these, Callapine now leads his own contributory kings: Trebizon, Soria, and Jerusalem. To contrast the resolute son of Bajazeth, Marlowe adds three unhistorical sons to the family of Tamburlaine (probably suggested by the three reported sons of Bajazeth in Part One). The Persians who are quickly eliminated in the first two acts of Part One have their counterparts in the Christian forces similarly defeated in the first two acts of Part Two. Through this method of substitution Marlowe had no difficulty in preserving the similarities between the two plays; his main requirement was inventing suitable names for the new characters.

The increased number of important characters in 2 Tamburlaine is one aspect of the increased confidence which

the playwright shows in the sequel. Marlowe's structuring of the play with episodes which extend beyond phases in his protagonist's career is one measure of his growing experience in the theatre. The staging of Part Two also shows a development of theatrical talent.

Tucker Brooke has commented on the possibility that Part One of Tamburlaine was originally performed at inn-yards and Harry Levin and Leo Kirschbaum have supported this view.⁵² In addition to noting the wording on the title-page, Tucker Brooke's other reason for supposing inn-yard performances is that 'no effort is made to employ the stage devices with which a real theatre was provided at the time'.⁵³ The stage directions for Part One are normally quite short and the copy could not have been a theatrical manuscript as entrances and exits - the most basic requirements - are sporadically marked. The stage directions in almost every case seem abbreviated and often vague. Some examples from the complex scene of confrontation between Tamburlaine and Bajazeth include:

They sound battle within and stay.
Bajazeth flies and he pursues him. The battle
short and they enter. Bajazeth is overcome.
He takes it from her and gives it Zenocrate.

(all from III.iii)

Another notable feature of the stage directions is the frequent use of pronouns and the word 'others' in entrances. No attempt is made to identify more than the most important characters or the spacing between them on the stage. Adverbs and adjectives rarely ornament the simple actions which are described. The props are few: crowns, treasure, a dagger, Bajazeth's cage and a container for his water, and the branches of laurel for the Virgins of Damascus. There is no indication of music. Except for Tamburlaine's costumes of scarlet and black, the stage directions, unlike the speeches, are notably free from references to colours. It is true, as M.C. Bradbrook points out, that 'speech is much more stressed than action, which is mostly violent and symbolic'.⁵⁴

The situation is quite different in Part Two. The stage directions are often long and descriptive and staging is clearly much more of a concern. It may be possible to agree with G.P. Baker's statement that Marlowe in Part Two 'was writing with so single an eye to the stage that his less experienced readers do not sufficiently visualize his attempt'.⁵⁵ The resources of the Elizabethan theatre, apparently uncalled for in Part One, are frequently required in the sequel. An important comparison can be made between the sieges which occur in the final acts of each play. For the siege of Damascus in Part One there are no indications that an upper stage was necessary. In Part Two, however, the first stage direction of Act V is 'Enter the Governor of Babylon upon the walls with others'. Two citizens soon approach him before Tamburlaine's forces led by Theridamas and Techelles 'scale the walls' (s.d.). Marlowe clearly designed the scene of the Governor's death with an upper stage in mind. Amyras calls his father's attention to 'how brave the captain hangs' (V.i. 148) before Tamburlaine gives the order to 'shoot at him all at once' (V.i. 156). The upper stage is also employed for the scene in which the Captain of Balsera, Olympia, and their son refuse to surrender to the forces led by Theridamas.

In addition to the two scenes which require an upper stage, there are two scenes which may make use of a discovery space and an inner curtain. The stage direction which precedes the scene of Zenocrate's death is designed suddenly to reveal the dying Queen and forcefully introduce Tamburlaine's long lament for his wife. The importance of this scene is emphasized by the unexpected use of the centre of the stage:

The arras is drawn, and Zenocrate lies in her bed of state; Tamburlaine sitting by her; three Physicians about her bed, tempering poisons; Theridamas, Techelles, Usumcasane and the three sons.

(II.iv)

Music ('They call music', 'the music sounds and she dies'), as well as the symmetrical grouping enhance the spectacle of

grief as Zenocrate dies. The music also serves to contrast Tamburlaine's desperate raving when he cannot prevent her death. The scene is framed within the inner stage which helps the audience separate the less significant military action from the private sufferings and frustration of the protagonist. After Tamburlaine vows to destroy the city, the scene is enclosed by the stage direction: 'The arras is drawn'.

Through staging, the death of Calyphas is closely related to the loss of Zenocrate. The stage direction preceding Act IV indicates that the discovery space is now a tent:

Alarm. Amyras and Celebinus issue from the tent where Calyphas sits asleep.

After Calyphas and Perdicas retire to play cards, Tamburlaine's conquering forces and their prisoners return from battle. When Tamburlaine notices the absence of Calyphas, the stage direction reads: 'He goes in and brings him out'. The stabbing of Calyphas soon follows as Tamburlaine's impetuosity is again centred before the audience.

The theatrical variety of Part Two is also developed with the use of props. Stage directions call for drums and trumpets during several entrances. New props include a sceptre in Callapine's elaborate crowning, the hearse of Zenocrate with 'the drums sounding a doleful march' (III.ii), the cards, Olympia's ointment, Tamburlaine's chariot with bits, bridles, reins, and a whip, the sacred books for burning, and a map. Colours are also more prominent in Part Two; along with the added aural effects and fires they create atmosphere unlike anything in Part One. In writing 2 Tamburlaine, Marlowe developed theatrical talents and an attention to staging which he seems not to have possessed during the composition of Part One.

iv. Sources

In addition to Marlowe's more sophisticated staging in the sequel, his use of sources is another area which shows a further development of dramatic skills. It has often been pointed out that the historical sources for the life of Tamburlaine were exhausted in Part One. A sequence of events was no longer available from any of the numerous authorities who had chronicled the career of his protagonist. It has been seen that specific dramatic intentions lie behind his adaptation of many of the features in Part One and it is to these purposes that he is faithful when organizing the sequel. The traceable sources for Part Two were not chosen for intrinsic historical accuracy or literary value but for the fulfilment of a consistent over-all design.

In contrast to the method of composition for the sequel, for Part One Marlowe consulted a large number of the historical accounts which were available during the sixteenth century in several languages. In 1941, Hallett Smith could write that

the known sources are already so many that the term source is ceasing to have a meaning in this context.⁵⁶

The search for sources has received notable contributions from Ethel Seaton, Leslie Spence, and Una Ellis-Fermor who have uncovered accounts of Tamburlaine by a large number of European writers. When confronted by these possible sources in preparing her excellent treatment of them, Una Ellis-Fermor conceded that 'to name all of these would be tedious'.⁵⁷ One of the principal sources known to have been used by Marlowe in Part One is Pedro Mexia's Silva de varia lección (1542) which was available in The Forest (1571), an English version by Thomas Fortescue. Another English version of Mexia's account was published in 1586, just one year before Marlowe wrote the play. It is possible that George Whetstone's The English Mirror provided Marlowe with the first impulse toward a dramatization of Tamburlaine. According to Whetstone, Tamburlaine 'even from his infancy ...had a reaching and an imaginative minde'.⁵⁸ Most of the major incidents in



Tamburlaine's life were available in The English Mirror,⁵⁹ a book which may have indirectly complemented the publication of Whetstone's own Promos and Cassandra in influencing the later extent and importance of the two-part play.

Marlowe's other major source is Petrus Perondinus's Magni Tamerlanis Scythiarum Imperatoris Vita (1553), which could be found distilled in John Bishop's Beautiful Blossoms (1577). Further details for the life of Tamburlaine may have been taken from such works as La Primaudaye's The French Academy, translated by T.B. (1586), Lonicerus's Chronicorum Turcicorum Tomus Primus (1556), and Curio's Sarracenicæ Historiæ (1567) in Thomas Newton's translation A Notable History of the Saracens (1575).⁶⁰

The second part of Tamburlaine, of special concern for the light it throws on Marlowe's development as a dramatist, 'carries on the form and pretense of history [although] it is actually a work of fiction'.⁶¹ Sources such as Paul Ivo and Ariosto have been discussed in relation to the date and structure of the play. Where Marlowe pursued related histories of Tamburlaine and his world in preparation for Part One and consulted more books for that play than for any other, his approach to the sequel does not show the same scholarly methods. Important scenes and characters are entirely his own invention. Other material is gleaned from various literary, historical, and technical works and sometimes conflated for dramatic effect.

The patterned structure of Part Two suggests that ideas with traceable sources seem to have come to Marlowe's mind from his wide reading. They were not sought in likely places. The kinds of effects and parallels which he wished to create often found stimulus in his memory. Where there were no written analogues for his intentions, Marlowe felt free to invent his own episodes. He saw in Tamburlaine's stature the potential for tragedy in spite of the historians who made little of his later life and natural death.

The two most unusual episodes in Part Two in regard to source materials are Sigismund's betrayal of his pagan allies

and the three scenes involving Olympha. In Marlowe's play Tamburlaine is not directly concerned with either of these incidents and in the sources for these incidents Tamburlaine is nowhere mentioned. Much of the first and second acts, including the first two scenes of the play, is based on events which occurred nearly forty years after Tamburlaine's death. The principals in the Battle of Varna in 1444 were Amurath II and Vladislaus of Poland and Hungary. For the Christian leader Marlowe substituted Sigismund, a contemporary Hungarian who was active during Bajazeth's siege of Constantinople. This bold anachronistic episode was manipulated from Bonfinius's Antonii Bonfinii Rerum Ungaricarum decades quattuor (1543) and Callimachus's Callimachi Experientis de clade Varnensi (1556). The latter work was also available in Lonicerus's Chronicorum Turcicorum Tomi Duo (1578).

In transposing the events leading up to the Battle of Varna to the world of Tamburlaine, Marlowe was careful to introduce a number of contrasts. In addition to those with the Persian monarchy in the early scenes of Part One, the Sigismund episode provides the basis for contrasts which are later developed within Part Two. Orcanes, who fulfills the historical role of Amurath II, has the first speech of the play:

Egregious viceroys of these eastern parts,
 Plac'd by the issue of great Bajazeth,
 And sacred lord, the mighty Callapine,
 Who lives in Egypt prisoner to that slave
 Which kept his father in an iron cage,
 Now have we marched from fair Natolia
 Two hundred leagues, and on Danubius' banks
 Our warlike host in complete armour rest,
 Where Sigismund, the king of Hungary,
 Should meet our person to conclude a truce.
 What? shall we parle with the Christian,
 Or cross the stream, and meet him in the field?

(I.i. 1-12)

In these twelve lines Orcanes, a new character, recalls the past fate of Bajazeth, announces the prominence and imprisonment of Callapine (also a new character), introduces himself and his preparations for warfare, provides the name, title, and religion of his antagonist, and in two concluding questions

foretells the direction of the first two acts. Contrasts are immediately made between past and future, pagan and Christian, and his own strength and strategic uncertainty. Orcanes thus serves several dramatic purposes although he offers little information about the intervening years which separate Part Two from Part One. Tamburlaine's first appearance is prepared for by the feared mention of his name during the negotiations between Turk and Christian. Marlowe follows his historical sources quite carefully concerning the truce, the vows to heaven, the breaking of the truce, the Turk's prayer to Christ, and the defeat of the Christians,⁶² and he obviously had a personal interest in the religious conflict in doing so. These events, however, are also fitted neatly into the structure of the play. Tamburlaine is frequently mentioned and the triumphant forces look forward to their confrontation with him while Callapine at the same time escapes from captivity and prepares to join his allies. Marlowe uses his source to show the increasing power of Tamburlaine's antagonists while Tamburlaine himself is engaged with the misconduct of his son and the death of his wife.

After the funeral of Zenocrate, the scenes involving Olympia and Theridamas are the next important action. For this episode, which also provides numerous contrasts to Part One and within Part Two, Marlowe used the story of Isabella and Rodomont in cantos 28 and 29 of Ariosto's Orlando Furioso. Details were added from Belleforest's Cosmographie Universelle (1575) where the siege of Rhodes provided some hints for Theridamas's siege of Balsera. In Belleforest, the mistress of the Governor saved her children from captivity by burning them.

Marlowe condenses Isabella's trick of preserving her chastity from Rodomont. Her preparation is home-made while Olympia claims to have procured her ointment from a cunning alchemist. Rodomont, characterized by Ariosto as a cruel Turk, has none of the idealized love which Theridamas, in imitation of Tamburlaine, exhibits. The subplot is brought

to bear on Zabina's suicide, as well as Zenocrate's capture and Tamburlaine's wooing, although like the Sigismund episode it was borrowed from sources which did not concern Tamburlaine.

Beyond the debt to Paul Ive, confined to one technical matter on fortification, and the possible suggestion of the chariot scenes from a dumb show in Jocasta, no other literary work can be called a major source for Part Two. It is evident that Marlowe was comfortable with such diverse forms of inspiration and also that his dramatic intentions were not upset by these alien borrowings.

One final source, which provided a valuable means of linking the two parts of Tamburlaine, was the atlas of Abraham Ortelius, Theatrum Orbis Terrarum. Due largely to the work of Ethel Seaton, the full significance of this atlas can be appreciated. Some of her findings are that

in Part I, Marlowe works on a large scale, without much detail ... Not more than ten towns are named ... In Part II, however, provinces of more recent interest are called by their contemporary names ... some thirty towns are mentioned.⁶³

Whole speeches, notably the reports to Tamburlaine by his three generals (I.vi), are built upon geographical journeys through exotic lands. The events based on the Battle of Varna are fitted into Tamburlaine's world with a close eye for geographical detail.

Entirely of Marlowe's invention are the sequence of episodes in Part Two and two of its principal scenes. Both the death of Zenocrate and the stabbing of the cowardly Calyphas have no basis in earlier writings. Nor are there anticipations for these events in either Part One or the early scenes of the sequel. The siege of Babylon is likewise invented, although it is modelled on the culminating siege of Damascus in the final act of Part One. The deaths of Zenocrate and Calyphas are among the most effective scenes in the play and are crucial for an estimate of Marlowe's purposes. The presentation of Tamburlaine's lament, Zenocrate's

death, and her husband's furiously irrational response to his loss occurs in two scenes which total exactly 300 lines. The character of Calyphas is prominent in three scenes and he appears silently in four others before his fate is violently shown in IV.i.

This is not to imply that Marlowe did not add his own dramatic ideas to the outline he received from his authorities when writing Part One. But the purpose is quite different in the earlier play. F.P. Wilson has discussed the ways in which Marlowe avoided monotony. The rise of Tamburlaine, writes Wilson, 'Marlowe has attempted to vary when possible, and when he makes the attempt he is almost always independent of his sources'.⁶⁴ The opening contrast between the Persian monarchy and Tamburlaine, the scene in which he silently oversees Agydas's attempt to influence Zenocrate, Zenocrate herself 'who turns Tamburlaine into a lover when he might have been merely a conqueror',⁶⁵ and especially Marlowe's own interpretation of the Scythian hero are among his most significant additions to the histories.

In Part Two interest is not so much varied as diverted in order that Tamburlaine's position may be studied in its decline. The scenes in which he does not appear, many of them originally suggested through structural parallels with Part One, offer critical approaches to Tamburlaine that could not be hinted at in his rise to power in Part One. The subplots involving Sigismund and Olympia may seem marginally relevant to Tamburlaine but they show the young dramatist creating situations which indirectly contribute to the audience's perception of his hero.

Marlowe confidently solved the problem of sources and succeeded in controlling a large number of dramatic ideas, both borrowed and invented, during the composition of Part Two. The sequel reveals how his reading and experience with the stage coalesced into a theatrical ingenuity that was not required of him in the original play. The chariot scene, invented by Marlowe, received as much attention in contemporary allusions as the scene with Bajazeth's cage, part of Tamburlaine's historical legacy.⁶⁶

v. Conclusion

Several critics when discussing the relationship between the two parts of Tamburlaine the Great speak of the second part as a logical sequel. It has been described 'as bringing to full expression much that was unobtrusively present in the thought of Part I',⁶⁷ as Marlowe explores 'the full, logical consequences of his hero's position',⁶⁸ and faces 'the genuinely tragic conflict that was bound to destroy the monster he created'.⁶⁹ Tamburlaine was clearly a subject which Marlowe thought deeply about and the continuation allowed him to reflect on his hero's unimpeded rise to power. In one sense, Marlowe rewrote his earlier play. Using the structure of Part One as a foundation, he created episodes which qualified much of the earlier enthusiasm which had helped inspire his powers of poetic expression. With more serious themes, he sustained his mastery of blank verse to achieve a wider range of effects: from the music of Tamburlaine's lament for Zenocrate to the bombast of his subsequent madness. Although Tamburlaine remains the same aspiring conqueror, he is given more scenes of private emotion in the sequel. In the glimpses which Marlowe gives us of Tamburlaine the man, the young dramatist approaches the nature of tragedy.

Tamburlaine's understanding of necessity and death, although seemingly caused only by his sudden distemper, raises him in his final moments to a tragic status. As he contemplates the map of his victories he sees his limitations, and the passion for accumulating crowns gives way to a quieter tone of acceptance. It is here that he learns what has escaped him during his domination of the world and what justifies M.M. Mahood to write:

Tamburlaine the Great is the only drama I know in which the death of the hero constitutes the tragedy.⁷⁰

The final scene has led many readers to consider Tamburlaine as a problem play. The heightening of the hero's stature after so much cruelty results in a moral ambiguity

regarding Marlowe's purposes. It seems that Tamburlaine's worldly success exhibits a ceaseless Renaissance striving. Some commentators have, however, adamantly stressed the Christian elements which a contemporary audience would have been aware of. David Bevington writes sanely about these apparently irreconcilable positions:

His key purpose is to assert the fascinating reality of Tamburlaine's career, not to formulate an easy moral response of emulation or revulsion.⁷¹

The epic quality of the verse and the spectacle and scope of the action suggest that dramatic intensity is foremost in importance. The play is built upon epic proportions. 'High astounding terms' (Part One, Prologue, l. 5) are spoken throughout campaigns and kingdoms on a wide geographical scale. There is also frequent reference to superhuman forces although they do not visibly affect the action.

Language and rhetoric help to unify both parts of Tamburlaine. The imagery and figures of speech which Marlowe used with success in Part One are consistently present in the sequel. Scenes of debate and persuasion depend on amplification in many of the long speeches, especially those by Tamburlaine. Minor verbal figures such as repetition, antithesis, and puns are accordingly scarce. There are over 400 similies and metaphors which, along with the constant use of proper names,⁷² create an exotic grandeur in Marlowe's blank verse.⁷³

The unifying factors of individual style, consistent characterization, structural parallels, and epic atmosphere suggest that Marlowe thought of the second part as a successful effort of historical imagination. The plays were offered to the public to read as a ten-act dramatic biography. In performance they were best understood in succession although theatrical conditions required that they be independent as well as complementary. In this last requirement Marlowe may not have been so successful. Certainly the elements of Part Two sustain an exciting and varied five-act play but the

special effects which are put into relief by frequent contrast to Part One are often extremely subtle. Only the dramatist would have a close knowledge of the frequency and extent of these parallels.

The popular success of Marlowe's two-part play was an immediate confirmation of his theatrical talents. These developed quickly after the warm reception of Part One. Part Two, which must have been written in a short period of time, shows a complex network of contrasts, the introduction and control of subplots, a closer attention to staging, an imaginative vitality which overcame a paucity of historical sources, the dramatization of loss and tragedy, and a continuing display of precocious blank verse. In addition to the lasting achievement of his dramatic language, Marlowe created a form which was to inspire a generation of two-part plays.

Notes to Chapter II

1. Robert Greene, The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse, edited by Alexander B. Grosart, The Huth Library, 15 vols (1881-6 reprinted N.Y., 1964), VII,8.
2. Arber II,488.
3. Chambers, E.S. II,135. The identification was first made by Chambers in 'The Date of Marlowe's Tamburlaine', TLS, 28 August 1930, p. 684.
4. Part Two, V.i.173. All references are to the edition by U.M. Ellis-Fermor (1930). On pp. 6-8 she discusses Greene's comment.
5. Tamburlaine, edited by J.W. Harper, The New Mermaids (1971), p. viii.
6. Hallett Smith, 'Tamburlaine and the Renaissance' in Elizabethan Studies and other Essays in Honor of George F. Reynolds (Boulder, Colorado, 1945), pp. 130-1. A marginal note by R.H., the author of The Arraignment of the Whole Creature, identifies 'Marlow in his poem' as the authority for a reference to Tamburlaine in the text.
7. Ellis-Fermor, pp. 11-13 discusses Heywood's Prologue and later attributions. Greene may be punning on Marlowe's name when soon after his reference to Tamburlaine he speaks of 'such mad and scoffing poets, that have propheticall spirits, as bred of Merlins race' (Works VII,8).
8. F.S. Boas, Christopher Marlowe, A Biographical and Critical Study (Oxford, 1940), p. 73 and F.P. Wilson, Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare (Oxford, 1953), p. 25.
9. Tamburlaine's lecture on fortification occurs in Part Two, III.ii. 53-92. The most obvious parallel with Spenser is at IV.iii.119-24. Roy W. Battenhouse, Marlowe's Tamburlaine: A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy (Nashville, 1941), pp. 178-92 gives a full account of the influence of Spenser.
10. Modern editors supply scene divisions omitted during the battle exits at II.iv, II.v, and II.vii of Part One. In Part Two the only use of the wording 'scaena ultima' (II.iv) follows another unmarked scene beginning with an exit to battle and a division is missed when three characters pass from the upper stage to the lower stage (III.iv). Both French and English systems of scene division are employed.
11. The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe, edited by Fredson Bowers, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1973), I,75. The probability that the copy is Marlowe's foul papers is supported by Roma Gill in her introductory note to Tamburlaine the Great 1593, Scholar Press Facsimile (Menston, 1973) and by Ellis-Fermor, p. 198 n.
12. Bowers, The Complete Works, I,73 suggests that Thomas Orwin was the printer.
13. Arber II,558.
14. Arber II,334.
15. Ellis-Fermor, p. 67 n discusses the transfer.

16. Bowers, The Complete Works, I,75 suggests that Jones's 'copy did not contain this material; hence his virtuous defense of the omission of unsuitable scenes may very possibly be an attempt to anticipate criticism that they were not present, though acted'.
17. The Plays of Christopher Marlowe, edited by Roma Gill (1971), p. 52.
18. In Edmund Ironside (c. 1590), a Chorus explains why dumb shows are necessary for a battle scene:

I fain would have you understand the truth
And see the battles acted on the stage,
But that their length will be too tedious;
Then in dumb-shows I will explain at large
Their fights, their flights, and Edmund's victory.

(ll. 968-72 in Six Early Plays Related to the Shakespeare Canon, edited by E.B. Everitt and R.L. Armstrong, Anglistica XIV (Copenhagen, 1965).)

William A. Armstrong in Marlowe's Tamburlaine: The Image and the Stage, University of Hull Inaugural Lecture (Hull, 1966), p. 6 suggests that among the possible influences of Legge's Richardus Tertius may be the absence of battles from the stage.

Also relevant may be the claim in the Prologue to The Wars of Cyrus (if it is after Tamburlaine), published in 1594, that 'shewes' (l. 15) have been banished. F.P. Wilson, The English Drama 1485-1585, Oxford History of English Literature, Volume IV, Part I (Oxford, 1969), p. 148 does not think dumb shows are meant, although the play's editor, J.P. Brawner (Urbana, 1942), pp. 125-6, assumes they are.

Marlowe's only dumb show occurs in the 1616 Doctor Faustus but in Tamburlaine, one stage direction approximates one (III.ii.65ff) and the episode in Part Two (IV.iii) with the 'pampered jades of Asia' seems to be derived from a dumb show preceding the first act of Jocasta, acted in 1566. The penultimate line of the Prologue to Part One, 'View but his picture in this tragic glass' (l. 7), might be pointing to some symbolic spectacle of prefiguration. Bent Sunesen, 'Marlowe and the Dumb Show', ES, 35 (1954), 241-53 discusses reasons why Marlowe's dramaturgy did not require dumb shows.

19. C.F. Tucker Brooke, The Life of Marlowe and 'The Tragedy of Dido Queen of Carthage' (1930), p. 44.
20. Bullough II, 444.
21. W.W. Greg, A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration, 4 vols (1939-59), III, 1196.
22. Wilson, p. 19.
23. H.D., pp. 23-31, 33.
24. H.D., pp. 26-9, 33.
25. H.D., pp. 319-22.

26. Tucker Brooke, p. 45.
27. Battenhouse, p. 258.
28. D.J. Palmer, 'Elizabethan Tragic Heroes' in Elizabethan Theatre, edited by John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, 9 (1966), p. 28.
29. Hunter (1954), p. 243.
30. Based on Clifford Leech, 'The Structure of Tamburlaine', Tulane Drama Review, 8 (1964), pp. 38-40.
31. Hunter (1954), p. 240.
32. Clifford Leech, 'The Two-Part Play: Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare', Shakespeare Jahrbuch, 94 (1958), p. 92.
33. Harry Levin, 'Marlowe Today', Tulane Drama Review, 8 (1964), p. 28. See above, note 27.
34. U.M. Ellis-Fermor, Christopher Marlowe (1927), p. 39.
35. Donald Peet, 'The Rhetoric of Tamburlaine', ELH, 26 (1959), p. 151.
36. J. Le Gay Brereton, 'Marlowe's Dramatic Art Studied in his Tamburlaine' in Writings on Elizabethan Drama, collected by R.G. Howarth (Melbourne, 1948), p. 76.
37. Helen L. Gardner, 'The Second Part of "Tamburlaine the Great"', MLR, 37 (1942), p. 19.
38. Alexander Leggatt, 'Tamburlaine's Sufferings', The Yearbook of English Studies, 3 (1973), p. 34.
39. Leech, 'The Structure of Tamburlaine', p. 40.
40. Susan Richards, 'Marlowe's Tamburlaine II: A Drama of Death', MLQ, 26 (1965), p. 384.
41. David M. Bevington, From 'Mankind' to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), p. 206.
42. Harry Levin, The Overreacher: A Study of Christopher Marlowe (1954), p. 53.
43. G.I. Duthie, 'The Dramatic Structure of Marlowe's "Tamburlaine the Great", Parts I and II', English Studies, n.s. 1 (1948), p. 105.
44. Based on Duthie, pp. 101-17. Warren D. Smith, 'The Substance of Meaning in Tamburlaine Part I', SP, 67 (1970), 156-66 has written on Part One in a similar manner. He calls the conflicting elements Mars and Venus.
45. Duthie, p. 118.
46. Duthie, p. 124.
47. The importance of Zenocrate to both Tamburlaine and Marlowe is considered from a psychoanalytical point of view by C.L. Barber, 'The Death of Zenocrate: "Conceiving and subduing both" in Marlowe's Tamburlaine', Literature and Psychology, 16 (1966), 15-24.

48. Leech, 'The Structure of Tamburlaine', pp. 45-61.
49. John D. Jump (ed.), Tamburlaine the Great, Parts I and II, RRDS (1967), pp. xxi-xxii.
50. See Wolfgang Clemen, English Tragedy before Shakespeare, translated by T.S. Dorsch (1961 reprinted 1967), pp. 126-9 for additional formal speeches in the play.
51. Bevington, p. 203.
52. Levin, The Overreacher, p. 51; The Plays of Christopher Marlowe, edited by Leo Kirschbaum (Cleveland, 1962), p. 12.
53. Tucker Brooke, p. 45.
54. M.C. Bradbrook, Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy (Cambridge, 1935 reprinted 1969), p. 143.
55. G.P. Baker, 'Dramatic Technique in Marlowe', Essays and Studies, 4 (1913), p. 174.
56. Hallett Smith, p. 129.
57. Ellis-Fermor (ed.), p. 26.
58. George Whetstone, The English Mirror (1586), p. 79.
59. See Thomas C. Izard, George Whetstone: Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters (N.Y., 1942), pp. 215-16 and 'The Principal Source for Marlowe's Tamburlaine', MLN, 58 (1943), pp. 411-17.
60. Ellis-Fermor's introduction (pp. 17-52) and notes contain a full treatment of sources. Later contributions include Battenhouse, pp. 129-49 and John Bakeless, The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe, 2 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), I, 204-38.
61. Irving Ribner, 'The Idea of History in Marlowe's Tamburlaine', ELH, 20 (1953), p. 251 n.
62. See Ellis-Fermor (ed.), pp. 41-3.
63. Ethel Seaton, 'Marlowe's Map', Essays and Studies, 10 (1921), p. 19.
64. Wilson, p. 34.
65. Wilson, p. 34.
66. Tucker Brooke, 'The Reputation of Christopher Marlowe', Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 25 (1922), pp. 365-73 assembles these contemporary references.
67. Leech, 'The Two-Part Play', p. 92.
68. Leggatt, p. 33.
69. Levin, The Overreacher, p. 53.
70. M.M. Mahood, Poetry and Humanism (1950), p. 63.
71. David Bevington, Tudor Drama and Politics (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), p. 213.
72. Levin, The Overreacher, p. 61 notes 1410 proper names of which 545 appear at the end of a line.
73. Part of the preceding paragraph is indebted to the excellent article by Donald Peet on the play's rhetoric.

CHAPTER III

The Influence of Tamburlaine on the Two-Part Play

Before Marlowe's death in 1593, several dramatic works attempted to achieve success with the form which he developed for Tamburlaine. These survive in Plot, manuscript, and quarto states and sometimes present considerable difficulties of date and authorship. Greene's Alphonsus, King of Aragon and the anonymous First Part of the Tragical Reign of Selimus were printed with concluding promises that a second part would be forthcoming. No evidence exists for supposing those promises to have been kept. Only the Plot is known for The First Part of Tamar Cham but Henslowe records frequent performances of Tamar Cham which he is often careful to designate as either Part One or Part Two. Alphonsus, Selimus, and Tamar Cham are all indebted for their subject as well as their form to the popularity of Tamburlaine. Their foreign heroes resemble and occasionally refer directly to Marlowe's protagonist as they rise in fortune through conquest. Some earlier English history plays also reveal the influence of Tamburlaine. A two-part play may have been intended by the author of Edmund Ironside, extant in manuscript, and in the year after the publication of Tamburlaine, The Troublesome Reign of King John was similarly printed in two parts although its length is less than 2900 lines. Before his death in 1592, Robert Greene may have followed the success of his Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay with a sequel known only through a garbled manuscript version; if written by Greene, John of Bordeaux also parallels the circumstances which encouraged Marlowe's unplanned continuation. It may have finally allowed him to write a dramatic sequel, after his plan to complete the history of Alphonsus in two parts was apparently denied him by the failure of his first play.

i. Alphonsus, King of Aragon

The evidence for dating Alphonsus and supposing it Greene's first theatrical work occurs in the Epistle preceding Perimedes (1588) in the same passage which helps to determine the date of Tamburlaine.¹ Greene speaks 'darkely' of an event which caused him some personal concern:

I keepe my old course, to palter up some thing
in Prose, using mine old poesie still, Omne tulit
punctum, although latelye two Gentlemen Poets,
made two mad men of Rome beate it out of their
paper bucklers: and had it in derision, for
that I could not make my verses jet upon the
stage in tragicall buskins, everie worde filling
the mouth like the faburden of Bo-Bell, daring
God out of heaven with that Atheist Tamburlan
... If I speake darkely, Gentlemen, and offend
with this digression, I crave pardon, in that I
but answeare in print, what they have offered on
the Stage.²

Neither the satirical play nor those responsible for deriding Greene's motto and his dramatic effort has been conclusively identified.³ That Alphonsus is the play in question is suggested by the derogatory reference to Marlowe's play which Alphonsus attempts to imitate. The quality of Greene's blank verse, decidedly inferior to that of his model, would easily be a target for such derision. Evidence suggesting that Alphonsus is Greene's first play may also be found in the text itself. The Prologue, spoken by Venus, indicates its author's awareness of venturing into a new species of writing:

I which was wont to follow Cupids games
Will put in ure Minervaes sacred Art,
And this my hand which used for to pen,
The praise of love, and Cupids peerles power,
Will now begin to treat of bloudie Mars,⁴
Of doughtie deeds and valiant victories.

Although styled on its title-page 'The Comicall Historie of Alphonsus, King of Aragon', the preceding lines point to a serious subject and hence the 'tragicall buskins' in which Greene sought to achieve success in his blank verse play.

Throughout his career, Greene depended on his ability to gauge accurately the tastes of his audience, repeatedly

satisfying them with popular pamphlet material. It appears that during the winter of 1587, when the accident which Gaudy reports perhaps forced Tamburlaine from the London stage, Greene sought to offer a play with comparable concentration on heroism and conquest. This kind of writing, perhaps in haste, was, however, alien to a talent developed in popular romance and he overestimated the impact of his largely experimental blank verse. He drew the ridicule of his contemporaries as the resulting literary accident was forced from the stage. He answered his critics in Perimedes with a spiteful attack on the morality of his model and so attempted to compensate for his inauspicious *début* as a playwright.

The affair would be even darker were it not for Thomas Creede who printed Alphonsus in 1599, seven years after Greene's death. His is the only extant edition of the play and the title-page observes that it was 'Made by R.G.'. Other plays by Greene or ascribed to him which posthumously issued from the press of Creede include 1 Selimus (1594), Lochrine (1595), A Looking Glass for London and England (1598), and James IV (1598).

The title-page notes also that the play 'hath bene sundrie times Acted'. This may be an attempt by the publisher to encourage sales, for no explicit references to the play's early stage history are known beyond Greene's own testimony. A reference has been sought in Peele's 'A Farewell to the Most Famous Generalles' in which he alludes to several plays:

Bid Theaters and proude Tragaedians,
 Bid Mahomets Poo, and mightie Tamburlaine,
 King Charlemaine, Tom Stukeley and the rest
 Adiewe.⁵

'Mahomets Poo' has been seen as an allusion to the brazen head of Mahomet which offers Delphic advice in IV.i of Alphonsus. Henslowe records the revival of a Mahomet play by the Admiral's Men and eight performances are listed between 14 August 1594 and 5 February 1594/5. It must have held some theatrical value in August 1601 when the Book was acquired from Edward Alleyn.⁶ This cannot be certainly equated with Alphonsus as it may be a lost play such as Peele's own The Turkish

Mahomet and Hiron the Fair Greek. One year before Creede's publication, another intriguing reference is found in Henslowe's inventory of 'owld Mahemetes head'.⁷ But it would seem desirable for Creede to call attention to the episode of Mahomet's brazen head by alternative title or other description on the title-page if both Peele and Henslowe, and perhaps the popular mind, associated Mahomet with Alphonsus.

The copy for the 1599 quarto of Alphonsus was probably Greene's own manuscript unaffected by theatrical use or later revision. The stage directions are persuasive evidence that the author was unsure of his staging; he offers tentative suggestions, includes literary descriptions, and leaves 'ghosts' in the entrance directions. Examples of these stage directions include:

After you have sounded thrise, let Venus be let downe from the top of the Stage, and when she is downe, say. (2-3)

Fausta rise up as it were in a furie, wake Amuracke and say. (1027-8)

Exit Venus. Or if you can conveniently, let a chaire come downe from the top of the stage, and draw her up. (2109-10)

The author of Alphonsus was evidently inexperienced in the staging of plays.

Greene chose for his subject the life of Alphonsus V of Aragon (1416-1458) who ruled Naples from 1442 until his death. He does not seem indebted to a particular authority for his plot and introduces many unhistorical situations and characters as well as magical and romance motifs within a mythological framework. In 1584, Greene had some awareness of an historical Alphonsus when he cites 'Alphonsus, the Prince of Aragon' without elaboration in the opening lines of the dedication to The Card of Fancy.⁸ But while writing the play, Greene did not look far beyond his main source which was Part One of Tamburlaine.

That Greene intended a two-part biographical play is shown in the Epilogue when Venus counsels her attendant Muses:

Meane time deare Muses, wander you not farre
 Foorth of the path of high Pernassus hill:
 That when I come to finish up his life,
 You may be readie for to succour me.
 Adieu deare dames, farwell Calliope.

(2104-8)

Although it was often his practice to promise sequels at the conclusion of his prose works, Greene is probably planning a continuation with Marlowe's success in mind. The correspondences between Alphonsus and 1 Tamburlaine are especially close, from their heroes' humble circumstances to the concluding preparations for royal marriages. It is likely that Greene was planning to introduce a new set of parallels to Marlowe's sequel that would lead to the death of Alphonsus and thus 'finish up his life'.

Greene's Alphonsus, like 2 Tamburlaine, is strongly dependent upon 1 Tamburlaine but where Marlowe's sequel is intellectually grounded on his earlier play for thematic reasons, Greene's imitation offers no such subtlety and restricts what natural dramatic instincts he possessed. A blind devotion to his model is particularly conspicuous throughout the first two acts. Like Tamburlaine, Greene's play is also formally divided into five acts with regular appearances from Venus before each stage in the rise of Alphonsus.

At the beginning of the play the hero is without much power and has few followers. Denied these by Flaminius's usurpation of his father's kingdom, he vows to return Aragon to its rightful rulers. He enlists Albinus to his cause just as Tamburlaine attracted Theridamas to his. Alphonsus soon joins Belinus (equivalent to Cosroe) who is preparing to defend his own interests against Flaminius. In her choric introduction to Act II, Venus offers a summary of her hero's progress and prepares for his further rise:

Thus from the pit of pilgrimes povertie,
Alphonsus ginnes by step and step, to climbe
 Unto the toppe of friendly Fortunes wheele,
 From banisht state as you have plainely seene,
 He is transformed into a souldiers life,

How he doth speed, and what doth him befall,
 Marke this our Act, for it doth shew it all.

(377-81, 390-1)

Before Alphonsus proceeds to his deserved crowns, the first stage direction of Act II describes his single combat with Flaminius, who is killed without speaking a word. A former enemy, Laelius, is soon won over to Alphonsus's side and affords a repeated parallel to Tamburlaine and Theridamas. As Tamburlaine won Persia for Cosroe and was named regent so Alphonsus is praised by Belinus and given Aragon as reward. The rebellion of Tamburlaine is copied in Alphonsus's boastful assertion of independent power, which he soon achieves when Belinus is driven to seek aid from the Turks.

John Clark Jordan has commented that 'there is, in reality, the play of Alphonsus, followed by the play of Amurack the Turk'.⁹ In the remaining three acts, Greene is slightly less servile in his dependence on Tamburlaine. After Alphonsus has rewarded his loyal followers with crowns, including that of the recently regained Aragon, he announces a more ambitious goal:

Alphonsus shall possesse the Diadem
 That Amurack now weares upon his head.

(827-8)

Much of the remainder of the play is centred on Amurack, his domestic affairs, and supernatural events which occur solely in his oriental domain. Amurack is Greene's answer to Marlowe's Bajazeth while his wife, Fausta, resembles Zabina, and their daughter, Iphigina, becomes equivalent to Zenocrate. One of Amurack's first commands is to dispatch the newly arrived Belinus to

the darksome grove,
 Where Mahomet this many a hundred yeare
 Hath prophesied unto our auncesters,
 To send me word and that most speedely,
 Which of us shall obtaine the victory.

(896-8, 906-7)

As an added preparation for his confrontation with Alphonsus, Amurack sends an attendant named Bajazet to a list of exotic lands which he rules. This list (910-12) is a feeble attempt to suggest geopolitics on a scale equivalent to that of Marlowe's play.

After the Turkish emperor is suddenly lulled to sleep by music, Greene introduces Medea, an enchantress, who arranges a séance with 'ceremonies belonging to conjuring' (939). Calchas, the augur of Homer's Achaians, rises from a trap door at her command, mildly protests at the disturbance, and is sent to 'the Destinies' to inquire

How Amurack shall speed in these his warres:

And when thou knowst the certaintie thereof,
By fleshlesse visions shewe it presently
To Amuracke, in paine of penaltie.

(962, 965-7)

It is soon revealed that Fausta is responsible for this supernatural soliciting. She and her daughter listen to Amurack, 'as it were in a dreame' (980-1), narrate the future victory of Alphonsus, an iconoclastic revenge for Mahomet's false prophecies, and the marriage of Iphigina to Alphonsus. At this final revelation, Fausta protests and is banished with her daughter. The play is padded by a review of these prophecies sixty lines later and more magic is introduced in Mahomet's Temple where a brazen head of the prophet provides ambiguous advice to Belinus (IV.i). Yet another picture of the future is presented by Carinus, whose happily prophetic dream promises glory for his son. The disguised Duke of Milan soon appears as a pilgrim and is also able to review Alphonsus's accomplishments before he is stabbed by the itinerant father.

When Greene eventually returns to his hero and Amurack's defiance of fate, his debt to Tamburlaine becomes 'as pervasive as in the earlier scenes. Prior to the arrival of Alphonsus, Amurack even names the Scythian hero as he addresses his forces:

remember with your selves,
 What foes we have, not mightie Tamburlaine,
 Nor souldiers trained up amongst the warres.

(1572-4)

Alphonsus's entry 'with a Canapie carried over him by three Lords, having over each corner a Kings head, crowned' (1582-3) is probably intended to rival the sensational spectacles staged in Tamburlaine. Both leaders claim Fortune as their ally: Alphonsus echoes Tamburlaine's

I hold the Fates bound fast in iron chains,
 And with my hand turn Fortune's wheel about.

(I.ii. 173-4)

with his own cruder version:

I clap up Fortune in a cage of gold,
 To make her turne her wheele as I thinke best.

(1614-15)

In order for Alphonsus to achieve victory, however, he must overcome not only Amurack and his contributory kings but also Fausta, now leading an army of Amazons, and Iphigina in single combat. Like Zenocrate, Iphigina fears concubinage but when the Turkish royal family is united in captivity and Carinus is reunited with his son, the marriage of Alphonsus and Iphigina is proclaimed to end the play. The father of the bride, like Marlowe's Soldan of Egypt, is spared and he promises as dowry the Turkish empire to his prospective son-in-law.

Of the promised second part of the play there is no trace but it seems probable, as Irving Ribner has suggested,¹⁰ that the author's intention was to present a conservative reply to the excesses of Tamburlaine. Ribner argues that Alphonsus is a champion of Christianity although that idea is mainly advanced indirectly through emphasis on his pagan antagonists. He avoids magic and superstition in regaining his crown. His principal motive is redress for the usurpation which has deprived both him and his father of their rightful titles. He is twice called the 'sonne and heire to olde Carinus' (416, 672) and in the final scene Amurack's recognition of his noble blood enables the unimpeded match with Iphigina:

What Amuracke thou dost deceive thy selfe,
Alphonsus is the sonne unto a King:
 What then? the worthy of thy daughters love.

(2068-70)

Alphonsus is not moved by the 'thirst of reign' or the 'sweetness of a crown' and he does not include violent slaughter of innocent victims among his military tactics.

Whatever Greene's intentions, the result cannot be said to have conveyed them effectively. J.C. Collins's description of the play as a 'phantasmagorical medley'¹¹ has been echoed by more recent critical judgements. 'Greene's absurd attempt to rival Tamburlaine'¹² must inevitably be measured against his model. Una Ellis-Fermor has spoken of the 'slender ... poetic territory the two poets held in common' and 'the wreckage Greene has made of Marlowe's poetry' by reducing 'the range of Marlowe's descriptive terms and images' to a few overworked words that rapidly become commonplace'.¹³

Apart from Greene's early experiments with magic and dreams, the influence of Alphonsus was mainly negative. Greene must have learned that his literary talents could not be realized by imitating the plot and dramatic language of a more skilful playwright. Although he attempted to introduce more familiar romance motifs into Alphonsus, he was unable to abandon a model to which he was unnaturally suited. The play is about 370 lines shorter than 1 Tamburlaine and has a mythological framework which adds little and occupies over 200 lines of verse. Much of the remainder is stalled by constant prophecy and repetitious explanation which Wolfgang Clemen has justly categorized as 'sheer reporting'.¹⁴ The failure of this attempted two-part play undoubtedly led Greene in the direction of romantic comedy where his achievements were more compatible with his previous literary experience in prose romance.

ii. Tamar Cham

The anonymous author of Tamar Cham was more fortunate than Greene in his imitation of Tamburlaine. Two parts of his play were frequently performed although neither was printed. A Plot of the first part is known but only through a transcript made in the early nineteenth century of the now lost original.¹⁵

That Tamar Cham is modelled on Marlowe's two-part play is apparent from its title as well as from its characters and action which correspond closely with those of 1 Tamburlaine. The earliest reference to the play occurs in Henslowe's Diary where the second part is offered as 'ne' on 28 April 1592.¹⁶ The first part must have been in existence before this date and may be as early as Alphonsus and a result of the same stimulus which prompted Greene's play.

The Plot has been dated by Greg c. 1602 on the evidence of the actors' names.¹⁷ Henslowe records that on 2 October of that year, Alleyn sold the Book to the Admiral's Men.¹⁸ In the Plot, he is designated as the actor of the title role which, recalling his earlier fame as Tamburlaine, suggests a further similarity between the two plays. A character in Blurt Master Constable (probably written a year before its publication in 1602) may confirm the ferocity of this oriental conqueror when he boasts: 'I scorn to run from the face of Thamer Cham'.¹⁹

Henslowe lists nine performances of Part One and ten performances of Part Two, none of them within six months of a Tamburlaine performance. Strange's Men presented Part Two six times at the Rose Theatre between the 'ne' performance on 28 April 1592 and 19 January 1592/3. The income for these six occasions averaged six shillings higher than for the eight performances of 2 Tamburlaine in 1594/5. Unlike 2 Tamburlaine, 2 Tamar Cham was often produced independently of its fore-piece presumably because its relationship was not as close.

When Alleyn rejoined the Admiral's, probably in 1594, he brought the play with him. Part One may have been revised for a performance marked 'ne' on 6 May 1596. It played alone successfully on four subsequent dates at weekly intervals. Part Two was reintroduced on 11 June 1596 and designated 'ne' for a second time when it was performed with Part One on consecutive days. During the next two weekly intervals, both parts were performed on consecutive days before receipts dropped below twenty shillings and the play was discontinued. In its brief span of recorded stage history, Tamar Cham seems to have

been a financial success although in consecutive performance the two parts do not show the same consistent popularity as Tamburlaine.²⁰

From the evidence of the Plot, W.W. Greg has been able to reconstruct the historical basis of the play. It appears that the hero is meant to represent Jenghis Khan, whose real name, Temuchin, may have provided the author 'an excuse for giving his play a title closely similar to that of the piece he sought to rival'.²¹ Greg also conjectures that the second part might be concerned with the Mongul successes in Russia and China. In any case the author's freedom with his subject is suggested by the presence of characters for whom no historical basis has been found.

Tamar Cham was early considered among the many imitations of Tamburlaine when the two titles were linked by Ben Jonson in his Discoveries (pub. 1641). He complains of

the Tamerlanes, and Tamer-Chams, of the late Age, which had nothing in them but the scenicall strutting, and furious vociferation, to warrant them then to the ignorant gapers.²²

A.J. Gurr suggests²³ they may have been considered together because of the actor who played their title roles. The plural certainly indicates Jonson's criticism of the acting style in these four plays if not in the other conquest plays as well.

It has not been noticed, however, how similar 1 Tamar Cham is to Alphonsus. Elements peculiar to Greene's play are regularly repeated although it may be possible that Greene imitated this play as well as 1 Tamburlaine. Like Greene, the author presents a chorus which appears on five occasions to divide the play into acts. The first character named in the Plot is Mango Cham, the historical grandson of Jenghis Khan, although he may function here as some other relative of the hero. Carinus is the first character introduced in Alphonsus. Tamar Cham also resembles Alphonsus in its use of magic. Spirits, of which two are named Diaphines and Ascalon, appear in II.i. At first they are visitors to Otanes, a follower of Tamar Cham, but they reappear in the

presence of other characters, including Tamar. In the penultimate scene of the play (V.ii) a mythological element is introduced in 'Pitho and linus 2 Satires: and 2 nymphes, Heron, and Thia'. An episode recalling Mahomet's brazen head can be recognized in the direction referring to Tarmia, the daughter of the King of Persia: 'To her the orracle speakes' (III.vi).

The play includes spectacles which rival those in Tamburlaine. One of them, in a central scene (III.iii), occurs when certain rebels are executed. That section of the Plot reads:

Exeunt Otanes and nobles
with the 3 Rebbells: To them Otanes: with a head.
To them Mr. Charles with an other head
To them Dick Jubie with an other head.
Exeunt.

There may be a relationship here to the stage direction in Alphonsus when he enters

with a Canapie carried over him by three Lords,
having over each corner a Kings head, crowned. (1582-3)

A far more colourful spectacle is intended in the final scene. The sequential entrance of 'Tartars', 'Geates', 'Amozins', 'Nagars', 'ollive cullord moores', 'Canniballs', 'Hermophrodites', 'people of Bohare', 'Pigmies', 'Crymms', 'Cattaians', and 'Bactrians' must have had a stunning effect on Elizabethan audiences. Whether the occasion for this scene is a marriage, like those announced at the conclusion of 1 Tamburlaine and Alphonsus, or a coronation is difficult to determine; it will be noted that Palmeda, a female part, is present for the procession. Twenty-four foreign visitors join the nine actors already on the stage. The author of this piece was determined to out-Herodotus Herodotus.

iii. Selimus

The 'Conclusion' in the printed text of 1 Selimus (1594) indicates that its author too was determined to elaborate the sensational elements of Tamburlaine. The play holds the

Elizabethan 'record for murders'²⁴ and more are confidently promised in a sequel:

Thus have we brought victorious Selimus,
 Unto the Crowne of great Arabia:
 Next shall you see him with triumphant sword,
 Dividing kingdomes into equall shares,
 And give them to their warlike followers.
 If this first part Gentles, do like you well,²⁵
 The second part, shall greater murthers tell.

The two-part plan is further emphasized by the title, which shares a conscious incompleteness with that of the bad quarto of 2 Henry VI published in the same year.²⁶ The title-page reads:

The First part of the Tragicall raigne of Selimus,
 sometime Emperour of the Turkes, and grandfather
 to him that now raigneth.

The publisher, Thomas Creede, notes that 'it was playd by the Queenes Majesties Players' but omits by initials or otherwise to hint at the name of the author. Neither the Stationers' Register nor Henslowe mentions Selimus and there is no evidence of the play's fortunes in performance which might suggest that the promised sequel was written.²⁷

Considerable effort on the part of several scholars has failed to make an unimpeachable case for single authorship. Robert Greene was the first to be associated with the play. Six passages from the play, totalling seventeen lines, are assigned to Greene in Robert Allot's Englands Parnassus (1600).²⁸ Unfortunately, Allot elsewhere errs in relation to Greene's works and so his attribution must be approached with caution.²⁹ Alexander Grosart, when he 'reclaimed' Selimus for Greene, endorsed Allot's ascription but weakened his case by citing dubious vocabulary parallels with Greene's other works.³⁰ On thematic grounds which will be considered later, Irving Ribner has explored reasons why Greene might have written Selimus as a second reply to Marlowe's Tamburlaine. While the only external evidence points to Greene, strong evidence in favour of the hand of Thomas Kyd, possibly as a reviser, may date certain lines of Selimus after Greene's death in September 1592.

Kyd's Cornelia, printed in 1594, was on his own evidence translated in 1593. One passage which Allot later selected closely follows Garnier's French and is nearly reproduced in Selimus. There can be little doubt as to the genesis of these lines. Kyd translates

Je l'aime chere mont, je l'aime; mais le droit
Qu'on doit à son pais, qu'à sa naissance on doit,
Toute autre amour surmonte..,

as

I love, I love him deerely. But the love
That men theyr Country and theyr birth-right beare
Exceeds all loves ...³¹

The lines in Selimus are almost identical:

I love, I love them dearly, but the love
Which I do beare unto my countries good,
Makes me a friend to noble Selimus.

(945-7)³²

Kyd's indirect influence at least must be acknowledged in such lines as

The unrevenged ghoast of Alemshae,
Shall now no more wander on Stygian bankes,
But rest in quiet in th' Elysian fields.

(714-16)

and

Shall Mahomet and poore Zonaras ghoasts,
And the good governour of Natolia
Wander in Stygian meadowes unreveng'd?

(1515-17)

Selimus is one of the most tantalizing pastiche plays in Elizabethan drama. In addition to the evidence which suggests Greene and Kyd as possible contributors, the author or authors of the play are clearly in debt to Seneca, Spenser, and Sidney and uncertain relationships exist in regard to Titus Andronicus and Lochrine, the latter printed anonymously by Creede in 1595. Charles Crawford has presented a remarkable list of indisputable echoes between Selimus and each of the seven plays accepted in the Marlowe canon. His unfortunate conclusion that Selimus

is Marlowe's first dramatic work is somewhat understandable in the face of so much intriguing evidence. The true position may be that the author was an unimaginative copier of Marlowe's work, possibly determined to deceive the public into thinking it the work of Marlowe, or perhaps someone exaggerating Marlovian ideas as a commentary on Tamburlaine. This leads to an unusual early attribution of the play.³³

Two extant manuscripts dated 1603 quote sixty-three lines from Selimus (305-67) and are headed 'Certaine hellish verses devysed by that Atheist and traitor Raleigh as it was said'.³⁴ Jean Jacquot has pointed out their ultimate source in Ovid and concluded that the speech spoken by Selimus has a specific dramatic function. That they could be lifted from a printed play for the purpose of defaming Raleigh has definite implications for Selimus. It may also be significant that the Baines Note describing Marlowe's alleged Atheist's Lecture seems to echo this speech. Selimus provides his own Atheist's lecture of 151 lines in which he analyzes religion's rewards 'for those that liv'd in quiet awe' (332).

And these religions observations,
Onely bug-beares to keepe the world in feare
And make men quietly a yoake to beare.

(335-7)

Baines accuses Marlowe of teaching that 'Religioun was only to keep men in awe' and 'willing them not to be afeard of bugbeares and hobgoblins'.³⁵ Irving Ribner associates the extra-dramatic use of Selimus with Greene's attack on 'that Atheist Tamburlan' in order to show why Greene might have written a play whose themes are otherwise alien to his other writings.³⁶ Greene may have attempted to expose the morality of Tamburlaine with a play in which the hero has no qualities to redeem his unnatural cruelty and blasphemous denial of religion. After unsuccessfully attempting the Christian imitation of Alphonsus, Greene chose the bolder method of an explicit thesis-drama. This reply to Tamburlaine was also intended through a two-part play.

Ribner's argument agrees with the moral tone of the title-page:

Wherein is showne how hee most unnaturally raised warres against his owne father Bajazet, and prevailing therein, in the end caused him to be poysoned: Also with the murthering of his two brethren, Corcut, and Acomat.

The Prologue further announces that

Here shall you see the wicked sonne pursue
His wretched father with remorslesse spight.

(11. 6-7)

Before his death, Corcut explains his recent conversion to Christianity and provides a choric warning to his brother:

Selim before his dreadfullmajestie,
There lies a booke written with bloudie lines,
Where our offences all are registred.
Which if we do not hastily repent,
We are reserv'd to lasting punishment.

Thy soule shall be tormented in darke hell,
Where woe, and woe, and never ceasing woe,
Shall sound about thy ever-damned soule.

(2152-6, 2167-9)

Yet Selimus proceeds through Part One without injury or setback and the 'Conclusion' quoted above seems to celebrate rather than criticize this progress. More direct morality elements would no doubt be forthcoming in the sequel when Selimus must die. He contemplates no such obstacles in the final speech of the play which previews the setting of his anticipated conquests:

those Soldanes of the Orient,
Aegypt and Persia, Selimus will quell,

This winter will we rest and breath our selves:
But soone as Zephyrus sweete smelling blast
Shall greatly creep over the flourie meades,
Wee'll have a fling at the Aegyptian crowne,
And joyne it unto ours, or loose our owne.

(2548-9, 2551-5)

Unlike Marlowe, the author of Selimus has reserved some historical episodes for his sequel. His sources, which probably include a version of Paolo Giovio's Turkish commentaries and Chapter 59 of la Primaudaye's French Academy (1586),³⁷

were not followed closely although the major events cited on the title-page were historically true. The ubiquity of literary parallels in the play points to several sources of direct inspiration; foremost among these was Tamburlaine. Lines from both parts of Marlowe's play are often echoed and his hero is mentioned by name three times during the last third of the play. Bajazet, the father of Selimus, recalls the fate of

That wofull Emperour first of my name,
Whom the Tartarians locked in cage,
To be a spectacle to all the world,
Was ten times happier then I am.
For Tamberlaine the scourge of nations,
Was he that puld him from his kingdome so.

(1753-8)

Another heroic genealogy is brought forward by Tonombey who swears by

the great Usancassanos ghoast,
Companion unto mightie Tamberlaine,
From whom my father lineally descends,

(2344-6)

that he will support Acomat's claim to the throne of Turkey. Selimus later confuses Tonombey's heritage when he taunts the 'Captaine of Aegypt, ... / Sprung from great Tamberlaine the Scythia theefe' (2438-9).

Similar to 1 Tamburlaine, Alphonsus, and 1 Tamar Cham, the play ends with its hero in triumph. Unlike those plays, however, there is no trace of romantic interest. The three women who appear in the play are all strangled at Selimus's command. Additional acts of violence, including the blinding of Aga and the lopping off of his hands on stage, are intended to exaggerate the violent world of conquest. The staging of the sieges seems derived from Marlowe. The only clear relationship with Alphonsus is a setting in the Temple of Mahomet (2021), but nothing is made of it.

The structural achievements of Tamburlaine went unnoticed by the author of Selimus. The printed text is unmarked by either act or scene divisions and contains, according to the

Malone Society Reprint of the play, thirty-one apparent sections, fifteen of which are less than fifty lines in length. The play displays many of the elements of Tamburlaine but partially because it is 'bogged down in set speeches ...

it reveals with especial clarity the defective sense of proportion that marks so many branches of early Elizabethan literature, the utter lack of balance and harmony between the various component parts of a work.³⁸

With Selimus, as well as the conqueror plays of Alphonsus and Tamar Cham, the two-part form is directly related to Marlowe. This biographical approach to the foreign history play was restricted to the rise and fall of a single man and thus limited to a single focus of attention. It is fairly certain that the unknown and perhaps unwritten sequels to Alphonsus and Selimus would not have superceded the influential status of Tamburlaine. Heroes for these derivative foreign histories were somewhat awkwardly recruited from Italy, China, and Turkey. Their relative lack of success, however, points at once to the special achievement of their model both in its characteristics, which could not be simply imitated, and in its significant place in the development of Marlowe as a playwright. After the Spanish Armada spurred aspiring dramatists to use English history for their subject matter, the chronicle play seems also to have felt the influence of Tamburlaine.

iv. English History Plays

Two anonymous plays, Edmund Ironside and The Troublesome Reign of King John, may show the two-part form of Marlowe's play extending into the English history play. The former is extant in manuscript while the latter was printed in two parts in 1591. Both plays may be discussed in less detail than the more direct imitations of Tamburlaine.

Although no formal epilogue, like those in Alphonsus and Selimus, promises a sequel, the conclusion of Edmund Ironside suggests a tentative resolution and the author's intention to

continue the story. The play ends with the reconciliation between the English forces under Ironside and the Danes under Canutus with strong hints that this precarious balance of power 'holds within it the seeds of woes to come'.³⁹ Leofric will 'wait upon occasion for revenge'⁴⁰ and Edricus, whose loyalties are upset by this peaceful compromise, also vows a part in its destruction:

Thus wise men can dissemble what they think,
And till occasion fits them, sleeping wink,
But I have sworn and I will keep my vow:
By Heaven, I'll be revenged on both of you!

(ll. 2057-60)

On the basis of this speech, the tentative peace established between Ironside and Canutus, and three entries in Henslowe's Diary, it has been suggested that the play (which is dated c. 1590) was a first part. Henslowe records ownership of a play with the title 'Hardicanewtes' in 1598 and performances of 'hardicute' and 'knewtus' in late October and early November of 1597.⁴¹

Henslowe may be using alternative titles for the same play, but as Hardicanute is the yet unborn son of Canutus, the possibility of a sequel must be allowed. No other evidence for a two-part play is available although the manuscript is known to have been used for a revival, probably independently, several decades after its composition.⁴² If a sequel carried the fortunes of Anglo-Saxon history beyond the reigns of the protagonists of Edmund Ironside, it indicates a departure from the single hero of Tamburlaine and its progeny. As in Shakespeare's early Histories, the state of England would become a concern which transcended the rise and fall of individual temporal leaders.

More certain and somewhat different evidence for the influence of Marlowe's Tamburlaine is found in the quartos of 1 and 2 The Troublesome Reign of King John printed in 1591. No author is named on the title-pages and E.A.J. Honigmann's view⁴³ that it is a Shakespearean bad quarto has not been widely accepted. There is no certain literary or theatrical reason why the play was divided into two parts and Bale's play is a very unlikely influence for it. This design was

probably intended to attract the reading audience who had been offered the two parts of Tamburlaine in the previous year. The success of that publication may have encouraged the suspicious publication by Sampson Clarke who 'having secured a single play ... attempted to make double profit out of it'.⁴⁴ The Troublesome Reign is the only play published by Clarke and only the second English play to name the company who performed it. A further reason for its publication in two parts may be a desire to rival the status given to the Admiral's Company by the publication of Tamburlaine, the first English play to include its company on a title-page. The same printer, Thomas Orwin, may be responsible for both Tamburlaine and The Troublesome Reign.⁴⁵

The Troublesome Reign of King John is less than 2900 lines but it is divided by a title-page which announces 'The Second part of the troublesome Raigne of King John'⁴⁶ and shares typographical features of presentation with the first title-page while indicating again performances by 'the Queenes Majesties Players', its printer and his place of business, and the date. A different printers' device fills the central portion of this second title-page. The speech before this division concludes with the words: 'The ende of the first part' (sig. G4v). To increase further the impression of two full-length plays, verses 'To the Gentlemen Readers' are prefixed before each part. This seems to be a compromise which incorporates the similarly addressed statement by Richard Jones and the separate prologues before each part of Tamburlaine. The verses may have been specially written for publication.

To attract readers, the first epistle gives special attention to the English subject of the play and special place to him as a Christian counterpart to Tamburlaine.

You that with friendly grace of smoothed brow
 Have entertained the Scythian Tamburlaine,
 And given applause unto an Infidel:
 Vouchsafe to welcome (with like curtesie)
 A warlike Christian and your Countreyman.
 Accept of it (sweete Gentles) in good sort,
 And thinke it was preparte for your disport.

(sig. A2)

The second part of the play (which is bibliographically independent) is also introduced 'To the Gentlemen Readers'. These verses do little more than describe the major events advertised on the previous page. The death of King John, already announced on both of the title-pages, is the principal subject of these lines. Part Two resumes with action which follows closely on that of Part One. It is possible that this point marked an interval in performance; the play is somewhat longer than is typical of its period.

Alphonsus, Tamar Cham, and Selimus were planned in imitation of Tamburlaine in the hope of sharing the sudden success of Marlowe's two-part play. This motive cannot be considered unusual. In the case of The Troublesome Reign of King John, however, its printed version claims to be something which it is not and its two-part nomenclature cannot be explained as a legitimate alternative to division, for instance, into acts. In subsequent editions of the play, printed with continuous signatures, an additional claim was made. The 1611 quarto was issued as the work of 'W.Sh.' and eleven years later those initials were expanded - just one year before publication of King John in the First Folio.

v. John of Bordeaux

A manuscript play lacking its title-page but known as John of Bordeaux is a further example of the influence of Tamburlaine. Apart from the Turkish material which forms a political background to its main romantic plot, John of Bordeaux is a sequel to Greene's Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay. Its author is most likely Robert Greene who, it seems, wrote an unplanned continuation to his most popular play. Recalling his unsuccessful plans for Alphonsus, the irony is remarkable.

Although there is no external authority which assigns the play to Greene, the internal evidence is persuasive, for within the abridged and confused text of John of Bordeaux, his hand is apparent. Since the Malone Society Reprint of the play

edited by W.L. Renwick 'in consultation with' W.W. Greg, their view that 'Greene's authorship is on the whole probable'⁴⁷ has been endorsed in further detail by Waldo McNeir and by a recent editor of Friar Bacon.⁴⁸

McNeir has added to and expanded the evidence for Greene's authorship set forth in W.L. Renwick's introduction.⁴⁹ He first notes that both Elizabethan dramatic and nondramatic sequels were almost exclusively offered by authors following up their own successes. Friar Bacon is unquestionably the work of Greene and probably his most popular play. Greene's prose works such as Mamillia (1580, 1583), Morando (1584, 1587), and the cony-catching pamphlets (1591-2) show his proclivity for producing continuations and linking a series of publications with the same title and when Tamburlaine provided a precedent, this practice was carried over to his first dramatic effort.

The close relationships between John of Bordeaux and Friar Bacon are a stronger reason for seeing the responsibility of the same author for both plays. Most important is the return of Friar Bacon, now old, but still in possession of his magical skills and capable of bringing a series of complications under his control as an agent of reconciliation. Friar Bacon offers no important anticipations of future events or hints that the hero will visit Germany at a later date. In John of Bordeaux, however, there are repeated references back to the earlier play. The links are particularly strong at the beginning where many allusions are directly related to previous incidents. Bacon is received by the Emperor of Germany who had visited him in Oxford. Frederick's welcome by Bacon 'at</oxford in thi howse of brassenos' (23-24) seems a warm memory which he is anxious to repay. Vandermast is less cordial as he remembers:

when I in England was. yor grace can tell<
 he sett me on a [stead] Jade that posted
 me in hast from Albion
 a vengance and a wherlwind brought me home.

(34-36)

Vandermast is here recalling his failure to better Bacon's magic and his sudden disappearance and return to Germany as a result. In John of Bordeaux Bacon emphasizes that he 'isould and age can not / be blith for many yeares must meditat on sin' (43-44). These words confirm the temporal relation to Friar Bacon and recall his speech of repentance in scene xiii of that play. The first scene of the sequel thus assumes some previous introduction to the English necromancer and is able to devote more of its exposition to the Turkish threat, the status of John of Bordeaux, his family who will be prominent in the main plot, and the hint that Vandermast will once again prove an antagonist to Bacon.

Frederick, Friar Bacon, and Vandermast are the only characters who reappear in the sequel. A number of others, however, have predecessors in Friar Bacon. Perce, Bacon's comic companion, replaces Miles who was destined for hell when he left Friar Bacon on a devil's back; both share a delight in idiosyncratic Latin. The spirit, Asteroth, is also recalled for duty in John of Bordeaux. He retains Greene's assignment of him as a representative of the north (1132), a tag which seems peculiar to Greene.⁵⁰ A similarly peculiar assignment is the distinction between Phobeter and Icelon (445-6) which repeats Greene's misinterpretation of Ovid in Menaphon.⁵¹

McNeir assembles a variety of stylistic resemblances between John of Bordeaux and Greene's known works.⁵² All of these strengthen the case for Greene's authorship. Among the many parallels of incident in Greene's works, those concerning Alphonsus are of particular interest here. Because the prospective glass was irreparably damaged in Friar Bacon, Bacon provides an alternative device to show Frederick the battle between the Turks and the forces led by John of Bordeaux. This scene (vi) closely resembles Amurack's vision induced by Medea through Calchas. Bacon conjures with like success; Greene's growing fondness for visual spectacle replaces the narration offered by Amurack in Alphonsus. A dumb show is indicated (447) and the battle is simultaneously staged just as were the events introduced to the audience through the

prospective glass in Friar Bacon. The banishment of Fausta and Iphigina which immediately follows Amurack's dream is paralleled by the banishment of John of Bordeaux and his family as the result of Frederick's dream. Both incidents are used to move the plot toward the main conflict which is resolved at the end of the play. Another general resemblance with Alphonsus is the characterization of a Turkish adversary who proudly threatens a Christian hero. McNeir is tempted to suggest that

possibly the Oriental matter in John of Bordeaux represents a hasty refurbishing of some of the material that he [Greene] had planned to use in the promised but undelivered sequel to his Alphonsus.⁵³

But none of the Turkish material is particularly innovative and its place in the play is decidedly secondary to the love intrigue.

Material which seems related directly to Selimus also enters the play. W.L. Renwick notes that three names, Amurath, Selimus, and Cali Bassa, come from Selimus but unaccountably omits Selimus in his list of characters (pp. ix, xv). McNeir does not mention this possible relationship to a play ascribed by some critics to Greene. The best explanation is that they represent typical Turkish names rather than an intentional borrowing from another play. Selimus in John of Bordeaux is the 'littell' (187) son of Amurath who is impersonated by Asteroth so that Bacon can escape Turkish captivity and steal some oriental clothing. Neither he nor the scene in which he appears (iii) bears any real relationship to the play of his name, which may have been written later.

The nature of the manuscript prevents an accurate parallel analysis such as was attempted with the printed texts of both parts of Tamburlaine. Renwick observes that 'the play takes its place among the group of plays with corrupt and shortened texts' (p. ix). A whole scene (xvi) is merely represented by the direction 'Enter the seane of the whiper' (1058). This, in addition to the direction following the conjuring for Frederick's dream, 'Exent Bacon/

to bring in the shows as you knowe' (446-7), and one calling for 'the show of Lucre' (1267) indicate that the company who used the manuscript as a prompt-book was familiar with it from previous performances. It appears to have been hastily transcribed from dictation by an uneducated scribe, with errors typical of this practice in abundance; verse is continually written as prose and punctuation is rare. Harry R. Hoppe has made a thorough investigation of speech-ascriptions, mishearings, repetitions, and other corruptive influences.⁵⁴ Henry Chettle rescued one hiatus by filling a space (1089f) left for a speech which could not be provided to the scribe. A similar gap (1119f) was never completed.⁵⁵

Explanations for the state of the manuscript suggest a memorial reconstruction, possibly for a travelling company,⁵⁶ which may have been the Queen's Men or one that acquired the play from them.⁵⁷ The comic scenes seem to be expanded perhaps 'to insure popularity with a provincial audience'.⁵⁸ Damage to the original prompt-book may have led to the reconstruction or, as Hoppe suggests, it may have been assembled during the absence of principal actors from a company who had been familiar enough with the text to play without it.⁵⁹

With the deficiencies of the manuscript in mind, a limited discussion of the structure is possible. Renwick recognizes eighteen scenes of which the third, concerning the Turkish material, and the last, which resolves the various complications, are well above the average lengths of the others. There are four entirely comic scenes (v, vii, xii, and the missing 'whiper' scene xvi) controlled by Perce. After the first scene, containing Bacon's welcome and an introduction to the political necessity of containing the militant Turks, the serious scenes follow a regular pattern and alternate between the fortunes of John of Bordeaux and the pursuit of his wife Rossalind, by Frederick's son Ferdinand, with the help of Vandermast. These separate plots coalesce after the banishment of John of Bordeaux which results in the independent itinerant exile of Rossalind and her children. Bacon becomes involved in Rossalind's cause and emerges at the end of the

play as the protector of innocence and the punisher of wrongdoing. His control of the final scene after a miraculous escape balances his central position as a celebrated visitor to the court in the first scene. His fortunate presence is approved by all except Vandermast who is punished with madness for his part in the illicit wooing.

With the exception of the comic scenes which, as noted by Renwick, are 'out of normal proportion to the rest of the play' (p. viii), the design of John of Bordeaux closely follows that of Greene's Friar Bacon. Here, as in its sequel, two plots are developed in parallel fashion with occasional overlap until Bacon effects the resolution. The dependence is not as strong as Marlowe's in 2 Tamburlaine but his 'tragicall discourses' are vastly different in purpose and scope from Greene's romantic comedies. The structure of the love plot in John of Bordeaux is closer than its political material to Greene's earlier play, and the early development of these love plots may profitably be compared.

Friar Bacon opens with Lacy's notice of Prince Edward's 'melancholie dumpe'.⁶⁰ Edward admits his attraction to Margaret, extols her beauty in Petrarchan terms, and praises her mien of pastoral simplicity. His friends contribute sympathy and suggestions and Edward concludes

it must be nigromaticke spels,
And charmes of art that must inchaine her love.

(125-6)

and prepares to

horse us in the morne,
And post to Oxford to this jolly Frier,
Bacon shall by his magicke doe this deed.

(128-30)

A provisional plan assigns Lacy to woo by proxy as a disguised farmer's son.

The love plot in John of Bordeaux develops along similar lines. Prince Ferdinand is presented with 'his toe frend ij noble men' (72), one of whom inquires 'what Cher my lord what

over clad in dumpes' (73). The lord refers again to Ferdinand's 'sollom dumpe' (84) before the lover admits its cause as

fayer Rossa<>ross<
 the fayer to fayer be case her fayernes is so
 chast, I Cort
 she coye I tell my grefful playnte but all my
 Lov is buried up in
 loss Counsell how to obtayne a Dame so fayer.

(96-99)

The suggestion 'trie art my Lord goe unto vandermast' (102) is quickly adopted by the Prince whose faith in Vandermast's 'spells' (107) somewhat alleviates his melancholy.

The romantic material in Friar Bacon represents innocent love in the English countryside. The sequel inaugurates an illicit love intrigue in a foreign setting which requires the skills of Vandermast. In the first scene, Bacon's welcome to Germany had stressed his friendship with John of Bordeaux. Vandermast is implicitly re-established as an adversary to Bacon when his name becomes associated in Ferdinand's plan to seduce John's wife. Vandermast's magic is foiled by Bacon who is unable, however, to prevent the banishment of both John and his wife for apparent treason. Their separate wanderings and Perce's intermittent comedy are the focus of several scenes which replace the Oxford events and subsidiary love plots of Friar Bacon. The sequel is concerned with the unification of John and his wife and the clarification of John's loyalty for which Bacon and his magic are the principal agents.⁶¹

In looking at the prose source for Friar Bacon it becomes clear that Greene chose incidents from The Famous Historie of Frier Bacon that had the most dramatic potential. These include the episode of the brazen head, the contest with Vandermast, and the deaths which cause Bacon to break the glass prospective. The source was not exhausted as there remain fourteen additional episodes, most of them unlinked to a chronological narrative. The unused stories, however, are well below those chosen as far as interest and opportunity for

spectacle are concerned. This may suggest that John of Bordeaux, like 2 Tamburlaine, was an unplanned sequel that looked first to its forerunner for additional inspiration.

As McNeir has shown,⁶² the author of John of Bordeaux consulted Greene's probable source for Friar Bacon. Beyond minor suggestions, very little was found that could be used in Bacon's unauthorized visit to Germany except that Vandermast was returned there after his ignominious failure to better Bacon's magic in Oxford. A revenge motif and a rematch thus suggested themselves to the playwright. This would mean an older Bacon and require a good reason for him to resume the practices which the prose romance and the earlier play make clear he had renounced. Vandermast's villainy supplied a good motive for the resumption of Bacon's magic which in turn could be a source of further spectacle in a sequel. The author is thus able to re-use devices which had proved successful in Friar Bacon and tint them with humanitarian purposes to contrast with Vandermast's determination to regain his reputation. The love plot and the Turkish threat were stock dramatic material which could be easily recast into romantic comedy. A happy ending would not require any comment about Bacon's death which is reported soon after his repentance in The Famous Historie.

The close contacts between John of Bordeaux and Friar Bacon suggest a date for the sequel not distant from its forerunner. Friar Bacon is assigned to 1589 on the strength of its post-Armada patriotism, a calendar reference to St James Day which agrees with 1589, and several other details, none of them definite, that point to that date.⁶³ Before Greene's death, Henslowe records its performance as an old play on 19 February, 25 March, 26 April, and 6 May 1592. The receipts were modest for these four performances and for three more in the following January, all played by the Strange's Men at the Rose Theatre. The Queen's Men and Sussex's Men jointly staged the play twice in April 1594.⁶⁴ Friar Bacon was first entered in the Stationers' Register in May 1594⁶⁵ and printed that year 'As it was plaid by her Majesties servants', the company responsible for its most recent performances.

Neither Henslowe's references to Friar Bacon nor the 1594 quarto describes it as a first part. Since Henslowe is often careful in identifying first and second parts, Renwick's conjecture (p. viii) that two Friar Bacon plays are meant by Henslowe's entries is unlikely, although the question of ownership remains a difficult one.⁶⁶ The name of John Holland, associated with the Strange's Men, appears three times in the manuscript of John of Bordeaux and it is on this evidence that he believes it possible that Henslowe's first seven records of a Friar Bacon play may refer to John of Bordeaux. The certainty that the sequel was performed and the strong possibility that its author was Robert Greene suggest only that it may have been originally associated with the Queen's Men shortly after the original success of Friar Bacon and that it was either unavailable or unwanted when Henslowe revived Friar Bacon in 1592.

Due to its unfortunate state of preservation and its absence from Henslowe's Diary and other contemporary records, it is difficult to determine how John of Bordeaux may have contributed to the contemporary respect given to Greene as a writer of comedy. In 1592 Henry Chettle, himself a contributor to the manuscript for one speech, praised Greene as 'the only Comedian of a vulgar writer in this country'.⁶⁷ In 1598 Francis Meres wrote that Greene was 'the best for Comedy amongst us'.⁶⁸ His achievement and influence in this genre have been acknowledged by modern critics on the basis of Friar Bacon and James IV. If the verse of John of Bordeaux was preserved in a condition nearer to its original form and a printed version or other reliable authority attributed the play to Greene, its historical value in the development of English drama might receive more notice. Despite its condition, the play's materials are lively and varied: the staging is at times spectacular, the structure is competent, and the motivations are consistent. The interest of Friar Bacon is not exhausted by his reappearance and John of Bordeaux makes a suitable central figure. Rosalind has affinities with Greene's other well-drawn heroines. Whether or not John of Bordeaux originally showed a ripening of its author's dramatic use of

blank verse, it confirms at least his dexterity with separate plots which proceed through varied complications to a satisfying conclusion.

T.W. Baldwin has remarked that 'Bacon is as much a landmark in comedy as Tamburlaine is in tragedy'.⁶⁹ Both of these plays as well as The Spanish Tragedy⁷⁰ were followed by sequels that were unlikely to have been planned before the original plays were first performed. Shakespeare's early series of English history plays represents a fourth area of innovative and influential dramatic activity which was established with more than one play. These categories of biographical drama, romantic comedy, revenge tragedy, and chronicle history called attention to themselves by extending characters, situations, and themes beyond the theatrical requirements of single performance.

Tamburlaine seems to have led some dramatists to consider the two-part play as a formula for success. Alphonsus, Selimus, and possibly Edmund Ironside were written in the hope that the same reception which was instantly given to 1 Tamburlaine would allow their authors an opportunity to rival Marlowe's achievement. The decision to write a sequel allowed him to increase the range of his youthful talents in tragedy. It is uncertain whether Greene similarly profited when he found his medium in romantic comedy and was encouraged to redevelop the materials of his most popular play. Whether or not the early form of The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth was in two parts, as has often been suggested,⁷¹ the sequence of history plays which begins with that King's funeral also contributed a new direction to Elizabethan drama and encouraged its author to explore and develop his own youthful talents. Greene was dead by early September 1592 and Marlowe was dead within another nine months but by that time Shakespeare had found early success with the Henry VI plays.

Notes to Chapter III

1. The views taken here agree with Chambers, E.S. III, 327 and N.J. Sanders, 'An Edition of Greenes Farewell to Folly and Alphonsus, King of Aragon' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1957).
2. Robert Greene, The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse, edited by Alexander B. Grosart, The Huth Library, 15 vols (1881-6 reprinted N.Y., 1964), VII, 7-8.
3. T.W. Baldwin, On the Literary Genetics of Shakspeare's Plays, 1592-1594 (Urbana, 1959), p. 33 identifies the 'Gentlemen Poets' as Marlowe and Munday and the play as the lost Heliogabalus, entered in the Stationers' Register on 19 June 1594 (Arber II, 654).
4. Robert Greene, Alphonsus King of Aragon, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1926), ll. 38-43. All references are to this edition.
5. The Life and Minor Works of George Peele, edited by David H. Horne (New Haven, 1952), ll. 20-3.
6. H.D., pp. 23-7, 180.
7. H.D., p. 319. The prop may have served in 1 Tamar Cham.
8. Works IV, 5.
9. John Clark Jordan, Robert Greene (N.Y., 1915), p. 191.
10. Irving Ribner, 'Greene's Attack on Marlowe: Some Light on Alphonsus and Selimus', SP, 52 (1955), 162-71.
11. The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene, edited by J. Churton Collins, 2 vols (Oxford, 1905), I, 73.
12. Kenneth Muir, 'Robert Greene as Dramatist' in Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig, edited by Richard Hosley (Columbia, Missouri, 1962), p. 46.
13. Una Ellis-Fermor, 'Marlowe and Greene: A Note on Their Relations as Dramatic Artists' in Studies in Honor of T.W. Baldwin, edited by Don Cameron Allen (Urbana, 1958), pp. 139-40.
14. Wolfgang Clemen, English Tragedy before Shakespeare, translated by T.S. Dorsch (1961 reprinted 1967), p. 179.
15. References are to Greg, Documents I, no. VII.
16. H.D., p. 18.
17. Greg, Documents II, 161.
18. H.D., pp. 205, 217.
19. The Works of Thomas Middleton, edited by A.H. Bullen, 8 vols (1885-6), I, I.ii.173. References to the Great Cham occur in The Jew of Malta (IV.vi), Much Ado About Nothing (II.i), Old Fortunatus (I.ii), The Shoemaker's Holiday (V.v), and Satiromastix (V.ii) although the play of that name may not necessarily be meant.

20. Based on H.D., pp. 18,19,36,37,47,48,54.
21. Greg, Documents II,162.
22. Ben Jonson, Discoveries 1641 and Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden 1619, edited by G.B. Harrison, The Bodley Head Quartos (1923), p. 33.
23. A.J. Gurr, 'Who Strutted and Bellowed?', SS 16 (1963), p. 96.
24. M.C. Bradbrook, Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy (Cambridge, 1935 reprinted 1969), p. 18.
25. All quotations are from the MSR edition by W. Bang and W.W. Greg (Oxford, 1908).
26. In 1638 the unsold stock was issued with a new title-page ascribing the play to T.G. These initials have been taken to represent Thomas Goffe who was born in 1591 and whose Turkish tragedies were in print in the 1630s. One of them, The Courageous Turk (1632), used Selimus as a source.
27. Samuel C. Chew, The Crescent and the Rose (N.Y.,1937), p. 493 notes the existence in manuscript of a Latin play by George Salterne called Tomumbeius sive Sultanici in Aegypto Imperii Eversio. It has few virtues and probably no literary relation to Selimus except that it deals with the fortunes of Selim I in Egypt. Annals, p. 54 dates it 1590, with limits 1580-1603.
28. Allot uses ll. 499-505, 1388-9, 1395, 35-6, 849-53, and 454-5 in that order.
29. See the MSR introduction, p. vi.
30. See the preface to The Tragical Reign of Selimus, edited by Alexander B. Grosart (1898).
31. Thomas Kyd, The Works, edited by Frederick S. Boas (Oxford, 1901), p. 136, IV.i.63-5. Garnier's French is found in Arthur Freeman, Thomas Kyd, Facts and Problems (Oxford, 1967), p. 169 n.
32. First pointed out by Charles Crawford, Englands Parnassus (Oxford, 1913), pp. 399-400. Freeman, p. 169 n believes it possible 'that Selimus was partly composed or revised by Kyd'. T.W. Baldwin, Literary Genetics, pp. 225-6 discusses the problem and concludes that the author of Selimus, which he dates 1592, is himself translating from Garnier.
33. Kenneth Muir, 'Robert Greene as Dramatist', p. 46. n has pointed out a borrowing from Astrophel and Stella in lines 283-4. The reference is to sonnet 23, line 13. In an earlier article, 'Who Wrote Selimus?', Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society (Literary and Historical Section), 6 (1948-52), 373-6, he introduced Greville as a possible contributor. For the influence of Spenser and the parallels to Lochrine and Marlowe, see Charles Crawford, 'Edmund Spenser, Lochrine and Selimus'; N&O, 104 (1901), pp. 61-3, 101-3, 142-4, 203-5, 261-3, 324-5. For a recent review of Crawford's conclusions, see Baldwin Maxwell, Studies in the Shakespeare Apocrypha (N.Y.,1956), pp. 52-63, 66-71, 202-3, 208-12.

34. They are printed with a full discussion in Jean Jacquot, 'Raleigh's "Hellish Verses" and The "Tragicaall Raigne of Selimus"', MLR, 48 (1953), 1-9.
35. Quoted in Paul H. Kocher, Christopher Marlowe: A Study of his Thought, Learning, and Character (Chapel Hill, 1946 reprinted N.Y., 1962), pp. 34, 36.
36. Ribner, 'Greenè's Attack on Marlowe', pp. 162-71.
37. Jacob Lopes Cardozo, The Contemporary Jew in the Elizabethan Drama (Amsterdam, 1925), p. 199 cites an English translation of Paolo Giovio in 1546. Ribner favours La Primaudaye as the main source.
38. Clemen, p. 131.
39. Frederick S. Boas, Shakespeare and the Universities, and other Studies in Elizabethan Drama (Oxford, 1923), p. 140.
40. Edmund Ironside in Six Early Plays Related to the Shakespeare Canon, edited by E.B. Everitt and R.L. Armstrong, Anglistica XIV (Copenhagen, 1965), l. 2036. All references are to this edition.
41. H.D., pp. 324, 60.
42. For an analysis of the manuscript, see Greg, Documents II, 256-61. The possibility of a two-part play is suggested in the MSR edition by Eleanore Boswell and W.W. Greg (Oxford, 1927), p. xii. E.B. Everitt, The Young Shakespeare, Anglistica II (Copenhagen, 1954), p. 49 also offers this hypothesis. In The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare, second edition (1965), p. 243, Irving Ribner writes: 'That the play must have had a sequel depicting his [Edricus's] downfall seems obvious'. It is possible that Edmund Ironside is indirectly influenced by Tamburlaine through 1 Henry VI which similarly ends with the suspense of a threat.
43. See his introduction to King John, The Arden Shakespeare (1954).
44. King John, edited by John Dover Wilson, NCS (Cambridge, 1936), p. xvii.
45. Greg suggests Orwin in A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration, 4 vols (1939-59), I, 178. See chapter II, note 12 for the suggestion by Fredson Bowers that Orwin printed Tamburlaine in 1590.
46. All quotations are from the facsimile edition of The Troublesome Reign of John, King of England, edited by J.S. Farmer, Old English Drama Students' Facsimile Edition, 2 vols (1911).
47. John of Bordeaux; or, the Second Part of Friar Bacon, edited by W.L. Renwick and W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1935 [1936]), p. xii. All references are to this edition.
48. Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, edited by J.A. Lavin, The New Mermaids (1969), pp. x, xii, xxiii.
49. Waldo F. McNeir, 'Robert Greene and John of Bordeaux'; PMLA, 64 (1949), 781-801. Much of this section is indebted to McNeir's presentation of relationships between Greene's known works and John of Bordeaux.

50. Lavin, p. 58 n.
51. Lavin, p. 71 n.
52. McNeir (1949), pp. 791-5.
53. McNeir (1949), p. 787.
54. Harry R. Hoppe, 'John of Bordeaux: A Bad Quarto that Never Reached Print', in Studies in Honor of A.H.R. Fairchild, edited by Charles T. Prouty (Columbia, Missouri, 1946), 119-32.
55. Chettle's relationship to the play is discussed by Harold Jenkins, The Life and Work of Henry Chettle (1934), pp. 55-9.
56. Hoppe, p. 132.
57. G.M. Princiss, 'Thomas Creede and the Repertory of the Queen's Men 1583-1592', MP, 67 (1970), p. 328.
58. Princiss, p. 328.
59. Hoppe, p. 132.
60. Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1926), l. 15. References are to this edition.
61. See Waldo F. McNeir, 'Reconstructing the Conclusion of John of Bordeaux', PMLA, 66 (1951), 540-3 for an interpretation of the last fragmented leaves of the manuscript.
62. McNeir (1949), pp. 784-7.
63. See Lavin, pp. xii-xiii.
64. H.D., pp. 16-21.
65. Arber II, 649.
66. Scott McMillin, 'The Ownership of The Jew of Malta, Friar Bacon, and The Ranger's Comedy', ELN, 9 (1972), 249-52 supports Renwick.
67. Henry Chettle, Kind-Harte's Dreame, edited by G.B. Harrison, Elizabethan and Jacobean Quartos (Edinburgh, 1966), p. 13.
68. Francis Meres, Palladis Tamia (1598) in Elizabethan Critical Essays, edited by G. Gregory Smith, 2 vols (1904), II, 320.
69. Baldwin, p. 263. Samuel Schoenbaum calls it 'a minor masterpiece' in William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life (Oxford, 1975), p. 114.
70. See Chapter VII below.
71. Henry V would seem a most likely subject for a play of conquest but The Famous Victories is not of this type although its date is close to (or possibly before) Tamburlaine. Chambers, E.S. IV, 17 discusses early references to it. The text published in 1598 is certainly an abridged one and falls into two sections with the foreign victories coming in the second half. Shakespeare's allocation of the same material in three plays perhaps encourages the suggestion for an original two-part form for the play by the following authorities: Chambers, W.S. I, 383; Bullough IV, 167; A.R. Humphreys, introduction to the Arden 1 Henry IV, pp. xxxii, xxxvi; and J.D. Wilson, 'The Origins and Development of Shakespeare's Henry IV', The Library, 4th ser. 26 (1945), p. 10.

CHAPTER IV

Shakespeare's First Tetralogy

i. Introduction

Shakespeare's earliest sequence of history plays forms a chronological tetralogy which attempts to dramatize the fortunes of England between the funeral of Henry V in 1422 and the victory of Henry of Richmond at Bosworth Field in 1485. It exceeds the length of Marlowe's two-part play by more than two and a half times or approximately 7600 lines and falls short by about the length of one play of equalling The Iliad. Many features of Shakespeare's historical sequence show a unity of design and a consistency in execution sustained through more than one hundred scenes. The reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV, and Richard III, a period six years shorter than the historical Tamburlaine's life, do not share the same possibilities of biographical unity as Marlowe's subject or the imitations of his Tamburlaine. Instead, a complex genealogical tangle of English nobility is the human background against which England suffers the effects of foreign and domestic conflict. Inevitably in the nature of continuous history, characters appear in more than one play: thirteen in two plays, three in three plays, and two, Margaret of Anjou and Henry VI, in all four plays - if the appearance of that King's ghost in Richard III is included. Yet no effort was made before 1623 to bring the entire sequence into print and no evidence such as that provided by Henslowe's Diary for Tamburlaine suggests that the chronological order of the plays dictated their order of performance. Judging by the frequency of editions, Richard III was in greater demand by the reading public and presumably also by theatre audiences.¹ The relationship between literary design and necessity of single performance is one issue of importance to the tetralogy. Conjecture and doubt have long surrounded the acceptance of some of the plays among Shakespeare's works. Questions of authorship, original titles, date, company,

order of composition, possible revision, and publication require discussion before Shakespeare's contribution to the sequel play can be assessed in relation both to his contemporaries and his own development as a dramatist.

In his introductions to the revised Arden editions of the Henry VI plays, Andrew S. Cairncross has dealt cogently with the problems which previous commentators have found in the texts and in the meagre external evidence associated with them. Internal evidence supports his arguments for Shakespeare's sole authorship of the plays and their chronological order of composition. No formal prologues or epilogues exist where an author's voice might be heard explaining his motives for continuing or his intentions to continue his dramatic subject into a sequel or a series of sequels.

Shakespeare's Epilogue to a later play, Henry V, however, may be his own retrospective glance toward the accomplishment of his first tetralogy. The final speech of the Chorus takes the form of a sonnet which closes the play with an authorial tone:

Thus far, with rough and all-unable pen,
Our bending author hath pursu'd the story;
Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crown'd 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; and, for their sake,
In your fair minds let this acceptance take.²

The three Henry VI plays which dramatize the loss of France and the Wars of the Roses are here accurately described. The frequent performances on 'our stage' point proudly to a common authorial source. The first scene of 1 Henry VI includes the first messenger's bold assertion that the losses which he has reported result because 'here you maintain several factions' (I.i.71). The Epilogue to Henry V seems to recall those crowded scenes of internal bickering and England's weakness when 'so many had the managing'.

Of the plays in Shakespeare's first historical sequence, the authenticity of Part One of Henry VI has been the most

constant source of doubt.³ Its inclusion in the First Folio and the Epilogue to Henry V constitute the only external evidence linking the play with Shakespeare's name. Francis Meres omits all three Henry VI plays from his Palladis Tamia: Wit's Treasury (1598). The histories which Meres lists as tragedies all have some claim for being recognized in that genre. T.W. Baldwin notes the quarto authority for calling Richard III and Richard II tragedies and assumes that if 2 Henry IV was known before Meres wrote, then the depiction of a life and death in both 'Henry the 4' and King John would be justification enough for also labelling them tragedies.⁴ Meres's careful symmetry of six titles for comedy and six titles for tragedy would be upset by the Henry VI plays. A third category of history plays into which they would fit more appropriately would be without a corresponding classical dramatist like Seneca to whom Shakespeare's accomplishments in tragedy are compared. Geoffrey Bullough suggests that Meres had merely not seen the plays.⁵

Part One of Henry VI was first designated as such in the First Folio. The Stationers' Register entry for 'soe manie of the said Copies as are not formerly entred to other men' labelled this play as 'the thirde parte of Henry ye Sixt' indicating its status, a previously unregistered addition, rather than its title.⁶ The Stationers' Register already showed a Part One of Henry VI when on 19 April 1602, the copyright for the inferior texts of 2 Henry VI and 3 Henry VI was transferred from their original publisher, Thomas Millington, to Thomas Pavier. It is here that two of Shakespeare's Henry VI plays are first called by that title. The Stationers' Register reads: 'the first and Second parte of Henry the VJth, ij bookes'.⁷ Millington had published quartos of his 'first part' in 1594 and 1600. An octavo of his 'second part' appeared in 1595 and the same text was issued again in 1600, in quarto. Their descriptive title-pages present a two-part play of what are known in the First Folio as Parts Two and Three of Henry VI. The 1594 quarto is indicated like Selimus of the same year,

also printed for Millington, as incomplete without a sequel. The entry in the Stationers' Register for 12 March 1594 corresponds almost exactly to the title-page which reads:

The First part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the death of the good Duke Humphrey: And the banishment and death of the Duke of Suffolke, and the Tragicall end of the proud Cardinal of Winchester, with the notable Rebellion of Jacke Cade: And the Duke of Yorkes first claime unto the Crowne.

The title-page of its sequel published without entry in the Stationers' Register reads:

The true Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henrie the Sixt, with the whole contention betweene the two Houses Lancaster and Yorke, as it was sundrie times acted by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembroke his servants.

When the copyright for these plays was transferred in 1602, the Stationers' Register entry gave no indication of a forerunner when it condensed their description to show that both parts of a two-part play were involved. The publishers were not and need not have been concerned with what is known in the First Folio as 1 Henry VI. In 1619, Pavier reissued both plays together as

The Whole Contention betweene the two Famous Houses, Lancaster and Yorke. With the Tragicall ends of the good Duke Humfrey, Richard Duke of Yorke, and King Henrie the sixt. Divided into two Parts: And newly corrected and enlarged. Written by William Shakespeare, Gent.

The earlier Contention plays provided the basis for Pavier's texts and his new title was adapted from their original title-pages. The claim for correction and enlargement was exaggerated but their ascription for the first time to Shakespeare has been shown to be justified.

The early editions are now generally accepted as reported versions of 2 Henry VI and 3 Henry VI. Book-length studies by Madeleine Doran and Peter Alexander have established their status as 'bad' quartos and demonstrated that the earlier titles were not source plays as had been long thought.⁸

The plays thus seem to have undergone a change of title before they were printed together in the First Folio. Both John Dover Wilson and Andrew S. Cairncross express this opinion with a great deal of confidence.⁹ Dover Wilson argues that 'since such "pirates" would be anxious to pass their fakes off as the real article we can feel confident that they made use of the names already familiar to the theatre-going public'.¹⁰ But such confidence is unwarranted. Henslowe's Diary frequently includes titles at variance with the printed versions of the same plays. The 'tragedey of the gvyes' and 'Longshanks' may serve as examples. Meres's mysterious Love's Labour's Won is an additional instance of a vague procedure in respect to play titles. We do not know exactly how the theatre-going public or even theatre managers remembered the titles of plays nor are we certain that the titles which their authors assigned to them were not merely tentative or convenient. Subtitles and alternative titles were freely interchanged. Advertising certainly had an important role. The supposed original titles of 2 Henry VI and 3 Henry VI appear to be products of the publisher rather than the author. Dover Wilson's argument might be reversed: because the early editions were pirated a change of title may have served as some temporary protection for their suspicious publication.

The lengthy advertising of The First Part of the Contention is reproduced carefully in the Stationers' Register. It omits the name of Henry VI from its title-page which emphasizes three deaths, Jack Cade's rebellion, and York's 'first claim'. The questionable right which Millington had to publish the play seems to have gone unchallenged and perhaps encouraged him to publish the sequel in the following year. The title-page of the 1595 octavo reverses the order of the houses of York and Lancaster and raises the Duke of York to the titular role although he dies before the end of Act I. The name of Henry VI is here first brought to the title-page where his death is advertised along with 'the whole contention'. It is possible that Shakespeare's original titles as parts of Henry VI were deliberately avoided in favour of the rather detailed descriptive

alternatives. Their original titles as plays about the reign of Henry VI may have been recalled when Pavier secured the copyright in 1602.¹¹

The significance of titles is related to a series of entries in Henslowe's Diary recording his receipts for the play called by him 'Harey the vj'. The Lord Strange's Men performed this play fifteen times in the four and a half month period between 3 March and 19 June 1592 and twice in January of the next year.¹² Except when the title appears once as 'Harey' (which probably indicates a confusion with the date 16 March), it is listed as 'harey the vj' (14 times) or 'harey the 6' (twice) with no indication that more than one play is meant.¹³ The first entry for this title is preceded by Henslowe's familiar notation 'ne'. His receipts were consistently high and averaged just over forty-one shillings for each performance. When the plague caused the theatres to be closed from 23 June until late December 1592, the regular cycle of its performances was interrupted.

During this period, Nashe's Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Divell was entered in the Stationers' Register (8 August) and published. In his pamphlet Nashe refers to a popular contemporary play:

How would it have joyed brave Talbot (the terror of the French) to thinke that after he had lyne two hundred yeares in his Tombe, hee should triumphe againe on the Stage, and have his bones newe embalmed with the teares of ten thousand spectators at least (at severall times), who, in the Tragedian that represents his person, imagine they behold him fresh bleeding?¹⁴

Nashe's enthusiastic description has several contacts with Shakespeare's 1 Henry VI.¹⁵ When linked with Henslowe's financial success earlier in the same year, the conclusion seems natural that 1 Henry VI is 'Harey the vj' which Nashe had seen and of which he had approved. The strength of this identification, however, is broken by a number of observations originally made by Peter Alexander and restated by Cairncross.¹⁶ Historical plays performed by different companies frequently

shared the same subject. The anonymous True Tragedy of Richard III (1594) and Shakespeare's own Richard III are clear examples of this practice. The title-page of the memorial version of 3 Henry VI states that it (and presumably its predecessor) had been acted by Pembroke's Men who are known to have folded in 1593.¹⁷ Since those printed versions frequently echo 1 Henry VI and Shakespeare's name is not associated with Strange's Men before 1594, it follows that Henslowe could well be referring to a non-Shakespearean play acted by Strange's. Nashe's reference to the presentation of Talbot 'at severall times' could be a celebration of that hero in two plays. Perhaps Henslowe's play enlarged the part of Talbot from Shakespeare's earlier play where he is shown in less than half the scenes. In 1864, Thomas Kenny wrote that 'we ought not to forget that Henslowe and his associates might easily have been induced to get up a play upon a subject which had already been successfully dramatised by a rival company'.¹⁸

The dates of Shakespeare's early history plays assume importance in this argument. A sure terminal date for 2 Henry VI and 3 Henry VI is set by Robert Greene's satiric adaptation of the line 'O tiger's heart wrapp'd in a woman's hide!' from 3 Henry VI (I. iv. 137) into 'Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hide' in A Groats-worth of Wit written just before his death in early September 1592. The theatres had been closed in late June of that year owing to the plague. A further narrowing of the date comes from The Troublesome Reign of King John, printed in 1591, which may include recollections of 1 Henry VI, 2 Henry VI, 3 Henry VI, and Richard III.¹⁹ An early date for the tetralogy thus seems very likely.

F.P. Wilson's remarks are almost always quoted in reference to Shakespeare and the English History play. He made the well-known observation that 'there is no certain evidence that any popular dramatist before Shakespeare wrote a play based on English history'.²⁰ If Shakespeare created the English History play, his accomplishment shows a close correspondence with Marlowe's success with biographical drama. Both dramatists significantly influenced Elizabethan drama in very possibly

their earliest efforts for the public stage. And both achievements resulted in sequels which continued the same subject beyond a single play.

ii. The Influence of Tamburlaine and the Composition of
1 Henry VI

Tamburlaine must have made as great an impression on Shakespeare as it did on some of his contemporaries. Their efforts to imitate Marlowe's hero and often his two-part form were more determined to exaggerate spectacular effects generated by an ambitious conqueror than seriously recognize the poetic and structural achievements of their model. It seems that their principal difficulty was to find an exotic hero, but he, once found, could be made to rise and fall with formulistic success. When Shakespeare decided to write plays based on the chronicles of his own country's past, he saw history as a more complex dramatic subject than the isolated successes of great men. Although he may have 'had Tamburlaine as a model before him',²¹ there are fundamental differences between biographical drama and Shakespeare's historical drama. The kind of continuity which links Shakespeare's tetralogy differs greatly from that of the two-part and intended two-part conqueror plays. These are circumscribed by the death of the hero and can have little interest beyond that point. The historical contexts are created by his acquisition of power through conquest. His enemies exist only in relation to himself whether they are presented as temporary obstacles or as a continuing target to destroy. His position at the centre of the play is assured by his increasing power until a marriage or other recognition of achievement celebrates the extent of his rise. This at least is the pattern of 1 Tamburlaine, Alphonsus, 1 Selimus, and 1 Tamar Cham.

In the period of English history which Shakespeare chose to dramatize, the source material could not be segmented by

individual rises or individual deaths. The 'colourless regal titles', writes E.M.W. Tillyard, are 'truer to the nature of the separate plays... than that they should be named after the seemingly most important characters or events'.²² Events and characters become significant within their continuous historical contexts. The emphasis on the past with which the tetralogy begins and the emphasis on the future with which Richard III ends indicate the close connexions between past and future. The history plays are not bound to a definite beginning or a definite end such as the rise and death of the biographical hero. The memory of Tamburlaine's life is more important than the fact that his sons and generals survive him; there could be no third part of Tamburlaine.

Shakespeare's history plays contain rises and falls, 'some episodes could be detached and expanded into regular tragedies',²³ but they are unlike the biographical plays whose centres are well indicated by their titles. Whatever Shakespeare's plays were originally called, their centres are 'historically England and morally the evils of civil discord'.²⁴

Exactly when Shakespeare decided to write a series of sequels can never be known. Marlowe tells us that he did not envisage 2 Tamburlaine until the first part had been often performed. After Marlowe's success it was much easier for a playwright to plan a dramatic sequence and distribute his sources accordingly. The dramatization of history presented a special advantage for 'if the genre is open-ended in the sense that its resolution leads to continuation, it may still possess a unity of its own'.²⁵ At the beginning of the 1590s, a dramatist writing history plays was practically creating that genre. Any forethought of sequels would by the nature of the subject require a different approach than that shown in Tamburlaine and its progeny.

If Shakespeare's historical sequence shows a fundamental break from Marlowe's two-part play, the influence of Tamburlaine was nevertheless significant in other ways. Shakespeare's debt, or rather, reaction to Tamburlaine took several directions. The number of verbal parallels which H.C. Hart collected for his

disintegratory purposes ²⁶ supports Cairncross's view that Shakespeare's familiarity with the play, especially in 2 and 3 Henry VI, suggests 'a complete absorption more likely to be due to frequent reading'.²⁷

Part One of Henry VI, which may have preceded the publication of Tamburlaine (S.R. 14 August 1590) begins in a sense where 2 Tamburlaine ends. The parallel in situation is not gratuitous. The historical Tamburlaine died in 1405 just prior to the reign of Henry V and the concluding lines spoken by his son and successor express the passing of a world-historical era:

Meet heaven and earth, and here let all things end,
For earth hath spent the pride of all her fruit,
And heaven consum'd his choicest living fire!
Let earth and heaven his timeless death deplore,
For both their worths will equal him no more.

(Part Two, V.iii. 249-53)

To these words and the earlier scenes of Zenocrate's sudden death and funeral Shakespeare is in debt when he begins 1 Henry VI with the funeral of Henry V. The sudden death of King Henry V produces a shock to England similar to that felt by Tamburlaine after the loss of Zenocrate. The Duke of Bedford interrupts a 'Dead March' (s.d.) with the first words of the play:

Hung be the heavens with black, yield day to night!
Comets, importing change of times and states,
Brandish your crystal tresses in the sky,
And with them scourge the bad revolting stars,
That have consented unto Henry's death -
Henry the Fifth, too famous to live long!
England ne'er lost a king of so much worth.

(I.i. 1-7)

Each of these lines seems written not only with a consciousness of the world of Tamburlaine but also with a distinct awareness of their new context.

The effect of Zenocrate's death on Tamburlaine and the world which he controlled offers several parallels to Bedford's speech. This atmosphere of crucial loss is adapted by Shakespeare to heighten the significance of Henry V's death. Bedford's words recall Tamburlaine's 'Black is the beauty of

the brightest day' which announces the cosmic process by which 'the golden ball of heaven's eternal fire' threatens 'to darken earth with endless night' (Part Two, II.iv. 1,2,7). The deaths of Zenocrate and Henry V are both given astrological confirmation of their importance. When Tamburlaine is shown at the side of Zenocrate's hearse with 'the drums sounding a doleful march' (s.d. III.ii), he commands the burning town to

kindle heaps of exhalations,
That, being fiery meteors, may presage
Death and destruction to th'inhabitants!

(III.ii 3-5)

Tamburlaine directs his rage to a particular act of revenge and enjoins the skies to enhance its meaning. Bedford uses the Tamburlaine word 'scourge' in his apostrophe to comets to revenge 'the bad revolting stars,/ That have consented unto Henry's death'.

The 'timeless death' of Tamburlaine lamented in the last lines of Marlowe's play is seen by Amyras as a loss to earth and heaven who are given feminine and masculine qualities respectively. As the child of those powers, Tamburlaine is seen as the final representative of his kind for 'both their worths will equal him no more'. When Shakespeare seeks to heighten the death of Henry V, he significantly makes Bedford assign the deprivation to England who 'ne'er lost a king of so much worth' (I. i. 7). The second speech of the play, by Gloucester, though drawn from Hall, presents an image of Henry V as a conqueror in the style of Tamburlaine. Descriptions of his blinding sword and 'sparkling eyes, replete with wrathful fire', use the imagery of 'dragon's wings' and 'mid-day sun' to fashion the memory of England's conqueror whose 'deeds exceed all speech:/ He ne'er lift up his hand but conquered'(I. i. 8-16).

In the first two speeches of the play Shakespeare applies to the funeral and memory of Henry V the language of greatness with which Marlowe surrounded his hero. But Shakespeare is very conscious of his direction away from another imitation of Tamburlaine. England is prominently set not only as the background to but also as the victim of Henry's death and the

inheritor of a political condition which neither Marlowe nor his imitators were challenged to dramatize. Exeter's speech shows a realization of this new situation and is the first instance of his continuing function in the play to comment in a choral capacity. His observations after Gloucester's eulogy are simple and direct:

Henry is dead and never shall revive.
Upon a wooden coffin we attend.

(I. i. 18-19)

His words skilfully convey the reality of the situation and correct Gloucester's picture of Henry as a king of epic proportion. He goes on to describe the members of the funeral as 'captives bound to a triumphant car' (I.i.22). This seems to be Shakespeare's first allusion to Tamburlaine's chariot and 'the pampered jades of Asia'. Exeter pleads to his fellow mourners to free themselves from a world that is now past. At the same time, Shakespeare shows that his dramatic concerns are not bound to glorification in the tradition of Tamburlaine. Exeter then rejects an alternative which seems also to allude to Tamburlaine's behaviour:

What! shall we curse the planets of mishap
That plotted thus our glory's overthrow?

(I.i. 23-24)

The third speech of the play ends when Exeter suspects supernatural opposition from the French who are mentioned in the play for the first time.

This analysis of the first twenty-seven lines of 1 Henry VI is intended to show Shakespeare announcing his play with situation and phrase that relate very closely to Tamburlaine. The funeral ceremony of Henry V symbolically leaves an historical era of English history centred on a strong and conquering king for a period when the health and unity of a nation assume more importance than the individual lives of its leaders. Shakespeare seems also to be conscious of leaving a dramatic era of character display and 'tragical discourse' for one of character conflict in his English history play. The general historical tradition from which Shakespeare takes his subject allows him

to be retrospective as well as to prepare ironically for later events. Henry V's memory is at first strongly felt and is not forgotten as events in France and England increase their pace toward the Wars of the Roses.

One further relationship between Tamburlaine and the beginning of the first scene of 1 Henry VI may be mentioned. When Gloucester reacts to Winchester's pieties, he accuses the Bishop: 'None do you like but an effeminate prince' (I.i. 35). The same adjective is used by Marlowe to describe Calyphas in 2 Tamburlaine (IV.i. 162). The relationship is very slight although David Riggs has commented that 'Shakespeare's plays embody a kind of sequel to Marlowe's, an assessment of the chaos that ensues when the weakling son succeeds the all-conquering father'.²⁸ History records the troubles of Henry VI's reign and the falling off there was after the death of Henry V. Shakespeare emphasizes this transition at the opening of his play with reference to a dramatic tradition that is unable to meet the demands of a new kind of historical drama.

As possibly Shakespeare's first play, 1 Henry VI reveals several experiments in regard to the writing of history plays which, like the chronicles on which they are based, cannot have final resolutions until the present. Problems have arisen about this play because its links with the following plays in the tetralogy seem unspecific and sometimes inconsistent rather than firm and confident as they are between the other histories in the series. The dramatic potential of the Wars of the Roses and the villainy of Richard III were surely in the playwright's mind when 1 Henry VI was written. But the degree to which they could be anticipated before the first play was received in the theatre was one of difficulties which the young dramatist must have felt. In the case of Alphonsus, Selimus, and perhaps Edmund Ironside (whose ending is similar to that of 1 Henry VI), sequels were promised or hinted but withheld until the public requested them, which apparently it never did. If Nashe's enthusiastic praise of Talbot refers to Shakespeare's play, then not much time could have elapsed before the following three plays in the tetralogy were planned, written, and produced. The echoes from the plays'

in The Troublesome Reign of King John may indicate that the tetralogy was completed in 1591 and almost continuous writing could only account for the speed with which the remaining plays were brought to the stage. Shakespeare was at no loss for source material as Marlowe had been after 1 Tamburlaine.

Marlowe returned to the success of his first play in order to structure its sequel. The parallels between those two plays are often so close that the sequel in effect presents an unhistorical commentary on the hero of the original play. Shakespeare organizes his sequels as continuous commentaries on historical facts although these are often altered for dramatic purposes. The linear nature of history allows him to refer to the past as well as to the future while the history of England unfolds on the stage. In writing 1 Henry VI he probably could not refer specifically to a dramatic future, to plays in the historical sequence which were foreseen but could not command his full energies for their special thematic concerns until the first play of the series was successful. The Temple Garden scene and the Suffolk-Margaret affair have sometimes seemed later insertions but they are more anticipative of future history than of the yet unwritten dramas to which they are always and perhaps unjustly compared.

As an inquiry into the sources of Tamburlaine showed the special nature of Marlowe's unplanned two-part play, a similar inquiry into Shakespeare's materials indicates his pre-conception of an historical sequence. Both J.P. Brockbank and Geoffrey Bullough have supported Shakespeare's composition of the Henry VI plays in the Folio order with reference to his historical sources. Brockbank notes that

the three parts of Henry VI coincide with three distinct phases of the history and show that Shakespeare did what he could to tease a form for each of the plays out of the given material.²⁹

The principal source of the Henry VI plays is Hall's Chronicle. Part One is based mainly on the first twenty-two years of Henry VI's reign although it includes the death of Talbot which occurred in 1453, the thirty-first year of the King's rule.

Hall devotes much of his account of that year to the completion of the disastrous French campaign which was marked by Talbot's death. Against the theory that 2 Henry VI preceded 1 Henry VI, it will be noted that Henry's twenty-second year, where Part Two begins, is an unlikely starting point for a series which is concerned at its outset with the end of the French wars. The dramatic and symbolic importance of Talbot's death would be difficult to overlook unless it had been previously dramatized. After his account of Talbot's end, Hall begins his section on the thirty-second year by re-emphasizing that

When foren warre and outward battailes, were brought to an end and finall conclusion; domesticall discord and civill discencion began again to renew and arise, within the realme of Englande:for when the care of outward hostilitie (whiche kept the myndes of the Princes in the realme occupied, and in exercise) was taken awaye and vanished, desire of sovereigntie, and ambicion of preeminence, sodainly sprang out so farre, that the whole Realme was divided into twoo severall faccions, and private partes.³⁰

The scope of the French losses is assumed at the beginning of 2 Henry VI because their significance had been intensified in the first four acts of the preceding play.

Rather than strand Talbot in a future play, Shakespeare completed the foreign phase of his sequence by showing his death out of chronological order in Part One. The fears expressed during the funeral of Henry V are confirmed when the last representative of that ruler's mythos dies on French soil in Act IV. The fifth act is thus available for events whose significance will develop more directly toward the Wars of the Roses. There will therefore be no need to return to France in the following play. All of Part Two is set in England.

Part Two dramatizes the period 1445 to 1455 and ends with the first battle of Saint Albans. The following five years of history are bridged by beginning Part Three with the Parliament which followed the second battle of St Albans in 1460. The last part of Henry VI ends with The King's death in 1471. For these plays as well as 1 Henry VI, Shakespeare consulted not only Hall but also Holinshed (1587 edition) and took some

details from Fabyan, Grafton, Hardyng, and Foxe. Bullough finds that the 'evidence of multiple sources tends in favour of Shakespeare's authorship of 1 Henry VI' and notes 'a similar use of details ... to that found in Shakespeare's undoubted Histories'.³¹ Shakespeare's use of his materials has been given a full account by Bullough who shows the frequent method of telescoping facts for dramatic purposes. Chronology is often altered and some confusions grow into inconsistencies although Parts Two and Three display more respect for history than Part One. The dramatic freedom in that play amounts to extensive shuffling.

An explanation for this difference in Part One may here be explored in some detail. The play was written, like others in its period, with the intention of a continuation. The more theatrical material of the Wars of the Roses and the reign of Richard III awaited the young playwright's success in his, and perhaps an Elizabethan's, first venture into serious historical drama based on England's past. In addition to public response, internal theatrical considerations probably also participated in Shakespeare's decision to pursue his intentions. An actor recently turned playwright would indeed be an 'upstart' of some kind if he supplied his company with a series of plays before the first had been produced and received professional approval as well as public acceptance. He would be anxious to profit from his experience. In Greene's attack on Shakespeare, some of the lingering spite concerning the failure of Alphonsus, Greene's first play and intended in two parts, may have returned when Shakespeare was quickly encouraged to write a succession of history plays. Greene's satirical quotation from Shakespeare comes from the third play of a sequence and from the second part of a two-part dramatization of the Wars of the Roses as they were later printed. Envy for this kind of success may have contributed to Greene's outburst.

Part One indicates that Shakespeare had not fully realized the scope and direction of his sequels. It is concerned with establishing a central emphasis on the English campaigns in France and presenting Talbot as an heroic image who is the

stranded and inevitable victim of political disorder at home. The long-term effects of this phase of history receive sustained attention in the Temple Garden scene (II.iv) and develop through the Margaret-Suffolk affair in the final act. These two actions, more than any other in the play, point to subsequent events. They point, however, more to the historical future than to the dramatic future and so do not represent the same kind of links which bind the next three plays together. As a result, the characterizations of Gloucester, York, and Margaret in Part One have seemed weak, tentative, and at times inconsistent with their counterparts in the sequels and thus led to doubts about authorship and various theories of revision. A better explanation is that Shakespeare was concentrating on the difficult task of organizing a play from the four hundred incidents³² in the French campaigns which are mentioned in the chronicles. The domestic personal conflicts, while directly related to the foreign wars, are also directly related to the future civil wars through the symbolism of the roses in the Temple Garden scene. The design of the play does not require the characterization of the English nobles to go far beyond delineating their historical positions in relation to the distant and to the future.

There is no question that while 1 Henry VI is based principally on the end of the Hundred Years Wars, it is also very much aware of the effects of this conflict on the future Wars of the Roses. Shakespeare is thus able to point often and with irony toward the civil wars through almost every major character. In the first scene Bedford invokes the spirit of Henry V to 'Prosper this realm, keep it from civil broils' (I.i. 53). In the Temple Garden scene, Warwick prophesies 'this brawl today, .../ Shall send between the Red Rose and the White/ A thousand souls to death and deadly night' (II.iv. 124, 126-7). Mortimer's last words to his nephew, Richard Plantagenet, are: 'prosperous be thy life in peace and war' (II.v. 114). King Henry ends his first speech of the play with a frightening image:

Civil dissension is a viperous worm
That gnaws the bowels of the commonwealth.

(III.i. 72-3)

Exeter closes both III.i and IV.i with his equally forbidding premonitions. Each of the scenes set in England includes such remarks, but none of this preparation for the civil wars is specific enough to be attached to the dramatic patterns of the succeeding plays. Those patterns had not yet been fully formulated. The anticipations point to a certain historical future but not to a specified dramatic future.

This lack of emphasis is seen more clearly in the characterization of Part One. One of the major difficulties in the play which led Dover Wilson and others to the conclusion that it was not entirely the work of Shakespeare is the inconsistency of some of the characters who reappear in the later plays. Gloucester appears to him as 'two different men', 'a common brawler' in the earlier play.³³ York similarly does not make the same impact that he does in the first scene of Part Two and the Margaret of Part One gives no indication of her future strength in the three following plays. Even the early taunting of Winchester to Gloucester that

Thy wife is proud; she holdeth thee in awe
More than God or religious churchmen may.

(I.i. 39-40)

is not necessarily a 'dramatically unnecessary' anticipation of Eleanor Cobham's important role in Part Two as Cairncross thinks.³⁴ It becomes so when compared with the later play but it is possible that this early reference is to her predecessor, Gloucester's first wife, who Hall says was 'abhorred of the Clergie'.³⁵ Lady Jaquet was Gloucester's wife until two years after the funeral of Henry V.

The Suffolk-Margaret episodes in the last Act appear to Dover Wilson as 'without any previous dramatic warning'.³⁶ But the emphasis given to Reignier before he becomes historically important as the father of the English Queen is strong enough preparation. Reignier is present in the first French scene

(I.ii) but more significantly his name and dukedom are heard in the second messenger's report in the first scene of the play:

France is revolted from the English quite,
 Except some petty towns of no import:
 The Dauphin Charles is crowned king in Rheims:
 The Bastard of Orleans with him is join'd:
 Reignier, Duke of Anjou, doth take his part.

(I.i. 90-4)

His importance is brought out further in the next scene where he poses as the Dauphin to test Joan. When Joan is later captured by the English, she names Reignier as the father of her child (V.iv. 78). Margaret emerges from the same battle as her successor, a thematic link well shown by Cairncross (liii, 114).

The alleged insertion of the Margaret-Suffolk affair as a sign of later revision intended to link up 1 Henry VI with the already written two-part play on the Wars of the Roses is diminished by a closer examination of these scenes. They certainly prepare for a sequel but what dramatic direction that sequel would take is given few certain and some misleading indications. If this play alone was extant, it would be difficult to reconstruct its sequel beyond a very general sketch. The Margaret-Suffolk scenes not only point forward but they are also significant to the play in which they occur.

Margaret, like the Countess of Auvergne who earlier entices Talbot to her castle (II.iii), appears in only one scene in the play (V.iii). Her part is small and consists principally of short, often witty replies to the wooing of Suffolk. She is passive and to Suffolk her 'Words [are] sweetly plac'd and modestly directed' (V.iii.179). She does not prefigure the 'tiger's heart' of the later plays. Her potential danger is stated directly by Suffolk who warns in the last speech of the play that 'Margaret shall now be Queen, and rule the King' (V.v. 107). Her affinities are to the other women in 1 Henry VI not to her dramatic character in the sequels although her historical position, emphasized in the chronicles, is expressed through Suffolk. Each of the

three French women characters, Joan, the Countess of Auvergne, and Margaret, is first introduced as harmless and innocent but proves otherwise. Joan is 'a holy maid' (I.ii. 51) but soon confronts Talbot as 'a woman clad in armour' (I.v. 3). The Countess of Auvergne is announced to Talbot as a 'virtuous lady, .../ With modesty admiring thy renown' (II.ii. 38-9) before she attempts to ensnare her visitor. Margaret enters the established pattern when she becomes Suffolk's prisoner immediately after Joan has been led off as York's captive. Alençon's earlier observation might be taken as a summary of the female roles in the play: 'These women are shrewd tempters with their tongues' (I.ii. 123).³⁷

Part One prepares for a sequel because of its emphasis on the critical period of English history which preceded the Wars of the Roses. They are felt as imminent as a result of the losses in France, the weakness of King Henry, the restoration of York, and the intended marriage of Margaret of Anjou to the King with the consequent loss of the remaining French territories. The special features of Part Two (the death of 'good' Duke Humphrey, the disgrace of his wife, the deaths of Suffolk and Winchester, and the appearance of York's sons) are not anticipated. Shakespeare had not yet evolved these scenes which are still to come before the civil wars. His interest in Part One was the creation of a unified play that was independent in order to complete the phase of history which involved the interaction of the French wars and the pressures that were pulling England apart at home. The following plays in the historical sequence show firmer dramatic links in theme and characterization and introduce ideas such as revenge which demand more definite long-range planning. This in turn brought a confident kind of dramatic investment in the future intentions of the series. For these reasons Part One stands as a more independent play than the following three which have more in common with each other both in regard to subject and to Shakespeare's dramaturgy.

iii Links Between the Plays

Despite the consistent warnings of civil war throughout Part One, the chaos and bloodshed which had been foretold are not fully represented until the final third of Part Two. In the first two-thirds of the play, the fall of Gloucester is the principal action. He and his fate are prominent in all but one of the first eleven scenes. The final third of the play begins with the rise of Jack Cade and proceeds through thirteen scenes until the celebration of York's victory at the battle of Saint Albans. There are more links between Part Two and the following two plays in the series than there are back to Part One. After the first scene, the play increasingly looks forward and its pace quickens sharply in the many short scenes following the death of Gloucester.

The first scene of Part Two does not review more than a minimal amount of the material dramatized in Part One and proceeds quickly to re-establish the enmity between Gloucester and Winchester (now Cardinal Beaufort), document the costly end to the French wars, and show continuing mutual distrust among the nobles. The scene concludes with York's forty-six line soliloquy in which he promises that 'A day will come when York shall claim his own' (I.i. 240). Suffolk, who had been given the last speech of 1 Henry VI, begins Part Two by presenting Margaret as England's Queen and Henry VI's wife. She brings with her the modesty and innocence which she displayed in her brief appearance in Part One, along with the largely unhistorical intimacy with Suffolk, and the disastrous articles of Peace which to Henry 'please us well' (I.i. 62). To Gloucester, who suddenly interrupts his reading of them, they mean 'Undoing all, as all had never been!' (I.i. 102) and a disgrace to the achievements of Henry V and to the military prowess of the assembled nobles. This is the speech which fails to mention Talbot whose exploits and death (occurring historically later) would seem likely to have been recalled if this play followed Part One. His absence from Gloucester's speech seems strange although some good reasons have been adduced for it.³⁸ Gloucester's patriotic outburst is addressed

to the remaining nobles and justifies his sudden displeasure while reading the articles of peace. A fuller understanding of his grief comes from a knowledge of Part One where he promotes the more profitable match between the King and the daughter of the Earl of Armagnac. Reference to the broken contract is omitted in the economical exposition of Part Two.

Part Two does not require Part One as an introduction and the absence of reference to Talbot or the broken promise does not impair its understanding. One small effect, however, is lost in the transition between the plays. Three lines before the exit of Margaret in Part One, the stage direction, 'Kiss her' (V.iii. 184), indicates the conclusion of Suffolk's wooing. After Suffolk presents the Queen in the first scene of Part Two, King Henry's words are:

Suffolk, arise. Welcome, Queen Margaret:
I can express no kinder sign of love
Than this kind kiss.

(I.i. 17-19)

Awareness of the wooing scene in Part One adds effective irony to Henry's greeting.³⁹ The true relationship between Suffolk and the Queen becomes apparent a little later in the first act. The fierce enmity between Gloucester and Winchester, shown in Part One, is more quickly introduced and directly recalled in the first scene. Gloucester warns 'We shall begin our ancient bickerings' (I.i. 143) and, as he departs in rage, Winchester reminds his audience 'Tis known to you he is mine enemy' (I.i. 147) and anticipates the principal action of the first three acts when he adds 'Nay, more, an enemy unto you all' (I.i. 148).

There is nothing in Part Two to compare with the resemblances between 2 Tamburlaine and its predecessor. Shakespeare's treatment of history looks forward with confidence to future plays in the series and there are several indications that his intentions for the following plays were fairly certain as he wrote Part Two. The nature of the historical material which he chose to dramatize in Part Two requires a sequel to realize the significance of York's claim

to the crown. Incomplete as it is in regard to the progress of the Wars of the Roses, 2 Henry VI attempts in the early part of the play to find a central figure in Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester whose rise and fall are prominently displayed in the titles of both the quarto and Folio versions. After the murder of Gloucester, the two following scenes (III.iii; IV. i) show the bad end of Winchester and the violent death of Suffolk. It is late in the play when the chaos erupts with the rebellion of Jack Cade. When open battle breaks out in the final act after York returns from Ireland, Shakespeare sets the direction of the following plays with a dramatic design rather than, as in Part One, with forebodings of a general historical nature.

Several events in Part Two indicate Shakespeare's planning for the subsequent plays. Of the three prophecies provided by the Spirit to the Duchess of Gloucester in Act I, the first foretells the death of York which occurs in Part Three. This conjuring scene is a kind of play within a play directed by Bolingbroke with verbal stage directions (I.iv. 7-12), written parts for Southwell and himself, a dumb show of magical ceremonies (s.d., I. iv. 22ff), and special effects of lightning and thunder. The Spirit is asked: "First, of the King, what shall of him become?" (I.iv. 28). The ambiguous reply looks forward to the next play:

The duke yet lives that Henry shall depose;
But him outlive, and die a violent death.

(I.iv. 29-30)

York himself repeats these lines (I.iv. 58-9) and adds some ironic scepticism. The fates of Suffolk and Somerset, also foretold by the Spirit, are shown in Part Two. All three of the victims are linked by an unusual fact: their severed heads are brought on the stage separately following their deaths. Suffolk's head is delivered to the Queen in the last act of Part Two and Richard's head is discussed in Part Three (II.ii. 2, 6) after Margaret has commanded that it be put on 'York gates' (I.iv. 179). In the first scene of Part Three, York's son, later Richard III, enters with the head of Somerset whom

he had killed in the previous play and historically five years before.

The introduction of Richard in Part Two is perhaps the best indication that Shakespeare had a good idea of the scope and direction of his sequels. His presence is completely unhistorical and a strong sign of his future importance to the dramatist. Both Richard and his brother, later Edward IV, are dramatized in three plays. They were aged three and twelve, respectively, at the time of their dramatic appearance at the first Battle of Saint Albans in Act V of 2 Henry VI. Much earlier the sons of York are mentioned by Warwick (II.ii. 57) who in the same scene prophesies:

My heart assures me that the Earl of Warwick
Shall one day make the Duke of York a king.

(II. ii. 77-8)

The 'Kingmaker' ironically foretells his successful efforts in Part Three to place Edward, the inheritor of his father's title, on the throne.

Richard, however, is more prominent than Edward in the play. In the scene of their first appearance, about one hundred lines before the end of V.i., Richard speaks ten lines against his brother's insignificant one. In addition, Clifford twice describes him in terms which look beyond Part Three to

Richard III:

Hence, heap of wrath, foul indigested lump,
As crooked in thy manners as thy shape!

(V. i. 157-8)

and

Foul stigmatic, that's more than thou canst tell.

(V. i. 216)

Already in Richard's first scene, Shakespeare develops the peculiarities of his appearance and speech which are continued in the historical sequence.⁴⁰ Richmond Noble points out Richard's early proclivity for religious references and calls it a sure sign that Shakespeare was artistically aware of his

treatment of future history.⁴¹

In the final scene of the play, Richard again appears and speaks six lines after killing Somerset in single combat. In Hall, Somerset is among several nobles who are killed in the battle of Saint Albans by York's 'ever freshe-men'.⁴² In Richard's unhistorical appearance, he is dramatically presented as a ruthless warrior as well as a fierce defender of his father's honour. As the agent of Somerset's death, he completes the prophecy made earlier by the Spirit and at the same time becomes associated with the twice-mentioned fate foretold of Henry VI. The ambiguity of

The Duke yet lives that Henry shall depose;
But him outlive, and die a violent death.

(I. iv. 29-30, quoted 59-60)

assumes a significant alternative interpretation when Richard violently stabs Henry VI twice at the end of Part Three and thus becomes the agent of two of the prophecies in Part Two. Although there are no direct references to the Spirit in 3 Henry VI, Richard's appearance there with the head of Somerset and his words to Henry

I'll hear no more: die, prophet, in thy speech.
For this, amongst the rest, was I ordain'd.

(V. vi. 57-8)

suggest that Shakespeare invented this broad unifying device to link 2 and 3 Henry VI. Richard's thematic importance to Shakespeare and the qualities which he is given by the dramatist show a definite preparation for his larger role in the following plays. Edward, who succeeded Henry VI and ruled for twenty-two years (1461-1483), speaks only one line in Part Two. Shakespeare's attraction to Richard is evident from the design of the tetralogy where he appears in thirty-six scenes in three plays.⁴³ The relative neglect of Edward's reign probably encouraged Thomas Heywood to make his own two-part play on the subject a few years later.

An additional link with 3 Henry VI concerns Shakespeare's use of its source material in Part Two. Hall attributes the

death of Clifford, like the death of Somerset, to York's 'ever freshe-men' but in Part Two he is the victim of single combat with York. When Hall later tells of the murder by Clifford's son of York's son, Rutland, the avenger is given these words:

by Gods blode, thy father slew myne, and so wil
I do the and all thy kyn.⁴⁴

The dramatic patterns of revenge and bloodshed between fathers and sons which culminate in Part Three are well established in anticipation of their fuller prominence in the sequel. This preparation for the next play suggests that its sources had been carefully sifted for their theatrical potential so that Shakespeare could begin immediately on his completion of the Wars of the Roses.

Features similar to those which link 2 Henry VI to its predecessor are present in 3 Henry VI. The intimations of a future play on Richard III are intensified by the presence of Richard in nineteen of the twenty-eight scenes. He is given two long soliloquies, one of seventy-two lines in III.ii and one of thirty-three lines after he has murdered Henry VI in the penultimate scene (V.vi) of the play. In addition to these speeches, Richard injects several malicious asides which reflect a wide range of the characteristics with which he directs his ambitions toward the crown and develops into Shakespeare's first major theatrical character. With these frequent asides, he is constantly in direct communication with the audience and even with single lines such as 'I hear, yet say not much, but think the more' (IV.i. 82), he is positioned to show an acute understanding of his enemies and competitors as well as to indicate a yearning to make the best use of both his weaknesses and the strengths of his chosen self-sufficiency. This yearning expresses itself as a dream in sight of its object:

Why then I do but dream on sovereignty;
Like one that stands upon a promontory
And spies a far-off shore where he would tread,
Wishing his foot were equal with his eye;

And chides the sea, that sunders him from thence,
 Saying he'll lade it dry to have his way:
 So do I wish the crown, being so far off;
 And so I chide the means that keeps me from it;
 And so I say I'll cut the causes off,
 Flattering me with impossibilities.

(III.ii. 134-43)

or, in the same soliloquy, as a kind of turbulent nightmare which identifies its goal as breath itself:

And yet I know not how to get the crown,
 For many lives stand between me and home:
 And I, - like one lost in a thorny wood,
 That rents the thorns and is rent with thorns,
 Seeking a way, and straying from the way;
 Not knowing how to find the open air,
 But toiling desperately to find it out -
 Torment myself to catch the English crown:
 And from that torment I will free myself,
 Or hew my way out with a bloody axe.

(III.ii. 172-81)⁴⁵

The desperation at Bosworth Field when Richard is 'seeking for Richmond in the throat of death' (Richard III, V. iv. 5) is ironically prophesied in the last line.

More direct anticipations of Richard III occur in 3 Henry VI, especially in the last act. This was also the procedure of both 1 Henry VI and 2 Henry VI whose final acts are required to achieve the difficult balance between some sort of resolution and an introduction to the following play. Richard, in soliloquy again, provides the firmest links as he looks forward to the remaining obstacles between himself and the crown:

Clarence, beware; thou keep'st me from the light,
 But I will sort a pitchy day for thee;
 For I will buzz abroad such prophecies
 As Edward shall be fearful of his life;
 And then, to purge his fear, I'll be thy death.
 King Henry and the Prince his son are gone;
 Clarence, thy turn is next, and then the rest,
 Counting myself but bad till I be best.
 I'll throw thy body in another room,
 And triumph, Henry, in thy day of doom.

(V.vi. 84-93)

Although Clarence's death occurs historically seven years

later (in 1478) it is evident that Shakespeare had planned the transition from 3 Henry VI to Richard III with dramatic certainty so that Richard could reach his earthly crown without waiting through a long dramatization of the long reign of Edward IV. In Richard III Edward's fatal illness is mentioned in the first scene (I.i. 136-7) and accompanies him on his first and only appearance (II.i) after the murder of Clarence in the previous scene. In 3 Henry VI Richard's older brothers are not developed very far beyond their respective reputations for lust and perjury, duly emphasized in the early scenes of the sequel. Shakespeare's principal attraction was to Richard and his planning for Richard III in 3 Henry VI shows the dramatist's conception of his hero's effective career spanning two plays. The first two of the eleven ghosts which haunt Richard before Bosworth Field are Prince Edward and his father, Henry VI, murdered in that order in the previous play. Margaret, who grows in strength and fury⁴⁶ toward her unhistorical presence in Richard III, is the only character other than Henry VI to be represented on the stage in each play of the tetralogy. Where the former King appears as a ghost, the former Queen also displays a haunting other-worldliness in her appearances.

As an additional preparation for Richard III, Shakespeare introduces 'Young Henry, Earl of Richmond' (IV.vi. 67) in a scene coming between two which show the rising fortunes of the Yorkists. He is dramatically superfluous and does not speak, but the prophetic words of Henry VI which are addressed to him look forward to the completion of the historical sequence:

Come hither, England's hope. Lays his hand on his head.
If secret powers
 Suggest but truth to my divining thoughts,
 This pretty lad will prove our country's bliss.
 His looks are full of peaceful majesty;
 His head by nature fram'd to wear a crown,
 His hand to wield a sceptre; and himself
 Likely in time to bless a regal throne.

(IV.vi. 68-74)

Henry's next lines to the future Henry VII are spoken in Richard III when the ghost of

Harry, that prophesied thou shouldst be king,
Doth comfort thee in thy sleep ...

(V.iii. 130-1)

with a direct allusion to the earlier play.

Although the anticipations of Richard III are present throughout 3 Henry VI and ten characters (including the two ghosts) reappear in the later play, 3 Henry VI has closer thematic and stylistic links to 2 Henry VI, with which it was closely associated in early publication. F.P. Wilson writes:

Henry VI, Part 3 is an obvious sequel to Part 2:
without Part 3 Part 2 is actable, but inconclusive.⁴⁷

Unlike Alphonsus and Selimus which reach a more conclusive resolution in their incomplete form, 2 Henry VI was written after Shakespeare had passed the tentative initial phase of his sequence and it and its sequel give the impression of continuous composition as well as continuous action. The contention between York and Lancaster is brought to a firm resolution with the violent deaths of King Henry VI and his heir in the final act.

Seven characters from 2 Henry VI continue their dramatic lives in Part Three. The first speech, by Warwick, who had spoken the last words in Part Two, parallels the similar use of Suffolk to bridge the first two plays. Some exposition is required for the theatrical practicality of the new play, but even so the first scene is, as Cairncross points out, 'relatively inadequate without some previous knowledge of 2 Henry VI.'⁴⁸ A short cut to the re-identification of the allegiances of the nobles is indicated in a stage direction preserved in the 1595 edition showing that red or white roses are displayed prominently by the eleven major characters and soldiers of both sides who are soon on the stage. The Yorkists, entering first, review the fortunes of the battle of Saint Albans fought at the end of the previous play. The fresh blood of their victims is commented upon and Richard carries the head of Somerset whom he had killed in the battle. The fate of Buckingham, reported in Edward's first four lines, is also preserved in a stage direction not in the Folio and

occurring in the battle scene in the previous play (V.ii. 71). There are many references to the death of Clifford, especially by his son who intensifies his demand for revenge⁴⁹ and finally achieves it when York is killed at the end of the first act. Clifford sets into the action and language of the play a pattern of violent revenge which is self-perpetuating. The imagery of wild animals, wild nature, and human butchery is continued from 2 Henry VI and broadened by the personal vendettas framed within the national war.

A few other references in 3 Henry VI are clarified by acquaintance with its predecessor. Rather than a third explanation of the complex genealogical relationships, the York claim to succession and other sidelights are abbreviated in I.i and III.iii. Longer, more detailed accounts had appeared in both 1 Henry VI and 2 Henry VI. Two brief references to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester lose their force in Part Three. In the first scene, after Warwick has confronted Henry with the accusation that he had lost France, the King responds:

The Lord Protector lost it, and not I:
When I was crown'd I was but nine months old.

(I.i. 111-12)

The first line is untrue and the second irrelevant. Henry in his desperation, soon confirmed by his aside 'I know not what to say: my title's weak' (I.i. 138), avoids the admission that the loss of French lands resulted through his marriage with Margaret. The Lord Protector was in favour of a more auspicious match. Another ironic mention of Humphrey is offered by Richard and can be appreciated more by knowledge of 2 Henry VI. When Edward distributes new titles to his brothers, Richard comments:

Let me be Duke of Clarence, George of Gloucester,
For Gloucester's dukedom is too ominous.

(II.vi. 106-7)

Some interesting parallels exist between 3 Henry VI and 1 Henry VI although they are not immediately required by an audience of Part Three. Warwick's prophecy in the

Temple Garden scene of Part One that

this brawl to-day,
Grown to this faction in the Temple Garden,
Shall send between the Red Rose and the White
A thousand souls to death and deadly night.

(II.iv. 124-7)

is unwittingly matched by Henry after witnessing a father who has slain his son and a son who has slain his father:

Wither one rose, and let the other flourish!
If you contend, a thousand lives must wither.

(II.v. 101-2)

A parallel between Margaret and Joan of Arc is implied on several occasions in Part Three. Before his death involving the unhistorical participation of Margaret, York ironically says 'A woman's general; what should we fear?' (I.ii. 68) and five lines later boasts that 'Many a battle have I won in France' (I.ii. 73). In the scene of York's death she is called 'an Amazonian trull' (I.iv. 114) and 'false French-woman' (I.iv. 149) and later King Edward concludes that 'she minds to play the Amazon' (IV.i. 105). In Part One, the Dauphin says to Joan 'thou art an Amazon' (I.ii. 104). Margaret herself, in the only scene of the play which is set in France announces: 'I am ready to put armour on' (III.iii. 230 quoted at IV.i. 104 by a Post). That scene also contains Warwick's arrival to the court of Lewis to procure a French bride for Edward. A broken contract, as in Part One, results when a Post arrives with the news that Edward has chosen Elizabeth Grey. This upsetting development causes Warwick to join with Margaret and return with her to England as Suffolk had done in somewhat comparable circumstances. Cairncross calls this scene in France 'imaginary',⁵⁰ which is a sign that Shakespeare was perhaps emphasizing the situation to reflect a pattern in his dramatization of history.

The three parts of Henry VI, the first Elizabethan play to be so divided under one title, share a common feature in their final acts. They each look forward with various degrees of certainty to a sequel. That Part Two and Part Three have a

closer relationship to each other than either has to Part One is not surprising in view of the phases of historical material on which they are based. The historical conclusion to the Wars of the Roses was, in the words of Hall, 'the Tragical doynge of Kyng Richard the III'. The houses of York and Lancaster were united by Queen Elizabeth's grandfather, Henry VII, just over a century before the plays were written.

The final and most important play of the sequence had as its obvious terminal point the victory of Richmond at Bosworth Field in 1485, fourteen years after the death of Henry VI. Richard III, who succeeded to the throne in 1483, was given so much advance preparation in 2 and 3 Henry VI that Shakespeare evidently planned not to delay the increasing pace of his rise or deny him dramatic prominence by attending to the reign of Edward IV.

Richard III is the second longest play of the canon. The 1597 quarto which 'recent editors agree ... was reconstructed from memory by Shakespeare's company'⁵¹ is 800 lines longer than 1 Henry VI and 400 lines longer than either Part Two or Part Three. The Folio text adds about 200 lines to the 3400 of the quarto. The increased length can be partly explained by the vast amount of exposition and recapitulation which the last play of the series must burden. In addition to these responsibilities, the remaining twelve years of the reign of Edward IV are compressed into 1000 lines in the first four scenes. These demands, complicated by the theatrical necessity of a play which could be performed for an audience not familiar with its predecessors, no doubt contributed to its length. There are continued references both to past history and to dramatic situations previously invented by Shakespeare.

The four scenes of the first act, especially, 'serve to remind us of happenings, usually unhistorical happenings, in the previous play'.⁵² There is really very little of substance that is new in Richard's famous opening soliloquy which is based on his two long soliloquies in 3 Henry VI. It is necessary, however, to have a restatement as a prologue in

which the wishful sentiments of King Edward in the last speech of 3 Henry VI are now described. 'These fair well-spoken days' (I.i. 29) capsules 'the prosperous reign of Kyng Edward the Fourthe' as Hall entitles this part of his history. The elimination of Clarence remains Richard's priority and thus whatever external stability his words describe is immediately threatened by their satirical tone and the confidently plotted fate for his brother.

Richard III requires a great deal of exposition in order to achieve independence from its predecessors in the series. Because many of the characters in the play have lost a husband, a son, or brother, continual reference is made to the appropriate slaughters and their circumstances as dramatized in 3 Henry VI. The reminders of the past lead to the stylized scenes of personal lament and the supernatural haunting of retributive ghosts described by Clarence and paraded before Richard in dreams. The frequent references to past crimes also help to define the survivors as a community of sufferers and allow the arrival of Richmond to become a symbol of the deliverance and purification of England that

hath long been mad and scarred herself,
The brother blindly shed the brother's blood,
The father rashly slaughtered his own son,
The son, compelled, been butcher to the sire.

(V.v. 23-26)

Here, in the last speech of Richard III, Shakespeare refers to the scene in 3 Henry VI where these actions are lamented in front of Henry VI.

The principal victims in 3 Henry VI, Rutland and York, Prince Edward and Henry VI, are the sons and fathers who are most frequently recalled in Richard III. The manner of their deaths is described in each case. Their violent ends are kept constantly in the audience's mind. The funeral of Henry VI and both his and his son's ghost at the end of the play are the most conspicuous reminders of the past. The stabbing of Prince Edward by the three sons of York in Part Three is mentioned by Richard, his widow, his mother, Clarence after

his dream, and Clarence's murderer. Anne's account is the most vivid:

Queen Margaret saw
Thy murderous falchion smoking in his blood;
The which thou once didst bend against her breast,
But that thy brothers beat aside the point.

(I.ii. 93-6)

and agrees exactly with its previous dramatization.

But Shakespeare's use of the past is not always so exact and shows that his purpose was not always merely to review. When Margaret herself recalls the scene of her son's death, she includes spectators who were neither historically nor dramatically present. At one point, she accuses Rivers, Dorset, and Hastings as 'standers-by' (I.iii. 209). Her curse, when later recalled, includes Grey but omits Dorset (III.iii. 15) thus extending the cumulative guilt for the murder beyond its perpetrators. Other apparent references to 3 Henry VI also indicate that Shakespeare did not rely on precise reference. Richard confronts Margaret with an order of events which differs from that which had been dramatized. He reminds her of the

The curse my noble father laid on thee
When thou didst crown his warlike brows with paper
And with thy scorns drew'st rivers from his eyes,
And then, to dry them, gav'st the Duke a clout
Steeped in the faultless blood of pretty Rutland.

(I.iii. 173-77)

The true order of events in I.iv of 3 Henry VI is first, Margaret's taunting presentation of the blood-stained handkerchief, then the crowning with paper, and finally York's curse of the 'tiger's heart wrapp'd in a woman's hide' (I.iv. 137). Richard's emphasis on York's curse is taken up by Margaret for her own curse a few lines later, which is recalled throughout Richard III. Shakespeare's re-ordering directs the scene toward her most significant words which 'function in some ways similar to those of the prophecies in Macbeth'.⁵³

Margaret's presence in the last play of the sequence is unhistorical; she left England in 1475, three years before the murder of Clarence and eight years before the date which

represents most of the incidents in the play. At the end of Part Three, Clarence reports her ransom and King Edward orders: 'Away with her and waft her hence to France' (V.vii. 41). But Shakespeare disregarded her historical fate and recognized her potential choric function. In her final scene she explains:

Here in these confines slyly have I lurked
To watch the waning of mine enemies.
A dire induction am I witness to,
And will to France, hoping the consequence
Will prove a bitter, black, and tragical.

(IV.iv. 3-6)

Her departure from the play comes before the last of her curses is fulfilled on Bosworth Field.

There are several other events which seem to refer to 3 Henry VI but do not agree in detail. Clarence appeals to his murderers to remind Gloucester

when our princely father York
Blessed his three sons with his victorious arm
And charged us from his soul to love each other.

(I.iv. 238-40)

The desperation of his appeal may be indicated by its impossibility; Clarence arrived in England from Burgundy after his father had been killed. When Edward later laments his brother's death, he recalls:

Who told me, in the field at Tewkesbury,
When Oxford had me down, he rescued me
And said, 'Dear brother, live, and be a king!'

(II.i. 113-15)

Neither history nor 3 Henry VI mentions this action or some of the others which Edward in the same speech attributes to Clarence.

It is thus somewhat misleading to emphasize any dependence of Richard III on the Henry VI trilogy. The complicated relationships are clearer with some preparation but Shakespeare's realization of their complexity is shown by the constant backward references intended to clarify them. The deaths of

Rutland, York, Edward, and Henry VI, Clarence's perjury, and Henry's prophecy of Richmond's future⁵⁴ all receive at least two reminders during Richard III so that the past achieves a kind of presence which becomes both thematically and theatrically important.

Much critical discussion has centred on the issue of a grand design in the first and especially the second of Shakespeare's historical sequences. What evidence there exists for their dating tends to suggest that the Henry VI plays and Richard III, unlike the second tetralogy, were written either without interruption or at least very nearly so. The final acts of the Henry VI trilogy strongly indicate Shakespeare's intentions of continuing: Part One is less sure about its sequel than Parts Two or Three and thus includes anticipations which remain safely vague about the dramatist's decisions concerning his use of sources and his historical imagination. Parts Two and Three are themselves a closely linked two-part play and also a definite sign of a future play about Richard III which they almost directly promise through their emphasis on Richard's unhistorical presence in much of the action.

The many links between the plays and the varying significance that they represent help to justify discussion of his overall achievement and development as an artist through the experience. One of the major advantages of the sequence to Shakespeare's early years in the theatre was the challenge of designing the individual plays as separately structured units. The dramatization of continuing history in a series of sequels had important effects on the independent construction of each play.

iv. The Structure of the Individual Plays.

The links which bind the historical sequence, especially in the final and opening scenes of adjoining plays, may have made Shakespeare more aware of the necessity of providing a

unity and sense of completeness in each play. The difficulty of imposing a dramatic form upon the continuum of history meant that each play in the series required more than a convenient stopping place. It meant that each play must have a satisfying design and conclusion in spite of its incompleteness. To do this without an abruptness that might interrupt or destroy the cumulative dramatic development of historical figures or the cumulative thematic significance of their actions necessitated close planning. It required a growing sense of not only what material was available, but also, and more importantly, how it would be used. Shakespeare's increasing alertness to these problems is evident in the plays.

The dramatist faced a special problem in the first play of his projected series. The sources with alterations and ingenious arrangements (like bringing forward Talbot's heroism and death) could produce a unified treatment of the English fortunes in France during the earlier part of the reign of Henry VI. This segment of history was more self-contained than the later chronicle material on the Wars of the Roses. Twenty of the twenty-seven scenes in Part One are set in France and concentrate on the struggle between the French forces led by Joan la Pucelle and the English forces led by Talbot, before both die and a royal marriage is proposed to seal a truce. The nature of the material for Part One leaves the play somewhat apart from the three sequels where all but one of their scenes take place in England.

But the neatness of the material for Part One along with Shakespeare's uncertain plans for the following plays left the dramatist with little room to show how important these years were to the future history of England. As a result, the most significant pointer to that future is the Temple Garden scene invented by Shakespeare. Presentiments of future domestic strife intensify here and are continued by such choric elders as Warwick and especially Exeter who 'doth wish/ His days may finish ere that hapless time' (III. i. 200-1). Although neither of their deaths is shown or reported in Part One, they are not among the characters in Part Two.

The use of such presentiments during the conflict in France is a partial solution to presenting the two principal concerns of the play: costly foreign wars and weakening domestic controls. The former will be completed by the end of the play but the latter will continue in subsequent plays. An effort to cross these lines of action occurs in Paris where, after King Henry has made Talbot Earl of Shrewsbury, a fictitious quarrel between Vernon, a Yorkist, and Basset, a Lancastrian, is tacked on to complete the short scene (III.iv). This prepares for their reappearance in the next scene (IV.i), which leads to Henry's open adoption of the red rose and his appointment of York as Regent of France to the exclusion of Somerset. The death of Talbot is soon shown to be the direct result:

The fraud of England, not the force of France,
Hath now entrapp'd the noble-minded Talbot:
Never to England shall he bear his life,
But dies betray'd to fortune by your strife.

(IV.iv. 36-9)

In a play which, according to Thomas Nashe, pleased its original spectators for bringing Talbot's life and death to the English stage, Shakespeare takes some pains to trace also the origin and early development of the York-Lancastrian conflict. These long-range preparations for York's claim to the crown are linked with the French campaigns because of his intention to write a sequel. The same is true, but to a lesser degree, of the personal conflict between Winchester and Gloucester which is extended from their initial confrontation in the first scene into three further meetings of bitter altercation. Winchester's threats are repeated in each of these scenes (I.iii, III.i, V.i).

Before the more direct historical links to 2 Henry VI in the last act of the play, Shakespeare has already integrated the Winchester-Gloucester and York-Somerset antagonisms into the background of the French wars. Their presence in the early scenes leaves no doubt as to Shakespeare's preparations to return to England in another play. The introduction of

Margaret in the last act of 1 Henry VI is a sign of Shakespeare's choice of a single linking device. Suffolk's threatening last words occur at a point that concludes the play with 'some comic conventions such as peace and preparation for marriage'.⁵⁵ But as the wars in France and the era of Henry V come to a close, 'suddenly a new set of forces has been released'.⁵⁶ A dramatic resolution is ominously darkened by historical factors which achieve the necessary balance between completing one play and hinting at another.

Two scenes (III. i -ii) of similar length form a 'massive center-piece'⁵⁷ in 2 Henry VI and are the longest in the trilogy. In addition to dividing Part Two they also divide the three Henry VI plays in half. The murder of Humphrey occurs between them and prepares the way for Cade's rebellion and the battle of Saint Albans, as well as the continued civil wars of Part Three. When Shakespeare planned his second and third plays in the series, he did so almost as if the acceptance of Part One resulted in a fresh start for the succeeding plays.

The structural and symbolic importance of Duke Humphrey and his fate emerges in 2 Henry VI to more prominence than Part One would indicate. One significant clue to the greater emphasis on Humphrey is shown by Shakespeare's use of Foxe to supplement his main historical sources. The Lord Protector of Part One becomes the sympathetic 'good' Duke Humphrey whose wisdom and justice are literally strangled by a conspiracy supported by Suffolk, Queen Margaret, Winchester, Buckingham, and York. The carefully plotted downfall of his wife Eleanor which precedes her husband's murder is also without anticipation in the previous play.

After the murder of Humphrey almost exactly in the centre of 2 Henry VI, Shakespeare quickens the pace of the play as Winchester and Suffolk fall and Cade creates havoc through ten short scenes until he is slain by Iden. At that moment, however, York returns from Ireland (V.i) and the interruption of violence is short before York and his newly arrived sons are in conflict with the King's forces at Saint Albans. Their

victory marks the end of the play and the four characters (Gloucester, Winchester, Somerset, and Suffolk) continued from Part One who die in Part Two are replaced by an equal number who will continue into Part Three. The introduction of the two future kings, Edward and Richard, along with Warwick the 'Kingmaker', and the revenge-minded young Clifford is essential preparation for Part Three. The situation at the end of Part Two has eliminated four non-martial figures and introduced four martial characters who are now firmly established into two opposing armies and tested under the conditions of open battle. Only King Henry remains apart from the violence. The action of the play has left the halls and gardens of the first half of the play for the streets and fields of battle.

The structure of Part Two differs from that of Part One in several ways. In Part One Shakespeare was forced to invent several interior links to unify the concurrent levels of action in the play. The geographical range between England and France, the highly personal and self-contained nature of the quarrels between Gloucester and Winchester and between York and Somerset, and York's own status as a claimant to the throne prevent a sustained treatment of any one of these several interests and thus lead to isolated episodes. Invented scenes, the three interrupted ceremonies (I.i, III.i, IV.i), the three similar thematic uses of 'the dominating female', and the significance given to the funeral of Henry V (I.i), the death of Mortimer towards the middle of the play (II.v), and the death of Talbot towards the end (IV.vii) are necessary to unify the 'recalcitrance of the historical material'.⁵⁸

The various means which Shakespeare uses to connect the issues of 1 Henry VI were required because of their relative subservience to the military world of the French wars. In Part Two, with the action set entirely in England, the construction of the play does not require such ingenious methods of uniting the material. The early scenes with Eleanor and Humphrey and the plotting by their enemies result in the protector of law and authority brought to disgrace and death. After the sequential deaths of Gloucester (III.ii),

Winchester (III.iii), and Suffolk (IV.i), the fortunes of war determine the chances of survival.

The very fast pace of the last third of 2 Henry VI results from the many short scenes and the frequent topographical references, especially to the London streets overrun by Cade and his mob. In the battle of Saint Albans, the hurried pursuits and escapes which surround the confrontations and lead to the deaths of Clifford and Somerset continue the pace until the end of the play and Warwick's last speech beginning: 'After them! Nay, before them, if we can' (V.iii. 28).

The structure of Part Three once again differs from its predecessors. After the stratified Part One and the contrasting halves of Part Two, Part Three alternates between the fortunes of the Yorkists and the Lancastrians.⁵⁹ These are enclosed by the killing of Rutland and his father York in unhistorical order in the third and fourth scenes of the play and at the end of the play by the killing of Prince Edward and his father Henry VI. The pattern of alternating fortunes is introduced and emphasized in the prominent opening lines of the first, third, and fifth scenes. Warwick begins the play by recalling the Yorkist victory in the previous play: 'I wonder how the King escap'd our hands!' (I.i. 1). The surge of Lancastrian power is announced by Rutland two scenes later: 'Ah, whither shall I fly to scape their hands?' (I.iii. 1). The first line of the fifth scene offers another verbal echo. After York has been stabbed at the end of the previous scene, Edward, unaware of his father's death, asks:

I wonder how our princely father scap'd,
Or whether he be scap'd away or no
From Clifford's and Northumberland's pursuit.

(II.i. 1-3)

The pattern of pursuit and escape is well announced at the beginning of these early scenes and well integrated into those which follow. In the battle of Towton (II.iii-vi), Warwick and the three surviving sons of York meet after separate entrances as they flee from the Lancastrians. George echoes Rutland when he excitedly asks: 'Whither should we fly?'

(II.iii. 11). In the following short scene it is Clifford's turn to fly, and soon Henry is alone on the stage and elaborates Hall's diagnosis of the battle as 'some time flowyng, and sometime ebbying':⁶⁰

Now sways it this way, like a mighty sea
 Forc'd by the tide to combat with the wind;
 Now sways it that way, like the self-same sea
 Forc'd to retire by fury of the wind.
 Sometime the flood prevails, and then the wind;
 Now one the better, then another best;
 Both tugging to be victors, breast to breast;
 Yet neither conqueror nor conquered.
 So is the equal poise of this fell war.

(II.v. 5-13)

The King's words are an unexpected prologue to the spectacle of the anonymous father and son who bear the bodies of their son and father, respectively, onto the stage and prepare to seize their victims' gold only to discover the true nature of their deeds. Lancastrian retreat soon completes the battle sequence as Clifford's death marks the Yorkist victory just as York's death had earlier been the culmination of their defeat. Speaking to York's sons, Warwick emphasizes the reversal:

Off with the traitor's head,
 And rear it in the place your father's stands.

(II.vi. 85-6)

The capture of Henry and the coronation of Edward achieve for the play a momentary stability between its fluctuating fortunes.

The York position, however, is soon undermined by Edward's marriage to Lady Grey. Its repercussions in Warwick's change of allegiance, Clarence's desertion of his brothers, and Margaret's renewed campaign aided by French soldiers once again tilt the war in the favour of the Lancastrians. Their success is temporarily consummated in the capture of Edward. The final movement of the play begins with Edward's escape to which Clarence's re-alignment with his brothers, Warwick's death, Margaret's capture, and the stabbing of Prince Edward and Henry VI are added before the play reaches a firm resolution with Edward looking forward to peace and proudly

displaying his new-born heir. But by this time Richard has announced his determination to take control of the future history of England and the last play in the tetralogy.

He does so as Shakespeare's first major hero and tragic protagonist in the historical sequence. Because Richard III is the final play in the series it does not require forward-looking links like those in the Henry VI plays. At the end of Part Three, the open civil wars have ended as have the patterns of pursuit and escape and of victory and defeat which actually begin with the Yorkist victory at Saint Albans in Part Two. The rise of Richard, Duke of Gloucester, and the fall of Richard III provide the tragic design of the last play. Between the funeral of Henry VI and the final speech by the future Henry VII, three Yorkist kings of England die silently before 'civil wounds are stopped, peace lives again' (V.v. 40). Between Richard's alarming prologue and Richmond's comforting epilogue the unity of the play is assured by the character of its hero and by such formal balancing devices as the dream, lamentation, and wooing scenes which form the basis of a study by A.P. Rossiter.⁶¹

Shakespeare's attention to the individual structure of each of the four plays in the sequence and his handling of recurrent and continuing historical patterns within and between the plays is a major achievement of his early experience as a dramatist. No specific formula was adequate to convey the form and pressure of the past and in the construction of each play he responded imaginatively to the challenge offered by the difficult chronicle sources. As in Marlowe's sequel to 1 Tamburlaine, so in Shakespeare's sequels to 1 Henry VI, the young playwrights gained advantages which only this kind of writing could provide. Successive plays on the same subject with many of the same characters not only created an accumulating set of possible dramatic comparisons and contrasts but also the danger of repetition and confusing cross-reference. Shakespeare well appreciated the potential complications of retrospection and anticipation and showed his capacity for integrating what was important in

the past and what would be important to the future into a unified design appropriate to each play in the tetralogy.

v. Conclusion

Despite the many direct and indirect links between the plays - including specific allusions, developing characters, continuing themes and parallel situations - each of the four plays has its own particular design with adequate exposition to make it independent, at least temporarily, from the others in the series. The first grouping of the plays together, in 1623, lies behind the comment by G.P. Baker who in 1907 wrote:

we have a great tetralogy of twenty acts in which no one of the quarters, except possibly the last, is conceived as a unit.⁶²

But until some thirty years after their composition, contemporary readers were provided with only inferior versions of Part Two and Part Three, six quartos of Richard III, and no edition of 1 Henry VI. A.C. Hamilton, writing sixty years after Baker, has given a more cautious view of the tetralogy:

The history plays compose a sequence because the action gains significance in relation to what has happened and to what will happen. One consequence, as Tillyard shows, is that the history plays expand to form larger wholes.⁶³

The individual units, conceived by theatrical necessity for single performance do, of course, repay their consideration as a larger whole. Shakespeare accepted from his Tudor historical sources and from contemporary political doctrine certain controlling ideas. The degree to which they inform the plays and function as an integral part of his dramatization of history has, however, been open to divergent opinion. It is Tillyard more than Shakespeare who wants us 'never' ... to forget that, as Hall said in his preface, "King Henry the Fourth was the beginning and root of the great discord and division".⁶⁴ A number of critics have recognized the presence

of such ideas but questioned their importance to the extent which Tillyard claims. Robert Ornstein notes that 'the three brief references to the deposition of Richard II in the first tetralogy scarcely convince us that it was the cause of Henry VI's calamities'⁶⁵ and J.P. Brockbank has shown that

the plays of Henry VI are not, as it were, haunted by the ghost of Richard II, and the catastrophes of the civil wars are not laid to Bolingbroke's charge; the catastrophic virtue of Henry and the catastrophic evil of Richard are not an inescapable inheritance from the distant past but are generated by the happenings we are made to witness.⁶⁶

Cosmic processes enter the historical sequence certainly, but there is no consistent policy in their use nor does there need to be. They are usually invented to serve dramatic ends although

the workings of Providence are at least faintly implied whenever dreams, prophecies, curses, omens, astrology, ironic coincidence, and similar devices are used to show part of the truth about history.⁶⁷

In his first four history plays Shakespeare is more concerned with the idea of kingship and good rule and its close relationship with order and disorder. Henry VI is the first Shakespearean king to be killed and J.F. Danby has ably demonstrated its significance to the dramatist's later tragedies.⁶⁸ The responsibility of the king, the lure of the crown, and the suffering which results when it becomes the object of struggle receive increasing emphasis in the plays.⁶⁹ The issues appear simple; it is true that York is

far better born than is the King,
More like a king, more kingly in my thoughts;

(2 Henry VI, V.i. 28-9)

but problematic when his challenge to the King moves closer to war:

Here is a hand to hold a sceptre up,
And with the same to act controlling laws.
Give place: by heaven, thou shalt rule no more
O'er him whom heaven created for thy ruler.

(2 Henry VI, V.i. 102-5)

The idea of kingship fascinated Shakespeare; in the next play in the series, five of England's kings, Henry VI, Edward IV, and the future Edward V, Richard III, and Henry VII, are represented on the stage and one is murdered there. Four kings and the corpse and ghost of Henry VI appear in Richard III. Just as the sequel to Tamburlaine led its young author to a deeper consideration of his subject, so Shakespeare's long commitment to the English history play deepened his appreciation of the political and ethical values of the past. Partly at least to avoid repetition, Shakespeare also broadened and developed his dramatic techniques for portraying those values.

We are not placed in a much better position than Nicholas Rowe 'to see and know what was the first Essay of a Fancy like Shakespear's'.⁷⁰ All of the contenders for that distinction, including 1 Henry VI, possess qualities which are unmatched in plays written about 1590. Of special interest in Shakespeare's history plays is the fact that their sources are English and not classical or foreign. The material was accessible and familiar to the audience of the public theatre. The standard of fidelity which so pleased Nashe was sustained in the subsequent plays in the series as was the long process of selecting incidents and organizing dramatic scenes from the yearly accounts of history provided by the chronicles.

It is clear from the individual structure of the plays that their author was already a shrewd selector and competent planner. The construction of each of the four plays achieves a unity which is appropriate to its subject. The origins of the Wars of the Roses in factitious quarrelling and in the kingly ambitions of York are made to intersect and influence the wars in France in Part One. In Part Two the 'good' Duke Humphrey makes a solitary defence of order before hired murderers kill him in his bed and before disorder, latent for so long, finally commands the main action of the play. The disorder is isolated and unrelieved by comedy or prose scenes in Part Three where the self-perpetuation of revenge is set against the background of alternating fortunes of war

which itself contributes to the dramatization of futility and waste. Well before the rise and fall of Richard III in the fourth part of the tetralogy, 'there is much ... to remind us that we are witnessing the education of a tragic playwright'.⁷¹

In addition to Shakespeare's skill in construction, a notable feature of the plays is the number and range of the characters who are portrayed. There are at least forty speaking parts in each play and eighteen characters are represented in at least two plays. Joan in 1 Henry VI and Cade and his followers in 2 Henry VI as well as the Simpcox episode in the same play and the discussion of conscience by the murderers of Clarence in Richard III all serve serious dramatic purposes with comedy. The mock-heroic strain in Joan (which owes something to Tamburlaine)⁷² and in Cade (which owes something to York) is especially effective as is the often noted controlling wit of Richard of Gloucester.

Without a central character, the Henry VI plays depend on secondary characters to a greater extent than is usual in plays of the same period. Opposing factions are not defined by strength or weakness and their members are contributors as well as supporters:

secondary speakers in Tamburlaine lack the character to modify the sentiments of their leaders, but any member of the group in the Henry VI plays may re-express an issue from his point of view or stimulate a new series of objections from a new speaker.⁷³

The distribution of important speeches to several nobles has a balancing effect upon their often differing views. But at the same time it decreases the opportunity to explore the individual characteristics of the speaker whose meaning in a speech and function in the play receive greater emphasis than his motivations or individual habits of mind.

There is a sure development in Shakespeare's handling of characterization through the tetralogy. In 1 Henry VI the demands of construction take precedence over the individual characters. It does not mean very much to say that the

characters are consistent for the demands of the plot are clearly of greater importance to the dramatist. Messengers who sometimes approximate 'mechanical levers',⁷⁴ the isolated choric function of Exeter, the late appearance of Henry VI, and the many scenes of war in France all contribute to the emphasis on events and their interpretation. The first scene, with the frustration and anxiety expressed over the death of Henry V, serves as a prologue to England's mounting problems both in France and at home. The impending royal marriage at the end of the play creates new problems when it is expected to bring peace. Between these events the characters are usually given a single differentiating quality, an epithet which they retain throughout the play. Even with this limitation the characters can be memorable. Hazlitt speaks of Talbot as 'a very magnificent sketch: there is something as formidable in this portrait of him, as there would be in a monumental figure of him or in the sight of the armour which he wore'.⁷⁵

The emergence of Duke Humphrey as the main figure of the earlier scenes of 2 Henry VI is accomplished by showing him in a greater range of moods than in the previous play where he is remembered principally as a quarreller. Shakespeare now shows him as a husband as well as the Lord Protector. His appealing ratiocination during the exposure of the Simpcox 'miracle' is soon followed by news of his wife's disgrace and a scene of private grief when Humphrey and Eleanor are together for the last time. Shakespeare's attention to Humphrey and his importance in the overall plan for the history plays may be gauged by the use of the word 'tragedy'. He is the first major character to die in England. Gloucester foretells his own fate as

the prologue to their play;
For thousands more, that yet suspect no 'peril,
Will not conclude their plotted tragedy.

(III.i. 151-3)

Warwick, after the murder, quickly realizes how 'suspicious is this tragedy' (III.ii. 193).

The audience is denied Humphrey's last moments but one of his murderers asks his accomplice: 'Didst ever hear a man so penitent?' (III.ii.4). It is not until Richard III, as Robert Y. Turner has shown, that 'all the characters who face death undergo a moment of self-awareness'.⁷⁶ Turner sees this development as an important change from the Henry VI plays where character is normally allied to moral categories and where characters do not experience moral changes. Richard's soliloquy after waking from his haunted dream is the most advanced sign that Shakespeare is

changing his personae from moral categories to flexible characters with internal motives capable of acting in a literal world of historical events.⁷⁷

Before these new psychological interests in Richard III Shakespeare shows his first English king challenged by situations for which he is partly responsible and which he is forced to endure. The character of Henry VI impressed Rowe who found him

still describ'd with Simplicity, passive Sanctity, want of Courage, weakness of Mind, and easie Submission to the Governace of an imperious Wife, or prevailing Faction: Tho' at the same time the Poet do's Justice to his good Qualities, and moves the Pity of his Audience for him, by showing him Pious, Disinterested, a Contemner of the Things of this World, and wholly resign'd to the severest Dispensations of God's Providence.⁷⁸

This is the picture which emerges most fully in 3 Henry VI where the King's 'imperious Wife' leads the Lancastrian forces to the scene of confrontation with York, whose own view of the Queen Robert Greene thought memorable enough to transfer to her creator. By the end of the trilogy Shakespeare had not only been the literary inspiration to Greene's final effort at blank verse, but also and more positively, he had provided a model in Humphrey to the anonymous author of Woodstock and a model in Henry VI for the character of Marlowe's Edward II. In addition to receiving this recognition from his contemporaries, he began to explore the mind of Richard of Gloucester with an increasingly

effective use of soliloquies and, as W.H. Clemen has shown,⁷⁹ a greater command of imagery.

Richard's first long soliloquy of seventy-two lines occurs in 3 Henry VI and is the longest continuous speech written by Shakespeare.⁸⁰ It concludes with a manifesto for the actor playing Richard and for Richard playing the actor:

Why, I can smile, and murder whiles I smile,
 And cry 'Content!' to that that grieves my heart,
 And wet my cheeks with artificial tears,
 And frame my face to all occasions.
 I'll drown more sailors than the Mermaid shall;
 I'll slay more gazers than the basilisk;
 I'll play the orator as well as Nestor,
 Deceive more silyly than Ulysses could.
 And, like a Sinon, take another Troy.
 I can add colours to the chameleon,
 Change shapes with Proteus for advantages,
 And set the murderous Machiavel to school.

(III.ii. 182-93)⁸¹

Towards the end of the play when Richard arrives for his 'bloody supper' (V.v. 83) in the Tower, Henry asks 'What scene of death hath Roscius now to act?' (V.vi. 10) and later refers to the news of his son's death as 'that tragic history' (V.vi. 28). Richard's histrionics climax a play which shows Shakespeare's increasing consciousness of the actor's art and the dramatic effects which the use of theatrical language is capable of creating. Earlier in the play, in the great scene of York's death at Wakefield which gave the 1595 octavo its title, 'there is enough in the ... counterpoint of reflection and feeling to tax the resources of its actors'.⁸² With good reason did Greene associate a line from this scene with his actor-rival. The spectacle of York's paper 'crown combined with Rutland's bloody handkerchief (borrowed from The Spanish Tragedy with its actor-spectators, play within a play, a frequent use of the stage metaphor) must justify Northumberland's guiding response to the scene. Of his enemy's words, Northumberland admits:

Beshrew me, but his passion moves me so
 As hardly can I check my eyes from tears.

Had he been slaughter-man to all my kin
 I should not for my life but weep with him,
 To see how inly sorrow gripes his soul.

(I.iv. 150-1, 169-71)

York's passionate speech and Northumberland's tears are recalled in Richard III (I.iii. 186) and anticipate some effects of the Player's 'Hecuba' speech in Hamlet.

Further evidence which may help to confirm Shakespeare's serious concern with acting is the presence of actors' names in the Folio texts of 2 and 3 Henry VI. Bevis and John Holland are named as rebels in the Cade uprising in Part Two (IV.ii) and Gabriel (I.ii. 48), Sinclo, and Humfrey (III.i. 1) are designated for minor parts in Part Three. The extent of their use as speech prefixes favours authorial origin and may indicate Shakespeare's growing reliance on certain actors for his historical sequence. There are, however, no records which show whether the same actors performed the roles of the major characters who appear in more than one play. It is known from an anecdote in the diary of John Manningham (1602)⁸³ that Richard Burbage played Richard III but it is uncertain whether Shakespeare's first major hero originally benefited from his talents. It is enough to wonder with F.P. Wilson 'at the strength of that unknown company which had the honour of giving the first performance [of 3 Henry VI]',⁸⁴ and Richard III.

The significance of Shakespeare's historical sequence to the history of Elizabethan drama and the development of the dramatist has several striking parallels with Marlowe and Tamburlaine. Both Tamburlaine and Richard III attracted the finest actors of the Elizabethan stage to their title roles. Both dramatists in perhaps their first plays for the public stage created influential genres from a two-part heroic biographical play and from a four-part series based on English history. The decision to pursue their subject beyond one play brought them closer to an understanding of the tragic, a shrewder and more critical involvement with their material, and an opportunity to explore their own artistic resources.

Their achievement reaches the nearest dramatic equivalent in English to the epic. Modern theatrical experience with the early history plays of Shakespeare has brought out their 'undeniable theatricality',⁸⁵ and also their close relationships which require the Henry VI plays to be performed in sequence for the fullest effect. When completed by Richard III, to which both 2 and 3 Henry VI look forward, they gain a unity, even in adaptation,⁸⁶ which the more popular and more independent plays of the second tetralogy have not demanded from modern directors and audiences.

Notes to Chapter IV

References to Shakespeare's plays are from the Arden Shakespeare editions of 1 Henry VI (1962 reprinted 1969), 2 Henry VI (1957 reprinted 1969), and 3 Henry VI (1964 reprinted 1969), all edited by Andrew S. Cairncross. References to Richard III are from the New Penguin edition by E.A.J. Honigmann (Harmondsworth, 1968).

1. There were six quartos (1597, 1598, 1602, 1605, 1612, 1622) of Richard III before the First Folio. The 1597 title-page states that the play had 'beene lately Acted by the Right honourable the Lord Chamberlaine his servants'; the 1612 title-page mentions that it was 'lately Acted by the Kings Majesties servants'.
2. Henry V, edited by J.H. Walter, The Arden Shakespeare (1954 reprinted 1970), Epilogue, ll. 1-2, 9-14.
3. John Dover Wilson's introductions and notes to his individual editions of the Henry VI plays (Cambridge, 1952) contain the most detailed argument for the view that Part One was completed later than Parts Two and Three. Allowance or support for this theory occurs principally in Chambers, W.S. I, 292-3 and Clifford Leech, 'The Two-Part Play: Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare', Shakespeare Jahrbuch, 94 (1958), pp. 103-5 and Shakespeare: The Chronicles, Writers and their work: no. 146 (1962), p. 14. Later revision is suggested by F.P. Wilson, Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare, p. 118 and 'The English History Play' in Shakespearian and Other Studies, edited by Helen Gardner (Oxford, 1969), p. 15; Bullough III, 24; G. Blakemore Evans, review of the New Cambridge Shakespeare Henry VI, Parts 1, 2, and 3, SQ, 4 (1953), pp. 86-7; Marco Mincoff, 'The Composition of Henry VI, Part I', SQ, 16 (1965), 279-87 and 'The Chronology of Shakespeare's Early Works', Shakespeare Jahrbuch (Weimar), 100/101 (1964/65), 253-65.

Cairncross (1 Henry VI, pp. xxviii-xxix) finds support in earlier critics such as Dr Johnson (1765), Charles Knight (1842), Hudson (1851), Grant White (1859), Thomas Kenny (1864), Courthope (1903), Alexander (1929), Price (1951), and Kirschbaum (1952). Recent critics have not attempted new reappraisals as much as they have stated their preferences. Critics such as J.P. Brockbank (1961), M.M. Reese (1961), Ernest Talbert (1963), Irving Ribner (1965), A.C. Hamilton (1967), David Riggs (1971), Robert Ornstein (1972), and Robert Y. Turner (1974) have begun with 1 Henry VI in their discussions of Shakespeare's developing concerns and skills in his history plays. Their conclusions strongly support Shakespeare's sole authorship of the play and its priority. The best detailed answer to Dover Wilson's position remains that of Cairncross. The present study intends to supplement his conclusions in the light of the context afforded by an examination of other early dramatic sequels.
4. T.W. Baldwin, On the Literary Genetics of Shakspeare's Plays, 1592-1594 (Urbana, 1959), p. 341.
5. Bullough III, 158.

6. Arber IV, 107 (8 November 1623).
7. Arber III, 204.
8. See Cairncross, 2 Henry VI, pp. xii-xvii.
9. 2 Henry VI, edited by John Dover Wilson, NCS (Cambridge, 1952), pp. vii-viii; Cairncross, 2 Henry VI, pp. xi, xlvi.
10. 2 Henry VI, p. vii.
11. The Folio, in turn, borrowed from their 'quarto' predecessors in the headings 'The second Part of Henry the Sixt,, with the death of the Good Duke Humfrey' and 'The third Part of Henry the Sixt, with the death of the Duke of Yorke'.
12. H.D., pp. 16-20.
13. As Henslowe normally records the separate parts of a title, Baldwin's analysis of price structures in Literary Genetics, pp. 326-30 can be dismissed.
14. McKerrow I, 212.
15. Cairncross, 1 Henry VI, p. xxxi provides references in the play at I.iv.42 for 'the terror of the French'; III.iii.5 for Talbot's 'triumph'; and IV.vii for his 'fresh bleeding'.
16. 1 Henry VI, p. xxxiii; Peter Alexander, Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III (Cambridge, 1929), pp. 188ff.
17. Chambers, E.S. II, 128.
18. The Life and Genius of Shakespeare, p. 247. G. Blakemore Evans, reviewing the Cambridge edition in SQ, 4 (1953), p. 86 similarly wonders if this might be 'Henslowe's attempt to "get-in" on the popularity of the Henry VI plays then being run by Pembroke's men at the Theatre'.
19. Evans, SQ, 4 (1953), p. 85 notes 'the play shows that the influence of 1 Henry VI, both in phrase and handling of situation, is pervasive, markedly stronger than that of the other two parts and that the borrowings...point...to The Troublesome Raigne as the debtor'. Cairncross lists several borrowings from 3 Henry VI in Appendix V (c) of his edition of that play. The apparent borrowings from Richard III are mentioned on pp. xliv-xlv of his introduction to 3 Henry VI. These, however, are more doubtful.
20. Wilson, Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare, p. 106.
21. Ribner, The English History Play, p. 97.
22. E.M.W. Tillyard, Shakespeare's History Plays (1944 reprinted Harmondsworth, 1969), p. 169.
23. Kenneth Muir, Shakespeare's Tragic Sequence (1972), p. 25.
24. F.P. Wilson, 'The English History Play', p. 18.
25. A.C. Hamilton, The Early Shakespeare (San Marino, Calif., 1967), p. 18.
26. 3 Henry VI, edited by H.C. Hart, The [original] Arden Shakespeare, second edition (1925), pp. xxxi-xxxvi.

27. 3 Henry VI, p. xliv.
28. David Riggs, Shakespeare's Heroical Histories (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), p. 98.
29. J.P. Brockbank, 'The Frame of Disorder--Henry VI' in Early Shakespeare, edited by John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, 3 (1961), p. 76.
30. Edward Hall, Chronicle (1809), p. 231.
31. Bullough III, 33, 35.
32. Brockbank, p. 76 estimates this number.
33. 1 Henry VI, NCS, p. xii.
34. 1 Henry VI, pp. li, 6.
35. Hall, p. 116.
36. 1 Henry VI, p. x.
37. David Bevington, 'The Dominating Female in 1 Henry VI', Shakespeare Studies, 2 (1966), p. 56 concludes that 'a comparison of Margaret with Joan and the Countess reveals...that Margaret belongs as much to Part I as to the ensuing cycle'.
38. Evans, p. 86 notes that 'the only person mentioned, apart from Henry V, who is not actually present is the dead Duke of Bedford, Gloucester's brother'.

Shakespeare may have thought it unnecessary to distort history again or, as both Somerset and York are present, Gloucester's purposes would be better served by not mentioning the man whose isolation and death were, in Part One, shown to be their responsibility.

39. The scene of parting between Suffolk and Margaret (III.ii) has some resemblances to the scene of their meeting in Part One. A stage direction only in the bad quarto is 'She kisses him' (III.ii.407, collation), as he departs to exile in France. The Lieutenant who orders his death in IV.i gives prominence to Suffolk's affection for the Queen: 'Thy lips, that kiss'd the Queen, shall sweep the ground' (IV.i.74). Shakespeare could here be thinking of that first meeting, fatal to England, in Part One. He is not concerned with how the Lieutenant learned of the secret court romance.
40. See. 3 Henry VI: II.ii.136 'foul misshapen stigmatic'; V.vi.51 'an indigest deformed lump'; Richard III: I.ii.57 'thou lump of foul deformity'.
41. Noble writes: 'It is an instance of the consistency with which Shakespeare has drawn Richard's character throughout the plays, that thus early after his first introduction he should utter 'odd old ends stolen forth of Holy Writ' (Richard III, I.iii.336), Richmond Noble, Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge (1935), p. 126, quoted by Cairncross, p. 148n. Noble also refers to Richard's taunt to young Clifford:
- Fie! charity for shame! speak not in spite
For you shall sup with Jesu Christ to-night.
(V.i.214-15)

42. Hall, p. 232.
43. Richard is present in nineteen of the twenty-eight scenes in Part Three, a higher percentage than the fifteen of twenty-five scenes in which he appears in Richard III.
44. Hall, p. 251 (1461-62).
45. Whatever the temporal relationship between 3 Henry VI and the anonymous Arden of Faversham (pub. 1592), the latter play includes an effective dream after which its hero uses a similar construction to express his fear:

With this I waked and trembled every joint,
 Like one obscured in a little bush
 That sees a lion foraging about,
 And, when the dreadful forest king is gone,
 He pries about with timorous suspect
 Throughout the thorny casements of the brake,
 And will not think his person dangerless
 But quakes and shivers though the cause be gone.
 (scene vi, ll. 20-7)

The Tragedy of Master Arden of Faversham, edited by M.L. Wine, The Revels Plays (1973). The difficulties in dating the play are discussed by the editor on pp. xliii-xlv.

46. See for instance her curses at V.v.73-8.
47. F.P. Wilson, 'The English History Play', p. 15.
48. 3 Henry VI, p. li.
49. References are at I.i.55; I.iii.5,46; I.iv.109,175.
50. 3 Henry VI, p. 80 n.
51. Honigmann, Richard III, p. 242.
52. R.A. Law, 'Links Between Shakespeare's History Plays', SP, 50 (1953), p. 174.
53. Honigmann, Richard III, p. 40.
54. Here again, Shakespeare departs from 3 Henry VI when Richard wonders:
- How chance the prophet could not at that time
 Have told me, I being by, that I should kill him?
 (IV.ii.99-100)
- Richard was not present when Henry and Richmond met.
55. Hamilton, p. 19.
56. Bullough III, 31.
57. Mark Rose, Shakespearean Design (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), p. 130.
58. Bullough III, 38; Rose, p. 129 calls attention to the last of these parallels.
59. Cairncross, 3 Henry VI, pp. lix-x provides a convenient chart of the major events in this pattern.
60. Hall, p. 256.

61. See 'Angel with Horns: The Unity of Richard III' in Angel with Horns: Fifteen Lectures on Shakespeare, edited by Graham Storey (1961 reprinted 1970), 1-22.
62. G.P. Baker, The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist (N.Y., 1907 reprinted N.Y., 1965), p. 151.
63. Hamilton, p. 31.
64. Tillyard, p. 153.
65. Robert Ornstein, A Kingdom for a Stage: the Achievement of Shakespeare's History Plays (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), p. 16.
66. Brockbank, p. 98. Similar points are made in a study of the imagery of Henry VI by Carol McGinnis Kay, 'Traps, Slaughter, and Chaos: A Study of Shakespeare's Henry VI Plays', Studies in the Literary Imagination, 5 (1972), 1-26.
67. Riggs, p. 48.
68. J.F. Danby, Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature (1948 reprinted 1972), p. 60.
69. Clifford Leech, 'The Two-Part Play', p. 102 writes: 'the very fact of continuing with the same historical characters, the same enveloping sequence of event, made him more likely to see the dreadfulness and the suffering as real things'.
70. In Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare, edited by D. Nichol Smith, second edition (Oxford, 1963), p. 4.
71. Brockbank, p. 81.
72. See Riggs, pp. 22, 105ff.
73. Robert Y. Turner, 'Shakespeare and the Public Confrontation Scene in Early History Plays', MP, 62 (1964), p. 10.
74. W. Clemen, 'Shakespeare's Use of the Messenger's Report' in Shakespeare's Dramatic Art (1972), p. 101.
75. William Hazlitt, Characters of Shakespear's Plays (1817 reprinted 1906), p. 165.
76. Robert Y. Turner, 'Characterization in Shakespeare's Early History Plays', ELH, 31 (1964), p. 241. See also his Shakespeare's Apprenticeship (Chicago, 1974), p. 129.
77. Turner, ELH, 31 (1964), p. 258.
78. Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare, p. 16.
79. See Wolfgang Clemen, The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery (1951), pp. 40-52 for an important account of Shakespeare's artistic growth in the tetralogy. In A Commentary on Shakespeare's Richard III (1968), the same critic concludes many of his sections by showing how Shakespeare has surpassed his contemporaries (and his earlier plays) in dramatic uses of curses, dreams, children, ghosts, etc.

80. Richard, in the three plays, speaks more lines of verse than any other character in Shakespeare's plays. Only Prince Hal-Henry V speaks more lines of which just over half are verse.
81. In Richard III, the opening exchange in III.v between Richard and Buckingham is another notable use of the language of the theatre.
82. Brockbank, p. 95.
83. Chambers, E.S. II, 308.
84. F.P. Wilson, Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare, p. 125.
85. Sir Barry Jackson, 'On Producing Henry VI', SS 6 (1953), p. 52. See also A.C. Sprague, Shakespeare's Histories, Plays for the Stage (1964), pp. 111-22.
86. The Wars of the Roses, adapted by John Barton and Peter Hall (1970), preserves about half of Shakespeare's 12,000 lines and telescopes the Henry VI trilogy into two plays.

CHAPTER V

Shakespeare's Second Tetralogyi. Composition and Publication; Woodstock

The sonnet which serves as Epilogue to Henry V looks both forward in history to 'Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crown'd King' (l. 9) and back in accomplishment to the Henry VI plays 'Which oft our stage hath shown' (l. 13). In 1623, when these lines were first printed, a reader of Shakespeare's plays, linked by this sonnet to tell the history of England over nearly ninety years, would receive his first direct indication that they were not planned or written in their historical order. Until the First Folio the impressive extent and ambition of Shakespeare's accomplishment had probably not attracted public recognition as a sequence of eight plays. There is no certain evidence that the Henry VI trilogy had benefited in revival or systematic revision influenced by the second tetralogy. Meres had neglected or been unaware of its existence although in 1598 Richard III with its many retrospective links was reprinted in a second quarto. The author of Palladis Tamia, otherwise attracted to patterns and parallels, does not bother to list Richard II, Richard III, Henry IV, and King John in historical order.

Unlike the first tetralogy, the four plays of the second sequence were available to the reading public within approximately two years after their date of composition. Richard II was first printed in late 1597 after Andrew Wise had entered its title in the Stationers' Register on August 29.¹ Two more editions followed in 1598 but it was not until the fourth quarto in 1608 that the deposition scene (IV.i. 154-318) was first printed. Part One of Henry IV was also printed twice in 1598 and sold by Wise after it was entered in the Stationers' Register on 25 February.² It became the most often printed of Shakespeare's plays before 1623 with editions appearing in 1599, 1604, 1608, 1613, and 1622. Only

one quarto of 2 Henry IV was published, by Andrew Wise and William Aspley in 1600. In the same year an abbreviated and corrupt text of Henry V, lacking among other things the 223 lines of the chorus, was printed for John Busby and Thomas Millington, who had also been responsible for the 'bad' quartos of 2 and 3 Henry VI which reappeared in 1600. Henry V was printed again in 1602 and 1619.

The title-pages of the early editions of Shakespeare's second historical sequence, with the exception of 2 Henry IV, do not advertise continuity or the reappearance of the major historical characters. On none of the title-pages of Richard II is Bolingbroke-Henry IV, Northumberland, or Hotspur mentioned. It was known in five quartos as 'The Tragedy of Richard the Second' and in the Folio as 'The Life and Death of Richard the Second'. The title-pages of the two parts of Henry IV are of particular interest. None of the seven quartos of Part One mentions Prince Henry or its relationship to a predecessor or a sequel. The existence of 2 Henry IV and its later publication by the same man who had entered both Richard II and 1 Henry IV in the Stationers' Register did not affect 'The History of Henry the Fourth' as Part One was known until in the First Folio it finally became 'The First Part of Henry the Fourth, with the Life and Death of Henry Sirnamed Hotspurre'. Only when precise identification was necessary, in a Stationers' Register entry on 25 June 1603, was 1 Henry IV called a first part.³ The single edition of 2 Henry IV in 1600 is surprising after Wise's very unusual success with the two earlier plays of the sequence, each of which had already appeared in three editions. Its title-page attracts the reader to

The Second part of Henrie the fourth, continuing to his death, and coronation of Henrie the fift. With the humours of Sir John Fal-staffe, and swaggering Pistoll.

To the apparent problem of but one edition of this well advertised play, the only one of the sequence to include the name of the author on its title-page, A.R. Humphreys offers

two suggestions: there may have been an unusually large printing 'or the strange haphazardness of output, or both [may] explain the single Quarto' (pp. xiii-xiv). Part Two of Henry IV was probably authorized for printing as a consequence of the pirated text of Henry V, published a short time earlier, and its title-page may owe something to the advertisement of Pistol in the 'bad' quarto. Wise and Aspley had entered their play in the Stationers' Register on 23 August 1600 where Shakespeare's name appears for the first time.⁴ Nine days before, Thomas Pavier had acquired the copyright for 'The historye of Henry the Vth with the battell of Agencourt' as 'formerlye printed'.⁵

No consistent effort was made on the title-pages of the early quartos to draw attention to either their close historical relationships or their common origin. The first three quartos of Richard II do not attribute the play to Shakespeare although they name the company. The first two editions of 1 Henry IV mention neither company nor author. Part Two of Henry IV alone mentions both the company and Shakespeare's name, while the pirated Henry V mentions only the company.

The contemporary evidence so far considered indicates that the chronological presentation of Shakespeare's Histories in the First Folio was not based on a tradition developed during the publication of the individual plays. No public recognition of the plays as a unified sequence or as members of a tetralogy survives prior to 1623. When the chronology of Shakespeare's plays is considered, a grand design is particularly elusive and Shakespeare's awareness of the restrictions of such a design emerges. Internal evidence strongly indicates the relaxation of Shakespeare's interest in relating his plays to each other in any more than would be the consequence of dramatizing a continuous period of English history.

Some of the challenges which anticipation and exposition presented in the first tetralogy have already been noticed. Part One of Henry VI proceeds through extensive selection and

compression of historical facts with frequent prophecies of later historical problems in the hope that an ambitious series of plays on a long period of history will be encouraged. This accounts for the melodramatic advertising found in Suffolk's threat at the end of the play:

Margaret shall now be Queen, and rule the King;
But I will rule both her, the King, and realm.

(V.v. 107-08)

Such lines suggest the suspense on which modern commercial broadcasting often depends to maintain the interest of its audience over an interim. These are the lines of a young Elizabethan playwright seeking what Marlowe had accomplished and what Greene had been denied. After the success of the first play, Shakespeare's plans were modified and unanticipated dramatic interests interrupted some of the continuity of character as new emphases were demanded. The long Wars of the Roses in 2 and 3 Henry VI were difficult to separate into independent and individual dramatic works. When the rise and fall of Richard III offered the unity of a single hero, Shakespeare responded with a play which remained popular throughout his career. Some of the links and continuities of the plays in the first tetralogy are probably due to their consecutive or nearly consecutive composition in the early 1590s.

The later histories do not share similar features of continuous composition. Chambers places four plays in addition to the two parts of Henry IV between the composition of Richard II and Henry V, for which there are good reasons to date 1595 and 1599 respectively.⁶ Of the four plays, it is likely that only 1 and 2 Henry IV were written without interruption unless The Merry Wives of Windsor or perhaps some of the material which was later included in it was written during the composition of 2 Henry IV for the Garter celebrations at Windsor in April 1597.⁷ It thus appears unlikely that any three or possibly two of the plays in the second tetralogy were written consecutively.

Richard II is usually assigned to 1595,⁸ near to the composition of Romeo and Juliet and A Midsummer Night's Dream

which are related to it in style. Samuel Daniel's Civil Wars, a source for Richard II, was entered in the Stationers' Register on 11 October 1594⁹ and probably issued early in 1595 when it may have helped to inspire Shakespeare's return to the English history play. If King John comes between Richard II and 1 Henry IV as Chambers and others suggest,¹⁰ it shows that Shakespeare was content to take his time with the second tetralogy. After he wrote Richard II he seems not to have been immediately interested in the later reigns of Henry IV and Henry V as much as in King John and possibly Edward III.¹¹ In addition to these other historical interests, Shakespeare was certainly writing The Merchant of Venice (30 July 1596-22 July 1598)¹² and there is the mysterious reference to a 'displeasing play' in the Epilogue to 2 Henry IV (l. 9). The usual limits for the composition of the two parts of Henry IV are late 1596 and early 1598 with more recent scholarship urging their completion before the theatres closed between July and October of 1597.¹³ This would leave a long interval before Henry V and prevent the actor who first played Prince John in 2 Henry IV from literally speaking for the author:

I will lay odds that, ere this year expire,
We bear our civil swords and native fire
As far as France.

(V.v. 105-07)

Part of the Epilogue to 2 Henry IV also suggests that a delay or change of plan affected its sequel. A change of plan is usually cited to explain the difference between what was promised in the Epilogue and what was delivered in Henry V, which can be dated with some confidence in the spring or summer of 1599.¹⁴ In his only other direct promise of forthcoming writing, Shakespeare safely foresaw 'some graver labour'.¹⁵ At the end of 2 Henry IV he seems to commit himself to a particular plan to which for some reason he was unfaithful:

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 martyr, and this is not the man.

(Epilogue, ll. 26-32)

The principal purpose of these lines is to make emphatic and public the new name for Sir John Oldcastle, the maligned ancestor of the Cobham family, who appears as Hal's companion in the anonymous Famous Victories of Henry V and was first used for that role in 1 Henry IV. The Epilogue announces the substitution of surname in answer to the Cobham's objections. The jocular tone ('for anything I know') insulates the author from a charge of malice as the allusions to comical-historical entertainment carefully prepare for the apology rather than for the dramatis personae of Henry V. This section of the Epilogue may have served in performance until 1 Henry IV was offered for publication and was probably omitted from performance as it was in the quarto, when the change of name had become well publicized.

The Epilogue may glance at the dramatic source of 1 and 2 Henry IV and Henry V, The Famous Victories of Henry V, which was printed in 1598 probably to take advantage of the popularity of Shakespeare's Histories. It survives in a corrupt version which was entered in the Stationers' Register four years earlier and written perhaps several years before.¹⁶

In addition to at least one play on the reigns of Henry IV and Henry V, Shakespeare's second tetralogy was preceded by a dramatization of most of the reign of Richard II. A manuscript play lacking its title-page and last leaf¹⁷ uses historical sources for the period of Richard's reign prior to Shakespeare's play and has been called The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second or, more familiarly and with better reason, Woodstock.¹⁸

Woodstock can be dated within the limits set by 2 Henry VI which influenced the anonymous author's treatment of Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester and Richard II which

makes use of Woodstock. Because the last leaf of Woodstock is missing it is not possible to determine if its author was advertising or anticipating his own sequel on the last years of Richard's reign. The play concludes with a scene in which the comic characters are prominent¹⁹ and is therefore unlikely to have provided links with a sequel that must be concerned with the deposition of the King and the crisis of succession. Bolingbroke and Mowbray are completely ignored and the character of Richard remains secondary to the tragedy of Woodstock: 'throughout it keeps to the character, dismissal, retirement, arrest and murder of Woodstock'.²⁰ In both Richard II and 1 Henry IV Shakespeare shows a familiarity with the play which has suggested to some scholars that he may have acted in Woodstock or that it may have been among the plays belonging to his company.²¹

Studies of the relationship between Woodstock and Richard II have provoked some firm denials that the plays form a two-part collaboration on the reign of Richard. J. Le Gay Brereton writes that

in no sense can Shakespeare's play be regarded as a sequel to the semi-historical Woodstock, though the real culmination of the earlier piece is the murder of Gloster, and Shakespeare takes up the subject practically where his predecessor dropped it, and proceeds to show the inevitable nemesis of the crime.²²

The new Arden editor of Richard II concludes that

there is certainly no warrant for thinking that our play was deliberately designed as a sequel to Woodstock: it contradicts and overlaps in a way that no sequel would. (p. xxxix)

The independence of the plays is also stressed in Geoffrey Bullough's examination of the sources of Richard II. Like Rossiter he denies Woodstock the misleading title of

'The First Part of the Reign of Richard II' for its matter is not confined to the first part of the reign, and its central figure is Gloucester, not Richard. Nor is Shakespeare's play a sequel to it in any normal sense of that word, since Woodstock V. 3-5 overlap and conflict with Richard II, Act I.²³

The author of Woodstock reaches into the later historical material of Richard's fall to claim the life of his favourite, Sir Henry Greene. In Woodstock, Greene is the unhistorical victim of combat with Arundel and his death inspires the longest speech of King Richard in the final act. Appearing alone on the stage for the only time in the play, the King eulogizes his slain favourite until an alarm interrupts his grief:

O princely youth: King Richard's dearest friend!
 What heavy star this day had dominance
 To cut off all thy flowering youthful hopes?
 Prosper, proud rebels! as you dealt by him
 Hard-hearted uncles, unrelenting churls,
 That here have murdered all my earthly joys!
 O my dear Greene, wert thou alive to see
 How I'll revenge thy timeless tragedy
 On all their heads that did but lift a hand
 To hurt this body, that I held so dear
 Even by this kiss and by my crown I swear -

(V.iv. 25-35)

In Richard II, Greene is alive until in III.i he is led with Bushy to execution. In the following scene his name figures prominently when Richard returns from Ireland. This major contradiction in the two plays suggests that the author of Woodstock was not interested in reserving the role of Richard's favourite for a later play and that Richard II was not written to be performed with Woodstock on consecutive days.

Another notable inconsistency which seems to contradict serial intention concerns the manner of and responsibility for Woodstock's death which is often referred to in Richard II. In the earlier play, Woodstock's capture is plotted by the King and his favourites and his death is performed by two murderers at the command of Lapoole in Calais. The victim is struck down and strangled in a featherbed. In the first scene of Richard II, Mowbray, who is not mentioned in Woodstock, is accused of the crime which is described as bloody (I.i. 100-105). In the second scene the Duchess of Gloucester pleads with Gaunt to revenge the murder but he refuses. The last scenes of Woodstock show both Gaunt and

York actively pursuing a martial revenge after Gaunt has promised the Duchess:

Go to our tents, dear sister, cease your sorrows.
 We will revenge our noble brother's wrongs;
 And force that wanton tyrant to reveal
 The death of his dear uncle, harmless Woodstock.

(V.iii. 1-4)

Although Shakespeare does not repeat the historical error of LaPoole's presence, the responsibility is never directly acknowledged or precisely identified and passes from Mowbray to the King (I.ii. 38-41; II.i. 128; II.ii. 102) and later to Aumerle (IV. i. 3, 37, 80-2). Woodstock is best considered as a play from which Shakespeare recalled many details of phrasing (especially concerning Richard's economic policies) and a dramatic source for several historical references which influenced his own exposition of previous events. Shakespeare is also indebted to Woodstock for the characterization of John of Gaunt whose choric function is brilliantly realized in the poetry of his death-bed speech. Shakespeare's Gaunt differs from his counterpart in Woodstock and Holinshed but may be compared to Woodstock himself in his patriotic fervour in opposing the King and his excesses.

ii. Richard II

Frederick S. Boas has suggested that Woodstock restricted Shakespeare to the events between April 1398 and March 1400 and thus prevented his use of comic material in Richard II.²⁴ But it is within this critical period of English history that Shakespeare had already shown an interest. In each of the Henry VI plays Richard is associated with Bolingbroke who

Depos'd his nephew, Richard,

(1 Henry VI, II.v. 64)

Seiz'd on the realm, depos'd the rightful king,
 Sent his poor Queen to France, from whence she came,
 And him to Pomfret; where, as all you know,
 Harmless Richard was murder'd traitorously.

(2 Henry VI, II.ii. 23-26)

rose against him, being his sovereign,
And made him to resign his crown perforce.

(3 Henry VI, I.i. 145-6)

In Richard III, Rivers's memory of Richard II's murder is a haunting reminder of his own fate:

O Pomfret, Pomfret! O thou bloody prison,
Fatal and ominous to noble peers!
Within the guilty closure of thy walls
Richard the Second here was hacked to death.

(Richard III, III.iii. 8-11)

Shakespeare had briefly used historical material from the earlier years of Richard's reign in 2 Henry VI when he based the Cade uprising in part on Wat Tyler's rebellion in 1381. By choosing to begin his play with the dispute between Mowbray and Bolingbroke in April 1398, Shakespeare adopts Hall's starting place as a natural beginning to a dramatic treatment of the tragedy of Richard II.

Richard II and Richard III represent the first and last reigns in the moral scheme of crime and retribution in Hall's Chronicle. With Shakespeare however, it is often better to remember that Richard II is his fifth or sixth history play rather than the first of a series of either four or eight. In limiting his play to two years of history, Shakespeare is repeating what had been successful in his most popular history play. The last two acts of Richard III deliberately deal with a comparable length of time (1483-85) after his character and ambition have been re-established and after the main events in the years since Henry VI's death have been telescoped to occupy the first two acts. Although it is without dreams, ghosts, or battles, a number of other features of Richard II relate it more closely to the earlier histories than to those which would follow to form the second tetralogy.

Many of the scenes in Richard II for which no historical authority was available have counterparts in the plays of the first tetralogy, and other situations may have been inspired by Shakespeare's previous experience rather than by his sources or Marlowe's Edward II. Some of the symmetry and

formal grouping of Richard II, the first scene at Windsor and the Garden scene (III.iv) for instance, recall, respectively, the opening confrontation in 3 Henry VI and later in that play the meeting in verse between the two keepers and Henry VI (III.i). The keepers and the gardeners share a similar choric function. The vengeful Duchess of Gloucester in the second scene of Richard II may be compared to the bereft widows of Richard III, notably Margaret who is 'hungry for revenge' (IV.iv. 61). Both Mortimer in 1 Henry VI and Gaunt, conscious of their approaching deaths, dignified and patriotic, 'Inforce attention like deep harmony' (Richard II, II.i. 6). Shakespeare's Gaunt owes an indirect debt to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester through Thomas Woodstock, also Duke of Gloucester. The last meeting between Richard II and his Queen (V.i) recalls the grief of Humphrey's parting from Eleanor who is similarly led in disgrace along a street (2 Henry VI, II.iv). Perhaps the most puzzling correspondence is between the deposition scene in Richard II, omitted from the early quartos, and the scene in 3 Henry VI where Henry proclaims Richard, Duke of York as his heir (I.i. 200-1).²⁵ The sporadic reports of Richmond's landing in the last scenes of Richard III may have influenced the suspense in similar reports of Bolingbroke's return to England in the early scenes of Richard II.

The same freedom of issuing unhistorical ages to his characters in the earlier history plays, notably to contrast Joan and Talbot in 1 Henry VI and Eleanor and Margaret in 2 Henry VI, is present in Richard II. Richard appears younger than Bolingbroke (III.iii. 204-5) and Hotspur is 'young Harry Percy' (II.iii. 21) and addressed 'boy' (II.iii. 36) although he was two years older than both Richard II and Bolingbroke. Hotspur, at the historical age of thirty-five, ironically promises his allegiance to Bolingbroke;

Such as it is, being tender, raw, and young,
Which elder days shall ripen and confirm
To more approved service and desert.

(II.iii. 42-44)

Prince Hal, his antagonist in 1 Henry IV, does not appear in Richard II. However, his reputation at the historical age

of twelve worries his father who nevertheless sees

some sparks of better hope,
Which elder years may happily bring forth.

(V.iii. 21-22)

The concern with destiny is reminiscent of the silent appearance of Richmond, historically aged ten, in 3 Henry VI where the king divines 'This pretty lad will prove our country's bliss' (IV.vi. 70).

No strong patterns or consistent verbal borrowings from Shakespeare's earlier work are present in Richard II. From the opening scene of accusation and challenge to the final scene where Shakespeare for the third time presents the coffin of a recently dead King, the lyrical poetry of Richard II brings to the play a unity of tone, a 'symphonic' array of thematic imagery,²⁶ and a subtlety of characterization which he had not yet achieved in a history play. Richard's 'voice with tears in it',²⁷ and the portrayal of contagious weeping and sorrow as formalized emotion is beyond such counterparts as the passion of York's death in 3 Henry VI and the formalized grief of loss among the widows of Richard III (IV.iv).

Although a comparison between Shakespeare's first weak king, Henry VI, and Richard II seems possible, Henry VI's 'quiet courage moves a deeper pathos than Richard's more spectacular renunciations'.²⁸ The cruelty of war, the strong will of his antagonists, and the dominating spirit of his own supporters including his wife are adversities which Richard does not face and in which no ruler could take delight. Enough similarity exists between the dramatic roles of Richard III and Richard II to justify Bullough's statement that 'Richard II is a companion picture to Richard III, and may have been conceived as such'.²⁹ The fullest statement of this pairing occurs at the conclusion of John Palmer's essay on Richard of Bordeaux:

Both are men of the artist type, the first working in imagination and the second in action. Both are egocentric ... Each is the child of Narcissus ... The two Richards present in their contraries the

same fundamental truth. The man who is self-centred in imagination and the man who is self-centred in action are equally out of touch with reality, and equally doomed to destruction.³⁰

Shakespeare's return to English history with a tragedy closely concerned with the last two years of one reign and the first few days of another left a short period before Henry VI. Samuel Daniel had already treated those years in narrative epic poetry, Hal and his companions had cavorted through The Famous Victories, Nashe had praised a scene where 'Henrie the fifth ... [led] the French King prisoner',³¹ and for several months after the composition of Richard II, a new play called 'harey the vth' was being acted by the Admiral's Men at the Rose.³² Neither the youthful exploits of Prince Hal nor his famous victory at Agincourt required formal anticipation or exposition like the long speeches of genealogical information and repeated identification of opposed factions and families in the first tetralogy. As Shakespeare was writing Richard II he may well have been thinking of the subsequent historical material in its recent literary manifestations and also in its potential dramatic appeal. But the self-contained material for his second historical tragedy made it unnecessary to add or advertise preparations like those in 1 Henry VI for the immediate continuations which would follow that play. The deposition of Richard II is not designed in the same way as the Temple Garden scene of the first tetralogy; in Henry IV Prince Hal has little relation to it and Falstaff none. Of the nearly forty characters in Richard II, only three, Henry IV and the two Percies, show signs of future importance to the dramatist. All of the other characters are conceived for their single role in Richard II. The bare mention of Worcester, Glendower, and Prince Hal and even the brief appearance of Hotspur do not indicate the same kind of planning or conspicuous presence that Shakespeare was anxious to make felt in his more closely related series of earlier history plays.

The main evidence in Richard II that shows Shakespeare preparing for Henry IV consists of the references to Glendower

and Prince Hal, the introduction of a youthful Hotspur, Carlisle's prophecy of 'Disorder, horror, fear, and mutiny' (IV.i. 142), Richard's more specific forecast of Northumberland's rebellion, and Bolingbroke's reflection on his vicissitudes which darkens his final speech. These are not such strong indications of dramatic planning as have sometimes been thought.³³

Early in 2 Henry VI, Salisbury describes how Edmund Mortimer

in the reign of Bolingbroke,
As I have read, laid claim unto the crown;
And, but for Owen Glendower, had been king,
Who kept him in captivity till he died.

(II.ii. 38-41)

In Richard II the future importance of Glendower is hardly indicated in Bolingbroke's last lines of III.i where he hastens his followers 'To fight with Glendor and his complices' (III.i.43). Nothing more is heard of the Welshman until 1 Henry IV. In the brief preceding scene, an Earl of Salisbury is shown persuading an anonymous Welsh Captain to remain in readiness to defend the King when he returns from Ireland. The Captain decides instead to heed his list of portents which 'forerun the death or fall of kings' (II.iv. 15). A case has been made for supposing that Shakespeare intended the superstitious Captain to represent Glendower with his characteristics already set for his part in the next play. Dover Wilson points out that twice elsewhere in Holinshed Glendower is titled a 'capteine' of the Welshmen.³⁴ But Glendower need not have been in Shakespeare's mind when he wrote the scene which uses a historical situation from Holinshed to elaborate an atmosphere of foreboding only hinted in the historian's account. Glendower and Bolingbroke are first associated in Holinshed after Richard's death. Bolingbroke gains a sense of command and decision by identifying a further obstacle by name after he has sentenced Richard's favourites to death, 'an act of quasi-regal authority',³⁵ just eight lines before.

The mention of Hal is not privileged historical or dramatic material. Bolingbroke goes into some detail when he asks:

Can no man tell me of my unthrifty son?
 'Tis full three months since I did see him last.
 If any plague hang over us, 'tis he.
 I would to God, my lords, he might be found.
 Inquire at London, 'mongst the taverns there,
 For there, they say, he daily doth frequent
 With unrestrained loose companions,
 Even such, they say, as stand in narrow lanes
 And beat our watch and rob our passengers,
 While he, young wanton, and effeminate boy,
 Takes on the point of honour to support
 So dissolute a crew.

(V.iii. 1-12)

In this speech Walter Kaiser has seen anticipation of Henry IV in the concern with

the prodigal son, the passage of time, the imagery of disease, the truancy in the tavern, the breaking of the law, the problem of honor, and, especially, the perils of evil companionship. ³⁶

As Bolingbroke is here speaking to Northumberland's son just before York's son enters to confess his conspiracy there is a thematic, as well as historical, interest in the activity of the King's son. However, as Hal was aged twelve at the time, his father's account of his precocious escapades does point to a future dramatic treatment of Hal's education and reign as Henry V. If Hal had appeared in Richard II, the link would be more certain. The young Richard III at a comparable age was introduced in the last act of 2 Henry VI and young Richmond makes a silent appearance in 3 Henry VI.

Hotspur's youth is quickly established but his role and character do not anticipate his prominence in 1 Henry IV. Hotspur reports a recent meeting with Hal in reply to Bolingbroke's inquiry (V.iii. 13-14) but he is not otherwise associated with his unhistorical combatant at Shrewsbury. Daniel's Civil Wars is probably responsible for levelling the ages of Hal and Hotspur. Soon after the introduction of 'young Hotespur' (Book III, 97.1)³⁷ with his 'yong undanger'd

hand' (109.3), Daniel describes 'Young Henrie, laboring where the stoutest are' (110.3) at Shrewsbury. Shakespeare's reading of Daniel was not confined to the material which he included in Richard II and Shakespeare accepted but did not necessarily anticipate a future rivalry between Hal and Hotspur.

The prophecies in Richard II have also been considered as proof that Shakespeare's dramatic plans for future historical sequels were developing. Carlisle's forebodings frame the deposition scene. His longest speech, of thirty-six lines, warns that if Bolingbroke is crowned

The blood of English shall manure the ground,
 And future ages groan for this foul act,
 Peace shall go sleep with Turks and infidels,
 And, in this seat of peace, tumultuous wars
 Shall kin with kin, and kind with kind, confound.
 Disorder, horror, fear, and mutiny,
 Shall here inhabit, and this land be call'd
 The field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls -
 O, if you raise this house against this house,
 It will the woofullest division prove
 That ever fell upon this cursed earth.
 Prevent it, resist it, let it not be so,
 Lest, child, child's children, cry against you woe.

(IV.i. 137-149)

After the deposition Carlisle's final words in the play similarly describe the future:

The woe's to come; the children yet unborn
 Shall feel this day as sharp to them as thorn.

(IV.i. 322-3)

There is nothing in Carlisle's lines that applies more to the reigns of Henry IV or Henry V than to the longer period of disorder and civil war which Shakespeare had dramatized a few years earlier. The emphasis on generations of strife, the destruction of the family, and the conflict between house and house are more suitable long-range predictions of the Wars between Lancaster and York than of the rebels in Henry IV or the traitors in Henry V. Carlisle speaks of future horror in traditional images of providential doom similar to those of Antony in Julius Caesar (III.i. 254-75) and these

are not taken as sequel preparation or advertisement.

One of Richard's forecasts is a more specific indication of the troubles of Henry IV. But before that he too seems to prophesy the Wars of the Roses:

Yet know, my master, God omnipotent,
Is mustering in his clouds, on our behalf,
Armies of pestilence, and they shall strike
Your children yet unborn, and unbegot.

Ten thousand bloody crowns of mothers' sons
Shall ill become the flower of England's face,
Change the complexion of her maid-pale peace
To scarlet indignation and bedew
Her pastures' grass with faithful English blood.

(III.iii. 85-8, 96-100)

When later in the play Northumberland interrupts Richard's last meeting with his Queen to report Bolingbroke's decision on their respective fates, Richard predicts

Northumberland, thou ladder wherewithal
The mounting Bolingbroke ascends my throne,
The time shall not be many hours of age
More than it is, ere foul sin gathering head
Shall break into corruption: thou shalt think,
Though he divide the realm and give thee half,
It is too little, helping him to all;
He shall think that thou, which knowest the way
To plant unrightful kings, wilt know again,
Being ne'er so little urg'd, another way
To pluck him headlong from the usurped throne.
The love of wicked men converts to fear,
That fear to hate, and hate turns one or both
To worthy danger and deserved death.

(V.i. 55-68)

As well as a direct link to the events in Henry IV, Richard's speech fits its present context as an appeal to his captor to consider his dangerous role as Bolingbroke's agent.

Northumberland's curt reply shows him unmoved and so Richard in his next speech tries again to prevent his own fate by appealing to the violated union 'twixt my crown and me, / And then betwixt me and my married wife' (V.i. 72-3). In 2 Henry IV Shakespeare makes the unusual attempt to recall this scene and quote lines from Richard's speech. It is not important that both Bolingbroke, who was not present, and Warwick, whom he believes had heard them, seem to remember

the words spoken by Richard only in the company of his wife, Northumberland, and some attendants and guards:

When Richard, with his eye brimful of tears,
Then check'd and rated by Northumberland,
Did speak these words, now prov'd a prophecy?
'Northumberland, thou ladder by the which
My cousin Bolingbroke ascends my throne'

'The time shall come' - thus did he follow it -
'The time will come, that foul sin, gathering head,
Shall break into corruption' - so went on,
Foretelling this same time's condition,
And the division of our amity.

(III.i. 67-71, 75-9)

Warwick's discourse on the 'history in all men's lives' (III.i. 80) pays tribute to Richard's powers of observation which in retrospect covers up any suggestion that Richard was a visionary or the mouthpiece of a dramatist planning a sequel.

Shakespeare's Northumberland is more prominent than the historical sources warrant and Bullough has suggested that 'the dramatist darkens Northumberland's character, no doubt to prepare for his behaviour in 1 Henry IV'.³⁸ This may be partly true as Richard's own analysis of the history of men's lives has warned. But without reference to Northumberland's subsequent career as a rebel it is possible to see his darkened role as a conspirator as complementary to Bolingbroke's inconspicuous rise to power. Northumberland in this way 'is used by Shakespeare to portray the negative side of the new realism' and to imply that 'Bolingbroke's acts, though surrounded by ambiguities of motive, are marked by the same undeviating direction as Northumberland's words'.³⁹ By distributing some of the essential background of conspiracy to the scenes in which Northumberland is prominent, Shakespeare releases Bolingbroke from preparations and declarations of purpose which might interrupt what John Russell Brown calls the 'dramatic focus'⁴⁰ of the play on Richard.

In the first tetralogy, Shakespeare was especially conscious of the links between the final scene of one play

and the opening scene of its sequel. The last speech of Richard II by Bolingbroke, now Henry IV, presents a shaken King:

Lords, I protest my soul is full of woe
 That blood should sprinkle me to make me grow.
 Come mourn with me for what I do lament,
 And put on sullen black incontinent.
 I'll make a voyage to the Holy Land,
 To wash this blood off from my guilty hand.

(V.vi. 45-50)

The King's intention to expiate the murder of Richard is not mentioned by Holinshed during his account of 1412 where Henry's plans for a voyage to the Holy Land are first announced. It thus appears that Shakespeare by the end of Richard II had already decided on the linking device between it and at least one play on the reign of Henry IV. In 1 Henry IV the King's plans for his journey are amplified in the first speech of the play and referred to several times in both 1 and 2 Henry IV until their ironic fulfilment in the Jerusalem Chamber in Part Two. Henry's announcement at the end of Richard II and again at the beginning of its historical sequel seems to indicate that Shakespeare had planned and begun the King's new tone of 'religious gravity'⁴¹ to unify his dramatization of the reign of Henry IV. The quest for redemption parallels his son's own redemption from dishonour which has been mentioned by his father in Richard II and becomes a fully developed theme of the later plays. Shakespeare may well have known of Henry's abortive plans for a Crusade twelve years later and brought them forward to good use but Henry's remarks in Richard II may also be related to invented material⁴² on the same subject which Shakespeare had included in earlier scenes of the play. Gaunt's death-bed speech establishes an ironic ideal well before his son's intentions. Gaunt speaks of England's kings

famous by their birth,
 Renowned for their deeds as far from home,
 For Christian service and true chivalry,
 As is the sepulchre in stubborn Jewry
 Of the world's ransom, blessed Mary's son.

(II.i. 52-6)

Prior to the deposition scene Carlisle reports to Bolingbroke the fate of his former antagonist:

Many a time hath banish'd Norfolk fought
 For Jesu Christ in glorious Christian field,
 Streaming the ensign of the Christian cross
 Against black Pagans, Turks, and Saracens.

(IV.i. 92-5)

Against Gaunt's 'true chivalry' and the noble exploits of banished Mowbray, Bolingbroke's personal motives taint the aftermath of his succession as he stands before the imposing image of his predecessor's coffin.

Shakespeare conceived Richard II not as a second part of Woodstock or the first part of a Bolingbroke trilogy as much as the tragedy of a king. Its structure is not designed as a prelude for subsequent dramas and it does not seek a sense of suspense to carry over into a sequel. The characterization of Bolingbroke and Hotspur is not firmly established for 1 Henry IV and more importantly, the style of the play serves its independent status.⁴³ It is open-ended as all historical drama must be but far less so than any of the plays in the first historical sequence. When Shakespeare returned to Holinshed for Henry IV and Henry V he used Richard II as a source play much as he used the history which it represents as a source of reference in the first tetralogy. To put it another way: if Richard II had been a failure Henry IV and Henry V might still have been written; if 1 Henry VI had failed its young author might well have turned to other subjects. After the enormous success of his narrative poems and the experience of nearly ten plays, Shakespeare must have realized that the most effective way to dramatize the material of tragedy was to contain it within the limits of one play and seek to attain its isolation in the continuum of history.

iii. The Two Parts of Henry IV

Part One of Henry IV, like Richard II, is limited to only two years of history. Towards the end of the King's opening speech he remarks that his intention to visit the Holy Land 'now is twelve month old' (I.i. 28) and the play ends with the Battle of Shrewsbury fought in July 1403. The relationship between this play and its sequel has been the source of much controversy and many commentators have tried to determine the moment when Part Two was planned. Both the continuities and contradictions between the plays have influenced the three main categories into which opinion on this issue has fallen.⁴⁴

Part Two is usually described as 'unpremeditated' by those who see the original success of Falstaff as the inspiration for his reappearance. Its similarities to 1 Henry IV recall the relationship of 2 Tamburlaine to its predecessor where Marlowe returned to an original structure with a darker and more critical approach to his hero. The Merry Wives of Windsor demonstrates Shakespeare's willingness to satisfy the demand for more Falstaff in new situations. Some of the characteristics of both 2 Tamburlaine and The Merry Wives of Windsor seem to lie behind 2 Henry IV. A second approach to the Henry IV plays proposes that Shakespeare planned two plays on the reign of Henry IV in which the central thematic interests advance more independently of political events than in the earlier histories. Some scholars would place the conception of two Henry IV plays near to that of Richard II. A third line of interpretation seeks a resolution between the first two. Harold Jenkins in The Structural Problem of Shakespeare's 'Henry the Fourth' concludes that 'the two parts are complementary, they are also independent and even incompatible' as a result of Shakespeare's decision to defer some of his material to a second play which continues to the accession of Henry V.⁴⁵

Interpretations and evaluations of 2 Henry IV have often depended upon tacit or argued assumptions about its relationship to Part One. Thirteen characters from Part One are re-introduced in the sequel. This compares with only three

characters continued from Richard II. In no other pair of Shakespeare's plays are more characters shared and the dual presence of so many dramatic figures invites consideration of their development, comparisons of their prominence and function, and an interest in any signs of contradiction or change of emphasis. The few soliloquies in the plays gain a special significance from this approach. What makes a study of Henry IV even more complex is Shakespeare's balanced introduction of tragic and comic elements to the historical setting.

The sources of Henry IV have been examined with results which make a valuable contribution towards the structural problem. Jenkins points out that Daniel's Civil Wars may have influenced an original plan to conclude a single play on Henry IV with the death of the King and the accession of his son. Daniel 'ignores the ten years that in history elapsed between the death of Hotspur and the Prince's accession'.⁴⁶ A.R. Humphreys shows how Shakespeare brought Daniel and Holinshed together to shape the two plays. Holinshed, as expected, provides the framework of historical facts onto which Daniel's differing emphases before and after his account of Shrewsbury impress a particular tone: 'the valiancy of Part I [and] the gravity of Part 2'.⁴⁷ Holinshed was more necessary to 2 Henry IV with his stress on the remaining years of Henry's unquiet reign, 'of Percy turbulence and princely reformation',⁴⁸ where Daniel could offer no guide to the narrative sequence of events. The comedy travels a long distance from The Famous Victories where some of the incidents admittedly originate. Its structure provides little to admire, however, and Shakespeare could not have had its slight historical interest in mind when he treated the same subject.

Anticipations in 1 Henry IV of a possible sequel are present but not persistent. The King concludes Part One as he did Richard II but with a greater sense of urgency as he prepares now for further conflict with the rebels. Northumberland, Scroop, Glendower, and the Earl of March

remain untested enemies. Each has been given considerable previous attention with Richard Scroop, Archbishop of York recently shown in a scene (IV.iv) where he names the others. The Battle of Shrewsbury provides an effective and extended climax of heroic action but it is also the connexion, as the battle of St Albans was in 2 Henry VI, to a sequel where the full effects for both sides are finally known. It seems safe to say that in the last scene of 1 Henry IV, Shakespeare was preparing for a long treatment of the remaining years of Henry's reign. Of less immediate significance is the unresolved fate of Falstaff who recedes somewhat from the action before his appearance at Shrewsbury.⁴⁹ Jenkins has persuasively argued that the early anticipations of his banishment were Shakespeare's initial preparations for including the rejection as a climax parallel to Hal's victory over Hotspur.⁵⁰ But Shakespeare would have needed at least another act for the King's death, a rejection scene, and a formal accession of the new King that would rival the long battle sequence. While Jenkins observes that Shakespeare may have realized as he wrote that potential material for Henry IV exceeded the limits for one play, he does not pursue the implication that the remaining material was not really enough for a full-length sequel. In spite of this difficulty, 2 Henry IV is the longer play by a little more than 200 lines.

Part Two has appeared to several critics as entirely 'unpremeditated'. It may be partly so and consists of much material that must have been carefully selected from Holinshed as well as a greater proportion of comic material and the addition of new comic characters. Instead of too much material for one play as may have been the case when 1 Henry IV was begun, he had too few historical requirements for the sequel with no help from Daniel and only a plethora of minor and unattractive political events available before the King's death. Shakespeare compensated for historical narrative by increasing Falstaff's role and developing suggestions from the previous play, its most important structural source. Part Two, as M.A. Shaaber and G.K. Hunter have demonstrated, shares many structural features with Part One.

In 2 Henry IV Shakespeare expanded several secondary roles from their 'sources' in 1 Henry IV. Marlowe was free in his sequel to create several new characters as replacements for those who had been eliminated by his hero in 1 Tamburlaine. The deaths of Zenocrate and Tamburlaine probably directed the initial planning for his unhistorical sequel. Shakespeare, on the other hand, needed to maintain some political interest for four acts before the expected historical scenes would bring the play to an appropriate conclusion. This agrees with the table of correspondences provided by G.K. Hunter which shows Shakespeare's use of parallel structure through only the first four acts of Part Two. In both plays the comic and historical scenes alternate in a regular though not perfect pattern. The historical scenes proceed through the threatening news of rebellion and its planning, a domestic scene among the Percies, and a scene focusing on Henry IV's personal troubles until the rebels are defeated. The comic scenes in both plays detail a para-military exploit, Hal's preparations for tricking Falstaff, a long tavern scene which is interrupted by serious news, Falstaff's preparations for war, and a demonstration of his martial techniques.⁵¹ At this point in Part Two the sickness of the King diverts the play to action prepared for early in 1 Henry IV. By IV.ii in Part One and IV.iii in Part Two, where in each play Falstaff interrupts the final historical scenes, the Arden lineation is 2339 lines for Part One and 2346 lines for Part Two. The individual scenes in 2 Henry IV are not measured against those in 1 Henry IV but the general plan justifies Shaaber's remark that 'structurally 2 Henry IV is almost a carbon copy of the first play'.⁵² Despite these similarities there is much that distinguishes each play. The parallel structure may have served Shakespeare as a rough guide during composition but it is unlikely that an audience would be expected to recognize the correspondences as a particular method by which to enjoy or judge the play.

The decline of Marlowe's hero over a series of parallel incidents in 2 Tamburlaine is a more functional use of parallel structure. There is no corresponding steadiness in Henry IV which allows a single view of its author's procedure

or intentions in developing the destiny of a major character. The death of Henry IV, the accession of Hal, and the rejection of Falstaff occur as inevitable events. They are expected and anticipated historical situations which arrive with due ceremony and emphasis. They are not goals toward which the earlier scenes are directed as much as events which await their delayed place in the action. Part Two nevertheless demonstrates a firm commitment to continuation. Rumour's Prologue leads directly on from the battle of Shrewsbury to the first historical scenes of rebel reconciliation and re-organization.

King Henry does not appear until the eighth scene which occurs close to the middle of the play. His health has been commented upon earlier (I.ii. 106-7, II.ii. 30, 39, 46) and soon after his soliloquy on sleep he remarks on the eight years which have passed since the death of Richard II. He is no longer the military leader of Part One; in his concern for his son's behaviour, the uncertain terms of his attainment of power, and his abortive crusade he raises issues which become more important in themselves than as dramatic links with the earlier plays. His position is that of a more private character in Part Two. The historical events of Part Two such as those at Gaultree do not require the King's presence and thus his movements are restricted in a physical sense to the interior chambers of his kingdom as well as in a spiritual sense to the thoughts of his mind. When Henry and Hal are together on stage for the first time the King is asleep as the prince is attracted directly to the 'polish'd perturbation! golden care!' (IV.v. 22). The final speech in Richard II and the first and last speech in 1 Henry IV were spoken by the King but neither history nor Shakespeare's interests allow him a similar prominence in the second play of his name.

Like that of his father, Prince Hal's role in 2 Henry IV is reduced. He is present in only four scenes and is given about half the number of lines which he had in Part One. He is also a late arrival on the stage. Hal's return to the low life of the tavern after Shrewsbury is the greatest obstacle

in considering the play as a ten-act drama. As H.E. Cain has emphasized:

the dramatic assumption of The Second Part is that the audience will or must forget that the Prince's reformation has already taken place in The First Part.⁵³

Part Two, as Jenkins says, 'requires a prince who is unreclaimed'⁵⁴ although a key scene in Part One (III.ii) shows a sincere reconciliation between father and son before Shrewsbury and during the battle Hal is told 'Thou hast redeem'd thy lost opinion' (V.iv. 47). After Part One, Shakespeare was confronted with the problem of what to do with Hal in the next play before the celebrated and legendary scene at his father's death-bed. Prior to this scene, Hal makes two limited appearances. The first is with Poins with whom he plans a tavern jest against Falstaff. Although Falstaff and the Prince are separated in their first appearances, Falstaff's letter allows him a presence which maintains their association from Part One, in spite of Shrewsbury. It has been considered significant that, with the exception of the tavern scene, Hal and Falstaff are physically separated during the play until the rejection. But in Hal's first appearance, their separation is appropriate in order that he and Poins may plot their jest in secret. Hal is present for only one-third of the tavern scene and entirely absent from the political events leading to Gaultree. As Sigurd Burckhardt remarks, 'it appears that Hal is quite deliberately being kept out of the play'.⁵⁵ He has no contact with his family or the historical episodes and makes no reference to his triumph at Shrewsbury. This isolation allows him to emerge later as a more worthy successor untainted by constant association with the scapegraces but it may also result because Shakespeare was at a loss to find a dramatic place for him in the material which precedes the accession. Shakespeare thus follows Daniel who had not seen literary possibilities for the Prince between Shrewsbury and the crown. Until the renewal of the King's worries about his son in IV. iv, references to Hal by other characters affirm his 'swift

wrath' (I.i. 109) against Hotspur but usually they revert to his companionship with Falstaff and the undepicted striking of the Lord Chief Justice. The rebels know that Hal and the King are pursuing the Welsh (I.iii.83) and Falstaff learns they 'are near at hand' (II.i. 134) but no further evidence confirms the implication that father and son are reconciled. The death-bed scene is concerned with showing just the opposite despite Warwick's earlier assurance that 'the Prince but studies his companions' (IV.iv. 68).

Tillyard's view that in 1 Henry IV 'the Prince is tested in the military or chivalric virtues' and in Part Two 'here again he is tested but in the civil virtues'⁵⁶ has been well received. The path toward 'the two quite separate moral evolutions which the play's chronology presents as successive but which in fact are in parallel'⁵⁷ lies between the excesses of Falstaff, the 'seeming valour' of Hotspur and the 'seeming virtue in government' of Prince John.⁵⁸ Hal's education becomes the motivating force of the plays and brings them into a far closer thematic relationship than a chronological ascent could provide.

In 1 Henry IV the Prince and Hotspur are associated from the very first scene after Westmoreland, in reporting Hotspur's victory at Holmedon, accounts it 'a conquest for a prince to boast of' (I.i. 76). The importance of honour is quickly established when the King replies with envy of

the father to so blest a son;
A son who is the theme of honour's tongue,
Amongst a grove the very straightest plant,
Who is sweet Fortune's minion and her pride;
Whilst I by looking on the praise of him
See riot and dishonour stain the brow
Of my young Harry.

(I.i. 79-85)

It is clear from the outset of Part One that Hal must attain valour in military service if he is to redeem his father's harsh opinion. Hal himself emphasizes this purpose:

Percy is but my factor (III.ii.147)

Percy stands on high,
And either we or they must lower lie.

(III.iii. 202-3)

I have a truant been to chivalry.

(V.i. 94)

The single combat between the Prince and Hotspur is appropriately the high point of Shrewsbury.

What has been called the parallel achievement of Hal in Part Two does not emerge to full parity until his accession and the embrace of the Lord Chief Justice 'as a father to my youth' (V.ii.118). It is an event which occurs without the kind of preparation displayed in Part One. Hal has no literal antagonist such as Hotspur by whom to prove his ability to rule well. The rejection of Falstaff occurs after Hal has achieved the respect of the Lord Chief Justice and it is to demonstrate his high regard for law and responsibility that he pursues a kingly image in this public act. The coronation is the corresponding event in Part Two to Shrewsbury but it does not represent a culminating triumph in quite the same way as the achievement of valour in battle. This, as suggested above, may occur as a result of the deferment of the accession, from an earlier plan of one play on the reign of Henry IV, or possibly to a later one to which it would form an opening scene. Without the consistent juxtaposition of Hal to a rival or the expectation of an earned victory, Part Two cannot be said to offer an education in quite the same way as Part One.

It has been recently argued that 'the theme of the Hal plot is not the education of the Prince, but his "skill" in accomplishing his final purpose of an unexpected appearance as an ideal King'.⁵⁹ This view holds the Prince firmly to his famous soliloquy early in Part One:

I know you all, and will awhile uphold
The unyok'd humour of your idleness.
Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
Who doth permit the base contagious clouds

To smother up his beauty from the world,
 That, when he please again to be himself,
 Being wanted he may be more wonder'd at
 By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
 Of vapours that did seem to strangle him.

So when this loose behaviour I throw off,
 And pay the debt I never promised,
 By how much better than my word I am,
 By so much shall I falsify men's hopes;
 And like bright metal on a sullen ground,
 My reformation, glitt'ring o'er my fault,
 Shall show more goodly, and attract more eyes
 Than that which hath no foil to set it off.
 I'll so offend, to make offence a skill,
 Redeeming time when men think least I will.

(I.ii. 190-8, 203-12)

According to Aoki, Hal's true nature is fully announced in this speech and operates rather than develops through the two parts of Henry IV. The impact and fulfilment of his intention to surprise the world actually occurs in Henry V. Only the audience is made aware of Hal's chivalrous virtues as Hotspur is killed, Vernon is executed, the King is absent, and Falstaff will not reveal the truth behind his own claims to good service at Shrewsbury. Professor Aoki insists that Hal has no need of education and the two plays are one long dramatization of the Prince's moral disguise and discovery. The problem which this interpretation raises is similar to that facing Marlowe in 2 Tamburlaine. As William Empson puts it:

Consider how difficult it is for a dramatist, especially with a mass audience, to run a second play on the mere assumption that everybody in the audience knows the first one.⁶⁰

Does the continuous composition of the plays suggested by external evidence then contribute to a complexity of thematic interrelationships of a literary kind to the detriment of theatricality? Some lines towards the end of Part Two may suggest this conclusion. When the King learns that his son 'dines in London' (IV.iv. 51) he is given another opportunity to express his despair:

Most subject is the fattest soil to weeds,
 And he, the noble image of my youth,
 Is overspread with them; therefore my grief
 Stretches itself beyond the hour of death.

(IV.iv. 54-7)

Warwick's reply seems to enforce Hal's own purposes in the soliloquy of the previous play:

The Prince but studies his companions
 Like a strange tongue, wherein, to gain the language,
 'Tis needful that the most immodest word
 Be look'd upon and learnt; which once attain'd,
 Your Highness knows, comes to no further use
 But to be known and hated. So, like gross terms,
 The Prince will, in the perfectness of time,
 Cast off his followers, and their memory
 Shall as a pattern or a measure live
 By which his Grace must mete the lives of other,
 Turning past evils to advantages.

(IV.iv. 68-78)

There are 4000 lines between this speech and the soliloquy in which Hal expressed his serious motives for upholding the unyoked humour of his companions' idleness. If Warwick's speech is taken as a late reminder in Part Two of what Hal had purposed in Part One, Shakespeare seems to be making a deliberate effort to emphasize the importance of secret motives although it is difficult to agree that he is only using the Prince as 'a measure for bringing out the exceptional quality of Falstaff's wit and imagination.⁶¹ In the following scene the Prince kneels to defend himself from a further series of accusations made from his father's death-bed:

If I do feign,
 O, let me in my present wildness die,
 And never live to show th' incredulous world
 The noble change that I have purposed!

(IV.v. 151-4)

The intent to surprise which had been prominent in Hal's soliloquy is after an exceptionally long interval returned to currency. But before Hal appears as the new King, Warwick, despite his earlier insistence on the necessity of the Prince's unconventional education, is now less confident.

Both he and the Lord Chief Justice await the new King with trepidation and some suspense until Hal admits: 'I have turn'd away my former self' (V.v. 58). This suggests that Warwick's earlier analysis of the Prince's wildness was intended to calm the sick and angered Henry IV rather than serve as an official explanation for the motives of Prince Hal who has been hidden from the audience during most of the play. Hal's 'former self' is an ambiguous concept that is not associated with education, even in his first soliloquy in Part One. Warwick's statement is really an hypothesis which has an isolated dramatic function just as his uncertainty has before Hal rejects his companions.

In the two parts of Henry IV Hal achieves parallel redemptions and parallel triumphs in military and civic virtues. In both cases Henry IV is absent from the events which determine his son's abilities - the single combat with Hotspur and the accession. The preparation for these events, however, is not parallel. Hal's soliloquy in Part One ironically prepares for the fuller but unhistorical reconciliation with his father while in Part Two the true historical and legendary reconciliation is less prominent than the rejection of Falstaff. There is some suspense in how Shakespeare will have his Prince emerge from the gloom of his father's troublesome reign toward his leadership at Agincourt. As it happens the circumstances of Hal's accession conform to the strategy of his first soliloquy. His forecast of public opinion is correct and Shakespeare returns to its effects in Henry V, partly no doubt to re-emphasize that

this is not the Prince of any such play as
The Famous Victories, no reckless ribald but
a good king in the making, taking a shrewd course
and living by his own discipline.⁶²

For reasons implied in Harold Jenkins' essay, Shakespeare's material for Part Two was partially limited but also determined by 'what Shakespeare warn[s] us to expect⁶³ in Part One. The conclusion of the Falstaff-Hal companionship outlined in

Hal's soliloquy must wait for a further rebellion and comic scenes in which Falstaff speaks more lines than any other character in the play.

Without a direct announcement by Hal, Part Two creates an uncertainty over Falstaff's status when the new King is crowned. The emphasis shifts in the sequel from Hal as a young Henry V to Hal as an uncertain administrator of his future responsibilities. He is isolated from the questionable politics of Gaultree, the continued anguish of his father, and the rising expectations of Falstaff with whom his confrontation as Henry V must accomplish the long-awaited confirmation of his noble purposes. Part Two does not consistently warn its audience of the manner of Hal's emergence as an ideal ruler.

In Part One, Falstaff and Hal were inextricably associated in their first scene together but in Part Two, Falstaff is opposed at the height of his military reputation by the Lord Chief Justice who reminds him that 'Your day's service at Shrewsbury hath a little gilded over your night's exploit on Gad's Hill' (I.ii. 147-8). The scene is notable for the inability of Falstaff to better the representative of Justice and final arbiter of his fate at the end of the play. The Prince of The Famous Victories and of legend is remembered for his physical indiscretions against the Justice and for his association with Falstaff, now announced as 'severed' (I.ii. 202) by the King. Apart from these casual references to the Prince the main interest in the scene is Falstaff's demonstration that he is 'the cause that wit is in other men' (I.ii.9) and the manner of his escape from the law. His first words in the play bring medical confirmation that to be old and merry will be less enviable attributes. Many critics have noticed a different Falstaff in Part Two and that change symptomatic of Shakespeare's concern in the sequel with time, age, disease, and decline.

Robert Ornstein has remarked how 'the generations passed in the earlier History Plays - men lived and died - but only in the second tetralogy do men actually grow old'.⁶⁴

Ornstein is confirming what Clifford Leech and L.C. Knights have taken as the dominating and unifying tone of 2 Henry IV. Leech's point that 'the poet's awareness of mutability grows more intense' is matched by Knights's description of the play as 'a tragi-comedy of human frailty, ... about the varied aspects of mutability - age, disappointment, and decay'.⁶⁵ This feeling constantly appears in the problems of the King, the rebels, and Falstaff and often enters the language of the play. At the start Rumour places himself before 'this worm-eaten hold of ragged stone,/Where Hotspur's father, old Northumberland,/ Lies crafty-sick' (Induction, ll. 35-7). Hastings characterizes his forces as 'time's subjects' (I.iii. 110) and the Archbishop of York confesses:

we are all diseases'd,
And with our surfeiting, and wanton hours,
Have brought ourselves into a burning fever,
And we must bleed for it.

(IV.i. 54-7)

Numerous examples of similar imagery join with the constant awareness of the King's physical infirmities, Falstaff's obsessional disorders, and the nostalgic forays of his companions into their distant youth to pervade the play with those qualities discussed by Leech and Knights. This serves to heighten the role of Prince Hal by comparison. As he departs from Falstaff's company and the tavern he admits to Poins:

I feel me much to blame,
So idly to profane the precious time.

(II.iv. 358-9)

The future King stands significantly apart from the world of his father's aging, the rebels' fears and setbacks, and Falstaff's idleness. Where in Part One, Hal was contrasted directly with Hotspur until the climax of single combat, in Part Two he is indirectly set against a collective opponent of deterioration and old age.

While Hal's role in 2 Henry IV decreases to half what it was in Part One, Falstaff continues to speak more lines

than any other character: about one-fifth of the total in each play. His career is not quite an arc of rise and fall through the two plays; as late as IV.iii he is the captor of 'Sir John Colevile of the Dale, a most furious knight and valorous enemy' (IV.iii. 38-9). This is one instance where Shakespeare has developed a scene in the sequel after a similar situation in Part One. Tillyard's consideration of the plays as 'a single organism'⁶⁶ is an apt description of this process. Lancaster's comment to Falstaff, 'When everything is ended, then you come' (IV.iii. 27), is also applicable to the appearance of Falstaff on the field at Shrewsbury. Shakespeare may even assume that his audience knows of Falstaff's dubious reputation for killing Hotspur when Colevile promptly surrenders after recognizing his opponent (IV.iii. 16-17). In each play Falstaff makes a similar entrance into the military world.

The long comic scene in Gloucestershire (III.ii) in Part Two demonstrates Falstaff's methods of recruiting. Its source is his admission that 'I have misused the King's press damnably' (IV.ii. 12) in Part One. His comment then that 'no eye hath seen such scarecrows' (IV.ii. 38) is true until they are paraded before his Selection Committee in Part Two. The recruiting soliloquy cannot be described as an anticipation of material which Shakespeare had reserved for a sequel.

The most obvious of the parallel comic scenes occurs in Eastcheap where the longest scenes in each part of Henry IV take place. Shakespeare builds upon the success of the tavern scene in Part One by developing a second exposure of Falstaff which again challenges his skill at recovery. The intrusion of the outside world puts an end to the fun in each case. In the second tavern scene the Prince's role is reduced and in his absence references to the rebels and the King are restricted. There is no occasion such as the Gad's Hill robbery to direct the motives of exposure or suggest comment upon the serious events of the play. The plan of Poin and Hal to disguise themselves in 'two leathern jerkins

and aprons' (II.ii. 164) recalls the buckram suits of their previous adventure and serve as a thin pretext for the Prince's final visit to the Boar's Head. Where in Part One the impersonations of other characters in the play led to a complex interaction between the history and the comedy, Falstaff's company increases and creates an isolated pause in the progress of the historical action. Education cannot accurately describe Hal's presence here and any application of critical ingenuity in order to discover the theme of Justice is futile. What is noticeable is the Prince's unwillingness to enter the idleness in the spirit in which he planned his entrance with Poin in the earlier scene.

New to Eastcheap are Pistol, Doll Tearsheet, and a much more talkative Hostess Quickly. The Prince does not know Doll ('What pagan may that be?' (II.ii. 146)) and Pistol completes his swaggering before Hal and Poin arrive. The independence of much of the comic material in this long scene and the higher proportion of it in Part Two suggest that Shakespeare was very much aware of his most popular attraction. Falstaff's greater freedom from the historical material is noticeable:

The narrative connexion between his wanderings and Prince John's mopping-up operation does not carry any significance. He is roving at large and, until the last scene, is given a large tether.⁶⁷

Shakespeare was fortunate in having available historical material which could continue as well as parallel that in Part One. He did not require or need to invent, like Marlowe, a parallel structure to enforce a criticism or systematic commentary and thus risk theatrical dependance on what had occurred in Part One. The shift of tone in the sequel does not arise from a comparative effort on the part of the audience, the development of specific allusions to Part One, or a marked progression of repeated motifs and situations which contrast with an order established for them in 1 Henry IV. The terms of the play are consistently set out in the language, ages, and physical and spiritual infirmities of

its characters controlled by the fate created for them by history.

iv Henry V

An important point in M.A. Shaaber's argument against the view of Henry IV as a ten-act play is that

the anticipations in [1 Henry IV] of the death of Henry IV and the rejection of Falstaff cannot be used to prove that he also had 2 Henry IV in mind, for these episodes might appropriately have begun the projected Henry V.⁶⁸

While denying the certainty felt by some critics that 2 Henry IV is necessary to Part One, Shaaber appears casually certain that Shakespeare had definite intentions to dramatize the reign of Henry V. The career of England's ideal ruler whose funeral and reputation had already been significant to the Henry VI plays was indeed a conspicuous subject for a further English history play. In 1599 when the play was written, it was the remaining reign that would unite a decade of professional acquaintance with the chronicles. Whether or not 1598 represents the date of the first edition of The Famous Victories or only the first surviving one it is clear that the wording of its title had a special appeal to theatre audiences. After offering two plays on the making of the ideal ruler, the portrayal of him in action and in love, as in the final scenes of his source play, would be obvious dramatic material. Shakespeare had plainly announced his intentions in the Epilogue to 2 Henry IV.

Among these intentions was the promise to 'continue the story, with Sir John in it' (Ep. 1. 28). There is good reason to question the arrangement of the comic scenes especially after the second Chorus but the strong claims for Falstaff's original presence made by J.D. Wilson and J.H. Walter must remain inconclusive.⁶⁹ In the printed text he is absent although frequent references to him presume an

established familiarity from Henry IV. The King, however, does not mention him and has no contact with his memory which is reserved for the grief of the Hostess and her company. It is not until well after the first report of Falstaff's sickness that Pistol actually speaks his name (II.iii. 5). He is identified only as the boy's master, Sir John, and 'the knight' before his mourners assemble to lament his loss. These references to Falstaff and others which associate him with Henry V ('The King has killed his heart' (II.i. 88); 'The King hath run bad humours on the knight' (II.i. 121); 'the fat knight with the great-belly doublet' (IV.vii. 50)) do not represent dramatic links of the same order which Shakespeare had used in the sequels to his previous history plays. Falstaff achieves a presence in the Hostess's account of his death but the patriotic spirit of the play does not permit his memory to enter the play with integrated force. This has often been taken as the reason for his disappearance from the dramatis personae. The emphasis is more on Henry V's youth as a legendary background to his heroism rather than as a subject which had been treated by the same dramatist in his previous history plays.

The Prologue makes no references to previous events in the life of Henry V and the references to his youth in the first scene resemble the worried description made by Henry IV at the end of Richard II. The Archbishop of Canterbury, a new character, recalls that

his addiction was to courses vain;
His companies unletter'd, rude, and shallow;
His hours fill'd up with riots, banquets, sports;
And never noted in him any study,
Any retirement, any sequestration
From open haunts and popularity.

(I.i. 54-9)

The impact of his 'reformation in a flood' (I.i. 33) is analyzed by Ely:

And so the prince obscur'd his contemplation
Under the veil of wildness; which, no doubt,
Grew like the summer grass, fastest by night,
Unseen, yet crecive in his faculty.

(I.i. 63-6)

Henry supports this view when he threatens the miscalculating Dauphin:

How he comes o'er us with our wilder days,
Not measuring what use we made of them.

(I.ii. 267-8)

His reputation also becomes a convenient weapon in maintaining the Dauphin's delusion that England

is so idly king'd
Her sceptre so fantastically borne
By a vain, giddy, shallow, humorous youth.

(II.iv. 26-8)

Shakespeare's dramatic use of references to the King's wilder days is a significant indication that Henry V is not especially concerned with the previous plays in the tetralogy. There are few specific references which disturb his legendary reputation of which the Elizabethans were generally in possession. Although the King's prayer the night before Agincourt has been often cited to support Shakespeare's dramatization of the Tudor myth, it is the only direct reference to Richard II. Its emphasis on repentance, ceremony, and ritual by 'the mirror of all Christian kings' (Chorus II, l. 6) before his nation's most important battle suggests a purpose more immediate to its context in this play than to a sequence of plays. 'The fault / My father made in compassing the crown' (IV.i. 299-300) is a problem which remains remote from the son. Of previous English kings mentioned in the play, it is not Richard II or Henry IV but Edward III who receives the most references. The French King recognizes his opponent as 'bred out of that bloody strain / That haunted us in our familiar paths' (II.iv. 51-2) and Exeter speaks 'of his leader as 'evenly deriv'd / From his most fam'd of famous ancestors, / Edward the Third' (II.iv. 91-3). The forward looking spirit of the play denies retrospective importance to earlier history and Henry V is allowed to pursue his fame without much concern for his place in a tetralogy.

Henry V is not only a sequel to the Henry IV plays but is also in content a prelude, as the Epilogue recognizes, to

the Henry VI plays. As Shakespeare began to find in the chronicles an increasing importance attached to the earlier careers of figures whom he had represented in his first histories, it is interesting to consider how far his previous experience affected their reappearance or how Henry V fits into the scheme of eight plays in the Folio order.

Bedford (John of Lancaster), Gloucester, Warwick, Salisbury, and Exeter link the English dramatis personae of Henry V to 1 Henry VI and Gloucester alone survives to 2 Henry VI. With the addition of Talbot (mentioned only once by name) and himself, Henry promises their names the familiarity of 'household words' in his speech on Saint Crispin's day (IV.iii. 52-4). Beyond this patriotic appeal, Shakespeare makes no further effort to provide these characters with attributes or futures which anticipate their roles in 1 Henry VI. The wooing scene between Henry and Katharine includes an ironic prediction that their issue 'shall go to Constantinople and take the Turk by the beard' (V.ii. 217-18) but the play seems to avoid situations which have their fulfilment in the historical material which Shakespeare had dramatized nearly ten years before. The admission by Cambridge that

For me, the gold of France did not seduce,
Although I did admit it as a motive
The sooner to effect what I intended

(II.ii. 155-7)

is only an oblique reference to the Yorkist claim which is treated with so much importance in 1 Henry VI. There are, however, several verbal parallels with both 1 Henry VI and Tamburlaine which were probably suggested by their common interest in war.⁷⁰

Perhaps the most striking inconsistency between Henry V and 1 Henry VI became the subject of a letter written shortly after the publication of the First Folio. In it Richard James considers the unusual career of Sir John Falstaff whose death is reported both before and after banishment 'on pain of death' (2 Henry IV, V.v. 63; 1 Henry VI, IV.i. 47):

A young Gentle Lady of your acquaintance, having read y^e works of Shakespeare, made me this question. How Sir John Falstaffe, or Fastolf ... could be dead in y^e time of Harrie y^e Fift and again live in y^e time of Harrie y^e Sixt to be banished for cowardice: Whereto I made answer that it was one of those humours and mistakes for which Plato banisht all poets out of his commonwealth.⁷¹

v. Conclusion

In the plays of the first tetralogy, Shakespeare made some effort to give a structural individuality to the historical material which formed the basis for each segment of his plan. In contrast to the sixty years which Henry VI and Richard III dramatize, the twenty years covered in the second tetralogy do not bring a corresponding unity as a sequence. It is difficult to discuss a Bolingbroke-Henry IV or Hal-Henry V trilogy within the tetralogy. Shakespeare is less concerned with continuity in the same sense as in his earlier plays. No single figure unites the second sequence as Margaret or Henry VI did the first. Without dreams, magic, or ghosts to propel interest into the future or offer recapitulation of the past, opportunities for cross-reference are diminished. With this lessening of artificial links the plays are freer to create an independence through style and tone demanded by their subject matter.

The second group of histories has been long recognized in the theatre and in the study as richer and more accomplished works. Their composition over a longer period of time, at intervals through at least four years, strongly contributes to their range. The development of a character in the earlier sequence was a function of his recurrence and growing historical importance while in the later plays characters are more closely suited to each other and their role within each individual play. Bolingbroke in 1 Henry IV is distinguished from his younger self in Richard II by a confirmed melancholy, an

almost religious gravity, and an exaggerated age which help 'to ennoble him and to make him remote from Hal'.⁷² The portrait of Henry IV comes closer to that of Holinshed now that Shakespeare is allowed to reappraise his coming to power in light of his 'ironic failure to acknowledge the parallel between the rebels and himself'.⁷³ Unlike Richard of Gloucester in the first tetralogy, Hal's role does not increase in preparation for the play named after him. That the conditions of one play do not establish a rigid pattern for its successors is also applicable to Henry V where Shakespeare's long interest in Prince Hal in the previous plays is nearly irrelevant to the discourses of the Chorus and the King. Tillyard, the adamant defender of a unified design throughout Shakespeare's histories, recognizes that the author of Henry V was not reluctant to proceed 'by jettisoning the character he had created and substituting one which, though lacking all consistency, satisfied the requirements both of the chroniclers and of popular tradition'.⁷⁴

As the demands of each play of the second tetralogy call for shifts in tone, style, or structure from its predecessor, the chronological proximity of their historical events and similar tendencies in technique and theme allow some common features to unify these later histories. R.J. Dorius's study of the 'themes of good husbandry and extravagance through the metaphoric language'⁷⁵ in the second sequence, for instance, is one approach which helps to bring the plays closer together. Of the various attempts to identify specific characteristics of the second tetralogy, Bullough's seems the most successful:

Whereas the first tetralogy was mainly concerned with negatives, the evils of dissension, the fratricidal strife of barons, disorder triumphant, the second group is concerned with positive values, the nature of good government, the qualities needed by a strong and wise ruler: prudence, leadership, consideration for popular feeling, ability to choose rightly between good and bad counsel, to put the public weal before private pleasures.⁷⁶

Henry IV and Henry V include a new use of prose comedy to encompass a more national dramatization of England under its rulers. In achieving this greater range Shakespeare brought to each play firmer objectives than those which were necessary to dramatize the conflicting factions in the Wars of the Roses. The earlier plays work their way through the generations of challenge, revenge, and victory on the battlefield toward completing an epic sequence on a long and complex period of history and no other dramatist attempted a similar project. The composition of the later histories benefited from the outlines of a source play and from a longer period of composition which allowed their author to relax the necessity of building each play upon its predecessor with frequent authorial linking devices in the form of threats, prophecies, and curses. The result is a lyrical historical tragedy, a two-part overhaul of The Famous Victories which admits a balanced relationship of realistic comedy with a commitment to the historical sources, and an epic celebration of English victory dominated by an 'atmosphere of strenuous activity'.⁷⁷ The change of style and tone from one reign to another indicates that an approach which was suitable to one subject was not continued for the sake of consistency to a larger whole. The sonnet which concludes Henry V is Shakespeare's signal of completion rather than an effort to make his audience realize that the plays are related in essential ways.

As Shakespeare advanced through his second sequence of histories, especially in 2 Henry IV and Henry V, both of which received an impetus from the reception of 1 Henry IV, his return to more or less pre-determined subject matter may have influenced an increasingly critical reaction to his initial dramatic creations and the expectations of his audience familiar with previous dramatizations, legend, or the chronicles. The dark tone of 2 Henry IV has been already mentioned as a sign of Shakespeare's more inquiring approach to the values represented in rebellion, leadership, and the extremes of Falstaffian independence. In Henry V undercurrents of a more serious nature have been suspected which to some

extent limit its surface exhibition of perfection. Though Henry is not the executor of his father's wish 'to busy giddy minds / With foreign quarrels' (2 Henry IV, IV.v. 213-14), the moral questions which the play raises are not capable of being answered in this kind of play. Tillyard suggests that 'the History Play served as a transition to authentic tragedy'.⁷⁸ Perhaps Shakespeare's concern for the futility of Henry's legacy in the plays named for his son led him, as Zdeněk Stříbrný observes, to

divine, at the very moment of reaching his historical synthesis, the destructive and ultimately self-destructive nature of the new men and their new ways. This divining glimpse in Henry V points forward to some of the conflicts in the great tragedies.⁷⁹

What is known of the early stage history of the second tetralogy suggests the independence of Richard II and Henry V from the two-part Henry IV. In the deposition made by Augustine Phillips after a performance of Richard II on the eve of the Essex Rising (1601), the play is described as 'so old and so long out of use that they shold have small or no Company at yt'.⁸⁰ Just eleven months earlier, the Lord Chamberlain's Company had acted at court 'Sir John Old Castell', presumably 1 Henry IV which was their property and not the play written by Wilson, Munday, Hathway, and Drayton for Henslowe.⁸¹ The success of Falstaff and Henry IV does not seem to have encouraged its company to a fresh familiarity with Richard II. The ambiguity of Queen Elizabeth's concern that 'this tragedy was played 40tie times in open streets and houses' lends itself to a variety of interpretations but it is doubtful that the Queen's words represent an accurate record of recent popularity.⁸²

Court records for 1612 show a performance of 'The Hotspur' and for 1625 'The First Part of Sir John Falstaff'.⁸³ Neither of these references can of course refer to 2 Henry IV which might not have been well known as a result of the single quarto edition in 1600. A notation dated 1619 may suggest that the sequel had not been seen at court during the previous

seven years.⁸⁴ But it was not forgotten by the man responsible for the Dering Manuscript, named for Sir Edward Dering (1598-1644), whose adaptation can be dated between 1622 and 1624.⁸⁵ The Dering Manuscript is an abridgement of the two parts of Henry IV into one play with new passages added to effect the transition. Although the arrangement of the scenes and the changes in the text have no authority, the play offers an interesting confirmation of what may have been Shakespeare's original intentions. The first three quarters of the acting script represent most of the action in 1 Henry IV. Post-Shrewsbury rebellion is slighted and the Gloucestershire scenes are omitted before the death of Henry IV and the accession of his son conclude the play. It resembles a kind of exercise to test the feasibility, which Shakespeare may have once considered, of making one play on the reign of Henry IV. That more is lost than gained in the process is self-evident but it may show that the private audience for whom it was intended was prepared to accept the obvious limitations in order to see Hal fulfill the plan of his first soliloquy in a single performance played with the same actors.

Without more contemporary evidence, it is not possible to determine if the same actors played the roles which overlap between Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V. The evidence which indicates their composition at different stages of Shakespeare's career tends to suggest that the roles of Hotspur and Bolingbroke in Richard II, for instance, need not have determined the casting of subsequent plays. The same may be said of Prince Hal and Henry V. Modern productions of the Henry IV plays have taken place on the same day only in the twentieth century.⁸⁶ It is perhaps not unexpected to find that when one company performed the entire sequence a reviewer wrote:

Though every effort was bent on making the four plays coalesce, the effect of each is so distinct, so complete in itself, their styles are so divergent,

their loose ends so uncompromisingly resist all attempts to marry them, that no single, comprehensive impression emerges. Not only do Richard II and Henry V insist on standing out from the main block, but even the two parts of Henry IV seem to spring asunder and proclaim their independence of each other.⁸⁷

Shakespeare's second tetralogy shows him taking a freer approach to his dramatization of successive periods of history. Very soon after announcing in the Epilogue to Henry V how 'Our bending author hath pursu'd the story' (1. 2) he began what has been taken to be a new one. But despite J.W. Lever's

fair surmise that Shakespeare ... put off the writing, or at least the performance, of his own Antony and Cleopatra - the historical sequel to Julius Ceasar - until some five years after Queen Elizabeth's death,⁸⁸

no evidence of an early stage history relates these two plays which the Folio places in the fifth and tenth positions in the Tragedy section. These Roman plays may make it easier to see the author of Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V in the process of creating for his later historical plays a more independent status than the ambitious design for his first plays permitted.

Notes to Chapter V

References to Shakespeare's plays are from the Arden editions of Richard II, edited by Peter Ure (1956 reprinted 1972), 1 Henry IV, edited by A.R. Humphreys (1960 reprinted 1970), 2 Henry IV, edited by A.R. Humphreys (1966 reprinted 1970), and Henry V, edited by J.H. Walter (1954 reprinted 1970).

1. Arber III,89.
2. Arber III,105. Editors distinguish two editions (Qo and Q1), the first of which survives in a fragment of four leaves.
3. Arber III,239 records a transfer from Wise to Matthew Law.
4. Arber III,170.
5. Arber III,169.
6. Chambers, W.S. I,270. James G. McManaway, 'Recent Studies in Shakespeare's Chronology', SS 3 (1950), 22-33 supports Chambers.
7. Chambers, W.S. I,270 gives 1600-1 for the date of The Merry Wives of Windsor. H.J. Oliver argues in his new Arden edition (1971), pp. liii-lviii for an early date, April 1597, and sees 'two minor advantages' in 'the theory that 2 Henry IV and The Merry Wives were being written at the same time' (p. lv). This was first suggested by H.N. Paul, quoted in The New Variorum 1 Henry IV, edited by S.B. Hemingway (Philadelphia, 1936), p. 355, who proposes the interruption of 2 Henry IV at IV.iii. Support by way of vocabulary analysis has come from Eliot Slater, 'Word Links with "The Merry Wives of Windsor"', N&Q, 220 (1975), 169-71. G.R. Hibbard's edition (Harmondsworth, 1973), pp. 47-50 has more recently argued that only some of the features of The Merry Wives were prepared for the Garter celebrations and that Shakespeare used them when he wrote the comedy a few years later. Despite the reappearance of Falstaff and five of his companions, The Merry Wives lies outside a study of two-part plays. To examine the relationship between the histories and The Merry Wives in this context is as misleading as comparing A Midsummer Night's Dream and The Two Noble Kinsmen where some of the same characters are also repeated.
8. See the New Variorum edition by Matthew W. Black (Philadelphia, 1955), p. 393; Ure, p. xxix; and the New Penguin edition by Stanley Wells (Harmondsworth, 1969), p. 15.
9. Arber II,661.
10. Chambers, W.S. I,270. In the New Penguin edition by R.L. Smallwood (Harmondsworth, 1974), p. 9, the editor writes that 'between the limits of 1591 and 1598 any date of composition is possible'. He prefers 1593 or 1594 (p. 10).
11. See Kenneth Muir, Shakespeare as Collaborator (1960), p. 39.

12. See the Arden edition by John Russell Brown (1955 reprinted 1972), p. xxvii.
13. See Bullough IV, 156 and the introductions by A.R. Humphreys to 1 Henry IV, pp. xiii-xv and 2 Henry IV, p. xvii.
14. Walter, p. xi.
15. In the dedication to Venus and Adonis.
16. Arber II, 648 (14 May 1594). Tarlton (d. 1588) acted in a play on Henry V, Nashe refers to one in 1592 (McKerrow I, 213), and H.D., pp. 33, 34, 36, 37, 47, 48 lists several performances of that title in 1595-6. The story which Shakespeare promises to continue was not a new one to the Elizabethan stage. See above Chapter III, note 71.
17. For a description of the manuscript, see the MSR edition by W.P. Frijlinck and W.W. Greg (Oxford, 1929) and Greg, Documents II, 251-6. Greg writes that 'one leaf probably is missing at the end (p. 251)...in the course of what appears to be the last scene' (p. 252).
18. Frijlinck, p. v discusses the problem of assigning a title to the play.
19. In his edition of Woodstock, A Moral History (1946), A.P. Rossiter notes of the final speech that 'this gathering-in of earlier cues suggests that the play ended on the next sheet--probably with Nimble still speaking' (p. 238). Rossiter's edition is the basis for all references.
20. Rossiter, p. 27.
21. Shakespeare's debt to Woodstock in Richard II has been examined in detail in the commentaries by Rossiter and Ure. John Elson has written on 'The Non-Shakespearian Richard II and Shakespeare's Henry IV, Part I', SP, 32 (1935), 177-88.
Frijlinck, p. xxv suggests that Woodstock belonged to Pembroke's Men while J.D. Wilson in his edition of Richard II, NCS (Cambridge, 1939), p. li suggests that Shakespeare may have acted in it.
22. J. Le Gay Brereton, 'Shakespeare's Richard the Second' in Writings on Elizabethan Drama, collected by R.G. Howarth (Melbourne, 1948), p. 22.
23. Bullough III, 359.
24. Frederick S. Boas, Shakespeare and the Universities (Oxford, 1923), p. 162. Bullough III, 359 notices how Shakespeare seems 'to avoid covering the same ground'.
25. A.L. French, 'Who Deposed Richard the Second?', E in C, 17 (1967), 411-33 discusses the ambiguity between deposition and abdication in Richard II with reference to a similar ambiguity in 3 Henry VI, I.i. He notes 'that long before Richard II Shakespeare could and did stage a deposition scene in which the participants thrashed out the complex issues thoroughly' (p. 431).
26. See Richard D. Altick, 'Symphonic Imagery in Richard II', PMLA, 62 (1947), 339-65.

27. Wells, New Penguin edition, p. 8.
28. M.M. Reese, The Cease of Majesty: A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays (1961), p. 244.
29. Bullough III, 356.
30. John Palmer, Political Characters of Shakespeare (1945 reprinted 1961), p. 179. See Travis Bogard, 'Shakespeare's Second Richard', PMLA, 70 (1955), 192-209 for a similar comparison between the 'actor kings' (p. 202).
31. McKerrow I, 213.
32. H.D., pp. 33, 34, 36, 37, 47, 48.
33. These are the links pointed out in Kenneth Muir's Signet edition, p. xxvi; R.A. Law, 'Links Between Shakespeare's History Plays', SP, 50 (1953), p. 176; Bullough III, 363-4; Ure, p. xxxiii n, and Humphreys's introduction to the Arden 1 Henry IV, p. xi.
34. NCS, p. 182. See also M.W. Black, 'The Sources of Shakespeare's Richard II' in Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies, edited by J.G. McManaway, G.E. Dawson, and E.E. Willoughby (Washington, 1948), p. 207.
35. Ure, p. lxvii.
36. Walter Kaiser, Praisers of Folly: Erasmus, Rabelais, Shakespeare (1964), p. 253.
37. Bullough IV, 211, 214.
38. Bullough III, 363.
39. Maynard Mack Jr, Killing the King: Three Studies in Shakespeare's Tragic Structure (New Haven, 1973), pp. 39-40.
40. John Russell Brown, Shakespeare's Plays in Performance (1966 reprinted Harmondsworth, 1969), p. 135.
41. Ure, p. 180 n.
42. See Ure's notes on II.i.53-6 and IV.i.92-100.
43. E.M.W. Tillyard, Shakespeare's History Plays (1944 reprinted Harmondsworth, 1969) argues that 'Shakespeare conceived his second tetralogy as one great unit' (p. 240) and is forced into an awkward demonstration that Hotspur 'in one place...speaks with a hearty abruptness that shows his creator had conceived the whole character already' (p. 265), that 'Bolingbroke too is consistent with his later self' (p. 266), and that the stylistic contrast between Richard II and its historical sequels was deliberately planned (p. 243). James Winny, The Player King: A Theme of Shakespeare's Histories (1968) rightly emphasizes 'Shakespeare's reappraisal of historical figures' (p. 86) and the difficulty in accepting the two Bolingbrokes 'as the same man' (p. 89).
44. More than two hundred years of critical activity are represented in the New Variorum edition of 2 Henry IV, edited by Matthias A. Shaaber (Philadelphia, 1940), pp. 558-63. Modern critics who think 2 Henry IV is an afterthought are R.A. Law, 'Structural Unity in the Two Parts of Henry the Fourth', SP, 24 (1927), 223-42;

G.B. Harrison (ed.), William Shakespeare, The Complete Works (N.Y., 1948), p. 655; M.A. Shaaber, 'The Unity of Henry IV' in J.Q. Adams Memorial Studies (Washington, 1948), p. 223; M.C. Bradbrook, Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry (1951 reprinted Harmondsworth, 1964), p. 170; and Hunter (1954), p. 248.

Tillyard treats the two parts as a single play planned with Richard II as does J.D. Wilson in The Fortunes of Falstaff (Cambridge, 1943), p. 4 and in his edition of 1 Henry IV (Cambridge, 1946), p. xi. He remarks that Shakespeare 'had the whole journey in view' when he wrote Richard II (p. xvi). H.C. Goddard, The Meaning of Shakespeare, 2 vols (Chicago, 1951 reprinted 1962), I, 161 considers the plays 'a single drama in ten acts' and the tetralogy 'a single work of art in four parts' (I, 148). More recently Bullough IV, 157 and A.R. Humphreys in his edition of 2 Henry IV, pp. xxii-xxviii have argued that Shakespeare originally planned two plays on the reign of Henry IV.

Keiji Aoki, Shakespeare's 'Henry IV' and 'Henry V', Hal's Heroic Character and the Sun-Cloud Theme (Kyoto, Japan, 1973) also sees the two plays as one (p. 6) but agrees with Jenkins (below) that their final form developed during the composition of Part One.

45. Harold Jenkins, The Structural Problem in Shakespeare's 'Henry the Fourth' (1956), p. 26.
46. Jenkins, p. 20.
47. 2 Henry IV, p. xxvii.
48. 2 Henry IV, p. xxviii.
49. Jenkins, p. 18 illustrates the marked decrease in Falstaff's speeches in the last two acts.
50. Jenkins, p. 15.
51. The preceding summary is based on Hunter (1954), pp. 244-5 and Shaaber (1948), p. 222.
52. Shaaber, p. 221.
53. H. Edward Cain, 'Further Light on the Relation of 1 and 2 Henry IV', SQ, 3 (1952), p. 33.
54. Jenkins, p. 25.
55. Sigurd Burckhardt, Shakespearean Meanings (Princeton, 1968), p. 158.
56. Tillyard, pp. 270-1.
57. Humphreys, 2 Henry IV, p. xxvi.
58. Irving Ribner, The English History Play, second edition (1965), p. 177.
59. Aoki, p. 6.
60. William Empson, 'Falstaff and Mr. Dover Wilson', Kenyon Review, 15 (1953), p. 232.

61. Aoki, p. 17.
62. Humphreys, 1 Henry IV, p. xxxiv.
63. Jenkins, p. 6.
64. Robert Ornstein, A Kingdom for a Stage: The Achievement of Shakespeare's History Plays (Cambridge, Mass., 1972), p. 158.
65. Clifford Leech, 'The Unity of 2 Henry IV', SS 6 (1953), p. 17; L.C. Knights, Some Shakespearean Themes and An Approach to Hamlet (1959 reprinted Harmondsworth, 1970), p. 46.
66. Tillyard, p. 303.
67. Bradbrook, Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry, p. 179.
68. Shaaber (1948), p. 221.
69. Wilson, Henry V, NCS (1947), pp. 113-16. Walter, pp. xxxiv-xxxix.
70. Some relationships with Tamburlaine include the conqueror theme, the clowning of an opposing king, a siege of a walled city whose Governor speaks from the battlements, and the royal marriage which concludes the play. Although Henry emphasizes that 'We are no tyrant, but a Christian king' (I.ii.241), Irving Ribner has described Henry V as 'a type of heroic drama of which Marlowe's Tamburlaine is the most significant progenitor' (The English History Play, p. 152) and J.D. Wilson (NCS, Henry V, p. xxvi) calls the hero 'a kind of English Tamburlaine'. The fullest account of echoes and analogies is Roy Battenhouse, 'The Relation of Henry V to Tamburlaine', SS 27 (1974), 71-9.

One of the closest verbal parallels between 1 Henry VI and Henry V is Burgundy's speech on 'this best garden of the world,/ Our fertile France' (V.ii.36-7) which recalls Joan's speech to him: 'Look on thy country, look on fertile France' (1 Henry VI, III.iii.44). Burgundy appears first in the last scene of Henry V when Shakespeare may have been more aware of approaching the historical material of 1 Henry VI. In the Epilogue which explicitly links the two plays, Shakespeare repeats the idea of 'the world's best garden' (l. 7). Henry VI's admonishment:

King Henry's peers and chief nobility
 Destroy'd themselves, and lost the realm of France!
 O, think upon the conquest of my father,
 My tender years...
 (IV.i.146-9)

is similar to the Epilogue which explains how

Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crown'd 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.
 (ll. 9-12)

71. Chambers, W.S. II, 241-2.

72. Virgil Whitaker, Shakespeare's Use of Learning: An Inquiry into the Growth of his Mind and Art (San Marino, Calif., 1953), p. 147.
73. Winny, p. 96.
74. Tillyard, p. 311.
75. R.J. Dorius, 'A Little More than a Little', SQ, 11 (1960), p. 13.
76. Bullough III, 356. Bullough appears to receive some guidance here from Una Ellis-Fermor, The Frontiers of Drama (1945), pp. 34-55. She notes of the second tetralogy that their 'task is to build up the positive figure of kingship, to which the group of minor and preliminary histories have so far contributed only negative suggestions' (p. 40). Shakespeare's 'increasingly secular historical outlook' (Humphreys, 1 Henry IV, p. 1) implicit in Bullough's remarks is argued with great force by J.F. Danby, Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature (1948 reprinted 1972), pp. 81-101.
77. Michael Goldman, Shakespeare and the Energies of Drama (Princeton, 1972), p. 58.
78. Tillyard, p. 325.
79. Zdeněk Strěbrný, 'Henry V and History' in Shakespeare in a Changing World, edited by Arnold Kettle (N.Y., 1964), p. 101.
80. Chambers, W.S. II, 325.
81. Chambers, W.S. II, 322; H.D., p. 125.
82. For discussion, see Ure, pp. lix-lxi.
83. Chambers, W.S. II, 343, 347.
84. Chambers, W.S. II, 346.
85. See the introduction to The History of King Henry the Fourth, as revised by Sir Edward Dering, Bart., A Facsimile Edition prepared by George Walton Williams and Gwynne Blakemore Evans (Charlottesville, 1974).
86. Barry Jackson directed the first afternoon-evening performance of Henry IV at the Birmingham Repertory Theatre on Shakespeare's birthday, 1921.
87. Richard David, 'Shakespeare's History Plays; Epic or Drama?', SS 6 (1953), p. 132. The review covers the 1951 season at Stratford.
88. J.W. Lever, The Tragedy of State (1971), p. 3.

72. Virgil Whitaker, Shakespeare's Use of Learning: An Inquiry into the Growth of his Mind and Art (San Marino, Calif., 1953), p. 147.
73. Winny, p. 96.
74. Tillyard, p. 311.
75. R.J. Dorius, 'A Little More than a Little', SQ, 11 (1960), p. 13.
76. Bullough III, 356. Bullough appears to receive some guidance here from Una Ellis-Fermor, The Frontiers of Drama (1945), pp. 34-55. She notes of the second tetralogy that their 'task is to build up the positive figure of kingship, to which the group of minor and preliminary histories have so far contributed only negative suggestions' (p. 40). Shakespeare's 'increasingly secular historical outlook' (Humphreys, 1 Henry IV, p. 1) implicit in Bullough's remarks is argued with great force by J.F. Danby, Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature (1948 reprinted 1972), pp. 81-101.
77. Michael Goldman, Shakespeare and the Energies of Drama (Princeton, 1972), p. 58.
78. Tillyard, p. 325.
79. Zdeněk Strěbrný, 'Henry V and History' in Shakespeare in a Changing World, edited by Arnold Kettle (N.Y., 1964), p. 101.
80. Chambers, W.S. II, 325.
81. Chambers, W.S. II, 322; H.D., p. 125.
82. For discussion, see Ure, pp. lix-lxi.
83. Chambers, W.S. II, 343, 347.
84. Chambers, W.S. II, 346.
85. See the introduction to The History of King Henry the Fourth, as revised by Sir Edward Dering, Bart., A Facsimile Edition prepared by George Walton Williams and Gwynne Blakemore Evans (Charlottesville, 1974).
86. Barry Jackson directed the first afternoon-evening performance of Henry IV at the Birmingham Repertory Theatre on Shakespeare's birthday, 1921.
87. Richard David, 'Shakespeare's History Plays; Epic or Drama?', SS 6 (1953), p. 132. The review covers the 1951 season at Stratford.
88. J.W. Lever, The Tragedy of State (1971), p. 3.

CHAPTER VI

The English History Play

The ease with which historical plays could accommodate sequels may be seen in the large number of such plays listed in Henslowe's Diary. Whether planned in two parts or inspired by an original success, the titles of several English history plays, most of them now lost, are either designated in two parts or suggest close relationships by the chronological proximity of their subjects. Those two-part plays which survive do not, like the imitations of Tamburlaine, show a strict structural dependence on a particular model. Although most of the known plays in this category were written after Falstaff had appeared in his second history play, with the exception of 1 Sir John Oldcastle (printed 1600), they do not call attention to Shakespeare's plays. The extant two-part plays set in England are less concerned with political history or heroic behaviour than with special interests: Robin Hood and Matilda in The Downfall and The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington (printed 1601), Shore's wife in 1 and 2 Edward IV (printed 1599), and Princess Elizabeth and the London citizenry in 1 and 2 If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody (printed 1605, 1606). There are also several plays with historical settings which are linked to others although they cannot be said to form two-part sequences. In addition to these groups of related plays, there was a flexibility which allowed two-part plays to become adapted into single plays. The most ambitious project by a playwright working alone after Shakespeare's historical sequences was probably Thomas Heywood's five-play cycle of Ages, completed a decade after Queen Elizabeth's death when the English History play as a genre had been exhausted.

i. The Huntington Plays

The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington and The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington were closely related in publication, performance, and composition. Both plays were published anonymously in 1601 by William Leake who entered their titles together in the Stationers' Register on 1 December 1600.¹ Both plays were licensed together by the Revels Office in late March 1598 when Henslowe entered in his Diary a notation for this purpose. A payment of five pounds to Anthony Munday on 15 February for 'the firste parte of Robyne Hoode'² indicates by implication Henslowe's commitment to finance and Munday's encouragement to write the second play for the Admiral's Company. The Revels account indicates that the sequel was completed before The Downfall was first performed. Between 20 February when Munday received ten shillings 'upon his seconde parte of the downefall or earlle huntynghon surnamed Roben Hoode' and 8 March, Henslowe provided additional instalments to Munday and his collaborator, Henry Chettle, to the sum of five pounds.³ Because the recipient of the final payment of sixty-five shillings was not recorded, the relative contributions of Munday and Chettle to the sequel remain uncertain and attempts to divide the play on internal evidence have not brought conclusive results.⁴ Even though Chettle's authorship could extend to The Downfall as the result of two payments of ten shillings made to him in November 1598 for 'mendyinge' in anticipation of a court performance,⁵ the published texts may represent the plays before these revisions and possibly well before their first performance. This is the conclusion reached by John C. Meagher who, after an examination of various inconsistencies which point to 'an unsettled and intermediate stage of composition', suggests that for The Downfall 'there is no reason to suppose that Chettle's later additions are present in any form' and that The Death, 'as it stands in the extant unperfected text, is either primarily or exclusively the work of Munday'.⁶

The Downfall is important for the discussion of its composition within an induction framework which towards the end of the play allows its pretended author, John Skelton, to speak of his preparations for a sequel. Although the Huntington plays have been considered examples of incompetently planned and poorly constructed works, the 'crude' inspiration for As You Like It⁷ and the 'sort of play ... not to be examined too seriously',⁸ they were probably performed just before Meres singled out their principal author as 'our best plotter'.⁹ Munday's long career in the theatre is sketchy and his dramatic works which survive cannot provide a firm basis for evaluating his influence upon his contemporaries. In addition to the Huntington plays, only 1 Sir John Oldcastle, a collaboration printed in 1600, and the manuscript play Sir Thomas More are extant from his known work in the 1590s.¹⁰

The Downfall and The Death are set within the reigns of Richard I and John but neither play relies upon political history except in the most incidental fashion. There is a second historical setting to The Downfall which is announced in the induction as the reign of Henry VIII. It is within a court setting that the players, directed by Skelton who is to assume the role of Friar Tuck, are brought together to rehearse the 'promis'd play' (16). Skelton introduces the preliminary dumb shows, explains 'The ground whereon our historie is laied' (39), and later steps in and out of his fictional role to comment on the performance and suggest various options for its conclusion. The problems of composition and the decisions he is forced to take as a result of the rehearsal are additional matters for discussion. Skelton's difficulties have sometimes been identified as Munday's. Promises made during The Downfall but unfulfilled both in its conclusion and in The Death have seemed the result of uncertainty and confusion. These criticisms may arise from an inadequate appreciation of the special relationship between the induction framework and the play. As author, director, and actor, Skelton is not outside the play like the Prologue to 2 Tamburlaine or the Epilogue to 2 Henry IV.

It is assumed that Henslowe recognized the incomplete nature of The Downfall when he recorded his payment for it as a first part. His delay in licensing it until after the second part was completed suggests that he may have thought the plays more effective if they were both available for performance at the same time. It would thus be to the advantage of the company to preserve if not emphasize Skelton's anticipations as advertisement. At the end of The Downfall Skelton resolves an authorial crisis by breaking up the rehearsal and saving the additional material which he claims to have prepared, not for the conclusion to the present play but as the basis for a second one.

Although the death of Robin Hood occurs in the second play there are some anticipations of it as the finale to The Downfall. After the introductory dumb shows in which Robin and Maid Marion (also called Matilda) indicate their affection by embracing, Skelton explains that 'only death can sunder their true loves' (99). The first scene of dialogue concerns the development of a conspiracy led by the Prior of York against his nephew, the hero of the play. Robin, already outlawed when he appears for the first time, promises an end to his grief only when 'I in grave be laied' (187). As a further level of stage illusion, Munday has Robin Hood discuss his own dramatic plans when he announces:

My first Scene tragick is, therefore tragicke speech,
And accents, fitting wofull action, I strive to get.

(260-1)

During his pursuit of justice with disguise, craft, and courage he remains aware that 'The sharpest ende is death, and that will come' (561).

After an intrusion by Skelton into what are later called 'ribble rabble rimes, Skeltonicall' (2235) and for which he is scolded by his fellow actor, Sir John Eltham, the next recognition of the rehearsal setting occurs when Eltham addresses Skelton by name for 'a worde or two beside the play' (2208). Eltham, who has been performing the part of Little John, is worried that the King will be disappointed:

Me thinks I see no jeasts of Robin Hoode,
 No merry Morices of Frier Tuck,
 No pleasant skipplings up and downe the wodde,
 No hunting songs, no coursing of the Bucke:
 Pray God this Play of ours may have good lucke,
 And the kings Majestie mislike it not.

(2210-15)

Skelton's reply emphasizes the new material in the plot and the particular tone he intends to achieve. His reported meeting with the King is perhaps not unlike that between Munday and Henslowe:¹¹

I promist him a Play of Robin Hoode,
 His honorable life, in merry Sherewod;
 His Majestie himselfe survaid the plat,
 And bad me boldly write it, it was good,
 For merry jeasts, they have bene showne before,
 Our play expresses noble Roberts wrong,
 His milde forgetting trecherous injurie:
 The Abbots malice, rak't in cinders long,
 Breakes out at last with Robins Tragedie.
 If these that heare the historie rehearst,
 Condemne my Play when it begins to spring,
 Ile let it wither while it is a budde,
 And never shewe the flower to the King.

(2217-21, 2226-33)

Skelton's threat to cancel the production and his use of organic metaphors to describe its state of development are significant reminders that although his plans are tentative Munday's may not have been. After a further but abortive admonition from Eltham about his fellow actor's speech habits, Skelton confirms the general direction of the play:

Wherefore still sit you, doth Skelton intreat you,
 While he facetè wil breefely repeate you, the history al,
 And tale tragical, by whose treachery, and base injury,
Robin the good, calde Robin Hood, died in Sherewodde:
 Which till you see, be rul'd by me, sit patiently, and give
 a plaudite, if any thing please yee.

(2242-7)

Because Robin's death does not occur until a third of the way through the sequel, this passage has become the basis for some observations about Munday's planning; it is the final argument in John C. Meagher's analysis of the play as an unfinished text.¹² Certainly his conclusion is justified

from the other evidence but it does not follow that these portions of editorial comment would have been omitted in the polished final version because they are misleading or mistaken. They emphasize to the audience the occasion of a rehearsal with its self-criticism in the same atmosphere of informality with which the play begins. At the same time they encourage the audience to return with expectations on another day.

If the unexpected appearance of King Richard towards the end of the play represents an emergency deus ex machina to delay tentatively the conspiracy threatening Robin's life, Munday appears to have abandoned his plans for a single play by this unanticipated event. A reconciliation is presented here between Robin and his enemies and forgiveness seems mutually agreed as the King concludes:

then as combined friends,
Goe we togither, here all quarrelles ends.

(2780-1)

A stage direction indicates that only Sir John Eltham and Skelton remain on stage and the speech headings for their ensuing discussion show that they have once again stepped out of their roles as Little John and Friar Tuck. Eltham, consistent with his earlier interest in the design of Skelton's play, feels that it may be somewhat incomplete. Speaking for the King, Sir John observes that

he expects withall,
To see the other matters tragicall,
That followe in the processe of the storie,
Wherein are many a sad accident,
Able to make the strictest minde relent:
I neede not name the points, you knowe them all.
From Marians eye shall not one teare be shed;
Skelton, yfaith tis not the fashion.
The King must greeve, the Queene must take it ill:
Ely must mourne, aged Fitzwater weepe,
Prince John, the Lords: his yeomen must lament,
And wring their wofull hands, for Robins woe.
Then must the sicke man fainting by degrees,
Speake hollowe words, and yield his Marian,
Chast maid Matilda, to her fathers hands:
And give her, with king Richards full consent,
His lands, his goods, late seazd on by the Prior,

Now by the Priors treason made the kings.
Skelton, there are a many other things,
 That aske long time to tell them lineally:
 But ten times longer will the action be.

(2787-2807)

This is a list of possibilities suggested to Skelton and not a catalogue of promises which should be interpreted as uncertainty on the part of Munday. Eltham is aware of the history and legend which is available to the playwright and offers his counsel from the point of view of his position within the court and his knowledge of the interests of the King. Skelton agrees that the play must continue and in searching for a solution lights upon an idea of his own:

Sir John, yfaith I knowe not what to doe:
 And I confesse that all you say is true.
 Will you doe one thing for me, crave the king
 To see two parts: say tis a prettie thing.

(2808-11)

What he goes on to tell the audience is also meant to be told the King:

for a while suspence
 Your censures of this Plaies unfinisht end:
 And Skelton promises for this offence,
 The second part shall presently be pend:
 There shall you see, as late my friend did note,
 King Richards revels at earle Roberts bower,
 The purpos'd mirth, and the performed mone,
 The death of Robin, and his murderers.
 For interest of your stay, this will I adde,
 King Richards voyage backe to Austria:
 The swift returned tydings of his death,
 The manner of his royall funerall.
 Then John shall be a lawfull crowned king,
 But to Matilda beare unlawfull love.
 Aged Fitzwaters finall banishment:
 His pitious end, of power teares to move
 From marble pillers. The Catastrophe
 Shall shewe you faire Matildas Tragedie,
 Who (shunning Johns pursute, became a Nunne,
 At Dumwod Abbey, where she constantly
 Chose death to save her spotlesse chastitie.
 Take but my word, and if I faile in this,
 Then let my paines be baffled with a hisse.

(2818-40)

It is clear from Eltham's earlier comments on the absence of merry jests, his uncertainty about the conclusion, and his interest in associated material as well as from Skelton's own realization of the incompleteness of the play, that The Downfall is intended to create the illusion of a first rehearsal. The author's decision to add a sequel (2821) echoes Marlowe's intention in the Prologue to 2 Tamburlaine to 'pen his second part'. The immediacy of Skelton's decision to write the sequel before the royal performance parallels the evidence from Henslowe's Diary that The Downfall was not performed until The Death was completed.

Some comparisons are possible from the speeches of similar length made by Eltham and Skelton at the close. Eltham's suggestions for 'the processe of the storie' emphasize the tone and passion of tragic material. His speech includes a succession of words (tragicall, sad, tear, greefe, weepe, lament, woe, sicke) which, he advises, should characterize the continuation of the play. After Eltham speaks mainly of effects, Skelton outlines events which he feels should be included. His proposed play may be divided into three actions which centre on Robin Hood, Richard, and Matilda. Only the death of Robin, the obvious culmination of his downfall, is essential to the concerns of Skelton's first play. But he clearly intends not only to go beyond it in time for the tragedy of Matilda but also to extend his play towards the quite unprepared future of Richard with his funeral. The Death, however, does not pursue Richard's career very far. After the first third of the sequel has completed the Robin Hood plot which gives the play its title, what may be called a new induction is presented by Friar Tuck. Skelton merely mentions:

You must suppose king Richard now is deade,
And John (resistlesse) is faire Englands Lord.

(The Death, 903-4)

The play now takes up the previously announced tragedy of Matilda with the abandonment of a number of characters

continued from The Downfall and the introduction of as many new ones for the Matilda plot.

Henslowe's Diary provides evidence that the potential material concerning Richard I was not forgotten. During the spring of 1598 Henslowe was financing several plays whose titles indicate a demand for subjects having earlier English history as their setting. These include The Famous Wars of Henry I and the Prince of Wales, Earl Godwin and his Three Sons, written in two parts,¹³ King Arthur, and in June 1598 The Funeral of Richard Coeur de Lion.¹⁴ For this play Drayton was paid thirty shillings, Wilson twenty-five, Chettle thirty-five, Munday twenty, and fifteen shillings were given without details of distribution to Wilson, Chettle, and Munday.¹⁵ This is Henslowe's first mention of Munday since he was paid in the preceding February and March for 2 Robin Hood.

The Huntington plays as printed may be difficult to describe as the two-part 'prettie thing' envisaged by Skelton. Although it might appear that Munday is covering his own flexibility in planning with the improvisations of his fictional author, it may be that the extended rehearsal framework is a significant pointer to his original and overall conception. Munday had intended similar effects, though on a smaller scale, in Sir Thomas More in which he provides a more concentrated treatment of early Tudor stagecraft. After More chooses an appropriate interlude to perform before a banquet, the absence of one player threatens to delay the action. But he is happily willing to participate and a fellow player later comments:

did ye marke how extemptrically he fell to the matter, and spake Lugginses parte, almoste as it is in the very booke set downe.¹⁶

Like More, Skelton is more concerned with smoothness of production than with his own speaking part. More's light approach to his stage experience can apply also to Skelton's: 'if Arte faile, weele inche it out with loove' (999). Eltham and Skelton are Munday's version of Medwall's A and B who similarly discuss 'the process of the play' in which they act.¹⁷

The illusion of amateur performance continues without interruption into The Death which begins with Skelton caught up in his role of Friar Tuck and momentarily unprepared to furnish the necessary exposition to his new audience. Medwall's A must also pause and ask 'By godis mercy where am I now?' (Part Two, l. 46). Somewhat restricted by his rhyme scheme, Skelton explains:

I and my mates, like addle pates, inviting
great States, to see our last play, are hunting
the hay, with ho, that way, the goodly Heart
ranne, with followe little John, Much play
the man; and I, like a sot, have wholly forgot
the course of our plot.

(The Death, 8-13)

After assuming his Friar's gown and hood, he continues:

Blithe sit yee all, and winke at our rude cry,
Minde where wee left, in Sheerewod merrily,
The king, his traine, Robin, his yeomen tall
Gone to the wodde to see the fat deare fall:
Wee left maid Marian busie in the bower,
And prettie linny looking, every hower,
For their returning from the hunting game,
And therefore seeke to set each thing in frame.

(17-24)

Warman, Doncaster, and the Prior of York, the villains of The Downfall, are promised to 'make our mirth be short and small' (29) before Friar Tuck proceeds to join his fellows in their hunt. The temporary truce with which The Downfall ends recalls that of 1 Tamburlaine. 'The tenser and more strident note of tragedy'¹⁸ now appears in the sequel. The Death like 2 Tamburlaine includes two major deaths: that of Robin Hood after the first third of the play and at the end, Matilda's death from poisoning.

The Death begins like its predecessor with an early scene of conspiracy. After Doncaster recalls the scene of forgiveness which ended Part One he commits himself to overturning the stability proclaimed there. Warman adds some further reminders of the previous play in his bid to encourage a genuine repentance similar to his own but he is stabbed for his efforts. The Prior is thus free to 'effect this Robins Tragedie' (240).

Similar to The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York, The Death completes the action indicated by its title within what may be called a long first act. The only formal division of the Huntington plays occurs here where five scenes of irregular length are numbered before Robin Hood's death. The villains claim responsibility for 'this blacke tragedy' (708), the dying hero extracts an oath of propriety from Prince John who promises to discontinue his passion for Matilda, and King Richard 'will prepare our power for Austria,/ After earle Roberts timelesse buriall' (833-4). A dirge signals the final exit of the mourners leaving only Friar Tuck to ask patience for 'this short play' (863).

Features similar to those at the end and the beginning of The Downfall are introduced at this point. Chester now fulfils the function taken earlier by Sir John Eltham by joining the Friar on stage and requesting:

Let not thy Play so soone be at an end.
 Though Robin Hoode be deade, his yeomen gone,
 And that thou thinkst there now remains not one,
 To act an other Sceane or two for thee:
 Yet knowe full well, to please this company,
 We meane to end Matildaes Tragedie.

(866-71)

The Epilogue connects with a new induction which allows time for the characters in the short play to assume costumes for their new roles. 'Matildaes storie' (874) is announced by the Friar who inaugurates the play with an epic invocation to Apollo 'That I may sing true layes of trothlesse deedes' (882). A Chorus aids in the exposition, reminding the audience of John's oath 'Never againe to seeke Matildaes love' (898). It is here that King Richard's death is announced and some of the new roles described before a series of three dumb shows, represented as dreams to King John, enter and like those at the beginning of The Downfall receive a full interpretation from the Friar. The parallel dumb shows confirm that this is an induction for a new action for which 'the poore Frier,/ Your partiall favours humbly doth require' (992-3).

The dismissal and introduction of a large number of characters in the new induction has the effect of detracting from the relationships between the twin plots which culminate respectively in the deaths of Robin Hood and Matilda. Most of the figures associated with Robin Hood, including Friar Tuck, disappear before Matilda's tragedy. Only Fitzwater, his daughter, the recently crowned John, and a few nobles continue through the induction. Despite the abrupt change in cast, a structure similar to that used in charting the fate of Robin Hood guides the tragedy of Matilda and gives some unity to the two actions.

John's pursuit of Matilda with 'quenchlesse, bootlesse fire' (990) follows several hints of this desire in The Downfall which are renewed and intensified in the development of Matilda's tragedy. Well before Skelton's promise of these developments towards the end of The Downfall, Prince John is described by his mother as doting upon Matilda (400-1) and he clearly admits his rivalry with Huntington: 'Only for Marian am I now his enemie' (556). The language of his later infatuation appears early in The Downfall when John promises her father:

like faire Phoebe, she may sit as Queene,
Over the sacred honourable maids,
That doe attend the royall Queene, my mother.
There shall shee live a Princes Cynthia,
And John will be her true Endimion.

(1200-4)

Only the sudden return of King Richard relaxes John's passion for the 'deitie' (2611) he has created of Matilda and only after the Robin Hood plot is completed in The Death does his lust reassert itself to the dramatic force it potentially represented in the earlier play.

The structural problem in the Huntington plays is created by the apparent discontinuity brought about by the new induction and dumb shows after Robin Hood's death. The subsequent material concerning Matilda might have been integrated into the earlier plot in a manner resembling Marlowe's treatment of the major deaths of Zenocrate and Tamburlaine

which occupy similar structural positions in 2 Tamburlaine. Instead, Munday has deliberately divided his sequel into what appear as two separate plays for the advantages of casting and dramatic focus. The deaths of Robin Hood and Matilda can also be seen as demanding separation for reasons suggested by an important source, Drayton's Matilda, first published in 1594 and augmented in 1596. The influence of Drayton¹⁹ perhaps led Munday away from explicitly using Robin Hood's death within the development of Matilda's tragedy as Marlowe had used Zenocrate in Tamburlaine's decline. The received legend of Matilda and King John does not include Robin Hood. Munday also chose to avoid a sentimental conclusion like the matching deaths of Matthew Shore and his wife at the end of the two-part Edward IV.

Drayton does not mention Robin Hood as he tells of John's 'quenchlesse fire'²⁰ in his pursuit of Matilda's chastity until her retirement to Dunmow Abbey as a nun and her eventual poisoning by the frustrated King assure its preservation. Drayton invents the escape to Dunmow²¹ which becomes the basis of several scenes in The Death. The identification of Matilda with the Maid Marion of Robin Hood legend belongs to Munday.²² Her change of name during The Downfall allows the two-part play to approach an untraditional unity when Matilda's death occurs in the same manner as Robin's earlier poisoning in the sequel. As the poisoning of Robin Hood is not a part of the tradition which has survived in ballads and other sources, this seems a deliberate parallel introduced into the early scenes as an effort of dramatic organization. It helps to counteract the external appearance of disproportion created by the Friar's separation of The Death into two parts of its own.

John's attraction to Matilda in The Downfall anticipates the major action it becomes in The Death. At Robin's death-bed, he is sworn by oath to resist urges that are immediately revived in his subsequent dreams as they are performed in the Friar's dumb shows. The Chorus comments:

If you remember, John did take an oath,
Never againe to seeke Matildaes love.

(897-8)

John's own death by poisoning which concludes both the two-part Troublesome Reign of King John and Shakespeare's King John but which does not occur at the end of The Death is anticipated at the time of his original oath as a just punishment if he should break it:

When John sollicites chast Matildaes eares,
With lawlesse sutes, as he hath often done:
Or offers to the altars of her eyes,
Lascivious Poems, stufte with vanities,
He craves to see but short and sower daies,
His death be like to Robins he desires,
His purjur'd body prove a poysoned prey,
For cowed Monkes, and barefoote begging Friers.

(778-85)

When Matilda takes the fatal drink her speech contains a firm structural reminder of Robin's death scene which crosses her tragedy with both the past fate of her true love and the future death of his lustful rival:

My deare lov'd Huntington by poyson dyed.
Good fellow, tell the king I thanke his Grace,
And doe forgive his causelesse crueltie.
I doe forgive thee to; but doe advise
Thou leave this bloodie course, and seeke to save
Thy soule immortall, closed in thy brest:

Gives it her.

Be briefe I pray thee: now to King Johns health
A full carouse; and god remember not
The curse he gave himselfe at Robins death,
Wishing by poyson he might end his life,
If ever he solicited my love.

(2590-2601)

Other references to Huntington during Matilda's tragedy place her story in a temporal relation to that of Robin Hood. The effect of Robin's death on Matilda is the subject of her father's first words after the induction. 'Since the too timely death of Huntington', he says, 'Not a blithe word had passage through her lips' (1285-6). The implication here of a wide gap of time separating the two actions in The Death

receives, later and more particular confirmation when her protective father reminds her that

five sad winters have their full course runne,
 Since thou didst bury noble Huntington.
 In these years, many months, and many daies,
 Have bene consum'd, thy vertues to consume.

(2175-8)

Two additional references to her relationship with Huntington add emphasis to her unyielding chastity. Oxford calls her a 'virgine spouse, true Huntingtons just heire' (1699) and after her death John remarks:

When she was lov'd of vertuous Huntington:
 Of chastitie the honour, all her life:
 To impure thoughts she never could be wonne.

(2975-7)

These links between Matilda's tragedy and her earlier relationship with Huntington both in The Downfall and in the first third of The Death show that the influence of Drayton has not entirely resulted in an extended dramatic appendix based on the legend of Matilda. From a structural point of view, the dramatization of Matilda's tragedy proceeds as though that of Huntington were controlling its development. The number of lines in the two plays before Robin's death is slightly less than twice the length of Matilda's tragedy. Within these narrower limits, the structure of the later action shares with the earlier one several features of presentation and thematic emphasis.

The matching inductions presented and explained by Skelton / Friar Tuck with three dumb shows and the matching deaths by poison of the protagonists serve as the framing devices of a parallel structure. The first scenes after each induction show, respectively, the enemies of Huntington planning their conspiracy and the King preparing his pursuit of Matilda. Banquet scenes soon follow where an inset dramatic presentation is staged. In The Downfall, the newly banished Earl first appears 'as if hee were sodainly raised from dinner' (s.d. 167-8) and uses the occasion of a spousal feast to confront his enemies with 'tragicke speech' (260). In the

sequel John is an uninvited guest who intends 'to revell at the feast, / Where faire Matilda graceth every guest' (1194-5). As a disguised participant in the masque, like Richard II in Woodstock, King John makes his first attempt to achieve his ends. While The Downfall branches off to dramatize some of the traditional material of the Robin Hood legend, the middle portion of Matilda's tragedy is concerned with baronial strife and the capture and escape of the heroine. Forgiveness is important to each play and occurs during the temporary reconciliation at the end of The Downfall but more prominently at the scene of Huntington's death. As Matilda dies of poison she too emphasizes:

That I forgive the King, with all my heart:
With all the little of my living heart,
That gives me leave to say, I can forgive.

(2650-2)

Her last line beginning 'Fly forth my soule' (2667) echoes her lover's dying words earlier in the performance, 'fly forth my breath' (690). John, as Prince and King, promises after each death a reformation while Huntington is to be buried 'at Wakefield, underneath the Abbey wall' (805) and Matilda at Dunmow 'Among the hallowed Nunnes' (3042).

The range of internal cross-reference between The Downfall and the tragedies of Huntington and Matilda within The Death shows that in spite of the unfinished and irregular attention to details such as entrances, exits, and speech prefixes, an ambitious design lies behind the two-part play. Munday's extensive commitment in the earlier play to the induction framework showing Skelton's lively impressions from his point of view as author and director is an ingenious use of stage illusion. To what extent the finished text and Chettle's revisions for the court performances improved the execution of the design is unfortunately unknown.

The Huntington plays cannot be considered as serious contributions to the English History play although historical figures and sources are important ingredients.²³ They draw heavily on theatrical tradition and are indebted to such

earlier plays as Edward I, George a Green, and perhaps the lost Pleasant Pastoral Comedy of Robin Hood and Little John,²⁴ as well as material which had appeared in The Troublesome Reign of King John and Shakespeare's King John, ballads, Drayton's Matilda, and the chronicles of Grafton and Holinshed.²⁵ The sources are handled throughout with a freedom that has caused some commentators to exaggerate the artistic shortcomings of the plays.²⁶

The Huntington plays also appear to have been the nucleus of a cluster of related plays in the Admiral's repertory in the last years of the sixteenth century. In addition to the lost Funeral of Richard Coeur de Lion discussed earlier, Look About You (printed 1600) and its lost sequel, The Honourable Life of the Humorous Earl of Gloster with his Conquest of Portugal by Anthony Wadson,²⁷ have links to Munday's plays. Haughton's lost Robin Hood's Pennyworths of December and January 1600/01²⁸ confirms the existing popularity of its subject and probably took advantage of the supply of appropriate properties and costumes.

Look About You, once dated a few years before the Huntington plays²⁹ but now more likely to have been written as a consequence of them,³⁰ includes younger versions of John, Queen Eleanor, and the Earl of Huntington as well as several other characters in the Huntington plays. It reached print in 1600 with notice that it was 'lately played' by the Admiral's Men but without indication of its author.³¹ It cannot be identified with confidence in Henslowe's Diary.

Look About You styles itself a 'Pleasant Commodie' and although it has some interest in history, its principal attraction is the constant and often clever use of disguise, a motif which has been calculated to occur sixteen times during the play.³² Young Huntington is addressed both by that title and Robin Hood throughout the play where he behaves 'as a mischievous youth'³³ while serving as Prince Richard's page during the latter's amatory pursuit of Lady Fauconbridge. Look About You has a relationship to the Huntington plays similar to that of The Merry Wives of Windsor to Shakespeare's

Henry IV plays. It does not make a sustained effort to fit into a chronological scheme although many of its characters are also present in Munday's plays. It concludes not with any sight of Huntington's downfall or death but with Richard's plans to fight in the Holy Land and the lines by Gloucester that promise what was evidently the subject of Wadeson's lost play:

He makes me wonder, and inflames my spirits,
With an exceeding zeale to Portingale,
Which Kingdome the unchristned Sarisons,
The blacke fac'd Affricans, and tawny Moores,
Have got unjustly in possession:
Whence I will fire them with the help of heaven.

(3189-94)

Earlier in the play, Gloucester is styled a 'humorous Earle' (842) which suggests that the title of the lost sequel of which this adjective was a part probably represented a fictionalized comedy of adventure.³⁴

History is generally of secondary significance in the Huntington plays and in the cluster of other works related to them. This did not seem to detract from their popularity which encouraged sequels if not chronological sequences to satisfy the interests of the audiences. The demand brought perpetuating employment to several of the Admiral's Company's dramatists as they extended established characters to new situations and branched into related historical frameworks for new plays. The projection (rather than interpretation or re-interpretation) of traditional and legendary material into manageable dramatic form was a consequence of a flexible stage practice which could absorb a wide variety of sources and periods of history into a finished product. Although the professional playwrights involved in these projects worked quickly, original approaches like the rehearsal organization of The Downfall could rearrange or repackage the conventions which were the inevitable concomitants of repertory and team writing.

There are some common features between the Huntington plays and Edward IV which was published in two parts in 1599

but written, as some evidence may suggest, two or three years before that date. Similarities between the two two-part plays include the dramatization of wanton kings seeking a mistress although Shore's wife acquiesces and Matilda resists after their metaphorical sieges. Both Edward IV and John woo in disguise while their jealous Queens similarly threaten with force the beauty of Shore's wife and Matilda, respectively. Behind this latter parallel must surely lie the influence of Samuel Daniel's 'The Complaint of Rosamond' as Henry II's concubine is mentioned by name in both 2 Edward IV and The Downfall and with more detail in Look About You where her reputed poisoner is a major character.³⁵ The popular romantic interest in these two-part plays has also strongly affected the legends on which they are based. Munday introduces poison for the death of Robin Hood and makes him an Earl although the precedent for that title is faint. Edward IV appears to be the earliest printed work in the extensive literature on Shore's wife to give her the Christian name of Jane.

ii. Edward IV

The two parts of Edward IV slight the continuity of political history in favour of the fortunes of Jane Shore. In its chronology Part One begins soon after Edward's marriage to Elizabeth Grey in 1465 and Part Two ends in the first year of the reign of Richard III (1483). Within Shakespeare's first tetralogy the material falls between the fourth act of 3 Henry VI and the third scene of the fourth act of Richard III. Only a few historical events and characters are shared, however, and the author of Edward IV does not seem to have been guided by The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York, published in 1595. In spite of its patchy background of English history and the earlier dramatization, by Shakespeare and the anonymous author of The True Tragedy of Richard III, of events during the last years of Edward IV and involving the villainy of Richard of Gloucester, the imaginative treatment of Jane Shore achieved a popular success. The printing history of Edward IV attests to this popularity and ten years after the plays were first published, the anonymous author of Pimlyco;

or, Runne Red-Cap (1609) is reminded of the large audiences who paid to see Shore's wife:

Amazde I stood, to see a Crowd
Of Civill Throats stretchd out so lowd;
(As at a New Play) all the Roomes
Did swarme with Gentiles mix'd with Groomes,
So that I truly thought all These
Came to see Shore or Pericles.³⁶

The only direct indication of the date of Edward IV is the upper limit set by the entry to John Oxenbridge and John Busby in the Stationers' Register on 28 August 1599 for

Twoo playes beinge the ffirst and Second parte of Edward the IIIIth and the Tanner of Tamworth With the history of the life and deathe of master Shore and Jane Shore his Wyfe as yt was lately acted by the Right honorable the E[a]rle of Derbye his servantes.³⁷

Six months later,³⁸ Busby transferred his rights to Humphrey Lownes whose name joins that of Oxenbridge on the title-page of the second edition in 1600. Both parts of Edward IV were printed together again in 1605, 1613, 1619, and 1626. None of these editions indicates the author but it is generally agreed that Thomas Heywood was the principal if not sole writer of both plays. Without any external evidence to support Heywood's authorship, attribution has depended on particular similarities of phrasing and on the general sympathies towards domestic tragedy and patriotic celebration of the London citizenry prominent in plays known to be Heywood's. That no relationship between Heywood and the Earl of Derby's Men, mentioned in the Stationers' Register and on the 1599 title-page, has been discovered should, however, allow the question of authorship to be less closed than it has on occasion appeared.³⁹

Thomas Heywood is first mentioned as a dramatist in Henslowe's Diary where the financing of 'hawodes bocke' is noted during October 1596.⁴⁰ The usual identification of the initials, T.H., with those of the dramatist indicates that the poem Oenone and Paris, registered and published in 1594, was probably the first of Heywood's works to reach print. Edward IV would then be the first of his plays to be printed. The manuscript play, Sir Thomas More, contains what is sometimes

thought to be Heywood's hand in the additions labelled B by Greg. The date of the manuscript, however, is not agreed upon although an early date of 1594-5 has been urged by Harold Jenkins for the revisions.⁴¹ Heywood, born about ten years after Shakespeare, would be in his early twenties at this time and just beginning his long association with the London theatre.

The story of Jane Shore, whose treatment in Edward IV prevents the play from being classified with some of the more political historical dramas of his contemporaries, was first presented in literary form in Thomas Churchyard's contribution to the 1563 edition of A Mirror for Magistrates.⁴² Although she died in 1527 and was alive when Sir Thomas More wrote his History of Richard III, her death at the end of 2 Edward IV occurs during the reign of Richard III, some forty years at variance with history. Hall and Holinshed based their short accounts of Shore's wife (without giving her a Christian name) on More but it was not until the last decade of the sixteenth century that her life and reputation suddenly became prominent in ballads, narrative poetry, and drama when Samuel Daniel's 'The Complaint of Rosamond' (1592) began a fashion for celebrating the pathetic falls of favoured mistresses. Daniel's heroine complains of her forgotten status in the early stanzas of the poem with what is probably a reference to Churchyard's most durable literary work:

Each penne dooth overpasse my just complaint,
 Whilst others are preferd, though farre more base:
Shores wife is grac'd, and passes for a Saint;
 Her Legend justifies her foule attaint;
 Her well-told tale did such compassion finde,
 That she is pass'd, and I am left behinde.⁴³

Churchyard responded in 1593 with a new version of his contribution to the Mirror in Churchyards Challenge, entered in the Stationers' Register on 9 April⁴⁴ and published by John Wolfe. Churchyard explains:

I have somewhat beautified my Shores wife, not in any kind of emulation [of Daniel], but to make the world knowe, my device in age is as ripe and reddie, as my disposition and knowledge was in youth.⁴⁵

To his original poem of fifty-six stanzas Churchyard inserts in six places an additional twenty-one stanzas which fashionably celebrate her fair appearance, digress on the song of the nightingale, and show an increased fascination with the moral lessons of her fall. Churchyard's additions were doubtless inspired by his wish to ensure the eternity promised the year before by Thomas Nashe:

Shores wife is yong, though you be stept in yeares;
in her shall you live when you are dead.⁴⁶

Churchyard, now in his eighth decade, must have received some satisfaction from the mounting interest in the woman to whom he had helped bring fame. In 1593, Anthony Chute's long poem, Beawtie dishonoured, written under the title of Shores wife, was also published by John Wolfe.⁴⁷ Her striking beauty is emphasized in his sympathetic account of her tribulations, especially when Richard III, 'A true-borne-infant-bloud-spilling murtherer',⁴⁸ ordered that she

Be turn'd into the streets and begge or dye
He sayes that all shall dye, (that dare relieve me.)

(sig. G1r)

Jane Shore is mentioned briefly in three poems, Willobie his Avis (1593), The Rising to the Crowne of Richard the Third (1594), and Drayton's Matilda (1594),⁴⁹ but none of these references or the new additions to Churchyard's poem suggests that productions of Edward IV were influencing the poetic interest in her. Churchyard's additions and Chute's poem cannot be shown to have directly influenced the play although the revival of her memory would be a strong reason for presenting her on the stage.

Jane Shore does appear in the anonymous True Tragedy of Richard the Third, printed in 1594 by Thomas Creede, 'as it was play'd by the Queenes Majesties Players'. Both the Stationers' Register entry of 19 June 1594⁵⁰ and the title-page advertise the 'lamentable end of Shores wife', with the latter noting it 'an example for all wicked women'. No such lamentable end is seen, however, for after two long appearances in the play, Jane's fate remains uncertain when the unknown

dramatist abandons her midway through the play. It may be an argument for the debated priority of Richard III that Shakespeare ignores any claim of Shore's wife to sympathetic treatment. She does not appear in Richard III and the several mentions of her name are used to undermine the stability of Edward IV's rule before he dies and later to accuse Hastings of treason. 'That harlot, strumpet Shore' (III.iv. 71) seems ready to appear but remains in the background as a convenient weapon for Gloucester's efforts to eliminate his rivals. E.A.J. Honigmann has suggested that her dramatic treatment in The True Tragedy may have been influenced by the sympathetic use of her legend in the narrative verse of 1593-4.⁵¹ Edward IV which is devoted to her story in both its parts seeks an apotheosis which is likely to represent a climax to this tradition.

The cruel treatment by Gloucester of his brother's mistress is emphasized in The True Tragedy. Jane Shore first appears with her maid, Hursly, in the scene (iii) immediately following Edward IV's death and soon after receiving that news realizes her fall has begun. Her association with Hastings leads to his death, her goods are confiscated, and Richard later orders that

she receive her open penance, let her be turnd out of prison, but so bare as a wretch that worthily hath deserved that plague: and let there be straight proclamation made by my Lord the Mayor, that none shall releve her nor pittie her, and privie spies set in everie corner of the Citie, that they may take notice of them that releeves her.⁵²

More, the chroniclers who used his account, and Churchyard do not mention this proclamation but it does occur in Anthony Chute's poem in which, at variance with Churchyard, she describes herself 'reft of my habite and attyre',

And not content with this disgrace to greeve me
He sayes that all shall dye, (that dare relieve me)

(sig. G1r)

This proclamation lies behind the final scene (xi) of Jane Shore's appearance in The True Tragedy. The friends whom

she had helped in her once fortunate position now forsake her and Lodowick, a servant to Hastings, refuses her aid because

straight proclamation is made that none shall succour her, therefore for feare I should be seene talke with her, I will shun her company and get me to my chamber, and there set downe in heroicall verse, the shameful end of a Kings Concubin, which is no doubt as wonderfull as the desolation of a kingdome.

(11. 1075-79)

The author of these lines may be showing his awareness of the revival of interest in Shore's wife.

A discussion of influences, possible sources, and material which might help to date the two parts of Edward IV must also include a lost play called The Siege of London which is listed by Henslowe for twelve performances between 26 December 1594 and 6 July 1596.⁵³ It is not marked 'ne' although the first performance by the Admiral's Men brought 63 shillings, more than twice the average receipts for the subsequent entries. The play was probably about 'the besieging of London, by the Bastard Falconbridge, and the valiant defence of the same by the Lord Maior and the Cittizens' as the title-page of 1 Edward IV describes the main historical matter of its first half. In Heywood's play the Shore material is associated with the insurrection; among the valiant citizens is the unhistorical presence of Matthew Shore. It would be more likely that a revision of The Siege of London would occur after it had lost its place in the repertoire which appears to have occurred in mid-1596 after its last performance brought Henslowe a small receipt. The Diary does not suggest that the lost play ever had a sequel.

There are some notable similarities between Edward IV and Michael Drayton's Englands Heroicall Epistles, entered in the Stationers' Register on 12 October 1597⁵⁴ and printed that year and again in 1598, 1599, and 1600. Both the play and the verses exchanged between Mistress Shore and Edward IV make the meeting between the King and Jane Shore at her husband's goldsmith shop a prominent feature. Drayton does not give a direct indication of a play on the subject although he notes that 'two or three poems written by sundry men, have

magnified this womans beauty'.⁵⁵ Neither Churchyard nor Chute in their poems mentions Shore's trade or a particular location for the King's wooing but both Drayton and Heywood employ jewel imagery as the medium for the King's compliments when he makes a disguised visit to Shore's shop in Lombard Street. Both accounts refer to Edward's 'strange disguise'⁵⁶ when he comes to woo. On the stage he extols her beauty while she is sewing:

Oh, rare perfection of rich Nature's work!
Bright twinkling spark of precious diamond,
Of greater value than all India!

Her radiant eyes, dejected to the ground,
Would turn each pebble to a diamond.

(IV.iii)

Drayton's King similarly values Mistress Shore:

O might I come a Diamond to buy,
Whose sparkling radiance shadowed but thine eye,
Would not my treasure serve, my Crowne should goe,
If any jewell could be prized so.

(sig. H6 r-v)

The comparable situation introduced into the Shore legend with these works suggests that Drayton is recalling a performance of the play rather than that Heywood is using the printed epistles as sources. Although in 1 Edward IV Jane confides to Mistress Blague that

Here is another letter from the King.
Was never poor soul so importuned?

And when he cannot come (for him) he writes,
Off'ring, beside, incomparable gifts;
And all to win me to his princely will.

(V. i),

it seems likely that a reference to Drayton's epistles is not intended and Heywood is heightening the suspense before her decision to leave her husband becomes unavoidable.

Edward IV and Jane Shore were the subjects of several early ballads as well as the inspiration for narrative poetry and drama. These ballads represent two distinct and opposite themes: a merry meeting between the King and the Tanner of Tamworth and the lamentation of Jane Shore. In The Garland

of Good Will by Thomas Deloney, the second piece is entitled:

A New Sonnet, conteining the Lamentation of Shores wife, who was sometime Concubine to King Edward the fourth, setting forth her great fall, and withall her most miserable and wretched end.⁵⁷

The earliest extant edition of The Garland is dated 1631 but a Stationers' Register entry for 5 March 1592/3⁵⁸ points to an earlier edition during the years when Deloney's chief occupation was ballad writing. In his 'Lamentation of Jane Shore', the traditional story of her fall is retold. Her husband's trade and the place of her meeting with Edward IV are not mentioned although she admits: 'For his chiefest jewel then, / he did repute me' (ll. 27-8). In Deloney's ballad of eighty-four lines the eighth stanza seems to underlie the news which Brackenbury delivers to Mistress Shore in 2 Edward IV and one line is nearly repeated. The ballad reads:

Then through London,
Being thus undone,
The Lord Protector published,
 a Proclomation:
One paine of death I should not be harbord.
(ll. 50-55)

Brackenbury reports:

The King, in every street
Of London and in every borough town
Throughout this land, hath publicly proclaimed,
On pain of death, that none shall harbour you.
(IV.i)

An entry in the Stationers' Register for William White on 11 June 1603 licenses a ballad called 'ye Lamentaçon of mistres Jane Shore'⁵⁹ and Rollins identifies this as the one included in The Garland of Good Will.⁶⁰ Another ballad with a title similar to Deloney's is included in Percy's Reliques and also in The Roxburghe Ballads where a second part and a short description of Jane Shore's appearance, copied from Drayton, are appended.⁶¹ Irving Ribner has considered this ballad as a source with which Heywood 'apparently supplemented Holinshed',⁶² but despite the notable similarities there is no convincing evidence that it preceded the play. An

unhistorical character, Mistress Blague, is mentioned three times in the ballad and appears in both parts of Edward IV. But more important is the anachronistic naming of Shoreditch by Richard III at the end of 2 Edward IV, and the comparable derivation claimed in the ballad:

The which now since my dying daye,
Is Shoreditch call'd, as writers saye.⁶³

More certain use of ballad material lies behind the scenes in Part One where Hobs, the Tanner of Tamworth, appears. The Stationers' Register records ballads about a meeting between a King and the Tanner of Tamworth as early as 1564, again in 1586, and in 1600 when William White entered a ballad which had been previously printed by John Danter.⁶⁴ This ballad, printed by Danter in 1596, is extant.⁶⁵ Although the inspiration for Hobs's role in 1 Edward IV derives from popular legend the dependence seems to be slight. The chief resemblances are the location of the King's meeting, the name of the Tanner's mare, and minor details concerning Edward's disguise and the exchange of his horse. The playwright has provided the Tanner with a wider range of interests including a daughter and a home, comical political views, and an opportunity to be entertained at Court. Heywood neatly uses the King's earlier disguise and his attraction for the common, but attractive daughter of Hobs as preparation for the later intrigue with Mistress Shore.

The uses of the Shore legend in contemporary literature point to the date of Edward IV midway between the usual limits of 1592-99, perhaps 1596-7. It probably preceded Drayton's Heroicall Epistles and 2 Henry IV⁶⁶ and seems to be influenced by Romeo and Juliet. Among Heywood's many innovations are the sad and successive deaths of Jane Shore and her husband after a last kiss and later the news that they 'Are in one grave interr'd all together' (V.iii). In Part One, Matthew Shore's outburst of oxymorons on recognizing the King in disguise (IV.iii) bears a resemblance to Romeo's rhetorically similar speech in the first scene of Shakespeare's play.

Edward IV shows the influence of Shakespeare's first tetralogy in its characterization of Richard of Gloucester

especially and in the political background to the domestic tragedy of the Shores. At times it seems to seek independence from Shakespeare's plays by emphasizing historical events which had not been dramatized previously and the two title-pages are careful in emphasizing such events. The insurrection of 1471 led by the Bastard Falconbridge is the principal historical matter in Part One and in Part Two Edward's excursion into France in 1474 occupies the first six scenes until a Chorus unexpectedly appears 'To speak of Shore and his fair wife again, / With other matters thereupon depending' (II.i).

It seems likely that both parts of Edward IV were planned together. Anticipations of themes and events in Part Two are present throughout Part One and show that the dramatist had already selected those historical events he wished to dramatize. The story of the Shores is given so much prominence that its incompleteness is easily noticed and the obvious freedom with which it is treated does not restrict the invention of future scenes in which their further fortunes might be shown. Anticipations of later historical events dramatized in Part Two begin in the ninth speech of 1 Edward IV when Edward is told by his mother that 'the child that is unborn shall rue', a distant warning of the murder of Edward V. Earlier in the same scene the Duchess of York fears retribution from France for her son's hasty marriage to Elizabeth Grey. A future conflict with France is often discussed and it finally becomes the main subject of the early scenes of Part Two. In the banquet scene which celebrates the defeat of the Falconbridge rising and represents the first meeting between Mistress Shore and the King, messengers interrupt the feast with letters from the Duke of Burgundy and the Constable of France (IV.ii), both of whom figure prominently in Part Two. Two scenes later, the claim to 'the crown and sovereignty of France' (IV.iv) is the basis for collecting contributions from Hobs and his neighbours. Before Hobs's final appearance at Court, the King announces his 'readiness for France' (V.v) and the play ends with his departure and farewell: 'Adieu! pray that our toil prove prosperous'.

Part Two, in the continuous collation of the first edition of the play, is given its own title-page advertising Edward's

journey into France, for obtaining of his right there: The trecherous falshood of the Duke of Burgundie and the Constable of France used against him, and his returne home againe. Likewise the prosecution of the historie of M. Shoare and his faire wife. Concluding with the lamentable death of them both.

Part Two includes a comparable cast of more than thirty speaking parts but of the major characters, only Edward, the Shores, and Mistress Blague return to prominent roles. By the end of the play all four are dead. The rebels, citizen defenders, and Hobs and his companions are replaced by the French leaders and the victims and followers of Gloucester. A slight degree of parallelism is used in the sequel. Each play begins with its principal historical action which results in victory for the King. In each of these military actions, Matthew Shore is involved in an unhistorical yet significant manner. His valour during the rising in Part One is ironically responsible for the loss of his wife who meets Edward at a celebration of the victory. In Part Two, he is arrested for the unlucky accident of being aboard a ship which unwittingly captured a French prize after the truce had been made. Shore's enforced return to England leads to the further pain of witnessing his wife's infidelity until their sentimental reunion and death.

Because the principal historical events in each play are distinct and independent, the progress of the Shore plot becomes the most difficult action to separate into two segments. She is at her height of favour and her husband is leaving in self-imposed exile by the end of Part One. In Part Two their ill luck and cruel treatment become progressively worse. This rise and fall structure is greatly simplified by the reintroduction of only a few main characters so that a minimal amount of exposition is necessary in the sequel. The Chorus which appears after the long scenes in France helps the dramatist to overcome the seeming irrelevance of the previous political and military action:

Now do we draw the curtain of our scene,
 To speak of Shore and his fair wife again,
 You must imagine since you saw him last
 Prepar'd for travel, he hath been abroad.
 His and her fortunes shall we now pursue,
 Grac'd with gentle sufferance and view.

(Chorus II.i)

The shift is abrupt and the early scenes in France are not significant to the remainder of 2 Edward IV. Knowledge of Jane's past, dramatized in Part One, is unnecessary when her story resumes and she is shown in her dedication to the poor. This provides her the opportunity to help her imprisoned husband who prefers, however, to remain incognito and is unrecognized during most of the play. The first challenge to her fortune comes in a confrontation with the Queen during which enough background is supplied to release the play from any dependence on its predecessor.

In the unexpected forgiveness tendered by the Queen, she asks:

What fort is so strong,
 But, with besieging, he will batter it?

(II.ii)

This question points to a thematic unity in Part One which helps to prevent it from seeming too disjointed or incomplete. One of Matthew Shore's reasons for fighting is to defend his wife from 'rebel's force' (II.i). The besieging of London thus becomes related to the 'siege' of Jane Shore. In her uncertainty following Edward's initial advances, she explains to Mistress Blague:

He, he it is, that with a violent siege
 Labours to break into my plighted faith.

(V.i)

Prior to Matthew's departure in disgrace, Jane admits:

I must confess, I yielded up my fort,
 Wherein lay all the riches of my joy;
 But yet, sweet Shore, before I yielded it,
 I did endure the long'st and greatest siege
 That ever batter'd on poor chastity.
 And but to him that did assault the same,
 For ever it had been invincible.

(V.iv)

Edward IV, if it is one of Heywood's earliest plays, illustrates his regard for the success of Shakespeare's earliest historical plays, just as his Oenone and Paris owes much to Venus and Adonis. The antics of Falconbridge's followers in Part One are derived from the Jack Cade scenes in 2 Henry VI and the capture of the rebel Spicing by a miller recalls the patriotism of Alexander Iden. General similarities to Richard III include references to the G prophecy, the drowning of Clarence, the murder of the Princes in the Tower, Gloucester's malicious asides, as well as Buckingham's suit for the Earl of Hereford's land and his concluding faith that Richmond is England's hope. But Heywood has also sought to dramatize characters only mentioned in Shakespeare such as Dighton and Forrest (quoted in Richard III, IV.iii. 9-19), Dr Shaw who is haunted by the incongruous ghost of Friar Anselm, and most importantly Jane Shore herself.

The two parts of Edward IV, the first full-length plays to be printed together since Tamburlaine, were a few years after their publication probably the basis for a single play on Jane Shore. Henslowe's Diary includes a receipt, possibly Chettle's, for forty shillings 'in earnest of the Booke of Shoare, now newly to be written for the Earle of worcesters players at the Rose of mr. Henschloes'.⁶⁷ In a dated entry (9 May 1603) Henslowe records:

Lent at the apoyntment of Thomas hewode and John duccke unto harey chettell and John daye in earneste of A playe wherin shores wiffe is writen the some of ... xxxxs.⁶⁸

This authorization is the closest external link between Heywood and the heroine of Edward IV. The most compelling difficulty of the two-part play generally, the uncertain assumption of returning audiences, may have been recognized as a theatrical weakness in Henslowe's busy repertoire if the new piece was to be an abridgement of Edward IV. In any event, Greg has described a copy of the 1605 edition as

partly prepared in a seventeenth century hand as a prompt-book for performance as a one-part play in five acts but apparently not completed.⁶⁹

There is evidence that Edward IV was known as 'Jane Shore' at the time of Henslowe's transaction⁷⁰ and it may be a derivative single play that is referred to in both Pimlyco; or, Runne Red-Cap and the Induction to Beaumont's The Knight of the Burning Pestle⁷¹ and which was performed in Germany in 1607 as 'The King of England and the Goldsmith's wife'.⁷²

iii. If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody; Sir Thomas Wyatt; 1 Sir John Oldcastle.

Earlier in the Induction to The Knight of the Burning Pestle the titles of plays mentioned for their popularity with the London citizenry include 'The Life and Death of Sir Thomas Gresham, with the Building of the Royal Exchange' (ll. 19-20). This is undoubtedly the play published in 1606 by Nathaniel Butter as 'The second part of If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, with the building of the Royall Exchange'. Although Butter entered that title in the Stationers' Register on 14 September 1605, he reissued the same text in 1606 with a new title-page advertising

The Second Part of Queene Elizabeths troubles.
Doctor Paries treasons: The building of the Royall Exchange and the famous victorie in 1588. With the humours of Hobson and Tawny-coat.

The representation of this play as a second part on both 1606 title-pages was apparently designed to follow the success of Butter's earlier publication in 1605⁷³ of If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody; or, The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth. That there is no external indication of it as first part or as an incomplete half of a two-part play raises additional suspicions about the advertising of these plays by Butter, who in 1608 published the 'bad' quarto of King Lear and who in 1605 issued The London Prodigal as written 'by William Shakespeare'.⁷⁴ An unintended irony of the 1605 If You Know Not Me publication is that the text probably represents only about half of the original play as this 'pirated text was obtained through collusion of some of the actors and possibly the help of a

stenographer'.⁷⁵ Despite the condition of the text, half the length of its sequel, it was reprinted in 1606, 1608, 1610, 1613, 1623, and 1639. After 1606, Part Two was published with its original longer title in 1609 and 1623. A final edition appeared in 1632 with some additions to the concluding Armada scenes.

Throughout their printing history, both plays were published without notice of their author but like Edward IV, If You Know Not Me is usually accepted as the work of Thomas Heywood. External evidence for Heywood's authorship of Part One appears thirty-two years after its first publication. In 'A Prologue to the Play of Queene Elizabeth as it was last revived at the Cock-pit', Heywood offers a well-known account of its fortunes:

for the cradle age,
Did throng the Seates, the Boxes, and the Stage
So much; that some by Stenography drew
The plot: put it in print: (scarce one word trew:)
(MSR, Part One, p. xxxviii)

Because the Epilogue written for the same revival refers to Elizabeth as both Princess and Queen, it is possible that the Armada episode printed with Part Two was performed on that occasion. The expanded version of the Armada victory, first printed in 1632, suggests that it was either newly written for a revival or that it was the original ending to Heywood's play about Elizabeth which was somehow transferred to the end of the Gresham play in order to justify the shared title of Butter's publications. It should be added that there is no basis but that of inference and internal evidence for attributing Part Two to Heywood.⁷⁶

Queen Elizabeth's presence in Part One makes the most probable date of composition after her death. The play on Sir Thomas Gresham may even have been written slightly earlier although the Queen's reduced role - she appears for the first time two-thirds through the play - must also have been written about 1604-5. There may have been some alterations like the addition of Dr Parry's treason to allow its claim to the status of a second part.

The title given to Heywood's two plays is perhaps intended to echo that of Samuel Rowley's play When You See Me, You Know Me which Butter also published in 1605. It is mentioned in the Stationers' Register on 12 February 1604/5⁷⁷ and was printed again in 1613, 1621, and 1632. With the exception of the 1621 printing, editions of When You See Me coincide with those of 1 If You Know Not Me. As Rowley's play deals with the reign of Henry VIII, the attraction of a roughly chronological sequence of Tudor history may have prompted Butter's use of linking titles. The catch-phrase used for Heywood's plays appears to be proverbial: it is spoken by a clown in the anonymous Mucedorus (printed 1598),⁷⁸ by Hobs in Edward IV (III.i) and by Hobson in 2 If You Know Not Me (1. 2071). It is quite apparent from the speakers assigned these words that they do not offer a serious indication of the subject or themes of the plays in which they occur.

When You See Me was according to its title-page acted by the 'Prince of Wales his servants'. The company who performed Heywood's plays is not mentioned on their title-pages but there is no evidence that he was writing for the same company at this time. Heywood is associated with Worcester's just before 1603 and continued writing for them when they became Queen Anne's Men in that year.⁷⁹

A close relationship between Rowley and Heywood in planning their plays on Tudor history is extremely doubtful and it appears that Butter was more interested than anyone in unifying the plays with catchy titles. Only Stephen Gardiner is represented in both plays. In Michel Grivelet's words, the If You Know Not Me plays

ne sont nullement les deux parties d'une même oeuvre mais deux productions distinctes, arbitrairement réunies par un éditeur sans scrupules.⁸⁰

This accusation is borne out by internal evidence. Elizabeth and Gresham are the only characters who are introduced in both parts of If You Know Not Me. Continuity between the plays by way of anticipation or exposition is absent and each work maintains its own emphasis quite independently of the other.

Butter's use of a cancel in 1606 for the title-page of Part Two, renaming it The Troubles of Queen Elizabeth, receives no confirmation from the text. It belongs within or near the genre of citizen comedy.⁸¹

In Part One, the troubles of Princess Elizabeth are the chief interest until, after much suffering and the suspense of ominous dreams, Sir Henry Carey (Karew) arrives in haste to announce that Queen Mary is dead and Elizabeth is now Queen. Throughout the play, Heywood's sympathies are unequivocal:

C'est bien d'une hagiographie qu'il s'agit, en effet. Elizabeth est une sainte, accomplie dans ses vertus, admirable dans ses souffrances.⁸²

A Protestant point of view is consistently maintained and furnishes the principal contrast between Elizabeth and her enemies. Faith in God during adversity and the prayers of her few loyal followers sustain her throughout the play. The conflict is even represented in a dream performed in dumb show:

Enter Winchester, Constable, Barwick, and Fryars:
at the other dore 2. Angels: the Fryar steps to her,
offering to kill her: the Angels drives them back.
Exeunt. The Angel opens the Bible, and puts it in
her hand as she sleepes, Exeunt Angels, she wakes.

(1049-53)

The Bible, opened to a particularly apposite passage, renews her hope and in the final speech of the play Elizabeth kisses the Bible, 'the Jewell that we still love best,/ This was our solace when we were distrest' (1582-3).

Gresham's brief role in Part One is unhistorical. He saves Elizabeth's life by discovering an attempt by Winchester to shuffle a warrant for the Princess's death among the business of state prepared for Philip's approval. It is after this revelation that 'Master Gresham the Kings Agent'(1166) is named for the first and only time in the dialogue and Sussex praises

his love to the King and Queenes majestyes,
His service to his Country, and care of the Princesse.

(1167-8)

This unexpected appearance of the hero of Part Two and the eight lines which he speaks are not recalled in the 'sequel' and give no indication of the order in which the two plays were written.

The sources used by Heywood for both parts of If You Know Not Me also argue against the sense of continuity and close relationship implied by the title. For Part One, Foxe, supplemented by Fabyan and Holinshed, were the principal sources as they were for Heywood's later prose work on the same subject, Englands Elizabeth: Her Life and Troubles (1631).⁸³ Part Two is based mainly on Stowe's chronicle supplemented by Heywood's invention. As Hobs was brought from folklore into the action of Edward IV, Hobson, a London haberdasher of popular legend, is introduced into the commercial life of Gresham's London.⁸⁴

The opening of Part Two bears no relation to the end of Part One and except for Hobson's account of profiting from bead sales during Mary's reign, there are no reminders of the era dramatized in Part One until the Queen's late appearance. The play does not respect chronology as it embellishes isolated historical events during Elizabeth's reign. References to the Battle of Alcazar and Sir Thomas Stukeley's death (1288ff) in 1578⁸⁵ precede the Queen's naming of the Royal Exchange in January 1571 (2015), Doctor Parry's attempt on the Queen's life in 1584, and the Armada victory at the close. Heywood's random use of historical material nevertheless was accounted a 'get-penny' by the actors according to Eastward Ho!.⁸⁶ The celebration of national pride, the worthiness of Elizabeth, and the virtues of thrift and social responsibility are all emphasized during the play which by including comic scenes and spectacle apparently produced a successful formula.

A two-part play which in some ways forms a fore-piece to Heywood's dramatization of Elizabeth is mentioned in Henslowe's Diary and may survive in a drastically abridged version published in 1607 under the title Sir Thomas Wyatt. Two plays, Lady Jane and its second part, were the basis for payments made by Henslowe to Dekker, Webster, Chettle, Smith, and Thomas

Heywood during October 1602.⁸⁷ Full payment was made to the five collaborators on 21 October 1602 for Lady Jane but only Dekker's name is directly associated with the sequel for which six days later he was given five shillings 'in earneste of 2 pte of Lady Jane'.⁸⁸ It is not certain that the second play was completed but usually assumed that the 'sewt of satten' costing five pounds 'for the playe of the overthrowe of Rebelles' refers to 2 Lady Jane.⁸⁹ It has been suggested that this expensive costume was for the Bishop of Winchester, 'a new and leading character in II Jane'.⁹⁰

Sir Thomas Wyatt was not entered in the Stationers' Register before its publication in 1607. Its title-page advertises 'The coronation of Queen Mary and the coming in of King Phillip', neither of which is shown in the play, and its authors as Thomas Dekker and John Webster. Abortive attempts to assign particular scenes or passages to Dekker and Webster may suggest that the attribution is suspect or incomplete.⁹¹ In addition, the text is quite short and may represent 'an actors' built version of a play (or two parts) shortened for performances in the Provinces'.⁹²

An attempt has been made to reconstruct the two Lady Jane plays on the assumption that Sir Thomas Wyatt is an abridgement designed from a selection of scenes from the two-part play. Because Dekker and Webster were among the playwrights paid by Henslowe for Lady Jane, the possible derivation of Sir Thomas Wyatt from it is given some attraction. Queen Anne's Men who performed Wyatt was the same company for whom the original Lady Jane plays were written although they were known then as Worcester's Men. Phillip Shaw's reconstruction of the scenario of Lady Jane seeks to show that

the principle of selection followed by the abridger or abridgers of Jane seems to have been to retain only the episodes associated directly with Wyatt's activities. The incidents thus dropped dealt largely with Jane and Mary.⁹³

By comparing the scenes in Wyatt with the source material from which they derive, Shaw is able to suggest scenes essential to the story of Jane which by their omission have left

inconsistencies in the single play. Greg notes a significant break in Wyatt after the ninth scene and suggests that point as the division between Part One and Part Two of Lady Jane.⁹⁴ Shaw supports this by noticing here the introduction of new characters such as the Bishop of Winchester, the impetus of a new plot concerning the marriage between Philip of Spain and Mary with Wyatt's rebellion, and the treatment of previous events as 'antecedent action'.⁹⁵

A tentative discussion of the composition of the lost two-part play is possible from its vestiges in Sir Thomas Wyatt as the continuity of traceable source material, mainly from Stowe and Holinshed,⁹⁶ is disturbed by abridgement. The five collaborators of Part One of Lady Jane seem not to have anticipated a second play and were concerned to follow a plan that would concentrate on Jane Grey's fall 'from Edward's death through Northumberland's trial, and Mary's rise, ending in a spectacular coronation finale'.⁹⁷

When a sequel was called for, contemporary historical material was pieced together and used to approach a finale showing the trial and execution of Jane. But it became a play more about Wyatt's rebellion and 'the overthrow of the rebels', as Henslowe termed it, because the role of Jane could not sustain the continuation of a biographical play in which she and her cause were the principal interests.

After the death of Elizabeth, when Heywood planned his own biographical play on her troubles during the reign of Mary for the same dramatic company, he took as his starting place the point where 2 Lady Jane seems to have finished. Heywood may even have incorporated some of the material from his collaboration into the new play when he felt it appropriate to overlap his play with the earlier dramatization of Tudor history. The repetition of a line spoken by Mary in both Sir Thomas Wyatt and 1 If You Know Me Not,⁹⁸ the peculiar spelling of Sir Henry Beningfield (the sources have Bedingfield) in both plays, and the similarity between Queen Mary's use of a prayer book (I.iii) in Sir Thomas Wyatt and Elizabeth's relationship to her English

Bible point to Heywood's partial use of Lady Jane as a source play.⁹⁹

If You Know Not Me refers back to the story of Guilford and Lady Jane (l. 821) and the fortunes of Wyatt's rebellion (ll. 99, 385-93). Mary's coronation and Philip's landing, advertised on the title-page of Wyatt and presumably once part of Lady Jane, occur in Heywood's play.

Particular influences from Shakespeare's historical sequences on Lady Jane or other lost two-part history plays are of course impossible to determine. Edward IV owes some inspiration to Shakespeare's first tetralogy and the two parts of If You Know Not Me include several verbal parallels to Shakespeare's second sequence, especially to Richard II. The royal suffering of both Richard and Princess Elizabeth and their contemporary association may have helped to suggest some of these similarities.¹⁰⁰ The doubtful intention of a two-part design for If You Know Not Me makes it unlikely that Heywood had Shakespeare's example in mind when these two plays were written.

Perhaps the most striking evidence of Shakespeare's influence on the two-part historical play concerns Sir John Oldcastle, written in two parts to rival Henry IV. There can be no question that the writing of Sir John Oldcastle in two parts for the Admiral's Men was thought the most appropriate reply to the two Falstaff plays which had ired the eleventh Lord Cobham, Henry Brooke. On 16 October 1599 Henslowe authorized the payment of ten pounds to Munday, Drayton, Wilson, and Hathway 'for the first pte of the lyfe of Sir Jhon Ouldcastell and in earnest of the Second pte'.¹⁰¹ Part One was performed for the first time in early November with Henslowe's approval indicated by a ten shilling gift to the dramatists.¹⁰² The second part, ready by Christmas of the same year when Drayton alone was paid four pounds,¹⁰³ was performed the following March with some recently acquired costumes from 'the littell tayller'.¹⁰⁴ In August 1600 entry was made in the Stationers' Register by Thomas Pavier for

The first parte of the history of the life of Sir John Oldcastell lord Cobham.
Item the second and last parte of the history of Sir John Oldcastell lord Cobham with his martyrdom.¹⁰⁵

Pavier's intention to publish both of these relatively new plays was apparently unsuccessful and whether or not it was the players who prevented publication of Part Two,¹⁰⁶ only Part One, styled so on its title-page, seems to have reached print. Two years later Henslowe records a payment to Dekker for additions to the play and an expensive investment for properties and costumes for Worcester's Men.¹⁰⁷ Although Percy Simpson has conjectured that the payment to Dekker might be for an 'amalgamation of the two parts into a single play',¹⁰⁸ the commission might have been required by the change of company and the demands of its new personnel.

The publication as well as the composition of Sir John Oldcastle may be related to Shakespeare's plays. The Stationers' Register entry for the Admiral's plays occurred one week after the attempt by and apparent failure of the Chamberlain's Men to stay publication of Henry V. Three days after the Oldcastle plays were registered by Thomas Pavier, he became owner of the copyright for Henry V and on 23 August 2 Henry IV was registered with the reputable Andrew Wise. The rush to get these plays into print, the players' fear in response, and the pirating of Henry V point to an intensification of theatrical rivalry with Thomas Pavier prepared to deal from both sides of the controversy.¹⁰⁹

Henslowe's advance payment for 2 Oldcastle before the first performance of Part One means that the dramatists were aware of proportioning their source material with a view towards completing the biography of their hero. His death would be shown in a manner necessary to justify the Stationers' Register's description of the play as the 'last parte ... with his martyrdom'. Historically, he was hanged and burnt in 1417. Identifiable sources for Part One include Foxe, Fabyan, and Holinshed with some supplementary unhistorical matter borrowed from Shakespeare's Henry IV and Henry V. The material for Part One

falls within the reign of Henry V and some overlap with Shakespeare's recent play on that King may be accounted for by the need to go outside the short period of Oldcastle's life which formed the basis of the two plays. The debts to Shakespeare's plays do not form a regular pattern of imitation as the collaborators seem to have been attracted to random features which suited their needs.¹¹⁰ The author of the last scenes cannot have been deeply inspired by his predecessors for in this section of the play inconsistencies occur and some of the previous political and religious themes are abandoned in favour of a series of short scenes of intrigue and disguise.¹¹¹

Part One is slightly indebted in structure to 1 Henry IV which was available to the collaborators in the 1598 quarto. The provision of Sir John of Wrotham, a lusty priest, from a single line in Fabyan¹¹² is intended to promote a series of comic scenes to rival Falstaff's success. Wrotham describes himself as

olde huddle and twang, yfaith,
A priest in shew, but in plaine termes a theefe.¹¹³

He is justly called a 'whooreson bawdy priest' (II.i. 236) for his constant association with Doll, his concubine. His relation to Falstaff is shown to be more than one of dramatic borrowing, however, when he tells the disguised Henry V how Prince Hal

once robde me before I fell to the trade my
selfe; when that foule villainous guts, that led him
to all that rogerie, was in's company there, that
Falstaffe.

(III.iv. 102-5)

In the same scene the King reminds Wrotham of Poins and Peto as well as of 'fat' Falstaff (III.iv. 62-5). The comic scenes in the play attempt to illustrate a religious bias consistent with the serious concerns of the play.¹¹⁴ The intention to seek a mixture of comedy and history, as in 1 Henry IV, presumably extended into the lost sequel. This mixture occurs despite the straight-faced fourteen-line Prologue which promises:

It is no pamperd glutton we present,
 Nor aged Councillor to youthfull sinne,
 But one, whose vertue shone above the rest,
 A valiant Martyr and a vertuous peere;

Let faire Truth be grac'te,
 Since forg'de invention former time defac'te.

(ll. 6-9, 13-14)

The final speeches in 1 Sir John Oldcastle give some hints about the direction of its sequel. Lord Powys, with the language of the theatre, invites Oldcastle to his home in Wales:

There yet remains a part of that true love
 He owes his noble friend unsatisfide,
 And unperformd, which first of all doth bind me
 To gratulate your lordships safe delivery.

(V.x. 155-8)

His offer of 'my house,/ My purse, my servants' (V.x. 163-4) is tempting to interpret as an opportunity for something like the Gloucestershire scenes in 2 Henry IV. Part One already includes comic Welshmen and Irishmen speaking in appropriate accents. The continuation of Catholic antagonism, represented by the Bishop of Rochester, to Oldcastle and his faith is ominously foretold as Powys warns that 'the Bishops hate pursues ye so' (V.x.166). A similar link in 1 Henry IV looks forward to its sequel in the continuing antagonism of the rebels as Henry IV and his son plan to march against Glendower in Wales.

iv. Lost Two-Part Historical Plays

Henslowe's Diary provides evidence of a wide range of two-part plays which are now lost. Many of the titles suggest comedies but a larger number indicate that the collaborators writing for Henslowe's companies consulted historical sources and used well-known historical figures to attract audiences. When not designated a Part One, Part Two, or even a Part Three, some of the titles show related interests which might create a cycle or sequence or at least a cluster of interrelated plays. Seldom is one dramatist alone responsible for both an original play and its sequel and the recipients of Henslowe's payments

frequently change from one play to another although different parts of the same title may be involved. English subjects are prominent although foreign history and classical subjects are not uncommon. The genre of some plays like Black Bateman of the North, written in two parts in 1598,¹¹⁵ is uncertain though a later play mixing history and tragedy, published in 1636, seems to treat some of the same material.¹¹⁶ Other lost two-part plays for which, like Lady Jane, there are grounds for supposing their survival in an altered form include Godfrey of Boulogne (1594),¹¹⁷ Hercules (1595),¹¹⁸ and Vortigern (1596) to which Uther Pendragon (1597) may be its historical sequel.¹¹⁹

Legendary British history is also represented in The Conquest of Brute (1598) with Day and Chettle the authors of the first part and Chettle alone responsible for the sequel.¹²⁰ These joined the recent Huntington plays and the two-part Earl Godwin and His Three Sons written earlier in 1598.¹²¹ No predecessor to Wilson's 2 Henry Richmond is known but some evidence of its dramatis personae suggests to Greg that it might have closely followed 2 Edward IV in its chronology.¹²² The period covered in Shakespeare's sequences of history plays does not seem to have been the basis for fresh dramatization. The Admiral's repertoire was principally concerned with pre-Edward III or Tudor history.

Chettle's The Life of Cardinal Wolsey (1601) was followed by his collaboration in The Rising of Cardinal Wolsey, evidently an attempt to write a first part to an original play which then became a second part.¹²³ A similar procedure is followed in Drayton and Dekker's trilogy of 1, 2, and 3 The Civil Wars of France which was written in the last months of 1598.¹²⁴ In January 1599, Dekker alone sold to Henslowe The First Introduction of the Civil Wars in France.¹²⁵ It was this kind of practice that must have prompted Middleton's character, Occulto, in The Widow to say:

How now, what thing's this?
 Now, by this light, the second part o' th' justice
 Newly reviv'd, with never a hair on's face.
 It should be the first rather by his smoothness,
 But I ha' known the first part written last.¹²⁶

The Life of Cardinal Wolsey is the only certain example of an original play assuming a new title as a second part. This has been suspected of Shakespeare's 2 Henry VI with 1 Henry VI later joining a two-part Contention play but the practice could not have been rare. On a larger scale, Shakespeare's second tetralogy supplies material which precedes in historical chronology his earlier sequence. The popularity of historical subjects during the 1590s encouraged the creation of sequences by vertical extension backwards as well as forwards in historical time and also horizontally toward the creation of clusters such as the Robin Hood-Coeur de Lion 'trilogy'. The achievement of a more or less complete coverage of English history is documented in An Apology for Actors (1612) in which Thomas Heywood argues that

playes have made the ignorant more apprehensive, taught the unlearned the knowledge of many famous histories, instructed such as cannot reade in the discovery of all our English Chronicles: and what man have you now of that weake capacity, that cannot discourse of any notable thing recorded even from William the Conquerour, nay from the landing of Brute, untill this day, beeing possest of their true use. For, or because Playes are writ with this ayme.¹²⁷

The range of dramatic genres and sub-genres which could accommodate plays with historical settings is discussed by Polonius and practised in many of the extant plays whether they are specifically designated two-part plays or are closely related through overlap or continuation.

One further lost play on English history may be briefly mentioned. On 6 November 1602, when Henslowe was recording the purchase of a 'sewt of satten' for The Overthrow of the Rebels,¹²⁸ a large number of patriotic playgoers assembled at the Swan Theatre in anticipation of a performance of England's Joy. A Plot intended for public advertisement survives and shows that the presentation was to include nine scenes of historical interest, of which the first was to

induct by shew and in Action, the civill wares of England from Edward the third, to the end of Queen Maries raigne, with the overthrow of Usurpation.¹²⁹

The similarity to Henslowe's title for 2 Lady Jane is noticeable and Heywood's two later plays on Elizabeth (who was to be impersonated as 'England's Joy') contain some incidents such as the Armada victory which were to be highlights of the programme. It is known from contemporary accounts, however, that England's Joy was a hoax show perpetrated by Richard Vennar who is called by one source 'the graund connicatcher'.¹³⁰ His elaborate plans were abbreviated soon after a large audience had paid a double fee for entry. Vennar's programme of historical variety may help to indicate the extensive popularity of historical plays with their wide range of linking chronology. His advertising emphasizes the grand scale of the event. The disappointment was of equal proportion as a letter written soon after the affair makes clear:

the common people, when they saw themselves deluded, revenged themselves upon the hangings, curtains, chairs, stooles, walles, and whatsoever came in their way, very outragiously, and made great spoile.¹³¹

In addition to the lost two-part plays mentioned in Henslowe's Diary which indicate foreign history or English history, classical and mythological interests are represented, respectively, by the anonymous 1 and 2 Caesar and Pompey (1594-5),¹³² 1 and 2 Hannibal and Hermes (1598),¹³³ and romance by 1 and 2 Fair Constance of Rome (1600).¹³⁴ Less mysterious than the two latter titles are 1 and 2 Hercules (1595) whose hero, as Ernest Schanzer remarks, was 'no rare visitor on the Elizabethan stage'.¹³⁵ This play has had a long association with Heywood's The Silver Age and The Brazen Age while these plays were considered products of the 1590s. This early dating has now been persuasively refuted and it appears that Heywood's cycle of five plays, The Golden Age, The Silver Age, The Brazen Age, and the two parts of The Iron Age were written in that order, published in that order, and possibly available for performance as an ordered sequence.

v. Heywood's Ages

Although they deal with remote mythological and legendary events, beginning after the death of Uranus with the lives of Jupiter and Saturn and proceeding in chronicle fashion to the suicide of Helen of Troy, Heywood's Ages were related by their author to the history of England. This is clear from his long poem of about 13,000 lines published in 1609 in seventeen cantos under the title of Troia Britannica; or, Great Britain's Troy. The traditional link between Britain and Troy was given a backward extension to the background to Troy. The poem and the sequence of five plays written slightly later begin at the same point. In An Apology for Actors, Heywood had placed the landing of Brute at the forefront of the English History play but implicitly, the Ages, by their dependence in various degrees on the organization and language of Troia Britannica, represent the ultimate sources of English history. The link is secured directly in the final play of the series, 2 Iron Age, when during the destruction of Troy, the ghost of Hector appeals to Aeneas to hasten his escape from the holocaust:

Away, and beare thy Country gods along,
Thousands shall issue from thy sacred seede,
Citties more rich then this the Grecian spoyle.
In after times shall thy successors build,
Where Hectors name shall live eternally.
One Romulus, another Bruite shall reare,
These shall nor Honours, nor just Rectors want,
Lumbardies Roome, great Britaines Troy-novant.

(p. 384)¹³⁶

Unlike the poem, however, the cycle of plays does not make a sustained attempt to furnish parallels to the present age with topical allusions or to engage in sudden patriotic celebrations of Elizabethan and Jacobean England during the narrative. A more practical reason for dramatizing the material is offered in the Prologue spoken by Homer before The Silver Age:

Since moderne Authors, moderne things have trac't,
Serching our Chronicles from end to end,
And all knowne Histories have long bene grac't,
Bootlesse it were in them our time to spend
To iterate tales oftentimes told ore,
Or subjects handled by each common pen;
In which even they that can but read (no more)
Can poynt before we speake, how, where, and when.

(p. 85)

The project of popularizing classical material as chronicle history and offering it as tangential to the practically exhausted genre of the English History play took place while Troia Britannica was still fresh in Heywood's mind. The usual limits of composition are 1609 and c. 1613 but more precise indications of their planning and performance can be found in Heywood's addresses 'To the Reader' which appeared with each of the five plays as they were published.

The Golden Age was entered in the Stationers' Register on 14 October 1611¹³⁷ and published that year with Heywood's assertion that it was 'the eldest brother of three Ages, that have adventured the Stage' (p. 3). The subsequent plays in the series have left no record in the Stationers' Register but the reader is told in The Silver Age, published in 1613, that 'wee begunne with Gold, follow with Silver, proceede with Brasse, and purpose by Gods grace, to end with Iron' (p. 83). This gives no evidence that The Iron Age was not yet written as this special address to the reader may be concerned only with the preparation of the plays for publication. In Heywood's similar address in The Brazen Age, also published in 1613, he returns to the family metaphor by referring to it as the 'third brother' (p. 167).

Although the two parts of The Iron Age were not printed until 1632, Heywood claims for them a strong link to their predecessor in his prefatory note:

This Iron Age ... beginneth where the other left, holding on, a plaine and direct course, from the second Rape of Hellen ... not onely to the utter ruine, and devastation of Troy; but it, with the second Part, stretcheth to the Deathes of Hellen, and all those Kings of Greece, who were the undertakers of that Ten yeares Bloody and fatall Seige.

(p. 263)

Part Two, published in the same year, includes a list of 'New persons not presented in the former part of this History' (p. 349) and with some pride announces to the reader the complete publication of 'an intire History, from Jupiter and Saturne, to the utter subversion of Troy' (p. 351). Heywood

goes on to apologize for any shortcomings as they were 'long since Writ' (p. 351), before explaining that his work on the pentalogy may not yet be complete:

If the three former Ages (now out of Print,)
 bee added to these (as I am promised) to make
 up an handsome Volume; I purpose (Deo Assistente,)
 to illustrate the whole Worke, with an Explanation
 of all the difficulties, and an Historicall Comment
 of every hard name, which may appeare obscure
 or intricate to such as are not frequent in Poetry.

(pp. 351-2)

The presence of Thomas Heywood's name on each title-page, his addresses to the reader in each of the five quartos, and the dramatis personae lists before each text show an uncommon authorial seriousness about the presentation of The Ages. Heywood also uses the addresses to call attention to the successful stage history of the plays. In 1 Iron Age he writes that

these were the Playes often (and not with the
 least applause,) Publickely Acted by two Companies,
 upon one Stage at once, and have at sundry times
 thronged three severall Theaters, with numerous
 and mighty Auditories.

(p. 264)

Queen Anne's Men, acting at the Red Bull as the title-page of The Golden Age observes, was probably the company who originally performed the plays. Suggestions for the other theatres to which Heywood refers include the Curtain and the Cockpit.¹³⁸

The Revels accounts show that on 12 January 1611/2 the King's and Queen's Companies performed The Silver Age at Greenwich.¹³⁹

Although only one edition of each of the plays was published there is no reason to suppose they were not the stage successes which their author claims. Thomas Freeman in 1614, immediately after addressing an epigram to Shakespeare, dedicates the following one to 'Master Heywood, of his Gold and Silver Age':

So wrote the ancient Poets heeretofore,
 So hast thou lively furnished the stage,
 Both with the golden, and the silver age,
 Yet then, as they, dost but discourse of store,
 Silver and gold is common to your Poet,
 To have it, no; enough for him to know it.¹⁴⁰

As late in the century as 1671, Francis Kirkman wrote of Heywood's plays that 'except his Loves Mistress, and next to that his Ages, I have but small esteem for any others'.¹⁴¹ Gerard Langbaine in his Account of the English Dramatick Poets (1691) recommends The Ages, because they are

generally sold together, and depend upon each other: and on another score they deserve the Preference, as being accounted by most the Flower of all his Plays.¹⁴²

These later appreciations speak of the Ages as what may be considered a five-part work as it is unlikely that either Kirkman or Langbaine witnessed performances of all of the plays on the stage. How far Heywood thought of the five plays as a single unit or as the Goethian dramatic poem which he intended to serve in a one-volume annotated edition is a question which is closely related to his use of sources.

In 1931 A.M. Clark confidently announced that 'The Ages are, beyond the shadow of a doubt, dramatizations of Heywood's own Troia Britannica'.¹⁴³ Unfortunately Clark was unable to argue his case in any detail and it has been shown that his statement applies without reservation only to the first play of the series. The Golden Age, as Allan Holaday has demonstrated, is indebted neatly in structure and frequently in language to the first five cantos of the poem.¹⁴⁴ Each of the acts of the play is based on its corresponding canto. This is apparently as far as Clark pursued the problem of the relationship between the poem and the plays. If his conclusion had been valid for the remaining plays, it would be difficult to believe otherwise than that Heywood was simply translating his narrative from one genre to another and using Troia Britannica as a pre-prepared source for a dramatic project of twenty-five acts with or without the intention to publish the material under the second format. Holaday has shown, however, that Heywood's use of the poem did not continue in the pattern of The Golden Age and the plays began to take on features which cannot be traced to the original sources, principally Caxton's Recuyell, which he had used for Troia Britannica. While some aspects of Heywood's five five-act structures can be matched to portions of his poem many others

cannot and influences such as Plautus and Shakespeare's Venus and Adonis become important to the plays.¹⁴⁵ As the series developed it is evident that Heywood also took more hints from the drama of his age and freed himself from depending on his poem or its direct sources. Pericles, as Langbaine was the first to point out,¹⁴⁶ suggested the use of Homer who, like Gower, provides an antique flavour by serving as Chorus between the acts and introducing the dumb shows. Situations in Heywood's plays may also be derived from The Winter's Tale, The Tempest, and Troilus and Cressida which in the quarto of 1609 became a convenient source for some of the Troy scenes in The Iron Age.¹⁴⁷

The composition of The Golden Age did not result in a strict routine for the subsequent Ages except that action continued to overshadow any interest in character or theme. Homer provides a useful bridge across the more spectacular feats of Heywood's gods and heroes which the resources of the stage could not provide. Even so, the amount of spectacle is remarkable and stage directions call for frequent and elaborate ascents, descents, battles, and special effects. Emphasis on character is necessarily limited by these features and the episodes tend to become self-contained within the act divisions. Interrelationships between these episodes are minimized although a central figure like Jupiter or Hercules is able to link the acts through his episodic adventures. Links between plays occur typically when the Epilogue looks forward to the large supply of available material.

At the end of The Golden Age, for instance, Homer promises in the next play to introduce Perseus,

Likewise how Jove with faire Alcmena lay:
Of Hercules, and of his famous deeds:
How Pluto did faire Proserpine betray:
Of these my Muse (now travel'd) next proceedes.

(p. 78)

As Prologue to The Silver Age, Homer, 'That in his former labours found you kinde' (p. 85), announces that his knowledge will now be made accessible to the less learned. He intends to 'enter where we left, and so proceed' (p. 86) after briefly identifying

the principal familial relationships of his characters. Dependence of one play on its predecessor continues to be slight if it exists at all. Homer's presence between the acts allows the play to change direction at short notice and in his final appearance, like that in The Golden Age, he simply advertises more labours of Hercules in the next play. The title-page of The Brazen Age lists the contents of each act individually with the death of Hercules as the concluding attraction. Its Prologue recognizes the existence of The Golden and Silver Ages but makes no comment upon their content. Anticipations of The Iron Age plays are very general but in the middle of The Brazen Age, Homer notices that the departure of the Argonauts 'begins the jarre/ Made Troy rack't after in a ten yeares warre' (p. 203). The intended sacrifice of Priam's sister Hesione, in order to placate the wrath of Neptune, allows Troy to enter the story. When Hesione is captured later by the Greek forces she prophesies that the Trojans will

Do the like out-rage on some Grecian Queene,
In just revenge of my injurious wrong.

(p. 225)

'The utmost fate of Troy' (p. 254) is mentioned just before Hercules's death but Homer's last appearance in the Ages ironically makes no reference to the Homeric material of The Iron Age.

The two Iron Age plays were certainly planned together and probably written soon after the Brazen Age despite the decision to terminate the regular appearances of Homer after the first three plays. Thersites acts as Chorus at the beginning of Act III of 1 Iron Age and also addresses the audience as Epilogue where he advertises 'Our second part' (p. 345) by mentioning young Pyrrhus, Queen Penthesilea, Sinon, Orestes, Clytemnestra, and Egistus who all appear for the first time in 2 Iron Age.

The two parts of The Iron Age stand slightly apart from the previous trilogy of Ages by focusing on the story of Troy through their ten acts. The second part depends more upon its predecessor than do any of the other plays as revenge becomes the overriding motivation and eventually leads to the lone

survivor, Ulysses, left on the stage at the conclusion. The fury of Pyrrhus and Orestes pursuing vengeance for the deaths of their fathers, Achilles and Agamemnon respectively, recalls the pattern of violence in 3 Henry VI. Pyrrhus announces that until

Troyes ground-sils swim in pooles of crimson goare.
Ramnesia's Alter fild with flowing helmes
 Of blood and braines: Priam and Hecuba
 Drag'd by this hand to death, and this my sword
 Ravish the brest of faire Polixena,
 I shall not thinke my fathers death reveng'd.

(p. 369)

In the fourth act the melancholy Cethus, unknown until then, inaugurates a new wave of revenge for his brother Palamides, also unknown to the audience, which eventually leads to the destruction the remaining Greek leaders. The last act represents Orestes's revenge for the murder of Agamemnon with the help of his father's ghost who, according to a stage direction (p. 423), points first to his wounds and then to Egistus and Clytemnestra before Orestes completes his task. Ulysses provides an Epilogue but he does not take account of the play as the fifth in a series as he briefly comments upon the suicide of Helen and prepares for his return to Penelope. The final two acts have been studied separately as 'a sort of appendix to the story of the Trojan War', a 'drama in miniature' in which Heywood uses nearly all the conventions of revenge tragedy.¹⁴⁸

Any conclusion regarding the unity of the Ages must be careful to isolate the addresses to the reader written by Heywood for the publication of the plays in 1611, 1613, and 1632. These prefaces discuss the plays as they become unified in print. They do not reflect theatrical conditions and internal evidence which suggest that the plays were intended to stand on their own, as the single performance at Greenwich of The Silver Age illustrates. In the quartos of 1632, Heywood, perhaps with an awareness of the collections of the plays by Lyly, Shakespeare, and Marston being or about to be published in 1632-3, writes as though the Ages were a single literary work which will soon be available in a 'handsome Volume' (p. 351). But the composition of the plays about twenty years before shows that they proceeded

from the demands of theatre audiences then and were planned (as the stage directions attest) to make the fullest possible use of staging for exciting physical movement and visual entertainment. Many of the individual acts are self-contained illustrations of heroic adventures from the classics. The final three plays of the series culminate respectively in the audience-attracting deaths of Hercules, Ajax and Helen of Troy.

The derivation of single plays from two-part plays has been observed in the case of Shakespeare's King John, the Dering manuscript of Henry IV, Sir Thomas Wyatt, and possibly the lost Jane Shore play of 1602. In none of these cases did an author adapt two of his own plays for a single performance. But a manuscript which Greg dates c. 1624¹⁴⁹ survives in the hand of Thomas Heywood and consists of selected scenes from The Golden Age and The Silver Age for the purpose of a single play. It is known as 'The Escapes of Jupiter' and, as that title implies, consists of scenes of Jupiter's love affairs with Calisto, Danae, Semele, and Alcmena which were copied with minor adjustments from their places in the two Ages. Acts II (Calisto) and IV (Danae) of The Golden Age and Acts IV (Semele) and II (Alcmena) of The Silver Age are extracted to form the new piece which gains a unity from its emphasis on Jupiter's amatory exploits without the necessity of accounting for the various fortunes of his parents or his offspring in the two chronicle source-plays. The auspices of 'The Escapes of Jupiter' are not known but it may be that the love interest was thought more appropriate for performance in one of the private theatres.

We have Heywood's word both in An Apology for Actors and in the Prologue to The Silver Age that the English Chronicles had provided a continuous stream of plays which, at least for the more promising dramatic material, completed an historical record of England from the earliest times.¹⁵⁰ Francis Kirkman nearly sixty years later wrote that 'by Playes alone you may very well know the Chronicle History of England, and many other Histories'.¹⁵¹ As a central panel in this achievement lies Shakespeare's connecting tetralogies. The earliest legendary history on British soil and Tudor history were the principal domains of the Admiral's Company although Shakespeare too

contributed to these periods. With such full coverage in linked sets of two-part plays, longer sequences, and clusters of plays set in a particular period, it is surprising that there sometimes seems a need to explain Shakespeare's abandonment of the English History play or the decline of the genre in terms of cultural pressures only.¹⁵² What Goethe said of the decline of Greek drama may be relevant here:

"Man is a simple being. And however rich, varied, and unfathomable he may be, the cycle of his situations is soon run through.

"But with the Greeks and the abundance of their productions - for each of the three great poets has written a hundred or nearly a hundred pieces; and the tragical subjects of Homer, and the heroic traditions, were some of them treated three or four times - with such abundance of existing works, I say, it can well be imagined that by degrees subjects were exhausted, and that any poet who followed the three great ones would be puzzled how to proceed.¹⁵³

Heywood's Prologue to The Silver Age is really saying the same thing about the limited choice of new historical material for the stage.

Heywood himself claimed to have been concerned with 220 plays of which Edward IV, If You Know Not Me, and the Ages may be only a sample of his historical plays. Each of these titles shows such a variety of compositional technique that it is difficult to generalize easily about any procedures that the two-part historical play developed. A systematic parallel structure like that found in Tamburlaine and its progeny of conqueror plays or the pattern of the Henry IV plays did not become a prominent feature in the extant histories. Part One of Sir John Oldcastle marks a special case of rivalry and it may be significant that that play refers to Falstaff in the same way that Selimus and Alphonsus include references to Tamburlaine. With the variety of these Elizabethan plays in mind it is interesting to see similar freedom in the historical plays written in more than one part by Ibsen, Strindberg, and Hardy 300 years later.¹⁵⁴

One aspect of some of the historical sequels is related to another genre of two-part plays. This is a second play which is

motivated by revenge. Already in 2 Tamburlaine Bajazeth's son Callapine is used in this capacity and revenge for past deaths is also important to 3 Henry VI and 2 Iron Age. In 2 Edward IV, Matthew Shore rejects an opportunity for revenge. In a more direct way, however, plays by Kyd, Marston, and Chapman may be discussed as a further area where the two-part play was developed.

Notes to Chapter VI

1. Arber III, 176.
2. H.D., pp. 86, 88.
3. H.D., p. 87. Chettle makes his first appearance in the Diary in these transactions.
4. See John C. Meagher's introduction to The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon, MSR (Oxford, 1965 [1967]), pp. viii-ix. All references are to the MSR editions of The Downfall (Oxford, 1964 [1965]) and The Death.
5. H.D., pp. 101, 102. The Admiral's Men performed at Court on 27 December, 6 January, and 18 February 1598/9 (Chambers, E.S. IV, 166).
6. The Downfall, p. vi; The Death, pp. vi, ix.
7. Bullough, II, 143.
8. F.P. Wilson, 'The English History Play' in Shakespearian and Other Studies, edited by Helen Gardner (Oxford, 1969), p. 48.
9. In Elizabethan Critical Essays, edited by G. Gregory Smith, 2 vols (1904), II, 320. The Stationers' Register entry for Meres's book is 7 September 1598 (Arber III, 125).
10. Munday's career is discussed by I.A. Shapiro, 'Shakespeare and Mundy', SS 14 (1961), 25-33.
11. Joseph Quincy Adams, 'The Author-Plot of an Early Seventeenth Century Play', The Library, 4th ser. 26 (1945), 17-27 does not mention this example in his survey of references to author-plots.
12. The Downfall, p. vii. In 'Hackwriting and the Huntingdon Plays' in Elizabethan Theatre, edited by John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, 9 (1966), p. 199, Meagher writes that Munday 'appears at first to have designed a single play to cover the story of the betrayal and exile of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon, with his subsequent life as Robin Hood, probably ending with his death'.
13. Godwin is mentioned in The Death, l. 378 and appears in the manuscript play Edmund Ironside.
14. H.D., pp. 88-90.
15. H.D., pp. 90-92.
16. Sir Thomas More, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1911), ll. 1152-3.
17. Fulgens and Luces, edited by F.S. Boas and A.W. Reed (Oxford, 1926), l. 126.
18. Harold Jenkins, The Life and Work of Henry Chettle (1934), p. 128.
19. See The Downfall, p. vi and Meagher, 'Hackwriting and the Huntingdon Plays', pp. 199-200 for the plausible suggestion that Drayton's influence affected Munday's plans after he began The Downfall.
20. l. 310. All references are to The Works of Michael Drayton, edited by J. William Hebel, 5 vols (Oxford, 1931-41). Matilda is in vol. I.

21. See Hebel V, 32. This volume is edited by Kathleen Tillotson and Bernard H. Newdigate.
22. See Meagher, 'Hackwriting and the Huntingdon Plays', pp. 199-200.
23. See Ribner, The English History Play, p. 268. J.M.R. Margeson, 'Dramatic Form: the Huntingdon Plays', SEL, 14 (1974), 223-38 argues that they are 'primarily romances' (p. 223) and have the conventions of romance and romantic drama rather than the realism of the History play: 'the central expectations of moral romance are fulfilled: the virtuous remain steadfast to the end, the evil are punished, and the sinning king is redeemed' (p. 228).
24. Entered in the Stationers' Register on 14 May 1594 (Arber II, 649).
25. Meagher mentions the sources in The Downfall, p. vii and discusses them in 'Hackwriting and the Huntingdon Plays', pp. 199-207.
26. See Meagher, 'Hackwriting and the Huntingdon Plays', pp. 207-19. Margeson's article is more sympathetic to the dramatic conventions of romantic drama which the plays follow.
27. H.D., pp. 165, 171, 177.
28. H.D., pp. 137, 138.
29. Fred L. Jones, 'Look About You and The Disguises', PMLA, 44 (1929), 835-41 identifies it as The Disguises, new in 1595.
30. M.A. Nelson, 'Look About You and the Robin Hood Tradition', N&Q, 207 (1962), 141-3 dates the play after 1 Henry IV and comments: 'it is absurd to suppose that this play should so matter-of-factly treat Robin Hood as the fairest flower of the English peerage without some recent precedent for doing so' (p. 142). E.A.J. Honigmann, King John, The Arden Shakespeare (1954), pp. xxii-xxiii also dates it later than the Huntingdon plays.
31. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1913), p. v mentions Anthony Wadson as the possible author by inference of his authorship of the apparent sequel. Nothing more is known of Wadson.
32. Jones, p. 837.
33. Jenkins, p. 257.
34. As Anne B. Lancashire, 'Look About You as a History Play', SEL, 9 (1969), 321-34 points out, 'historically, Robert of Gloucester was never in Portugal, but a tradition seems to have existed in Elizabethan times of Gloucester as a conqueror of that land' (p. 329). She refers to Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy, I.iv.141-6.
35. 2 Edward IV, edited by Barron Field, II.ii; The Downfall, l. 661; Look About You, ll. 34, 73, 74, 152, 154, etc. Daniel's poem describes Elinor:
 Enrag'd with madness, scarce she speaks a word,
 But flies with eger fury to my face,
 Offring me most unwomanly disgrace.
- ll. 579-81 in Poems and A Defence of Ryme, edited by Arthur Colby Sprague (Cambridge, Mass., 1930 reprinted Chicago, 1965).

36. Chambers, W.S. II, 217.
37. Arber III, 147.
38. Arber III, 156 (23 February 1599/1600).
39. See H. Dugdale Sykes, 'Thomas Heywood's Authorship of King Edward IV', N&Q, 149 (1925), 183-4. Greg's confidence that the plays are 'unquestionably Heywood's' (Diary II, 173) has been scolded by S. Schoenbaum, Internal Evidence and Elizabethan Dramatic Authorship (1966), p. 80. Heywood's mention of Mistress Shore in An Apology for Actors (1612), sig. G1v does not, unfortunately, provide evidence of his authorship of the play.
40. H.D., p. 50.
41. Harold Jenkins, 'A Supplement to Sir Walter Greg's Edition of Sir Thomas More', Malone Society Collections, Volume VI (Oxford, 1961 [1962]), p. 189.
42. 'Shore's Wife' in The Mirror for Magistrates, edited by Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge, 1938), pp. 373-86. The Mirror was reprinted in 1578 and 1587 with Churchyard's poem which is the only one in the Mirror that deals with a woman.
43. Samuel Daniel, Poems and A Defence of Ryme, ll. 23-8.
44. Arber II, 629.
45. Thomas Churchyard, Churchyards Challenge (1593), sig. S4v.
46. McKerrow I, 309. Ingenioso-Nashe in 2 Return from Parnassus (ed. Leishman), ll. 306-7 seems to recall this promise.
47. Arber II, 632 (16 June 1593).
48. Sig. F3v. References are to the edition of 1593.
49. Willobie his Avisas, edited by G.B. Harrison, The Bodley Head Quartos (1926), p. 34; The English Works of Giles Fletcher, the Elder, edited by Lloyd E. Berry (Madison, 1964), p. 123 (ll. 7-12); Hebel I, 215 (ll. 43-4).
50. Arber II, 654.
51. E.A.J. Honigmann, 'Shakespeare's "Lost Source-Plays"', MLR, 49 (1954), p. 305.
52. All references are from the MSR edition by W.W. Greg (Oxford, 1929), ll. 1009-14.
53. H.D., pp. 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 47.
54. Arber III, 92.
55. Englands Heroicall Epistles (1597), sig. I4r.
56. Drayton, sig. H6r; 1 Edward IV, IV.iii. All references to the play are from Barron Field's edition for The Shakespeare Society (1842) which he divides into acts and scenes.

57. The Works of Thomas Deloney, edited by Francis Oscar Mann (Oxford, 1912), p. 302.
58. Arber II, 627.
59. Arber III, 237.
60. Hyder Edward Rollins, An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries (1557-1709) in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, SP, 21 (1924), no. 1452. If this is a later version of Deloney's ballad, the use of 'Jane' in the title indicates the influence of the play.
61. Thomas Percy, Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, edited by Henry B. Wheatley, 3 vols (1886, reprinted N.Y., 1966), II, 269-73; The Roxburghe Ballads, edited by Charles Hindley, 2 vols (1873-4), II, 108-121. The second part in The Roxburghe Ballads is assigned a different author and a later date (Percy, II, 268) and the description is copied from that provided by Drayton in the notes following Jane Shore's epistle to Edward IV. No copies printed earlier than the late seventeenth century are known.
62. Ribner, The English History Play, p. 273.
63. Percy II, 273 (ll. 133-4).
64. Arber I, 264 (1564); II, 451 (1586); III, 173 (1600).
65. Printed in The English and Scottish Popular Ballads, edited by Francis James Child, 5 vols (N.Y., 1882-98 reprinted 1957), V, 81-3.
66. A phrase in 2 Henry IV (V.iii.3), 'and so forth', is, notes the Arden editor of that play, 'used repeatedly as a meaningless gag by Josselin, a fussy citizen, in Thomas Heywood's 1 Edward IV' (p. 169).
67. H.D., p. 194.
68. H.D., p. 226.
69. W.W. Greg, A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration, 4 vols (1939-59), I, 256.
70. The printed play is listed as 'Jane Shore' in the bookseller's list (dated 1603) transcribed in T.W. Baldwin, Shakspeare's Love's Labor's Won (Carbondale, Illinois, 1957), pp. 30-1.
71. Francis Beaumont, The Knight of the Burning Pestle, edited by Michael Hattaway, The New Mermaids (1969), Induction, l. 51.
72. Annals, p. 206.
73. Arber III, 295 (5 July 1605) for Part One; Arber III, 301 for Part Two.
74. 1 Tamburlaine and 1 and 2 Edward IV as well as 1 Hieronimo and 1 The Honest Whore were also printed in 1605.
75. Madeleine Doran (ed.) If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part II, MSR (Oxford, 1934 [1935]), p. xvii. All references to the plays are from the MSR editions by Madeleine Doran.

76. I have followed the suggestions made by Madeleine Doran in her introductions to the MSR editions.
77. Arber III, 283.
78. In The Shakespeare Apocrypha, edited by C.F. Tucker Brooke (Oxford, 1908), I.iv.65-7. An earlier use not cited by Tilley occurs in Robert Wilson's The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London (1588) in relation to Tarlton (Dodsley VI, 397).
79. Chambers, E.S. III, 338-9.
80. Michel Grivelet, Thomas Heywood et le drame domestique Élizabéthain (Paris, 1957), p. 376.
81. See Alexander Leggatt, Citizen Comedy in the Age of Shakespeare (Toronto, 1973), pp. 8, 20-3.
82. Grivelet, p. 133.
83. See Robert Grant Martin, 'The Sources of Heywood's If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part I', MLN, 39 (1924), 220-2; Ribner, The English History Play, p. 219.
84. Extant jestbooks concerning Gresham are dated 1607 and 1610. See Doran, Part II, p. x.
85. Heywood may have written a Stukeley play in 1596. See J.Q. Adams, 'Captaine Thomas Stukeley', JEGP, 15 (1916), 107-29.
86. Eastward Ho!, edited by C.G. Petter, The New Mermaids (1973), IV.ii.70-5.
87. H.D., pp. 218-19.
88. H.D., p. 219. Greg suggests that later but unspecified payments of ten shillings to Smith and three shillings to Chettle on 12 November were also for the sequel. See Greg, Diary II, 232.
89. H.D., p. 219. See Greg, Diary II, 232; Chambers, E.S. III, 294.
90. Phillip Shaw, 'Sir Thomas Wyat and the Scenario of Lady Jane', MLQ, 13 (1952), p. 237 n.
91. Shaw, p. 238 n points out that 1607 also saw publication of Northward Ho! and Westward Ho! featured as the work of Dekker and Webster and issued by two different publishers. He suggests that the third publisher capitalized on these plays and that Sir Thomas Wyatt contains traces of all of the original authors of Lady Jane.
92. W.L. Halstead, 'Note on the Text of The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt', MLN, 54 (1939), p. 588.
93. Shaw, p. 228.
94. Greg, Diary II, 232-3.
95. Shaw, pp. 234-5.
96. See Mary Forster Martin, 'Stow's "Annals" and "The Famous Historie of Sir Thomas Wyat"', MLR, 53 (1958), 75-7.

97. Shaw, p. 236.
98. At the proposed opening of 2 Lady Jane (Sir Thomas Wyatt in Bowers, I, III.i.1) and near the beginning of 1 If You Know Not Me (l. 48), Mary begins a speech with: 'By gods assistance and the power of heaven'.
99. These parallels were first noted by Mary Forster Martin, 'If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobodie and The Famous Historie of Sir Thomas Wyat', The Library, 4th ser. 13 (1932), 272-81.
100. See Charles R. Forker, 'Shakespeare's Histories and Heywood's If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody', Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, 66 (1965), 166-78.
101. H.D., p. 125.
102. H.D., p. 126.
103. H.D., p. 129.
104. H.D., p. 132.
105. Arber III, 169.
106. As suggested by Percy Simpson, MSR (Oxford, 1908), p. vi.
107. Dekker was paid fifty shillings for the additions on 17 August 1602 and 7 September 1602 (H.D., pp. 213, 216). New properties for the play are recorded on 21 August 1602 (H.D., p. 214).
108. MSR, p. vi.
109. In 1619 Pavier published Sir John Oldcastle with the date 1600 and Shakespeare's name on the title-page.
110. Parallels with Shakespeare are noticed by Tillyard, p. 130 and in more detail by K. Tillotson in Hebel V, 48.
111. See Hebel V, 45. It is in this series of short scenes that a transposition occurs in the printed text.
112. See R.E. Bennett, 'The Parson of Wrotham in Sir John Oldcastle', MLN, 45 (1930), 142-4. Bennett suggests that Wrotham appeared also in the lost second part.
113. I.ii.161-2. All references are to Tucker Brooke's Shakespeare Apocrypha.
114. See Mary Grace Muse Adkins, 'Sixteenth-Century Religious and Political Implications in Sir John Oldcastle', University of Texas Studies in English, 22 (1942), 86-104.
115. Payments for the original play were made to Chettle, Dekker, Drayton, and Wilson in May 1598. Chettle and Wilson were paid for Part Two in June and July 1598 (H.D., pp. 89-93). The original play is not designated Part One in the payments or in Henslowe's inventory of plays (p. 324).
116. Black Bateman has been identified with William Sampson's The Vow-Breaker (1625-36) in R.B. Sharpe, The Real War of the Theaters (Boston, 1935), pp. 37 n, 78, 127. Sharpe is supported by K. Tillotson, 'William Sampson's "Vow-Breaker" (1636) and the Lost Henslowe Play "Black Batman of the North"', MLR, 35 (1940), 377-8.

117. Twelve performances of this title are recorded from 19 July 1594 (marked 'ne') to 16 September 1595 (H.D., pp. 22-31). Only the first and third entries call it the second part but Greg, Diary II, 166 believes one play is meant. An earlier entry for Jerusalem acted 22 March 1592 by Strange's (H.D., p. 17), a S.R. entry for 'an enterlude entituled Godfrey of Bulloigne with the Conquest of Jerusalem' on 19 June 1594 (Arber II, 654), and Heywood's Four Prentices of London (earliest extant edition 1615) have been linked by Greg, Diary II, 166; Chambers, E.S. III, 340-1; and E.H.C. Oliphant, The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher (New Haven, 1927), pp. 175-6. It is agreed that The Four Prentices could more easily have had a sequel than a predecessor. The subtitle in both Heywood's play and the S.R. entry in 1594 is the same which leads Chambers to associate them and also identify the earlier Jerusalem as the same play. Oliphant agrees, leaving the second part mentioned by Henslowe as lost despite Greg's view that Heywood's play was called a second part so as 'to distinguish it from the Strange's and S.R. play, and not to imply a sequel'.
118. 1 and 2 Hercules are anonymous plays first produced on 7 May 1595 and 23 May 1595 respectively. Performances of Part One are recorded eleven times and of Part Two eight times until 6 January 1596. The majority of performances (6) took place on consecutive days. (H.D., pp. 28-34). The authorities who have considered 1 and 2 Hercules as the basis for or identical with Heywood's Silver Age and Brazen Age are discussed by Ernest Schanzer, 'Heywood's Ages and Shakespeare', RES, n.s. 11 (1960), pp. 18-19.
119. Both plays are anonymous. Vortigern was new on 4 December 1596 and was performed twelve times before 2 April 1597 (H.D., pp. 55-7). 'Henges' (Hengist) usually identified as the same play, was performed on 22 June 1597 (H.D., p. 59). Uther Pendragon was new on 29 April 1597 and received seven performances before 13 June 1597 (H.D., pp. 58, 59). Vortigern-Hengist and Uther Pendragon have been identified as Middleton's Hengist, King of Kent; or, The Mayor of Queenborough and William Rowley's The Birth or Merlin; or, The Child Hath Found his Father, respectively (see Oliphant, p. 403; Sharpe, p. 98). Middleton's play is extant in two manuscripts and was published in 1661; Rowley's was printed in 1662. Their relationship is discussed at length in R.C. Bald's edition of Hengist (N.Y., 1938), where he notes a link in the Admiral's repertoire with the lost King Arthur (1598). Bald clarifies much previous speculation by dating Middleton's play 1616-20 and Rowley's slightly later although at some time, one company may have performed them in conjunction. The revised ending to the 1661 quarto of Hengist suggests this conclusion. See Bald, pp. xxii-xxiii, xxxiv-xxxv.
120. The composition of this play is uncertain. Henslowe paid £2 to Day and £7.14s to Chettle between 30 July 1598 and 22 October 1598 (H.D., pp. 96, 98, 100) which as Greg (Diary II, 195) points out 'seems too large for a single piece'. The last three payments (12, 18, 22 October) total £6, an appropriate amount for one play. Chambers, E.S. II, 169 thinks Chettle added only a sequel to Day's older play and that Brute Greenshield, licensed 22 March 1599 (H.D., p. 106), is that sequel. Harold Jenkins, The Life and Work of Henry Chettle, p. 216 comments on the possibility that the playwrights confused two distinct Brutes.

121. Payments to Chettle, Dekker, Drayton, and Wilson between 25 March and 10 June 1598 (H.D., pp. 88-90). A connexion with the older Hardicanute is proposed by Greg (Diary II, 192). Godwin appears in the manuscript play Edmund Ironside.
122. Purchased from Wilson on 8 November 1599 (H.D., p. 126). See H.D., p. 288 for an outline of five scenes. Greg's discussion (Diary II, 207-8) attempts to identify a series of abbreviated names of characters but seems to go too far in specifying a dramatic relationship to Edward IV.
123. Chettle received £6 between 5 June 1601 and 18 August 1601 for The Life (H.D., pp. 171, 175, 176, 177, 180). On 24 August Chettle was given 20s 'in earenest of A play called j pt of carnall wollsey' (H.D., p. 180). Drayton, Munday, and Wentworth Smith joined Chettle in the composition of The Rising as it is sometimes called (H.D., pp. 183, 184) and full payment was made on 12 November 1601 for this 'firste pt' (H.D., p. 184). The Life is later called 'the 2 pte' (H.D., p. 201).
124. Payments to Dekker and Drayton between 29 September and 30 December 1598 (H.D., pp. 98, 100, 101, 103) for three plays. Between payments for Part One and Part Two they sold Connan, Prince of Cornwall to Henslowe (H.D., p. 100) which may suggest that their plans to continue with The Civil Wars were tentative and may have depended upon the reception of the first part.
125. Dekker was paid for The First Introduction on 20 January 1599 and perhaps also on 30 January (H.D., pp. 103, 104). See Greg, Diary II, 197. W.L. Halstead, 'Dekker's Arrest by the Chamberlain's Men', N&Q, 176 (1939), 41-2 conjectures that the play was unfinished and that it was commissioned by the Chamberlain's Men.
126. The Works of Thomas Middleton, edited by A.H. Bullen, 8 vols (1885-6), V, 198 (IV.ii.65). The Widow was published in 1652 but written 1615-17.
127. Thomas Heywood, An Apology for Actors (1612), sigs. F3r-v.
128. H.D., p. 219.
129. Greg, Documents I, no. VIII.
130. Chambers, E.S. III, 501. The source is John Manningham's Diary, entry for 27 November 1602.
131. Chambers, E.S. III, 501. Chamberlain to Carleton on 19 November 1602.
132. Part One was performed eight times from 8 November 1594 (marked 'ne') to 25 June 1595 (H.D., pp. 25-28, 30). Two performances are recorded for Part Two: as 'ne' on 18 June 1595 and on 26 June (H.D., p. 30). The latter performance represents an occasion when Part One had been performed the previous day. Chambers, W.S. I, 398-9 discusses an extravagant theory advanced by Robertson of a Caesar trilogy with nearly all the major contemporary dramatists concerned with various revisions.
133. Subtitled Worse Afear'd than Hurt. Payments to Dekker, Drayton, and Wilson between 17 and 27 July 1598 (H.D., pp. 93-4). Dekker and Drayton were paid for a second play on 30 August and 4 September (H.D., pp. 97-8) which, as Greg (Diary II, 195) notes, is not called Part Two although a separate play is meant.

134. Payments to Dekker, Drayton, Hathway, Munday, and Wilson for Part One on 3 and 14 June 1600 (H.D., p. 135) and 'in earneste of ther second pte' on 20 June 1600 (H.D., p. 136). Possibly, as Chambers (E.S. II, 173) thinks, 2 Fair Constance was not finished. The subject was treated by Chaucer in 'The Man of Law's Tale'.
135. Schanzer, p. 20.
136. All references are to page numbers in volume 3 of The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood, edited by [R.H. Shepherd], 6 vols (1874).
137. Arber III, 470.
138. F.S. Boas, Thomas Heywood (1950), p. 84 believes that only The Iron Age is meant. Chambers, E.S. III, 345 mentions the likely theatres.
139. Chambers, E.S. IV, 126, 178.
140. Thomas Freeman, Runne and a great cast (1614), epigram 93, sig. K3r. This was a second collection of 100 epigrams published with Rubbe, and a great cast.
141. In W.W. Greg, Bibliography, III, 1353. Kirkman's remarks occur in an advertisement to his 1671 Catalogue of Plays.
142. Gerard Langbaine, An Account of the English Dramatick Poets (Oxford, 1691), p. 259.
143. A.M. Clark, Thomas Heywood, Playwright and Miscellanist (Oxford, 1931), p. 63.
144. Allan Holaday, 'Heywood's Troia Britannica and the Ages', JEGP, 45 (1946), pp. 431-2.
145. See John S.P. Tatlock, 'The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature, Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood', PMLA, 30 (1915), pp. 721-5. See also Schanzer, p. 24.
146. Langbaine, p. 259.
147. The parallels to Shakespeare are discussed in Schanzer's article. A.C. Bradley, Shakespearean Tragedy (1904 reprinted 1969), pp. 112 n, 356 n calls attention to Heywood's debt to Hamlet in 2 Iron Age as well as to several echoes from Troilus and Cressida.
148. Robert Grant Martin, 'A New Specimen of the Revenge Play', MP, 16 (1918), pp. 2, 8.
149. W.W. Greg, 'The Escapes of Jupiter' in Collected Papers, edited by J.C. Maxwell (Oxford, 1966), p. 164.
150. Wilhelm Creizenach, The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare, translated by Cécile Hugon, (1916), pp. 232-4 provides a chronological list of more than sixty extant and lost plays on English history.
151. Greg, Bibliography, III, 1353.
152. See Ribner, The English History Play, pp. 266-7.
153. Johann Peter Eckermann, Conversations with Goethe, translated by John Oxenford, edited by J.K. Moorhead (1971), p. 113.
154. Ibsen's Emperor and Galilean was expanded when the material outgrew his plans for a single play. It first became a trilogy and then was reduced to a two-part play. See Michael Meyer, Ibsen (Harmondsworth, 1974), pp. 253, 383-4. Strindberg planned an historical cycle covering 700 years. See W. Johnson, Strindberg and the Historical Drama (Seattle, 1963), p. 13. Hardy's The Dynasts was published in three parts as an Epic-Drama.

CHAPTER VII

Tragedies

A play first published in 1605 as a fore-piece to Kyd's The Spanish Tragedy, Chapman's two-part dramatization of The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron, and the sequels by Marston and Chapman featuring, respectively, Antonio's Revenge and The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois present tragical themes in settings other than the East or England. The plays of Marston and Chapman and possibly The First Part of Hieronimo also share a more local geographical similarity with their performance in private playhouses by the boys' companies of the early seventeenth century. Marston's Antonio and Mellida was written for Paul's Boys, the Byron plays were performed at the Blackfriars by the Children of the Queen's Revels, and Bussy D'Ambois, written originally for Paul's, may have been revived with revisions to join its sequel at the Whitefriars. The text of The First Part of Hieronimo suggests performance by boys prior to publication but its action and themes probably coincide with those of the lost 'Spanish Comedy' performed at the Rose Theatre in early 1592.

Before discussion of these plays, two others in which revenge motifs figure prominently and which have been identified as second parts may be briefly noticed. To Spain, Italy, and France, Denmark has been added as the setting of related plays concerning revenge. Chettle's The Tragedy of Hoffman; or, A Revenge for a Father, published in 1631, and Henslowe's payment in July 1602 of twenty shillings to him 'in earneste of A tragedye called A danyshe tragedy' (nearly six months before mention of 'A tragedie called Hawghman')¹ lead Greg to suppose a lost fore-piece which dealt 'with the story of Hoffman's father, such as the extant work throughout presupposes'.² Harold Jenkins, however, finds the evidence in Henslowe an

'unsatisfactory' basis for a confident identification of the earlier entry.³ An entry in the Stationers' Register on 9 September 1653 notes 'The Maids Tragedie. 2nd Part', but the manuscript play first called The Second Maiden's Tragedy by Sir George Buc in 1611 is not a sequel to Beaumont and Fletcher's The Maid's Tragedy. The nomenclature, as Greg observes, probably originates in Warburton's notations for the collection of which the unprinted play formed a part.⁴

i. The First Part Of Hieronimo

The publication in 1605 of The First Part of Hieronimo affected the status of The Spanish Tragedy later in the century when the two plays were represented in four different book catalogues as 'Hieronimo, both parts' or the same title in 'two parts'.⁵ The lists by Archer (1656), Rogers and Ley (1656), Kirkman (1661, 1671), and Marsh (1662) included these entries although the title-pages of The Spanish Tragedy, printed at least ten times between 1592 and 1633, gave no hint that a first part existed. The year in which The First Part of Hieronimo was published did not see a reprinting of The Spanish Tragedy although the rights to both plays were owned at this time by Thomas Pavier.⁶

Internal evidence would date The First Part not long before its publication, nearly twenty years after the more popular revenge play, were it not for Henslowe's Diary which shows that Strange's Men were performing two closely related Spanish plays in the early months of 1592. Between 23 February and 22 June 1592 Hieronimo or his son, Don Horatio, are represented in the titles of twenty plays performed at the Rose. On three groups of consecutive days (13, 14 March; 30, 31 March; 21, 22 May) and a Saturday-Monday combination (22, 24 April),⁷ Henslowe records performances of two Spanish plays of which the first is usually distinguished as a comedy. This procedure makes it extremely unlikely that the same play was repeated.⁸ The second play on these

four occasions was performed separately nine times as 'Jeronymo'. The seven other performances are marked as 'spanes comodye donne oracioe', 'comedy of doneoracio', 'doneoracio', 'comodey of Jeronymo', or 'comedey Jeronymo'. Henslowe progressively shortens the first title until its fourth performance on 10 April when Hieronimo becomes associated with the comedy for the first time, suggesting that like his son he was a principal character in the play.

Two distinct plays, neither of which is marked 'ne', are clearly meant by these titles. This is Henslowe's earliest surviving record of daily performances and during the period before the closing of the theatres in June 1592, the comedy brought an average receipt of just over 24 shillings on the seven days it was played. The Hieronimo play, which can be confidently identified as The Spanish Tragedy, was much more successful although at the last recorded consecutive performance (21, 22 May), the receipts for it were slightly below those for the comedy performed on the previous day. Although this fore-piece is not mentioned again during the lucrative revival of The Spanish Tragedy by the Admiral's in 1597, the comedy was (during its 1592 season) performed more often than Friar Bacon which brought an average of only about 18 shillings for each of its four performances.

'The Spanish Comedy' is not heard of in the Stationers' Register entry on 6 October 1592 for 'the Spanishe tragedie of Don Horatio and Bellmipeia'⁹ or in the ensuing difficulties over copyright when Edward White incurred a fine on 18 December for 'havige printed the spanishe tragedie belonging to Abell Jeffes'.¹⁰ Jeffes's lost edition, however, may well have contained traces of 'The Spanish Comedy' if the 'grosse faults' claimed for it in the undated (1592) edition resulted from actors who took part in both plays. The many allusions to The Spanish Tragedy make no mention of a companion comedy.

The First Part of Hieronimo would seem to be the lost comedy as it treats of events in the lives of Andrea, Don Horatio, and Hieronimo prior to the opening of The

Spanish Tragedy. Several difficulties, however, prevent a simple acceptance of this identification. The 1605 quarto is only about 1200 lines in length and in both number of lines and scenes falls below the longest act (III) of The Spanish Tragedy. The text has some appearances of a 'bad quarto' and shows few stylistic resemblances to the revenge play. A study of the rhyme schemes has suggested that the same author was not responsible for both plays.¹¹ But in matters of plot development, emphasis, and agreement with events mentioned in The Spanish Tragedy, a close relationship to the revenge play can be demonstrated. If a source for the plot of The Spanish Tragedy were known it would allow a more exact consideration of the relationship between the two plays. A major source is lacking for both plays although there are good reasons for supposing the true source of The First Part to be The Spanish Tragedy itself.¹²

Thomas Heywood's early attribution of The Spanish Tragedy to Thomas Kyd is generally accepted and Soliman and Perseda has good claims for being his only other extant work written for the stage. If Soliman can be dated after The Spanish Tragedy,¹³ it suggests an effort to expand and capitalize on material partially presented in the earlier play which may be dated between 1585 and 1587.¹⁴ The composition of 'The Spanish Comedy' which undoubtedly dramatized earlier events may have been a further result of the popularity of Hieronimo, despite his assertion in the revenge play that 'comedies are fit for common wits' (IV.i. 157). The other possibilities are that Kyd provided a revenge sequel to an existing Spanish play or that he planned his own two-part play centring on Hieronimo and his son. These possibilities may be considered while the 1605 First Part remains temporarily out of the discussion.

An undisputed fact is that 'The Spanish Comedy' was written and performed before the text of The Spanish Tragedy was printed in 1592. This suggests that the same author encouraged or participated in its original composition and that the same company was involved in its original performances. The absence of a narrative source for The Spanish Tragedy makes it extremely unlikely that another hand created an

independent linking play as a rival attraction to audiences who had seen or were to see The Spanish Tragedy. It is also hard to imagine a companion play that could compete with the achievements of the revenge tragedy which attracted so much attention from contemporary writers. A first part could not hope to attain an independent status or match the excitement of revenge if the plays were written as consecutive parts. The Spanish Tragedy provides no direct evidence that it was written as a sequel and despite its need to clarify previous events in the life of Andrea and political relationships between Spain and Portugal, further background information about Hieronimo or his son is unnecessary for an understanding of their positions in The Spanish Tragedy. Yet their names represent the title roles in the comedy and it would follow that perhaps the title was intended to draw attention to their already existing 'later selves' in The Spanish Tragedy. It may be further remarked that Henslowe's designation of the play as a comedy does not necessarily mean that it was comic¹⁵ as he would (for his purposes) be more anxious to distinguish two plays, one of which is termed a tragedy in its Induction (l. 91), concludes with that word, and was soon to be published as The Spanish Tragedy. We learn at once of victory 'with little loss' (I.ii. 7) and the general happiness that news brings in the King's first words to Hieronimo:

But now Knight Marshal, frolic with thy king,
For 'tis thy son that wins this battle's prize.

(I.ii. 96-7)

Although Andrea would have to be a victim in any preliminary play and is so in The First Part, the first words of that play are similarly addressed to Hieronimo by the King:

Frolic, Hieronimo; thou art now confirm'd
Marshall of Spain ...¹⁶

The 'corrupt and probably "reported" :¹⁷ text of 1 Hieronimo presents difficulties in dating. There are several reasons to suppose that it was in the repertory of a children's company in the early seventeenth century as Hieronimo often draws attention to his diminutive stature.¹⁸

In addition to this evidence of a late date, what appear to be echoes and parodies of plays from this period are also found.¹⁹ One likely interpretation is that the play bears a resemblance to the lost 'Spanish Comedy' and repeats in outline the events of the play while reflecting an updating and adaptation for performance by the Children of the Chapel, who were according to Webster's Induction to The Malcontent acting a Hieronimo play at this time.²⁰ That the title-page advertises it as the first part of one of the most famous plays of its age may not be as suspicious as it seems if the basis for it was a play by Kyd or a fellow dramatist written soon after The Spanish Tragedy, and like 2 Tamburlaine, an unanticipated 'sequel'.

A fore-piece written as an unplanned 'sequel' might be expected to exploit some of the more successful elements of the original play and tend toward a clever use of dramatic irony to justify itself. To remain consistent to The Spanish Tragedy, a careful use of the antecedent events it refers to would be necessary as the play moved towards a conclusion to join with The Spanish Tragedy. Before Hieronimo's epilogue, the last line of 1 Hieronimo is: 'Set on to Spain in most triumphant measure' (xiii. 6).²¹ The inclusion of as many of the same characters as possible would allow their established relationships to be used again. The First Part includes these features. The sequence of events takes precedence over characterization. With already established characters as a donnée an 'industrious' playwright (such as Kyd was described by Dekker in 1607)²² would be allowed to exploit the popularity of Hieronimo and easily reintroduce the other major characters.

The single printing of 1 Hieronimo, not before 1605 or in association with The Spanish Tragedy, the failure of the extant ballad of uncertain date on Hieronimo²³ to recognize antecedent material, and the absence of 'The Spanish Comedy' from Henslowe's later records suggest what 1 Hieronimo confirms: a fore-piece dramatizing 'the Warres of Portugall and the life and death of Don Andrea' (title-page) could not compete for any length of time with the

careful and controlled plot of The Spanish Tragedy with its celebrated opportunities for mature acting and exciting staging.²⁴

The first act of The Spanish Tragedy provides extensive description and information for a preliminary play. Andrea's opening speech gives details of his own social status, his relationship to Bel-imperia, 'the late conflict with Portingale' (I.i. 15), his funeral by Don Horatio, and the passage with Charon to the underworld. Each of these subjects is shown in 1 Hieronimo. The general's long report of the battle in the second scene of The Spanish Tragedy adds some details of the tribute question, the confrontation between Don Pedro and Don Rogero, Andrea's fate at the hand of Balthazar, and Horatio's capture of the Portuguese Prince. The conflicting claims to the prisoner by Horatio and Lorenzo are soon introduced and the circumstances of the capture explained. These interests are also represented in 1 Hieronimo and the minor inconsistencies which emerge on closer comparison may help to show that The Spanish Tragedy was written before a play dealing with the Wars in Portugal which 'The Spanish Comedy' probably emphasized in the same way that 1 Hieronimo does.

When the Spanish King asks for reports of the battle his general replies at length on the fortunes of the conflict. In 1 Hieronimo, Hieronimo is present on the battlefield and leaving it announces:

I'll to the king before, and let him know
The sum of victory, and his [Balthazar's] overthrow.

(xi. 145-6)

Hieronimo's presence in the conflict is not suggested in the Spanish Tragedy but it can be accounted for by the need to have him appear as often as possible in the 'sequel' because of his prominence in the revenge play. Otherwise at the age of fifty (i. 25) his association with his son in war as well as in peace is not easily explained. Don Rogero, who is mentioned in passing in the general's report as a 'worthy man of war' (I.ii. 43) but whose fate is

uncertain, is killed by Alexandro in 1 Hieronimo as Andrea cries 'valiant Rogero slain!' (xi. 91) and rushes to revenge the death of 'Worthy Rogero' (xi. 96). In the same conflict, Lorenzo kills Don Pedro and Balthazar's cry of 'Valiant Don Pedro' (xi. 95) spurs him toward single combat with Andrea. The symmetrical staging of this battle is striking and even more remarkable is the fact that Don Pedro is alive in The Spanish Tragedy although he speaks only four words towards the end of the play (III. xiv. 4).²⁵ The staging of the battle scene in 1 Hieronimo has required Don Pedro's death after his earlier confrontation with Horatio in the patterned challenges preceding the battle (x. 122-4). It appears as though both Don Pedro and Don Rogero were taken from their mention in the general's speech for this battle scene in The First Part.

The circumstances of Andrea's death and the capture of Balthazar seem also at variance in the two plays. In 1 Hieronimo the stage direction for Andrea's death reads:

They fight and Andrea hath Balthazar down. Enter Portugales and relieve Balthazar and kill Andrea.

(xi. 106. 1-2)

Despite this emphatic stage direction Andrea is allowed a final speech:

Oh, I am slain; help me, Horatio!
My foes are base, and slay me cowardly;
Farewell dear, dearest Bel-imperia:
Yet herein joy is mingled with sad death:
I keep her favor longer than my breath. He dies.

(xi. 107-111)

There follows the further stage direction: 'Sound alarm.
Andrea slain, and Prince Balthazar vaunting on him!' (xi. 111.1).
In The Spanish Tragedy, the general reports:

in that conflict was Andrea slain -
Brave man at arms, but weak to Balthazar.
Yet while the prince, insulting over him,
Breath'd out proud vaunts...

(I.ii. 71-4)

Bel-imperia later remarks:

For what was't else but murd'rous cowardice,
 So many to oppress one valiant knight,
 Without respect of honour in the fight?

(I.iv. 73-5)

A significant point of agreement is Balthazar's dishonourable and unchivalrous behaviour once Andrea has been dismounted.²⁶ Horatio's capture of Balthazar is in conspicuous and noble contrast to Andrea's fate under similar circumstances.

Important to the order of composition of the two plays may be the fact that horses are specifically emphasized in all reports of the battle in The Spanish Tragedy. The heroic situation witnessed by Horatio and other survivors is heightened by the description of mounted knights and dismounted conflict. When this scene for the fore-piece came to be written, horses obviously would have to be omitted from the staging. In 1 Hieronimo an indication of this problem occurs in Lorenzo's lie (which Hieronimo immediately challenges) that 'My lance first threw him from his warlike steed' (xi. 131). This seems consciously suggested by Horatio's claim in the revenge play that 'first my lance did put him from his horse' (I.ii. 156). In The Spanish Tragedy horses figure prominently in the accounts by the general (I.ii. 79), by Horatio (I.ii. 156), the judgement by the King (I.ii. 180-1), and Horatio's speech to Bel-imperia (I.iv. 22).

Some close verbal parallels occur between the controversy in The Spanish Tragedy in which Horatio and Lorenzo argue over their prisoner and the scene they describe as it appears in 1 Hieronimo. Lorenzo claims 'I seiz'd his weapons first' (xi. 128) but Horatio remembers 'But first I forc'd him lay his weapons down' (I.ii. 158) which is consistent with his words in 1 Hieronimo: 'Tis easy to seize those were first laid down' (xi. 130). At the Spanish court, Balthazar admits 'And truth to say I yield myself to both' (I.ii. 165) while in the scene of his capture in 1 Hieronimo his words are: 'The vanquish'd yields to both' (xi. 142).

The first act of The Spanish Tragedy may also provide the source for Andrea's funeral scene in 1 Hieronimo and his

wearing of Bel-imperia's scarf that Horatio 'pluck'd from off his liveless arm' (I.iv. 42). The parting of Andrea from Bel-imperia as described by her to Horatio occurs in 1 Hieronimo where she says:

Lend me thy loving and thy warlike arm,
On which I knit this soft and sinken charm
Tied with an amorous knot ...

(ix. 15-17)

to which Andrea adds ironically: 'This scarf shall be my charm 'gainst foes and hell' (ix. 24). When Andrea dies in 1 Hieronimo, Horatio, according to a stage direction, 'takes his scarf and ties it about his arm' (xi. 163.1) and emphasizes this action with the following speech:

This scarf I'll wear in memory of our souls,
And of our mutual loves; here, here, I'll wind it,
And full as often as I think on thee,
I'll kiss this little ensign, this soft banner,
Smear'd with foes' blood, all for the master's honor.
Alas, I pity Bel-imperia's eyes;
Just at this instant her heart sinks and dies.

(xi. 164-70)

This goes some way towards supporting the importance of the scarf as a stage prop in The Spanish Tragedy. Horatio tells Bel-imperia that he wears 'it in remembrance of my friend' (I.iv. 43) before she explains its significance to their love, as 'my favour at his last depart' (I.iv. 47). Andrea's last line in 1 Hieronimo is 'I keep her favor longer than my breath' (xi. 111). Andrea's relationship to Hieronimo's son is framed by Horatio's endearment to 'my second self' (ii. 1) and 'My other soul, my bosom, my heart's friend' (xi. 112). It may be significant that like Andrea's scarf, the handkerchief taken by Hieronimo from his son's dead body is 'besmear'd with blood' (II.v.51). If the scarf and the handkerchief are the same, as Ejner Jensen suggests, it may 'be a symbolic link, joining the revenge for Horatio to that of Andrea'.²⁷ The victims are further identified by the figure of Revenge who in the first scene of The Spanish Tragedy speaks to Andrea's ghost of 'the author of thy death' (I.i. 87) just as Hieronimo before his son's body declares:

To know the author were some ease of grief,
For in revenge my heart would find relief.

(II.v. 40-1)

Before his murder, 'Don Horatio is, as it were, the living surrogate for the ghost Andrea'.²⁸

Dramatic irony would be an obvious aim of a play written to prepare for the involved plot of intrigue and discovery in The Spanish Tragedy. The First Part offers several good examples of this practice. Lazarotto, at Lorenzo's bidding, promises of Andrea 'I'll turn him to a ghost' (iii. 72). When Lazarotto accidentally kills Alcario, who has been disguised as Andrea, the murder suggests to the true Andrea:

 this pretends my death; this misery
Aims at some fatal pointed tragedy.

(vii. 95-6)

and later he adds

 I much fear me, ...
Most doubtful wars and dangerous pointed ends
To light upon my blood.

(vii. 139-41)

These lines are spoken by the character whose ghost will remain on stage throughout The Spanish Tragedy. After Andrea's death in the battle scene, Lorenzo leaves the stage with Balthazar (xi. 148.1) giving point to his previous line, 'I'll choose my sister out her second love' (xi. 148), a promise fulfilled, of course, in The Spanish Tragedy. After Andrea's obsequies are performed, he makes an unexpected appearance at the end of the play as a ghost, seen only by Horatio and accompanied by Revenge and Charon. The action here is speeded up for dramatic purposes. The ghost recalls in The Spanish Tragedy that three nights passed before Charon allowed him passage (I.i. 20-6).

The idea of revenge is used extensively in 1 Hieronimo although the causes for its presence are not strictly relevant. Lorenzo, after instantly declaring himself a Machiavel in an aside, sets out in his soliloquy at the end of the first

scene a plan to murder Andrea because the choice of Andrea as 'Lord High Ambassador' (i. 83) has by-passed his own availability. With unusual logic he supports his plot by reasoning 'He loves my sister; that shall cost his life' (i. 121). Before the main battle Balthazar rouses his soldiers to revenge the injustices of the Spanish demand for tribute (x. 1-19). During the battle, Balthazar seeks out Andrea to revenge the death of Don Pedro while Andrea with 'a revengeful sword' (xi. 104) hastens to revenge the death of Don Rogero. As soon as Andrea is slain, Horatio announces himself as the revenger of Andrea's death. The emphasis on revenge in the play seems accountable mainly to its importance in The Spanish Tragedy.

Some structural parallels between the two plays may also suggest the use of The Spanish Tragedy as the source for 1 Hieronimo. As Balthazar and Lorenzo overhear the wooing of Horatio and Bel-imperia (II.ii) and comment on what they observe, so Hieronimo and his son similarly listen as Lorenzo and Lazarotto plot the death of Andrea (iii). Arthur Freeman has pointed to the duplication 'in little' of Lorenzo's promise to acquire a pardon for Pedringano.²⁹ In 1 Hieronimo Lorenzo makes the same promise to Lazarotto with similarly fatal results for the hopeful prisoner (vii. 115-16; viii. 45-55). A later variation on this 'quaint device' (IV.v. 5) occurs in Marston's Antonio's Revenge. The Spanish Tragedy is closest to what may be the source of this incident in A Copie of a Leter (1584).³⁰

The relationship between the casting requirements of 1 Hieronimo and 'The Spanish Comedy' must also be somewhat tentative as the extant play was probably presented by boys in the early seventeenth century. Even so, it allows the insignificant appearances of Pedringano, Villuppo, and Alexandro. Of the major characters, only Duke Medina survives the play and does not appear in The Spanish Tragedy. He, his son Alcario, and Lazarotto are introduced mainly for the early intrigue directed by Lorenzo against Andrea. The presence of Don Rogero is suggested in The Spanish Tragedy by the single mention of his name. In the last scene, the names of Phillippo and Cassimero appear in a stage direction

but as they do not speak, Boas has suggested, plausibly, that the short text may be incomplete.³¹

Boas has also questioned what appears to be a major difference in the relationship between Andrea and Bel-imperia as presented in 1 Hieronimo and reported in The Spanish Tragedy.³² The ghost of Andrea is not the only character to suggest that his affair was covert from fear of Bel-imperia's father (I.i. 10).³³ Cairncross seeks to account for the lack of corroboration of these references in 1 Hieronimo by holding to his view that they were once in an original first part but lost in the uncertain transmission of the text.³⁴ The references to Castile's former wrath towards his daughter's first lover allow the audience to accept more easily the support given to Balthazar's suit by Lorenzo and Castile. The relationship between Andrea and Bel-imperia and its tragic conclusion in war is public knowledge in 1 Hieronimo, and thus allows the opportunity for Lorenzo's plot against his life. Its failure which results in the deaths of Lazarotto and Alcario earlier in the play creates a contrast to the successful murder of Bel-imperia's second lover in The Spanish Tragedy.

Another important feature of 1 Hieronimo is the emphasis placed on Andrea's role as the elected ambassador sent to deal with the tribute question in the recalcitrant Portuguese court. This business has no basis in The Spanish Tragedy but may be seen to supply the principal motivation for Lorenzo's villainy when envy for the honour leads to his vengeful rage toward Andrea. By adding a political dimension to his role as soldier and lover, Andrea is raised to a higher level of respect and creates the occasion in his initial visit to Portugal to challenge Balthazar and thus prepare for their important single combat at the end of the play.³⁵ Once again these changes may show how 1 Hieronimo grew out of the needs of writing a 'sequel' on the career of Andrea before he was called upon to be the Chorus of The Spanish Tragedy. It might be said that he arrives as a ghost more comfortably from Seneca than from a play concluding with his entry into the underworld.

The extensive amount of exposition in The Spanish Tragedy is as remarkable as that in Hamlet. The lost Ur-Hamlet, sometimes ascribed to Kyd, probably also included a fuller emphasis on background than is usual in most self-contained plays. In any case, 'every event in [The Spanish Tragedy] looks a long way backwards, or a long way forwards'.³⁶ Analyses of the speeches of report and exposition in The Spanish Tragedy by Wolfgang Clemen and others³⁷ have shown how the six witnesses to the 'late conflict' (Andrea's ghost, the general, Balthazar, Lorenzo, Villuppo, and Horatio) transcend the requirement of giving information toward the creation of distinct points of view reflecting the personal interests and ambitions of the leading characters. 'The report of the battle', Clemen adds, 'in a sense establishes the atmosphere of the tragedy in that it strikes the note, fundamental to the play, of bitter strife and slaughter'.³⁸

As a critical aid to the contemporary estimate and understanding of The Spanish Tragedy, 1 Hieronimo is of limited value. The speculation by Empson and subsequently by Coursen that the death of Andrea was, like the fate of Uriah, prearranged and that Balthazar's capture was the result of collusion by the house of Castile is not supported in 1 Hieronimo, to which neither critic makes reference.³⁹ The First Part, however, invents its own motive for Lorenzo's hatred of Andrea and shows the abortive attempt through Alcario and Lazarotto first to discredit and then to murder his sister's lover until Lorenzo eventually supports a rival for her hand. He does not take an active role in the battle or enact a Spanish version of the Portuguese treachery of which Villuppo accuses Alexandro in The Spanish Tragedy. But Lorenzo's delight at Andrea's death is plain:

Andrea slain, thanks to the stars above!
I'll choose my sister out her second love.

(xi. 147-8)

and he leaves the stage with Balthazar, his 'future' accomplice in the murder of Horatio. The links between Andrea and Horatio in The Spanish Tragedy are perhaps tightened by these events and the antagonism between Hieronimo and Lorenzo is developed

with similar emphasis in each play. The Knight Marshal stands for justice in protecting Andrea from Lorenzo's plot involving the hired assassin, Lazarotto, and in challenging Lorenzo's claim to the capture of Balthazar in the same way that he pursues justice for his son's death in The Spanish Tragedy. Whatever the origins of the extant First Part, the parallels between it and Kyd's tragedy suggest a significant relationship between the continued presence of Andrea on the stage and what seems like a change of focus after Horatio's death. The author of 1 Hieronimo put into dramatic practice not only most of the preliminary events mentioned in The Spanish Tragedy but also some suggestions for interpreting the events presented there. He shows a high respect for The Spanish Tragedy, develops implications with some care, and where necessary invents plausible details for the sake of continuity. Despite the occasional frivolity of 1 Hieronimo the lost play on which it was probably based was often more thoughtful than has been recognized.

As Willard Farnham notes, The Spanish Tragedy 'shows itself the head of a dramatic line as clearly as its contemporary Tamburlaine'.⁴⁰ Although there are no firm links between the plays written by dramatists who were a few years later sharing the same chamber, both Tamburlaine and The Spanish Tragedy were among the most popular plays of their generation and were being performed with 'sequels' that were evidently not planned at the time of the original play. Neither sequel has a narrative source but both seem dependent in detail and structure on their originals. Cairncross would have Kyd adding to his long list of theatrical innovations the creation of the two-part play⁴¹ but the uncertain date and authorship of 'The Spanish Comedy' and the likelihood of its later composition does not permit his confidence. Yet as the order of performance in Henslowe's Diary shows, 'The Spanish Comedy' formed a two-part attraction with The Spanish Tragedy. With the evidence of Marlowe's 2 Tamburlaine and Greene's own probable sequel to Friar Bacon, the suggestion that Kyd was in some way responsible for his own sequel is strengthened. Arthur Freeman has written of

The Spanish Tragedy that

Kyd's manner of spinning out the plot reveals nothing less than genius for altering, intensifying, blending, and augmenting story lines only hinted at by known precedents ... we cannot fail to be struck both by the originality and the ingenuity of the author.⁴²

Restricted by the decision to present earlier background to The Spanish Tragedy, the author of 'The Spanish Comedy' (if as is likely 1 Hieronimo preserves some of its features) developed hints and expanded implications from the rigidly self-contained⁴³ tragedy in an exercise which, however ingenious, was not surprisingly eclipsed by the original and greater inspiration.

ii. Antonio and Mellida

Andrew S. Cairncross has suggested that John Marston's Antonio and Mellida and Antonio's Revenge take the earlier Spanish plays as their model and that the young dramatist's choice to link a comedy to a revenge tragedy with several features, of parallel structure was influenced by Kyd's precedent.⁴⁴ The correspondences between the revenge plays are not those of an imitator, however, for Marston depends upon and encourages the recognition of Kydian revenge conventions for his own purposes. How earlier events in the struggles of Don Horatio and Andrea can be related to those of Antonio and Mellida is uncertain. Although Henslowe's 1592 listing of titles shows the distinction between comedy and tragedy in consecutive performance, a fore-piece to The Spanish Tragedy could not provide, like Antonio and Mellida, a happy ending of romantic comedy and it is probably Henslowe's wish merely to distinguish two plays that accounts for his description of the lost play. Marston follows the sequence of genre, comedy before tragedy, but consciously tilts them to face and contrast each other rather than emphasize two stages of continuous narrative.

Marston's plays were entered in the Stationers' Register on 24 October 1601 as 'a booke called the ffyrst and second partes of the play called Anthonio and Melida'⁴⁵ and published separately in quartos dated 1602 with the titles 'The History of Antonio and Mellida, the first part' and 'Antonio's Revenge. The second part'. The running-titles link the plays as 'The first parte of Antonio and Mellida' and 'The Second Parte of Antonio and Mellida' but the authorial preference to call the sequel Antonio's Revenge is perhaps indicated before the Prologue and on the final page where 'Antonii Vindictae Finis' follows the last speech. Both title-pages ascribe authorship to Marston's initials and auspices to the 'children of Paules'. The Induction to Part One and frequent allusions in both plays to performance by boys establishes 1599, when such performances resumed, as the earliest date for the writing of Part One. The Stationers' Register entry provides the posterior limit.

The dates of composition may have important consequences for the form of Antonio's Revenge which without warning introduces important new characters and themes to the story of the lovers. Several explanations have been offered to account for what appears as a sudden change of direction in Antonio's Revenge, away from what few indications of a sequel Marston provides in Antonio and Mellida and towards a close association with the Hamlet story to which even Mellida becomes subservient. The major alternatives seem to be that Marston wrote both Antonio plays by the winter of 1599, that his own Jack Drum's Entertainment (dated 1600)⁴⁶ and the influence of Shakespeare's Hamlet intervened before Marston's sequel, or that both plays post-date Jack Drum and Hamlet. The use by Chambers and others of the seasonal references in the two prologues to suggest consecutive composition and the months of their first production has been cogently challenged by G.K. Hunter.⁴⁷ Both Donald J. McGinn and David Frost suspect 'some powerful outside influence', namely Shakespeare's Hamlet, deflecting Marston's sequel toward the conventions of revenge tragedy generally and the action of Hamlet specifically.⁴⁸ Caputi and more

recently Philip J. Finkelpearl have brought forward new and convincing arguments for assigning both plays to late 1600 or 1600-01⁴⁹ but the possible influence of the Ur-Hamlet⁵⁰ and Marston's eccentric dramaturgy may be also relevant to the unexpected form of Antonio's Revenge.

The discontinuities between Part One and Part Two are striking not to say exaggerated in their effect. There are few anticipations of what might be included in a sequel to Antonio and Mellida but all those direct suggestions of future action turn out to be misleading. At the close of the Induction, the actor about to perform the part of Antonio comments:

... I have heard that those persons, as he
[Galeatzo] and you, Feliche, that are but
slightly drawn in this comedy, should receive
more exact accomplishment in a second part;
which, if this obtain gracious acceptance,
means to try his fortune.

(Induction, ll. 134-8)

Both Feliche and Andrugio, Antonio's father, are the unexpected victims of Piero's violence during the few hours which Marston allows to pass before the action of Antonio's Revenge begins. The reconciliation announced between the houses of Piero and Andrugio at the end of Antonio and Mellida and bound by the prospective marriage seems secure. Even Rossaline, 'a rather likeable forthright hussy'⁵¹ who is prominent at Piero's court in Part One, disappears silently between the plays after speaking of her own future:

when my sweet-fac'd coz hath told me how she likes
the thing call'd wedlock, maybe I'll take a survey
of the check-roll of my servants; and he that hath
the best parts of - I'll prick him down for my
husband.

(V.ii. 254-7)

Earlier Piero had suggested that her marriage might join with that arranged for Mellida with the Prince of Milan in order to 'shut up night with an old comedy' (V.ii. 50). The conventional ending of romantic comedy is emphasized again in Antonio's last lines in the play:

Here ends the comic crosses of true love;
O may the passage most successful prove.

(V.ii. 264-5)

At the end Andrugio comes forward and describes the play as a comedy (l. 3) just as the actor of his son's role did in the Induction (l. 135).

Marston similarly calls attention to the genre of the sequel as the conventions of revenge tragedy violently usurp those of romantic comedy. The dramatic conventions which derive in part from Romeo and Juliet and As You Like It for Antonio and Mellida and from Hamlet and The Spanish Tragedy for Antonio's Revenge are not disguised in imitation but accentuated in a very self-conscious way. Marston's principal resources are plays from the popular theatre rather than independent narrative or historical sources. In Antonio's Revenge the characters become even more aware of their participation in a performance as parallels to The Spanish Tragedy and Hamlet proliferate to maintain a close association between the action and the stage. Pandulpho Feliche chooses, after the deaths of Andrugio and his son have been disclosed, to 'talk as chorus to this tragedy' (I.ii. 299), and he clearly alludes to Hieronimo when he denies a more active role:

Would'st have me cry, run raving up and down
For my son's loss? Would'st have me turn rank mad,
Or wring my face with mimic action,
Stamp, curse, weep, rage, and then by bosom strike?
Away, 'tis apish action, player-like.

(I.ii. 312-16)

During the only meeting of the lovers in Antonio's Revenge, Antonio also denies a theatrical style when he tells Mellida:

I will not swell like a tragedian
In forced passion of affected strains.

(II.ii. 105-6)

Piero on the other hand will not abjure the style of acting that defines his villainy and welcomes each new opportunity to display it:

Swell plump, bold heart,
 For . . . Tragoedia Cothurnata mounts;
 Piero's thoughts are fixed on dire exploits,
 Pell mell! confusion and black murder guides
 The organs of my spirit. Shrink not, heart:
Capienda rebus in malis praeceps via est.

(II.ii. 218-24)⁵²

Soon afterwards, however, the positions of the revengers and Piero are brought closer once the ghost of Andrugio has directed his son to 'seize on revenge' (III.i. 45). Antonio justifies the murder of Piero's son, Julio, with an unconscious repetition of the reasoning which Piero gives for his hatred of Antonio. After the murder, Antonio's appearance resembles Piero's entrance in the first scene smeared with the blood of his recent victim. Pandulpho too emerges for inaction:

Man will break out, despite philosophy.
 Why, all this while I ha' but play'd a part,
 Like to some boy that acts a tragedy,
 Speaks burly words and raves out passion.

(IV.ii. 69-72)

By the end of the fourth act, Antonio and Pandulpho have become conspirators and retire to 'think a plot' and Antonio echoes Piero with his forecast of 'pell-mell vengeance' (IV.ii. 118). The ritualized stabbing of Piero after his tongue has been plucked out and he has been served with a banquet containing his son's limbs is signalled by Antonio's 'Now, pell-mell!' (V.iii. 108). Andrugio's ghost meanwhile has become a Kydian chorus for 'the last act of my son's revenge' (V.i. 11) and later places himself on stage as a 'spectator of revenge' (V.iii. 53). The final speech of the play is also deliberately self-conscious when Antonio echoes the penultimate line of Romeo and Juliet with his celebration of Mellida's memory.

Never more woe in lesser plot was found.
 And, O, if ever time create a muse
 That to th'immortal fame of virgin faith
 Dares once engage his pen to write her death,
 Presenting it in some black tragedy,
 May it prove gracious, may his style be deck'd
 With freshest blooms of purest elegance.

(V.iii. 176-82)

Each play announces its association with a particular genre, often with such exaggerated awareness on the part of the characters that the presence of parody is plainly evident.⁵³ Parody creates a major difficulty in discussing the Antonio plays, however, for serious intellectual issues, court satire, and scenes of genuine emotional intensity also find a place of importance.

In Antonio and Mellida these ingredients are difficult to isolate and evaluate according to their relative importance or be considered as requiring further development in a sequel. The exhibition of folly and the presentation of serious ideas means that sometimes the play attempts 'to render the laughter serious'; other times what seems at first serious becomes 'steadily undercut'.⁵⁴ Apparently irrelevant comic episodes, the interruptions for song and music, and the formal soliloquies all seem apart from the simple requirements of a plot that frequently echoes and parallels the conventions of romantic comedy. What may more accurately be called serious moments rather than serious episodes or scenes occur during what seem like the accidental presence on the stage of a character consciously prepared to express them. Such random appearances do not allow a full exploration of the ideas during the action. The attempted stoic detachment represented by Feliche, for example, is both an important part of the court satire which takes up nearly half the play and a position which becomes related to the feelings of loss and the situation of displaced power which affect Antonio and Andrugio. As serious issues of the play, G.K. Hunter has discussed 'the discontinuities, the disappointments, the sudden reversals of fortune, the ironies of a complex human situation'⁵⁵ while Finkelpearl considers the failure of a preconceived philosophical programme of behaviour to order or avoid basic human experience.⁵⁶ These concerns are clear enough when isolated but become vitiated by the parody, satire, song, music, and romantic intrigue which strain to an unusual degree the concentration necessary for an audience to relate all these interests. Rather than attempt to find a

comprehensive unity in the literary, philosophical, and contemporary social topics which are invoked, the structure of the play is best approached in smaller units which stray from and strain the romantic intrigue.

The limitations placed on the plot of Antonio and Mellida by the static scenes of social satire and the direct expressions of feeling and thought are just those which allow the small number of principal characters and the movement of the plot from separation to reconciliation to seem all that is required. The easily recognizable romantic conventions and their parody in bizarre expression and exaggerated gesture, such as Antonio's frequent falls to the ground or Piero's stridings and stalkings (cf. Induction, ll. 15-17), encourage self-contained vignettes. It is unnecessary that each episode or scene contributes directly to the main plot. The provision of songs (though only their positions are indicated in the text) prolongs and emphasizes moments of emotional stress. What G.K. Hunter recognizes as the boys' abilities in 'short tableau-like presentations of action, in ensemble and quick-change contrasts' limits the usefulness in Marston's case of Hunter's earlier demonstration of the broader parallel features which link Antonio and Mellida to its sequel.⁵⁸

While the shift of emphasis is abrupt between the dramatic conventions of romantic comedy and revenge tragedy, the discontinuity may be appreciated as a necessary sacrifice to Marston's self-conscious dramaturgy. Audience expectations derived from standard characters and popular plots of the adult theatres are continually exploited (in caricature and exaggeration yet still remain a useful framework for the genuine moments of sympathy, suspense, and intellectual reflection.

Antonio's Revenge includes the unanticipated introduction of Maria, the widow of Andrugio; Julio, Piero's son; and Pandulpho, Feliche's father. None of these close relations is mentioned in Antonio and Mellida and all of them serve to bring the play into line with the pattern

of revenge in Hamlet and The Spanish Tragedy. Maria stands in close relation to Gertrude, Julio's death occurs in structural proximity to that of Polonius in Hamlet, and Pandulpho's position resembles that of Hieronimo. The drink of friendship proposed by Piero at the end of Antonio and Mellida turns out to contain the poison which kills Andrugio and his ghost resembles those of Shakespeare and Kyd. The question of Piero's usurpation which claimed an important place in the comedy is not revived as a condition of revenge. The importance of Mellida is similarly weakened in the sequel as she becomes an innocent victim, like Ophelia and Isabella, during the course of the revenge action. These represent only some of the more obvious contacts with Hamlet and The Spanish Tragedy.⁵⁹

The first scene of Antonio's Revenge is carefully constructed to reverse the conclusion of the comedy and supply a new frame of reference for the development of the new play. Piero and his accomplice Strotzo, introduced to parallel the role of Pedringano in The Spanish Tragedy, enter after the murder of Feliche. Piero is 'unbrac'd, his arms bare, smear'd in blood, a poniard in one hand, bloody, and a torch in the other' (I.i. 0. 1-2) and he immediately speaks of 'dead night' (l. 3), 'meager ghosts' (l. 8), 'black thoughts' (l. 8), and his 'triumphing vengeance ... bursting forth in braggart passion' (ll. 11-12). An entirely new motive for his antagonism toward Andrugio and Antonio is introduced in Piero's former rivalry for Maria. When the manner of Andrugio's death turns out to be poison, the parallel with Claudius and Gertrude becomes 'inescapable even before Piero's vow 'By this warm reeking gore, I'll marry her' (I.i. 103) and his satisfaction with the plot to 'Poison the father, butcher the son, and marry the mother' (I.i. 105). Throughout Piero's opening scene, Marston makes a determined effort to upset the concluding security of Antonio and Mellida and show the ease with which it was undone by skilful calculation. Piero appeals for 'loud applause to my hyprocrisy' (I.i. 31), and admits the 'seeming

grant / Unto fruition of Antonio's love' (I.i. 57-8), the 'Judas kiss' (I.i. 60), 'pretense of love' (I.i. 63), and the suddenness ('all in one night' (I.i. 78)) of Andrugio's death by poison and Feliche's by poniard. Piero speaks 91 lines of the total of 110 in the first scene while Strotzo's somewhat ludicrous attempts to speak end four times with one word and four times before he can complete a sentence. His purpose is merely to give temporary pause to Piero's monomaniacal raving which seems, however, to have serious implications as it illustrates the preceding Prologue's warning of the 'common sense of what men were, are ... [and] what men must be' (ll. 18-19).

The appearance of important new characters in Antonio's Revenge helps to create a world for the play which seems distant from the comedy. In the first scene, Piero discloses the falsity of his reconciliation but without experiencing that scene in Antonio and Mellida, an audience could not be as sharply affected by the abrupt undercutting of the romantic ending of the comedy. Piero's ranting does not provide a sense of the contrasts involved. For this reason the second scene showing the arrival of Maria, unaware of Piero's recent crimes, presents the necessary contrast in the tone of her ironic questions:

Art thou assur'd the dukes are reconcil'd?
 Shall my womb's honor wed fair Mellida?
 Will heaven at length grant harbor to my head?
 Shall I once more clip my Andrugio,
 And wreathe my arms about Antonio's neck?

(I.ii. 12-16)

This scene does much to reinstate in reverse the abrupt transition from the last scene of Antonio and Mellida to the sequel. Lucio's reply to Maria is a calm summary of that final scene describing 'The dukes united' (I.ii. 23), the 'sound carouse /... unto each other's health' (I.ii. 25-6), 'And all the clouds clear'd of threat'ning discontent' (I.ii. 28). What contrast is lost by the interval between the two parts is partly made up in this ironic lightness and promise. Nutriche's dream of a wedding night adds a

comically sexual dimension to the imminent marriage of Antonio and Mellida, a stage direction signals that 'soft music gently moves the air' (I.ii. 61), and the dawning of a 'clear day' (I.ii. 64) temporarily removes this scene back to the world of romantic comedy. The third scene (in the 1602 quarto) begins as a jesting counter-part to Nutriche's image of marriage and takes place in the bridegroom's company. But after a hundred lines of banter about cuckolds with the 'sapless jests' (I.ii. 100) of Balurdo the fool, Antonio erupts in a long account of his 'horrid dreams' (I.ii. 103) which returns the play to the violent atmosphere of Piero's earlier speeches. According to Piero's first speech he shares the darkness with 'howling dogs, nightcrows, and screeching owls, / ... meager ghosts' (I.i. 7-8) while 'all the earth is clutch'd / In the dull leaden hand of snoring sleep' (I.i. 3-4). Antonio's dream begins when 'Two meager ghosts made apparition' (I.ii. 106), the bloody image of a freshly stabbed corpse and one in 'my father's shape' (I.ii. 109) who 'Both cried, "Revenge!"' (I.ii. 110). With Antonio's dream the play resumes the tone of the tragedy of blood with which in Piero's appearance and language it began.

When Maria comes forward to greet her son the illusions of promise and peace return in Antonio's welcome:

The dukes are leagu'd in firmest bond of love
And you arrive even in the solsticy
And highest point of sunshine happiness.

(I.ii. 177-9)

The dream is quickly forgotten with these lines and the expectation of Mellida's first appearance in the play builds up to a peak of visual horror when the first image of Antonio's dream is indicated by a stage direction:

The curtain's drawn, and the body of Feliche,
stabb'd thick with wounds, appears hung up.

(I.ii. 193. 1-2)

With this substitution, Antonio's Revenge irrevocably breaks its ties with Antonio and Mellida; 'Revenge' appropriately

replaces 'Mellida' in the title. Marston has aimed at repeating the shock with which tragedy takes over from comedy by twice alternating the tone of Senecan violence (in Piero's report of his villainy and Antonio's reported dream) with the romantic prospects envisaged by Maria and the climax of violent irony when the call to Mellida is answered by the hanging body of Feliche. Within the first 300 lines, Antonio's Revenge provides its exposition by returning to the expectations which concluded Antonio and Mellida. The audience is allowed knowledge denied them in the earlier play but it is now surrounded with the dramatic irony which Piero's first scene has prepared. The assumption of reconciliation and not the manner of its apparent achievement or characterization in the comedy is the basis for both Piero's pride in its destruction and Maria's ironic hope of its fruitfulness. This assumption is revived when Maria is told by Lucio of its nearing consummation which prevents its being allowed to remain an event in the past which has been entirely invalidated by Piero.

The alternation of mood between the peaks of extreme emotion represented by Piero's speeches, Antonio's dream, and the discovery of Feliche's body is further evidence that Marston aims principally at particular effects rather than broadly based relationships which attempt an overall unity within each of the plays. Consistency of character and continuity of narrative become less important than the intensity of adjacent episodes and scenes. Partly for this reason too, the parallel structure which G.K. Hunter has tabulated between the plays represents a less significant feature here than in the other two-part plays which he considers.

There is too much emphasis given to new characters and conventions in Antonio's Revenge to allow systematic cross-reference to unify the plays. Antonio's Revenge draws attention to its parallels with Hamlet and The Spanish Tragedy and depends more on their recognition than on a relationship to the comedy through 'a series of parallel yet contrasting incidents, set against one-another, act against act'.⁶⁰

Before considering some of the structural relationships in the Antonio plays, however, the nature of more direct reminders of Antonio and Mellida in Antonio's Revenge may help to show how little effort Marston has made to link the plays as a single narrative. Most of the references to Antonio and Mellida after the first few scenes occur in the speeches of Balurdo. He recalls the mock knighting ceremony and masque at the end of the comedy by insisting on his new title (I.ii. 93) and remembers its attainment as reward for his voice (III.ii. 47-8). Balurdo also continues his pursuit of 'a fat leg of ewe mutton' (V.ii. 10-11; V.ii. 74) which he had desired in the earlier play (V.i. 20). Balurdo is the character whose actions and words have changed least from one play to the other and it has been suggested that 'his success as a character in Antonio and Mellida is the only justification for his appearance here'.⁶¹

The final act of Antonio's Revenge contains the most impressive parallels to the corresponding act of the comedy. Mellida's arranged marriage and Maria's match with Piero are occasions for masques. Mellida's disguised suitors attempt to woo her before Andrugio's bold entrance and the sudden reconciliation. In Antonio's Revenge the conspirators approach their victim in disguise. Woodstock and The Death of Robert Earl of Huntington include similar masque situations but it is probably to The Spanish Tragedy that one looks for more useful comparisons.⁶² Piero's offer at the close of Antonio and Mellida to 'drink a health' (V.ii. 250) with Andrugio is paralleled in Antonio's Revenge when he ironically announces:

I drink this Bordeaux wine
Unto the health of dead Andrugio,
Feliche, Strotzo, and Antonio's ghosts.

(V.iii. 24-6)

As it was learned at the beginning of the play that the previous drink was poisoned, the repetition is strengthened in Piero's immediate wish:

Would I had some poison to infuse it with,
That, having done this honor to the dead,
I might send one to give them notice on't.

(V.iii. 27-9)

Parallels between the corresponding acts of the plays are less specific before these final masques. Pandulpho's replacement of his son as a spokesman for stoic detachment is a thematic link although its principal appeal is to the creation of a Hieronimo figure to support Marston's attention to the action of revenge. The first four acts are generally similar in the movement from Piero's triumphant pride and his enemies' distress toward the seeming reversal of Antonio's fortune in the comedy and the genuine reversal attained through violent revenge. Antonio's success in disguise, as an Amazon and a sailor in Part One, comes to more exciting and efficient use as Maria's fool and a masquer in Part Two. In each play the drowning of Antonio is reported to Piero who gloats in the welcome news while Antonio is allowed to infiltrate the court - to escape with Mellida in the comedy and to revenge his father's death in the sequel. Escapes from Piero in each play maintain suspense but create frustration when Mellida is recaptured in Part One and dies in captivity in Part Two, both in the fourth acts of their respective plays.

The use of these indirect parallel motifs competes with the more direct allusions to the plays of the public theatre. Because these are made with specific verbal echoes and self-consciously theatrical arrangements of characters and development of plot, they come to mind principally as parody and clever adaptation rather than as structural contacts which bring Antonio's Revenge towards a closer relationship with its predecessor. The decreased importance of Mellida and the love plot directs a greater emphasis towards the new features of the sequel. Mellida's death occurs offstage and is not vividly felt like Zenocrate's in 2 Tamburlaine or felt with any emphasis until the final speeches when the violence is completed. The absurd suggestion of Feliche's body being placed in her bed while

she sleeps unawares and her arranged trial which ends in the trick of Strotzo's death after he, according to plan, confesses responsibility for Andrugio's death, give evidence that Mellida's importance has been reduced in favour of other interests.

The Prologues are clear and appropriate indications of the plays they precede and their contrasts are instructive to Marston's purposes. G.K. Hunter has indicated how they represent the opposing masks of comedy (spring and summer) and tragedy (winter) with tonal suggestions of the genres they introduce.⁶³ But what is unexpected is the intrusion into Antonio and Mellida of a 'tragic idiom which not only counterpoints but comes close to drowning out the rarer speech of romantic exuberance and hyperbole'.⁶⁴ To take this further and consider the plays as 'a precocious and brilliant ten-act drama'⁶⁵ requires relationships more subtle, ironic, and literary than the plays can support, if imagined in performance with their emphasis on immediate effects. Their distinctive qualities seem designed more for theatrically contrasting extremes than ironic commentary and it is perhaps this temptation and the attraction to parody that deprives Marston's plays of a closer unity. It is also true that Marston's language, often as vehement and twisted as Lautréamont's, is not always suited to the emotions and situations it attempts to describe. Much of Marston's newly developed dramatic style rings of his verse satires and even a number of the satirical characters in Antonio and Mellida bear similarities to those of his nondramatic works.⁶⁶ Finkelpearl calls Antonio and Mellida 'a Senecan comedy'⁶⁷ and a significant parody of the third addition to The Spanish Tragedy, the Painter scene, indicates that this revenge play was in Marston's mind as he wrote the comedy.⁶⁸ But because it ends as a self-contained play without the concluding suspense or threatening asides of other first parts, its relationship to Antonio's Revenge, if intended to be a close one, must have depended on the special theatrical style with which the boys' company performed the plays. But there is no reason to suppose that the appropriate style or

styles were not within the range of the children for whom Marston wrote.⁶⁹

Marston dedicated the printed text of Antonio and Mellida to 'Nobody' and describes his offering as the result of a tendency 'to be seriously fantastical' (Ded. l. 6). Whatever the precise meaning of this term, it seems not only to describe Marston's approach to his 'unique comic-tragic diptych filled with lofty matter'⁷⁰ but also to explain the weakness of its hinge. The plays are certainly among the earliest which Marston wrote and the experience and experiment they represent were preparation for the success of The Malcontent, 'in some respects ... a continuation and amalgam of Antonio and Mellida and Antonio's Revenge, combining similar tragic and comic "crosses" in a single play'.⁷¹

iii The Byron Plays

Although George Ghapman was included by Francis Meres among 'the best for tragedy' in 1598, the earliest of his extant tragedies, Bussy D'Ambois, belongs to the Jacobean stage. It was followed by the two-part Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron a few years later, and at the end of the decade by The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois which may have been the occasion for a revision of the original play. This dating of Bussy D'Ambois (1604), the Byron plays (1607-8), and The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois (1610-11) was established by Chapman's first modern editor, Thomas Marc Parrott,⁷² and although earlier dates have been suggested, they do not attract widespread support.⁷³ In a review of the subject, Robert Ornstein has written:

there is not sufficient evidence supporting the thesis of earlier dates to counterbalance the conservative scholarly arguments which support Parrott's dating of Chapman's plays.⁷⁴

Bussy D'Ambois existed independently until 1610-11 when the imaginary brother of its hero and the fictional revenge

of his death were presented in what must have been an unanticipated sequel. The Byron plays are thus the first of Chapman's plays to receive a two-part association and the philosophical interests they present may have had a bearing on Chapman's later decision to prepare the second group of related plays. The Byron plays were entered together in the Stationers' Register on 5 June 1608⁷⁵ and published together that year under the single title of The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron. The dedication speaks of 'these poor dismembered poems',⁷⁶ a reference to the 'ruthlessly censored'⁷⁷ text arising from the objection to their performance made by La Boderie, the French Ambassador. Serious omissions or alteration occur in Act IV of The Conspiracy and Act II of The Tragedy as the result of La Boderie's influence. A letter from him dated 8 April 1608 expresses regret at not having the author among those (3 players) who were arrested on this occasion.⁷⁸ The letter has also been important for new views on the possible revision of the text and its stage history prior to La Boderie's intervention. John B. Gabel has made a good case for considering the objectionable scene which the Ambassador mentions between the French Queen and Mme de Verneuil (not in the extant text) and the short masque scene which refers to it in The Tragedy as interpolations and not part of Chapman's original version of the play.⁷⁹ Although the masque is touched on in the source of the Byron plays, Edward Grimeston's General Inventorie of the History of France (1607),⁸⁰ its place in the structure of the play is suspicious, especially as the final act of the quarto has 954 lines and divides its four scenes into halves of comparable length which approximate the length of the other acts of the play. Gabel suggests that the original final four acts have been dislodged by an insertion which was later found objectionable. The Conspiracy and The Tragedy in this rearrangement become of similar length⁸¹ not only to each other as Gabel notes, but also to the two parts of Tamburlaine which like Chapman's plays were printed with omissions. The offending scene referred to by La Boderie

almost sounds like 'the fond and frivolous gestures' of which Richard Jones complained in 1590. When the Byron plays were printed again in 1625, the only second edition of a Chapman play before his death in 1634,⁸² none of the cuts was restored although subsequent performances are perhaps suggested by the addition of 'and other publique stages' after what appeared on the 1608 title-page as 'Acted lately in two playes, at the Black-Friars'.

Despite the 'dismemberment' of his 'poems', Chapman's Byron plays have received high praise. F.P. Wilson remarks that

if we wish to find Chapman at his greatest, we look to the two plays which were inspired by the career of Charles Duke of Byron.⁸³

A.P. Rossiter cites Chapman as

the author of the most intellectual of Elizabethan plays - which I take to be ... Charles, Duke of Byron.⁸⁴

According to Theodore Spencer, The Tragedy contains 'the most complete presentation of a reaction to death in all Elizabethan drama'.⁸⁵ Comparison with Tamburlaine in this and other respects is inevitable in critical discussions of the Byron plays which in some ways are better suited to the term 'tragical discourses' with which Marlowe's plays were described on their title-page.

Unlike Tamburlaine, however, The Conspiracy and The Tragedy, which share one 'Prologus' in the printed text, were certainly planned together and gain a greater effectiveness by their relentless movement toward Byron's death, fresh in the mind of English audiences after his execution in 1602 and the comparisons that could be drawn with the demise of

The matchless Earl of Essex, whom some make
(In their most sure divinings of my death)
A parallel with me in life and fortune.

(Trag., IV.i. 133-5)

The first line of the 'Prologus' of Chapman's two-part play recalls the lost tetralogy written by Dekker and Drayton for the Admiral's Men in 1598-9. After 'the uncivil civil wars of France' (Prol. 1. 1), 'admir'd Byron' whom 'All France exempted from comparison' (15-16) ascended to greatness until 'hellish treachery' (18) and 'Policy' (20) came into conflict with 'his country's love' (18). The 'Prologus' introduces 'our conspirator' (22) as the subject of de casibus tragedy. His end is inextricably tied to his conspiracy as 'He bursts in growing great, and, rising, sinks' (21). Both plays are prefigured in these lines and The Conspiracy includes further reminders of Byron's fate as it moves towards its own temporary resolution.

The conspirators led by Savoy are introduced first but Byron is soon mentioned (I.i. 59) as a potential accomplice in their designs:

his desires
Are higher than his state, and his deserts
Not much short of the most he can desire.

(I.i. 67-9)

With the entrance of Henry IV, almost precisely at the centre of the first scene, the other 'state' in Byron's career becomes firmly established when the King refuses to countenance the bankrupt La Fin or

now our old wars cease,
To wage worse battles with the arms of peace.

(I.i. 128-9)

Before his appearance on the stage, Byron is placed between Savoy's plotting and Henry's stability in the face of as yet unspecified 'trait'rous hopes' (I.i. 203). The direction which Byron will take is made plain in the second scene which Roiseau, loyal to the King, introduces in a choric fashion. He retires to watch Picoté, 'tempter of our Duke' (I.ii. 13) prepare an emblem of treason, a carpet woven with the 'history of Catiline' (I.ii. 15) on which Byron will walk in his first appearance in the play. The introduction of these representatives of Savoy and Henry

juxtaposes the principles which will divide Byron in the two plays. The carpet suggests the relevant associations of Catiline and Agamemnon before 'Loud music' accompanies Byron's entrance. His soliloquy ironically restates what the omniscient 'Prologus' had already warned:

I stand on change,
And shall dissolve in changing ...
'Tis immortality to die aspiring,
As if a man were taken quick to heaven;
What will not hold perfection, let it burst.

(I.ii. 27-8, 31-3)

'Perfection' and 'aspire' are key words that remain close to Byron's self-image and useful to the attraction of his service in the conspiracy. While he warns of those who 'seek without them that which is not theirs' (I.ii. 158), Byron prefigures his own execution when those he condemns deserve

all their ornaments of wit and valour,
Learning and judgment, cut from all their fruits.

(I.ii. 163-4)

Chapman's careful planning of the two plays is shown in his use at the beginning of Byron's temptation of material which occurs first in Grimeston during the account of Byron's trial. When the trial is presented in The Tragedy, Byron's accusation that La Fin relied on magical powers in his political dealings looks back to the third scene of The Conspiracy when La Fin tempts Byron to conclude that

If to be highest still, be to be best,
All works to that end are the worthiest.

(II.i. 154-5)

La Fin's claim to superhuman powers leads Byron on to visit La Brosse, an astrologer. This occurs as Byron prepares to depart for England at the King's request that he 'breathe a while in temperate English air' (II.ii. 49). Meanwhile the conspiracy is strengthened^{er} by Byron's participation and he is encouraged to reach for the rewards which he believes his service to the King deserves. The background supplied by the 'Prologus' is echoed but without a hint that it advances

him toward his tragedy:

As I swum pools of fire and gulfs of brass
 To save my country, thrust this venturous arm
 Beneath her ruins, took her on my neck
 And set her safe on her appeased shore.
 And opes the King a fouler bog than this,
 In his so rotten bosom to devour
 Him that devour'd what else had swallow'd him,
 In a detraction so with spite embru'd,
 And drown such good in such ingratitude?

(III.ii. 70-8)

Henry understands well the threat which Byron presents to both his own security and that of the state when he tells Byron that 'de la Fin and such corrupted heralds ... may puff men too with persuasions / That they are gods in worth and may rise kings' (III.ii. 263, 267-8). Byron's knowledge that

daily and hourly proof
 Tells us prosperity is at highest degree
 The fount and handle of calamity.

(III.iii. 24-6)

does not cause him to be wary. Before the augury is forcefully extracted from La Brosse (adapted from the dialogue between Seneca's Oedipus and Creon), the astrologer is threatened with what is to be Byron's own fate:

for by the skill
 Shown in thy aged hairs I'll lay thy brain
 Here scatter'd at my feet ...

(III.iii. 61-3)

The Caput Algol⁸⁶ revealed by La Brosse is evidence that 'the man hath lately done/ An action that will make him lose his head' (III.iii. 70-1). It gives rise to one of Chapman's most famous speeches as Byron announces his 'kick at fate' (III.iii. 130), his determination that 'Spite of the stars and all astrology/ I will not lose my head' (III.iii. 106-7), and his conviction that the self-sufficient man 'to himself is a law rational' (III.iii. 145).

Byron's approaching fate in The Tragedy is a matter of current concern to Chapman throughout The Conspiracy as frequent references to it testify. The confrontation between

the King and Byron after the latter's visit to England falls away to reconciliation and pardon at the end of the play which is diverted to the low comedy of Savoy's antics with three ladies of the court. The ending of The Conspiracy presented Chapman with the task of rounding off one stage in his hero's rebellion while making sure that the struggle in Byron's mind remains a potential threat to the King. Early in the last act a hint of future trouble comes from D'Auvergne who is arrested with Byron in the following play:

I am your friend, my lord, and will deserve
That name, with following any course you take;
Yet, for your own sake, I could wish your spirit
Would let you spare all broad terms of the King;
Or, on my life, you will at last repent it.

(V.i. 50-4)

D'Auvergne twice restrains Byron after the King replies with laughter to the Duke's long but hollow defence of his reputation and loyalty. Violence is averted in their final meeting in the play when Henry makes an understanding analysis of the situation and leaves Byron with almost no alternative but to acknowledge his trespass and receive the pardon of the King. The deflation of the conspiracy is completed when Byron and the King become the audience to Savoy's courtship. The laughter which had earlier threatened a fatal collision between the play's protagonists now joins them in dispersing the danger:

With him [Savoy] go all our faults, and from us fly,
With all his counsel, all conspiracy.

(V.ii. 267-8)

To some extent the conclusion must be 'an artificial contrivance'⁸⁷ for practical theatrical reasons. For the same reasons, The Tragedy offers a new beginning as a play but its political and moral themes develop quickly from the base provided in The Conspiracy. The two-part structure gives Chapman an opportunity to change the cast for the second play and allow more weight to the loyal supporters of the King and the legal opposition to Byron. La Fin becomes the chief representative of the conspirators and his

presence in the sequel helps to achieve an historical continuity. Henry IV, Byron, D'Auvergne, and four minor nobles of the King's party complete the list of returning characters. The absence of leading and secondary conspirators and the second-hand and distant nature of their activities leave Byron without allies in his struggle against the King and the legal system which determines his fate. La Fin's secret betrayal of Byron results in fresh evidence against the conspiracy and without the support of name or numbers, he becomes trapped. Savoy was the first character to speak in The Conspiracy. The first speaker in the sequel is Henry who, already in knowledge that Byron is 'fall'n in so trat'rous a relapse' (I.i. 1), indicates that the direction of the second play will turn to 'one of descent and deprivation, not (as in Part One) of ascent and aggregation'.⁸⁸

The main structural relationships between The Conspiracy and The Tragedy are those of parallelism. They illustrate in G.K. Hunter's view, 'the form at its most exact'.⁸⁹ Despite the mutilated text, Hunter finds features in the first four acts of The Tragedy which correspond to those of The Conspiracy and he emphasizes these in the wording of his summaries of the action. Gabel in his rearrangement of the acts makes no reference to Hunter's earlier tabular presentation of parallels within the quarto act divisions. This would seem to suggest that his own rearrangement might work against Chapman's structural intentions. Parallelism in fact supports Gabel's theories. The 1608 quarto omits any indication of Act II and where Parrott provides a division it is probably to separate the suspect masque scene and isolate the textual problems in this area of the play.

The first acts of The Conspiracy and The Tragedy include clear signs that Chapman is designing his plays with structural parallels of a contrasting nature. Savoy and his followers discuss their 'hidden drifts' (I.i. 22) in The Conspiracy as the King and his counsellors in The Tragedy seek the means to 'discern by whom and what designs / My rule is threaten'd' (I.i. 98-9). Byron soon becomes the chief subject of each

opening scene. To the conspirators, his ambition is an attractive quality which they plan to exploit for their purposes. Janin in the second speech of The Tragedy chooses an appropriate adjective when he discusses 'The fatal thirst of his ambition' (I.i. 21). La Fin's importance to each play is also highlighted by parallelism. After La Fin is described to Savoy as a 'discontented spirit' who 'Will serve Byron ... /In giving vent to his ambitious vein'" (I.i. 95, 99-100), Henry is seen banishing La Fin, 'the centre to impiety' (I.i. 161). In The Tragedy Henry is anxious for La Fin to arrive: 'Yet do I long, methinks, to see La Fin' (I.i. 87). La Fin's betrayal of Byron turns him from the instrument of Savoy (instability) to the instrument of Henry (stability) and marks the contraction of the dangers which threaten the King. At the close of the first scene of each play Henry relates the security of his state directly to his future heirs. In the first play, his fear of 'aspirers' (I.i. 195) leads to the hope of a fruitful marriage:

I have trust in heaven
I am not yet so old, but I may spring,
And then I hope all trait'rous hopes will fade.
(I.i. 201-3)

In The Tragedy his hope has been fulfilled. The young Dauphin is brought in and Henry prays:

From ... unchristian broils and homicides
Let the religious sword of justice free
Thee and thy kingdoms govern'd after me.
(I.i.134-6)

Henry and his heir are referred to in the corrupt reported scene (Consp., IV.i. 144-53) in Elizabeth's court where the Dauphin's birth is announced as giving

all men cause enough to fear
All thought of competition with him.
(IV.i. 147-8)

The placement of this theme in corresponding positions early in each play is a direct indication of their contrasting directions.

Byron is introduced in the second scene of each play where he is flattered and tempted by Picoté and La Fin respectively and expensive gifts are mentioned among the temptations (Consp., I.2. 203-7; Trag., I.2. 62-4). Roiseau in The Conspiracy speaks the first and final speeches of this scene as a spy in the King's service. La Fin is discovered later in The Tragedy to have betrayed Byron and as Roiseau kept the King informed in the earlier play, so La Fin will bring the incriminating evidence of Byron's treachery to Henry's notice.

The difficulties of reconciling Gabel's act divisions and those used by Hunter begin with the second act of The Tragedy containing what is believed to be an interpolated masque scene at Henry's court. In The Conspiracy La Fin applies his skill to draw Byron into Savoy's party, Roiseau reports his observations to Henry who decides to send Byron 'To breathe a while in temperate English air' (II.ii. 49), and Savoy praises Byron's military career to the King and receives the reaction he had calculated. Hunter includes the third scene of The Tragedy in his second act although Parrott labels it I.iii. In it, La Fin's report to Henry parallels Roiseau's in The Conspiracy. Omitting the masque scene and placing the third act of the quarto (and Parrott) as Chapman's original Act II, parallels to its counterpart in The Conspiracy include the decisive nature of La Fin's power over Byron. He alone persuades Byron to return to court just as he alone persuaded Byron to join Savoy in the earlier play. Instead of sending Byron away, Henry now awaits him at the court. In a speech that recalls his English counterpart dramatized by Shakespeare, Henry IV questions Byron:

Have you maintain'd your truth of loyalty,
 When, since I pardon'd foul intentions
 (Resolving to forget eternally
 What they appear'd in, and had welcom'd you
 As the kind father doth his riotous son),
 I can approve facts fouler than th'intents
 Of deep disloyalty and highest treason?

(III.ii. 86-92)

Although Byron denies any 'foul intentions', Henry reserves 'clemency and pardon' (III.ii. 121) for the Duke. This attitude parallels the earlier play when after receiving Roiseau's report, the King held out hope that Byron's visit to England would result in self-redemption and not require firmer authority.

The third act of The Conspiracy continues with the success of Savoy and La Fin in severing the ties between Byron and the King. Savoy encourages Byron's ambition through flattery and reports the King's deflation of Byron's military achievements. Byron replies:

What wrongs are these, laid on me by the King,
To equal others' worths in war with mine!
Endure this, and be turn'd into his moil
To bear his sumptures; honour'd friend, be true,
And we will turn these torrents ...

(Consp., III.ii. 210-14)

Henry continues to warn Byron of the possible consequences of associating with 'de la Fin and such corrupted heralds' (III.ii. 263). The act ends with Byron's visit to the astrologer, La Brosse, the revelation of his Caput Algol, and his violent repudiation of it. More imminent omens are present in the quarto Act IV of The Tragedy. The Captain of Byron's guard reports the sudden death of 'the kind fowl, the wild duck' (IV.i. 114) that had befriended and depended on Byron. Further 'strange ostents' (IV.i. 113) have occurred:

Your goodly horse, Pastrana, which the Archduke
Gave you at Brussels, in the very hour
You left your strength, fell mad, and kill'd himself.

(IV.i. 123-5)

Two other horses which Byron had received as gifts are reported to have suddenly died as presages 'Of some inevitable fate that touch'd you' (IV.i. 129). Byron himself confirms these inauspicious signs and compares some of them to identical auguries before the death of Essex. Elsewhere in this act of The Tragedy Henry's consternation increases. His proofs of Byron's disloyalty and Byron's refusal to admit their existence strain the King's patient offer of

justice and increase his sense of ingratitude (scene ii) until the decision to arrest and imprison Byron becomes necessary. This is in contrast to the corresponding third act of The Conspiracy where Byron is allowed the freedom to depart to the English court. Byron's rebellious 'kick at fate' (Consp., III.iii. 130) is now a hollow gesture as he is quickly disarmed and led under guard to prison.

The advantages of Gabel's restructuring of the act division become more apparent in what the quarto of The Tragedy considers the fifth act. This act, which includes four scenes and 954 lines - more than 40% of the play - contains, according to Hunter, no structural parallels with The Conspiracy. But if this section holds Chapman's final two acts as a result of the inserted material, some of which was omitted after the French Ambassador's objection, then a reconsideration of possible parallels is justified. The fourth act of The Conspiracy has certainly been altered to a makeshift second-hand report of Byron's visit to the court of Elizabeth. In Hunter's words,

it is reported how Byron's pride and ambition were rebuked in England. He is reported to have accepted these rebukes.⁹⁰

In The Tragedy the first two scenes of the long fifth act deal first with some of the international repercussions of Byron's activities which include a visit from the Spanish Ambassador and a reference to England (V.i. 81) and then with Byron's arraignment in the Golden Chamber where he is confronted with the charges of the justices. Byron is approaching the moment when his reputation and ambition must face the hard realities of law. His admonishment in the court of Elizabeth is a faint anticipation of the trial which finally determines his fate. Earlier, he considered his conflict as a personal one with Henry's image of him; now, as in England, an impartial force challenges him to understand the principles of rule which the King represents. La Fin comes forward as a surprise witness and Byron's desperate countercharge that his tempter possessed magical properties is a direct reminder of the early scene in The Conspiracy when La Fin offered his powers in those terms.

The final two scenes of each play are principally designed with their own dramatic contexts in mind and those of The Tragedy create a particularly intense and concentrated transition from 'the rebellious noble, rightly condemned' to 'an archetype of the dying tragic hero'.⁹¹ The correspondences between the plays are mainly the evidence of Chapman's consistent portrayal of his hero. Byron recalls his great achievements during the siege of Amiens as a contribution to his country's welfare that can never be adequately recompensed (Consp. V.i. 147-51; Trag. V.iii. 165-183). He recalls also that the Queen of England had

Told me that if the wilful Earl of Essex
Had us'd submission, and but ask'd her mercy,
She would have given it past redemption.

(V.iii. 140-2)

But his professed innocence goes unrecognized and he is sentenced to death. What may seem a slight parallel but is perhaps quite significant does not take the form of words. In The Conspiracy, Byron's violent reaction to the King in the final scenes resulted when the King turned his back on the Duke's long review of his service with the laughter of 'Ha, ha, ha!' (Consp., V.i. 155). A distinct reminder of this rebuff occurs in the last scene of The Tragedy in the lines which precede Byron's mounting of the scaffold:

Up? 'Tis a fair preferment - ha, ha, ha!
There should go shouts to upshots; not a breath
Of any mercy yet? Come, since we must.

(Trag., V.iv. 160-2)

The executioner (who is a Burgonian, thus fulfilling a prophecy to this effect made by a 'bitter wizard' (V.iii. 80-2)) directs the prisoner to

Kneel, I beseech your Grace,
That I may do mine office with most order.

(V.iv. 179-80)

and it is in this position that Byron remains for the final 80 lines of the play. Parrott comments:

It seems plain that we have here an instance of a 'tableau' ending, a curtain being drawn after the last line to conceal the figures of Byron kneeling on the scaffold and the hangman standing over him with his raised sword. (p. 623)

A notable contrast is here made to the final scene of The Conspiracy in which Byron kneels to receive the admonishment of the King. Byron's penultimate speech in the earlier play indicates his submission, albeit temporary, to Henry's authority:

'Tis all acknowledg'd, and, though all too late,
Here the short madness of my anger ends:
If ever I did good I lock'd it safe
In you, th'impregnable defence of goodness;
If ill, I press it with my penitent knees
To that unsounded depth whence nought returneth.

(Consp. V.ii. 101-6)

Byron is allowed to 'Rise without flattery, rise by absolute merit' (V.ii. 110) but as the final two lines of this speech suggest, he has rehearsed the position in which his execution will occur in the second play.

Parallel structure is the principal method which Chapman uses to unify the plays and emphasize the reversals which lead to Byron's final tragedy. Anticipations in The Conspiracy and references to events in the earlier play throughout The Tragedy also tighten the double play in the same way as the speeches of choric function which comment on the increasing uncertainties of Byron's situation. As Peter Ure remarks, 'In The Tragedy we learn little more of the data of Byron's character; we learn a good deal more about his situation'.⁹² Chapman is not concerned with adding to the portrait of his hero which he found in Grimeston. Parallels between the plays, especially those involving Byron, Henry, and La Fin, do not affect the consistent non-developing nature of Chapman's characters but they do alter the tone of the second play to one that is 'more desperate and solemn'.⁹³ as Henry's authority and control and Byron's isolation become increasingly sure.

It has been said that 'the close tie between the two Byron dramas would seem to have required one continuous performance⁹⁴ but the tie may be stronger because such performances were not practical. An audience returning to see The Tragedy would be reminded of The Conspiracy not only through preliminary exposition and cross-reference but also from similarities and contrasts created through the parallel structure, the evidence of which may also be useful for determining the textual history of The Tragedy.

iv. The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois

After the Byron plays Chapman returned to a French setting for his next tragedy, The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois, and included in it two characters, Soissons and Epernon, who had appeared in both The Conspiracy and The Tragedy. The Revenge, like the original Bussy D'Ambois, concerns the court of Henry III and although that King is prominent in both plays there is no attempt to link him with his successor or to conceive of the Bussy and Byron plays together as an historical tetralogy on recent French affairs. The first three plays, however, share several of Chapman's philosophical interests, while The Revenge develops a new direction and emphasis in Chapman's thought which he continues to explore in his later tragedies. Contrasts between Bussy and his mythical brother, Clermont, are developed in some parallel episodes which recall the original play but the steady parallelism which in the Byron plays served as means of focus is not present. The evidence for a revival and revision of Bussy D'Ambois at about the same time of the composition of its sequel suggests that consecutive performances of the two plays were intended at the Whitefriars in 1610-11.

Bussy was first published in 1607 (and reissued with a 1608 title-page) in a text that varies considerably from the one published in 1641 which claims to be 'much corrected

and amended by the Author before his death' (in 1634). Modern editors have differed over the origin of the changes, whether they all occurred at the same time or were the responsibility of one man, and whether or not they were indeed Chapman's own revisions.⁹⁵ Certain changes can be best explained with reference to The Revenge, not only to date them but also to suggest that the two plays were performed together when the sequel was ready for the stage. The principal change to this end is a rearrangement of the conclusion of Bussy 'to put the final stress on the living characters whose affairs are important to the new play.'⁹⁶ Verbal similarities between some of the revisions and The Revenge point to a date near to the latter's composition when consecutive performances were being planned.⁹⁷ The argument for consecutive performance rests mainly on the ethical contrasts between Bussy and Clermont rather than on textual considerations which, except for the new ending of Bussy, do not anticipate the revenge sequel.⁹⁸ The title of the sequel makes clear its relationship and dependence on Chapman's first tragedy. When The Revenge was published in 1613,⁹⁹ however, no other links with its predecessor are mentioned. The play is called 'A Tragedie' that 'hath beene often presented at the private Play-house in the White-Fryers'. In his dedication the author records that some 'maligners' of 'the scenical presentation' apparently objected to the unhistorical action. Chapman answers them:

And for the autenticall truth of either person or action, who (worth the respecting) will expect it in a poem, whose subject is not truth, but things like truth? Poor envious souls they are that cavil at truth's want in these natural fictions; material instruction, elegant and sententious excitation to virtue, and deflection from her contrary, being the soul, limbs, and limits of an autenticall tragedy.¹⁰⁰

Perhaps it was pointed out to Chapman that Montsurry who dies at the end of the play was very much alive while his murder was being performed at the Whitefriars.

The revenge sequels of Marston and Chapman share the materials and conventions of the genre for purposes of a specifically personal nature. Neither dramatist is a mere imitator of the Kydian revenge play but rather each unexpectedly chooses to invent a revenge plot as the vehicle for a sequel with strong contrasts to its predecessor. In each play some of the reappearing characters have undergone changes which leave them with little or no relationship to their original portrayal. Stoical preoccupations are prominent in each play but perhaps the closest parallel occurs after Clermont's suicide when Charlotte, his sister, with approval from the Countess of Cambrai and Tamyra, decides

In cloisters, then, let's all survive.
Madam, since wrath nor grief can help these fortunes,
Let us forsake the world in which they reign,
And for their wish'd amends to God complain.

(V.v. 210-13)

The Countess concurs: 'In heaven's course comfort seek, in earth is none' (V.v. 215). The conclusion is similar to that in Antonio's Revenge when after the revenge is completed Pandulpho explains:

We know the world; and did we know no more
We would not live to know; but since constraint
Of holy bands forceth us keep this lodge
Of dirt's corruption till dread power calls
Our soul's appearance, we will live enclos'd
In holy verge of some religious order,
Most constant votaries.

(V.iii. 147-53)

Marston pursues an exaggerated display of revenge motifs at the expense of continuity with Antonio and Mellida while Chapman minimizes the potential theatricality of revenge, as well as continuity, in favour of ethical considerations centred in the contrasting heroes of the Bussy plays. The idea of the revenge play seems for Chapman one of expedience rather than effect as he 'subordinated everything else to the characterization of Clermont'.¹⁰¹

The opening scenes of The Revenge attempt to justify the propriety of the title. The first speaker is Baligny, brother-in-law to Clermont but more closely related to La Fin of the Byron plays. He attributes the death of Bussy to 'Stupid permission' (I.i. 3) with 'Murther made parallel with law! Murther us'd/ To serve the kingdom' (I.i. 4-5). Bussy acquires the epithet 'brave' in the first two mentions of his name (I.i. 3, 77) and it is soon learned that 'his apparition and excitement' (I.i. 84) have led Clermont to 'undertake himself Bussy's revenge/... in the noblest and most manly course' (I.i. 88,90). Tamyra and Charlotte, 'full of her brother's fire' (I.i. 109) have vowed to support him. But it becomes immediately clear that Clermont's distinctive qualities are not those of his sister or slain brother although they reputedly share a common base:

Men affirm
Though this same Clermont hath a D'Ambois' spirit,
And breathes his brother's valour, yet his temper
Is so much past his, that you cannot move him.

(I.i. 180-3)

Further contrasts are drawn in Monsieur's encounter with Clermont which is identical in format to that between Monsieur and Bussy in the earlier play. Monsieur now desires Clermont's opinion of himself:

Thy soul, more learn'd, is more ingenious,
Searching, judicial; let me then from thee
Hear what I am.

(I.i. 216-18)

Monsieur expects some sign of gratitude for introducing both Clermont and Bussy to court (I.i. 258) but Clermont recalls his brother's estimate of Monsieur's motives, especially with regard to 'killing of the King' (I.i. 278), a phrase thrice repeated in Bussy's interview. Bussy and Monsieur had maintained a cautious mutual respect; Clermont and Monsieur achieve a sharp break after their examination of each other and the reluctant revenger goes on to impress the friendly Guise with an analysis of Monsieur's hollow claims to greatness in a sententious display of his learning.

Tamyra opens the second scene of the play by summoning revenge in a way that resembles Lady Macbeth's first scene. She contributes further justification for organizing the sequel around 'The cruell'st murther that e'er fled the sun' (I.ii. 14). Her husband's entrance joins nicely with the revised ending to Bussy where the end of their love if not their marriage is resolutely accepted. These conditions remain in force although Montsurry's offer of forgiveness seems motivated principally for 'good show' (I.ii. 48). Montsurry admits that 'the Furies haunt me' (I.ii. 102) and he quickly rejects Clermont's challenge when Baligny gains entrance to present it.

The middle acts of The Revenge are derived from Chapman's source for the Byron plays and serve to deflect the revenge plot while Clermont is stalked and captured at the King's command for his association with Guise. Grimeston provides the source for these episodes in the account of Byron's friend, D'Auvergne, whose capture occurred in 1604. The contrasts between Bussy and his brother are emphasized again before Clermont departs for Cambrai under the direction of the treacherous Baligny. Guise explains why 'he exceeds his brother Bussy' (II.i. 82):

because, besides his valour,
 He hath the crown of man, and all his parts,
 Which learning is; and that so true and virtuous
 That it gives power to do as well as say
 Whatever fits a most accomplish'd man;
 Which Bussy, for his valour's season, lack'd;
 And so was rapt with outrage oftentimes
 Beyond decorum; where this absolute Clermont,
 Though (only for his natural zeal to right)
 He will be fiery, when he sees it cross'd,
 And in defence of it, yet when he lists
 He can contain that fire, as hid in embers.

(II.i. 83-94)

Guise is similarly expansive during his successful plea for Clermont's pardon (IV.iv. 14-46). The character of 'this Senecal man' (IV.iv. 42) is elaborated well beyond dramatic requirement as Chapman takes advantage of every opportunity to display his hero as the quintessence of Stoicism. Where demonstration is restricted, such occasions of description

are exploited.

Chapman's devotion to his new hero results in a drastic reorganization of the secondary characters. Henry III, Monsieur, Guise, Montsurry, and Tamyra are the only characters (excluding the ghost of Bussy) who are reintroduced into the second play. In The Revenge they no longer have relationships of any importance between each other but serve in separate capacities for various requirements of the plot and the exhibition of Clermont's virtues. The King is presented as a scheming 'despot, operating an inhuman machinery of power through a chain of secret agents',¹⁰² an unexpected change from his role in Bussy but necessary in the sequel to motivate the material which Chapman adapted from Grimeston. Monsieur serves to bring out the important contrasts between the brothers in the second scene but disappears to Brabant when this function is completed. At the end of the fourth act, his death is briefly reported as a fulfilment of Bussy's 'dying prophecy' (IV.v.99). Guise, one of the perpetrators of Bussy's murder, is now Clermont's sponsor and close friend which renders him immune from the ghost's threats and the revenger's sword. The friendship between Guise and Clermont becomes the reason for the latter's suicide when he learns how the Guise was murdered:

Shall I live, and he
Dead, that alone gave means of life to me?
But friendship is the cement of two minds,
As of one man the soul and body is,
Of which one cannot sever, but the other
Suffers a needful separation.

(V.v. 149-50, 157-60)

The sentiments in Byron's final speech concerning 'my dear friend of D'Auvergne' and 'the sad loss of his worthy friendship' (Trag., V.iv. 237, 239) are found also in Grimeston and may have influenced the relationship between Guise and Clermont in The Revenge.¹⁰³

The relationship between Montsurry and his wife, Tamyra, is one that receives little notice as their roles as victim and supporter, respectively, of Clermont's revenge are more

useful, especially in the final scenes, to Chapman's portrait of his hero. Montsurry's pusillanimity in reluctant combat and Tamyra's impetuous demands for revenge represent polarities of action and temperament which have no basis in the earlier play. Like most of the other characterization in the sequel they draw attention to Clermont's distinctive attitudes.

G.K. Hunter notes that the careers of Bussy and Clermont resemble each other in a pattern of 'temptation, ambush, and death' but 'there is little or no parallelism of structure ... to set forth the ethical parallel'.¹⁰⁴ The careful sequence of correspondences between the Byron plays derives from biographical and historical pressures which strengthen the positions of Byron and Henry IV to a point that defies compromise. The parallel situations which are presented in The Revenge are not so ordered. They are not developed on a basis of growth or decline nor are they presented in an entirely random fashion but they do illustrate the same principle of contrast which accounts for the frequent comparisons of Bussy to Clermont and the characterization of secondary figures that helps to identify and exhibit the special traits of Chapman's hero.

While some of the parallels between The Revenge and Bussy may suggest that the earlier play provided a convenient source when original material was lacking, most of them sustain the philosophical contrasts between the two heroes, although not in a regular pattern based on the act divisions. The meeting between Clermont and Monsieur (I.ii) with the references in it to Bussy's similar encounter is the first of the parallels that are designed to contrast 'Bussy's rash behaviour and Clermont's deliberate control'.¹⁰⁵

The first act of The Revenge also contains an interesting reversal of the roles of Guise and Monsieur from their positions in Bussy. Bussy's old patron, Monsieur; becomes alienated by Clermont's candid criticism while Clermont's patron, Guise, was impetuously bullied by Bussy in the earlier play. Later in each play, Monsieur and Guise both appeal persuasively to Henry III for the pardon of their

respective protégés. The long report of Bussy's heroism in a duel is reported by a Nuntius in the second act of the first play but in the sequel, Clermont's challenge to Montsurry is met by a hasty rejection and retreat and it is not until the final act that Clermont confronts his brother's murderer. Both Bussy and Clermont are the victims of ambush and although they receive advance warning of danger, their attitudes toward it are quite different. Bussy is killed in the confused struggle of the last act but Clermont is released with a pardon after being more concerned with the ethics of his capture, the interruption of his 'purpos'd recreation', and the welfare of his 'most noble mistress, / Countess of Cambrai' (IV.i. 111, 115-16) than with violence or fear. The relationship between Clermont and his 'noble mistress' is first mentioned after his capture. Although her grief when she hears of these events is enough to cause loss of eyesight from excess weeping, Clermont remains dispassionate and uses the occasion to embark on a long speech in favour of 'friendship chaste and masculine' (V.i. 188). It is not necessary for Chapman to juxtapose direct references to Bussy's passionate and adulterous affair with Tamyra for the point of contrast. When Clermont appeals to his ideal of friendship and he kills himself for its loss, Chapman presents the strongest counterpoint to Bussy's career of illicit love and uncontrollable fortune. Compared with the exciting spectacle and noise of conjured spirits, the Friar's ghost, and the discharge of pistols in Bussy, The Revenge ends with a macabre dance of ghosts accompanied by music which peacefully marks the completion of revenge and allows Clermont to reject worldly action for a more truthful ending to the play.

The preceding parallels leave a strong suggestion that their effectiveness would be increased by two-part performances. Chapman's Byron plays had already been written with this intention and the choice of subject and title for The Revenge lends some support to this view. During the interval between the composition of the Bussy plays, Chapman's intellectual sympathies had undergone a transition which is well brought

out through the contrasts of the later play. Like 2 Tamburlaine, it comments upon the original play but in far more radical fashion, to the point of being a 'confutation', 'a retraction, by times almost formal, of The Tragedy of Bussy'.¹⁰⁶

One difficulty is discussing the linked plays of Chapman and Marston is the evidence that suggests that during the early seventeenth century performances occurred only once each week at Paul's and Blackfriars.¹⁰⁷ The Antonio and Byron plays are exceptional in the repertories which normally emphasized self-contained comedies of a satirical nature and did not include historical plays like the public theatres. Marston's Prologue to Antonio and Mellida addresses 'The select and most respected auditors' (Prologue, l. 3) and Antonio's final speech in the sequel appeals to 'the calm attention of choice audience' (V.iii. 184). The limited availability of performances may have weakened some of the direct and indirect cross-references between plays such as Marston's and Chapman's Byron but it may also have meant a higher proportion of returning audiences. It is noteworthy that these plays were published together not long after their first appearance on the stage. The evidence that private performances and the plays designed for them were more measured than their public counterparts and that the observance of act intervals in performance and act divisions in print was usual practice may also have had some bearing on the efforts of these dramatists to develop parallelism based on these divisions. Unfortunately the question of weekly performances of individual plays is still somewhat uncertain and if there were exceptions, these two-part plays would have the best qualifications. Some change in the practice must have occurred, and probably gradually, before Heminge and Condell in their address 'To the great Variety of Readers' of Shakespeare's plays could refer to the wits who 'sit on the Stage at Black-friers, or the Cock-pit, to arraigne Playes dailie'.¹⁰⁸

The fate of the unanticipated sequels to The Spanish Tragedy and Bussy D'Ambois is unfortunately summarized by burlesque and malignity respectively. Neither sequel seems to have maintained an association with the original play in later revivals in the seventeenth century. It is perhaps to the somewhat contrived nature of 'The Spanish Comedy' and the unhistorical fiction of The Revenge that attention was immediately drawn. The theatricality of The Spanish Tragedy and Bussy D'Ambois achieved fame for the actors of the title roles (noticed especially in the Prologue to the 1641 Bussy) but when these self-contained plays spawned the young manhood of Kyd's ghost and the moralizing of Bussy's brother, the stage life of the sequels proved to be ephemeral.

Notes to Chapter VII

1. H.D., pp. 203,207.
2. Greg, Diary II, 223; see also II,226.
3. The Tragedy of Hoffman, edited by Harold Jenkins, MSR (Oxford, 1950 [1951]), p. v.
4. The Second Maiden's Tragedy, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1909), pp. v-vi.
5. Arthur Freeman, Thomas Kyd, Facts and Problems (Oxford, 1967), p. 120.
6. Pavier acquired the copyright to The Spanish Tragedy from William White on 14 August 1600 (Arber III,169). The First Part was not entered in the Stationers' Register before publication.
7. H.D., pp. 16,17,18.
8. The only occasions when two plays were performed on consecutive days were in 1595 for The Wiseman of Westchester (H.D.,p. 28), 1596 for Vortigern (H.D., p.55), and 1597 for Alexander and Lodowick (H.D., p. 56).
9. Arber II, 621.
10. See Philip Edwards (ed.), The Spanish Tragedy, The Revels Plays (1959), p. xxviii. All references are to this edition.
11. See J.E. Routh, Jr, 'Thomas Kyd's Rime Schemes and the Authorship of Soliman and Perseda and of The First Part of Jeronimo', MLN, 20 (1905), 49-51.
12. There is an unnoted connexion between scene xii of 1 Hieronimo and Robert Wilson's The Cobbler's Prophecy, published in 1594 and written perhaps five years before that date. In both plays, Charon is under some pressure to supply a boat to off-stage voices demanding one. See the MSR edition by A.C. Wood and W.W. Greg (Oxford, 1914), ll. 614 ff. The Charon scene in 1 Hieronimo follows from the Induction to The Spanish Tragedy and it may be a further indication that 'The Spanish Comedy' lies behind the extant play.
13. See Freeman, pp. 140-54 for discussion of authorship, sources, and date.
14. See Freeman, pp. 70-9 and Andrew S. Cairncross (ed.), The First Part of Hieronimo and The Spanish Tragedy, RRDS (1967), pp. xxx-xxxiii. Edwards, pp. xxi-xxvii prefers c. 1590 although in a later publication, Thomas Kyd and Early Elizabethan Tragedy, Writers and their work: no. 192 (1966), p. 5, he seems to suggest a date closer to Tamburlaine.
15. Chambers, E.S. IV,23 following Greg, Diary II,150 states that because The First Part is not a comedy it cannot have a relationship to 'The Spanish Comedy'. This unnecessary conclusion survives in Freeman, pp. 124,177.
16. i.1-2. All references are to Cairncross's edition which is divided into scenes only.

17. Chambers, W.S. I, 149n. Cairncross p. xv calls the text 'extremely corrupt ...it seems clear that it is "memorial"'. J.R. Mulryne (ed.), The Spanish Tragedy, The New Mermaids (1970), p. xv n remains unconvinced that 1 Hieronimo is a 'memorial reconstruction'.
18. Cairncross lists examples at iii.103,114; vi.65; x.33,37,46; and xiii.10-11.
19. See Freeman, p. 176. Chapman's The Gentleman Usher (1602-4), in the repertory of the Children of the Chapel, seems to provide the basis for scene vi in its own III.ii.
20. F. L. Lucas (ed.), The Complete Works of John Webster (1927), 4 vols III,307. Freeman, pp. 123-4 considers a possible association of the play with the King's Men.
21. This recalls the final line of 2 Henry VI which links to its sequel.
22. Thomas Dekker, A Knight's Conjuring (1607), sig. K4v.
23. Printed in F.S. Boas (ed.), The Works of Thomas Kyd (Oxford, 1901), pp. 343-7.
24. At least not in England. Boas, p. xcix indicates that both plays (or versions of them) were played in Dresden in June 1626.
25. This recalls the death of Greene in Woodstock and his appearance in Richard II.
26. Andrew S. Cairncross, 'Thomas Kyd and the Myrmidons', Arlington Quarterly, 1 (1968), 40-5 makes the interesting suggestion that 'the medieval version of the death of Troilus [is] applied to the death of Don Andrea at the hands of Balthazar and his halberdiers' (p. 42). The third addition (ll. 36-9), first printed in the 1602 quarto of The Spanish Tragedy, makes a similar point although knowledge of the fore-piece is not clear.
27. Ejner J. Jensen, 'Kyd's Spanish Tragedy: The Play Explains Itself', JEGP, 64 (1965), p. 13.
28. G.K. Hunter, 'Ironies of Justice in The Spanish Tragedy', Renaissance Drama, 8 (1965), p. 96.
29. Freeman, p. 177.
30. See F.T. Bowers, 'Kyd's Pedringano: Sources and Parallels', Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, 13 (1931), 241-9 and Freeman, pp. 57-9.
31. Boas, p. xlv n.
32. Boas, p. xlii.
33. See also II.i.46-7; III.x.54-70; III.xiv.111-12.
34. Cairncross. (ed.), pp. xvii-xviii.
35. There is an echo in this scene (iv.60-1) of 2 Tamburlaine, I.iv.84,92-3.
36. Edwards, Thomas Kyd and Early Elizabethan Tragedy, p. 27.
37. See Wolfgang Clemen, English Tragedy before Shakespeare, translated by T. S. Dorsch (1961), pp. 103-4, also Scott McMillin, 'The Figure of Silence in The Spanish Tragedy', ELH, 39 (1972), pp. 30-1.

38. Clemen, p. 104 n.
39. William Empson, 'The Spanish Tragedy' in Elizabethan Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism, edited by R.J. Kaufmann (N.Y., 1961), p. 60, also Herbert R. Coursen, Jr, 'The Unity of The Spanish Tragedy', SP, 65 (1968), 768-82.
40. Willard Farnham, The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy (Oxford, 1936 reprinted 1957), p. 391.
41. Andrew S. Cairncross, review of Arthur Freeman, Thomas Kyd, Shakespeare Studies, 5 (1969), p. 321.
42. Freeman, pp. 50,70.
43. Anne Righter, Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play (1962 reprinted Harmondsworth, 1967), p. 76.
44. Cairncross, review of Freeman, p. 322.
45. Arber III, 193.
46. See Anthony Caputi, John Marston, Satirist (Ithaca, 1961), pp. 259-60.
47. Chambers, E.S. III, 429-30; G.K. Hunter, introduction to Antonio and Mellida, RRDS (1965), p. x. All references to the Antonio plays are from this edition and the same editor's Antonio's Revenge, RRDS (1966).
48. Donald J. McGinn, 'A New Date for Antonio's Revenge', PMLA, 53 (1938), pp. 129-37; David Frost, The School of Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 276-9. The phrase is from McGinn, p. 130.
49. Caputi, p. 261; Philip J. Finkelpearl, John Marston of the Middle Temple (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), pp. 268-71.
50. See J.H. Smith, L.D. Pizer, and E.K. Kaufman, 'Hamlet, Antonio's Revenge, and the Ur-Hamlet', SQ, 9 (1958), 493-8.
51. John Peter, 'John Marston's Plays', Scrutiny, 17 (1950), p. 151.
52. There is a similarity here to Hieronimo's excitement before his play within a play (IV.i.159-61).
53. See Caputi, pp. 130-1, 148 and R.A. Foakes, 'John Marston's Fantastical Plays: Antonio and Mellida and Antonio's Revenge', PQ, 41 (1962), 229-39; also Foakes's Shakespeare, The Dark Comedies to the Last Plays (1971), pp. 63-70 and 'Mr Levin and "Good Bad Drama"', E in C, 22 (1972), 327-9.
54. Caputi, pp. 131, 141.
55. Antonio and Mellida, introduction, p. xiv.
56. Finkelpearl, pp. 145-8.
57. Antonio and Mellida, introduction, p. xv.
58. Hunter (1954), pp. 241-3. The table of parallels is reprinted in Hunter's introduction to Antonio's Revenge, p. x.
59. Ashley H. Thorndike, 'The Relations of Hamlet to Contemporary Revenge Plays', PMLA, 17 (1902), pp. 155-68 considers Antonio's Revenge and revenge conventions.

60. Introduction to Antonio's Revenge, p. x.
61. Douglas Cole, 'The Comic Accomplice in Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy', Renaissance Drama, 9 (1966), p. 137.
62. See M.R.Golding, 'Variations in the Use of the Masque in English Revenge Tragedy', The Yearbook of English Studies, 3 (1973), 44-54.
63. Introduction to Antonio's Revenge, pp. ix-x.
64. Allen Bergson, 'Dramatic Style as Parody in Marston's Antonio and Mellida', SEL, 11 (1971), p. 311.
65. Bergson, p. 307.
66. See J.W. Lever, The Tragedy of State (1971), p. 21 and Finkelpearl, p. 141.
67. Finkelpearl, p. 149.
68. See Harry Levin, 'An Echo from The Spanish Tragedy', MLN, 64 (1949), 297-302.
69. See Michael Shapiro, 'Children's Troupes: Dramatic Illusion and Acting Style', Comparative Drama, 3 (1969), 42-53.
70. Finkelpearl, p. 140.
71. Arthur C. Kirsch, Jacobean Dramatic Perspectives (Charlottesville, 1972), p. 32.
72. Thomas Marc Parrott (ed.), The Plays and Poems of George Chapman, 2 vols (1910-14), The Tragedies (1910), pp. 541 (Bussy), 571 (Byron), 591 (The Revenge).
73. Elias Schwartz, 'The Dates and Order of Chapman's Tragedies', MP, 57 (1959), 80-2; 'The Date of Bussy D'Ambois', MP, 59 (1961), 126-7; 'The Date of Chapman's Byron Plays', MP, 58 (1961), 201-2. Replies are by Robert Ornstein (see following note) and John B. Gabel, 'The Date of Chapman's Conspiracy and Tragedy of Byron', MP, 66 (1969), 330-2. Marion Jones and Glynne Wickham, 'The Stage Furnishings of George Chapman's The Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Biron', Theatre Notebook, 16 (1962), 113-17 argue for an earlier version in August 1602, soon after the deaths of Essex (25 February 1601) and Byron himself (31 July 1602). Their principal evidence is from H.D., p. 217 which cites payment for 'A scafowld and bare for the playe of Berowne'. Whether this earlier version, which the authors attribute to Chapman and Chettle, was in two parts is not considered although they argue for a revision of the text before publication. Robert Wren, 'Salisbury and the Blackfriars Theatre', Theatre Notebook, 23 (1969), 103-9 suggests that an original Conspiracy included James I and Salisbury.
74. Robert Ornstein, 'The Dates of Chapman's Tragedies, Once More', MP, 59 (1961), p. 64.
75. Arber III, 380.
76. Parrott (ed.), p. 152. All references are to this edition.
77. Chambers, E.S. III, 258.
78. The letter is reprinted in Chambers, E.S. III, 257-8. Wren, pp. 106-7 includes a translation of it.

79. John B. Gabel, 'The Original Version of Chapman's Tragedy of Byron', JEGP, 63 (1964), 433-40.
80. Entered in the Stationers' Register on 3 March 1605/6 (Arber III, 315).
81. Gabel, p. 439 estimates Act IV of The Conspiracy to have been about twice its present length.
82. Bussy D'Ambois 1608 is a reissue of the 1607 text.
83. F.P. Wilson, Elizabethan and Jacobean (Oxford, 1945), p. 102.
84. A.P. Rossiter, English Drama from Early Times to the Elizabethans (1950), p. 165.
85. Theodore Spencer, Death and Elizabethan Tragedy (Cambridge, Mass., 1936 reprinted N.Y., 1960), p. 245.
86. See Johnstone Parr, 'The Duke of Byron's Malignant Nativity' in Tamburlaine's Malady and other Essays on Astrology in Elizabethan Drama (Tuscaloosa, 1953), 85-93.
87. James Smith, 'George Chapman, II', Scrutiny, 4 (1935), p. 59.
88. Hunter (1954), p. 239.
89. Hunter (1954), p. 238.
90. Hunter (1954), p. 239.
91. Peter Ure, 'The Main Outline of Chapman's Byron', SP, 47 (1950), p. 586.
92. Ure, p. 582.
93. Millar MacLure, George Chapman: A Critical Study (Toronto, 1966), p. 136.
94. J.W. Wieler, George Chapman--The Effect of Stoicism upon his Tragedies (N.Y., 1949), p. 52.
95. Parrott and Robert J. Lordi, RRDS (1964) base their texts on the 1641 quarto while Nicholas Brooke's edition in the Revels Plays (1964) and Maurice Evans's for The New Mermaids (1965) use the 1607 edition although a few readings are allowed from 1641. See Brooke's introduction, pp. lx-lxxiv for a good account of the textual problems and the possibility that Nathan Field was involved in the revisions.
96. Brooke, introduction, p. lxxii n.
97. Peter Ure, 'The Date of the Revision of Chapman's "The Tragedy of Bussy D'Ambois"', N&Q, 197 (1952), 1-2. Albert H. Tricomi, 'The Revised Bussy D'Ambois and The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois: Joint Performance in Thematic Counterpoint', ELN, 9 (1972), 254-6 reviews the evidence favourably.
98. John Freehafer, 'The Contention for Bussy D'Ambois, 1622-41', Theatre Notebook, 23 (1968/9), 61-9 argues against joint production on the basis of the revisions which he dates a decade after the composition of The Revenge.
99. Entered in the Stationers' Register on 17 April 1612 (Arber III, 481).

100. Parrott (ed.), p. 77. All references are to this edition.
101. Parrott (ed.), p. 576.
102. J.W. Lever, The Tragedy of State (1971), p. 49. Lever, pp. 48-50 and Parrott, p. 576 consider changes of characterization in the plays.
103. See E.E. Wilson, Jr, 'The Genesis of Chapman's The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois', MLN, 71 (1956), 567-9.
104. Hunter (1954), p. 237 n.
105. Tricomi, p. 259. I have added to his account of parallels that show 'Chapman's desire to create two contrasting styles of tragedy at the same time that he counterpoints two utterly different types of heroism and propounds a philosophy antithetic to that articulated in Bussy D'Ambois' (p. 261).
106. MacLure, pp. 132, 125.
107. Chambers, E.S. II, 48; Alfred Harbage, Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions (N.Y., 1952), pp. 44-5; William A. Armstrong, 'The Audience of the Elizabethan Private Theatres', RES, n.s. 10 (1959), p. 242; Andrew Gurr, The Shakespearean Stage, 1574-1642 (Cambridge, 1970), p. 70.
108. Quoted by Armstrong, p. 242.

CHAPTER VIII

Comedies

The direction taken by Marston's sequel as a reversal and contrast to Antonio and Mellida is a pattern common to many of the extant sequels to comedies of the period. The second parts of The Honest Whore and The Fair Maid of the West by Dekker and Heywood, respectively, are dependent in their opening scenes on leading characters making a volte-face from positions established in an earlier play. A similar situation in Fletcher's sequel to The Taming of the Shrew is indicated by its title, The Woman's Prize; or, The Tamer Tamed. Marston's unexpected introduction of Maria and Piero's renewed passion for her in Antonio's Revenge anticipate a further requirement of these comic sequels. Dekker introduces an important father while Heywood and Fletcher are dependent on new wives to organize later developments in the dramatic careers of their protagonists.

The circumstances of composition observed earlier in the sequel to Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay are shared by all of the comedies considered in the present chapter. The lost comedies in two or three parts which are recorded in Henslowe's Diary similarly suggest that sequences of comedies were probably not envisaged and the success of original plays became the principal stimulus for second parts. The line between comedy and comical history was no doubt a thin one and some dramatists seem to have been comfortable in crossing it and extending comic as well as historical plays where the opportunity existed. Somewhat outside of the related comedies so far mentioned lie the Cambridge Parnassus plays and the moral comedies of Robert Wilson although these too show similarities to the better known sequels of citizen life and romantic love.

i. Robert Wilson's Moral Comedies; Lost Two-Part Comedies

An interval approximate to that between the composition of Chapman's *Bussy* plays separates Robert Wilson's two moral comedies, The Three Ladies of London and The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London, but there is rather more direct evidence to show that the first play was revived and revised to benefit its sequel. The Three Ladies was first published in 1584 'as it hath been publiquely played' and a second edition appeared in 1592. About one tenth of the three thousand variants are substantive¹ and among these is a change from twenty-six to thirty-three in the number of years since Peter's Pence. If the references are as precise as they seem, The Three Ladies was probably written in 1581, twenty-six years after the Act of 1554-5, 'in Queen Mary's time',² to which the character called Simony refers. Stephen Gosson mentions Wilson's play and its lost rival, London against the Three Ladies, in his Plays Confuted in Five Actions which was entered in the Stationers' Register on 6 April 1582.³ Several references in the sequel to the death of Tarlton on 3 September 1588 (393-6) and the Armada victory of the same year (475-7) suggest that seven years passed before The Three Ladies was revived and The Three Lords written. The Three Lords was published by Richard Jones in 1590 after he had entered its title in the Stationers' Register on 31 July 1590 as 'A comedie of the plesant and statelie morrall'.⁴ This was just two weeks before Marlowe's two-part play was registered by him as 'twooe commicall discourses'.⁵ Jones, however, was not involved with the publication of The Three Ladies in 1584 (Roger Warde) or 1592 (John Danter).

The three Ladies are Lucre, Love, and Conscience, who during the first play are corrupted by Dissimulation, Fraud, Simony, and Usury. In the trial scene which concludes the play, the ladies are punished with imprisonment by the Judge, Sir Nicholas Nemo, after it is learned that Fraud 'was seen in the streets, walking in a citizen's gown', Usury 'was seen at the Exchange very lately', and Simony 'was seen this day walking in Paul's, having conference and very great familiarity

with some of the clergy' (364). This situation of defeat and triumph was one that might be easily reopened and reversed but it may have been the Armada victory which first suggested a sequel that could combine the appropriate moral reformation of the ladies with a topical military victory by the three Lords who were to become their husbands. A later action involving the three Ladies would be better understood in relation to their previous misfortunes and it is no doubt for this reason that the earlier play was returned to the stage. The Three Lords in the manner of a moral history proceeds from the point reached in its predecessor and is not disturbed by events or characters portrayed there. Wilson admits a good deal of reference back to the original play as well as an account of the ladies' fortunes during their internment which reflects, sometimes in a self-conscious way, the interval between the composition of the plays. When the three Lords, Policy, Pomp, and Pleasure, address their suit to Nemo, he replies:

What, those three caitiffs, long ago condemn'd?
Love, Lucre, Conscience? well-deserving death,
Being corrupt with all contagion:
The spotted ladies of that stately town?

(405)

While Nemo contemplates their release, he admits that 'The time of their endurance hath been long' (407) and that despite previous requests for their freedom, he has delayed his decision until all three were appropriately matched.

Other characters who had appeared in The Three Ladies comment on their careers in the interval. Fraud, Usury, Dissimulation, and Simony, it is learned, were banished when their mistresses were confined and their reunion involves familiar rituals of recognition (409-13). Returning from the country Dissimulation explains that 'Now, hearing some speech that the ladies should be sued for, I am come in hope of my old entertainment, supposing myself not known of many' (412). Simony, Fraud, and Usury also have appropriate stories of their recent wanderings. The clown, Simplicity, reports several vicissitudes since the earlier play. He has retained a

vocabulary of malapropisms but gained a wife, Painful-Penury, and learned a new trade, selling ballads. His recognition also provides opportunities for exposition. Pleasure's page, Will, asks him 'were you not a mealman once, and dwelt with Lady Conscience?' (399). Simplicity, however, has difficulty recognizing the ladies in their unhappy state: 'ye look all so like broom-wenches' (422) and he requires some effort to 'believe that you are the three that were the three fair ladies of London' (422). Simplicity provides further links by recalling events in The Three Ladies involving his victimization by Fraud (413), his service to Lady Conscience (422-3), and begging 'till the beadles snapp'd me up' (423). At the concluding celebration of victory and marriage Nemo refers to the earlier play when he recalls how

Hospitality, that was wont to feed him,
Was slain long since, and now the poor do need him.
That Hospitality was an honest man,
But had few friends, alas! if he had any;
But Usury, which cut his throat as then,
Was succoured and sued for by many.

But what mean I, one of the marriage train,
To mourn for him will ne'er be had again?

(497-8)

The third quarter of The Three Lords (in a play which is not formally divided into acts and scenes) is concerned with the defeat of Pride, Ambition, and Shame with their pages Treachery, Tyranny, and Terror all in emblematic costume. Their herald wears a coat that 'must have the arms of Spain before, and a burning ship behind' (s.d.. 462). Fraud and his fellow knaves become associated with the foreign enemy (456) though their own fate must await the end of the play. The patriotic purpose of these scenes is plain while the 'balanced staging and exchanged taunts reveal the influence of the big scenes of confrontation in Tamburlaine'.⁶ Before the final marriage, however, a new threat, represented by the three Lords of Lincoln, also suitors to the three Ladies, must be dispersed. F.P. Wilson parallels this demonstration of civic pride with the preceding demonstration of patriotic pride.⁷

The morality mode of The Three Lords is more clearly understood as a post-Armada rather than a post-Tamburlaine phenomenon. While Wilson abandons the fourteeners of The Three Ladies for the blank verse of its sequel, the earlier play still controls its direction, although the laboured attack on social ills is now somewhat muted by festive comedy and a closeness 'to civic street pageantry'.⁸ In a rudimentary way it attempts a structural unity with The Three Ladies by unravelling the situation reached there by way of corruption, which ends in a legal ceremony of trial and punishment. The Three Lords offers a process of redemption leading to the celebration of marriage and peace. The revised original play and its sequel may represent the earliest two-part performances of linked comedies. Wilson had joined the Queen's Men in 1583⁹ and the special attention given to Tarlton's memory in The Three Lords may suggest his presence with them in 1588-9.¹⁰ It might also be suggested, but very tentatively, that the emphasis placed on praising the Queen in the final speeches is under court auspices. Chambers suggests that Wilson's The Cobbler's Prophecy (1589-93, 1594) may have been a court play¹¹ and the Queen's Men are known to have performed before Elizabeth on 26 December 1588 and 9 February 1588/9.¹² But no specific explanation may be necessary for Wilson's mode of dramatic operation. While other dramatists were trying to inaugurate two-part plays in imitation of Marlowe, who began his sequel with:

The general welcomes Tamburlaine receiv'd,
When he arrived last upon our stage,
Hath made our poet pen his second part,

Wilson was evidently content to lower the key and announce in the 'Preface' to his sequel:

My former fruits were lovely Ladies three;
Now of three Lords to talk is London's glee
Whose deeds I wish may to your liking frame,
For London bids you welcome to the same.

(373)

'Robert Wilson, Gent.' appears on the title-page of The Cobbler's Prophecy entered in the Stationers' Register

on 8 June 1594 and printed that year by John Danter for Cuthbert Burby.¹³ An earlier entry (8 May 1594)¹⁴ but later publication (1595) concerns The Pedlar's Prophecy which, mainly for the similarity of its title to Wilson's play, has been sometimes attributed to him. The same characters are not represented in both plays and The Pedlar's Prophecy may be as early as 1561.¹⁵ The points of similarity between the Prophecy plays need not be considered here except to note that many comedies were written with strikingly similar titles. None can be strictly categorized as two-part plays and reasons for their titles include rivalry, reply, imitation, and coincidence.¹⁶

Robert Wilson's name is associated with a number of lost historical plays written for Henslowe in two parts. Of the lost comedies which acquired second parts, Henslowe's accounts suggest that sequels resulted when an original play, which is seldom called a Part One, had achieved some popularity. The very successful Seven Days of the Week, for instance, had been performed sixteen times in just over seven months before a second part was added in January 1595/6. Only two performances of '2 wecke' are listed although the original play continued to be performed until 31 December 1596.¹⁷ The title of these anonymous plays may indicate a moralistic subject.¹⁸

Thomas Dekker is associated with two plays with similar titles for which an earlier two-part existence for each may be supposed.¹⁹ Henslowe records six performances of an old play between 3 February 1595/6 and 24 May 1596 which he gives the title 1 Fortunatus, indicating that a second part existed or was planned.²⁰ In November and December 1599, Dekker was paid nine pounds for the preparation and alteration of 'the hole hystory of ffortunatus' which received a performance at court at Christmas.²¹ Two months later it was entered in the Stationers' Register as 'A Commedie called old Fortunatus in his newe lyverie'²² and published in 1600. Chambers suggests that 'probably Dekker boiled the old two parts down into one play', a remark that with Greg's later approval has led to Bowers's bolder 'conjecture that the November conflation of the two old plays could have been done with court performance

as the objective'.²³

A conflation may have been undertaken by Dekker later in 1600 when he was paid one pound for 'the fortewn tenes.' on 6 September.²⁴ Unlike Fortunatus, however, evidence of an ingredient rather than the product has survived, in the severely mutilated form of 'The Plot of the Second Part of Fortune's Tennis'. Earlier attempts to identify a Tennis play by Munday with Henslowe's entry and the fragmentary Plot are unsatisfactory and Greg with Chambers's later retraction seems confident that Dekker was paid to fuse two plays acquired from Pembroke's in 1597.²⁵ A topical intention may have prompted the revision when the Admiral's Men moved to the Fortune Theatre about this time.

Haughton and Day were paid for Part Two of Tom Dough between 30 July and 11 September 1601²⁶ and although no first part of that title is known, the same authors' Six Yeoman of the West may be the original play. For this the collaborators received payment between 20 May and 8 June and the investment in properties through 6 July, equivalent to one pound per yeoman, may have helped to encourage their re-use in a sequel.²⁷ Henslowe makes no additional payments for 2 Tom Dough. When Day received twenty shillings for Six Yeoman, Henslowe's Diary shows that he was simultaneously involved with completing the trilogy with Haughton called variously The Blind Beggar of Bethnal Green or Tom Strowd.²⁸ Day is absent from the Diary for the next few months while Haughton with Hathway and Smith were preparing a two-part play with a similar title, The Six Clothiers. The original play is not labelled Part One during the payments for it between 12 and 22 October and '2 pte of the vj clothers', for which the playwrights were paid forty shillings in November, may not have been completed.²⁹ There may have been a common source for 2 Tom Dough, The Six Yeoman of the West, and The Six Clothiers in Thomas Deloney's prose fiction, especially his Thomas of Reading; or, The Six Yeoman of the West in which 'Tom Dove' and other clothiers are prominent.

Chettle's completion of Part Two of The London Florentine may also be in doubt. It was a sequel to the original play for which Heywood and Chettle were paid in December and January 1602/3.³⁰ At about the same time, Worcester's Men were acquiring two parts of The Black Dog of Newgate which, despite its ominous title, seems to have been designated at first as 'John dayes comodye'. He was joined by Hathway, Smith, and an unnamed poet. After completing the second part they were also paid two pounds for additions to it in February 1602/3.³¹ Material of a similar nature, some ascribed to Luke Hutton, had been available in pamphlet form a few years earlier³² and a later comedy refers to what may have been a supernatural attraction in the lost play.³³ Another completed but lost two-part play is The Knaves performed at Court in March 1613 but the subject, presumably comic, is not known.³⁴

ii. Lost Comic Trilogies; The Parnassus Plays

Of the three trilogies of related comedies which are known to have been planned or completed, only the Cambridge Parnassus plays are extant in their entirety. The Admiral's Men are associated with three plays by Henry Porter set in Abington and three plays featuring Tom Strowd, of which the first, by Day and Chettle, was followed by two sequels by Day and Haughton. These sequences are represented by their first parts which reached print in 1599 and 1659 respectively.

The Two Angry Women of Abington has been dated ten years before two editions of it were published in the year of Porter's death.³⁵ A second part of the same title had been written for Henslowe not long before with records of payments on 22 December 1598 and 12 February 1598/9.³⁶ For a further Abington play, The Two Merry Women of Abington, Porter received forty shillings on 28 February but the completion of this play is uncertain for within a week he and Chettle had received an advance for another.³⁷ The extant text may have been revised between the proposed early date of composition and its publication³⁸ and the demand for two sequels and two editions is nearly certain evidence of a successful revival. Its principal action occurs within one night³⁹ and there is

adequate opportunity for reintroducing Mistress Barnes and her adversary, Mistress Goursey, in further plays. The latter's son comments:

Good Lord what kind of creatures women are?
 Their love is lightly wonne and lightly lost,
 And then their hate is deadly and extreame.⁴⁰

Frank Goursey provides some further signs of potential action when he tells Phillip Barnes: 'Well we shall see one day how you can woe' (2542). At the end of the play a marriage is announced between Phillip's sister, Mall, and Frank Goursey and a future match for Phillip might have been an appropriate subject for a sequel. Mall's epilogue suggests a willingness on the part of the author at least to continue writing comedy:

If any thing be in the pen to blame,
 Then here stand I to blush the writers shame,
 If this be bad, he promises a better,
 Trust him, and he will proove a right true debter.

(3034-7)

Henslowe's records give a good indication of the development of the two sequels to The Blind Beggar of Bednal Green, acquired by the Admiral's Men from Day and Chettle on 26 May 1600,⁴¹ nearly a year after Porter had been fatally stabbed by John Day.⁴² When the second part to this play was completed in May 1601 it was known as 2 Tom Strowd⁴³ and a third part, begun in the same month and licensed in the following September,⁴⁴ continued to be known by this shorter title. The extant text, published in 1659, is probably the original play, 'though not necessarily in unaltered form'⁴⁵ as the result of later performances by the successors of the Admiral's. It uses the original title and advertises 'The merry humor of Tom Strowd the Norfolk Yeoman' whose role must have been greatly expanded in the sequels that bore his name.

As the trilogy developed it is also probable that the historical interest of Henry VI's reign, in which the play is set, receded further and further from its already slight importance. Although some of the characters from Shakespeare's trilogy on the same King's rule are present, little effort

of historical imagination has gone into their portrayal. The chief inspiration seems to have been ballad material and earlier Admiral's plays featuring disguise.⁴⁶ With Chettle's departure from the project after the first play it may be supposed that Day's familiarity with Norfolk became the dominant inspiration for the comedies which followed in collaboration with Haughton. It has been suggested that the extant play contains portions of these later comedies,⁴⁷ but the introduction of Momford in disguise as the blind beggar, Old Strowd, and his son Tom indicates no previous knowledge of these characters. The play leads without suspicion of tampering to an appropriate conclusion while Chettle's peculiarities have been tentatively identified in the final section of the play.⁴⁸

Although only the final play of the anonymous Parnassus trilogy reached print, its position as a sequel and even the titles of its predecessors are prominently mentioned in the prose and verse Prologues. Two editions of The Return from Parnassus; or, The Scourge of Simony appeared in 1606 but manuscripts of the earlier plays as well as a manuscript version of the printed play are extant. J.B. Leishman in his edition of the trilogy has provided a full account of the textual problems, the evidence relating to authorship and date, and the connexions with contemporary personalities and literature which are perhaps the most valuable feature of the plays.⁴⁹ Some observations concerning their development and structure may be offered, however, from the point of view that the Parnassus plays are a series of related dramatic works.

The plays do not adopt a nomenclature of identical titles distinguished as a Part One, Two, or Three, although they have come to be known and will be referred to as The Pilgrimage to Parnassus, and The First and Second Parts of the Return from Parnassus.⁵⁰ There is some evidence to suggest that the third play was known originally as 'The Progress from Parnassus' (p. 9n). Over the Christmas period in 1598/9, 1599/1600, and 1601/2 they were acted by students at St John's College, Cambridge as entertainments.⁵¹ Apart from the

probable revival of the final play in 1602/3 with revisions, there is no evidence that they were played together or within closer limits than the intervals between their first performances. Although links of a dramatic nature are present, topical interests are prominent and their composition and in the case of 2 Return, its revival, reflect an authorial effort to maintain a satiric review of the year's literary activity as a principal attraction.

The authorship of the trilogy has been disputed. The view that a single author was responsible⁵² has on its side the weight of stylistic evidence but while Leishman recognizes that 'the general resemblance in style and presentation between all three plays is very striking' (pp.29-30), he is unable to feel confident that some of the statements made in the Prologues to 2 Return do not hint, with admitted ambiguity, that more than one author was involved. He concludes that a second playwright wrote 1 and 2 Return (p. 31). D.J. Lake has looked again at the authorship question and from a statistical analysis of stylistic features decided that 'it is highly probable that one man wrote all three Parnassus plays' and 'this conclusion is not clearly contradicted by any statement in the prologues',⁵³ The identity of this anonymous observer of the London literary world is unknown.⁵⁴

An indication of the author's success with The Pilgrimage may be found in the increased length and scope of its successors. The First Return and the Second Return are respectively twice and three times its length so that the final play contains one half of the total lines of the trilogy. It seems probable that the original Parnassus play was at first an experimental venture which increased its share of the Christmas entertainments in successive years.

The three plays are related to each other chiefly in the continuing journey of the two youths, Philomusus and Studioso, toward completion of their studies and some recognition for their academic achievement in the outside world. The two scholars appear in each play. In The Pilgrimage Consiliodorus

counsels them toward

Parnassus hill

Where with sweet Nectar you youre vaines may fill,
That aged Collin, leaninge on his staffe,
Feedinge his milkie flocke uppon the downs,
May wonder at youre sweete melodious pipe
And be attentive to youre harmonie.

(11. 36-7, 45-8)

After an inauspicious career, the heroes at the end of the final play

will be gone unto the downes of Kent,
Sure footing we shall find in humble dale:
Our fleecy flocke[s] weel learne to watch and warde
In Julyes heate and cold of January;
Weel chant our woes upon an oaten reede,
Whiles bleating flock[s] upon their supper feede.

(11. 2153-8)

The similarities in these two passages at opposite ends of the trilogy do not, however, reflect a circular structure for, as will be seen, the events of each play do not attempt to maintain a firmly directed picaresque narrative. The plays give slight attention to their predecessors and the dates of performance and topical interests allow little importance to be attached to anticipations of future action.

The Pilgrimage is structured in five acts, in which Studioso and Philomusus share the stage with Consiliodorus, Madido, Stupido, Amoretto, and Ingenioso, each of whom remains confined to the one act in which he first appears. During these meetings each of these five characters speaks more lines than either of the scholars as they represent fatherly advice, and the temptations of drink, puritanical retirement, and Ovidian delight, before Ingenioso offers realistic advice based on his own unfortunate experience. Despite these trials Philomusus and Studioso have in four years

paste this wearie waye.
Nowe are wee at the foote of this steepe hill
Where straght our tired feet shall rest there fill.

(11. 699-701)

In the first and last acts, Consiliodorus and Ingenioso speak of the future in a way that might suggest that the author would be willing to continue the story. Consiliodorus speaks three times of his expectation that the young scholars will return from Parnassus (11.17,100,107) and his belief that 'Learninge and povertie will ever kiss' (1.76) becomes the main theme of the succeeding plays. In the last act, Ingenioso warns them of a future in the secure dotage of 'a viccars seate' (1.652) or tutoring 'a companie of seaven yeare olde apes' (1.654), a clown concludes his interruption of the play by promising 'the next time you see mee Ile make you better sporte' (11.696-7), and Philomusus plans to relax 'And scorene eache earthlie Gullio of this age' (1.716). The First Return offers only an approximate fulfilment of Ingenioso's warnings as Philomusus becomes a village sexton and among Studioso's contractual obligations to his employer is the tutoring of his young son. The clown does not reappear and the reference to a 'Gullio' in The Pilgrimage is perhaps more a specific contemporary allusion (pp.132n,182n) than an indication that the character by that name is to appear in the following play.

The changes of emphasis in The First Return are clearly seen in the greater prominence of Ingenioso, the only character in addition to Philomusus and Studioso who is represented in all three plays. Apparently the thinly disguised portrait of Nashe (pp. 71-9) was not only successful but also a particular attraction because he was a former St John's man, a favourite of the plays' author, and much in the news during the late 1590s. The reappearance of Ingenioso in effect controls the direction of the second play. In The Pilgrimage, Studioso and Philomusus divided one third of the total lines between them. In 1 Return Ingenioso speaks nearly a quarter of the total lines and his patron, Gullio, who is never on the stage at the same time as the two scholars, also speaks more lines than either of them. The cast is enlarged to include characters of social station rather than allegorical significance. Music is introduced (1.451f) and the author thinks now in scenes and subplots rather than the similarly structured

acts of The Pilgrimage. The various interests must be brought to separate resolutions in the final act. Ingenioso decides to sever himself from his patron, and like Luxurio, Philomusus, and Studioso, seek his fortune abroad.

The main characters are reunited on the stage in much the same way as in Robert Wilson's sequel. Studioso has heard 'that Ingenioso is in towne, folowinge a goutie patron by the smell' (ll. 136-7) and a few lines later 'that ladd of jollitie' (l. 139) arrives to answer Philomusus's question, 'how hath thy pocket fared since our laste partinge?' (ll. 146-7), and Studioso's equally familiar inquiry 'how haste thou fared since I sawe thee laste?' (ll. 155-6). In addition to these three, Consiliodorus is the only other character to reappear. His function is to provide in the first scene of the play a temporal location seven years after the opening of The Pilgrimage when his scholars have 'proceeded M.A., and left Cambridge for the unkind world outside' (p. 139 n). In his final appearance, Consiliodorus offers similarly grave but more caustic reflections on the fate of scholars before his farewell in the knowledge that 'Deaths nighte will come, and end my livinge daye' (l. 1100).

The process of expansion observed in 1 Return continues in 2 Return which more than doubles the number of speaking parts. Like its predecessor, 2 Return is announced as 'a Christmas toy' (ll. 28, 30) in the Prologue which differs slightly in the manuscript and printed versions. Leishman identifies here a reviser's hand in the reference to 'some foure yeare' (ll. 35-6) which apparently represents the interval between the first performance of The Pilgrimage in 1598/9 and the second performance of 2 Return in 1602/3 (p. 221 n). The figure of Momus goes on to discuss these previous plays:

These same Philomusus and Studioso have beene followed with a whip and a verse like a Couple of Vagabonds through England and Italy. The Pilgrimage to Pernassus, and the returne from Pernassus, have stood the honest Stagekeepers in many a Crownes expence for linckes and

vizardes: . . . for this last is the last parte of the returne from Pernassus, that is, the last time that the Authors wit wil turne upon the toe in this vaine . . .

(ll. 36-40, 44-6)⁵⁵

The second verse Prologue, thought by Leishman to have been omitted in performance when the earlier prose Prologue was written for the revival (p. 223 n), is another area of ambiguous evidence for determining authorship. It is reminiscent of the Epilogue to Henry V as it recalls The Pilgrimage and 1 Return:

In Scholers fortunes twice forlorne and dead
Twice hath our weary pen earst laboured,
Making them Pilgrims to Pernassus hill,
Then penning their returne with ruder quill.
Now we present unto each pittying eye
The schollers progresse in their miserye.

(ll. 70-5)

Philomusus and Studioso appear briefly in each act of 2 Return as their continuing search for fulfilment leads them through disguise and cony-catching, 'the basest trade' (l. 1846) of acting, and playing the fiddle until they decide to retire. Their destination at the end of 1 Return had been 'Rome or Rhems' (l. 1560) but when they first appear in 2 Return 'Nor Rome nor Rhemes' (l. 393) has been a successful adventure. The subtitle of the play describes its central action which is tangential to the fortunes of Ingenioso, Studioso, and Philomusus but it displays Amoretto, who had been seen last in The Pilgrimage. On his entrance in the first play (l. 371 f) and in the third (l. 620 f) he carries his personal copy of Ovid but his second appearance no longer represents a temptation to the scholars and is used independently of them for the satire of legal and religious practices. Contemporary literary and theatrical practices are the more varied bases of comedy with the introduction of Furor Poeticus, speaking the exaggerated language of Marston, and the bolder introduction by name of John Danter, the London publisher, as well as Kemp and Burbage. Those authors not

represented in the guise of characters are the subjects at the opening of the play of a long review of their merits and deficiencies introduced through the convenient prop of Belvedere; or, The Garden of the Muses, an anthology published in 1600.

It is very doubtful that the author of the Parnassus plays, to borrow Dover Wilson's words about Shakespeare and Richard II, had 'the whole journey in view' when he provided his first entertainment. But the encouragement which he must have received on this occasion and his desire to create a Christmas institution with plays written in English for an academic audience focused his satiric gifts for an increasingly ambitious use of fresh materials. No great dramatic achievement can be claimed for this author but he was probably rewarded in full with the 'Plaudite', the last word of each play, which the actors requested of their local and probably satisfied audiences.

iii. The Honest Whore

It was not until 1630 that a comedy was published which called attention to its being a second part. Although Dekker's 2 Honest Whore was entered in the Stationers' Register on 29 April 1608 as 'the second parte of the converted Courtesan or honest Whore',⁵⁶ twenty-five years passed between its probable date of composition and a second entry⁵⁷ which finally produced an edition. By this time, four editions of the original play, none of which is called Part One, had appeared. Henslowe records payment to Dekker and Middleton for this play between 1 January and 14 March 1604⁵⁸ and although Middleton's involvement has been denied⁵⁹ there are no persuasive reasons to doubt a collaboration. The sequel was probably written by Dekker alone and completed towards the end of the year or the beginning of 1605.⁶⁰

The titles mentioned in the unfruitful Stationers' Register entry of 1608 are best understood in relation to

the first two editions of the original play which had both appeared late in 1604.⁶¹ Originally published as The Honest Whore, the play was soon available also as The Converted Courtezan⁶² before a further edition in 1605 returned to the original title which survived through the fourth (1615-16) and fifth (1635) quartos. The company for whom the first play was written was the Prince's Men, though neither title-page mentions them, and they presumably acted both plays at the Fortune Theatre.

Bowers conjectures that because the 1630 quarto of Part Two is often found bound with the fifth quarto of Part One 'the stationers owning the respective copyrights made an agreement for sale of a collected edition'.⁶³ Whether a similar idea was considered earlier by Thomas Man the younger, who was responsible for the initial entries in the Stationers' Register, is not known. The implication of a 1635 collected edition is that Part Two, when first printed five years before, had not met with an enthusiastic reading public. It is generally held, however, that the sequel is the more accomplished work and one of Dekker's most successful plays.⁶⁴

The printing history of 1 and 2 Honest Whore bears a resemblance to that of 1 Henry IV, which first appeared in two editions in the same year and was never called a Part One, and 2 Henry IV, of which a single quarto appeared. A more substantial comparison is the introduction of a redeemed Prince of England and a converted courtesan of Milan into a second play where their new moral positions are retested or in doubt.

The main plot of 2 Honest Whore requires a whore who although converted in an earlier play must be the subject of suspicion concerning the permanence of her titular status. Unlike Shakespeare's reintroduction of Prince Hal, Dekker encourages a dramatic recognition of Bellafront's earlier reformation by reversing Count Hippolito's relationship to her. Early in Part One, he had effectively persuaded Bellafront to sever her connexions with the bawds and panders

of her former life. In Part Two, he seeks to persuade her to return to her former life for his own pleasure. This unanticipated development is brought out in several structural contrasts between Hippolito's moral authority in Part One and his role as an agent of temptation in the sequel. The series of ironic contrasts created by Dekker is complicated by the fact that the marriages consummated or announced for the Count and Bellafront, respectively, in the last act of Part One have been in progress for some time when Part Two opens. There was no sign of temptation when the Count and the whore were unmarried. In addition to developing the main characters in an unexpected direction, Dekker also continues a subplot involving Candido, a linen-draper whose matrimonial fortunes involve successive wives. All of the early title-pages of both parts of The Honest Whore rate 'the humours of the Patient Man' with his 'Longing Wife' in Part One or with his 'Impatient Wife' in Part Two as important attractions.

Although Bellafront does not in 2 Honest Whore return to her former trade or mix with her former associates, all of the main characters are at one time unconvinced of her reformation. Bellafront is first introduced to the audience of Part Two through Lodovico, one of the two major characters in the sequel who had not appeared in Part One. When asked if he knows her, Lodovico replies:

I was sure her name was in my Table-booke once,
I know not of what cut her dye is now, but she
has beene more common then Tobacco: this is she
that had the name of the Honest Whore.

(I.i. 84-7)

In Robert Wilson's sequel, the title roles were similarly identified when Simplicity wondered if 'You are the three that were the three fair ladies of London' (p. 422).

Bellafront has also changed in appearance since the previous play but more importantly, as Lodovico goes on to explain:

This is the Blackamore that by washing was turned
white: this is the Birding Peece new scowred:
this is shee that (if any of her religion can be
saved) was saved by my Lord Hipolito.

(I.i. 89-91)

The former relationship of the Count and Bellafront is made clear in this exposition but it is also necessary to the play that her stark change is open to question, not so much because her sincerity is in doubt but because the nature of such a change is, in the minds of most of the characters, an impossibility. After Lodovico's companions have contributed some Horse-whores puns to the first scene, Bellafront confirms to Hippolito that 'when I had lost my way to heaven, you shewed it: I was new borne that day' (I.i. 138-9). The religious language of her testimony becomes linked to Lodovico's earlier parenthetical doubts and although she seems firmly established in this new life, she will question her own ability to maintain it under the pressure of later events in the play.

The second major character without prior dramatic life is Bellafront's father, Orlando Friscobaldo. Dekker uses this character to control the development of the comedy. Orlando helps to link the courtly world with which he is apparently familiar to his only daughter whom he has not seen for 'seventeene Summers' (I.ii. 143). Naturally he is unaware of her moral reformation and unconvinced of it when first told but his fatherly instincts direct him to her aid and his exposure of the prodigal husbands of the play. It is Bellafront's poverty that first persuades Orlando to test her alleged virtue and he chooses to do so as a disguised serving-man, formerly of her father's household. He takes up his new position just as Hippolito's advances begin and his faith in Bellafront's resistance is soon established by her refusal to accept the Count's jewels and money.

Orlando, of all the characters, including Bellafront herself, becomes perhaps the most ardent supporter of his daughter's power to elude temptation and persevere under pressure. After her husband is released from prison at the opening of the play, his need to return to the low life she rejected requires financing. Matheo 'Must have money, must have some, must have a Cloake, and Rapier, and things' and urges Bellafront to 'set your limetwigs , and get me some

A little later, however, Bellafront again allows herself the possibility of returning to her former life while extending her father's ability to maintain his deception:

If as you say I'm poore, relieve me then,
 Let me not sell my body to base men.
 You call me Strumpet, Heaven knowes I am none:
 Your cruelty may drive me to be one:
 Let not that sinne be yours, let not the shame
 Of common Whore live longer then my name.
 That cunning Bawd (Necessity) night and day
 Plots to undoe me; drive that Hag away,
 Lest being at lowest ebbe, as now I am,
 I sinke for ever.

(IV.i. 129-38)

Although Dekker does not show Bellafront reverting to the life of whoredom represented by the denizens of Bridewell in the final scene, nearly all of the characters believe she has and both she and Orlando allow its possibility. If the path of her conversion need not be performed like Hal's, it must be proved like his to her father and the sceptics who place no faith in its prior enactment. Knowledge of the earlier play is not essential for the ironies which develop from the exchange of situation between Hippolito and Bellafront although there are two episodes in the main plot which are made clearer by reference to Part One. The first occurs in the opening scene when a poor scholar, who is not mentioned again, requests patronage from Hippolito for his book. Michael Manheim has shown the thematic link between the Count's question:

To how many hands besides hath this bird flowne,
 How many partners share with me?

(I.i. 169-70)

with the immediate reply 'Not one' and the interview in Part One between Bellafront and Hippolito where he asks:

how many men
 Have drunke this selfe-same protestation,
 From that red tycing lip?

(II.i. 280-2)

and receives from her a similar reply.⁶⁶ In the same scene

of Part One occurs Hippolito's long speech of persuasion against whoredom which is counterpointed in Part Two with his speech in favour of it. Hippolito recalls his earlier success 'with one parlee' (IV.i. 245) and asks:

will you yeeld this Fort,
If with the power of Argument now (as then)
I get of you the conquest: as before
I turnd you honest, now to turne you whore,
By force of strong perswasion?

(IV.i. 248-52)

A comparison of these long and complementary scenes is illuminating⁶⁶ but it would probably be outside the powers of a theatre audience. The title-page of Part Two calls attention to 'the Honest Whore, perswaded by strong Arguments to turne Curtizan againe: her brave refuting those Arguments'.

The longest scenes in each play are the final ones in which the main plot and the Candido plot merge: in Bethlehem Hospital in Part One and in Bridewell Prison in Part Two, both institutions standing in 'Milan'. Candido is hustled off to Bedlam in Part One for alleged madness and to Bridewell in Part Two for allegedly receiving stolen goods. He twice recalls his former experience in the sequel:

being not mad,
They had mee once to Bedlam, now I'm drawne
To Bridewell, loving no Whores.

(IV.iii. 179-81)

and

I was in Bedlam once, but was I mad?
They made me pledge Whores healths, but am I bad,
Because I'm with bad people?

(V.ii. 210-12)

Between his second release by the Duke and his introduction in Part Two as the subtitled 'patient man' (I.ii.5), there are occasional allusions to his former wife in Part One (I.ii. 6-8 ; II.ii. 110-11) and more subtly to his business adventures in the earlier play (III.iii. 34). But Candido is the only character from the subplot recalled to duty in the sequel and although many of the linen-drapeer's scenes resemble

similar tests of his patience in Part One, they are not concerned with ironic progression like the main plot and his matrimonial problems represent more an expedient than a thematic parallelism in the two plays.

The close connexion between the two plots in Part Two has been praised over the looser organization displayed in the earlier play. While Larry S. Champion has probably overplayed his criticism of emotional and narrative 'tricks' in Part One, the play does seem at times 'frankly melodramatic as a result of ... lack of comic control'.⁶⁷ It is possible to relate some of these features to Marston's Antonio and Mellida which is also set in Italy and similarly develops a Romeo and Juliet situation to a happy, if temporary, conclusion. The funeral of Infelice, arranged by the Duke to prevent her marriage to Hippolito, opens 1 Honest Whore. After this successful strategem she is awakened from her trance and told by her father that Hippolito is dead. Doctor Benedict and the Duke then plan 'a strong Spell ... poison can doo't' (I.iii. 94,97) to eliminate the Count. The good offices of the Doctor and his later surrogate, Friar Anselmo, bring the lovers together 'To turne the ancient hates of your two houses/ To fresh greene friendship' (V.ii. '378-9). None of this intrigue is recalled in the sequel. But Marston's sequel and Dekker's both depend on the reversal of an earlier situation. Antonio's Revenge goes to the extremes of tragedy for its contrast and Pandulpho Feliche is introduced as a stoic commentator who later joins the conspiracy against Piero. Part Two of The Honest Whore also introduces an important father who takes a guiding hand in the development of the play. Where Marston was led in his sequel to the grotesque and violent and went outside the world of his play for theatrical conventions and allusions which strain its coherence, Dekker developed a comedy which is controlled from within and between its major and minor plots.

Neither Marston's two-part play nor The Honest Whore has a narrative source but it has been thought that Dekker's sequel received some stimulus from Measure for Measure⁶⁸ as

Marston's may have done from Hamlet. Bellafront in Part One threatens to fly from Milan

and with teares,
Wash off all anger from my fathers brow,
He cannot sure but joy seeing me new borne.

(IV.i. 193-5)

But this news of a father, who is not named, does not constitute evidence that a sequel was being planned before the first play was completed. Like other comedies recorded in Henslowe's Diary which were followed by second parts, 1 Honest Whore seems to have been contemplated as a single play before it became the inspiration for another. Like Hal in 2 Henry IV it was necessary though easier for Bellafront to remain unreformed in the eyes of the other characters and be shown again achieving a moral position that she had already once attained.

iv. The Tamer Tamed

The subplot of The Honest Whore involving Candido and his shrewish wife, Viola, in Part One and a new bride in Part Two may have helped to inspire a sequel to Shakespeare's The Taming of the Shrew. Without making a connexion between Dekker's play and John Fletcher's The Woman's Prize; or, The Tamer Tamed, William Hazlitt called Candido 'a Petruchio reversed'.⁶⁹ When he is introduced in Part Two, Candido recalls the displeasure of his former wife and vows 'Ile tame you' (II.ii. 74) but the bride quickly avoids a potential conflict by declaring her dislike of 'The wife that is her husbands Sovereigne' (II.ii. 109).

Fletcher's play is usually dated 1611,⁷⁰ nearly twenty years after the composition of The Taming of the Shrew and the publication of The Taming of a Shrew. Although the latter play was printed in 1594, 1596, and 1607 and Shakespeare's not until 1623 with a 'first' quarto in 1631, Fletcher's principal character is Petruchio and not Ferando of A Shrew and so his

references to Petruchio's earlier career must be to The Shrew. The sequel did not reach print until the Folio of 1647.⁷¹ Earlier references to the play occur in 1633 when it was owned by the King's Men, suppressed by Sir Henry Herbert, and performed at court.⁷² Its title at this time was The Tamer Tamed which, unlike its alternative title, calls attention to Shakespeare's character, the principal action of the play, and the reversal which it dramatizes.

This reversal concerns Petruchio and his new wife, Maria, who have just been married when the play begins. A similar situation occurs in the first scene of the subplot in 2 Honest Whore after Candido's first wife has died between the plays. The bride is not named in Dekker's sequel but her behaviour during the wedding feast and the references to Candido's former wife anticipate the more imaginative repercussions which occur when Petruchio is married for a second time. As in the main plot of 2 Honest Whore, a reversal of role in the main character and very little else is borrowed from the earlier play and made the basis for the new one. Fletcher adds a subplot concerning Maria's sister, Livia, who escapes from an older suitor, Moroso, to join the younger Rowland in marriage at the end of the play. Although Moroso and Shakespeare's Gremio have a slight resemblance, it is to the main plot that Fletcher directs his attention and Livia's actions are designed to show her as well as Maria in control of their romantic lives.

The Induction to The Shrew is omitted as it must be unless Sly is to be imagined as unsatisfied with one play or insisting on a sequel to which he would probably be unsympathetic. In The Tamer Tamed the equality of women is recognized through a conflict which develops quickly after the wedding and so quickly that Petruchio is unprepared for the frustrations it entails. His reputation, as created by Shakespeare, is the principal cause of this frustration. Although there are frequent references to his earlier marriage none of them mentions his former wife by name. The composition of the sequel did not require Fletcher to have an especially close or recent familiarity with The Shrew and he invents some of his

exposition as events that have occurred between the plays. It is learned in the first scene that

his other wife,
 Out of her most abundant stubbornnes,
 Out of her daily hue and cries upon him,
 (For sure she was a Rebell) turn'd his temper,
 And forc'd him blow as high as she.

(I.i. 16-20)

Petruchio has apparently been under unexpected pressure since he was last seen on the stage. His acquisition of shrewish tendencies gives cause for concern among his friends who suspect that his domination of his new wife 'will bury her' (I.i. 47). Maria is described as the opposite of his former wife; Tranio pities 'the poore Gentlewoman' (I.i. 8), Moroso describes her as a 'soft maid' (I.i. 22), Sophocles wonders if he is 'A fit match for this tender soule' (I.i. 40), while Byancha advises her

let not your blushes,
 Your modesty, and tendernesse of spirit,
 Make you continuall Anvile to his anger:
 Believe me, since his first wife set him going,
 Nothing can bind his rage.

(I.ii. 57-61)

It is not long, however, before Maria announces a revolution in her former self:

Farewell all poorer thoughts, but spight and anger,
 Till I have wrought a miracle. Now cosen,
 I am no more the gentle tame Maria;
 Mistake me not; I have a new soule in me
 Made of a North-wind, nothing but tempest;
 And like a tempest shall it make all ruins,
 Till I have run my will out.

(I.ii. 69-75)

Although Tranio and Byancha are the names of characters in Shakespeare's play, their positions in Fletcher's sequel are different and no effort is made to associate them with a former dramatic existence. Tranio, Lucentio's servant in The Shrew, is now a gentleman and friend of Petruchio while Byancha is the cousin of Livia and Maria and not related to the former wife. In addition to these changes of character,

the setting has moved from Italy to England although the characters' names are chiefly of continental or classical origin.

Petruchio's reputation is built upon references to his first marriage and it is this reputation rather than the details of its attainment which Fletcher emphasizes and which the women of the play challenge. In addition to Petruchio's change after his first marriage, it is recalled how

the bare remembrance of his first wife
Will make him start in's sleep, and very often
Cry out for Cudgels, Colstaves, any thing;
Hiding his Breeches, out of feare her Ghost
Should walk, and weare 'em yet.

(I.i. 31, 33-6)

Maria names the first wife as 'a foole' (I.ii. 141) whose rebellion cannot compare to that which she has planned. When Maria is supported by Livia and Byancha, military imagery enters their language and the conflict of the sexes, with parallels to Lysistrata, is established as the dominant action of the play. The desire for equality takes the form of desire for fame. Maria seeks 'that/ Will make me ever famous' (I.ii.192-3). With Byancha's encouragement that she will 'be chronicl'd', Maria replies: 'That's all I aime at' (I.ii. 176). During their first confrontation with Petruchio Maria announces that she fears 'Neither Petruchio Furius, nor his fame' (I.iii. 174) and with a similar directness announces her position:

Ile make you know, and feare a wife Petruchio,
There my cause lies.
You have been famous for a woman tamer,
and beare the fear'd-name of a brave wife-breaker:
A woman now shall take those honours off,
And tame you ...

(I.iii. 261-6)

Maria continues to look upon the conflict as an historical event. Her speech comes to resemble a kind of feminist St Crispian's day speech when she warns Livia to remain loyal to

the Noble Cause

We now stand up for: Thinke what women shall
 An hundred yeare hence speak thee, when examples
 Are look'd for, and so great ones, whose relations
 Spoke as we do 'em wench, shall make new customs.

(II.ii. 79-83)

The fact that to Petruchio the defence of his reputation seems more important than the issues involved is one way in which Fletcher allows the resurgence of feminine power to gain a sympathetic position. Petruchio's concern with the identity established for him in the former play is stringent:

Am I Petruchio, fear'd, and spoken of,
 And on my wedding night am I thus jaded?

(I.iii. 286-7)

This identity remains an obsession which in a later scene he attempts to maintain by representing the conflict of wills in terms of physical strength and weakness:

I know her aime: may I with reputation
 (Answer me this) with safety of mine honour,
 (After the mighty mannage of my first wife,
 Which was indeed a fury to this Filly,
 After my twelve strong labours to reclaime her,
 Which would have made Don Hercules horn mad,
 And hid him in his hide) suffer this Sicely,
 Ere she have warm'd my sheets, ere grappel'd with me,
 This Pinck, this painted Foyst, this Cockle-boat,
 To hang her Fights out, and defie me friends,
 A wel known man of war?

(II.vi. 9-19)

Petruchio does not exhibit anything like Candido's patience when Maria has him locked up as a victim of the plague, visited by a Doctor who endorses the diagnosis, and guarded in isolation by two armed watchmen. When he finally forces the doors open, this victimization is again questioned in relation to his reputation: 'Am I grown so tame after all my triumphs?' (III.v. 107). Further vexations occur, including Maria's dressing up as a whore, until in the final scene, Petruchio, like Marston's Antonio, arises from a coffin, accepts his wife's apology, and plans to celebrate with 'all the best meat may be bought for money,/... I am born again' (V.iv.59-60).

Fletcher does not return to The Shrew for specific allusions or a complementary structure in the development of his play. Certain features appear in both plays but these cannot be identified as anything more than casual resemblances. Petruchio's first words in The Tamer Tamed announce a wager which may recall the last scene of Shakespeare's play. His confidence about his wedding night and the unexpected frustration which follows may be intended to contrast with his confidence over Katherina's obedience. The wager motif, however, continues and is expanded in the subplot involving Rowland and Livia and loses any local significance in its wider use throughout the play. Another similarity between the plays is an address by Petruchio to the audience, but this kind of appeal also occurs in the debate scene in 2 Honest Whore where Hippolito asks for a judgement. A final resemblance is the sharing of imagery concerning kites and falcons which might not be considered surprising in plays involving taming.

What is new to the taming theme in Fletcher's play are a number of classical references which contribute to the stress laid upon military imagery to create a mock-heroic conflict out of the battle of the sexes. As the adversaries already see the issues of the conflict in terms of fame and reputation, these references serve to heighten the contest of wits. The Prologue of anonymous authorship emphasizes this 'battaile without blood' (1. 3) while the Epilogue calls attention to its lesson: 'To teach both Sexes due equality' (1. 7), a lesson which Petruchio learns is not to be realized by waiting for women to

saile
As brave Columbus did, till they discover
The happy Islands of obedience.

(II.i.56-8)

Unless John of Bordeaux, 1 Hieronimo, and the later Parnassus plays were written by dramatists other than those responsible for the original plays, The Tamer Tamed is the only extant sequel which differs in authorship from its predecessor. The evidence available for the authorship of collaborative lost plays shows that at least one of the

original playwrights was involved with their sequels. These of course were written for the same company though in the case of John of Bordeaux there is no firm evidence for this. The auspices of The Tamer Tamed in 1611 are unknown but in 1633 the King's presented it before the King and Queen when it was 'Very well likt'. The play which was presented to the same audience two nights before was The Taming of the Shrew and recorded by Sir Henry Herbert as 'Likt'.⁷³ This arrangement is not an unlikely one for earlier performances of Fletcher's play. It was certainly common in the Restoration. John Lacy's adaptation of Shakespeare's play, Sauny the Scot, concludes with lines spoken by Petruchio which attest to the popularity of consecutive performances:

I've Tam'd the Shrew, but will not be asham'd,
If next you see the very Tamer Tam'd.⁷⁴

v. The Fair Maid of the West

The Taming of the Shrew waited nearly twenty years for a sequel. It is generally believed that between twenty and thirty years separate the composition of the two parts of Thomas Heywood's The Fair Maid of the West which were published together in 1631 soon after a consecutive performance at court. A.M. Clark supposes that

several years, perhaps as many as twenty, must have elapsed between the breezy simplicity of the one and the Fletcherian morality of the other.⁷⁵

G.E. Bentley and Robert K. Turner, Jr would favour a date for Part One before 1603 and thus increase Clark's maximum interval by at least six years⁷⁶ while the most recent and fullest discussion of the date of Part One returns to Clark's preference for 1609 or 1610.⁷⁷ Part Two is also difficult to date although it is usually assigned to c. 1630, just prior to the first clear reference to it on 16 June 1631 when both plays were entered in the Stationers' Register.⁷⁸

Turner has studied the text in detail and believes that because 'the two title-pages were clearly impressed from the

same setting', it is likely that both plays were published together by Richard Royston as one book.⁷⁹ There are separate dedications and addresses to the reader by Heywood, dramatis personae lists indicating performances in which the same actors took the leading roles in each play, a Prologue before Part One and an Epilogue following Part Two. The names of the actors show that Queen Henrietta's Men were responsible for the court performances to which the title-pages and the prefatory matter refer.⁸⁰ It is curious that the argument for single book production does not take into account what Heywood has to say before each play. In addition to the more than casual dependence of the sequel on its predecessor, the author's own remarks may support the bibliographical analysis. The presence of two dedications in one volume is original to this two-part play although in the following year, the two parts of The Iron Age share the same features. Signature sequences for 1 and 2 The Fair Maid of the West are independent and only Part One is paginated.⁸¹ In his epistle to the reader printed before Part One, Heywood speaks in the plural of his offering:

These comedies, bearing the title of The Fair of the West, if they prove but as gracious in thy private reading as they were plausible in the public acting, I shall not much doubt of their success.⁸²

That Heywood thought of the two plays as one unit may also be suggested in his glance at Jonson when offering his plays 'singly' (1.3). The dedication to Part Two strongly implies a parallel between the relationship of the two dedicatees and an appropriate form of publication:

The first part of this work I bestowed upon your friend Mr. John Othow; the second I have conferr'd upon you, both being incorporated into one house and noble society, the proximity in your chambers and much familiar conference having bred a mutual correspondency betwixt you (ll. 1-5).

When Heywood returns to address the reader of Part Two he assumes that the reader is in possession of both plays:

if thou beest tired in the first part, I would not wish thee to be travell'd in the second; ... By this time you cannot choose but be acquainted with the most of our acts ... you have heard the beginning of their troubles, but are not yet come to the end of their travels ...

(ll. 1-2,7-8,10-12)

The marriage proclaimed at the end of Part One between Bess Bridges (the heroine of both the title and the subtitle, 'A Girl worth Gold') and Spencer offers no indication that further adventures await the lovers in a second play. The sequel is a somewhat mechanical extension of many of the elements and most of the major characters from Part One into a new series of escapes and reunions in the exotic court of Fez and later in Florence. A Chorus intervenes between these settings after three acts and creates two short plays out of the sequel. This structure results in a repetition of the motifs of coincidence and recognition which probably made Part One a successful play of romance and adventure long before Part Two was written.

When the sequel opens it is natural that the principal members of Bess's crew, Roughman, Clem, and Goodlack, who have sailed on the Negro in search of Spencer would be still at Mullisheg's court in Fez where he was at last found. In addition to these five English characters, Mullisheg and his subordinates, Bashaw Alcade and Bashaw Joffer, are also reintroduced. But the last and most extraordinary reintroduction occurs in the second section of the play when an unnamed Florentine merchant who was pardoned at Bess's intervention in Part One turns up conveniently in his native country after shipwreck 'on the coast of Florence' (Chorus, III. iv. 31) and an attack by lustful banditti involve all five English characters in separate adventures and ultimately of course in a series of recognitions. In the first play the Italian merchant speaks only seven lines in one of which he identifies himself as a Florentine (V.i. 149). This character proves useful to Heywood in the sequel and he may be the inspiration for centring the last two acts in Florence.

He is first seen with the Duke of Florence when Bess is saved from a melodramatic bandit intent on raping her. The merchant seems to recognize her 'But where, what place, or in what country now/ I cannot call to mind' (IV.i. 82-3). Soon he is able to make a precise identification which allows him to recall the last scene of Part One:

'Tis she; I now remember her.
She did me a great courtesy, and I am proud
Fortune, however enemy to her,
Has given me opportunity to make
A just requital.

(IV.i. 90-4)

The opportunity is shown to be Heywood's as well when the merchant's explanation to the Duke of this 'English virgin/ So highly grac'd by mighty Mullisheg' (IV.i. 99-100) allows the self-conscious reply: 'A legend worthy to be writ in gold' (IV.i. 101). After the merchant provides a further list of Bess's virtues, the Duke responds with an attitude reminiscent of the Gentlemen in the last act of The Winter's Tale and a further theatrical allusion:

The report
Strikes us with wonder and amazement too;
But to behold the creature were a project
Worthy a theater of emperors,
Nay, gods themselves, to be spectators.

(IV.i.115-9)

At this point the use of the merchant leads Heywood into difficulty. Florence soon inquires of Bess's husband, 'as our merchant told us' (IV.i.132), though no such information had in fact been given. Although the merchant speaks to Spencer several times in the next few scenes a recognition is denied him until the last scene and he must keep silent until, after Bess has already identified her husband, he adds:

My lord, I know that gentleman
For Spencer and her husband, for mine eyes
Saw them espous'd in Fez.

(V.iv. 126-8)

The most important new character in Part Two is Mullisheg's queen, Tota, who is given the first speech of the play. She is not mentioned in Part One. There, Mullisheg had suppressed his interest in Bess after Spencer had been identified among the prisoners taken under his law respecting foreign merchants. In Part Two, Mullisheg's lust for Bess and Tota's intent on revenging her husband for his neglect of her are the principal ingredients of the new plot. These actions recall the opening of Marston's Antonio's Revenge with its emphasis on revenge and secret plotting and 2 Honest Whore (first published in 1630) with its main impetus built on a character who seeks lustful satisfaction from a heroine whose marriage he has made possible.⁸³ At the same time that Mullisheg justifies his desire for Bess as a war 'with weak woman' (I.i.233), Tota is planning 'my just revenge', a phrase which she repeats three times (I.i. 170; I.i. 200; II.ii. 10). Fortunately for Bess and Spencer the agents chosen for these projects are Roughman and Goodlack. Their solution is a bed trick which although successful leads to complications when the English attempt to escape from the country. This three-act play concludes with Mullisheg's forgiveness and generosity in his last appearance:

A golden girl th'art call'd, and, wench, be bold;
Thy lading back shall be with pearl and gold.

(III.iii. 184-5)

These sentiments are a variation on his final words in Part One:

Lead in state,
And wheresoe'er thy fame shall be enroll'd,
The world report thou art a girl worth gold.

(V.ii. 151-3)

The Chorus which introduces the final two acts of Part Two narrates an attack by pirates, shipwreck, and separation of the English crew. The promise that 'More of their fortunes we will next pursue' (III.iv. 33) is very similar to the Chorus in 2 Edward IV which announces of the Shores: 'His

and her fortunes shall we now pursue' (III.i). The despair after the shipwreck expressed by Roughman, 'Lower we cannot fall' (IV.i.19) is matched in 2 Edward IV by Shore's 'Lower than now we are, we cannot fall' (V.ii) and Bess's answer might have been spoken by Jane Shore:

Yes, into the ground, the grave. Roughman,
Would I were there; till then I never shall have
True rest. I fain would know what greater misery
Heaven can inflict, I have not yet endur'd.

(IV.i.20-3)

When the banditti appear and their captain threatens rape, the danger posed earlier by Mullisheg and later by the Duke of Florence shows how Heywood's completion of a full-length sequel was dependent on repetition. Spencer's separation from Bess follows this pattern when a second oath of honour presents a further obstacle to their reunion as well as another contrast to the oath-breaking Mullisheg. Bess's chastity and Spencer's courage receive further demonstrations in this episode. In addition to the surprising presence of the Florentine merchant, Bashaw Joffer turns up as a prisoner in the last scene where he eagerly accepts conversion to Christianity.

Numerous minor references to Part One in the sequel remain unintelligible without some knowledge of the original play. Roughman alludes obliquely to his unsuccessful wooing of Bess in the earlier play (I.i. 136-8) and Bess refers to Spencer's picture which she kept in her chamber before sailing in search of him (II.i. 64-5 ; III.ii. 150-1). It is Clem, the clown, who is responsible for the most frequent references to a former dramatic life. Like Balurdo in Marston's plays, Clem uses some of his old jokes and favourite quotations for a second time.⁸⁴

In Part One, Clem rises from a drawer in Bess's tavern to 'a courtier in the court of Fez' (V.i.115) as he parodies the third line of 'the old ghost in Jeronimo' (V.i. 112). His old trade becomes useful after the shipwreck in Part Two as he turns 'from a courtier of Fez' to 'a drawer in Florence' (IV.v. 52-3) in time to rejoin the itinerant Spencer and

Goodluck in a chance tavern encounter. The source of Clem's early references to 'stone' (I.i. 52) and 'medicine' (I.i. 91) becomes clear when he mentions his 'being made an eunuch' (II. i. 51) in exchange for the title of Bashaw of Barbary in Part One. Balurdo was similarly proud of his new title. Clem must even remind the Florentine merchant of this honour in the last scene of the sequel (V.iv. 133-4).

Neither part of The Fair Maid of the West is indebted to a particular source for the romantic adventures of its heroine. But where in Clark's words, Part One is 'the quintessence of popular literature', in Part Two Heywood

had to cater for a new taste, and to the detriment of the play added to the old ingredients Italian courts and intrigues, banditti and other properties of the transpontine picturesque.⁸⁵

Part Two illustrates the inability of some sequels to sustain an original impulse for an entire play. When the Chorus must intervene for a new start, the continuation of the same characters cannot disguise a tendency toward the composite play with the result that Part Two becomes two plays in one.

The dramatis personae lists printed before each of Heywood's plays indicate that Bess, Spencer, Clem, Goodluck, Roughman, and Mullisheg were represented by the same actors in recent performances. Perhaps, as Bentley suggests,⁸⁶ the positions of the Prologue and Epilogue indicate a special performance of both plays during one evening. If so, the dependence of the sequel on its predecessor was recognized in its stage history as well as in its printed form. Like The Tamer Tamed, 2 Fair Maid of the West was closely associated with its older original play during the Restoration. In 1662, a book ascribed to John Dauncey was published with the title

The English Lovers, or, A Girl Worth Gold.
Both Parts, So often Acted with General applause;
now newly formed into A Romance.⁸⁷

The addition of sequels to independently planned comedies by a second author or by the same author at a much later date link all of the extant plays discussed in this chapter with

the exception of The Honest Whore. (The Parnassus plays must remain a special case.) But the evidence for a stage history of these sequels shows that the original plays by Wilson, Shakespeare, and Heywood were given a new dramatic life in revivals as the result of the continuations. The composition of lost plays recorded by Henslowe and of The Honest Whore also indicates that the actors responsible for the major characters of the presumably successful first parts were available when second or third parts were added. If a unity was required by an audience it was probably appreciated through the theatrical experience. The reading public was more likely to be attracted to prose fiction such as the version of Pericles by Wilkins or Dauncey's two-part romance, than the thin narrative of linked comedies without biographical or historical interest.

Notes to Chapter VIII

1. H.S.D. Mithal, 'An Edition of R[obert] W[ilson]'s The Three Ladies of London and The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1959), p. cx.
2. Dodsley VI,272. All references to both plays are to this edition by page number.
3. Arber II,409.
4. Arber II,556.
5. Arber II,558.
6. David Bevington, Tudor Drama and Politics (Cambridge, Mass.,1968), p. 191.
7. F.P. Wilson, The English Drama 1485-1585, edited by G.K. Hunter, Oxford History of English Literature, Volume IV, Part I (Oxford, 1969), p. 59.
8. Bevington, p. 191.
9. Chambers, E.S., II, 349.
10. But see Chambers, E.S. II,107 where Wilson's name is not present on a (probably incomplete) subsidy list.
11. Chambers, E.S. III,516.
12. Chambers, E.S. IV,104.
13. Arber II,653.
14. Arber II,649.
15. Listed under that date in Annals, p. 36. See G.L. Kittredge, 'The Date of The Pedlers Prophecie', Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, 16 (1934), 97-118.
16. The dating of the following examples is from Annals:
 - The Two Italian Gentlemen (1579-84, 1585) Anon., translation
 - The Two Gentlemen of Verona (1590-98,1623) Shakespeare
 - Love's Metamorphosis (1588-90),1601) Lyly
 - Maid's Metamorphosis (1599-1600,1600) Anon.
 - A Knack to Know a Knave (1592,1594) Anon.
 - A Knack to Know an Honest Man (1594,1596) Anon.
 - The Isle of Dogs (1597, Lost) Nashe and others
 - The Isle of Gulls (1606,1606) Day
 - Love's Labour's Lost (1590-97,1598) Shakespeare
 - Love's Labour's Won (1590-98, extant under another title?) Shakespeare
 - The Two Merry Women of Abington (1599, Lost) Porter
 - The Merry Wives of Windsor (1597-1602, 1602) Shakespeare
 - Every Man in his Humour (1598, 1601) Jonson
 - Every Man out of his Humour (1599, 1600) Jonson
 - Every Woman in her Humour (1603-8,1609) Machin?

Westward Ho (1604,1607) Dekker and Webster
Eastward Ho (1605,1605) Chapman, Marston, Jonson
Northward Ho (1605,1607) Dekker and Webster

These groups of plays might suggest from their titles the reappearance of established characters in further action but this is not the case. Dekker's borrowing of Captain Tucca, Demetrius Flannius, Crispinus, and Horace for his own purposes in Satiromastix also does not qualify it and Jonson's Poetaster, where these characters first appeared, as a two-part play. Moll Cutpurse appears in both The Roaring Girl by Dekker and Middleton and Nathan Field's Amends for Ladies but it is probably to a personal appearance, as Chambers, E.S. III,297 suggests, that the Epilogue of the former play refers, rather than to a sequel advertisement.

17. H.D., pp. 30,31,32,33,34 (Part Two), 35,54,55.
18. R.B. Sharpe, The Real War of the Theaters (Boston, 1935), p. 53.
19. M.C. Bradbrook, The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy (1955), p. 121 suggests despite Greg, Diary II,218-19 that Dekker's If it be not a Good Play is a compression of two plays on Friar Rush.

Some indication of Dekker's alterations of two-part plays may be found in the following speech by Horace in Satiromastix:

Fannius his Play-dresser; who (to make the Muses beleeve, their subjects eares were starv'd, and that there was a dearth of Poesie) cut an Innocent Moore i'th middle, to serve him in twice; and when he had done, made Poules-worke of it.
 (Bowers I., II.ii.39-42)

Chambers, E.S. IV,47 rejects an application of this to Captain Thomas Stukeley.

20. H.D., pp. 34-7.
21. H.D., pp. 126-8.
22. Entered 20 February 1600 (Arber III,156).
23. Chambers, E.S. III,291; Greg, Documents II,132; Bowers I,107. The suggestion was made earlier by Charles H. Herford, Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century (Cambridge, 1886 reprinted London,1966), pp. 210-11.
24. H.D., p. 137.
25. Gertrude Marian Sibley, The Lost Plays and Masques, 1500-1642 (Ithaca, 1933 reprinted N.Y.,1971), p. 58 reviews earlier opinion. See W.W. Greg, 'The Evidence of Theatrical Plots for the History of the Elizabethan Stage', RES, 1 (1925), pp. 270-1; also his Documents II,131-3.
26. H.D., pp. 178,181.
27. H.D., pp. 170-1 (authorship); 175-7 (properties).
28. H.D., p.170.
29. H.D., p. 183.

30. H.D., pp. 207, 209.
31. H.D., pp. 220, 224.
32. Entered on 3 November 1595, 22 December 1595, 8 January 1596, 9 February 1596 (Arber III, 52, 56 (twice), 58).
33. The Witch of Edmonton, Bowers IV, IV. i. 237.
34. Chambers, E.S. IV, 127.
35. See J.M. Nosworthy, 'Notes on Henry Porter', MLR, 35 (1940), 517-21. Nosworthy discusses relationships between Shakespeare and Porter's sole surviving play in later articles leading up to his theory in Shakespeare's Occasional Plays (1965), pp. 93-114 that a lost Abington play is the source for The Merry Wives of Windsor.
36. H.D., pp. 102, 105.
37. H.D., pp. 105, 106.
38. Perhaps for publication as A.C. Partridge suggests in Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama (1964), p. 16.
39. See William J. Lawrence, 'The Elizabethan Nocturnal' in Pre-Restoration Stage Studies (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), p. 135.
40. Henry Porter, The Two Angry Women of Abington, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR, (Oxford, 1912), ll. 961-3. References are to this edition.
41. H.D., p. 135.
42. On 6 June 1599. See Leslie Hotson, 'The Adventure of the Single Rapier' in Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated and other Essays (1949), pp. 193-203.
43. H.D., pp. 163, 166, 167, 168, 169.
44. H.D., p. 181.
45. Harold Jenkins, The Life and Work of Henry Chettle (1934), p. 189.
46. See Jenkins, pp. 193-8.
47. Sharpe, p. 175; Robin Jeffs, introduction to The Works of John Day, edited by A.H. Bullen (1881 reprinted 1963), p. xiv.
48. Jenkins, p. 207.
49. The Three Parnassus Plays (1598-1601), edited by J.B. Leishman (1949). All parenthetical references are to page numbers of his introduction and commentary or to line numbers of his text.
50. The titles given to the first and second plays in the Rawlinson MS. are The Pilgrimage to Parnassus and The Returne from Parnassus. The Halliwell-Phillipps MS. agrees in title to that of the printed version which was entered in the Stationers' Register as 'An. Enterlude' (Arber III, 304).
51. There was apparently no performance in 1600/1 (pp. 24-6).

52. Chambers, E.S. IV, 39.
53. D.J. Lake, 'The Integrity of the "Parnassus" Trilogy', N&Q, 219 (1974), p. 290.
54. Annals, pp. 70, 78, 86 allows the possibility of Owen Gwyn's participation for which Marjorie L. Reyburn argues in 'New Facts and Theories about the Parnassus Plays', PMLA, 74 (1959), pp. 325-35. See also the exchange of letters between Sidney Thomas and Marjorie L. Reyburn in 'A Note on Owen Gwyn and The Returne from Parnassus, Part II', PMLA, 76 (1961), 298-300.
55. The reading of 'last parte' (MS.) is disputed by Lake, p. 288 who prefers the 1606 quarto's 'least parte'.
56. Arber III, 376.
57. Arber IV, 238.
58. H.D., p. 209.
59. S. Schoenbaum's argument that Dekker was unassisted in 'Middleton's Share in "The Honest Whore", Parts I and II', N&Q, 197 (1952), 3-4 is questioned by Peter Ure, 'Patient Madman and Honest Whore: The Middleton-Dekker Oxymoron', Essays and Studies, n.s. 19 (1966), p. 22 and George R. Price, Thomas Dekker (N.Y., 1969), p. 164 n where he estimates Middleton's share as 700-800 lines, chiefly in the *Candido* scenes.
60. M.T. Jones-Davies, Un Peintre de la vie Londonienne: Thomas Dekker, 2 vols (Paris, 1958), II, 370.
61. Entered 9 November 1604 (Arber III, 275).
62. Bowers IV, 409-14 discusses a recently discovered perfect copy.
63. Bowers II, 133. His text is the basis for all references.
64. Larry S. Champion, 'From Melodrama to Comedy: A Study of the Dramatic Perspective in Dekker's The Honest Whore, Parts I and II', SP, 69 (1972), p. 193 n, records favourable opinions of Part Two.
65. Michael Manheim, 'The Thematic Structure of Dekker's 2 Honest Whore', SEL, 5 (1965), pp. 363-4.
66. See Manheim, pp. 376-9.
67. Champion, p. 200.
68. Champion, pp. 208-9 notices several similarities, exclusively in Part Two, with Shakespeare's play.
69. William Hazlitt, Lectures on the Literature of the Age of Elizabeth (1820 reprinted 1882), p. 95.
70. Baldwin Maxwell, Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger (Chapel Hill, 1939), pp. 29-45 gives a full account of the evidence for dating the play in 1611. Although he objects to its description as a sequel or continuation in a strict sense, 'sequel' is a convenient term in a discussion of the two related plays.
71. A contemporary manuscript is discussed by George B. Ferguson in his edition of the play (The Hague, 1966) which is the basis for all quotations.

72. The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert, edited by Joseph Quincy Adams (New Haven, 1917), pp. 20,53.
73. Dramatic Records, p. 53.
74. Quoted and discussed in Hazelton Spencer, Shakespeare Improved (Cambridge, Mass., 1927 reprinted N.Y., 1963), p. 279.
75. Arthur Melville Clark, Thomas Heywood (Oxford, 1931), p. 110.
76. Gerald Eades Bentley, The Jacobean and Caroline Stage, 7 vols (Oxford, 1941-68), IV,568. Robert K. Turner, Jr, 'The Text of Heywood's The Fair Maid of the West', The Library, 5th ser. 22 (1967), p. 299 writes: 'What slender evidence there is, then, suggests that Heywood wrote Part II some thirty years after Part I'.
77. Brownell Salomon, introduction to The Fair Maid of the West, Part I, Salzburg Studies in English Literature 36 (Salzburg, 1975), pp. 3-13.
78. Arber IV, 254.
79. Turner, p. 299.
80. Bentley IV,570. The Company performed at Hampton Court three times between 10 October 1630 and 20 February 1630/1.
81. Turner, p. 312 n credits R.A. Sayce with the observation 'that the printer may have omitted page numbers from Part II as a means of distinguishing its sheets from those of Part I'.
82. ll. 4-7. All references are to the RRDS edition by Robert K. Turner, Jr (1968).
83. More exotic precedents may be The Knight of Malta (1616-19) by Fletcher, Field, and Massinger (noticed by Eldred Jones, Othello's Countrymen (1965), p. 116) or Soliman and Perseda (1587-92).
84. Part One, V.i.129 and Part Two, I.i.50 for jokes on barbers and Barbary; Part One, V.i.110 and Part Two, IV.ii.13 for his quotation (also in The Tamer Tamed, II,vi.156-7) from The Spanish Tragedy.
85. Clark, pp. 213,216.
86. Bentley IV,570.
87. Bentley IV,570.

CHAPTER IX

Conclusion

In the absence of established (or contemporary) critical theory, the publication of Tamburlaine gave direction to each of the ways in which two-part plays were developed. Its title-page description as a single work 'divided' into two parts was the ambitious design which plays by Shakespeare, Heywood, Munday, Marston, and Chapman achieved and to which plays by Greene and other dramatists aspired - apparently without success. The unexpected response to theatrical circumstances, which Marlowe admitted was the inspiration for Part Two, became the more widely followed process by which second parts were written. The only other play printed in 1590, The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London, represents a variation on the unanticipated sequel when it shared in a revival of the original play after a considerable interval. Although Wilson's play appears to be the first sequel written after Tamburlaine, Greene is probably the first dramatist to plan a two-part play and Shakespeare the first to complete a planned sequence. The earliest performed sequels of the permanent theatre have an unrecognized importance to the history of English drama. An account of this influence during the crucial years of the Elizabethan stage and a parallel between it and the development of the Greek Theatre must await a consideration of the issues which this study has raised concerning the values and limitations of sequels.

Only two closely related plays which were initially planned as a sequence were printed for presentation in one volume. Part One of Edward IV and The Conspiracy of Charles, Duke of Byron contain confident anticipations of the directions of their second parts. The French campaign and the continuing saga of Shore and his wife in Edward IV and the conflict between Henry IV and Byron in Chapman's play are necessary developments to which the earlier plays call attention well

before their final scenes. Two-part plays published individually in the same year which, like Edward IV and Byron, share one entry in the Stationers' Register include the Huntington plays and Antonio and Mellida. Part One of Sir John Oldcastle was also registered with its second part which, however, does not seem to have been printed. While Munday's sequel fulfils many of the expectations advertised in The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington, its division into two tragedies and its deferment of Richard Coeur de Lion to a third play creates a structure which, although not without its own interest, diffuses its ingredients into two rather distinct narrative units held together primarily in the juxtaposition possible from continuous performance. The shock tactics of Marston's Antonio's Revenge receive little direct warning and the slight indication of a second part mentioned in the induction to the first play proves to be without foundation. The lost successor to the printed Oldcastle play, if the difficulties of collaboration present in its final act were overcome, might be expected to remain faithful to the special purpose of biographical apotheosis which led to its commission.

The form of Tamburlaine to which Greene and the author of Selimus were attracted as a charm against failure but which remained an abandoned ambition led to the tentative planning of sequels. The authors of these detached first parts, which also include Edmund Ironside and to some extent 1 Henry VI, were the first playwrights to apportion common source material into distinct sections and unify a particular phase of their subject before going on to its completion in subsequent plays. The biographical conqueror plays make a direct appeal to their audience to encourage a continuation. The English History plays rely on a dangerous threat to their temporary historical resolutions for suspense about the stability of peace. The direct or semi-direct advertisement of sequels was never a very successful device. Alphonsus and Selimus and possibly Edmund Ironside remained incomplete while Shakespeare developed new interests and skills which left the characterization and emphases of 1 Henry VI for the very quick

entry into domestic civil war and the rise of Richard of Gloucester. Marston's induction, Munday's induction framework, and Shakespeare's Epilogue to 2 Henry IV contain some premature promises. The surest authorial announcements are found in Heywood's Ages and accounted for by his familiarity with the material of the future plays, the eventual destiny of his gods and heroes. Even in its inferior texts, the first successfully planned sequence of plays, Shakespeare's 2 and 3 Henry VI, was published as a first part and a continuation making up the 'whole contention'. They were reprinted in 1600 with their former title-pages, transferred together to Thomas Pavier as first and second parts, and reprinted with continuous collation and identical running-titles for the intended Shakespeare collection in 1619. For the first time since Tamburlaine, the title-page presented a single work, 'The Whole Contention', with the description that it was 'Divided into two Parts'.

The larger number of sequels which can be termed unanticipated have acquired the epithets of 'illegitimate'¹ and 'unpremeditated' which imply illicit or criminal activity. The extant plays of this variety are predominantly comedies. Continuations from original plays with historical interest include 2 Tamburlaine, The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois, and possibly 1 Hieronimo as the battle of Alcantara fought between Spain and Portugal in 1580 does not seem to be treated as an historical event. Continuity is not of very much importance to Look About You, The Merry Wives of Windsor, 2 The Fair Maid of the West, or John of Bordeaux which have English historical elements in their predecessors. The more serious sequels by Marlowe and Chapman retain historical characters while abandoning a continuous framework of historical situations. The freedom of these fictitious sequels of foreign history is also a feature of the imitations of Tamburlaine such as Alphonsus, Selimus, and 1 Tamar Cham which in order to move closer to the successful biographical unity of Marlowe's play manipulate their heroes accordingly.

Dramatists without a supply of chronologically organized source material such as was available for Shakespeare's history plays or Heywood's Ages were faced with special problems although they shared many. Among these areas of decision were the continuation or abandonment of established characters, the introduction of new characters, the creation of a structure that was independent or analogous to the original play, the adaptation of already proven and successful features, the quantitative and qualitative use of cross-references especially in the opening scenes, and the indication of a temporal relationship to the previous play.

Tamburlaine may have acquired its sequel very quickly after its original success but of all the two-part plays it represents the longest narrative interval between its two parts. For his three sons to have grown to warrior status after the marriage to Zenocrate, a considerable number of years must be imagined to have passed. At the opposite extreme, Antonio's Revenge follows the action of its predecessor with only a few hours separating the plays. Non-historical sequels usually make little effort to present a specific time-scheme which relates it to an earlier play. The intervals before the sequels by Wilson, Dekker, and Fletcher can only be measured in years and Friar Bacon is shown as an aged visitor to Germany. A much shorter passage of time is necessary for the intrigue in 2 The Fair Maid of the West and the revenge for the death of Bussy D'Ambois. While 1 Hieronimo is designed to join the opening scene of The Spanish Tragedy, Look About You with the younger Robin Hood does not attempt a similar link and it may be compared to an unwritten play featuring a corpulent Jack Falstaff as a merry page to Mowbray. The lost Rising of Cardinal Wolsey and The First Introduction to the Civil Wars of France seem to be the only other first parts written last, although the Epilogue to Henry V recognizes a similar situation. Except for the English History plays, Shakespeare's in particular, a time-scheme relating the beginning of a new play to that of its predecessor does not seem to have been a pressing

concern. The marriage of Margaret to Henry VI, the effects of the battle of St Albans, the funeral of Henry VI, the death of Richard II, the effects of the battle of Shrewsbury, and the coronation of Henry V are the subjects with which Shakespeare introduces his linked history plays after the previous play has led up to them.

The composition of sequels did not require dramatists to be very definite about the passage of time or aging of their characters and 2 Henry IV stands as a special exception to both contemporary and Shakespeare's own practice. An issue of more importance was the choice of characters for the new play. The cast of an original play did not dictate that of its sequel in any genre. In regard to major speaking roles, 1 Hieronimo has the closest relationship to its predecessor and an effort was made to find a place for most of the characters in The Spanish Tragedy, although it meant returning Andrea and Don Rogero to life and disposing of Don Pedro prematurely. The early court intrigue against Andrea required the invention of three new characters to form a conspiracy with Lorenzo. Apart from this unusual sequel, the Henry IV plays share the most characters, with thirteen. There are ten returning characters in Richard III including two ghosts while the future Edward V and Henry Richmond return after their silent appearances in 3 Henry VI. An equal number are retained in Marston's sequel and 2 The Fair Maid of the West, both of which begin with a short interval after the conclusion of their first parts. In addition to the ghosts of Henry VI and his son, those of Andrugio and Bussy D'Ambois haunt sequels after their deaths in earlier plays. The remaining sequels retain a core of between five (Tamburlaine) and nine (Henry V) characters from the previous play. Petruchio is the only character which Fletcher reintroduces, 1 Henry IV continues with three, while John of Bordeaux also contains three familiar characters with Bacon joining Vandermast and the Emperor of Germany after his long journey. The varied interests of the Huntington-Matilda plays and Edward IV require large casts and extensive doubling in their nearly

self-contained sections of historical or legendary focus.

A truer picture of the relationships of dramatis personae is found in the number of characters with new names who bear similarities to previous characterizations. The opponents and victims of Tamburlaine, some of the fathers and sons in the Wars of the Roses, Perce in John of Bordeaux, Lazarotto in 1 Hieronimo, and Pandulpho Feliche in Antonio's Revenge are examples of characters assuming familiar dramatic functions. Aspects of Agydas are distributed to Calyphas and Almeda in 2 Tamburlaine, the replacement of conspirators with legal figures parallels the change of allegiance of La Fin in The Tragedy of Byron, and the inmates of Bedlam become the denizens of Bridewell in 2 The Honest Whore. Massive adjustments of minor characters are necessary for Matilda's tragedy, the political events of 2 Edward IV, and the fast developments of Heywood's Ages.

It would seem to follow that sequels with the fewest returning characters contain the greatest opportunity for introducing new directions and interests but this is not always the case. The introduction of a new character, especially to a family or marriage that had functioned without them in an earlier play, sometimes has the effect of injecting a sequel with entirely new motivations. The writers of sequels are responsible for a number of marriages, unexpected arrivals of relatives, births, and deaths, very often without historical authority for their god-like powers. Between sequels and original plays, marriages are performed for Simplicity and Pistol while Candido and Petruchio become widowers and acquire new and unmanageable brides: The Tamer Tamed owes its inception to this latter event. The appearance for the first time of Callapine, Tamburlaine's sons, Orlando Friscobaldo, Andrugio's widow, Clermont D'Ambois, and Mullisheg's wife allows a new life to subjects of original plays that seem to have reached a terminal point. Pandulpho Feliche and Julio come to the dramatic aid of Marston's revenge play while Clermont's sister and her husband help the reluctant revenger of Bussy D'Ambois into his considered

stoical position. After their vigorous dramatic careers, Robin Hood and Matilda, the Shores, and Falstaff are given sad and sentimental deaths. The critical activity of later years which treats dramatic characters as real people with girlhoods, boyhoods, and extra-dramatic domestic lives can find an ample justification from sequels, many of which were encouraged by audiences who desired to see 'more' of their favourite characters.

In addition to continuous time-schemes and settings, and the reappearance of characters, plays are related directly with specific verbal allusions or indirectly with structural repetition. Exposition is the most obvious area for a summary of the action which has occurred in a previous play. The often indefinite references to time intervals may result from the intention of dramatists to begin a new action rather than feel constrained by the completion of an old one, with the consequence that interpolated references to previous plays sometimes assume the status of topical allusions rather than necessary exposition. The non-historical sequels with the closest temporal relationships, Antonio's Revenge and 2 The Fair Maid of the West, make a very determined effort to escape from an immediate concern with antecedent action. In the few hours of the previous night, Piero has accomplished two daring murders and the vivid theatrical pride with which he announces them is the first phase of an ingenious and ironic manipulation of both the audience who may be familiar with the previous play and the characters who are unaware of his villainy. The juxtaposition of contrasting atmospheres and levels of awareness is a skilful answer to the difficulties of writing a sequel and Marston deserves credit for the careful control of these early episodes. The hanging body of Feliche achieves a peak of visual horror for both the audience and the characters on the stage. The first-hand description of the violence in the opening scene and Antonio's ominous vision of it in his reported dream leave the audience in no doubt about the direction of the play. The suspense before the innocent characters recognize their new situations repeats and thus

achieves independence from the broader two-part juxtaposition of comedy to tragedy. In a less satisfactory manner, Heywood begins his sequel with the unexpected appearance of Tota. Her motives for revenge and Mullisheg's relapse into illicit passion soon account for the new dangers to Bess Bridges. The renewal of passion by both Piero and Mullisheg seeks with different levels of success to avoid an easy fulfilment of the concluding marriage preparations in their predecessors. Later, the related figures of Balurdo and Clem become the principal agents of persistent, irritating, and somewhat unnecessary references to their earlier dramatic lives.

It has been noticed that dramatists took the opportunity to time intervals between plays to make considerable changes in their dramatis personae. The least concern with details of a previous play occurs in The Tamar Tamed, the only certain occasion when a different author borrowed and extended a subject treated by another dramatist. The closely unified Byron plays have a very intricate degree of verbal cross-reference and its recognition as one long work with a combined title was clearly intended by Chapman. The inductions to The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington and 2 Henry IV supply a helpful means of exposition which at the same time present the return of lively antiquarian interest with Skelton and the thematically important introduction of Rumour. The Chorus in 2 Edward IV is a more direct announcement of continuation but Matthew's recent difficulties require more explanation than the traditional fortunes of his wife. Part Two of The Honest Whore and 2 Henry IV rely on a double moral time structure for Bellafront and Hal to re-enact or re-prove the sincerity of their reformations. Dekker's play and Chapman's revenge sequel show a more than usual recognition, by contrasts and references, of extended debates or interviews in their predecessors. Marlowe, Greene, and Wilson also feel a confident freedom to refer to specific incidents in previous dramatizations. The creators of Tamburlaine, Friar Bacon, and Falstaff seem to have been sure that such retrospective reference would be appreciated.

Historical plays have the advantage of assuming preknowledge of dramatized and undramatized events of earlier history. The exposition in 2 and 3 Henry VI, 1 Henry IV, and Henry V provides no specific difficulties except perhaps for genealogy in the earlier histories. In Richard II and Richard III, special situations arise. The existence of Woodstock seems to have affected some of the early references to previous events in Richard II while in Richard III, the most retrospective play considered in the present study, Shakespeare's references to the past are committed through frequent repetition to presenting the play as the culmination not only of a long period of history but also of a long sequence of plays. Margaret and Henry VI (as a ghost) are appearing in their fourth plays. Apart from the general allusions to well-known historical events, Shakespeare makes a special effort to recall dramatic events through lament, curse, and dream scenes, but a surprising number of references to what seem like dramatic events have no basis in the previous plays or in history. Shakespeare's first use a major central figure in this history play goes a long way toward overcoming the difficulties of retrospection and his success in this respect is indicated in the frequent quartos of the play and its long history of independent performance.

There are often close relationships between the quality of direct cross-reference and similarities in structure that draw attention in an indirect way to the design of an earlier play. While nearly all sequels show the influence of their predecessors in suggesting character relationships and new ways in which older and presumably successful material can be redeveloped, the repetition of situations and the development of related material indicate various degrees of dependence on and interrelationship with the immediate and convenient source plays. In plays with sustained biographical interests in which a single protagonist approaches a peak of success (usually military) and security (usually through marriage) in the first play and falls gradually from that high point in a sequel, symmetrical tendencies are most often evident.

Tamburlaine and the three first parts in imitation of Marlowe's play show this design most clearly. The success plots of 1 Tamburlaine and 1 Tamar Cham have reason to be associated with the title-page description of the most obvious manifestation of this form in Alphonsus, published as a 'Comicall Historie'. The path of decline to tragedy or at least death would have been the logical direction of the unwritten or lost second parts of these conquest plays.

The rise and fall structure of the two-part play is seen next, though in less clearly marked stages, in the fortunes of Jane Shore and Falstaff. Chapman returns to this design for the heroic subject of Byron and brings it to such a high level of achievement that it is easier to see the theatrical disadvantages that adhered to the ambitious scale to which some sequels aspired. Part Two of Tamburlaine with its careful dependence on intellectually organized parallels was perhaps more fortunate in the theatricality of its language and staging, a widely recognized attraction to the Elizabethan audience. It must be remembered that Tamburlaine is the only one of Marlowe's plays published during his lifetime and the authorial nature of the text, carefully divided for literary appearance, may suggest that the finer structural effects of Part Two could receive their fullest appreciation in the hands of the reader rather than in the distraction and pace of performance. Of all the two-part plays, Byron comes the closest to a closet drama with its many speeches of reasoned debate and it seems likely that when it was brought to the stage, material of a more theatrical nature, the scenes which offended the French ambassador, had to be added for the benefit of spectators. If the principal stimulus for publication was the scandal it provoked, Chapman's sense of discouragement (which he was to feel on more than one occasion) may have contributed to the presence of some of the controversial material, to the detriment of the already censored and 'dismembered poems'. Byron and Tamburlaine are special cases in which a literary unity of close and ordered parallelism departs from the more usual presence of parallels

which are isolated at intervals or used as a framing device at the beginning and conclusion of a sequel.

The fall of a protagonist representing a reversal of his fortune in an original or first play is the earliest form in which the two-part play was developed. About ten years after the publication of Tamburlaine when the two-part play was in the process of exhausting English history and depending on a greater use of comic and legendary material, Marston's rather daring and original Antonio plays seem to have given a new inspiration for some of the sequels written in the early seventeenth century. It is easier to demonstrate Marston's direct influence on extant two-part plays than it is Shakespeare's, whose Henry IV plays have been suggested as inspiring 'a considerable crop of other two-part plays with historical themes'.² Marston and Marlowe (and Heywood if Edward IV is his) were about the same young age when their first plays were published and each dramatist marked an ambitious entry into print with a two-part play.

Where Marlowe without historical sources was nevertheless committed to dramatizing the life of Tamburlaine to his death and presenting events in his decline with intricate parallels to the progress of his rise in Part One, Marston introduced a new and exaggerated kind of reversal in his sequel. After the conventions of comedy and revenge tragedy on which he depends had been established for several years, their use by boys' companies for startling effects seems to have influenced the sequels of later dramatists. The renewed and unexpected passion of Piero for Maria with the ironic reversals which could be developed from this situation is present in Dekker's Hippolito, Fletcher's Petruchio, and Heywood's Mullisheg. With the exception of Chapman's plays and Heywood's Ages, which bear special relationships to philosophical interests and the popularization of classical legend, respectively, the few Jacobean sequels depend on ironic reversal of situation rather than on a reversal of fortune from triumph to defeat and death. Consistency of motivation and characterization is disregarded in order to achieve new and striking emphases.

To varying degrees, repetition is a consistent feature of dramatic sequels. The sequels which seem to have been written very soon after the production of their predecessors or prepared with an earlier play for joint performance or nearly consecutive performance have a greater frequency of structural contacts. Matilda's tragedy on a reduced scale follows the pattern of Huntington's career through one play and the beginning of another. The organization of blocks of historical material at the beginning of each part of Edward IV before the dramatist turns to the Jane Shore story follows the same principle although its execution appears to be a cruder variation. The involvement of Matthew Shore in chronicle history and the link between the sieges of the King help to soften the evident structural difficulty of integrating such diverse materials. Like the Huntington plays and 2 Edward IV, 2 The Fair Maid of the West requires a Chorus to rescue continuity when an abrupt conclusion occurs within the play.

Although the alternation of comic and historical scenes in the two parts of Henry IV follows a regular pattern, Shakespeare's control over his material prevents similar tendencies toward composite structure, although the comedy and history are less closely related in Part Two. The King and his son are kept out of the play in absence of a literal antagonist such as Hotspur provided Hal in the earlier play. Part Two of Tamburlaine without Bajazeth and 2 Henry IV without Hotspur encourage the creation of abstract opponents such as death and age, respectively, to sustain suspense and conflict. The central tavern scene and other aspects of Falstaff's appearance in Part Two have their sources in Part One. A second part frequently owes its organization to an earlier play and the extent of this debt is almost always greater than that involving source plays for single plays.

The issues that have been raised concerning verbal cross-reference, structural interrelationship, and the tendency toward composite structures point to some of the disadvantages of two-part plays. It required a great amount of effort and ingenuity for a playwright to continue a subject beyond an original terminal point. The

sequels in this category were likely to be intellectually dependent on their predecessor or unable to maintain a full-length play after the original impulse became quickly exhausted. This tendency toward a composite play of diverse materials is seen most clearly in The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington, 2 The Fair Maid of the West, and 2 The Iron Age. The plays by Heywood have nearly detachable final sections of two acts which require a new setting or a new and complicated pattern of revenge, respectively, with the sudden introduction of new characters. In the case of 2 The Iron Age Heywood's organization of material had already slipped into composite structure in The Brazen Age, really five plays in one as its title-page advertises. The sequels to The Fair Maid of the West and Bussy D'Ambois make a desperate but finally unsatisfactory attempt to divert attention from the tired repetition of situations and motifs that had already been fully explored. The attempts to follow self-contained tragedies with sequels were few and Jacobean playwrights were wise not to repeat what Chapman had done.

The surest way of allowing an audience to recognize any special relationships which were intended in two parts of a play was through publication. The suspicious presentation of The Troublesome Reign of King John and If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody points toward the reading value of two-part plays. Tamburlaine and Edward IV with two plays to each volume were often reprinted while later in the century, Heywood's Ages and the Hieronimo plays were sold together. Only very successful plays could expect a returning audience to appreciate subtle verbal and structural unifying devices and in the cases where sequels were written after a long interval there is often good reason to suppose they resulted from a revival of the original play or were specially written when a revival was anticipated. The sequels of Wilson and Chapman in this respect include the titles of the older original plays within their own new ones. It is unlikely that the plays in Shakespeare's tetralogies or Heywood's Ages were performed in week-long festivals for the benefit of the few spectators

who might be available or willing to look for a grand design.

Even when two-part plays held theatrical value beyond a season the large number of abridgements points to a growing recognition that the best features from them could be most effective only from amalgamation. In addition to the two-part plays represented by The Escapes of Jupiter, the Dering manuscript, Old Fortunatus, and Sir Thomas Wyatt, evidence for a similar flexibility exists in regard to a Jane Shore play and Fortune's Tennis. After the exhaustion of the English History play, very few two-part sequences were written during James's reign. That so few examples of sequels from Henslowe's professional dramatists survive may confirm what the speed of their composition suggests; from the point of view of the dramatist it was easier to continue familiar subjects than it was to begin a new one. Their prolificity with printed sources such as the chronicles and Deloney's fiction, which furnished four linked plays, probably contributed to shorter and shorter runs and consequently more and more new plays or sequels whenever possible, since they earned the same money. At least four related plays resulted from the evident success of Munday's use of Robin Hood. Not enough is known of the attraction of individual actors to determine their role in the continuation of popular characters but from the point of view of management and finance, some importance must have been attached to already purchased properties, especially if the presence of historical costumes contributed to the composition and casting of appropriate plays.

The composition of Shakespeare's Histories parallels the developments that have been described after the initial period of excitement and creativity during the late 1580s and 1590s when sequels first joined English drama. The long period of history which Shakespeare chose for his first tetralogy points increasingly forward to Bosworth field and when that point is reached, recapitulation is a significant feature both before and after the death of Richard III. Yet during the steady accumulation of dramatized history, Shakespeare takes pains to organize each play with an individual structure which bears a close relationship to the subject

of each phase of history. Geoffrey Bullough has concluded that these early histories provided

a valuable training in compressing lengthy actions, selecting episodes, grouping characters, and discovering patterns of likeness and contrast, different sorts of climax.³

His further observation that 'Shakespeare's dramatic technique developed before his poetic genius'⁴ is relevant to the consciously sustained differences in tone and atmosphere that distinguish the plays of the second tetralogy which deal with a much shorter period of history. While historical time continues through them, dramatic time begins and ends in the self-contained limits of each play. The earliest critical description of two of Shakespeare's adjacent historical plays may refer to a disadvantage of the earlier sequence which Shakespeare was not to repeat. Ben Jonson's allusion to the 'long jars' of York and Lancaster in the Prologue to the Anglicized version of Every Man in his Humour may be taken as a reference not only to the historical duration of the Wars of the Roses but also to the excessive dramatic time necessary for their presentation. The scale of Shakespeare's youthful ambition, while important to his development as a dramatist and the firm establishment of the genre of the English History play, has nevertheless resulted in the theatrical neglect of these plays on the modern stage.

The name of Aeschylus has on occasion entered critical discussions of Shakespeare's first tetralogy. While no direct relationships can ever be demonstrated between the achievements of the Greek and English dramatists, the observations of Goethe on the decline of Greek drama have been relevant to the exhaustion of the English historical drama where more than sixty titles of lost and extant plays are known. A parallel between the origins of Greek drama and the importance of sequels to the growth of English drama may now be suggested. In a study which has disclaimed the somewhat vague birth of tragedy through ritual and evolution, Gerald F. Else has re-directed emphasis to 'successive creative acts by ... men of

genius ... with certain conditioning factors precedent to each'.⁵ It is just this kind of description that can apply to the sudden achievements of English drama in the three or four years after the first performance of Tamburlaine. Marlowe's play gave a new impetus to dramatic literature. It attracted Greene to the stage and indirectly led to his more comfortable successes in romantic comedy with Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay establishing a native model in this genre. Kyd's accomplishment in revenge tragedy was, like Friar Bacon, a recognized landmark. Each play acquired a sequel which doubtless further drew attention to its major characters and the new kind of dramatic action that both dramatists created. Finally, Shakespeare's 1 Henry VI, also influenced by Tamburlaine and perhaps his first work for the stage, and the succeeding history plays indicate his early recognition, encouragement, confidence, and youthful ambition. They established a fourth influential model in a particular genre where achievement was made more prominent as the result of Marlowe's innovation of the dramatic sequel.

Notes to Chapter IX

1. W.J. Lawrence, Pre-Restoration Stage Studies (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), p. 350.
2. Clifford Leech, 'The Two-Part Play: Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare', Shakespeare Jahrbuch, 94 (1958), p. 105. This is recalled by J.M.R. Margeson, 'Dramatic Form: the Huntington Plays', SEL, 14 (1974), p. 233.

A brief note may be added here on later developments of the two-part play. Lodowick Carlell, an amateur dramatist, wrote Arviragus and Philicia (1635-6) and The Passionate Lovers (1629-38) in two parts for court performances before the interregnum. Some closet dramas and political dialogues are so divided before the opening of the theatres. In the later seventeenth century, heroic subjects such as The Siege of Rhodes (Davenant, 1656-9), The Conquest of Granada (Dryden, 1670-1), and The Destruction of Jerusalem (Crowne, 1677) were accommodated by the larger scale of two parts. The reading value of longer dramatic works, a feature recognized in Elizabethan and Jacobean England, applies to Goethe's Faust and Hardy's The Dynasts when the romans fleuves of Balzac and Zola were beginning and ending, respectively. Also notable is O'Neill's trilogy, Mourning Becomes Electra. The modern film industry which seems to have influenced prejudices towards sequels by many critics exploits popular subjects in the same way that the dramatists of Henslowe's companies did.

3. Bullough VIII, 352.
4. Bullough VIII, 352.
5. Gerald F. Else, The Origin and Early Form of Greek Tragedy (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), pp. 2,7.

Select Bibliography

The Bibliography is arranged in three sections: A. Dramatic Works, B. Additional Primary Sources, and C. Secondary Sources. Abbreviations for The Malone Society Reprints (MSR), New Cambridge Shakespeare (NCS), and Regents Renaissance Drama Series (RRDS) continue to be employed.

A. Dramatic Works

1. Collections

Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses, edited by W.W. Greg, 2 vols (Oxford, 1931)

'Lost' Tudor Plays, edited by John S. Farmer, *Early English Dramatists* (1907)

Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, edited by Geoffrey Bullough, 8 vols (1957-75)

A Select Collection of Old English Plays, edited by Robert Dodsley, fourth edition, edited by W. Carew Hazlitt, 15 vols (1874-6)

The Shakespeare Apocrypha, edited by C.F. Tucker Brooke (Oxford, 1908)

Shakespeare's Library, edited by J.P. Collier, second edition, edited by William Carew Hazlitt, 6 vols (1875)

Six Early Plays Related to the Shakespeare Canon, edited by E.B. Everitt and R.L. Armstrong, *Anglistica XIV* (Copenhagen, 1965)

2. Plays of Unknown or Uncertain Authorship

The Tragedy of Master Arden of Faversham, edited by M.L. Wine, *The Revels Plays* (1973)

Edmund Ironside; or, War Hath Made All Friends, edited by Eleanore Boswell and W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1927)

John of Bordeaux; or, The Second Part of Friar Bacon, edited by W.L. Renwick and W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1935 [1936])

Look About You, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1913)

The Three Parnassus Plays (1598-1601), edited by J.B. Leishman (1949)

The Second Maiden's Tragedy, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1909)

The Tragical Reign of Selimus, edited by W. Bang and W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1908)

The Tragical Reign of Selimus, edited by Alexander B. Grosart (1898)

The Troublesome Reign of John, King of England, edited by J.S. Farmer, *Old English Drama Students' Facsimile Edition*, 2 vols (1911)

The True Tragedy of Richard the Third, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1929)

The Wars of Cyrus, edited by James Paul Brawner (Urbana, 1942)

The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second; or, Thomas of Woodstock, edited by Wilhelmina P. Frijlinck and W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1929)

Woodstock, A Moral History, edited by A.P. Rossiter (1946)

3. Plays of Known Authorship

- Beaumont, Francis, The Knight of the Burning Pestle, edited by Michael Hattaway, The New Mermaids (1969)
- Chapman, George, Bussy D'Ambois, edited by Nicholas Brooke, The Revels Plays (1964)
- Bussy D'Ambois, edited by Maurice Evans, The New Mermaids (1965)
- Bussy D'Ambois, edited by Robert J. Lordi, RRDS (1964)
- The Plays and Poems, edited by Thomas Marc Parrott, 2 vols (1910-14)
- Chapman, George, Ben Jonson, and John Marston, Eastward Ho!, edited by C.G. Petter, The New Mermaids (1973)
- Chettle, Henry, The Tragedy of Hoffman, edited by Harold Jenkins, MSR (Oxford, 1950 [1951])
- Day, John, The Works, edited by A.H. Bullen, with an introduction by Robin Jeffs (1881 reprinted 1963)
- Dekker, Thomas, The Dramatic Works, edited by Fredson Bowers, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1953-61)
- Drayton, Michael, Richard Hathway, Anthony Munday, and Robert Wilson, The Life of Sir John Oldcastle, edited by Percy Simpson and W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1908)
- Fletcher John, The Woman's Prize; or, The Tamer Tamed, edited by George B. Ferguson (The Hague, 1966)
- Greene, Robert, Alphonsus King of Aragon, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1926)
- Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1926)
- Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, edited by J.A. Lavin, The New Mermaids (1969)
- The Plays and Poems, edited by J. Churton Collins, 2 vols (Oxford, 1905)
- Heywood, Thomas, The Dramatic Works, edited by [R.H. Shepherd], 6 vols (1874)
- The Fair Maid of the West, Part I, edited by Brownell Salomon, Salzburg Studies in English Literature 36 (Salzburg, 1975)
- The Fair Maid of the West, Parts I and II, edited by Robert K. Turner, Jr, RRDS (1968)
- The First and Second Parts of King Edward IV, edited by Barron Field, The Shakespeare Society (1842)
- If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody, Part I, edited by Madeleine Doran and W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1934 [1935])
- If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody, Part II, edited by Madeleine Doran and W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1934 [1935])
- Kyd, Thomas, The First Part of Hieronimo and The Spanish Tragedy, edited by Andrew S. Cairncross, RRDS (1967)
- The Spanish Tragedy, edited by Philip Edwards, The Revels Plays (1959)
- The Spanish Tragedy, edited by J.R. Mulryne, The New Mermaids (1970)

- Kyd, Thomas, The Works, edited by Frederick S. Boas, (Oxford, 1901)
- Lyly, John, Gallathea and Midas, edited by Anne Begor Lancashire, RRDS (1970)
- Marlowe, Christopher, The Complete Works, edited by Fredson Bowers, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1973)
- The Life of Marlowe and 'The Tragedy of Dido Queen of Carthage', edited by C.F. Tucker Brooke, in the Methuan series The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe, general editor R.H. Case (1930)
- The Plays, edited by Roma Gill (1971)
- The Plays, edited by Leo Kirschbaum (Cleveland, 1962)
- Tamburlaine the Great, edited by U.M. Ellis-Fermor, in the Methuan series The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe, general editor R.H. Case (1930)
- Tamburlaine the Great 1593, introductory note by Roma Gill, Scolar Press Facsimile (Menston, 1973)
- Tamburlaine, edited by J.W. Harper, The New Mermaids (1971)
- Tamburlaine the Great, Parts I and II, edited by John D. Jump, RRDS (1967)
- Marston, John, Antonio and Mellida, edited by G.K. Hunter, RRDS (1965)
- Antonio's Revenge, edited by G.K. Hunter, RRDS (1966)
- Medwall, Henry, Fulgens and Lucre, edited by F.S. Boas and A.W. Reed (Oxford, 1926)
- Middleton, Thomas, Hengist, King of Kent; or, The Mayor of Queenborough, edited by R.C. Bald (N.Y., 1938)
- The Works, edited by A.H. Bullen, 8 vols (1885-6)
- Munday, Anthony, The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon, edited by John C. Meagher and Arthur Brown, MSR (Oxford, 1965 [1967])
- The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon, edited by John C. Meagher and Arthur Brown, MSR (Oxford, 1964 [1965])
- Sir Thomas More, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1911)
- Porter, Henry, The Two Angry Women of Abington, edited by W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1912)
- Rowley, Samuel, When You See Me, You Know Me, edited by F.P. Wilson and John Crow, MSR (Oxford, 1952)
- Shakespeare, William, The Complete Works, edited by G.B. Harrison (N.Y., 1948)
- Henry the Fourth, Part I, edited by Samuel Burdett Hemingway, New Variorum Shakespeare (Philadelphia, 1936)
- The First Part of King Henry IV, edited by A.R. Humphreys, The Arden Shakespeare (1960 reprinted 1970)
- The First Part of the History of Henry IV, edited by John Dover Wilson, NCS (Cambridge, 1946)
- The Second Part of King Henry IV, edited by A.R. Humphreys, The Arden Shakespeare (1966 reprinted 1970)

- Shakespeare, William, The Second Part of Henry the Fourth, edited by Matthias A. Shaaber, New Variorum Shakespeare (Philadelphia, 1940)
- The History of King Henry the Fourth, as revised by Sir Edward Dering, Bart., A Facsimile Edition prepared by George Walton Williams and Gwynne Blakemore Evans (Charlottesville, 1974)
- King Henry V, edited by J.H. Walter, The Arden Shakespeare (1954 reprinted 1970)
- King Henry V, edited by John Dover Wilson, NCS (Cambridge, 1947)
- The First Part of King Henry VI, edited by Andrew S. Cairncross, The Arden Shakespeare (1962 reprinted 1969)
- The First Part of King Henry VI, edited by John Dover Wilson, NCS (Cambridge, 1952)
- The Second Part of King Henry VI, edited by Andrew S. Cairncross, The Arden Shakespeare (1957 reprinted 1969)
- The Second Part of King Henry VI, edited by John Dover Wilson, NCS (Cambridge, 1952)
- The Third Part of King Henry VI, edited by Andrew S. Cairncross, The Arden Shakespeare (1964 reprinted 1969)
- The Third Part of King Henry the Sixth, edited by H.C. Hart, The [original] Arden Shakespeare, second edition (1925)
- The Third Part of King Henry VI, edited by John Dover Wilson, NCS (Cambridge, 1952)
- The Wars of the Roses, adapted by John Barton and Peter Hall (1970)
- King John, edited by E.A.J. Honigmann, The Arden Shakespeare (1954)
- King John, edited by R.L. Smallwood, New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1974)
- King John, edited by John Dover Wilson, NCS (Cambridge, 1936)
- The Life and Death of King Richard the Second, edited by Matthew W. Black, New Variorum Shakespeare (Philadelphia, 1955)
- The Tragedy of Richard the Second, edited by Kenneth Muir, The Signet Classic Shakespeare (N.Y., 1963)
- King Richard II, edited by Peter Ure, The Arden Shakespeare (1956 reprinted 1972)
- King Richard the Second, edited by Stanley Wells, New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1969)
- King Richard II, edited by John Dover Wilson, NCS (Cambridge, 1939 reprinted 1951)
- King Richard the Third, edited by E.A.J. Honigmann, New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1968)
- The Merchant of Venice, edited by John Russell Brown, The Arden Shakespeare (1955 reprinted 1972)

Shakespeare, William, The Merry Wives of Windsor, edited by G.R. Hibbard, New Penguin Shakespeare (Harmondsworth, 1973)

The Merry Wives of Windsor, edited by H.J. Oliver, The Arden Shakespeare (1971)

Webster, John, The Complete Works, edited by F.L. Lucas, 4 vols (1927)

Wilson, Robert, The Cobler's Prophecy, edited by A.C. Wood and W.W. Greg, MSR (Oxford, 1914)

B. Additional Primary Sources

Adams, Joseph Quincy (ed.), The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert (New Haven, 1917)

Allot, Robert (compiler), Englands Parnassus, edited by Charles Crawford (Oxford, 1913)

Arber, Edward (ed.), A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640, 5 vols (1875-94)

Chettle, Henry, Kind-Harte's Dreame, edited by G.B. Harrison, Elizabethan and Jacobean Quartos (Edinburgh, 1966)

Child, Francis James (ed.), The English and Scottish Popular Ballads, 5 vols (N.Y., 1882-98. reprinted 1957)

Churchyard, Thomas, Churchyards Challenge (1593)

'Shore's Wife' in The Mirror for Magistrates, edited by Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge, 1938), pp. 373-86

Chute, Anthony, Beawtie dishonoured, written under the title of Shores wife (1593)

Daniel, Samuel, Poems and A Defence of Ryme, edited by Arthur Colby Sprague (Cambridge, Mass., 1930 reprinted Chicago, 1965)

Dekker, Thomas, A Knight's Conjuring (1607)

Deloney, Thomas, The Works, edited by Francis Oscar Mann (Oxford, 1912)

Drayton, Michael, Englands Heroicall Epistles (1597)

The Works, edited by J. William Hebel, 5 vols (Oxford, 1931-41)
Volume V is edited by Kathleen Tillotson and Bernard H. Newdigate.

Fletcher, Giles, the Elder, The English Works, edited by Lloyd E. Berry (Madison, 1964)

Freeman, Thomas, Rubbe, and a great cast: Epigrams and Runne and a great cast. The second book (1614)

Greene, Robert, The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse, edited by Alexander B. Grosart, The Huth Library, 15 vols (1881-6 reprinted N.Y., 1964)

Hall, Edward, Chronicle [The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke] (1548 reprinted 1809)

Henslowe's Diary, edited by R.A. Foakes and R.T. Rickert (Cambridge, 1961)

- Henslowe's Diary, edited by W.W. Greg, 2 vols (1904-8)
- Heywood, Thomas, An Apology for Actors (1612)
- Hindley, Charles (ed.), The Roxburghe Ballads, 2 vols (1873-4)
- Jonson, Ben, Discoveries 1641 and Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden 1619, edited by G.B. Harrison, The Bodley Head Quartos (1923)
- Lindsay, Sir David, The Works (Edinburgh, 1568)
- Nashe, Thomas, The Works, edited by Ronald B. McKerrow, second edition, revised by F.P. Wilson, 5 vols (Oxford, 1958)
- Peele, George, The Life and Minor Works, edited by David H. Horne (New Haven, 1952), in the Yale series The Life and Works of George Peele, general editor Charles Tyler Prouty
- Percy, Thomas (ed.), Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, edited by Henry B. Wheatley, 3 vols (1886 reprinted N.Y., 1966)
- Plummer, Charles (ed.), Elizabethan Oxford: Reprints of Rare Tracts, Oxford Historical Society (Oxford, 1887)
- Smith, G. Gregory (ed.), Elizabethan Critical Essays, 2 vols (1904)
- Whetstone, George, The English Mirror (1586)
- Willobie, Henry, Willobie his Avis, edited by G.B. Harrison, The Bodley Head Quartos (1926)

C. Secondary Sources

- Adams, Joseph Quincy, 'The Author-Plot of an Early Seventeenth Century Play', The Library, 4th ser. 26 (1945), 17-27
- 'Captaine Thomas Stukeley', JEGP, 15 (1916), 107-29
- Adkins, Mary Grace Muse, 'Sixteenth-Century Religious and Political Implications in Sir John Oldcastle', University of Texas Studies in English, 22 (1942), 86-104
- Alexander, Peter, Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III (Cambridge, 1929)
- Altick, Richard D., 'Symphonic Imagery in Richard II', PMLA, 62 (1947), 339-65
- Aoki, Keiji, Shakespeare's 'Henry IV' and 'Henry V', Hal's Heroic Character and the Sun-Cloud Theme (Kyoto, Japan, 1973)
- Armstrong, William A., 'The Audience of the Elizabethan Private Theatres', RES, n.s. 10 (1959), 234-49
- Marlowe's Tamburlaine: The Image and the Stage, University of Hull Inaugural Lecture (Hull, 1966)
- Bakeless, John, The Tragical History of Christopher Marlowe, 2 vols (Cambridge, Mass., 1942)
- Baker, George Pierce, The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist (N.Y., 1907 reprinted N.Y., 1965)
- 'Dramatic Technique in Marlowe', Essays and Studies, collected by C.H. Herford, 4 (1913), 172-82

- Baldwin, T.W., On the Literary Genetics of Shakspere's Plays, 1592-1594 (Urbana, 1959)
Shakspere's Love's Labor's Won (Carbondale, Illinois, 1957)
- Barber, C.L., 'The Death of Zenocrate: "Conceiving and subduing both" in Marlowe's Tamburlaine', Literature and Psychology, 16 (1966), 15-24
- Battenhouse, Roy W., Marlowe's Tamburlaine: A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy (Nashville, 1941)
 'The Relation of Henry V to Tamburlaine', SS 27 (1974), 71-9
- Bennett, R.E., 'The Parson of Wrotham in Sir John Oldcastle', MLN, 45 (1930), 142-4
- Bentley, Gerald Eades, The Jacobean and Caroline Stage, 7 vols (Oxford, 1941-68)
The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642 (Princeton, 1971)
- Bergson, Allen, 'Dramatic Style as Parody in Marston's Antonio and Mellida', SEL, 11 (1971), 307-25
- Best, Michael R., 'A Theory of the Literary Genesis of Lyly's Midas', RES, n.s. 17 (1966), 133-40
- Bevington, David M., 'The Dominating Female in 1 Henry VI', Shakespeare Studies, 2 (1966), 51-8
From 'Mankind' to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England (Cambridge, Mass., 1962)
Tudor Drama and Politics (Cambridge, Mass., 1968)
- Black, Matthew W., 'The Sources of Shakespeare's Richard II' in Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies, edited by James G. McManaway, Giles E. Dawson, and Edwin E. Willoughby (Washington, 1948), 199-216
- Blatt, Thora Balslev, The Plays of John Bale (Copenhagen, 1968)
- Boas, Frederick S., Christopher Marlowe, A Biographical and Critical Study (Oxford, 1940)
Shakespeare and the Universities, and other Studies in Elizabethan Drama (Oxford, 1923)
Thomas Heywood (1950)
University Drama in the Tudor Age (Oxford, 1914)
- Bogard, Travis, 'Shakespeare's Second Richard', PMLA, 70 (1955), 192-209
- Bowers, Fredson Thayer, 'Kyd's Pedringano: Sources and Parallels', Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, 13 (1931), 241-9
- Bradbrook, M.C., The Growth and Structure of Elizabethan Comedy (1955)
Shakespeare and Elizabethan Poetry (1951 reprinted Harmondsworth, 1964)
Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy (Cambridge, 1935 reprinted Cambridge, 1969)
- Bradley, A.C., Shakespearean Tragedy (1904 reprinted 1969)

- Brereton, J. Le Gay, Writings on Elizabethan Drama, collected by R.G. Howarth (Melbourne, 1948)
- Brockbank, J.P., 'The Frame of Disorder—Henry VI' in Early Shakespeare, edited by John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, 3 (1961), 73-99
- Brooke, C.F. Tucker, 'The Reputation of Christopher Marlowe', Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 25 (1922), 347-408
- Brown, John Russell, Shakespeare's Plays in Performance (1966 reprinted Harmondsworth, 1969)
- Burckhardt, Sigurd, Shakespearean Meanings (Princeton, 1968)
- Cain, H. Edward, 'Further Light on the Relation of 1 and 2 Henry IV', SQ, 3 (1952), 21-38.
- Cairncross, Andrew S., review of Arthur Freeman, Thomas Kyd, Shakespeare Studies, 5 (1969), 321-5
 'Thomas Kyd and the Myrmidons', Arlington Quarterly, 1 (1968), 40-5
- Caputi, Anthony, John Marston, Satirist (Ithaca, 1961)
- Cardozo, Jacob Lopes, The Contemporary Jew in the Elizabethan Drama (Amsterdam, 1925)
- Chambers, E.K., 'The Date of Marlowe's Tamburlaine', TLS, 28 August 1930, p. 684
The Elizabethan Stage, 4 vols (Oxford, 1923)
William Shakespeare, A Study of Facts and Problems, 2 vols (Oxford, 1930)
- Champion, Larry S., 'From Melodrama to Comedy: A Study of the Dramatic Perspective in Dekker's The Honest Whore, Parts I and II', SP, 69 (1972), 192-209
- Chew, Samuel C., The Crescent and the Rose (N.Y., 1937)
- Clark, Arthur Melville, Thomas Heywood, Playwright and Miscellanist (Oxford, 1931)
- Clemen, Wolfgang, A Commentary on Shakespeare's Richard III, translated by Jean Bonheim (1968)
The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery (1951)
English Tragedy before Shakespeare, translated by T.S. Dorsch (1961 reprinted 1967)
Shakespeare's Dramatic Art (1972)
- Cole, Douglas, 'The Comic Accomplice in Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy', Renaissance Drama, 9 (1966), 125-39
- Cope, Jackson I., '"The Best for Comedy": Richard Edwardes' Canon', Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 2 (1961), 501-19
- Coursen, Herbert R., Jr, 'The Unity of The Spanish Tragedy', SP, 65 (1968), 768-82
- Crawford, Charles, 'Edmund Spenser, Lochrine, and Selimus', N&Q, 104 (1901), 61-3, 101-3, 142-4, 203-5, 261-3, 324-5, 384-6

- Creizenach, Wilhelm, The English Drama in the Age of Shakespeare, translated by Cécile Hugon (1916)
- Danby, John F., Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature (1948 reprinted 1972)
- David, Richard, 'Shakespeare's History Plays; Epic or Drama?', SS 6 (1953), 129-39
- Doran, Madeleine, Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama (Madison, 1954)
- Henry VI, Parts II and III, Their Relation to the 'Contention' and the 'True Tragedy' (Iowa City, [1928])
- Dorius, R.J., 'A Little More than a Little', SQ, 11 (1960), 13-26
- Durand, W.Y., 'Palaemon and Arcyte, Progne, Marcus Geminus, and the Theatre in which they were acted, as described by John Bereblock (1566)', PMLA, 20 (1905), 502-28
- Duthie, G.I., 'The Dramatic Structure of Marlowe's "Tamburlaine the Great", Parts I and II', English Studies, n.s. 1 (1948), 101-26
- Eckermann, Johann Peter, Conversations with Goethe, translated by John Oxenford, edited by J.K. Moorhead (1971)
- Edwards, Philip, Thomas Kyd and Early Elizabethan Tragedy, Writers and their work: no. 192 (1966)
- Ellis-Fermor, U.M., Christopher Marlowe (1927)
- The Frontiers of Drama (1945)
- 'Marlowe and Greene: A Note on Their Relations as Dramatic Artists' in Studies in Honor of T.W. Baldwin, edited by Don Cameron Allen (Urbana, 1958), 136-49
- Else, Gerald F., The Origin and Early Form of Greek Tragedy (Cambridge, Mass., 1967)
- Elson, John James, 'The Non-Shakespearian Richard II and Shakespeare's Henry IV, Part I', SP, 32 (1935), 177-88
- Empson, William, 'Falstaff and Mr. Dover Wilson', Kenyon Review, 15 (1953), 213-66
- 'The Spanish Tragedy' in Elizabethan Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism, edited by R.J. Kaufmann (N.Y., 1961), 60-80
- Evans, G. Blakemore, review of The New Cambridge Shakespeare Henry VI, Parts 1, 2 and 3, SQ, 4 (1953), 84-92
- Everitt, E.B., The Young Shakespeare: Studies in Documentary Evidence, Anglistica II (Copenhagen, 1954)
- Farnham, Willard, The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy (Oxford, 1936 reprinted 1957)
- Finkelpearl, Philip J., John Marston of the Middle Temple (Cambridge, Mass., 1969)

- Foakes, R.A., 'John Marston's Fantastical Plays: Antonio and Mellida and Antonio's Revenge', PQ, 41 (1962), 229-39
 'Mr Levin and "Good Bad Drama"', E in C, 22 (1972), 327-9
Shakespeare, The Dark Comedies to the Last Plays (1971)
- Forker, Charles R., 'Shakespeare's Histories and Heywood's If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody', Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, 66 (1965), 166-78
- Freehafer, John, 'The Contention for Bussy D'Ambois, 1622-41', Theatre Notebook, 23 (1968/9), 61-9
- Freeman, Arthur, Thomas Kyd, Facts and Problems (Oxford, 1967)
- French, A.L., 'Who Deposed Richard the Second?', E in C, 17 (1967), 411-33
- Frost, David L., The School of Shakespeare (Cambridge, 1968)
- Gabel, John Butler, 'The Date of Chapman's Conspiracy and Tragedy of Byron', MP, 66 (1969), 330-2
 'The Original Version of Chapman's Tragedy of Byron', JEGP, 63 (1964), 433-40
- Gardner, Helen L., 'The Second Part of "Tamburlaine the Great"', MLR, 37 (1942), 18-24
- Gilbert, Allan, 'Were Spenser's Nine Comedies Lost?', MLN, 73 (1958), 241-3
- Goddard, Harold C., The Meaning of Shakespeare, 2 vols (Chicago 1951 reprinted Chicago, 1962)
- Golding, M.R., 'Variations in the Use of the Masque in English Revenge Tragedy', The Yearbook of English Studies, 3 (1973), 44-54
- Goldman, Michael, Shakespeare and the Energies of Drama (Princeton, 1972)
- Greg, W.W., A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration, 4 vols (1939-59)
Collected Papers, edited by J.C. Maxwell (Oxford, 1966)
 'The Evidence of Theatrical Plots for the History of the Elizabethan Stage', RES, 1 (1925), 257-74
- Grivelet, Michel, Thomas Heywood et le drame domestique Élizabéthain (Paris, 1957)
- Gurr, Andrew, The Shakespearean Stage, 1574-1642 (Cambridge, 1970)
 'Who Strutted and Bellowed?', SS 16 (1963), 95-102
- Halstead, W.L., 'Dekker's Arrest by the Chamberlain's Men', N&Q, 176 (1939), 41-2
 'Note on the Text of The Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt', MLN, 54 (1939), 585-9
- Hamilton, A.C., The Early Shakespeare (San Marino, 1967)
- Harbage, Alfred, Annals of English Drama, 975-1700, revised by S. Schoenbaum (1964)

- Harbage, Alfred, Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions (N.Y., 1952)
- Hazlitt, William, Characters of Shakespear's Plays (1817 reprinted 1906)
Lectures on the Literature of the Age of Elizabeth (1820 reprinted 1882)
- Herford, Charles H., Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century (Cambridge, 1886 reprinted 1966)
- Holaday, Allan, 'Heywood's Troia Britannica and the Ages', JEGP, 45 (1946), 430-9
- Honigmann, E.A.J., 'Shakespeare's "Lost Source-Plays"', MLR, 49 (1954), 293-307
- Hoppe, Harry R., 'John of Bordeaux: A Bad Quarto that never reached Print' in Studies in Honor of A.H.R. Fairchild, edited by Charles T. Prouty (Columbia, Missouri, 1946), 119-32
- Hotson, Leslie, Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated and other Essays (1949)
- Hunter, G.K., 'Henry IV and the Elizabethan Two-Part Play', RES, n.s. 5 (1954), 236-48
 'Ironies of Justice in The Spanish Tragedy', Renaissance Drama, 8 (1965) 89-104
- Izard, Thomas C., George Whetstone: Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters (N.Y., 1942)
 'The Principal Source for Marlowe's Tamburlaine', MLN, 58 (1943), 411-17
- Jackson, Sir Barry, 'On Producing Henry VI', SS 6 (1953), 49-52
- Jacquot, Jean, 'Raleigh's "Hellish Verses" and The "Tragicall Raigne of Selimus"', MLR, 48 (1953), 1-9
- Jenkins, Harold, The Life and Work of Henry Chettle (1934)
 'A Supplement to Sir Walter Greg's Edition of Sir Thomas More', Malone Society Collections, Volume VI (Oxford, 1961 [1962])
The Structural Problem in Shakespeare's 'Henry the Fourth' (1956)
- Jensen, Ejner J., 'Kyd's Spanish Tragedy: The Play Explains Itself', JEGP, 64 (1965), 7-16
- Jewkes, Wilfred T., Act Division in Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays, 1583-1616 (Hamden, Connecticut, 1958)
- Johnson, Walter, Strindberg and the Historical Drama (Seattle, 1963)
- Jones, Eldred, Othello's Countrymen (1965)
- Jones, Emrys, Scenic Form in Shakespeare (Oxford, 1971)
- Jones, Fred L., 'Look About You and The Disguises', PMLA, 44 (1929), 835-41
- Jones, Marion and Glynne Wickham, 'The Stage Furnishings of George Chapman's The Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron', Theatre Notebook, 16 (1962), 113-17

- Jones-Davies, M.T., Un Peintre de la vie Londonienne: Thomas Dekker,
2 vols (Paris, 1958)
- Jordan, John Clark, Robert Greene (N.Y., 1915)
- Kaiser, Walter, Praisers of Folly: Erasmus, Rabelais, Shakespeare (1964)
- Kay, Carol McGinnis, 'Traps, Slaughter, and Chaos: A Study of Shakespeare's
Henry VI Plays', Studies in the Literary Imagination, 5 (1972), 1-26
- Kenny, Thomas, The Life and Genius of Shakespeare (1864)
- Kirsch, Arthur C., Jacobean Dramatic Perspectives (Charlottesville, 1972)
- Kirschbaum, Leo, 'The Authorship of 1 Henry VI', PMLA, 67 (1952), 809-22
- Kittredge, G.L., 'The Date of The Pedlers Prophecie', Harvard Studies and
Notes in Philology and Literature, 16 (1934), 97-118
- Knights, L.C., Some Shakespearean Themes and An Approach to 'Hamlet',
(1959 reprinted Harmondsworth, 1970)
- Kocher, Paul H., Christopher Marlowe: A Study of his Thought, Learning, and
Character (Chapel Hill, 1946 reprinted N.Y., 1962)
- Lake, D.J., 'The Integrity of the "Parnassus" Trilogy', N&Q, 219 (1974),
286-90
- Lancashire, Anne B., 'Look About You as a History Play', SEL, 9 (1969),
321-34
- Langbaine, Gerard, An Account of the English Dramatick Poets (Oxford, 1691)
- Law, Robert Adger, 'Links Between Shakespeare's History Plays', SP, 50
(1953), 168-87
'Structural Unity in the Two Parts of Henry the Fourth', SP, 24 (1927),
223-42
- Lawrence, William J., Pre-Restoration Stage Studies (Cambridge, Mass., 1927)
- Leech, Clifford, Shakespeare: The Chronicles, Writers and their work: no.
146 (1962)
'The Structure of Tamburlaine', Tulane Drama Review, 8 (1964), 32-46
'The Two-Part Play: Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare', Shakespeare
Jahrbuch, 94 (1958), 90-106
'The Unity of 2 Henry IV', SS 6 (1953), 16-24
- Leggatt, Alexander, Citizen Comedy in the Age of Shakespeare (Toronto, 1973)
'Tamburlaine's Sufferings', The Yearbook of English Studies, 3 (1973),
28-38
- Lever, J.W., The Tragedy of State (1971)
- Levin, Harry, 'An Echo from The Spanish Tragedy', MLN, 64 (1949), 297-302
'Marlowe Today', Tulane Drama Review, 8 (1964), 22-31
The Overreacher: A Study of Christopher Marlowe (1954)

- Mack, Maynard, Jr, Killing the King: Three Studies in Shakespeare's Tragic Structure (New Haven, 1973)
- MacLure, Millar, George Chapman: A Critical Study (Toronto, 1966)
- Mahood, M.M., Poetry and Humanism (1950)
- Manheim, Michael, 'The Thematic Structure of Dekker's 2 Honest Whore', SEL, 5 (1965), 363-81
- Margeson, J.M.R., 'Dramatic Form: the Huntington Plays', SEL, 14 (1974), 223-38
- Martin, Mary Forster, 'If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobodie and The Famous Historie of Sir Thomas Wyatt', The Library, 4th ser. 13 (1932), 272-81
'Stow's "Annals" and "The Famous Historie of Sir Thomas Wyatt"', MLR, 53 (1958), 75-7
- Martin, Robert Grant, 'A New Specimen of the Revenge Play', MP, 16 (1918), 1-10
'The Sources of Heywood's If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part I', MLN, 39 (1924), 220-2
- Maxwell, Baldwin, Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger (Chapel Hill, 1939)
Studies in the Shakespeare Apocrypha (N.Y., 1956)
- McGinn, Donald J., 'A New Date for Antonio's Revenge', PMLA, 53 (1938), 129-37
- McManaway, James G., 'Recent Studies in Shakespeare's Chronology', SS 3 (1950), 22-33
- McMillin, Scott, 'The Figure of Silence in The Spanish Tragedy', ELH, 39 (1972), 27-48
'The Ownership of The Jew of Malta, Friar Bacon, and The Ranger's Comedy', ELN, 9 (1972), 249-52
- McNeir, Waldo F., 'Reconstructing the Conclusion of John of Bordeaux', PMLA, 66 (1951), 540-3
'Robert Greene and John of Bordeaux', PMLA, 64 (1949), 781-801
- Meagher, John C., 'Hackwriting and the Huntingdon Plays' in Elizabethan Theatre, edited by John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, 9 (1966), 197-219
- Meyer, Michael, Ibsen (Harmondsworth, 1974)
- Mill, Anna J., 'Representations of Lyndsay's Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis', PMLA, 47 (1932), 636-51
- Mincoff, Marco, 'The Chronology of Shakespeare's Early Works', Shakespeare Jahrbuch (Weimar), 100/101 (1964/65), 253-65
'The Composition of Henry VI, Part I', SQ, 16 (1965), 279-87
- Mithal, H.S.D., 'An Edition of R[obert] W[ilson]'s The Three Ladies of London and The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London' (unpublished Ph.D dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1959)

- Muir, Kenneth, 'Robert Greene as Dramatist' in Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig, edited by Richard Hosley (Columbia, Missouri, 1962), 45-54
Shakespeare as Collaborator (1960)
Shakespeare's Tragic Sequence (1972)
 'Who Wrote Selimus?', Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society (Literary and Historical Section), 6 (1948-52), 373-6
- Nelson, Malcolm A., 'Look About You and the Robin Hood Tradition', N&Q, 207 (1962), 141-3
- Noble, Richmond, Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge (1935)
- Nosworthy, J.M., 'Notes on Henry Porter', MLR, 35 (1940), 517-21
Shakespeare's Occasional Plays (1965)
- Oliphant, E.H.C., The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher (New Haven, 1927)
- Ornstein, Robert, 'The Dates of Chapman's Tragedies, Once More', MP, 59 (1961), 61-4
A Kingdom for a Stage: The Achievement of Shakespeare's History Plays (Cambridge, Mass., 1972)
- Palmer, D.J., 'Elizabethan Tragic Heroes' in Elizabethan Theatre, edited by John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, 9 (1966), 11-35
- Palmer, John, Political Characters of Shakespeare (1945 reprinted 1961)
- Parr, Johnstone, Tamburlaine's Malady and other Essays on Astrology in Elizabethan Drama (Tuscaloosa, 1953)
- Partridge, A.C., Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama (1964)
- Peet, Donald, 'The Rhetoric of Tamburlaine', ELH, 26 (1959), 137-55
- Peter, John, 'John Marston's Plays', Scrutiny, 17 (1950), 132-53
- Price, George R., Thomas Dekker (N.Y., 1969)
- Price, Hereward T., Construction in Shakespeare (Ann Arbor, 1951)
- Princiss, G.M., 'Thomas Creede and the Repertory of the Queen's Men 1583-1592' MP, 67 (1970), 321-30
- Reed, A.W., Early Tudor Drama (1926)
- Reese, M.M., The Cease of Majesty: A Study of Shakespeare's History Plays (1961)
- Reyburn, Marjorie L., 'New Facts and Theories about the Parnassus Plays', PMLA, 74 (1959), 325-35
- Ribner, Irving, The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare, second edition (1965)
 'Greene's Attack on Marlowe: Some Light on Alphonsus and Selimus', SP, 52 (1955), 162-71
 'The Idea of History in Marlowe's Tamburlaine', ELH, 20 (1953), 251-66

- Richards, Susan, 'Marlowe's Tamburlaine II: A Drama of Death', MLQ, 26 (1965), 375-87
- Riggs, David, Shakespeare's Heroical Histories: 'Henry VI' and its Literary Tradition (Cambridge, Mass., 1971)
- Righter, Anne, Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play (1962 reprinted Harmondsworth, 1967)
- Rollins, Hyder Edward, An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries (1557-1709) in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, SP, 21 (1924)
- Rose, Mark, Shakespearean Design (Cambridge, Mass., 1972)
- Rossiter, A.P., Angel with Horns: Fifteen Lectures on Shakespeare, edited by Graham Storey (1961 reprinted 1970)
English Drama from Early Times to the Elizabethans (1950)
- Routh, James E., Jr, 'Thomas Kyd's Rime Schemes and the Authorship of Soliman and Perseda and of The First Part of Jeronimo', MLN, 20 (1905), 49-51
- Sanders, N.J., 'An Edition of Greenes Farewell to Folly and Alphonsus, King of Aragon' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Birmingham, 1957)
- Schanzer, Ernest, 'Heywood's Ages and Shakespeare', RES, n.s. 11 (1960), 18-28
- Schoenbaum, Samuel, Internal Evidence and Elizabethan Dramatic Authorship (1966)
'Middleton's Share in "The Honest Whore", Parts I and II', N&Q, 197 (1952), 3-4
William Shakespeare: A Documentary Life (Oxford, 1975)
- Schwartz, Elias, 'The Date of Bussy D'Ambois', MP, 59 (1961), 126-7
'The Date of Chapman's Byron Plays', MP, 58 (1961), 201-2
'The Dates and Order of Chapman's Tragedies', MP, 57 (1959), 80-2
- Seaton, Ethel, 'Marlowe's Map', Essays and Studies, collected by E.K. Chambers, 10 (1924), 13-35
- Shaaber, M.A., 'The Unity of Henry IV' in Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies, edited by James G. McManaway, Giles E. Dawson, and Edwin E. Willoughby (Washington, 1948), 217-27
- Shapiro, I. A., 'Shakespeare and Mundy', SS 14 (1961), 25-33
- Shapiro, Michael, 'Children's Troupes: Dramatic Illusion and Acting Style', Comparative Drama, 3 (1969), 42-53
- Sharpe, Robert Boies, The Real War of the Theaters (Boston, 1935)
- Shaw, Phillip, 'Sir Thomas Wyatt and the Scenario of Lady Jane', MLQ, 13 (1952), 227-38
- Sibley, Gertrude Marion, The Lost Plays and Masques, 1500-1642. (Ithaca, 1933 reprinted N.Y., 1971)
- Slater, Eliot, 'Word Links with "The Merry Wives of Windsor"', N&Q, 220 (1975), 169-71

- Smith, D. Nichol (ed.), Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare, second edition (Oxford, 1963)
- Smith, Hallett, 'Tamburlaine and the Renaissance' in Elizabethan Studies and other Essays in Honor of George F. Reynolds, (Boulder, Colorado, 1945), 126-132
- Smith, James, 'George Chapman, II', Scrutiny, 4 (1935), 45-61
- Smith, John Harrington, Lois D. Pizer, and Edward K. Kaufman, 'Hamlet, Antonio's Revenge, and the Ur-Hamlet', SQ, 9 (1958), 493-8
- Smith, Warren D., 'The Substance of Meaning in Tamburlaine Part I', SP, 67 (1970), 156-66
- Spencer, Hazelton, Shakespeare Improved (Cambridge, Mass., 1927 reprinted N.Y., 1963)
- Spencer, Theodore, Death and Elizabethan Tragedy (Cambridge, Mass., 1936 reprinted N.Y., 1960)
- Sprague, Arthur Colby, Shakespeare's Histories, Plays for the Stage (1964)
- Stríbrný, Zdeněk, 'Henry V and History' in Shakespeare in a Changing World, edited by Arnold Kettle (N.Y., 1964), 84-101
- Sunesen, Bent, 'Marlowe and the Dumb Show', ES, 35 (1954), 241-53
- Sykes, H. Dugdale, 'Thomas Heywood's Authorship of King Edward IV', N&Q, 149 (1925), 183-4
- Talbert, Ernest William, Elizabethan Drama and Shakespeare's Early Plays (Chapel Hill, 1963)
- Tatlock, John S.P., 'The Siege of Troy in Elizabethan Literature, Especially in Shakespeare and Heywood', PMLA, 30 (1915), 673-770
- Thomas, Sidney and Marjorie L. Reyburn, 'A Note on Owen Gwyn and The Returne from Parnassus, Part II', PMLA, 76 (1961), 298-300
- Thorndike, Ashley H., 'The Relations of Hamlet to Contemporary Revenge Plays', PMLA, 17 (1902), 125-220
- Tilley, Morris Palmer, A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Ann Arbor, 1950)
- Tillotson, Kathleen, 'William Samson's "Vow-Breaker" (1636) and the Lost Henslowe Play "Black Batman of the North"', MLR, 35 (1940), 377-8
- Tillyard, E.M.W., Shakespeare's History Plays (1944 reprinted Harmondsworth, 1969)
- Tricomi, Albert H., 'The Revised Bussy D'Ambois and The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois: Joint Performance in Thematic Counterpoint', ELN, 9 (1972), 253-62
- Turner, Robert K., Jr, 'The Text of The Fair Maid of the West', The Library, 5th ser. 22 (1967), 299-325
- Turner, Robert Y., 'Characterization in Shakespeare's Early History Plays', ELH, 31 (1964), 241-58

- Turner, Robert Y., 'Shakespeare and the Public Confrontation Scene in Early History Plays', MP, 62 (1964), 1-12
Shakespeare's Apprenticeship (Chicago, 1974)
- Ure, Peter, 'The Date of the Revision of Chapman's "The Tragedy of Bussy D'Ambois"', N&Q, 197 (1952), 1-2
 'The Main Outline of Chapman's Byron', SP, 47 (1950), 568-88
 'Patient Madman and Honest Whore: the Middleton-Dekker Oxymoron', Essays and Studies, collected by F.P. Wilson, n.s. 19 (1966), 18-40
- Whitaker, Virgil K., Shakespeare's Use of Learning: An Inquiry into the Growth of his Mind and Art (San Marino, 1953)
- Wieler, John William, George Chapman--The Effect of Stoicism upon his Tragedies (N.Y., 1949)
- Wilson, E.E., Jr, 'The Genesis of Chapman's The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois', MLN, 71 (1956), 567-9
- Wilson, F.P., Elizabethan and Jacobean (Oxford, 1945)
The English Drama 1485-1585, edited by G.K. Hunter, Oxford History of English Literature, Volume IV, Part I (Oxford, 1969)
Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare (Oxford, 1953)
Shakespearian and Other Studies, edited by Helen Gardner (Oxford, 1969)
- Wilson, John Dover, The Fortunes of Falstaff (Cambridge, 1943)
 'The Origins and Development of Shakespeare's Henry IV', The Library, 4th ser. 26 (1945), 2-16
- Winy, James, The Player King: A Theme of Shakespeare's Histories (1968)
- Wren, Robert M., 'Salisbury and the Blackfriars Theatre', Theatre Notebook, 23 (1969), 103-9