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**Abstract**

Literary scholars agree that William Shakespeare used Samuel Daniel’s *First Four Books of the Civil Wars* as a source for his play *Richard II*, launching an interaction between the authors that lasted for many years. What has not been recognized, however, is that they may have influenced each other’s works on English history before the publication of Daniel’s epic poem. Textual, bibliographical and biographical evidence suggests that Daniel borrowed from some of Shakespeare’s earliest works, the *Henry VI* plays, while writing *The First Four Books*, and that Shakespeare could have used a pre-publication manuscript of *The Civil Wars* to write *Richard II*. A review of extant versions of *The Civil Wars*, the *Henry VI* plays and *Richard II* reveals a complex relationship between the authors as they wrote and revised works on the Wars of the Roses while both had connections to the Countess of Pembroke and the Earl of Essex. This analysis illuminates the works while disclosing one of the first instances of Shakespeare’s plays inspiring another artist, challenging images of Daniel as a poet who disdained theater and Shakespeare as a playwright who cared only about the popularity of his works on stage.
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Abbreviations, Editions and Modernization

The bibliographical history of Samuel Daniel’s *Civil Wars* and Shakespeare’s early history plays is complicated. Full descriptions of editions used are included in the body of this thesis. This listing of abbreviations and editions used is included for quick reference. Abbreviations for other works cited frequently are also noted. Modernized titles are used when referring to a work unless citing a specific early modern edition.

Citations of modern act, scene and line numbers from Shakespeare’s plays are from the following Oxford University Press editions:


Quotations from early modern editions of Shakespeare’s plays designate which edition is used and signature numbers are cited. Quotations from *The Civil Wars* similarly designate which edition is being quoted; however, stanza and line numbers are cited. For manuscripts of *The Civil Wars*, folio pages are cited, along with stanzas as they appeared in *FFB Q1595:1-IV* and *Q1595:1-V* (see below), where applicable.

Daniel

*CW/The Civil Wars - The Civil Wars Between the Houses of Lancaster and York*. Sometimes used generically to refer to all editions.


*FFB/The First Four Books - First Four Books of the Civil Wars* including the fifth book. Unless otherwise noted, edition used is *FFB Q1595:1-IV* for the first four books and *FFB Q1595:1-V* for the fifth (collectively, *FFB Q1595*).

*FFB Q1595:1-IV - The first fowre Bookes of the ciuile wars betweene the two houses of Lancaster and Yorke* (London, 1595), in *EEBO* (494:01; reproduction of a quarto in Harvard University Library). IHS title-page, does not include fifth book.


*MS I-II - Manuscript of first two books of The Civil Wars* (London, BL, Sloane MS 1443; CELM: DaS1).

Shakespeare
IH6, 2H6 and 3H6 - Henry VI, Parts One, Two and Three.

Contention - The First Part of the Contention Betwixt the Two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster. Unless otherwise noted, edition used is Contention Q1594.

Contention Q1594 - The first part of the contention betwixt the two famous houses of Yorke and Lancaster . . . (London, 1594), in EEBO (946:14; reproduction of a quarto in Folger Shakespeare Library).

F1623 or First Folio - Mr. William Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies (London, 1623), in EEBO (774:11; reproduction of a folio in the Folger Shakespeare Library).

R2 - Richard II

R2 Q1597 - The tragedie of King Richard the second . . . (London, 1597) in EEBO (353: 09; reproduction of a quarto in the Huntington Library).

True Tragedy - The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York. Unless otherwise noted, edition used is True Tragedy O1595.


Other
BL - British Library.

EEBO - Early English Books Online.

ESTC - English Short Title Catalogue.

OED - Oxford English Dictionary.


REED - Records of Early English Drama.

TNA – The National Archives

UP - University Press

Modernization
Quotations from early modern texts are presented in their original spelling and punctuation; however, modernized lettering is substituted for “vv” (for “w”), long “S”, ligatures, tilde (“~” for contractions of “n” or “m”) and thorns (“Y” for “th”). Circumflexes over the letter “o” (ó) are ignored.
Chapter 1
Introduction - Daniel and Shakespeare: 1592 to 1595

It is widely accepted that William Shakespeare used Samuel Daniel’s *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* as a source for *Richard II*. Critical analyses of *Richard II* use the 1595 publication of Daniel’s poem to establish the earliest date for Shakespeare’s composition of the play. The appearance of *The First Four Books* in print is also thought to have launched an interaction between Daniel and Shakespeare through their works on English history that lasted for many years. Shakespeare continued to use Daniel’s epic on the English civil wars of the fifteenth century now known as The Wars of Roses as a source for his *Henry IV* plays, likely written between 1596 and 1598, while more than a decade later, in 1609, Daniel revised his poem, reflecting the influence of Shakespeare’s plays.

This account of the correspondence between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s writings on English history ignores any possible relationship between the works prior to Shakespeare’s use of the printed edition of *The First Four Books* as a source, for instance the possibility that Daniel was...

---


influenced by Shakespeare’s earlier plays as he wrote the initial installment of *The Civil Wars.*

Yet, Daniel’s poem includes numerous parallels to the three plays on the reign of Henry VI attributed to Shakespeare, plays written and performed years before the appearance of *The First Four Books.* The current understanding also overlooks the existence of early manuscripts of Daniel’s poem that could have served as Shakespeare’s source for *Richard II,* rather than the 1595 printed edition. A stanza that appears in one of those manuscripts, but in no printed version of the poem, includes imagery that parallels a section of *Richard II* and calls into question the dating of Shakespeare’s composition of the play. A study of Daniel’s poem and Shakespeare’s early history plays reveals numerous facts that have been inadequately considered in analyses of the relationship between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s works, calling for a reassessment of our current understanding of the scope, depth and direction of influence between those works.

Traditional scholarship has long assumed that Daniel, the courtly poet, would have paid little attention to the dramatic works of Shakespeare, the fledgling popular playwright, while writing *The First Four Books.* In this thesis, I reassess that assumption through a re-evaluation of the relationship between Daniel’s poem and the history plays written and performed in the early to mid-1590s. Such a re-evaluation encompasses an analysis of textual parallels and a consideration of the authors’ shared use of common sources. It also includes a review of the context of their composition of the works, a review that reveals links between Daniel and Shakespeare as they concurrently wrote and revised works on the same topic. At a minimum,

---

4 As described later in this chapter, Daniel’s poem was published in multiple editions between 1595 and 1609. I use the title *The Civil Wars* to refer collectively to all versions of the work. Specific editions are cited based on their title-pages and dates.

the analysis illuminates both Daniel’s poem and Shakespeare’s plays, illustrating how two writers in different mediums depicted many of the same events in sometimes disparate but often surprisingly similar ways. The analysis also suggests a more complex relationship between the works than currently accepted.

The 1595 First Four Books of the Civil Wars includes much overlap with Henry VI Parts 1, 2 and 3, plays believed to include some of Shakespeare’s earliest work, perhaps written collaboratively by the young playwright. Versions of all three plays had been performed prior to the appearance of The First Four Books and Daniel had a connection to the acting company that was performing two of them as he was writing his epic poem. His patron from 1592 to 1594, Mary Sidney, was the wife of Henry Herbert, the Earl of Pembroke, the man who sponsored the acting company that performed versions of Henry VI Parts 2 and 3.\(^6\) Daniel also had indirect connections to Shakespeare as the playwright wrote Richard II. Between 1594 and 1595, Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s patrons, Charles Blount (Baron Mountjoy) and Henry Wriothesley (the Earl of Southampton), were both close friends of Robert Devereux, the Earl of Essex, and members of his circle of supporters. During this period, both artists composed works about the deposition of Richard II, a topic of interest to Essex and those around him.

The analysis of Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s connections to the Essex circle discloses important background for The First Four Books and Richard II. It also identifies parallels between the works that are best understood in the context of their composition under the shared influence of Essex and his followers. Evidence suggests that Daniel may have been familiar with the

\(^6\) Margaret P. Hannay, Philip’s Phoenix: Countess of Pembroke (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990), pp. 112-118. Although she could be referred to as Mary Sidney Herbert or Mary Herbert, I generally refer to Mary Sidney by her birth name or as the Countess of Pembroke. When using the Sidney name for either her or her brother, Philip, I include the first name to distinguish them from each other.
Henry VI plays as he wrote The First Four Books and that Shakespeare could have used an early manuscript version of Daniel’s poem while writing Richard II – a potentially very different version of the relationship between the works than one which begins with Shakespeare reading the published edition of The First Four Books in 1595.

Overview of Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s Careers in the Early 1590s

In this thesis, I analyze Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s careers and works in the early to mid-1590s. For context, this introductory chapter includes a brief overview of their literary status prior to the 1595 appearance of Daniel’s First Four Books.

The 1592 publication of Daniel’s sonnet cycle Delia and his historical poem The Complaint of Rosamond established him as one of the leading poets of his day, arguably second only to Edmund Spenser among living writers.\(^7\) Spenser himself praised Daniel’s work, proclaiming in Colin Clouts Come Home Again:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{And there is a new shepheard late vp sprong,} \\
\text{The which doth all afore him far surpasse . . .} \\
\text{Then rouze thy feathers quickly } \textit{Daniell,} \\
\text{And to what course thou please thy selfe aduance . . .}\end{align*}
\]

Daniel was embraced by prominent literary figures of the day – Thomas Nashe, Gabriel Harvey, Thomas Churchyard.\(^9\) Soon after the publication of Delia and Rosamond he also


\(^9\) Grosart, ed., \textit{Samuel Daniel}, vol. 4, pp. viii-ix; Thomas Nashe, \textit{Pierce Penilesse his supplication to the diuell} (London, 1592), sig. D3v; Gabriel Harvey, \textit{Foure Letters and
gained the support of Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, sister of the late Sir Philip Sidney and one of the most influential patrons of the arts in the 1590s. Immediately upon his arrival on the literary scene, Daniel was viewed as one of the leading poets to English nobility.

In 1592, when *Delia and Rosamond* was published, Shakespeare was an actor and playwright who had worked on a few plays (*Two Gentlemen of Verona*, the *Henry VI* plays, *Titus Andronicus*, *The Taming of the Shrew* and perhaps *Arden of Faversham*), some collaboratively; but he was unrecognized as an author. It was only with the publication of his two non-dramatic poems, *Venus and Adonis* (1593) and *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594), that his name appeared in print, and it was then in dedications that accompanied the works, not advertised on their title pages. At this stage in his career, Shakespeare’s name was not used to sell works he had written. Printed editions of his plays did not include authorial attribution until 1598. Daniel’s name, on the other hand, was featured prominently on the title-page of his works beginning with the 1594 *Delia and Rosamond Augmented. Cleopatra*. By 1595, when *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* was published, Daniel was widely recognized and praised whereas Shakespeare was just beginning to achieve recognition, more so for his poems than his plays. Their relative status at the time has influenced critical assessments of the relationship between their works, leading literary scholars to infer influence in solely one

---


direction, from Daniel to Shakespeare. A representative example is from the recent *New Oxford Shakespeare Authorship Companion*, which, in affirming the view that *The First Four Books* was a source for *Richard II*, opines that “in this period of their respective careers, a professional playwright like Shakespeare was more likely to borrow from a prestigious courtly poet like Daniel than vice-versa.”

**Issues Surrounding Daniel’s *First Four Books* and Shakespeare’s Early History Plays**

The principal works addressed in this thesis are *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*, the three *Henry VI* plays and *Richard II*. A simple version of the known “facts” surrounding their publication and production histories, ignoring complications, is as follows:

- All three *Henry VI* plays were performed by 1592 and versions of two were printed in 1594 and 1595,
- Daniel’s *First Four Books of the Civil Wars* was published in 1595,
- Shakespeare’s *Richard II* was performed in late 1595, soon after the appearance of Daniel’s poem.

This simplified chronology ignores a wide range of issues that complicate the analysis of the relationship between the works. Even the seemingly simple title of this thesis, “Samuel Daniel’s *First Four Books of the Civil Wars* and Shakespeare’s Early History Plays”, includes multiple possible inaccuracies and partial facts which I could be accused of not appropriately recognizing. I hope to acquit myself of that charge by fully considering those issues in this thesis, while an overview is provided here.

---

15 Since *FFB* does not extend into the reign of Richard III, Shakespeare’s play on the reign of that king is considered only peripherally in this thesis.
16 Documentation supporting both this simplified chronology and the complications surrounding it will be evaluated throughout the body of this thesis.
As implied by its published title, *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* included the first installment of a projected longer work. Between 1595 and 1599, a fifth book was printed and added to unsold copies of *The First Four Books*. Extant copies of *The First Four Books* with a title-page dated 1595 exist in two states, with and without the fifth book. This results in the counterintuitive circumstance of a work titled *The First Four Books* often being regarded as including five books. In this thesis, I evaluate matter in all five books; accordingly, a more accurate description of the work analyzed might be *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* (including the fifth book). For convenience, I refer to *The First Four Books* and, unless otherwise noted, this should be regarded as encompassing the fifth book. Quotations from Books I-IV are from a copy that includes only those books (Q1595:I-IV; EEBO 494:01, reproduction of an original in Harvard University Library) and quotations from Book V are from a copy that includes all five (Q1595:I-V; EEBO 2283:05, reproduction of an original in British Library, General Reference Ashley 537).

Daniel revised and supplemented *The Civil Wars* twice after adding the fifth book. In 1601, he augmented the work with a sixth book. In 1609, he expanded the former third book, divided it in two (then the third and fourth books), and added an eighth. In both instances, he revised many stanzas included in prior editions. The final version of *The Civil Wars*, that published in 1609, covered English history from the Norman conquest (1066) through Edward IV’s

---

17 *ESTC* includes the work under the title *The first foure bookes of the ciuile wars between the two houses of Lancaster and Yorke* (STC 6244). A second 1595 edition (STC 6244.3) includes the title, *The First Fowre Bookes of the ciuile warres betweene the two houses of Lancaster and Yorke*, but identical text. Copies with each title-page exist with and without the fifth book. See James G. McManaway, “Some Bibliographical Notes on Samuel Daniel’s *Civil Wars*”, *Studies in Bibliography*, 4 (1951/1952), 31-39 (pp. 31-32). McManaway describes the two as the “IHS” (STC 6244.3) and “Royal Arms” (STC 6244) issues.
marriage to Elizabeth Grey (1464). The poem remained an unfinished work, Daniel stating that he intended to continue it through to the reign of Henry VII (1485). In this thesis, later editions of *The Civil Wars* are considered only to the extent they shed light on Daniel’s treatment of material in *The First Four Books*.

In referring to “Shakespeare’s Early History Plays”, I include the plays now known as *Henry VI Parts 1, 2 and 3*. This simplification obscures multiple issues associated with the dramatic works. The first is authorship. Current scholarship suggests that all three plays are collaborative and that one, *Henry VI Part 1*, may be mostly by others. One literary scholar has gone so far as to say that calling that play “Shakespeare’s *King Henry VI, Part One*” is “a necessary commercial fiction”. Given the unsettled status of this research it is, in a sense, controversial to include these works in the category of “Shakespeare’s Early History Plays”. I recognize that I may be “cheating” by doing so and hope to obtain allowance by considering the authorship question in my analysis. I do not mean to pre-judge authorship by calling the plays “Shakespeare’s” or to ignore the likely collaborative process involved in assimilating source materials into the *Henry VI* plays.

The second issue associated with the *Henry VI* plays is the question of exactly what plays are being discussed. A version of *Henry VI Part 2* appeared in a 1594 quarto titled *The First Part of the Contention betwixt the Two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster*. A version of *Part

---

21 *The First Part of the Contention betwixt the Two Famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, (London, 1594).
3 was printed in a 1595 octavo as *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York.* Both early printed editions are significantly shorter than the plays included in the First Folio and differ from the longer versions in ways that have never been conclusively explained. It is uncertain whether the First Folio versions represent the plays as originally performed or if the two early editions document works that were revised after their initial composition and adapted to become the *Henry VI* plays as they appear in the First Folio. In this thesis, I consider both versions of each play and address the question of which version existed prior to the publication of Daniel’s poem. I further contend that a consideration of the relationship between the *Henry VI* plays and Daniel’s *First Four Books* should be included in any analysis of evaluating and dating possible revisions to the plays.

Similarly, although it appears in only one version, that in the First Folio, it is uncertain whether the text of *Henry VI Part 1* represents that play as originally performed in the early 1590s. The relationship of 1H6 to a work that Philip Henslowe called *harey the vj* is debated and some believe that the text in the First Folio includes later revisions. As with *Parts 2* and *3*, the possibility of revision is evaluated as part of this thesis. There is also a scholarly debate as to whether *Part 1* preceded or followed *Parts 2* and *3*. Since some version of all three clearly preceded *The First Four Books*, the order of their initial composition figures only tangentially into questions surrounding their relationship to Daniel’s poem.

Finally, even the play *Richard II*, one that is accepted to be entirely Shakespeare’s, is not without textual complications. The play was printed in 1597, two years after it was initially performed, in a quarto that did not include its potentially controversial “deposition scene”.

---

Whether that scene was included in the play as originally written, and was censored, or whether it was added in later years remains a topic of debate. Again, the comparison to Daniel’s poem sheds light on this debate.

Reconsideration of Daniel

While the focus of this thesis is on the relationship between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s works, I hope that it can play a part in the reevaluation of Daniel in his own right, exclusive of the consideration of him as a Shakespearean source. Today Shakespeare is widely recognized as a poetic genius while Daniel has faded into obscurity. No edition of Daniel’s complete works has appeared since the late nineteenth century and many individual works, including The First Four Books of the Civil Wars, are not available in any modern print edition. Yet at the time that Daniel and Shakespeare were writing, especially the early to mid-1590s, Daniel was the more highly regarded poet. It is not intended as disparagement to Shakespeare to say that this assessment had some basis. Daniel’s published editions by 1595 included a broad range of influential works: the sonnet cycle Delia, the historical poem Rosamond, the closet drama The Tragedy of Cleopatra and the epic First Four Books of the Civil Wars. All were trend-setting works that provided inspiration to artists for years to come. Before turning to The First Four Books, Shakespeare, had already been influenced by Rosamond while writing The Rape of Lucrece and had likely begun writing his sonnets using Delia as a model.

23 John Pitcher’s forthcoming Oxford UP edition of The Works of Samuel Daniel will represent the most significant step in resolving the issues of availability and recognition of Daniel’s works. I hope that my thesis can help support and amplify his efforts.

The precision of Daniel’s poetry, clarity of his expression and his thoughtful approach to complex topics can speak to us today, just as they did to his contemporaries. He was widely read for at least two centuries after his death; Alexander Pope parodied him, Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Charles Lamb debated and praised his works, William Wordsworth quoted him.25 Even C. S. Lewis, who was not uncritical of Daniel, said of him that he “actually thinks in verse; thinks deeply, arduously; he can doubt and wrestle . . . he is the most interesting man of letters whom that century produced in England.”26 By approaching one of his works, *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*, through the lens of his now better known contemporary, I hope to help revive an appreciation of his poetic artistry and unique voice among a wider audience than early modern literary scholars, perhaps among Shakespeare enthusiasts. With that in mind, I quote more extensively from Daniel’s works than from his now globally-recognized contemporary. Lastly, I also include, as Appendix 1 of this thesis, the entire text of *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* as originally printed between 1595 and 1599 (with footnotes noting variants from extant manuscripts). I believe this to be the first time the entire poem that served as Shakespeare’s source has been reprinted in over 400 years.

An element of the reconsideration of Daniel offered by this thesis is a reevaluation of his attitude toward English drama. Modern literary scholars who have studied Daniel emphasize

his criticism of popular theater. I believe that this perspective overstates his disregard for
theater and ascribes to him a dismissiveness that prevented him from distinguishing between
greater and lesser works or finding pearls within both (the same may be true for those around
him, including his patrons). One such pearl is the depiction of the relationship between
Queen Margaret and the Duke of Suffolk in *Henry VI Part 2*, a relationship included in a
section of the play that most scholars, regardless of their perspective on authorship and
revision, believe is principally by Shakespeare. If Daniel borrowed from this section of the
play, it may be one of the earliest examples of an artist finding inspiration from Shakespeare’s
dramatic works. The assessment of whether such influence existed allows us to reconsider
both Daniel’s judgment and Shakespeare’s status as a literary artist during the early stages of
their careers.

A reconsideration of Daniel’s works and of their relationship to Shakespeare’s is also
warranted by developments in scholarship during the last decades of the twentieth century and
early part of the twenty-first. The last time Shakespeare and Daniel scholars analyzed the

27 The early modern practices of taking notes at performances and extracting excerpts from
printed works for recording in commonplace books may explain how such “pearls” were
preserved for later use. See Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice*
and Poets”, in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San

28 Meghan Andrews has asserted that Michael Drayton was Shakespeare’s “first literary
reader”, citing the influence of Shakespeare’s poems on works written by Drayton between
1593 and 1595 and of the *Henry VI* plays on Drayton’s *Heroical Epistles*, printed in 1597;
Andrews, “Michael Drayton, Shakespeare’s Shadow”, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 65 (2014), 273-
306 (pp. 277, 279, 306). If Daniel found inspiration in the *Henry VI* plays it was concurrent
with Drayton’s use of Shakespeare’s poetry and before Drayton’s borrowing from the plays.
relationship in any depth was in Laurence Michel’s 1958 critical edition of The Civil Wars.\textsuperscript{29} Since that time, critical thinking has shifted on a wide range of issues that bear on questions surrounding the relationship between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s works (these shifts are mentioned here while detailed citations of the research underlying them are included in the body of the thesis).\textsuperscript{30} The idea that Mary Sidney led a movement to reform English drama has been substantially discredited. The relationship between noble patrons and the acting companies they sponsored has been reevaluated and many details of the activities of those acting companies have become available for the first time. The Henry VI plays are no longer regarded as the lesser efforts of a young playwright but are viewed as important developments in the English history play and a wide range of issues surrounding them has been studied extensively. Significant research has been done on Essex and the impact of literature emanating from his circle. Analyses of Shakespeare as collaborator, literary artist, playwright of the court and contemporary political commentator have called into question previous notions of the playwright as an actor and solo author who did not care if his dramatic works enjoyed a life beyond the popular stage. Our idea of what constitutes a literary source has changed and now encompasses a range of intertextuality. The circulation of manuscripts, well after the establishment of printed books, has been analyzed as an alternate form of publication. Network theory has shed light on how ideas get transmitted and has been used to trace

\textsuperscript{29} Michel, ed., Civil Wars, pp. 7-28. Critical editions of Shakespeare’s works have addressed Shakespeare’s use of Daniel as a source, but none has evaluated the overall relationship between Daniel’s poem and Shakespeare’s plays.

\textsuperscript{30} Critics whose works have especially advanced the developments noted include (in alphabetical order): Leeds Barroll, Michael G. Brennan, John Burrows, Hugh Craig, Richard Dutton, Lukas Erne, Alexandra Gajda, Andrew Gurr, Andrew Hadfield, Margaret P. Hannay, Paul E. J. Hammer, Grace Ioppolo, Paulina Kewes, Noel J. Kinnamon, Peter Lake, Mary Ellen Lamb, Harold Love, Sally-Beth MacLean, Lawrence Manley, Scott McMillin, Robert S. Miola, Records of Early English Drama (REED), Gary Taylor, Steven Urkowitz, Bart van Es, Blair Worden and H. R. Woudhuysen. For details of the works involved, see Bibliography.
connections within early modern literary networks. These developments call for a re-
evaluation of the relationship between Daniel’s *First Four Books of the Civil Wars* and
Shakespeare’s early history plays.

One recent study includes a description that serves as an excellent summary of a perspective
that I will be employing in this thesis. In his book *Shakespeare’s Companies*, Terence G.
Schoone-Jongen considers the question of Shakespeare’s theatrical affiliation prior to the
formation of the Chamberlain’s Men and provides a framework for evaluating hypotheses
proposed, defining differing levels of probability (possible, plausible, probable):

> In analyzing the competing claims for Shakespeare’s early theatrical career . . ., my assessment relies heavily on a terminology of the possible, the plausible and the probable. I regard a possibility as a hypothesis which no evidence flatly contradicts; . . . A plausibility is something more than a possibility, in that it is speculation which can be justified (though not proven) on one or more counts. . . . At the same time, however, a plausibility is not strong or convincing enough to rule out other possibilities or plausibilities. In the case of a probability, other possibilities can effectively be laid aside because the probable hypothesis is so much stronger or more likely than any alternatives.31

Schoone-Jongen is clear about what qualifies a theory as plausible, relative to one which is
possible: it requires positive evidence. He is less clear about the criteria for determining when
a hypothesis is probable, using the imprecise standard that it is “more likely than any
alternatives”. I believe that the gauge for measuring the likelihood of one hypothesis relative
to another should, like Schoone-Jongen’s categorization of plausible versus possible, involve
evidence. A likely hypothesis is one that a wide range of positive evidence substantiates and
no evidence refutes, other than the existence of other unproven alternatives. A probable

hypothesis is further supported by evidence disproving the alternatives. In looking toward evidence as a means of classifying the likelihood of conclusions reached, I am extrapolating from Robert Hume’s methodology for reconstructing the context of the composition of a work, a methodology he refers to as “Archaeo-Historicism”.\textsuperscript{32} Quoting Hume, “One of the most basic principles of Archaeo-Historicism is that you can only claim what you have evidence to support”.\textsuperscript{33} In evaluating questions surrounding the nature of the relationship between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s early works on English history, I assess evidence that has been previously inadequately considered and evaluate ranges of hypotheses to determine which plausible explanation is better supported by such evidence.

Applying the combination of Schoone-Jongen’s possible-plausible-probable framework and Hume’s archaeo-historicist methodology, I hope to demonstrate that the current view of Daniel as a poet who was unaware of Shakespeare’s early work, while still possible, is improbable, that various explanations of how Daniel could have encountered the plays are plausible and that, based on an analysis of the textual, bibliographical and biographical evidence, a more complex relationship than that currently comprehended is probable.

\textbf{An Apology}

In conducting my analysis, I question and, at times, criticize the work of scholars that have come before me in studying Daniel. I particularly challenge the work of Laurence Michel, the man who published the most on Daniel’s \textit{Civil Wars} in the twentieth century, including the


\textsuperscript{33} Hume, \textit{Reconstructing Contexts}, p. 93.
only printed edition of the complete poem to appear in the past 130 years. This is unfortunate, as his edition is shrewd, insightful and enjoyable. He conveys a great understanding of and appreciation for Daniel and takes the reader with him on a journey that too few modern readers have taken. I highly recommend his work. Unfortunately, since I disagree with some of his key conclusions and these disagreements inform a central aspect of my thesis, I quote and refer to his work principally to contradict it. By way of apology both to him and to others whose conclusions I challenge, I offer Daniel’s words from his 1618 prose *Collection of the History of England*, his last work:

Pardon us Antiquitie, if we miscensure your actions which are euer (as those of men) according to the vogue, and sway of times, and haue onely their upholding by the opinion of the present. Wee deale with you but as posterite will with us (which euer thinkes it selfe the wiser) that will iudge likewise of our errors according to the cast of their imaginations.34

---

Structure of Thesis and Content of Chapters

This thesis falls into four sections: one on the *Henry VI* plays and *The First Four Books* (chapters 2 and 3), one on *Richard II* and Daniel’s poem (chapters 4 and 5), one on the uncertain chronology of Daniel’s fifth book and the *Henry VI* plays (chapters 6 and 7), and a conclusion (chapter 8). One aspect of the organization that may not be immediately apparent is that it is intended to follow a chronological sequence. The reason that the *Henry VI* plays are revisited in the latter part of the thesis is the consideration of possible revisions to them in the mid to late 1590s, around the same time that Daniel added a fifth book to his poem.

Chapter 2 evaluates parallels between the *Henry VI* plays and *The First Four Books* to determine whether they indicate Daniel’s awareness of the plays and a plausibility of

---

influence. Chapter 3 reviews the performance and publication history of the *Henry VI* plays and compares it to biographical details of Daniel’s life to evaluate how he could have encountered the dramatic works. Chapter 4 analyzes two extant manuscripts of portions of *The Civil Wars* to determine if they preceded the printed edition and assess whether Shakespeare could have used an early manuscript version of the poem as a source for *Richard II*. Chapter 5 considers Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s connections to the Essex circle during the period when Daniel was completing *The First Four Books* and Shakespeare was writing *Richard II*, elucidating the influence of the thinking of the Essex circle on both artists. Chapter 6 analyzes matter in the fifth book of *The Civil Wars* to determine when the book was written. Chapter 7 evaluates the relationship between Daniel’s poem and possible revisions to the *Henry VI* plays. Chapter 8 reaches conclusions on the relationship between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s early works and considers implications for scholarship on both writers. Two appendices include the full text of *The First Four Books* (Appendix 1) and images from extant Daniel manuscripts (Appendix 2).

In reevaluating the relationship between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s early works, I review many textual, bibliographical and biographical facts previously inadequately considered. In some instances, the review suggests specific conclusions regarding that relationship; in others, it offers possibilities and raises questions for further study. The consideration of the evidence is more important than the conclusions reached. I believe that the analysis highlights Daniel’s importance as a writer who warrants further attention than he has been accorded. The reconsideration of the relationship between his works and Shakespeare’s is long overdue.
Chapter 2
Textual Parallels between the *Henry VI* Plays and
*The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*

There is significant overlap between the *Henry VI* plays and *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*, overlap in subject matter, episodes depicted, characterization, themes, imagery and wording. Given the shared sources for the works, the English history chronicles, it is inevitable that there would be similarities between the two; however, some parallels include verbal echoes and thematic likenesses that are only partially supported by common sources, or not supported at all. This chapter evaluates parallels that cannot be as readily explained as others, textual evidence that may indicate influence of one work on the other.

In analyzing textual overlap between some of Shakespeare’s earliest works and the first edition of Daniel’s poem, it is not my objective, at this stage of the analysis, to determine whether Daniel was personally aware of Shakespeare or to speculate on the nature of his engagement, if any, with the playwright’s work.¹ Such questions may be addressed only once a chronology of the composition and revision of the works is hypothesized, a chronology that will be considered in later chapters. At this stage, I seek to reevaluate textual evidence that has been inadequately considered in assessing the relationship between the *Henry VI* plays and *The First Four Books* to determine if it plausibly indicates influence. I believe that such an evaluation sheds new light on the works while yielding a better understanding of the relationship between the texts. Even if one concludes that there is no evidence of influence and that similarities are coincidental, effectively the currently accepted conclusion, the assessment of the parallels and

¹ Michael Baxandall describes a wide range of potential engagements that one artist can have with another’s work. For example, an artist can “draw on, . . . appropriate from, . . . refer to, . . . paraphrase, . . . respond to” the work of another. Michael Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1985), 59.
consideration of the context of composition of the works yields new insight into areas where
the authors of the plays and the poem varied from their sources but still came to present their
material in similar ways.

Critical Consideration of the Relationship Between the Henry VI Plays and The Civil Wars

In the introductory section of his critical edition of The Civil Wars, Laurence Michel concludes
it unlikely that Daniel knew of or was influenced by the Henry VI plays while writing his first
edition of the poem.2 Although Michel’s edition was published nearly sixty years ago, his
view of the relationship between the Henry VI plays and The First Four Books is still generally
accepted and represents an effective summary of current scholarly consensus. Accordingly, it
is worth quoting his statements supporting that view at length:

The likelihood that Daniel knew Shakespeare or any of his works before at least
1604 is small. There is no convincing external evidence, and what similarities
in their writings can be mustered . . . can all be instances of a one-way
influence, if any, from Daniel to Shakespeare.3

Daniel was a self-conscious littérateur, a purist, and, scornful of the popular
stage and its purveyors, would not conceive of its productions, even when
printed, as literature. It is therefore unlikely that he would have seen or read the
plays and even less likely that he would have considered them proper source
material.4

Relying on the basic probability asserted above, we may assume that Daniel did
not know the original plays of which The Contention and The True Tragedy are
generally considered to be some kind of distorted versions.5

This is the extent of Michel’s consideration of the relationship between the Henry VI plays and
the first edition of Daniel’s Civil Wars; he evaluates no evidence of possible influence between

---

4 Michel, ed., Civil Wars, pp. 7-8.
5 Michel, ed., Civil Wars, p. 27.
the plays and *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* as printed in 1595. He does consider the possibility that when Daniel came to write the eighth book of *The Civil Wars*, published in 1609, the poet may have “sought out the dramatist’s treatment of material he was about to work up for the first time”, material that includes “the wooing of Lady Grey by Edward IV; and King Henry on the molehill at Towton”, both events depicted in *Henry VI Part 3*. Michel concludes that “the evidence that in 1609 Daniel drew upon *Henry VI* is less extensive and convincing” than indications that the poet appropriated elements of *Richard II* and the *Henry IV* plays at that time. Michel believed that Daniel either remained unaware of or ignored the *Henry VI* plays, even when he was borrowing from Shakespeare’s later plays for his 1609 revisions to *The Civil Wars*. In reaching this conclusion, Michel may have been prejudiced by his own low opinion of the *Henry VI* plays. In an earlier essay written with Cecil Seronsy, Michel and Seronsy describe Daniel as “a very discriminating critic” and state that “one can applaud his discrimination” in ignoring the *Henry VI* plays.

It is unfortunate that Michel’s image of Daniel and his own low opinion of the *Henry VI* plays pre-empted his consideration of the possibility that the plays influenced Daniel’s poem. At a minimum, the comparison of *The First Four Books* to the plays could have helped contextualize the poem, relating it to other works on the same topic written around the same time. Further, some scholars who preceded Michel reached different conclusions about the relationship between the plays and the poem. Albert Probst in his 1902 German doctoral dissertation, “Samuel Daniel’s *Civil Wars between the two Houses of Lancaster and York* und

---

6 Michel, ed., *Civil Wars*, p. 27.
7 Michel, ed., *Civil Wars*, p. 28.
Michael Drayton’s *Baron’s Wars: Eine Quellenstudie [A Source Study]*”, evaluates areas of overlap between Daniel’s poem and the *Henry VI* plays. In that dissertation Probst, working with the then-current belief that Shakespeare’s *Richard II* preceded the first edition of Daniel’s poem, assumes that Daniel used that play as a source for *The First Four Books*. Given his assumption of Daniel’s awareness of Shakespeare’s work prior to 1595, he was more open to considering the possible influence of the *Henry VI* plays on the poem. He detects such influence in a few areas; however, given his focus on Daniel’s and Drayton’s use of the English chronicles, his analysis of Shakespeare’s influence is limited. In most instances, Probst mentions the similarities between *The Civil Wars* and the *Henry VI* plays without providing analysis of common sources, generally accepting the plays’ influence on Daniel to be likely. The lack of detail provided for his conclusions may account for why his findings have been largely ignored, although contributing factors include the facts that his work is a dissertation (not a book or article) in German and begins with the assumption that *Richard II* preceded *The Civil Wars*, a chronology now regarded as incorrect. I believe, however, that many of his observations retain validity and note them as parallels are considered.

Shakespeare scholars have generally not explored the possible influence of the *Henry VI* plays on *The Civil Wars*, as their focus is on Shakespeare’s use of Daniel as a source. Since the

---

10 Gillian Wright similarly provides a limited analysis of Daniel’s use of Shakespeare in “Samuel Daniel’s Use of Sources in *The Civil Wars*, *Studies in Philology*, 101 (2004), 59-87. Wright states that her “survey makes no claim to be exhaustive. It focuses strictly on one category among the sources, the chronicle histories . . .” (p. 60). She provides commentary on areas where Daniel may have used Shakespeare’s work in later editions as he was revising his poem (pp. 72-73, 86).
11 See Michel, ed., *Civil Wars*, p. 7 for his reasons for discounting Probst’s analysis.
*Henry VI* plays were believed to have preceded the poem, the relationship was not considered.

F. W. Moorman’s comment from his 1904 essay “Shakespeare’s History-Plays and Daniel’s *Civile Wars*” summarizes the situation well and stands to this day:

> Our interest lies primarily in discovering the influence of Daniel upon Shakespeare, and we may consequently ignore whatever Daniel has to say concerning the reign of Henry VI, inasmuch as his poetic version of that reign appeared long after the three Parts of Shakespeare’s ‘Henry VI’, had been written and acted.12

One scholar who peripherally considered the relationship between the *Henry VI* plays and Daniel’s poem was E. M. W. Tillyard in *Shakespeare’s History Plays*.13 Tillyard, an admirer both of Daniel’s poem and of the *Henry VI* plays, was well suited to giving the analysis full consideration; however, this was not his focus. Rather, Tillyard was intent on proving that Daniel, like Shakespeare, used his works to expound the Elizabethan world picture or Tudor myth, the idea that the overthrow of Richard II had upset the divinely-established natural order.14 Hence, Tillyard states that, “The question of debt . . . is of trivial importance compared with the planning of an ambitious poem. . . . Daniel’s intention in the *Civil Wars* is precisely Shakespeare’s in his History Plays”.15 Tillyard is not concerned with the question of influence, only with analyzing the similarity of political outlook, an analysis now questioned, at least with respect to Shakespeare.16 Tillyard contends, however, that “Daniel could not have

escaped knowing, at least by hearsay, Shakespeare’s first historical tetralogy”, a statement that challenges Michel’s contention that it was unlikely “Daniel knew Shakespeare or any of his works before at least 1604”.\(^{17}\)

More recently, Andrew Hadfield has argued that the *Henry VI* plays are modeled on Lucan’s epic, *The Pharsalia*, the same poem that served as Daniel’s inspiration for his account of the English civil wars.\(^{18}\) Hadfield credits those plays with inspiring the 1590s “vogue for Lucanizing English history”, a vogue which in his analysis includes Daniel’s poem.\(^{19}\) Hadfield’s analysis takes on increased credibility with the recent attribution of portions of the *Henry VI* plays to Christopher Marlowe.\(^{20}\) Marlowe had translated the first book of Lucan’s *Pharsalia*, a translation that circulated in manuscript in the early 1590s.\(^{21}\) Although he does not explicitly address Daniel’s awareness of the *Henry VI* plays, Hadfield’s analysis implies that Daniel knew of and was influenced by the plays. This assumption makes more sense if the plays are, in fact, informed by the poem that served as his inspiration.

My evaluation of the relationship between the *Henry VI* plays and *The First Four Books* begins with an analysis of the textual overlap between the works and reconsiders whether such

\(^{17}\) Tillyard, *Shakespeare’s History Plays*, p. 238; Michel, ed., *Civil Wars*, p. 7.
\(^{19}\) Hadfield, *Shakespeare and Republicanism*, p. 107.
overlap indicates influence, an analysis that inherently questions Michel’s conclusion. Such questioning is supported by Probst’s belief that some aspects of The Civil Wars reflect the influence of the Henry VI plays, Tilleyard’s assertion that Daniel was likely aware of the plays, and Hadfield’s thesis that the dramatic works helped spur a movement that included Daniel’s poem.

As noted in chapter 1, the comparison of The Civil Wars to the Henry VI plays is complicated by the existence of multiple versions of Parts 2 and 3 and questions surrounding possible revisions to all three plays. I begin by making textual comparisons to the earliest printed edition of each play and note where substantive variants in the 1623 First Folio (F1623) impact the comparison. In addition, a fifth book was added to The First Four Books of the Civil Wars at an undetermined date between 1595 and 1599. In this chapter I evaluate textual overlap between that fifth book and the Henry VI plays without dating the book relative to potential revisions of the plays. All issues surrounding dating, authorship and revision of the works are considered in chapters 6 and 7. My analysis begins by evaluating textual parallels in the works and comparing those parallels to common sources and analogues to determine if influence is indicated. Where uncertain, direction and timing of possible influence is assessed later.

Parallels documented in only F1623 and not the early printed editions are regarded as uncertain with respect to direction of influence, if any, while those documented in the 1594 quarto of Contention (Q1594) and the 1595 octavo of True Tragedy (O1595) are evaluated as possible indications of Daniel being influenced by the plays.

Textual Parallels - Book IV

The most extended overlap between *The First Four Books* and the *Henry VI* plays is their shared depiction of a romantic relationship between Henry’s queen, Margaret of Anjou, and William de la Pole, the Duke of Suffolk, a relationship featured in both *Henry VI Part 2* and Daniel’s fourth book. Such a relationship is not detailed in the English chronicles which describe Suffolk as a favorite of both Margaret and the king. Literary scholars and modern historians affirm this assessment of the historical relationship among the three, concluding that Shakespeare invented the idea of the queen and duke as lovers. Wording in one section of Hall’s *Union*, however, could have inspired both Daniel and the playwright(s) of the *Henry VI* plays to invent an adulterous relationship between the queen and the royal favorite. In a passage describing the commons’ objections against Suffolk, Hall states that the queen “entierly loued the Duke” and the chronicler refers to him as the “Quenes dearlynge”. Nowhere, however, does Hall provide any details of an intimate relationship between the queen and her “dearlynge”. Hall’s use of the word may be intended to indicate that Suffolk was a member of the court favored by the queen, a trusted advisor. Recognizing this, the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) includes the quotation from Hall as an example of the use of “darling” defined as “a favourite, a minion.”

---

23 See, for instance, Edward Hall, *The vnion of the two noble and illustrate families of Lancastre and Yorke* (1548), fols. CLVIIIr–v, where Henry reluctantly agrees to Suffolk’s banishment, “meanyng by this exile, to appease the furious rage of the outragious people, and that pacified, to reuocate him into his olde estate”.


26 *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) online (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2016) definition (b) of “darling”.
Hall’s suggestive wording could have inspired the depiction of an amorous relationship between Margaret and Suffolk in one or both of 2H6 and The First Four Books. It is more difficult, however, to pinpoint possible shared inspiration for invented events and interactions employed in both works to illustrate that relationship. For instance, both the play and the poem include descriptions of Suffolk’s departure upon his exile and the queen’s reaction to the duke’s death.

*Henry VI Part 2* includes two emotional scenes dramatizing Margaret’s reaction to her lover’s fate. The first is a lengthy dialogue in which the two lament their enforced separation and part for the last time (*2H6 III.2.304-417*). The second sees a distracted Margaret carrying Suffolk’s decapitated head during a meeting between Henry and his advisors (*2H6 IV.4.1-24*). Both scenes, the queen’s parting from Suffolk and her mourning for his death, are dramatic highlights of *2H6* without precedent in its sources, which do not provide details of the queen’s separation from her favorite and are silent about her reaction to his death.

Daniel presents a more reserved version of Margaret’s reaction to Suffolk’s exile and death than that in *2H6*, yet he, like the play, includes in Book IV a mourning queen and a reference to the lovers’ emotional parting. Upon being informed of Suffolk’s death, Margaret undergoes “wondrous passions” and addresses her dead lover in her mind:

> Whose death when swift-wingd fame at full conuaid Vnto the trauaild *Queen* misdoubting nought, Despight and sorrow such affliction laid

---

27 Unless otherwise noted, citations of act, scene and line numbers in Shakespeare’s plays are from the Oxford University Press individual editions of the plays, published in the early 2000s (see “Note on Abbreviations, Editions and Modernization” for details). Quotations, however, are from early modern quartos/octavos or F1623 and designate which text is being used.
Vpon her soule as wondrous passions wrought:
O God (saith she) and art thou thus betraid?
And haue my fauours thy destruction brought?

(FFB Q1595:1-IV, IV.104.1-6)²⁸

Margaret’s lament occupies seven stanzas, a significant portion of the poem given that it is an episode with no historical basis. Michel noted that he had “not found an exemplar for the speech in any of Daniel’s usual chronicle sources.”²⁹ The queen relives the scene where she and Suffolk parted; she recalls the “wofull” look that revealed her lover’s dejected “heart”:

Deere Suffolke, o I saw thy wofull cheere  
When thou perceiuedst no helpe but to depart:  
I saw that looke wherein did plaine appeare  
The lamentable message of thy heart:

(FFB Q1595:1-IV, IV.107.1-4)

Margaret’s recollection of Suffolk’s departure in Daniel’s poem resonates with the parting scene in 2H6:

Suff. I goe.  
Queene. And take my heart with thee.  
She kisseth him.  
Suff. A iewell lockt into the wofullst caske,  
That euer yet containde a thing of woorth,

(Contention 1594, sig. F1r; 2H6, III.2.412-414)³⁰

Both the poem and the play exhibit a sense of pity for Suffolk, a pity not expressed by the English chroniclers, while both also include the words “heart” and variations of the word “wofull” in their invented scenes of Suffolk parting from his love.

²⁸ Quotations from editions of The First Four Books and The Civil Wars cite the edition, book and stanza number, and line number (where applicable).
²⁹ Michel, ed., Civil Wars, p. 353.
³⁰ The version in F1623 is substantially identical, 2H6 F1623, sig. N4v; 2H6 III.2.412-414.
The similar depictions of a grief-stricken queen recalling her lover and speaking to him in her mind may be coincidence. Daniel’s approach differs from that in the play, combining the queen’s reaction to Suffolk’s death and their parting into a complaint, a literary form that the poet had used in *Rosamond* to similarly explore the mind of a grief-stricken, flawed woman.\(^{31}\) The idea of Margaret suffering an emotional loss may have independently occurred to Daniel and appealed to his predisposition for expressing what John Pitcher calls “the grace and pathos of a great woman who was suffering”, something he had done previously in *Rosamond* and *The Tragedy of Cleopatra*.\(^{32}\) If so, Daniel and the author(s) of 2H6 coincidentally sought a way to elicit sympathy for a queen condemned by the chroniclers and both found it in the shared invention of her grief at Suffolk’s death.

Probst sees the queen’s lament being inspired by the play:

> Von einer wörtlichen Übereinstimmung ist natürlich abzusehen, denn so weit geht die Anlehnung Daniel’s an die historischen Dramen seines Zeitgenossen an keiner Stelle, wohl aber können einige jener Reden bei Daniel ihre Veranlassung gefunden haben in den Worten, welche bei den gleichen Gelegenheiten der Dramatiker seinen Personen in den Mund legt, und manche der in Shakespeare’s Worten ausgesprochenen Gedanken finden sich auch bei Daniel wieder. So können z. B. die Klagen der Königin Margaret bei der Kunde von dem Tode ihres Günstlings Suffolk (C.W. V.102 ff.) ihre Veranlassung und ihr Vorbild gehabt haben in dem schmerzerfüllt Worten der Königin in “Henry VI” B. Act IV sc. 4. \(^{33}\)

[Translation: A verbatim concordance is not found at any point between Daniel and the historical dramas of his contemporary, but some of Daniel’s speeches may have found their origin in the words which the dramatist, on the same occasion, put in characters’ mouths, and some of the thoughts expressed in Shakespeare’s words are echoed in Daniel. Thus, Margaret’s complaint on the

---


33 Probst, “Samuel Daniel’s Civil Wars”, p. 76.
news of the death of her favorite, Suffolk (CW V.102 ff.), has its model in the
grieved words of the Queen in Henry VI Part 2, Act IV, scene 4.\textsuperscript{34}

If Daniel’s reference to the woeful Suffolk’s departure provides evidence of influence, this
would be a clear case of Daniel borrowing from the play. Some version of 2H6 had been
performed by 1592 and the scene of Margaret and Suffolk’s parting is included in Q1594 as
well as F1623, both describing him as “the wofullst” cask holding Margaret’s “heart” (words
echoed in Daniel’s stanza). With respect to the scene of Margaret holding Suffolk’s severed
head, the analysis is more complicated; the quarto and folio versions of this scene differ
materially. The quarto includes no lines for the mournful queen, only the stage direction,
“Enter the King reading of a Letter, and the Queene, with the Duke of Suffolkes head”
(\textit{Contention} Q1594, sig. F4v).\textsuperscript{35} The folio, on the other hand, gives the queen 10 lines in which
she either speaks about her dead lover or addresses his severed head. Daniel’s depiction of
Margaret addressing the dead Suffolk in her mind is more analogous to the scene in F1623. In
both versions, however, Henry says to his queen, “How now Madam, still lamenting and
mourning for Suffolkes death” (\textit{Contention} Q1594, sig. G1'; 2H6 F1623, N6'; 2H6 IV.4.20-
21), indicating that she has been demonstrating her grief in some way. The implications of the
differences between Q1594 and F1623 are evaluated in chapter 7.

Daniel’s fourth book shares another unhistorical element with 2H6 related to Suffolk’s death:
both works depict him being killed by pirates. The play includes a scene dramatizing the
duke’s capture and murder (2H6, IV.1). After his captors argue whether to ransom or kill their

\textsuperscript{34} I thank Dr. Kevin Goldberg, Jana Boerger and Michael Otte for their assistance in translating
Probst.

\textsuperscript{35} As a side note, I would nominate this bizarre stage direction from the quarto to rank
alongside “Exit pursued by a bear” as one of the most striking in Shakespeare’s works.
prisoners, Suffolk is taken offstage uttering his final line, “And Suffolke dies by Pyrates on the seas” (Contention Q1594, sig. F2v; 2H6 F1623, sig. N5v; IV.1.139). Similarly, the “Argument” that precedes the fourth book of Daniel’s poem states that the duke was murdered by pirates:

Suffolke that made the match preferd too hie
Going to exile a pirat murthereth:

(FFB Q1595:I-IV, Argument of the Fourth Book, 5-6)

The chroniclers who describe Suffolk’s death do not mention pirates, rather they say that “he was encontered with a shippe of warre aperteynyng to the duke of Excester”. Daniel seems to recognize that he was stretching the truth; the body of the poem does not refer to pirates, instead it ambiguously states that the earl was encountered on the seas by “some” who assured that he would never return home, not naming his killers:

But as he to his iudged exile went,
Hard on the shore he comes encountered
By some, that so far off his honor sent,
As put his backe-returne quite out of dread:
For there he had his rightfull punishment
Though wrongly done, and there he lost his head,
Part of his bloud hath Neptune, part the sand,
As who had mischiefe wrought by sea and land.

(FFB Q1595:I-IV, IV.103)

In his 1609 revisions, Daniel clarified the ambiguity, adding a note stating that Suffolk was captured by a warship:

As the D. was sayling into France, hee was incountered with a ship of Warre, appertaining to the D. of Excester: who tooke him, & brought him back to Douer; where his head was striken off, and his body left on the sands.

---

The bulk of the stanza remained intact, leaving it so unclear that Coleridge later called it “unintelligible” without the note:

Considering the style of this poem & how it is pitched, it is unpardonable in the Author to have put the particulars of Suffolk’s Death in a Note; & yet having inserted a Stanza unintelligible without it. 37

Coleridge most likely did not know the earlier version of Daniel’s poem that included no note and, therefore, would have been all-the-more unintelligible. At that stage, in 1595, the stanza becomes clear only if combined with the line in the prefatory Argument referring to Suffolk’s death by pirates.

The addition of the note in 1609 demonstrates Daniel’s awareness that he was artistically misrepresenting the circumstances of Suffolk’s death. Yet, even at that point he left the reference to pirates in the Argument for the then Book V. In all editions of the poem, Daniel seems to have wanted to leave the impression that Suffolk was killed by pirates, an impression unsupported by the English chronicles. That impression had precedent, however, in the popular play, Contention, a play which dramatized Suffolk’s death by pirates and highlighted on its printed title-page “the banishment and death of the Duke of Suffolke”. Daniel also emphasizes the separation of Suffolk’s head from his dead body, saying “there he lost his head, / Part of his blood hath Neptune, part the sand”, while Hall specifically states that Suffolk’s killer “left hys body with the heade vpon the sandes of Douer”, a detail repeated in Holinshed

and Stow. In 2H6, of course, Suffolk’s severed head appears onstage, separated from his body.

There is a possible common source for Daniel’s and the play’s depiction of Suffolk being killed by pirates, the collection of complaints titled The Mirror for Magistrates. Mirror was originally published in 1559 and was supplemented and expanded in six editions between 1563 and 1587. The work has been cited as a potential source for a number of Shakespeare’s plays and was an influence on Daniel in his 1592 Complaynt of Rosamond. All editions of Mirror included a complaint for Suffolk, which describes how he was “worthily punyshed for abusing his Kyng and causing the destruction of good Duke Humfrey”. Mirror provides no support for an amorous relationship between Suffolk and Margaret and includes an account of Suffolk’s death that, in its original version, cites the “Earle of Deuonshires barke”. Editions from 1571 onwards, however, changed the ship to a “Pyrates Barke, that was of little price”.

It is possible that Mirror’s association of Suffolk’s death with pirates appealed to both Daniel and the playwright(s) of 2H6, inspiring them to use that account to romanticize the relationship between the duke and Margaret. It would be unusual, however, for Daniel to prefer Mirror for Magistrates over the more historically-based chroniclers – Hall, Holinshed and Stow – for a detail such as the identity of Suffolk’s murderers. Probst, whose dissertation provides the most comprehensive study of Daniel’s sources, does not specifically comment on the basis for the

---

38 Hall, Union, fol. CLVIII; Holinshed, Chronicles, p. 632; Stow, Annals, p. 629.
39 Baldwin, Mirror, pp. 10-21.
41 Baldwin, Mirror, p. 162.
42 Baldwin, Mirror, p. 168.
43 Baldwin, Mirror, p. 168.
poet’s account of the duke’s death. He does, however, have a section where he reviews the relationship between *The Civil Wars* and *Mirror for Magistrates*, concluding that he found no instance where Daniel used *Mirror* as a source:


[The life sketches from the time of Henry VI [in *Mirror*] are numerous: Gloucester . . . Suffolk . . . Jack Cade . . . and finally the unfortunate King Henry VI . . . In this abundant quantity of matter, there is not a single episode that aligns with Daniel’s portrayal of the event and demonstrates the influence of the “Mirror for Magistrates” . . . The influence of the corresponding poems of the “Mirror for Magistrates” is, in my estimation, out of the question.]

Although I do not regard Probst’s analysis as conclusive, it does demonstrate Daniel’s preference for other sources and decreases the likelihood of the poet looking to *Mirror* for details of Suffolk’s death. It remains possible, however, that *Mirror* was the source for Suffolk’s death by pirates in both *The First Four Books* and *2H6*.

The parallels relating to Suffolk and Margaret considered so far have all involved *Henry VI Part 2*; there is another relating to *Part 1*. In their depictions of the earl fetching England’s future queen from France, both Daniel’s poem and *1H6* compare Suffolk to Paris stealing Helen of Troy. In *1H6*, Suffolk is analogized to Paris in the last scene of the play:

*Suf.* Thus Suffolke hath preuail’d, and thus he goes  
As did the youthfull *Paris* once to Greece,  
With hope to finde the like event in loue,  
But prosper better than the Troian did:  

(1H6 F1623, sig. M2'; 1H6 V.6.103-106)

---

44 Probst, “Samuel Daniel’s *Civil Wars*”, pp. 94-95.
The ending of *1H6* foreshadows the adulterous relationship that occupies a significant portion of *2H6* (or refers back to it, if *2H6* was written first). Daniel’s poem, unlike the play, does not explicitly state that Suffolk intends for Margaret to be his mistress at this stage in the narrative; however, he does similarly use an analogy between the earl and Paris to introduce his relationship to Margaret. After three stanzas describing Suffolk’s role in arranging the king’s marriage, Daniel reflects:

> What *Paris* brought this booty of desire  
> To set our mighty *Ilium* here on fire?

(*FFB Q1595:1-IV, IV.64.7-8*)

Daniel’s comparison of Suffolk to Paris hints at a romantic relationship with the queen he brings to England, as Paris brought Helen to Troy/Ilium, a relationship that is later confirmed in the queen’s laments about “her loue”.

Like Suffolk’s death by pirates, it is possible that the analogy of Suffolk to Paris was suggested to both Daniel and the playwrights of *1H6* by *The Mirror for Magistrates*. In Suffolk’s complaint, the duke refers to Margaret as being “In wit and learning matchles hence to Greece”, possibly invoking a comparison to Helen. Both Daniel and *1H6*, however, specifically make the comparison of Suffolk to Paris, who is not mentioned in the *Mirror* imagery, both refer to Troy/Ilium and both use this analogy at the same point in their narratives, during Suffolk’s negotiation of Henry’s marriage. *The Civil Wars* and *1H6* are more like each other in their comparison of Paris to Suffolk than either one is like *Mirror*. If the authors of the poem and the play independently found inspiration from *Mirror*’s invocation

---

of Helen, they both adapted it in the same way and used it to introduce a romantic relationship between the duke and Henry’s queen.\textsuperscript{46}

In addition to the similarities involving Suffolk and Margaret, the fourth book of The First Four Books includes two other parallels with the Henry VI plays not explained by shared sources. The works use similar imagery to describe Gloucester’s removal and they both credit the Duke of York with personally instigating Cade’s rebellion. Likenesses in wording, imagery and logic reinforce the overlap.

Both The First Four Books and 2H6 include the prosecution and death of the Duke of Gloucester, Henry’s uncle and England’s Protector. While there are many similarities in their presentations of the episode – for instance the assumption that Gloucester was murdered at the queen’s instigation – most can be explained by the chronicles. One poetic echo, however, cannot be so explained. In 2H6, after Henry acquiesces to Gloucester’s arrest, Gloucester says,

\begin{quote}
O! thus King Henry casts away his crouch,  
Before his legs can beare his bodie vp,
\end{quote}

(contention Q1594, sig. D4v; 2H6 III.1.189-190)\textsuperscript{47}

In The First Four Books, after Gloucester’s death, Daniel says of him:

\begin{quote}
And now the king alone all open lay,  
No vnderprop of bloud to stay him by,  
None but himselfe standes weakely in the way  
Twixt Yorke and the affected sou’raignty:
\end{quote}

(FFB Q1595:I-IV, IV.92.1-4)

\textsuperscript{46} Probst (“Samuel Daniel’s Civil Wars”, p. 74) sees Daniel’s invocation of the Paris/Helen analogy being influenced by the Henry VI plays, however, he cites a line from 3H6, II.2.145, where Edward, insulting Margaret, says, “Helen of Greece was fayrer farre then thou” (3H6 F1623, sig. P2’), apparently missing the more closely analogous lines from 1H6.

\textsuperscript{47} Line is substantially identical in F1623 (sig. N2’).
Both works refer to Gloucester as Henry’s crutch or underprop without which the weak king cannot stand. I have not found any inspiration for the imagery using either the word “crutch” or “underprop” in the historical chronicles and literary analogues. It is possible that the image was suggested by Hall who said that the “waight and burden of the realme, rested” upon the duke:

But the publique wealth of the realme of Englande, by the vnworthy death of this pollutique prince, susteined great losse, & ran into ruyne, for surely the whole waight and burden of the realme, rested and depended vpon him, as the experience afterward did declare.

Hall’s imagery emphasizes Gloucester’s role as England’s supporter, but does not specifically refer to a weak Henry who cannot stand without the duke’s assistance, something shared by both Daniel’s poem and the play.

In Daniel’s fourth book, as in 2H6 and most of the chronicles, Gloucester’s murder is immediately followed by Suffolk’s exile and Cade’s rebellion. Unlike the chroniclers, however, both poem and play show York playing an active part in planning that rebellion. In 2H6 (III.1.331-383), York has a long soliloquy describing how he intends to attain the crown. Among other things, he reveals that he has “seduste a headstrong Kentishman, / Iohn Cade of Ashford, / Vnder the title of Iohn Mortemer” (Contention, Q1594, sig. E1v-E2r). Immediately after the queen’s lamentation of Suffolk’s death, Daniel similarly describes how the rebels in Kent gathered under a leader who falsely took the name Mortimer:

Thus in her passion lo shee vttered,
When as far greater tumults now burst out,

---

48 A search for “underprop” or “under-prop” on EEBO yields 144 hits in 107 records; however, nearly all of them use the word as a verb, not a noun, saying that something is being used “to underprop” something else, often associated with building and religious imagery. A search for “crutch” near “Henry” or “Gloucester” yields only entries related to 2H6/Contention.

49 Hall, Union (1548), fol. CLI"
Which close and cunningly were practised
By such as sought great hopes to bring about:
For vp in armes in Kent were gathered
A mighty insolent rebellious rout
Vnder a daangerous head; who to deter
The state the more, himselfe nam’d Mortimer.

(FFB Q1595:I-IV, IV.111)

The fact that both FFB and 2H6 refer to Kent and to Cade naming himself Mortimer is not noteworthy as these are included in the chroniclers’ accounts of the rebellion. No such shared source exists, however, for Daniel’s assertion, in the immediately following stanza, that York secretly instigated the rebellion:

The Duke of Yorke that did not idle stand
But seekes to worke on all aduantages,
Had likewise in this course a secret hand,

(FFB Q1595:I-IV, IV.112.1-3)

In both The Civil Wars and 2H6 the instigation of Cade’s rebellion is personally attributed to York. There are also parallels in York’s logic in 2H6 and that ascribed to him by Daniel. Both describe how York wins whether the rebels prosper or not. In 2H6 York says (III.1.374-81):

and by that meanes
I shall perceiue how the common people
Do affect the claime and house of Yorke,
Then if he haue successe in his affaires,
From Ireland then comes Yorke againe,
To reape the haruest which that coystrill sowed,
Now if he should be taken and condemd,
Heele nere confesse that I did set him on,

(Contention Q1594, sig. E2r)\textsuperscript{50}

Using Cade, York intends to test how the people are disposed toward a rebellion by the descendants of Mortimer. If Cade succeeds, York benefits; if he fails, York is not incriminated. Daniel describes York’s thinking in a similar way:

\textsuperscript{50} The lines in F1623 differ, though the sense of them is the same; 2H6 F1623, sig. N3’. 
Knowing himselfe to be the onely one
That must attempt the thing if any should,
And therefore lets the Rebel now runne on
With that false name t’effect the best he could . . .
For if the traitor sped, the gaine were his;
If not, yet he standes safe, and blameles is.

(FFB Q1595:1-IV, IV.113)

As in 2H6, Daniel’s York is using Cade to test support for his claim to the crown. If Cade succeeds, “the gain were his”, if Cade fails, he “blameless is”. The words differ, but York’s logic is the same as in 2H6 (“if he haue successe / . . . then comes Yorke againe . . . if he should be taken . . . / Heele nere confesse that I did set him on”). The sixteenth-century chroniclers do not describe York’s instigation of Cade’s rebellion. As with the unhistorical romantic relationship between Margaret and Suffolk, the conclusion of literary scholars and modern historians is that the depiction in 2H6 is not historically accurate; York was not personally involved in Cade’s rebellion. Contrary to their sources, 2H6 and Daniel both show York planning the uprising and both describe him using the same logic – let Cade test support for the Mortimer/Yorkist claim and York wins whether the rebel succeeds or not.

These shared elements between the fourth book of Daniel’s poem and the Henry VI plays are supported by hints or suggestive wording in the English history chronicles or The Mirror for Magistrates. I will now consider overlaps in Daniel’s fifth book, overlaps which include closer verbal parallels and fewer instances of possible inspiration from common sources.

Textual Parallels - Book V

The parallels between the fifth book of The Civil Wars and the Henry VI plays include three from Talbot’s defeat at Bordeaux. This is a prominent episode in both the poem, where it comprises 26 stanzas of the fifth book (V.77-102), and in 1H6, where it occupies most of the fourth act. As in 1H6, Daniel describes Talbot being joined at the battle by his son, whom the father unsuccessfully tries to convince to flee the battlefield (FFB 1595-1599, V.90-91; 1H6 IV.5, IV.6). Many similarities in this exchange are supported by the common sources, Hall’s Union (fols. CLXVv - CLXVr) and Holinshed’s Chronicles (p. 640). Both the poem and play, however, provide overlapping details of the son’s death that are inconsistent with the chronicles. Both describe young Talbot rushing on the French and being overcome. In 1H6, the elder Talbot relates how his son personally fought against the French nobility:

When from the Dolphins Crest thy Sword struck fire,
It warm’d thy Fathers heart with proud desire
Of bold-fac’t Victorie . . .
The irefull Bastard Orleance, that drew blood
From thee my Boy, and had the Maidenhood
Of thy first fight, I soone encountred . . .

(1H6 F1623, L5r; 1H6 IV.6.10-18)

One scene later, the general reports his son’s death:

Dizzie-ey’d Furie,and great rage of Heart,
Suddenly made him from my side to start
Into the clustring Battaile of the French:
And in that Sea of Blood, my Boy did drench
His ouer-mounting Spirit; and there di’d
de

(1H6 F1623, sig. L5r; 1H6 IV.7.11-15)

52 Despite the inclusion of descriptions of the conference between Talbot and his son in Hall and Holinshed, Probst sees 1H6 as being Daniel’s more likely source, given the less extensive version included in the chronicles (Probst, Samuel Daniel’s Civil Wars, p. 33).
Daniel’s poem includes a similar description of the young Talbot fighting the “chiefest Peeres” of the French:

On th’other part, his most all-daring sonne  
(Although the inexperience of his yeeres  
Made him lesse skyld in what was to be done,  
Yet dyd it thrust him on beyond all feares)  
Flying into the mayne Battalion,  
Neere to the King, amidst the chiefest Peeres,  
With thousand wounds became at length opprest,  
As if he scornd to dye, but with the best.  

(FFB, Q1595:I-V, V.100)

Daniel’s imagery of the inexperienced Talbot “Flying into the mayne Batallion” parallels Talbot’s description in 1H6 of how his son, “Suddenly . . . from my side did start / Into the clustering Battle of the French”. The shared imagery does not have precedent in the chronicles, none of which provides details of how young Talbot was killed. After describing the death of the elder Talbot, Hall simply states:

there dyed manfully hys sonne the lord Lisle [young John Talbot], his bastard sonne Henry Talbot, and syr Edward Hull, elect to the noble order of the Gartier, and xxx. valeant personages of the English nacion.53

Hall’s statement that young Talbot “dyed manfully” may have inspired both playwright and poet to describe him rushing on the French, although the consonant wording of “Battle”/“Batallion” suggests possible influence between their works.

The description of Talbot’s defeat in 1H6 and Daniel’s poem also both emphasize how the elder Talbot ignored his age and performed the feats of a younger man. Again, this is a detail absent from the English chronicle sources. In 1H6, Talbot, describing his own actions, says:

Then Leaden Age,  
Quicken’d with Youthfull Spleene, and Warlike Rage,
Beat downe Alanson, Orleance, Burgundie,
And from the Pride of Gallia rescued thee.
The irefull Bastard Orleance, . . .
I soone encountred,
And interchanging blowes, I quickly shed
Some of his Bastard blood,

(1H6 F1623, sig. L5v; 1H6 IV.6.12-20)

The play’s description of how the aged Talbot discovered newfound vigor and fought with the best of the French corresponds to Daniel’s statement that the English general’s reinvigorated spirit belied his years and helped him perform incredible feats, driving “back the stoutest powres” with “infatigable hands”:

Whilst Talbot, whose fresh spirit hauing got
A mervailous aduantage of his yeeres,
Carries his vnfelt age as if forgot,
Whirling about where any neede appeares: . . .
Now urging here, now cheering there he flyes,
Vnlocks the thickest troupes where most force lyes.

In midst of wrath, of wounds, of blood and death, . . .
Driues back the stoutest powres that forward prest:
There makes his sword his way, there laboreth
Th’infatigable hands that neuer rest,
Scorning vnto his mortall wounds to yeeld
Till Death became best maister of the field.

(FFB Q1595:I-V, V.97-98)

Both the play’s and Daniel’s description of Talbot’s rejuvenation have no basis in the chronicles; rather, they contradict the chroniclers’ accounts. Hall emphasizes that Talbot’s age hampered the general’s actions, causing him to ride “on a little hakeney” during the battle:

When the Englishmen were come to the place where the Frenchmen were encamped, . . . they lyghted al on fote, the erle of Shrewesbury [Talbot] only except, which because of his age rode on a little hakeney, and fought fiercely with the Frenchmen . . . . But his enemies hauing a greater company of men, a more abundance of ordinance then before had bene sene in a battlayle, fyrst shot him through the thyghe with a handgonne, and slew his horse, & cowardly killed him, lyenge on the grounde . . .

---

54 Hall, Union, fols. CLXVc-CLXVIv.
In Hall, it is the rest of the English troops who “lyghted al on fote” and “fought fiercely”, while Talbot “because of his age rode on a little hakeney” and was ultimately killed “with a handgonne . . . lynge on the grounde” – a narrative inconsistent with the Talbot of 1H6 whose “Leaden age / Quicken’d with Youthfull Spleene, and Warlike Rage” or with the “whirling about” and “infatigable hands” described by Daniel.

The third element shared by The Civil Wars’ narration of Talbot’s defeat and the Henry VI plays includes the closest verbal echoes. It is the comparison of a battle to a war between waves and wind. Interestingly, the section of the Henry VI plays that includes this description is not that dramatizing Talbot’s defeat in 1H6, rather it is in the battle of Towton in 3H6. In that play, King Henry sits on a molehill and describes the raging battle:

This battell fares like to the mornings Warre,
When dying clouds contend, with growing light, . . .
Now swayes it this way, like a Mighty Sea,
Forc’d by the Tide, to combat with the Winde:
Now swayes it that way, like the selfe-same Sea,
Forc’d to retyre by furie of the Winde.
Sometime, the Flood preuailes; and than the Winde:
Now, one the better; then, another best;
Both tugging to be Victors, brest to brest:
Yet neither Conqueror, nor Conquered.
So is the equall poise of this fell Warre.

(3H6 F1623, P2v; 3H6, II.5.1-13; as discussed below, this is from F1623, not True Tragedy.)

Daniel employs similar imagery to describe the fighting at Bordeaux:

For as with equall rage, and equall might
Two aduers winds combat with billowes proude
And neyther yeeld: Seas, skyes maintayne like fight,
Wawe against wawe opposd, and clowd to clowd.
So war both sides with obstinate despiht,
With like reuenge, and neyther party bowd:
Fronting each other with confounding blowes,
No wound, one sword vnto the other owes.

(FFB Q1595:I-V, V.96)

Both compare the battle to a struggle between waves and wind and both use the words “war”, “cloud”, “sea(s)”, “combat”, “wind(s)”, “equal” and “might”/“mighty” in their descriptions.

Of the 59 words in Daniel’s stanza, 28 (47%) are included in the section of 3H6 quoted above (including repetitions). Of the 103 words in the section of 3H6, 38 (37%) are included in Daniel’s stanza. While the image of a battle being like a fight between opposing waves, or waves and wind, may have independently occurred to both Daniel and the playwrights of 3H6, it is noteworthy that they use so many of the same words to describe it. A comparison to three possible partial sources of inspiration or analogues demonstrates that the extent of similarity is unusual, both in language and concept.

Randall Martin suggests that the image in 3H6 may have been inspired by Hall, who says of the battle at Towton:

This deadly battayle and bloudy conflicte, continued x. houres in doubtfull victorie. The one parte some time flowyng, and sometime ebbyng, . . .

Hall’s use of the phrase “some time flowyng, and sometime ebbyng” may have given rise to the image of a swaying wave. But the wind plays no part in Hall’s imagery and his description

55 The words included in Daniel’s stanza also contained in the description from 3H6 are as follows, with the counts for repeated words noted parenthetically: “with” (5), “equal” (2), “and” (4), “might” (“mighty” in 3H6), “winds”, “combat”, “neither” (2), “seas”, “like” (2), “cloud” (2), “to”, “so”, “war”, “both”, “one”, “the”, “other” (“another” in 3H6). Of the 46 unique words in stanza V.96, 17 (37%) are included in the comparable section of 3H6.


of the battle includes none of the more significant words shared between Daniel and 3H6. It may have triggered the wind-wave imagery in one of the two, but unlikely both.

In analyzing this section of Daniel’s poem, Probst cites a similar description of the fight between Paridel and Scudamor in Book IV of *The Faerie Queene*, a book first printed in 1596 although circulated in manuscript earlier:

> As when two billowes in the Irish sowndes,  
> Forcibly driuen with contrarie tydes  
> Do meete together, each abacke rebowndes  
> With roaring rage; and dashing on all sides,  
> That filleth all the sea with fome, diuydes  
> The doubtfull current into diuerse wayes:  
> So fell those two in spight of both their prydes, . . .

Probst concludes that Daniel’s imagery is closer to 3H6 than to Spenser. I agree with that assessment; the imagery from *The Faerie Queene* includes nothing about winds or clouds, only waves. It shares fewer words with either Daniel or 3H6 than they share with each other. In this regard, *The Faerie Queene* may provide an analogue for the imagery in *The Civil Wars* and 3H6, but one that is more instructive in pointing out how the images in both differ from Spenser’s epic than in identifying that poem as a source. It demonstrates how imagery of violent waves may have been a common trope, with Spenser’s poem likely being written

---

59 Probst, “Samuel Daniel’s *Civil Wars*”, p. 82, “Eine grössere Übereinstimmung mit Shakespeare zeigt folgender Vergleich: Daniel vergleicht den Kampf Talbot’s gegen die Franzosen mit dem Zusammenstosse zweier Winde: . . .”; [Daniel shows great consistency with Shakespeare when he compares Talbot’s fight against the French with the collision of two winds: . . .]; p. 121, “Eine ähnlichen Vergleich verwendet Spenser in Bezug auf den Kampf zwischen Paridell und Scudamour . . . Jedoch steht das bereits erwähnte Bild in Shakespeare’s ‘Henry VI’ dem Daniel’schen näher.” [Spenser employed a similar comparison regarding the battle between Paridel and Scudamour...However, the imagery in Shakespeare’s Henry VI described above better approximates Daniel’s].
60 The description in 3H6 has 19 words (18%), counting repetitions, also included in Spenser’s stanza while that in FFB has 12 (20%).
around the same period as the fifth book of *The Civil Wars* and *3H6*, but the trope did not include elements shared by the poem and the play.

One of Daniel’s principal inspirations for his poem, Lucan’s *Pharsalia*, includes a section that describes how the winds control the ebb and flow of the waves. The description, however, is not employed to describe the violence of battle, rather it is used to evoke the shoreline where Caesar’s forces amassed, a shoreline that was “nor sea, nor land” as the waves covered it and rolled back. As it is included in Lucan’s first book, I can quote from a contemporary translation, one that Daniel could have possibly seen, that by Christopher Marlowe:

> And others came from that uncertain shore  
> Which is nor sea, nor land, but oftentimes both,  
> And changeth as the ocean ebbs and flows;  
> Whether the sea rolled always from that point  
> Whence the wind blows, still forced to and fro,  
> Or that the wandering main follow the moon...  

It is believed that Marlowe translated the first book of Lucan’s *Pharsalia* in the late 1580s and that it circulated in manuscript, although it was not published until 1600, seven years after the poet’s death. Lucan’s imagery, as translated by Marlowe, could therefore feasibly have been an influence on either Daniel or *3H6*. As noted earlier, Marlowe has been identified as a potential part author of the *Henry VI* plays, hence raising the possibility that the wind-wave imagery from *3H6* is directly related to his translation. Since this section of the play is one that differs significantly between the O1595 and F1623 versions, the ramifications of the

---

parallel are addressed in chapter 7. For now, I consider only the extent of similarity between Lucan’s imagery and that in Daniel’s poem and 3H6.

It is apparent from Lucan’s poem that wind-wave imagery was used by writers long before the Henry VI plays or The Civil Wars. It is possible that Pharsalia provided partial inspiration for the imagery employed by one or both; however, the two works share a critical element absent from Lucan. The interaction between wind and waves is violent in the play and Daniel’s poem, used to describe a raging battle, not the regular movement of waves back-and-forth over the shore. If Daniel and/or the author(s) of 3H6 were inspired by Lucan’s poetic wind-wave imagery, they both employed it for a very different purpose. The depiction of winds battling waves in FFB has 11 words (17%) shared with Marlowe’s translation while that in 3H6 has 10 words (10%), a significantly lower proportion than the words shared with each other.

Hall’s, Spenser’s and Lucan’s imagery, quoted above, all share elements of the invocation of wind and waves in the poem and the play. None, however, are as close to the two as they are to each other. The similarity between Daniel’s description of Talbot’s battle at Bordeaux and Henry’s commentary on Towton in 3H6 provides the most extended verbal parallel between the Henry VI plays and the five books of The Civil Wars published between 1595 and 1599. At a minimum, potential influence between the two seems plausible. Since some version of the 3H6 is known to have been performed by 1592, three years before the earliest possible date of the fifth book, one might think it obvious that the direction of influence, if any, was from play to poem. Unfortunately, the textual history of the play complicates the analysis. The wind-wave imagery appears only in the F1623 version of 3H6, not the O1595 version of True Tragedy. The early printed edition instead includes an image of a mastless ship:
How like a mastlesse ship vpon the seas,
This woful battaile doth continue still,
Now leaning this way, now to that side driue,
And none doth know to whom the daie will fall.

(True Tragedy, O1595, sig. C2v)

While this imagery involves the seas and a wavering battle, swaying back and forth, it shares much less with Daniel’s description of Talbot’s defeat than the imagery in the folio version of the scene. Since it is uncertain when the folio scene, first printed in 1623, was written and when, between 1595 and 1599, Daniel added the fifth book to The Civil Wars, the analysis of potential influence is particularly complex. Chapter 7 evaluates these factors and considers the implications with respect to direction of potential influence.

In addition to this parallel from the folio version of Henry VI Part 3, any comparison of Daniel’s poem to Part 1 necessarily calls for a consideration of questions surrounding potential revision of that play. This includes all elements of the play’s depiction of Talbot’s defeat and its analogizing of Suffolk to Paris. Again, these questions are considered in chapter 7.

Textual Parallels: Source or Paralogue?

I have analyzed nine textual parallels between The First Four Books of the Civil Wars (including the fifth book) and the Henry VI plays. The following list assigns numbers to them so they may be easily referred to in later chapters:

1. Suffolk’s woeful parting from Margaret (FFB, IV.107; 2H6, III.2),
2. The queen’s reaction to Suffolk’s death (FFB, IV.104; 2H6, IV.4),
3. Suffolk’s murder by pirates (FFB, IV.Argument, IV.103; 2H6, IV.1),
4. Suffolk compared to Paris (FFB, IV.64; 1H6, V.6),
5. Gloucester as Henry’s crutch/underprop (FFB, IV.92; 2H6, III.1),
6. York’s instigation of Cade’s rebellion (FFB, IV.112; 2H6, III.1),
7. The death of young Talbot (FFB, V.100; 1H6, IV.6-7),
8. Talbot’s heroic feats, ignoring his age (FFB, V.97-98; 1H6, IV.6),
9. Wind and wave imagery to describe a battle (FFB, V.96; 3H6, II.5).
Shared partial inspiration for some of these parallels is suggested by common sources while others are more difficult to explain. There are many other parallels between Daniel’s poem and the *Henry VI* plays that I have either referred to briefly or not mentioned because they are more readily dismissed as coincidental given their basis in the English chronicles. Among the ones I have not cited are the following six: (1) the characterization of Henry VI’s pious, pacifist nature (*FFB*, IV.54-56, V.63-68; *2H6* I.3, *3H6* 2.2); (2) Suffolk being rewarded for arranging Henry’s marriage to Margaret as if he had achieved a “mighty benefit”/“great favor” (*FFB*, IV.62; *2H6*, I.1); (3) a complaint about the loss of Anjou and Maine that contains a play on the word “Maine” (*FFB*, V.19; *2H6*, I.1); (4) Daniel’s use of Warwick’s sobriquet “Kingmaker”, one who “Monarchs makes, and made, againe puts downe” (*FFB*, V.16; *2H6*, II.2; *3H6*, II.3, III.3, V.1); (5) a description of York’s troubled mind on being challenged by Henry’s messenger (*FFB*, V.58; *2H6*, V.1); and, (6) the poetic use of the phrase “tumultuous broils” (*FFB*, I.1; *3H6*, V.5). The volume of parallels raises the question of whether they are indicative of influence or some other form of intertextuality.

In his essay “Seven types of intertextuality”, Robert S. Miola describes different categories of relationships between texts. He defines “source texts” as follows:

> Source texts provide plot, character, idea, language, or style to later texts. The author’s reading and remembering directs the transaction, which may include complicated strategies of *imitatio*. The source text in various ways shapes the later text, its content, or its rhetorical style and form.\(^{64}\)

---

The parallels listed above certainly exhibit similarities in “content”, “rhetorical style” or “form”. What is unclear, however, is whether they reflect one author “reading” (or possibly viewing, in the case of a play) and “remembering” another’s work. Miola describes another form of intertextuality that is more diffuse than a source, a form he refers to as “paralogue”:

Paralogues are texts that illuminate the intellectual, social, theological, or political meanings in other texts. Unlike texts or even traditions, paralogues move horizontally and analogically in discourses rather than in vertical lineation through the author’s mind or intention.65

Are the parallels between The First Four Books of the Civil Wars and the Henry VI plays indicative of one being a source for the other or are the works paralogues, texts that exhibit similarities due to common contexts of their composition? On its own, the textual evidence is inconclusive. There are not enough clear, extended verbal echoes to confirm influence. It is possible that the works reflect two (or more) authors interpreting their sources in similar ways, especially when it came to translating historical figures into fleshed-out characters and inventing episodes to illustrate those characters: Margaret, the fierce but vulnerable queen; Suffolk, the opportunist; the Talbots, heroic warriors who define glory even in defeat; York, the hot-tempered pretender to the crown who schemes and dissembles; Warwick, the powerful king-maker who changes monarchs at his will; and, Henry, the good man but ineffectual king. The chronicles contain hints for these characterizations, but none of the usual sources fully explain the bulk of the overlapping depictions in The First Four Books and the Henry VI plays. If the works are paralogues, they were written by artists of similar minds when it came to characterization.

65 Miola, “Seven Types of Intertextuality”, p. 23.
In considering questions of possible influence and direction of influence, it is helpful to categorize the parallels enumerated above based on two gauges: extent of support in sources and existence of textual overlap in the early printed versions of the Henry VI plays. Some parallels have limited support in the chronicles, others almost none. Some parallels arise when comparing Daniel’s poem to both the quarto/octavo and the folio versions of the plays while others relate only to the folio. The parallels that most strongly suggest the influence of the plays on Daniel’s initial composition of the poem are those that both have a limited basis in the chronicles and appear in the early printed versions. I am not implying that Daniel necessarily had read those printed versions, rather I take those printed versions to document the existence of textual elements that existed prior to the publication of The First Four Books; Daniel could have seen the plays performed. I believe that two of the parallels listed above fit into both categories, having limited basis in sources and appearing in early versions of the plays: Suffolk’s woeful departure (#1, above) and Margaret’s reaction to Suffolk’s death (#2). There are three other parallels that have partial support in common sources, and are therefore more questionable of potential influence, while being fully documented in the early printed editions of the plays: Suffolk’s murder by pirates (#3), Gloucester as Henry’s crutch (#5) and York’s instigation of Cade’s rebellion (#6). These three may be dismissed unless influence is accepted for #1 and #2, in which case they would also become plausible evidence of influence.

The evaluation of the similarity between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s depiction of Margaret’s reaction to Suffolk’s death is complicated by alternate versions of the scene in the quarto of Contention and the folio version in 2H6. The one textual overlap that has no support in the chronicles and appears clearly, with a verbal parallel, in both an early version of the play and the First Folio is Suffolk’s parting from Margaret. Daniel’s queen who relives her lover’s
departure in her mind and says she “saw thy wofull cheere / When thou perceiu’dst no helpe but to depart” seems to recall the scene from *Contention* of exiled Suffolk parting from his lover and taking her heart as “A iewell lockt into the wofullst caske”. The scene, which exists in both versions of the play, has no precedent or suggestion in Daniel’s or Shakespeare’s sources. This does not prove influence, but the conclusion that the two are paralogues and similarities are coincidental requires a strong belief in two artists’ ability to use similar imagery and wording to illustrate the same invented event. If, on the other hand, one accepts this parallel as being evidence of Daniel using *2H6* as a source, then the others become more likely indications of influence as well. Once influence is accepted for one, demonstrating that Daniel was familiar with the play, other areas of overlap, including those partially supported by common sources, become plausible evidence of one work influencing the other.

The probability that areas of overlap indicate influence is impacted by an assessment of whether it was likely that Daniel was aware of the plays based on external evidence. In some ways, the complicated analysis of potential influence is simplified by the answer to one question. Was Michel correct when he said:

> The likelihood that Daniel knew Shakespeare or any of his works before at least 1604 is small. There is no convincing external evidence, and what similarities in their writings can be mustered . . . can all be instances of a one-way influence, if any, from Daniel to Shakespeare. . . .

My analysis of the textual parallels between the *Henry VI* plays and *The First Four Books* suggests that Michel was incorrect in at least one of his assertions embedded in this statement. Some “similarities in their writings”, for instance the reference to a “woeful” Suffolk’s departure, cannot be an instance of influence from Daniel to Shakespeare. The play which

---

includes it had been performed years before the appearance of *The First Four Books* and it is documented in a printed edition of the play published a year before Daniel’s poem. The similarity may be coincidence, a paralogue not a source, but it cannot be an instance of the playwright(s) of 2H6 using Daniel as a source.

I believe that a second element of Michel’s assertion is also incorrect, the idea that there is no “convincing external evidence” that Daniel knew Shakespeare’s early works. There are three pieces of external evidence indicating that Daniel was at least aware of the *Henry VI* plays by 1594. Two of them involve contemporary common references to Daniel and the plays in works that appeared as Daniel was writing the poem. These suggest his awareness of the plays. The third involves the entry of Daniel’s poem in the Stationers’ Register, an entry that indicates some level of familiarity with the published text of at least one of the plays.

**External Evidence of Daniel’s Awareness of the *Henry VI* Plays**

On February 4, 1592, the first collection of Daniel’s poems attributed to him was entered in the Stationers’ Register.67 *Delia. Contayning certayne sonnets: with the complaint of Rosamond* was an immediate success, resulting in a second expanded edition that same year.68 The first critical recognition of Daniel’s work is included in Thomas Nashe’s *Pierce Pennilesse his Supplication to the Deuill*, a book entered in the Stationers’ Register on August 8, 1592, six


68 Pitcher, ‘Daniel, Samuel’, *ODNB*, “The book, on sale by the spring of 1592 . . . was an immediate success; Daniel followed up in the same year with a second edition, which supplied four new sonnets to Delia, and a revised version of Rosamond.” For a bibliographic description of the two 1592 editions, see Harry Sellers, “A Bibliography of the Works of Samuel Daniel”, *Proceedings and Papers of the Oxford Bibliographical Society*, 2 (1927), 29-54, (pp. 32-33).
months after Daniel’s volume. Connections between Nashe and Daniel, as well as between Nashe and the Henry VI plays, complicate the implications of Nashe’s work, as will be discussed below. At a minimum, however, Nashe documents the positive critical reception of Daniel’s Rosamond. In a section defending poetry against its detractors, he states:

you shall finde there goes more esquisite partes and puritie of witte, to the writing of one such rare Poem as Rosamond, than to a hundred of your dunsticall Sermons.

A few pages later, Nashe attacks the “shallow-braind censures” who criticize plays, offering praise of a recent popular work from the London stage:

Nay, what if I proove playes to be no extreame: but a rare exercise of vertue? First, for the subject of them (for the most part) it is borrowed out of our English Chronicles, wherein our forefathers valiant acts (that haue line long buried intrustie brasse, and worme-eaten bookes) are revuied, and they themselues raised from the Graue of Obliuion, . . . How it would haue ioyed the braue 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 haue his bones newe embalmed with the teares of ten thousand spectators at least, (at seuerall times) who in the Tragedian that represents his person, imagine they behold him fresh bleeding.

Nashe’s eloquent statement is generally interpreted as a reference to some version of 1H6, perhaps performed as harey the vj, which played to large crowds at the Rose Theatre from March to June 1592 (see chapter 3, pp. 72-74, for further analysis of these performances). The recognition of a play that depicted the death of Talbot in the printed work that also included the first public praise of Daniel’s poetry offers positive evidence that Daniel was

---

70 Nashe, Pierce Penniless, sig. D3r.
71 Nashe, Pierce Penniless, sig. F3r.
plausibly aware of a popular play dramatizing the historical matter about which he was writing. A connection between Daniel and Nashe in 1591 to 1592 increases the likelihood of that awareness.

In 1591, the year before the publication of Daniel’s *Delia and Rosamond*, the first printed edition of the late Sir Philip Sidney’s *Astrophel and Stella* appeared in a volume that included “sundry other rare sonnets of diuers noble men”, including 28 by Daniel, and an introductory address “Somewhat to read for them that list”, by Nashe. The edition was published by Thomas Newman and was likely based upon a stolen or surreptitious manuscript version of Philip Sidney’s poems. It was called in by the Stationers’ Company which took action against Newman. It is unclear how Newman came to possess such a manuscript. H. R. Woudhuysen speculates that one or both of Daniel and Nashe may have been involved, both potentially seeking the favor of Mary Herbert née Sidney, the Countess of Pembroke. Regardless of the accuracy of that speculation, the inclusion of their works in the unauthorized published edition of *Astrophel and Stella* is an indication of Daniel’s and Nashe’s awareness of each other and may provide evidence of their personal acquaintance. This increases the likelihood that Daniel would note Nashe’s recognition of a play about Talbot in *Pierce Penniless*. If Daniel personally knew Nashe, another connection further increases that likelihood; Nashe was a probable part author of the play.

---

73 Philip Sidney, *Syr P.S. His Astrophel and Stella, . . . To the end of which are added, sundry other rare sonnets of diuers Noble men and gentlemen* (London, 1591), sigs. I3v-L2v, A3v-A4v.
76 Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney*, pp. 371-383. Daniel’s involvement with the Countess of Pembroke after the appearance of his *Delia and Rosamond* will be addressed in chapter 3.
In the past two decades, a strong consensus has developed that Nashe is the author of at least the first act of *Henry VI Part 1*.\(^{77}\) If that is the case, Nashe’s praise of the play is a self-serving promotion of a contemporary theatrical work in which he had a hand. It may also indicate that Nashe was working on the play in 1591, around the time of his association with Daniel and the publication of *Astrophel and Stella*. While these connections are speculative, they reinforce the evidence provided by Nashe’s citation of one of the *Henry VI* plays in *Pierce Penniless* that Daniel plausibly had some awareness of the play.

Another work that appeared before the publication of *The First Four Books* also refers to both Daniel’s *Rosamond* and the *Henry VI* plays. Katherine Duncan-Jones identified a reference in Giles Fletcher’s poem *The Rising to the Crowne of Richard the third* which she believes proves that all three *Henry VI* plays were familiar to English audiences by September 1593 and that playgoers were looking forward to *Richard III*.\(^{78}\) The poem appears in the 1593 book *Licia, or Poemes of Loue, . . . whereunto is added the Rising to the Crowne of Richard the third*.\(^{79}\) The opening stanza begins:

```plaintext
The Stage is set, for Stately matter fitte,
Three partes are past, which Prince-like acted were,
To play the fourth, requires a Kingly witte,\(^{80}\)
```


\(^{78}\) Katherine Duncan-Jones, “‘Three partes are past’: The Earliest Performances of Shakespeare’s First Tetralogy”, *Notes and Queries*, 50 (2003), 20-21.

\(^{79}\) Giles Fletcher, *Licia, or Poemes of loue . . . Whereunto is added the rising to the crowne of Richard the third* (London, 1593).

\(^{80}\) Fletcher, *Licia*, sig. L2v.
In Duncan-Jones’s words, “Fletcher’s remark that ‘Three partes are past’ makes best sense as referring to recent performance of the plays we now know as 1, 2, and 3 Henry VI.”\textsuperscript{81} The reference to “the fourth” is an apparent reference to a play about Richard III, the subject of Fletcher’s poem, a play that was anticipated but had not yet been performed in late 1593.\textsuperscript{82}

Two stanzas later, on the same page, Fletcher cites a historical figure brought back to life in another recent work:

\begin{quote}
Rosamond was fayre, and farre more fayre than she,
Her fall was great, and but a womans fall.\textsuperscript{83}
\end{quote}

As with Nashe’s recognition of a play about Talbot a year earlier, it provides evidence that Daniel may have been aware of a work referring to the Henry VI plays, one that concurrently invoked the heroine of his poem. This time, however, the reference to the Henry VI plays documents the recognition of all three and implies that there was public awareness of them in late 1593, when Daniel was certainly writing The Civil Wars.

The joint mention of Daniel’s poems alongside references to the Henry VI plays in two separate works published between 1592 and 1593 indicates an environment where Daniel’s awareness of the plays seems more likely than his lack of knowledge of them. A third piece of external evidence provides the strongest indication that he was familiar with the published edition of one of them, Contention. The entry of Daniel’s poem in the Stationers’ Register in October 1594 seems to have been modeled on the title of that play as it was printed a few months earlier.

\textsuperscript{81} Duncan-Jones, “‘Three partes are past’”, p. 20.

\textsuperscript{82} Fletcher, Licia includes a note “To the Reader” dated “Septemb. 8. 1593”, sig. B1\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{83} Fletcher, Licia, sig. L2r.
Contestation was entered in the Stationers’ Register on March 12, 1594 and was printed soon thereafter with the title-page: 

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 Cardinall of Winchester, with the notable Rebellion of Jacke Cade: | And the Duke of Yorkes first clame vnto the Crowne. | LONDON. | Printed by Thomas Creed, for Thomas Millington, and are to be sold at his shop vnder Saint Peters Church in Cornwall. | 1594.

(Contention Q1594, title-page)

Seven months later, on October 11, Daniel’s poem was entered in the Stationers’ Register not as The Civil Wars but as The discension betwixt the houses of Yorke and Lancaster:

Symon waterson/ Entred for his copie vnder the wardens handes, a booke intituled, The discension betwixt the houses of Yorke and Lancaster in verse penned by Samuell Danyell, vppon Condidion that before yt be printed he shall procure sufficient authority for the printing of yt.

It is unclear why Daniel’s work would be identified as The Discention betwixt the houses of Yorke and Lancaster and not as The Civil Wars. An extant early manuscript of the first two books (analyzed in chapter 4) includes the title “The ciuile warrs betweene the houses of york & Lanaster [sic]”. The title does not include the word “discention”, nor is that word used anywhere in the body of the poem to describe the conflict. The title of the work was certainly important to Daniel who sought to associate his epic with Lucan’s Pharsalia, a work also known by its alternate title, De Bello Civili [The Civil War], as echoed in Daniel’s opening.

---

85 Arber, ed., Transcript, vol. 2, fol. 313\. 
86 BL, Sloane MS 1443; CELM, DaS 1. This manuscript is analyzed in chapter 4.
line, “I sing the civill warrs”.

In 1603, Daniel referred to his poem as “my Homer-Lucan”, in his Defense of Ryme, emphasizing its connection to Lucan’s epic. Daniel does not seem to have intended the poem to be titled The discention; why then is it recorded that way in the Stationers’ Register?

I believe a plausible explanation is that it was contemplated that Daniel’s poem would be printed and marketed as The discention to be reminiscent of The Contention, the play on the same topic printed as Daniel was completing the first edition of his work. Both were being represented as adaptations of Hall’s chronicle, The vnion of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre & Yorke beeving long in continual discension. Daniel may have adopted the word “discension” from Hall; however, the contemplated title of Daniel’s work, The discention betwixt the houses of Yorke and Lancaster, is more similar to The First part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster, than it is to Hall’s work. Both poem and play include the words “betwixt” and “houses”, words that do not appear in Hall, and present the family names of York and Lancaster in the same order, the opposite order of that in Hall. Reflecting the intent to take advantage of the play’s popularity, Daniel’s poem may have been initially submitted to the Stationers’ Company with a title-page that closely mirrored the play, a title-page that could be used to market the work. Paulina Kewes points out that early modern readers did not necessarily distinguish between different genres – chronicles, stage

plays, poems – in regarding all as histories. They “expected . . . to make comparisons across a spectrum of texts dealing . . . with the national or foreign past.” The fact that Daniel’s poem was entered as *The discention . . . in verse* (my emphasis) encouraged a comparison to the dramatic and prose versions of the same historical material.

Of course, it would be Daniel’s publisher, Simon Waterson, not Daniel himself, who registered the work and would be concerned with marketing it. Yet Daniel’s involvement in the decision of how his poem would be titled and sold is suggested by the Stationers’ Register entry that specifically identifies him, indicating that the manuscript submitted featured his name. The poet would undoubtedly be aware if the poem that he intended to be called *The Civil Wars* was expected to be sold with an alternate title. Perhaps Daniel and Waterson debated the title, with the publisher desiring to take advantage of the popularity of *Contention*. If that were the case, it appears that Daniel won in the end, since the printed work was called *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* and not the title by which it was identified in the Stationers’ Register.

Regardless of why Daniel’s poem was registered as *The discention*, not *The Civil Wars*, the close parallel between the work as entered in the Stationers’ Register and the title page of *Contention* provides strong evidence that Daniel was aware of a printed version of the play. The title of his poem as entered in the Stationers’ Register, *The discention betwixt the houses of Yorke and Lancaster in verse* closely parallels *The First part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster*, printed within the preceding seven months. That printed edition included a romantic relationship between Margaret and Suffolk, a depiction of

---

their woeful parting, Suffolk’s death by pirates, a description of Gloucester as Henry’s crutch and York’s personal instigation of Cade’s rebellion, all elements included in the fourth book of Daniel’s poem. Contrary to Michel’s assertion regarding the lack of external evidence of Daniel’s knowledge of the *Henry VI* plays, the registration of his work in the Stationers’ Register indicates it likely that he knew of at least *Contention* while parallels with the first edition of the poem provide indications of possible influence that can be in only one direction, from that play to Daniel.

In this chapter I have evaluated nine textual parallels between the *Henry VI* plays and Daniel’s *First Four Books of the Civil Wars* (including the fifth book) not fully explained by reference to common sources. I have also considered bibliographical evidence suggesting that Daniel was aware of the *Henry VI* plays as he was writing his poem and that he may have had some familiarity with the printed edition of one of the plays. The analysis is not conclusive of influence; there are no extended quotations and it remains possible that all areas of overlap are coincidental. The evidence demonstrates, however, that the hypothesis that Daniel adopted elements of the *Henry VI* plays while writing his poem is plausible. There is textual and bibliographical evidence of such influence. Employing Hume’s framework, this hypothesis needs to be further tested through a review of other evidence, specifically biographical and historical evidence of whether Daniel could have encountered the plays in performance or print. In the next chapter I evaluate such evidence to determine if it supports or refutes the hypothesis that Daniel was influenced by the *Henry VI* plays.
Currently accepted literary scholarship holds that Daniel was likely unaware of the *Henry VI* plays while writing *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* and that the first published edition of his poem was not influenced by the plays. This view is based, in part, on the fact that Oxford-trained Daniel inhabited a milieu dominated by the aristocracy, people like his patrons, the Countess of Pembroke and Baron Mountjoy, who are thought to have had little exposure to or regard for popular theater. A review of what is known of Samuel Daniel’s life and the performance and publication history of the *Henry VI* plays, however, yields a number of connections between those around Daniel and theater, as well as connections to these specific plays. Two of the plays, *Contention* and *True Tragedy*, were likely being performed by Pembroke’s Men, the acting company sponsored by the Countess’s husband, when Daniel was part of the Pembroke household and contemplating, if not composing, *The Civil Wars*. Further details of Mary Sidney’s activities during the summer of 1592 suggest a vehicle for Daniel see performances of the plays. Similarly, Mountjoy’s documented interest in playbooks and historical drama provides evidence of how Daniel could have become aware of printed editions of the plays as they became available.

Biographical and historical evidence surrounding Daniel’s life and the performance history of the *Henry VI* plays provides a basis for testing the hypothesis that he was influenced by the plays while writing *The First Four Books*. Much of this evidence, especially analysis of Mary Sidney’s activities and details of the itineraries of the acting companies, has become available in the past few decades and so was not encompassed in Michel’s 1958 analysis when he
concluded it unlikely that Daniel “would have seen or read the plays”. The new evidence calls for a reevaluation of Michel’s conclusion.

Samuel Daniel and the Countess of Pembroke: 1592 to 1594

During the three years preceding the October 1594 entry of The First Four Books of the Civil Wars in the Stationers’ Register, Daniel wrote The Tragedy of Cleopatra under the patronage of Mary Sidney, the Countess of Pembroke, and completed the first edition of The Civil Wars with the support of Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy. As described in chapter 2 (p. 56), his literary career was effectively launched in late 1591 with the inclusion of his sonnets in the first edition of Philip Sidney’s Astrophel and Stella. Soon after its publication, the edition was called in by the Stationers’ Company, most likely at the insistence of Mary Sidney who tightly controlled the publication of her brother’s works. Daniel was either visiting Italy at the time with Sir Edward Dymoke or had recently returned to England. The seemingly unauthorized publication of his poems gave Daniel reason to appeal to the Countess for patronage in his 1592 edition of Delia and Rosamond. The volume included a prose dedication “To the Right Honorable Ladie Mary, Countesse of Pembroke” in which Daniel protested the inclusion of his poems in the questionable edition of her brother’s work and pleaded for support:

Right honorable, although I rather desired to keep in the priuate passions of my youth, . . . seeing I was betraide by the indiscretions of a greedie Printer, and had some of my secrets brewraide to the world, vncorrected: doubting the like of the rest, I am forced to publish that which I neuer ment. . . . And for my selfe, seeing I am thrust out into the worlde, and that my vnboldned Muse, is forced to

---

1 Michel, ed., Civil Wars, p. 8.
appeare so rawly in publique; I desire onely to bee graced by the countenance of your protection: whome the fortune of our time hath made the happie and judicall Patronesse of the Muses, . . .

*(Delia and Rosamond, 1592a, sig. A2v*)

Daniel’s appeal to the Countess worked; he was soon writing under her patronage and direction. The exact date when Daniel gained Mary Sidney’s support is unknown but may be important in determining how he could have encountered the *Henry VI* plays. Daniel’s signature in an autograph book of German traveler Erhard Grünthaler places him in Padua in June 1591 following a journey through the Alps. The entry of *Delia and Rosamond* in the Stationers’ Register on February 4, 1592 may indicate that he had returned to England by that date. He was certainly in England by March as details of a lawsuit between Dymoke and his uncle, the Earl of Lincoln, place Daniel in Dymoke’s home on March 1 of that year.

Some literary scholars have speculated that his involvement with the Countess began before the publication of *Delia and Rosamond* and that she may be the “Delia” of his poems. Daniel biographers, however, have dismissed that possibility based on the change in tone between his 1592 dedication to her and that in 1594, and the lack of any documentation connecting Daniel to the Pembrokes before 1592. The 1592 prose dedication seeks patronage (“I desire onely to bee graced by the countenance of your protection”, *Delia and Rosamond*, 1592a, A2v) whereas . . .

---


the 1594 verse dedication addresses the Countess as a current patron (“Great Patroness of these my humble Rymes”, Delia and Rosamond Augmented. Cleopatra., 1594, A2r). It is possible that Daniel had acquired the Countess’s support by the time of the original dedication; in the Oxford DNB, John Pitcher, posits that Daniel was “permitted . . . to dedicate an authorized edition of the Delia sonnets . . . to Sidney’s sister, Mary, countess of Pembroke”.10 I believe, however, that the change in tone reflects a shift in Daniel’s relationship with Mary Sidney and that her patronage began after the first dedication. Mary Ellen Lamb points out that many writers dedicated works to the Countess, but not all were afforded approval.11

A clue as to when Daniel first met the Countess might be provided by her literary career. Her translations of Phillippe de Mornay’s Discourse on Life and Death and Robert Garnier’s tragedy Antonius were entered in the Stationers’ Register on May 3, 1592, three months after the entry of Delia and Rosamond.12 The affinity of Daniel’s historically-oriented and tragic Complaint of Rosamond with her tragedy Antonius may have been what drew her to him. She directed Daniel to write a companion piece to her classical play, one continuing the narrative past Mark Antony’s death and relating it from the standpoint of Cleopatra. It is plausible that Daniel’s composition of Cleopatra and the period of Mary Sidney’s patronage began around the time of the entry of her translation of Antonius in the Stationers’ Register. The registration of her work for publication provides evidence that she would be motivated to acquiesce to his public request for patronage if he would agree to write the sequel to Antonius.

10 Pitcher, “Daniel, Samuel (1562/3–1619)”, ODNB.
12 Victor Skretkowicz, “Mary Sidney Herbert’s Antonius, English Philhellenism and the Protestant Cause”, Women’s Writing, 6 (1999), 7-25 (p. 12); Arber, ed., Transcript vol. 2, fol. 288c.
Delia and Rosamond appeared in two printed editions in 1592, both including Daniel’s appeal to the Countess for his work to be “graced” by her “countenance” (sig. A2v in both editions). This differed from the dedication that preceded Delia when it was printed two years later with Cleopatra, in the 1594 Delia and Rosamond. Cleopatra. The 1594 dedication referred to her as “Great Patroness of these my humble Rymes” (sig. A2'). The shift seems to reflect a change in Daniel’s status between the printing of the second edition of Delia and Rosamond (at some point after February 1592) and the entry of Cleopatra in the Stationers’ Register (October 19, 1593). During the intervening period, Daniel apparently began composing The Tragedy of Cleopatra under the direction of the Countess, a “worke the which she did impose / Who onely doth predominate my Muse”, according to the poet (Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra, 1594, sig. H5').

While composing Cleopatra, Daniel may have joined the Pembroke household and served as tutor to twelve-year old William Herbert. Although there is no firm documentation of Daniel filling such a role, a decade later, in 1603, the poet addressed his Defence of Ryme to Herbert, referring to Wilton as his “best Schoole”, perhaps implying that the Pembroke estate was both his source of learning and employment as an instructor. If Daniel was the young Herbert’s tutor, his role was short-lived. On March 9, 1593, William Herbert matriculated at New College, Oxford where he was tutored for the next two years by John Lloyd. In assuming

---

13 See Lamb, “Countess of Pembroke’s Patronage”, pp. 164-165, for description of differing levels of status and respectability afforded to those who sought the Countess’s patronage.
15 Hannay, Philip’s Phoenix, p. 112; McCabe, Ungainefull Arte, p. 254.
16 Daniel, A Panegyrick Congratulatorie . . . . Also Certain Epistles With a Defence of Ryme (1603), sig. E4v.
duties in the Pembroke household, Daniel would have joined a stable of other writers who
served the Herbergs in various capacities. Even if Daniel was not Herbert’s tutor, he
plausibly had some role in the household, perhaps secretary to the Countess, as he wrote
_Cleopatra._

Between mid-1592 and late 1593, Daniel seems to have resided with the Pembrokes and acted
as one of the Countess’s principal poets-in-residence, occupied with writing _Cleopatra._
During this period, he likely spent time at the principal Pembroke estate, Wilton in Wiltshire,
and at their other residences – Ivychurch and Ramsbury (both in Wiltshire), and Baynard’s
Castle in London. As discussed in greater detail later, a visit by Queen Elizabeth and the
court to Ramsbury in August 1592 places the Pembroke household there at that time. Mary
Sidney and Daniel probably spent most of summer of 1592 in Wiltshire at some combination
of Wilton and Ramsbury, preparing for and attending the queen’s visit.

Daniel remained with the Pembrokes for two years or less. At some point, he experienced
financial difficulty and took refuge with Mountjoy. His financial situation is indicated by both
external evidence and references in _The First Four Books._ On April 8, 1595, Daniel’s friend
and fellow poet, Fulke Greville, wrote to Robert Cecil indicating that he sought the Queen’s
approval to gain Daniel a steady income:

_The parsonage in the Isle of Wight, which I moved Her Majesty for Samuel Danyel, and which she was pleased to be certified by you from your father, is_

---

_Pembroke 1580-1650_ (London: Continuum International Publishing, 2011), p. 8; Brennan,
_Literary Patronage_, p. 99.

18 Hannay, _Philip’s Phoenix_, p. 112; Michael G. Brennan, _Literary Patronage in the English

20 Hannay, _Philip’s Phoenix_, p. 106.
called Shawflete. . . . Sir, you shall do a good deed to help the poor man; many will thank you.\textsuperscript{21}

While Greville’s letter indicates that Daniel’s economic difficulties continued through April 1595, stanzas of *The Civil Wars* included in both the printed edition and early manuscripts attest to the shelter, if not financial support, that Mountjoy provided before that date as Daniel completed the first edition of his poem during 1594 (the dating of the manuscripts is evaluated in chapter 4).\textsuperscript{22} Daniel describes himself as a “fortune-tossed wight” whom Mountjoy has received into his “quiet shore”:

\begin{quote}
And thou *Charles Mountjoy* borne the worldes delight,
That hast receiu’d into thy quiet shore
Me tempest-driuen fortune-tossed wight,\textsuperscript{23}
Tir’d with expecting and could hope no more:
And cheerest on my better yeares to write
A sadder Subiect then I tooke before,
\textit{(FFB, Q1595:I-IV I.5.1-6)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
And you o worthy you, that take remorse
Of my estate, and helpe my thoughts to rise;
Continue still your grace that I may giue
End to the worke, wherein your worth may liue.
\textit{(FFB, Q1595:I-IV, III.132.5-8)}
\end{quote}

The inclusion of these stanzas in early manuscripts indicates that Daniel left the Pembroke household and began writing, with Mountjoy’s support as he shifted from completing *Cleopatra* to writing *The Civil Wars*, perhaps around the time of or soon after *Cleopatra’s* death.

\textsuperscript{21} Rees, *Samuel Daniel*, p. 63. Rees cites Historical Manuscripts Commission (Hatfield House), part v, p. 166 as the original source.
\textsuperscript{23} Pitcher, “Daniel, Samuel”, *ODNB*, notes, “the [shipwreck] metaphor was borrowed from Tasso, but even so his difficulties were probably real enough”.
October 1593 registration. This places Daniel in the Pembroke household from mid-1592 till a date between late 1593 and early 1594.

There are indications that Daniel was already writing *The Civil Wars* when he published the first version of *Delia and Rosamond* in February 1592. The Latin motto on the title page of that edition, “*Aetas prima canat veneres postrema tumultus*”, based on a line from Propertius’s *Elegies*, II.x.7, translates as “Let youth sing of love, age of war”. The twenty-nine to thirty-year-old Daniel seemingly already considered himself past the frivolous considerations of youth, such as sonnet writing, upon the publication of his first poems and was contemplating if not composing a work on “*tumultus*” (a variation of a word used in the opening line of *The Civil Wars*, “I sing the ciuil warrs, tumultuous broyles”). Daniel’s “Epistle Dedicatorie” to the 1612 edition of *The First Part of the Historie of England* indicates that he first took up the study of history “in forraine countries”, which may refer to his travels in France and Italy from 1586 to 1591. Daniel was contemplating if not already writing *The Civil Wars* in mid-1592 when he was directed by Mary Sidney to put it aside and write a companion tragedy to *Antonius*. It was apparently in the forefront of his mind as he completed *Cleopatra* in late 1593. The dedication to the Countess accompanying that work includes an appeal for her support of his efforts in setting English history to verse, efforts that he felt “More fitting” to his “nature” and he concludes with his aspiration “to take a greater taske in hand”:

> And I heereafter, in another kinde,

---


More fitting to the nature of my vaine,
May (peraduenture) better please thy minde,

(Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra, 1594, sig. H5v)

But, (Madam,) this doth animate my mind,
That fauored by the Worthyes of our Land,
My lynes are lik’d, the which may make me grow,
In time to take a greater taske in hand.

(Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra, 1594, sig. H7v)

The Countess did not succumb to Daniel’s plea; when he took up The Civil Wars again, he did so with Mountjoy’s support.27 On October 11, 1594, less than a year after the registration of Cleopatra, the work, which included four books with over 4,000 lines of verse, was entered in the Stationers’ Register. It appeared in print the following year, with multiple references to Mountjoy in the text and no explicit dedication (perhaps a tactful attempt to not insult the Countess).28 The period between Daniel joining Mountjoy and the entry of the work, a period of six months to a year, is insufficient for Daniel to have composed the bulk of the text. A significant portion must have been written either while he was working with the Countess or before then. It appears that he wrote the bulk of the work during the three-year period between the 1592 appearance of Delia and Rosamond and the 1595 publication of The First Four Books, temporarily setting it aside in mid-1592 to write Cleopatra. Just as Daniel was setting aside The Civil Wars, versions of the three Henry VI plays were being performed by two acting companies, Lord Strange’s Men and the Earl of Pembroke’s Men.

Strange’s Men, Pembroke’s Men and the Henry VI Plays
Extant documentation of the early performance history of the Henry VI plays suggests multiple instances where Daniel could have seen performances of the plays. I regard each of these

27 McCabe, Ungainefull Arte, pp. 254-255.
28 McCabe, Ungainefull Arte, pp. 255.
instances of Daniel’s possible access to the plays as plausible, though none of them rises to the level of probable. Each will be reviewed before considering details of the Countess of Pembroke’s activities that make one scenario more likely, while not ruling out others.

As described in chapter 2 (pp. 55-56), Nashe’s *Pierce Penniless* includes the first documentation of a likely performance of one of the *Henry VI* plays, *Henry VI Part 1*, a play that Nashe may have partly written. Nashe’s comment coincides with fifteen entries in Philip Henslowe’s diary between March 3 and June 19, 1592 of a play he listed as *harey the vj*. The play was part of the repertory of Lord Strange’s Men, the resident acting company at the newly expanded Rose Theatre. Andrew Gurr notes that Strange’s Men’s run at the Rose, from February 19 to June 22 of that year, “may well have been the longest tenure for one company at one playhouse up to that time” and Lawrence Manley states that they “offered 105 performances of 24 different plays”. The plays included the very popular “Ieronymo” [*The Spanish Tragedy*] and “The Iewe of Malltuse” [*The Jew of Malta*]; however, *harey the vj* was “the single most profitable and most frequently performed” of their repertory. Although uncertain and still subject to some debate, it is probable that the play being referred to by Nashe and *harey the vj* are one and the same, and that both are some version of the play printed

---

in the 1623 first folio as The first Part of Henry the Sixth. The final performance of harey the vj during Strange’s Men’s 1592 run at the Rose on June 19, 1592 was a few days before the Privy Council ordered the London theaters closed on June 23, 1592, initially due to an apprentices’ riot and later due to the outbreak of plague. The theaters remained closed through late December.

The performances of harey the vj at the Rose from March to June 1592 present the first opportunity for Daniel to see a version of one of the Henry VI plays. Daniel’s whereabouts after early March 1592, when he was with Dymoke in Lincoln, are unknown. Soon thereafter, Daniel left Dymoke and joined the Countess of Pembroke. While it is possible that he went directly from Lincoln to the Pembroke estate, Wilton, in Wiltshire, it is also possible that he came first to London and met the Countess there. If that were the case, the period between March and June 1592 is the most likely timeframe for such a meeting to occur. During that time, the two editions of Daniel’s Delia and Rosamond were being printed, both evidencing significant revisions from prior versions (including the versions of the Delia sonnets included in the 1591 Astrophel and Stella). Daniel may have been actively involved in making such revisions. In later years, he was known to have worked at the London home of his friend and publisher, Simon Waterson, and he may have done the same while the 1592 editions of Delia and Rosamond were being finalized. It is possible that the Countess was also in the city during that period, staying at the Pembrokes’s London home, Baynard’s Castle. As with

34 Manley and MacLean, Lord Strange’s Men, pp. 96-99; Schoone-Jongen, Shakespeare’s Companies, pp. 109-111; Taylor and Loughnan, “Canon and Chronology”, pp. 515-516. 35 Henslowe, Henslowe’s Diary, p. 19; Manley and Maclean, Lord Strange’s Men, p. 248. For listings of dates during which the London playhouses were closed see Gurr, Shakespearian Playing Companies, p. 91; Taylor and Loughnane, “Canon and Chronology”, p. 443. 36 Rees, Samuel Daniel, p. 123.
Daniel, there exists no documentation of her whereabouts from March to June 1592. She generally organized annual moves of the household to London. If there was such a move in 1592, it would not have been during the summer, because the Countess would have been in Wiltshire, preparing for the Queen’s August visit to Ramsbury.

If Daniel and the Countess were in London during March to June 1592, it is likely that they knew of the popular play being performed at the Rose. Based on the estimated capacity of the Rose, up to 2,500 spectators, the fifteen performances of *harey the vj* could have accommodated 37,500 attendees. This represented 19% of the entire London population of under 200,000 at the time and a more significant portion of the theater-going population. Even if the average attendance was half of that amount, a figure it almost certainly exceeded (based on its profitability), over 9% of the entire population of London attended a performance of *harey the vj* during Strange’s Men’s three-month run at the Rose. It is probable that a poet who was writing a poem about the English civil war and his prospective patron would hear something of the play that included the heroic death of Talbot, a play possibly in part by Nashe, who had penned the dedication to the 1591 edition of Philip Sidney’s *Astrophel and Stella* that included Daniel’s poems.

The next documentation of performances of one of the *Henry VI* plays is from another work published in 1592. *Greene’s Groatsworth of Wit*, entered in the Stationers’ Register on September 20, 1592, famously used a variation of a line from *Henry VI Part 3*, a line that also appears in the octavo of *True Tragedy*, to ridicule an actor-playwright who had a “Tygers

---

heart wrapt in a Players hyde” and saw himself as “the onely Shake-scene in a countrey”.

The parody of a line from 3H6 (“Tygers hart wrapt in a womans hide”) provides evidence that some version of that play had been performed by September 1592 and that Shakespeare, a player, was recognized as at least part author of the play. Combined with Nashe’s reference to a version of 1H6 and the assumption that 2H6/Contention preceded 3H6/True Tragedy, the September 1592 variation of a line from 3H6 establishes that all three plays had been performed before that date. It is also regarded as evidence that a performance of True Tragedy occurred in London, perhaps at John Burbage’s The Theatre, or at The Rose before Philip Henslowe began making records of performances in his diary in February of that year. Unfortunately, no documentation exists of any such performance of True Tragedy in London; however, if it did occur in 1592, it would have been before the closure of the theaters in June.

Wherever True Tragedy had been performed before September 1592, it was staged by the Earl of Pembroke’s Men. The title-page of the 1595 octavo notes that it had been “sundrie times acted by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembroke his servaunts.” The possible relationship between the Countess of Pembroke and the acting company that bore her husband’s name is considered in the next section of this chapter. For now, the association of True Tragedy with Pembroke’s Men increases the likelihood that the Countess and Daniel would have been aware of the play performed in London if the two of them were there. At a

---

40 Greene’s Groatsworth of Wit Bought With a Million of Repentance . . ., London, 1592, F1v. John Jowett has demonstrated that Greene’s Groatsworth is a likely forgery, perpetrated by Henry Chettle after Robert Greene’s death on September 3, 1592, “Johannes Factotum: Henry Chettle and Greene’s Groatsworth of Wit”, Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 87 (1993), 453-486. The work, however, is still referred to as Greene’s Groatsworth of Wit.

41 Schoone-Jongen, Shakespeare’s Companies, pp. 27-35.

42 Gurr, Shakespearean Playing Companies, p. 270; Manley and MacLean, Lord Strange’s Men, p. 302. Schoone-Jongen argues that Strange’s Men did not play at The Theatre but may have played at The Rose, Shakespeare’s Companies, pp. 59-61, 79.
minimum, Daniel would have had an interest in a play being performed by the company supported by Pembroke, the husband of his prospective patron, especially one about the English civil wars. Although more speculative than the reasonably well-documented performance of *harey the vj* in London during that year, again it is possible that Daniel would have been aware of a performance of *True Tragedy* in early to mid-1592.

Both Strange’s and Pembroke’s Men toured during the remainder of 1592 as the London theaters remained closed.\(^43\) It is probable that *harey the vj* and *True Tragedy* were in their respective repertories. It is also likely that the repertory of Pembroke’s Men included *The Contention*. The quarto of that play, published in 1594, unusually, does not cite a specific acting company on its title-page; however, the close association of *Contention* to *True Tragedy* is taken by most scholars to indicate that Pembroke’s Men owned both.\(^44\) All three of the plays – *harey the vj*, *Contention* and *True Tragedy* – were likely being performed in the provinces during the summer of 1592 by Strange’s and Pembroke’s Men.

As with all performance records of the time, there survives limited documentation of Strange’s and Pembroke’s Men’s provincial tours. Lawrence Manley and Sally-Beth MacLean describe both the sources and limitations of such documentation in reconstructing Strange’s Men’s travels:

> The 1592 tour records include no private residences or inns, nor, as we have indicated, do they reflect every town that may have been favored with a performance on the routes taken. What we know is based only on very incomplete data, and where records do exist, it must be admitted that only the reward paid for a single official performance before the mayor or council is noted. . . . We can safely assume that there may also have been private

\(^{43}\) Gurr, *Shakespearian Playing Companies*, p. 91.

\(^{44}\) Gurr, *Shakespearian Playing Companies*, p. 269; Schoone-Jongen, *Shakespeare’s Companies*, p. 120.
residences with hosts friendly to Lord Strange along the preferred southern roads, but the loss of family records, especially acute in the south, prevents us from identifying these additional locations.\textsuperscript{45}

As they note, extant documentation, principally civic records, is incomplete and does not reflect performances at private residences. The Earl of Pembroke’s sponsorship of Pembroke’s Men provides evidence that he may have been one of the “hosts friendly” to acting companies and establish the Pembroke estates as plausible locations for such private performances. Unfortunately, the Pembroke Wiltshire homes, Wilton and Ramsbury, were among those whose records have been lost; both were destroyed by fire in the 17th century.\textsuperscript{47} The only documentation that survives to indicate the likelihood of performances at those estates are the limited records of Strange’s and Pembroke’s Men’s tours, records that can establish if such performances were feasible based on other stops in the companies’ travels.

As described by Sally-Beth MacLean, the tour routes taken by the acting companies followed regular patterns:

\begin{quote}
We can say with some assurance, therefore, that tour routes followed long-familiar roads across England to towns and households with an established taste – and even need – for public and private entertainment. Ease of travel must have dictated the choice of some routes over others . . .\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{45} Manley and MacLean, \textit{Lord Strange’s Men}, p. 251.

\textsuperscript{47} Wilton was destroyed in 1647 and Ramsbury in 1648. If any records remained at the Herberts’ London estate, Baynard’s Castle, they were destroyed in the great fire of 1666. Hannay, \textit{Philip’s Phoenix}, p. 177; Margaret P. Hannay, \textit{Mary Sidney, Lady Wroth} (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2010), p. xiv. See also Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre <http://www.wshc.eu/blog/tag/Ramsbury.html>. Manley and MacLean note a thorough search for tour records relating to 1593 from many sources along “several roads through Wiltshire”, including accounts at Wilton, which search “yielded no returns”, \textit{Lord Strange’s Men}, p. 260.

One of the most popular routes was along the Marlborough road between London and Bristol.\textsuperscript{49} Civic records of Bristol include a payment of 30s to Strange’s Men between August 6 and August 19, 1592, indicating they were on the Marlborough road during that month.\textsuperscript{50} Bristol is approximately 40 miles from Marlborough, a three to four-day journey for a travelling company.\textsuperscript{51} Manley and MacLean specifically cite Wilton as a location not far from Marlborough that could have easily served as one of the “private residences” where they believe performances may have occurred:

> Along or near this same route there were alternatives for players prominent at court – the Earl of Pembroke’s residence at Wilton some thirty-five miles southwest of Marlborough and the Earl of Hertford’s residence at Tottenham House, a few miles east of the town . . . \textsuperscript{52}

What Manley and MacLean do not note is that the other Pembroke home in Wiltshire, Ramsbury, was a mere few miles from Marlborough, less than a day’s journey. From August 26 to 29, 1592, Queen Elizabeth and the court visited the Pembrokes at Ramsbury.\textsuperscript{53} Unfortunately, no records exist of how the Pembrokes entertained the visiting members of the court during their stay there.\textsuperscript{54} Lord Strange’s Men were on the Marlborough road less than a

\textsuperscript{49} MacLean, “Tour Routes”, p. 10.  
\textsuperscript{50} Records of Early English Drama: Patrons & Performances (REED: P&P), Bristol, 142.  
\textsuperscript{51} Andrew Gurr (Shakespearian Playing Companies, p. 46) notes that the travelling companies could rapidly travel great distances. Queen Anne’s Men travelled from Leicester to Hythe, “a journey of more than two hundred and thirty miles in eighteen days” from March 16 to April 3, 1613 (approximately 13 miles a day). The Queen’s Men travelled from Norwich to Coventry, “a distance of a hundred and thirty miles in eight days by the main Tudor roads” from June 25 to July 4, 1594 (approximately 16 miles a day).  
\textsuperscript{52} Manley and MacLean, Lord Strange’s Men, p. 250.  
\textsuperscript{54} Wilson-Lee, “Women’s Weapons”, pp. 128-129. Literary scholars have speculated that a performance of Mary Sidney’s “A Dialogue between Two Shepherds . . . in Praise of Astraea”
day’s journey from Ramsbury during August 1592, the same month when the Pembrokes were hosting Queen Elizabeth there. Manley and MacLean state that during their summer 1592 tour, Strange’s Men were “never more than a few days from London or the location of the itinerant royal court”, perhaps indicating that requests for royal entertainments were anticipated.\textsuperscript{55} A performance by Strange’s Men at Ramsbury for Queen Elizabeth is plausible, as is a performance at Wilton during the period leading up to the royal visit.

Strange’s Men were touring within an area that would have allowed them to perform at one or both of Wilton and Ramsbury during August 1592. What of Pembroke’s Men? Records of their provincial tours during their brief life from 1592 to 1593 are less clear than those for Strange’s Men, but one record that overlaps between the two companies indicates that both may have been in Bath, 13 miles from Bristol and just off the Marlborough-Bristol road, during August 1592. Civic records for Bath include payments of 16s, 3d to Strange’s Men and 16s to Pembroke’s Men for an unspecified date between June 11, 1592 and September 10, 1593.\textsuperscript{56} The REED \textit{Patrons and Performances} website includes the following notation for this joint record:

Entry one of a number that follow a 22 Aug. payment to the Queen’s players, but it cannot be determined whether these entries were entered into the account chronologically or whether the 22 Aug. referred to is for 1592 or 1593.\textsuperscript{57}

---

\textsuperscript{55} Manley and MacLean, \textit{Lord Strange’s Men}, p. 251.


\textsuperscript{57} REED: \textit{P & P, Somerset} 15.
The proximity of this record to that of an August payment to The Queen’s Men may indicate that this payment is similarly around the month of August, although uncertain if it is for 1592 or 1593. I believe that the history of Pembroke’s Men suggests it is more likely for 1592 as records for 1593 place them far from Bath before they broke up during the summer of that year. A letter dated September 28, 1593 from Philip Henslowe to his son-in-law, Edward Alleyn, documents the demise of the company. In the letter, Henslowe states [text in brackets quoted from R. A. Foakes]:

> as for my lorde a penbrockes . . . they are all at home and hauffe ben t[his] v or sixe weackes for they cane not saue ther carge [w]th trauell as I heare & weare fayne to pane the[r] parell for ther carge.58

If Henslowe’s letter can be taken at face value, the members of Pembroke’s Men had been back in London for five or six weeks as of September 28, 1593. The latest they could have arrived back home was August 24, indicating that they left the last stop on their final tour some time before that. Records during the summer of 1593 place them in York (in the north), between June 1 and 28, at Caludon Castle in Warwickshire (the Midlands) on June 21 and in Rye, Sussex (the far southeast) between July 1 and 31.59 The journey between those three locations was over 300 miles during a two-month period. A stop in Bath, in Somersetshire (southwest England) would have added at least 130 miles to an already long two-month trip. Although such a side-trip is feasible (the travelling companies could travel upwards of 15

---

59 I thank Sally-Beth MacLean and Peter Greenfield for pointing out the performance at Caludon Castle to me, a performance not included on the REED *Patrons and Performances* website but included in Greenfield’s paper “Entertainments of Henry, Lord Berkeley, 1593-4 and 1600-05”, *Records of Early English Drama Newsletter*, 8 (1983), 12-24 (p. 14). I also thank Prof. MacLean for sharing with me her tentative itinerary for Pembroke’s Men. Unlike me, MacLean concludes that Pembroke’s Men visited Bath in 1593, between stops in York and Rye, rather than in 1592.
miles a day), it seems to me less likely than a visit to Bath in the prior year, 1592.\textsuperscript{60} Similarly, a trip to Bath after the July 1593 performance at Rye is possible, before the company returned to London by late August. Bath, however, is not along the route between Rye and London and would have added nearly 200 miles to a 60-mile trip. It seems more likely that the stops at Caludon Castle on June 21, 1593 and Rye in July of that year document two of the last stops on the company’s final tour, a tour that proceeded from north, through the midlands, and down to the southeast before the company returned to London and pawned their apparel.

It remains possible that the recorded payment to Pembroke’s Men in Bath relates to 1593, not 1592. If the records were not recorded chronologically, as noted by REED, the payment could relate to any date between June 1592 and September 1593. If such a performance was in 1593, it still places Pembroke’s Men near the Herberths’ estates in Wiltshire during a period when Daniel was working with the Countess. For substantially the entire time that Daniel worked under the Countess’s patronage, the acting company sponsored by her husband was touring with two of the \textit{Henry VI} plays and, during that time, is documented to have been at Bath, a location not far from the Pembroke estates. I believe, however, that the record of concurrent payments to Strange’s Men and Pembroke’s Men in Bath is more likely to relate to 1592 than 1593. If that is the case, the record places both companies a few days from both Pembroke estates, Wilton and Ramsbury, during 1592, while documentation suggests that a performance in nearby Bath may have been in August of that year, the month of the queen’s visit to Ramsbury. Performances by the companies at either location are plausible and, based upon the evidence provided by their touring records, may provide the most likely indication of an

opportunity for Daniel to have encountered the plays in performance. As analyzed below (pp. 88-92), the mention of Mary Sidney in the will of an actor who died during August 1592 increases that likelihood.

Another record of Strange’s Men’s 1592 provincial tour documents a further opportunity for Daniel to have seen a performance of one of the *Henry VI* plays. Strange’s Men performed at Oxford on October 6, less than two weeks after Henry Herbert is documented to have been there, accompanied by his son, William, as Queen Elizabeth held court at the university town from September 22 to 28.61 If Daniel was serving as William’s tutor at the time, he may have accompanied the two of them, especially given his ties to the university.62 It is possible that they stayed on longer than the queen’s visit or could have heard of the upcoming performance by Strange’s Men. This may qualify as an opportunity for Daniel to have seen a *Henry VI* play that is possible, but short of plausible; nevertheless, it documents the intersecting paths of the Pembrokes and one of the companies performing the *Henry VI* plays during 1592, both being in Oxford around the same time.

Following their 1592 provincial tours, Strange’s Men and Pembroke’s Men returned to London in December to perform at court during the Christmas season. They were the only two companies invited to perform that year, Strange’s Men three times and Pembroke’s Men

---


62 The title-page of the first published work to include Daniel’s name, the 1585 *Worthy Tract of Paulus Jovius*, states that the book is “By Samuell Daniell late student in Oxenforde”. Samuel Daniel, *The worthy tract of Paulus Iovius* (London, 1585). Daniel matriculated at Magdalen Hall in 1581, but left before earning a degree; Rees, *Samuel Daniel*, pp. 2-7.
twice. Manley and MacLean note that that all three of the *Henry VI* plays may have been presented there. If Michael J. Hirrell is correct that the duration of play performances could last up to four hours, it is also possible that Pembroke’s Men could have performed *The Contention* and *True Tragedy* together as one play, *The Whole Contention*, as it was published years later in 1619. Capping a year in which Samuel Daniel’s path could have crossed with performances of the *Henry VI* plays either in London or while they were on tour, or both, these final speculated performances provide a possible opportunity for him to see all three plays at once. There is evidence that Mary Sidney may have been at court that Christmas season. A poem entitled “A Pleasant Conceite penned in verse” delivered by Thomas Churchyard on New Year’s Day that year included a tribute to the Countess. She could have been present to hear the poem, perhaps while promoting and supporting the acting company that bore her husband’s name. Pembroke’s Men achieved prominence at court extremely quickly “for a company of wholly new players” (quoting Andrew Gurr), perhaps indicating that the influence

---

64 Manley and MacLean, *Lord Strange’s Men*, pp. 310-311. Richard Dutton points out that the 1619 reissue of *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy* as *The Whole Contention* advertised that the play was “Divided into two Parts”, suggesting that the two works had been played together. “The Contention . . . and the True Tragedy . . . would together amount to over 4,000 lines. Court would seem to be the only plausible venue for such a production.” Richard Dutton, *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2016), p. 131.
65 Michael J. Hirrel, “Duration of Performances and Lengths of Plays: How Shall We Beguile the Lazy Time?”, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 61 (2010), 159-182, p. 160; *The Whole Contention betweene the Two Famous Houses, Lancaster and Yorke* (London, 1619). *The Whole Contention* is approximately 4,200 lines long. Hirrel asserts that plays were delivered at a speed of approximately 20 lines per minute (“Duration of Performances”, 160-161), suggesting that *The Whole Contention* could be performed in three and a half hours.
of their patron and his wife was a more dominant factor than the quality of their work.\textsuperscript{67} If the Countess was there, she may have been accompanied by her protégé who had recently published his widely-admired poems, \textit{Delia} and \textit{Rosamond} – another connection that seems possible, perhaps plausible, but short of probable. Once again, however, the overlap of the history of the companies performing the \textit{Henry VI} plays with biographical details of Daniel’s patron challenges the idea that Daniel would not have been aware of them. Whether in London during March to June, at Wilton or Ramsbury in August, at Oxford in October or at court in December, there were plenty of opportunities for the Pembrokes and Samuel Daniel to attend a performance of one or more of the \textit{Henry VI} plays during 1592.

\textbf{Mary Sidney and Pembroke’s Men}

Much has been written about the history of Pembroke’s Men.\textsuperscript{68} Schoone-Jongen provides an excellent summary of the facts and theories surrounding the company in \textit{Shakespeare’s Companies}.\textsuperscript{69} He notes three “contentious” and “frustratingly complicated” issues surrounding the company: its repertory, personnel and origin.\textsuperscript{70} A full consideration of these issues is

\textsuperscript{67} Andrew Gurr, “Three Reluctant Patrons and Early Shakespeare”, \textit{Shakespeare Quarterly}, 44 (1993), 159-174 (p. 168).
\textsuperscript{69} Schoone-Jongen, \textit{Shakespeare’s Companies}, pp. 119-145.
\textsuperscript{70} Schoone-Jongen, \textit{Shakespeare’s Companies}, pp. 119.
beyond the scope of this thesis; however, two have a direct bearing on the question of whether the company performed at a Pembroke estate during the summer of 1592: its origin and personnel.

After one notation in 1575-1576 of a performance by a company patronized by the Earl of Pembroke, Pembroke’s Men disappears for 17 years and resurfaces in records between 1592 and 1593.\textsuperscript{71} The later company is almost certainly unrelated to the 1575 one and, therefore, was formed around 1592. In 1592, the 57-year-old Henry Herbert, the Earl of Pembroke, was in poor health and spent most of his time fulfilling his duties as the Lord President of Wales in Ludlow and the Welsh Marches.\textsuperscript{72} There is no good answer to the question of why he would have chosen to sponsor an acting company at that time. As noted by Gurr, some literary scholars have speculated that the Countess of Pembroke may have encouraged him to do so:

> Whether Mary Herbert did intervene with her husband to make him its patron . . . there is just not enough evidence to say. Among the many guesses about Mary Sidney’s interest in reforming the drama there are a few which have proposed that she must have prompted her husband to become the patron of a new company in 1592.\textsuperscript{73}


Gurr implies that the question of whether Mary Sidney was involved in the formation of Pembroke’s Men is intertwined with the Countess’s “interest in reforming the drama”. For many years, literary critics saw Mary Sidney as the leader of a “circle” to reform English theater, returning it to classical standards espoused by her brother, Philip Sidney, in his *Defense of Poesy*. This view of the Countess’s dramatic efforts was “canonized” (to adopt a word used by Edward Wilson-Lee) by T.S. Eliot in his 1932 essay, “Apology for the Countess of Pembroke”.

There is little evidence, however, to support the idea that Mary Sidney or anyone around her objected to English drama or tried to reform it. In a 1981 ground-breaking essay, Mary Ellen Lamb argued that no such circle of reformers existed. Subsequent researchers have expanded on her work, evaluating biographical details of the Countess’s life (Margaret Hannay) and analyzing elements of her work (Michael Brennan, Noel J. Kinnamon, Paulina Kewes, Daniel Cadman, Edward Wilson-Lee, Gavin Alexander), to dismiss Eliot’s view of Mary Sidney and those who dedicated works to her. They have demonstrated that the Countess’ work in translating Garnier’s *Antonius* and encouraging Daniel to write *Cleopatra* were not part of a campaign against English drama, but rather were efforts to adapt

---


continental works on history, including dramatic works, for an English audience and use them for contemporary political commentary.\textsuperscript{77} Eliot’s view of the Countess’s efforts to reform English drama has been replaced by one that sees her as “far more likely to sponsor drama than to undertake a campaign against the popular stage”, to quote her biographer, Hannay.\textsuperscript{78}

This revised view of Mary Sidney’s attitude toward drama supports the possibility that she played a role in the formation of Pembroke’s Men, perhaps in anticipation of the Queen’s visit to Ramsbury in the summer of 1592. The company sprang into existence and achieved the honored position of being invited to court during the year of this visit. It is plausible that during 1592 Mary Sidney undertook three efforts to promote English drama: publishing her translation of Garnier’s \textit{Antonius}, directing Daniel to write \textit{Cleopatra} and encouraging her husband to sponsor an acting company to perform for Queen Elizabeth, first at a Pembroke estate and later at court. Four of the works associated with Pembroke’s Men are of the type that she would want to include in the repertory of a company that could perform at her direction: \textit{Titus Andronicus}, \textit{Contention}, \textit{True Tragedy} and Marlowe’s \textit{Edward II}.\textsuperscript{79} These are works on Roman and English history that fit the criteria her brother, Philip Sidney, described as the appropriate use of drama. Sidney praises the English history play, \textit{Gorboduc}, stating that it:

\textsuperscript{79} Gurr, \textit{Shakespearian Playing Companies}, p. 269; Schoone-Jongen, \textit{Shakespeare’s Companies}, pp. 120-124.
is full of stately speeches and well-sounding phrases, climbing to the height of Seneca’s style, and as full of notable morality, which it doth most delightfully teach, and so obtain the very end of poesy . . .

Sidney’s praise of Gorboduc could easily apply to most of the known repertory of Pembroke’s Men, suggesting that the Countess of Pembroke could have played a role in choosing their material. Roslyn Knutson notes the unusual paucity of comedies in Pembroke’s Men’s repertory, The Taming of a Shrew being their only known comedy.

A further piece of evidence potentially attaches Mary Sidney to Pembroke’s Men during the summer of 1592, the mention of “my ladie Pembroke” in the will of the actor Simon Jewell. Questions surrounding Jewell’s will are some of the “frustratingly complicated” issues surrounding Pembroke’s Men, questions of who was in Pembroke’s Men and whether the company’s personnel included Jewell. If Jewell was a member of Pembroke’s Men, then his will may document a performance by the company commissioned by the Countess during the month of the Queen’s visit to Ramsbury. If Jewell was not one of Pembroke’s Men, his will documents Mary Sidney’s association with some other acting company at that time.

---

Simon Jewell prepared his will on August 19, 1592 and died shortly thereafter. Its final sentence prescribes how his share of money owed by the Countess of Pembroke should be distributed:

Item my share of suche money as shalbe givenn by my ladie Pembroke or by her meanes I will shalbe distributed and paide towards my buriall and other charges by mr Scott and the saide mr Smithe.

Elsewhere in the will, Jewell describes how his “sixth parte” of the amounts invested by him and his “fellowes” in “apparell”, “horses waggen” and other trappings of an acting company should be collected and paid out. The implication that Jewell was part of an acting company is clear and a reference to his “sixth parte” indicates that he was one of the sharers of that company. Jewell’s reference to “my ladie Pembroke” led Mary Edmond, the researcher who first discovered the will, to conclude “that Jewell and his ‘fellows’ were in fact the original Lord Pembroke’s men.” That conclusion, however, has been challenged by later research on the members of the acting companies of the time. Jewell mentions four men who are believed to have been members not of Pembroke’s Men, but of the Queen’s Men: “mr Johnson” (William Johnson), “Roberte Nicholls”, “mr Smithe” (William Smith) and “mr Cooke” (Lionel Cooke). Additionally, the use of the name “Simon” as a speech prefix in the quarto of The Old Wiues Tale is taken to indicate Jewell’s inclusion in a performance of that Queen’s Men’s

---

83 Hanabusa, “Will of Simon Jewell”, p. 11. Jewell was buried on August 21 and his will was administered on August 23.
84 Although Mary Edmond provides a full transcription of the will (“Pembroke’s Men”, pp. 129-130), the most complete analysis of it, including a facsimile reproduction and alternate transcription, is included in Hanabusa, “Will of Simon Jewell”, pp. 23-24. Quotations from the will are from Hanabusa’s transcription.
86 Edmond, “Pembroke’s Men”, p. 130.
Most early modern theater historians and literary scholars now regard the Queen’s Men as the most likely company of Jewell’s association. As with the records of touring by Pembroke’s Men and Strange’s Men, described earlier, notations from locations where the Queen’s Men performed during the summer of 1592 are consistent with the possibility that the company could have performed at Wilton or Ramsbury just prior to Jewell’s death. A payment to the company is recorded at Bristol in July 1592 and another in Bath in August of either that year or the next, both locations not far from the Pembroke estates in Wiltshire. Based on the current predominant scholarly thought on Jewell’s affiliation and the consistency of the Queen’s Men’s touring records, I believe it more likely that he was a member of that company than Pembroke’s Men.

Yet there remains evidence that Jewell may have had some association with Pembroke’s Men. G.M. Pinciss, Karl P. Wentersdorf and Scott McMillin all accept the possibility of Pembroke’s Men having been formed out of the Queen’s Men and of the company including former actors from the Queen’s Men at the time of Jewell’s death. Jewell’s company affiliation remains a debated issue. Finally, there is another potential connection between Jewell and Pembroke’s Men. Just as the use of the speech prefix “Simon” in Old Wives Tale is taken to indicate

---


89 Schoone-Jongen reviews the details of the competing claims for Jewell’s acting company association (*Shakespeare’s Acting Companies*, p. 127) and concludes the Queen’s Men to be the most likely, while Hanabusa (“Will of Simon Jewell”, p. 12) states, “Although theatre historians have not yet unanimously agreed on the question of Jewell’s affiliation, the balance of probability tilts toward the Queen’s Men in the light of existing scholarship.”

90 *REED:P&P*: Bristol, 142; Somerset 15. The latter of these two entries is the one quoted earlier (p. 80) that includes a note, “The payment was made on 22 Aug., but it cannot be determined whether this was for 1592 or 1593”. Hanabusa, “Will of Simon Jewell”, pp. 19-20.

Jewell’s involvement in a performance of the Queen’s Men’s play, the use of the name in the 1594 quarto of *The Taming of a Shrew* may indicate his appearance in that play. The name “Simon” appears in the induction for *A Shrew* and in a stage direction in the body of the play.\(^{92}\) The title-page of *A Shrew* states that the play had been “sundry times acted by the Right honorable the Earle of Pembrook his seruants”. If the use of Simon’s name in *Old Wives Tale* reinforces Jewell’s connections to The Queen’s Men, then the similar use of the name in the quarto of *A Shrew* provides a link to Pembroke’s Men, increasing the likelihood that his reference to “my ladie Pembroke” in his will indicates some connection between the Countess and that company.

The evidence surrounding Jewell’s will is unclear and conclusions drawn from it varied. As such, it does not offer clear evidence of a performance by Pembroke’s Men. At a minimum, however, it establishes that the Countess of Pembroke had a connection to some acting company during the summer of 1592, the period when Daniel was at the Pembroke estates. This connection strengthens the possibility that she had commissioned the performance of plays during that summer. The probable performance indicated by Jewell’s will, even if by the Queen’s Men, does not preclude the commissioning of performances by others; rather it increases the plausibility of them.

From August 26 to 29, 1592, the Pembrokes hosted the court for three days and nights at Ramsbury.\(^{93}\) As described by Margaret Hannay, Mary Sidney would have been the principal person responsible for the details of the visit, including entertainments:


\(^{93}\) *Calendar of Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, Part XIII (Addenda)* (London: Printed under authority of his Majesty’s
Her estate duties would have become difficult as she prepared for the queen’s visit to Ramsbury in August 1592. . . . Although no details of the visit survive, the countess must have ensured the same level of provisions as did Leicester at Kenilworth [in 1575] . . . The Pembroke’s would no doubt have planned entertainments for the queen, but no records of these programs are extant. 94

In August 1592, Pembroke’s Men, Strange’s Men and the Queen’s Men were all plausibly near Ramsbury and there is evidence that Mary Sidney owed money to an acting company at that time. Although documentation is incomplete and details complicated, Jewell’s will provides evidence that Mary Sidney commissioned the performance of one or more plays for the Queen’s visit while details of the itineraries for Pembroke’s Men and Strange’s Men support the possibility of them performing at a Pembroke estate at that time. Pembroke’s Men, the company sponsored by Mary Sidney’s husband, had a repertory that included Contention and True Tragedy while Strange’s Men repertory included harey the vj, plays that fit with Mary Sidney’s penchant for historical drama. I do not believe that these facts render the performance of those plays at Ramsbury probable, as they do not rule out other possibilities; however, the accumulation of evidence gives such performances a higher likelihood than other means of Daniel seeing a performance of one or more of the Henry VI plays. At a minimum, the evidence makes the performance of the plays at a Pembroke estate during the summer of 1592 plausible and provides a reasonable explanation of how Daniel could have gained familiarity with them.

Mountjoy and Printed Editions of Contention and True Tragedy

I have evaluated the possibility that Daniel attended a performance of one or more of the Henry VI plays while he was working with the Countess of Pembroke from 1592 to 1593. In

94 Hannay, Philip’s Phoenix, p. 151.
some ways, however, the more obvious way for him to have had access to the plays was in
print. Normally, it is not necessary to prove exactly how an author encountered a printed work
to demonstrate the likelihood of that work’s influence, if such influence is indicated by textual
overlap. The fact that the work was published is sufficient to imply access to it. The
publication of *The First Four Books* in 1595, for instance, is sufficient evidence that
Shakespeare could have used it while writing *Richard II*. The situation is different with
respect to printed editions of plays, especially printed editions in the early 1590s when the
publication of plays was relatively new.95 Playbooks from that time are thought to have been
regarded as something less than literature.96 This view is reflected in Laurence Michel’s
comment that Daniel was “scornful of the popular stage” and “would not conceive of its
productions, even when printed, as literature”.97 There is evidence, however, that Mountjoy,
Daniel’s patron after his time with the Countess of Pembroke, did not hold this view. Such
evidence supports the plausibility of Daniel reading published versions of plays covering the
topic about which he was writing as they became available in print.

The first issue to consider is whether, based on the timeframes involved, the printed versions
of the plays could have feasibly influenced Daniel’s composition of the poem. As noted
earlier, *The First Part of the Contention* was entered in the Stationers’ Register in March 1594,
seven months before the October entry of *The Civil Wars* and potentially a year or more before
the appearance of *The First Four Books* in print. Daniel could have read the play before
completing the first edition of his poem and it could have influenced any part of Books I to IV.
The analysis of the octavo of *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York* is more complicated.

95 Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, pp. 55-79.
96 Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, p. 57.
The work was never entered in the Stationers’ Register, perhaps because it was covered by the entry of *The First Part of the Contention*. It was printed with a title-page dated 1595. In theory, it is possible that the volume appeared before *The First Four Books* and could have influenced Daniel’s composition of the first edition of the poem. Realistically, however, given the time it would have taken to set the printing of *The First Four Books*, it is unlikely for the octavo to have a significant influence on the original volume that included four books, even if the printed version of the play appeared months before Daniel’s poem. This would not impact the analysis of any of the parallels analyzed in chapter 2, none of which involve the first four books of Daniel’s poem and 3H6 (see p. 49). There is, however, the potential for *True Tragedy* to have influenced the fifth book, based both upon the timing of the works and upon a textual parallel identified in chapter 2, wind-wave imagery used to describe a battle (parallel #9). Daniel added the fifth book to *The Civil Wars* between 1595 and 1599. It is, therefore, feasible for the octavo to have influenced it. Daniel’s wind-wave imagery in the fifth book could have been influenced by the “mastlesse ship” (*True Tragedy* 1595, sig. C2v) used to describe the battle of Towton in *True Tragedy*. Again, differences between the early printed edition of the play and that in the First Folio complicate the analysis; however, for this chapter the important point to consider is whether there is evidence that Daniel plausibly had access to either or both *Contention* and *True Tragedy* in their early printed editions.

Daniel was writing under Mountjoy’s patronage when *Contention* appeared in print during 1594. Mountjoy was known as a studious man, one who delighted in collecting and reading books. Like his friend, Robert Devereux, the Earl of Essex, he especially sought out books on
Fynes Moryson, Mountjoy’s personal secretary during his Irish military campaign of the early 1600s, recorded extensive details of Mountjoy’s habits and activities and published them in his *Itinerary* printed in 1617. He described Mountjoy’s love for books and included his “reading in Histories” in the list of his lord’s studies:

> Touching his studies or Bookishnesse, (by some imputed to him in detraction of his fitnes to imbrace an actiue imployment), he came young and not well grounded from *Oxford* Vniuersity; but in his youth at *London*, he so spent his vacant houres with schollers best able to direct him, as besides his reading in Histories, skill in tongues, . . . and so much knowledge (at least in Cosmography and the Mathematikes) as might serue his owne ends; . . .

Given Mountjoy’s interest in history, one might assume that a play on the English civil war would appeal to him, especially since he had a poet writing under his patronage on the same topic. Once again, however, the fact that it was a play, not proper literature, might cause scholars to dismiss such an assumption. An element of Moryson’s description of Mountjoy’s interests calls such a dismissal into question. On the same page where he addresses Mountjoy’s “bookishness”, he lists other pursuits that “delighted” Mountjoy, including “reading play-bookes”:

> He delighted in study, in gardens, an house richly furnished, and delectable for roomes of retrait, . . . in reading play-bookes for recreation, and especially in fishing and fishponds, seldom vsing any other exercises, . . .

Although Mountjoy studied much on serious topics – such as history, languages and mathematics – one of his principal sources of reading “for recreation”, what we might call pleasure reading, was “play-bookes”. Earlier in his description of Mountjoy, Moryson states

---


99 Fynes Moryson, *An itinerary written by Fynes Moryson Gent. First in the Latine tongue, and then translated by him into English* (London, 1617).

100 Moryson, *Itinerary*, Part II, sig. Ff4r.

that he “will be so farre from lying and flattering, as I will rather be bold modestly to mention some of his defects”. Whether Moryson would have considered Mountjoy’s love of plays among his “defects” is an open question, but it does appear that he is being honest when he describes his former lord, a man who had been dead for more than ten years when Moryson’s book appeared.

Mountjoy’s interest in plays, or at least his lack of disdain for them, is further demonstrated in another contemporary account of his activities. In a letter to Sir Robert Sidney (Mary Sidney’s brother) dated February 15, 1598, Rowland Whyte wrote about the activities at court in Sidney’s absence, activities that included the performance of two plays in one night:

Sir Gilly Meiricke made at Essex House yesternight a very great supper. There were at it my Ladies Leicester, Northumberland, Bedford, Essex, Rich, and my Lords of Essex, Rutland, Mountjoy, and others. They had 2 plays which kept them up till 1 o’clocke after midnight. Whyte’s letter documents that on at least one occasion, not only did Mountjoy attend a play, he did so enthusiastically, seeing two plays and staying up till “1 o’clocke after midnight”. Combined with Moryson’s description of Mountjoy’s reading of playbooks for pleasure, it affirms Daniel’s patron’s interest in plays.

104 The fact that the showing of the plays was connected to “a great supper” held on February 14, Valentine’s Day, and was attended by five ladies, including Mountjoy’s mistress, Lady Rich, may partially explain his enthusiasm.
105 Potential evidence of Mountjoy’s interest in theater is also provided by an oft-cited performance of *Gorboduc* commissioned by Mountjoy and staged at Dublin Castle on September 7, 1601. Wiggins and Richardson, *British Drama*, vol. 1, p. 377; Christopher Morash, *A History of Irish Theatre, 1601-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002), pp. 2-3. Unfortunately, the story is most likely apocryphal. It was first included in W. R. Chetwood’s
Given Mountjoy’s documented openness to plays, enthusiasm for reading playbooks and interest in history, it is plausible that he would been aware of the printed editions of *Contention* and *True Tragedy*, works published just as Daniel was writing *The Civil Wars*, a poem covering the same topic, under his patronage. If that is true, it is similarly plausible that he would have purchased them and shared them with Daniel, the poet writing a poem with his support that covered the same material as the plays. As documented in his 1606 *Funeral Poem* for Mountjoy, then the late Earl of Devonshire, Daniel used Mountjoy’s well-stocked library for research. Daniel describes the extensive notes that Mountjoy left in the volumes in his library:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Witnesse so many volumes whereto thou} \\
\text{Hast set thy notes vnder thy learned hand,} \\
\text{And markt them with that print as will shew how} \\
\text{The point of thy conceiuing thoughts did stand;}\end{align*}
\]

It is plausible that Mountjoy’s library, a library with which Daniel was familiar, included the 1594 quarto of *Contention* and the 1595 octavo of *True Tragedy*. As stated earlier, normally one does not need to demonstrate the likelihood of an author’s access to a published work to demonstrate that he may have been influenced by it. In this circumstance, however, the plausibility of Daniel’s access to these playbooks is supported by evidence documenting his patron’s reading habits and Daniel’s access to his library.

---

1749 *A General History of the Stage* (pp. 50-51), a work described by Arthur Freeman as a likely source of numerous inaccuracies; “The Beginnings of Shakespearian (and Jonsonian) Forgeries: Part II”, *The Library*, 5 (2004), pp. 402-427. Freeman notes the *Gorboduc* story as one of Chetwood’s likely forgeries (pp. 414-415). Further, a review of Fynes Moryson’s *Itineraries* (Part II, sigs. Nn2c-Nn4f) includes no reference to a performance and reveals that Mountjoy was in Trim, not Dublin, from August 29 to September 9, 1601, a range that includes the date of the supposed performance of *Gorboduc*.

“ydle shadowes” and “Gross Barbarism”

In this chapter, I have analyzed connections that Daniel’s patrons, Mary Sidney and Charles Blount, had to contemporary drama, providing evidence that they may not have held the dismissive view of it sometimes ascribed to them. But what of Daniel himself? Michel supports his conclusion of Daniel’s lack of awareness of the Henry VI plays by citing the poet’s low regard for theater, stating that Daniel was “scornful of the popular stage and its purveyors”.107 Michel quotes two lines from Daniel’s dedication “To her sacred Maiestie” from the 1601 edition of The Civil Wars as evidence of Daniel’s scorn:

Nor shall I hereby vainely entertaine
Thy Land, with ydle shadowes to no end;108

Michel infers that Daniel is invoking plays and players as “ydle shadowes”, applying a figurative definition of the word “shadow”, such as that in OED entry 6b: “Applied rhetorically to a portrait as contrasted with the original; also to an actor or a play in contrast with the reality represented”.109 When read in context, however, there is little to suggest that Daniel’s use of the phrase “ydle shadowes” is intended to mean plays. Rather he is saying that if he lives to complete his poem, he pledges to use it to teach the blessings of Elizabeth’s peace, not solely to entertain. This is closer to the definition of the word “shadow” in OED entry 6a: “An unreal appearance; a delusive semblance or image; a vain and unsubstantial object of pursuit. Often contrasted with substance.”110 The “ydle shadowes to no end” are, in

107 Michel, ed., Civil Wars, pp. 7-8.
109 OED Online.
110 OED Online.
fact, Daniel’s own poem in its present form, which does not yet reach to Elizabeth’s reign.

This is reflected in the opening and closing stanzas of the dedication:

Here sacred Soueraigne, glorious Queene of Peace,
The tumults of disordred times I sing,
To glorifie thy Raigne, and to increase
The wonder of those blessings thou doost bring . . .

(The Works of Samuel Daniel Newly augmented, 1601, Sig. A2v)

Whereto if these my Labors shall attaine,
And which, if Fortune giue me leaue to end,
It will not be the least worke of thy Raigne,
Nor that which least thy glory shall commend,
Nor shall I hereby vainely entertaine
Thy Land, with ydle shadowes to no end;
But by thy Peace, teach what thy blessings are,
The more t’abhorre this execrable warre.

(The Works of Samuel Daniel Newly augmented, 1601, A2v)

Daniel is begging pardon and favor for his poem; there is no reason for him to be referring to theatrical performances and no indication that he intended to do so. Michel’s view of the stanza as an attack on theater begins with the assumption that Daniel was critical of contemporary drama and fits the phrase “ydle shadowes” to fit that assumption. In the context of the 1601 dedication of The Civil Wars to Queen Elizabeth, the phrase relates to insubstantial poetry, not plays, consistent with another use of the word “shadowes” in The First Four Books. In two stanzas (IV.5-6), Daniel has the ghost of Henry V upbraid him and the other poets of Elizabeth’s day for seeking “fained Palladins / Out of the smoke of idle vanitie”. The king enjoins Daniel to write of true heroes, not “imaginary ground / Of hungrie shadowes which no profit breed”. Daniel uses the word “shadowes” to describe poetry that is not adequately true to life and heroically instructional; he may even be alluding to Spenser’s The Faerie Queene with the phrase “fained Palladins”, a poem that Daniel has Henry V criticize along with his
own.\textsuperscript{111} The interpretation of “hungrie shadowes” as a reference to theater, like “ydle shadowes”, would follow only from a presupposition of Daniel’s disregard for theater.

Daniel also used the term “idle shadowes” in \textit{The Tragedie of Cleopatra}. In that play, Cleopatra uses the term to describe the fretful visions conjured in her mind of her son’s imagined doom,

\begin{quote}
My sp’rit suggests of luckless bad euent: 
But yet it may be tis but loue doth dote, 
On idle shadowes which my feares present. 
\textit{(Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra, 1594, L5\textsuperscript{v}-L6\textsuperscript{r})}
\end{quote}

Again, Daniel uses the word “shadowes” to invoke “a delusive semblance or image” (to quote the OED) – not plays. There is nothing surrounding his use of the term “ydle shadowes” in his 1601 dedication for \textit{The Civil Wars} to indicate that it is intended as a criticism of plays.

The belief in Daniel’s critical attitude toward popular theater begins with an interpretation of another work. It follows from the assumption that he is referring to contemporary drama when he attacks “\textit{Gross Barbarism}” in his dedication, “To the Right Honourable, the Lady Marie, Countesse of Pembrooke”, in his 1594 edition of \textit{The Tragedy of Cleopatra} (italicization as originally printed):

\begin{quote}
Now when so many pennes (like Speares) are charg’d, 
To chace away this tyrant of the North: 
\textit{Gross Barbarism}, whose powre growne far inlarg’d, 
Was lately by thy valiant Brothers worth, 
First found, encountred, and prouoked forth: 
Whose onset made the rest audacious, 
Whereby they likewise haue so well discharg’d, 
Vpon that hideous Beast incroching thus. 
\textit{(Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra, 1594, H5\textsuperscript{r})}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{111} Paleit, \textit{War, Liberty and Caesar}, pp. 67-68.
Daniel’s use of the term “Gross Barbarism” has been regarded as a critique of the popular theater of his day. This interpretation of Daniel’s meaning is closely associated with the belief in Mary Sidney’s circle to reform English drama. Like that belief, the idea of Daniel’s scorn for popular drama was advanced by T.S. Eliot. In his essay “Seneca in Elizabethan Translation”, Eliot refers to the term as part of Daniel’s “attack” on theater:

that attack in which Daniel, in his dedication of Cleopatra to the Countess of Pembroke, declared himself the foe of “Gross Barbarism”.\(^{112}\)

Just as we have re-evaluated and dismissed the existence of Mary Sidney’s circle, it is time to re-evaluate Eliot’s interpretation of Daniel’s use of the phrase “Gross Barbarism”.

In the dedication accompanying Cleopatra, Daniel states that “Gross Barbarism” was “found, encountered, and prouoked forth” by the Countess’s brother. Eliot identifies this as a reference to Philip Sidney’s Defense of Poesy and associates it with the section of that work where Sidney criticizes contemporary drama for its lack of observation of the Aristotelian unities:

For where the stage should always represent but one place, and the uttermost time presupposed in it should be, both by Aristotle’s precept and common reason, but one day, there is both many days, and many places, inartificially imagined. . . . where you shall have Asia of the one side, and Afric of the other, and so many other under-kingdoms, that the player, when he cometh in, must ever begin with telling where he is . . .\(^{113}\)

Such an association seems natural, since the dedication is attached to a play that does observe the unities, Cleopatra, a work designed to accompany the Countess’s Antonius, another play that did the same. As has been pointed out, however, by those who have questioned the belief

---


in Mary Sidney’s “circle”, writing closet tragedies that observe the Aristotelian unities does not, by itself, constitute an attack on plays that do not.\textsuperscript{114}

In citing the “\textit{Gross Barbarism}” that Philip Sidney “encountred”, Daniel seems to be referring to something specific in Sidney’s work. Nowhere in the brief section of \textit{Defense of Poesy} where he addresses drama does Sidney use the word “barbarism” or “barbarous” to describe contemporary theater practices.\textsuperscript{115} He describes some plays as “gross absurdities . . . neither right tragedies, nor right comedies, mingling kings and clowns”; but “gross absurdities” are different from “gross barbarism”.\textsuperscript{116} Sidney does, however, employ words that are variations of “barbarism” many times in his \textit{Defense}, almost always referring to some form of ignorance. He uses the word “barbarous” to describe people or nations that he sees as ignorant or uneducated, contrasting them with people who possess learning (my emphasis in bold):

\begin{quote}
Even among the most \textbf{barbarous} and simple Indians where no writing is, yet have they their poets who make and sing songs . . . a sufficient probability that, if ever learning come among them, it must be by having their hard dull wits softened and sharpened with the sweet delights of poetry . . .\textsuperscript{117}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Since then poetry is of all human learning the most ancient and of most fatherly antiquity, as from whence other learnings have taken their beginnings; since it is so universal that no learned nation doth despise it, nor \textbf{barbarous} nation is without it . . .\textsuperscript{118}
\end{quote}

In addition to equating barbarism with ignorance, in these sections of \textit{Defense of Poesy} Sidney advocates the use of poetry to combat such ignorance. Sidney uses the word

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{114} Cadman, \textit{Sovereigns and Subjects}, pp. 4-6; Hannay, Kinnamon, Brennan, eds., \textit{Collected Works}, pp. 35-43.
\item \textsuperscript{115} In Sidney, \textit{Major Works}, the section of \textit{Defense of Poesy} addressing drama occupies 84 lines (1257-1341) of the 1543-line work.
\item \textsuperscript{116} Sidney, \textit{Major Works}, p. 244.
\item \textsuperscript{117} Sidney, \textit{Major Works}, p. 214.
\item \textsuperscript{118} Sidney, \textit{Major Works}, p. 232.
\end{itemize}
“barbarous” in a Latin quotation to demonstrate the ignorant nature of those who invoke Plato’s critique of poets to cast aspersions on poetry:

*Qua authoritate barbari quidam atque hispidi abuti velint ad poetas e republica exigendos* [Translation by Katherine Duncan-Jones: “Referring to Plato, ‘whose authority certain *barbarous* and uncouth men seek to use to banish poets from the commonwealth’ ”].\(^{119}\)

The defense of poetry against its supposedly learned detractors is the central theme of Sidney’s *Defence of Ryme*, a theme announced in the work’s second paragraph:

And first, truly, to all them that, professing learning, inveigh against poetry, may justly be objected that they go very near to ungratefullness, to seek to deface that which, in the noblest nations and languages that are known, hath been the first light-giver to ignorance, . . . \(^{120}\)

Sidney objects to those who criticize poetry, especially those who profess learning but “seek to deface . . . the first light-giver to ignorance”. Based, in part, on T.S. Eliot’s perceived equivalence of “barbarism” with the Elizabethan stage, Sidney’s work has sometimes been regarded as a wholesale critique of English drama. It is not. A critique of contemporary theater is included in one brief section of *Defense of Poesy*, a section that nevertheless has praise for the play *Gorboduc*. Rather the work is a wholesale critique of those who attack poetry. I believe that this is the context of Daniel’s phrase “*Gross Barbarism*”, it is a reference to the ignorance of poetry’s supposedly learned detractors.

Regarded in this context, the stanza from Daniel’s dedication to *Cleopatra*, is no longer an attack on Elizabethan popular theater, but rather is a defense of poets who, taking Sidney’s lead, have turned on the “*Gross Barbarism*” of ignorant critics and have “discharg’d / Vpon

---


\(^{120}\) Sidney, *Major Works*, p. 212.
that hideous Beast” by writing English poetry. Further context for Daniel’s praise of such poets are lines later in the dedication where he singles out Mary Sidney’s work in translating the Psalms as an example that has built a “Bulwarke” against “these Monsters”:

Who doost with thine own hand a Bulwarke frame
Against these Monsters, (enemies of honour.)
Which euer-more shall so defend thy Fame,
That time nor they, shall neuer pray vpon her.

Those Hymnes that thou doost consecrate to heauen,
Which Israel’s Singer to his God did frame:
(Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra, 1594, sig. H6v)

Later in the dedication, he similarly cites “great Sydney & our Spencer”, repeating his praise for poets who fight barbarism.

Further context for Daniel’s use of the phrase “Gross Barbarism” comes from his Defence of Ryme, published in 1603. In that work, Daniel defends contemporary poetry and the use of rhyme in English verse, against an attack from Thomas Campion. In his Observations in the Art of English Poesie, Campion claimed that modern poets should observe Greek and Roman standards of composition based on the numeration of syllables:

Learning first flourished in Greece, from thence it was deriued vnto the Romaines, both diligent obseruers of the number, and quantity of sillables, not in their verses only, but likewise in their prose. Learning after the declining of the Romaine Empire, and the pollution of their language through the conquest of the Barbarians, lay most pitifully deformed, till the time of Erasmus, Rewcline, Sir Thomas More, . . . In those lack-learning times, and in barbarized Italy, began that vulgar and easie kind of Poesie which is now in vse throughout the most parts of Christendome, which we abusiuely call Rime . . .

Like Sidney, Campion refers to uneducated nations (in his case, the Germanic people who overtook Rome) as “Barbarians” and he accuses them of bringing a lesser form of poetry to

---

“barbarized” Italy. Daniel responds in his *Defence of Ryme* both that English poetry should follow its own course, not adhering to ancient standards, and that it is inappropriate to refer to “this or that nation Barbarous, these or those times grosse”:

Methinks we should not so soon yeeld our consents captiue to the authoritie of Antiquitie, vnesse we saw more reason: all our vnderstandings, are not to be built by the square of *Greece* and *Italie*. . . Nor can it be a touch of arrogant ignorance, to hold this or that nation Barbarous, these or those times grosse, considering how this manyfolde creature man, wheresoever he stand in the world, hath always some disposition of worth, . . . Will not experience confute vs, if we should say the state of *China*, which neuer hard of Anapestiques, Trochies and tribracques, were gross, barbarous and unciuile? And is it not a most apparent ignorance, both of the succession of learning in *Europe*, and the generall course of things, to say that all lay pittily deformed in these lacke-learning times from the declining of the Romane Empire, till the light of the Latine tongue was reuiued by Rewcline, Erasmus and Moore.\(^{123}\)

It would be inconsistent for the man who rejected being held “captive to the authority of antiquity” and who believed it wrong to call China “gross, barbarous and uncivil” because they had “never heard of anapestics”, to refer to modern English drama as “*gross Barbarism*” because it did not observe the Aristotelian unities. Rather, in his dedication to the Countess, he attacks the ignorance of the critics who disparage poetry, such as those first “encountred” by Sir Philip Sidney in his *Defense of Poesy*. He also praises English poets who took up Sir Philip’s charge by writing their own poems, poets like his sister, Mary. Daniel’s *Defense of Ryme* provides evidence that both Eliot’s interpretation of the phrase “*gross Barabarism*” and the resulting conclusion that Daniel was disdainful of English drama may be misguided.

The only place where Daniel clearly criticized theater was in two writings related to his 1604 play *Philotas*: an “Apology” for the play and a letter sent to Robert Cecil (addressed to him as

Lord Cranborn) craving pardon for the dramatic work.\textsuperscript{124} *Philotas* caused Daniel to be called before the Privy Council to answer questions about perceived similarities to the Essex rising of 1601. Daniel was ultimately cleared of wrongdoing; however, the affair caused him great embarrassment and difficulty. In the Apology, Daniel states that he thought:

> the representing so true a History, in the ancient forme of a Tragedy, could not but have had an unreprouable passage with the time, . . . seeing with what idle fictions and grosse follies, the Stage at this day abused mens recreations.\textsuperscript{125}

Daniel echoed this sentiment in his letter to Cecil, where he disclaimed an association with the “idleness” of the stage:

> And for this tragedie of Philotas, wherein I sought to reduce the stage from idleness to those grave presentments of antiquitie vsed by the wisest nations,\textsuperscript{126}

Regardless of the value, or lack thereof, of the inclusion of these statements in Daniel’s defense of himself, they serve as clear criticisms of the theater of his day. Yet, they are not a rejection of all theater. Daniel objected to plays that presented “idleness” or “idle fictions and grosse follies”, phrases that seem to describe frivolous comedies. There were many such plays to object to. Based on Wiggins and Richardson’s *Catalogue of British Drama*, 1600, the year when Daniel claimed to have drafted *Philotas*, saw at least 51 plays written, many of which could easily be described as “grosse follies”.\textsuperscript{127} It is unclear whether Daniel intended his statements as indictments of all theater of the time. He cites his own authorship of a “true . . .


\textsuperscript{125} Michel, ed., *Philotas*, p. 156.

\textsuperscript{126} Michel, ed., *Philotas*, p. 37; Rees, *Samuel Daniel*, p. 98; Sellers, “Bibliography”, p. 51

\textsuperscript{127} Wiggins and Richardson, *British Drama*, vol. 4, p. xii. Daniel claimed to have begun writing *Philotas* “neere half a yeare before the late Tragedy of ours, (whereunto this is now most ignorantly resembled)”. (Michel, ed., *Philotas*, p. 156). The “Tragedy” Daniel refers to is the 1601 Essex uprising.
History, in the ancient forme of a Tragedy” as a worthy effort. While he may be referring to
the classical literary “forme” of his “Tragedy”, he does not seem to rule out the possibility of
there being other historical works, tragedies, not written in the classic style, that similarly
sought to appeal to “the better sort”. Such historical tragedies made up the bulk of the
repertory of Pembroke’s Men in 1592 and, as noted earlier (p. 88), that repertory surprisingly
lacked comedies (except *Taming of A Shrew*). It is uncertain whether Daniel would have
dismissed them because they did not follow the “ancient forme of a Tragedy”, but it is clear
they would not fit his complaints about plays that were “idle fictions and grosse follies”.

Whatever Daniel intended in his pointed comments about contemporary theater during the
*Philotas* affair, they constitute his only documented criticisms of drama, criticisms written to
defend himself and distinguish his work from certain forms of popular theater. This provides
insufficient evidence to support the view of Daniel as being so “scornful of the popular stage
and its purveyors” that he would ignore the *Henry VI* plays both in performance and in print.

A wide range of evidence supports the plausibility of Daniel having been aware of and
influenced by the *Henry VI* plays. Textual parallels exist between the works that cannot be
fully explained by common sources. The registration of *The Civil Wars* in the Stationers’
Register echoes the title of the printed edition of one of the plays published months before
Daniel’s poem. Two of the plays were performed by the acting company sponsored by the
husband of Daniel’s patron, the Countess of Pembroke. All three plays were being performed
by acting companies that were near a Pembroke estate during the month when Queen Elizabeth
and the court were visiting. There is documentation that the Countess owed money to an
acting company during that same month. Daniel’s patron for *The Civil Wars*, Mountjoy, had a
documented interest in playbooks and history. The play whose title is echoed in the registration of Daniel’s poem was published while Daniel was writing with Mountjoy’s support. All this evidence supports the plausibility of Daniel having been influenced by the plays. Finally, the limited evidence supporting the alternate hypothesis, Daniel’s lack of regard for theater, is inconsistent with other elements of Daniel’s works and may be based on a faulty interpretation of the phrase “gross Barbarism”. Given this evidence, I believe that the hypothesis that Daniel was aware of and influenced by the plays has a greater likelihood than the alternate conclusion that he was unaware of them. I do not necessarily believe that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the plays’ influence on Daniel is probable, however there is enough evidence to indicate that he was likely aware of them and that Michel’s conclusion that Daniel was unaware of the plays is improbable. Ultimately, the determination of where on the possible-plausible-probable scale various hypotheses belong will vary by reader. More important is the recognition that much evidence has not been considered in the current view of Daniel and the relationship between his poem and the *Henry VI* plays. This evidence makes the influence of the plays on his poem more likely than has currently been recognized.

“pennes (like Speares)”

An ambiguous phrase in Daniel’s dedication of *Cleopatra* provides possible evidence of Daniel’s personal awareness of Shakespeare while he was writing *The Civil Wars*, evidence that is inconclusive but that I identify as an area for future research. I have evaluated indications that Daniel’s reference to “*Gross Barbarism*” in the dedication represents not an attack on theater, but rather a call to use poetry to fight ignorance. Regarded in this context, Daniel’s stanza commending poets who fight against “*Gross Barbarism*” includes an intriguing reference. Daniel states that “so many pennes (like Speares) are charg’d / To chace
away this tyrant”. What does he mean by “pennes (like Speares)”
? The most obvious interpretation is that he is introducing the imagery of warfare to illustrate the ability of writers/poets to attack their detractors, a variation of “the pen is mightier than the sword”. In doing so, he imagines Philip Sidney and other poets as knights fighting “Gross Barbarism” and “these Monsters”. He expands on this militaristic imagery throughout the dedication (“charg’d”, “discharg’d”, “bulwarke”). I am not the first reader of Daniel, however, to detect another possible meaning in the phrase “pennes (like Speares)”; is it potentially a veiled reference to Shakespeare?

A full evaluation of the possibility that Daniel personally knew Shakespeare by the time of his 1594 dedication to Cleopatra is beyond the scope of this thesis. Such an evaluation would encompass questions of Shakespeare’s whereabouts during the early part of his career. I am not prepared to address these questions. I do, however, point out some facts that should be considered in evaluating the possibility that Daniel is referring to Shakespeare.

In late 1593 when Daniel’s Cleopatra was entered in the Stationers’ Register, Shakespeare’s name had appeared in only one printed work, Venus and Adonis. Shakespeare’s poem, entered
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128 Alexander, Writing After Sidney, p. 65.
129 Hannay, Philip’s Phoenix, p. 123; Hannay and others, Collected Works, pp. 36-37.
130 Albert Hartshorne, in an 1899 essay, asserts, “Fuller, who lived near enough to Daniel’s time to speak with accuracy, . . . relates that he was used to retire for long periods in his house in Old Street for quiet communion with the muses. Here he received his friends, among them Shakespeare, Chapman, Marlowe . . . Drayton, and Jonson, besides the numerous persons of position who loved the gentle man”, “Samuel Daniel and Anne Clifford, Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery”, Archaeological Journal, 56 (1899), 186-210 (pp. 197-198). Thomas Fuller reports that “Mr. Daniel would lye hid at his Garden-house in Oldstreet, nigh London”, but does not mention visits from the poets described by Hartshorne, History of the Worthies of England (London, 1662), fols. Ddd2v-Ddd3v (p. 28 of Somersetshire). As far as I know, Hartshorne’s assertion has never been verified or documented.
in the Stationers’ Register on April 18, 1593 and printed in that same year, included a dedication signed “Your Honors in all dutie, William Shakespeare.” The title-page of the work included no authorial attribution. Shakespeare’s next printed work, Lucrece was entered on May 9, 1594, well after the entry of Daniel’s Cleopatra. If Daniel’s “pennes (like Speares)” indicates his recognition of Shakespeare and if that recognition came from printed works, it would have to be from the dedication in the 1593 edition of Venus and Adonis. It is possible that Daniel’s reference to “pennes (like Speares)” attacking “Gross Barbarism” is an invocation of Venus and Adonis; however, Lucrece seems, to me, a more plausible candidate, given the serious, tragic nature of its subject.

When Daniel wrote his dedication to the Countess for Cleopatra in 1593 to 1594, Shakespeare was almost certainly already writing Lucrece. The subject matter of that poem raises an interesting connection to Sidney’s Defense of Poesy. In Defense of Poesy, Sidney cites “the constant though lamenting look of Lucretia, when she punished in herself another’s fault”, as worthy material for “the first and most noble sort” of poet. It is possible that Shakespeare was taking up Sidney’s challenge, trying to claim himself as a poet of “the first and most noble sort”, in writing Lucrece. That this may have been in Shakespeare’s mind as he dedicated his earlier poem to Southampton is indicated in his “vowe to take aduantage of all idle houres, till I haue honoured you with some grauer labour”, expressed in that poem’s dedication.

---

131 Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen, eds., Shakespeare’s Poems, p. 479.
133 Sidney, Major Works, p. 218.
135 Shakespeare, Venus and Adonis (1593), sig. A2r; Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen, eds., Shakespeare’s Poems, p. 479.
noted by Bart van Es, before the formation of the Chamberlain’s Men in 1594, Shakespeare’s literary career adhered to “the model of the ‘poet-playwright’, established through the example of Ovid” and followed by many of his fellow professionals.\textsuperscript{136} It is possible that both Daniel and his patron, the Countess, Philip Sidney’s sister, knew of the young poet with high ambitions. This line of reasoning becomes very speculative; however, a reading of Daniel’s comment about “pennes (like Speares)” makes sense if interpreted as [in my words]: Pens (like Shakespeare’s) have been inspired by your brother’s work to write worthy poems, like \textit{Lucrece}, attacking the ignorant detractors of poetry.

I do not suggest that Daniel’s use of “pennes (like Speares)” can be conclusively identified as a reference to Shakespeare. The phrase is ambiguous, perhaps purposefully so. Based on current scholarship on Shakespeare’s life, Daniel’s potential personal knowledge of the poet/playwright before 1595 is unprovable. Less is known about Shakespeare, the man, than is known of the early versions of the \textit{Henry VI} plays and the acting companies that performed them. Hence, unlike my conclusion that it is likely that Daniel was aware of some version of the \textit{Henry VI} plays while writing \textit{The First Four Books of the Civil Wars}, I conclude his personal knowledge of Shakespeare to be something between possible and plausible and his use of “pennes (like Speares)” to be an intriguing potential reference to the young poet.

While Daniel’s personal knowledge of Shakespeare before 1595 is uncertain, Shakespeare’s knowledge of Daniel is better established. Daniel’s first volume of poetry, \textit{Delia and Rosamond}, printed in 1592, clearly had an influence on some of Shakespeare’s earliest works.

\textsuperscript{136} van Es, \textit{Shakespeare in Company}, pp. 28-29, see also pp. 57, 73-74.
Bart van Es and Georgia Brown both credit Daniel with inspiring Shakespeare’s *Lucrece*.\(^{137}\) While it is unknown when Shakespeare wrote his sonnets, some that may have been written in the early 1590s are thought to reflect the influence of *Delia*.\(^{138}\) Romeo’s words over the lifeless body of Juliet from *Romeo and Juliet*, written between 1593 and 1596, are thought to have been inspired by two sections of *Rosamond*.\(^{139}\) Shakespeare’s knowledge of Daniel is believed to have come from published editions of the poet’s work, editions that were widely available in print. In the next chapter, however, I will consider the possibility that the playwright could have had access to an unpublished early manuscript of *The Civil Wars* while writing *Richard II*, a possibility that raises further questions about the relationship between the two writers and the interaction of their works.


\(^{138}\) Duncan-Jones, ed., *Shakespeare’s Sonnets*, pp. 270, 322.

Chapter 4
Manuscripts of The Civil Wars and the Date of Richard II

In the preceding chapters I have considered the relationship between Daniel’s *First Four Books of the Civil Wars* and the *Henry VI* plays, a relationship that has been largely unexplored. In this and the next chapter I come to a relationship that has been analyzed extensively, that between Daniel’s first edition of *The Civil Wars* and *Richard II*. After many years of discussion and debate, it is now widely accepted that Shakespeare used Daniel’s poem as a source and that the publication of *The First Four Books* in 1595 establishes the earliest possible date for Shakespeare’s composition of *Richard II*.¹ An important factor, however, has been missing from the analysis. There exist two manuscripts of portions of Daniel’s poem, raising the possibility that Shakespeare could have used such a manuscript, rather than the printed edition, as his source. A stanza that appears in one of those manuscripts but in no printed version of *The Civil Wars* includes imagery that parallels a description in Shakespeare’s play. The parallel bolsters the possibility that Shakespeare may have had access to a pre-publication version of the poem. In this chapter I will describe the manuscripts, catalogue variants between them and the printed editions of Daniel’s poem, review evidence of their dates and consider how the existence of the manuscripts impacts the dating of *Richard II*.

In the next chapter I evaluate differences between the manuscripts and the printed edition of *The First Four Books*, differences that document Daniel’s revision of the poem. Given the possibility that Shakespeare could have used a pre-publication version of the poem as his

source, it becomes uncertain whether revisions preceded or followed Shakespeare’s play. I review evidence of how Daniel and Shakespeare could have encountered each other’s work and evaluate Daniel’s revisions for direction of influence.

Manuscripts of The Civil Wars

The British Library holds two manuscripts of sections of The Civil Wars, one of Books I-II (BL, Sloane MS 1443; CELM, DaS 1; referred to herein as “MS I-II”) and another of Book III (BL, Harley MS 7332, fols. 262r-280v; CELM DaS 4; “MS III”). The two manuscripts are described and analyzed in essays by Cecil Seronsy and Robert Krueger. The manuscripts differ significantly from the first three books as they appear in the 1595 quarto of the poem (Q1595:I-IV). Q1595:I-IV includes long sections that do not appear in the manuscripts and many variants, some minor, others substantive, within some stanzas that do. The manuscripts include no prefatory arguments and more limited marginal glosses. MS I-II contains six stanzas that never appeared in any printed edition. MS I-II plays a more central role in my analysis than MS III, both because it has stanzas never published and because it exhibits numerous substantive differences from Q1595:I-IV in episodes also depicted in Shakespeare’s Richard II. Establishing whether both manuscripts preceded or followed Q1595:I-IV, however, is important for determining if pre-publication versions of all three books existed.


3 The stanzas are included in Seronsy, “Daniel’s Manuscript” (1953) and in Michel, ed., Civil Wars, in the “Variants” sections on the first two books (pp. 295-312).
I begin with a description of the physical appearance of both manuscripts, as a comparison of the two is helpful in assessing the differing purposes for which they may have been intended. 4 I will then analyze variants from Q1595:I-IV in MS I-II and MS III, in turn. Appendix 1 of this thesis provides the text of Q1595:I-IV and notations of variants from the extant manuscripts. 5 Appendix 2 includes images of select pages from the manuscripts.

MS I-II has been bound, on its own, by the British Museum in a volume labeled “The War Between York and Lancaster” on its spine, while the leaves of MS III have been included in a collection labeled “Miscellaneous Poems”. The new binding for MS I-II appears to preserve the original gatherings, each of which is stitched into the new volume at the folds in the leaves. The leaves of MS I-II have been numbered 1 to 37, on the recto side of each folio, in a different hand than that of the body of the manuscript but in ink that seems contemporaneous. As noted by Seronsy and Krueger, the pages of MS III “have stitching holes showing that they had at one time been bound.” 6 The leaves of MS III were originally unnumbered but are now numbered 262 to 280, on the recto side of each, conforming to the current pagination of the volume in which they are included. 7 In referring to pages in the two manuscripts I use the folio numbers as they appear in the current volumes (MS I-II: 1r-37v; MS III: 262r-280v).

Stanzas are not numbered in either manuscript. In citing stanzas, I use the numbering from Q1595:I-IV (where applicable) and refer to the MS pages on which they appear.

---

4 Unless otherwise noted, descriptions are based upon my examination of the manuscripts.
5 Text of Books I to IV is based on The first fowre Bookes of the ciuile wars between the two houses of Lancaster and Yorke (London, 1595), in EEBO (494:01; reproduction of a quarto in Harvard University Library).
7 The leaves were previously numbered 286 to 304, rather than the present 262 to 280. The pages appear complete and are numbered consecutively using both paginations.
MS I-II is in a neater, more ornate hand than that of MS III and on heavier paper. MS I-II includes elaborate titles on the first page of each book and each page thereafter is comprised of exactly three stanzas carefully included within the margins. MS I-II may have been a presentation copy for a potential patron such as Mountjoy or Daniel’s later patron Margaret Clifford. MS III is not as carefully prepared as MS I-II. Although Seronsy and Krueger note that MS III is written in a hand that “is too neat and careful to suggest that the poem was copied as an entry into a commonplace-book”, this implies a greater level of care than appears on physical inspection. While the hand is generally “neat and careful”, the spacing and ruling of lines is often careless; some lines partially obscure others and the right margin is.

---

8 See Appendix 2 for images from both manuscripts. Sellers describes the handwriting of MS I-II as “a conventional book-hand” (“Bibliography”, p. 49). Seronsy and Krueger describe the writing of MS III as “a conventional Elizabethan Secretary hand” (“Manuscript of Book III”, p. 157). The handwriting of MS I-II has elements of the handwriting shown in the first few pages of John de Beau-Chesne and M. John Baildon, Booke containing diuers sortes of hands (London, 1571), whereas that of MS III is closer to the “small secretarie” hands shown later in that book (which includes no page or signature numbers).

9 The title on the first page of Book I (MS I-II, fol. 1r) is “The ciuile warrs / betweene the hou / ses of york & / Lanaster [sic]”. The page includes the first two stanzas. The title on the first page of Book II (MS I-II, fol. 21r) is “The Second Canto”. This is the only time that the word “Canto” is used to describe a book of the poem and is perhaps an indication of Daniel’s intent for his poem to emulate classical epics. See Appendix 2 for images.

10 The Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts (CELM) describes a notation of a manuscript of The Civil Wars formerly among the Clifford family papers at Skipton Castle: “MS of ‘The Civil Wars between the Houses of York and Lancaster, a Poem. only 2 Cantos ending with the death of Richard 2nd’. So catalogued in a MS list of ‘Books in the Closset in the Passage Room next the Pantry in Skipton Castle 28th Aug 1739’ ” (CELM DaS 3). John Pitcher concludes that the Clifford/Skipton manuscript is “almost certainly the copy . . . among the Sloane manuscripts in the British Library”, “Margaret, Countess of Cumberland’s The Prayse of Private Life, Presented by Samuel Daniel” in In Prayse of Writing, edited by S.P. Cerasano and Steven W. May (London: The British Library, 2012), pp. 114-144 (pp.135-136). It may be the same manuscript; however, the second book of MS I-II does not end “with the death of Richard 2nd”, which is in Book III. Given the difference between the description of the Clifford/Skipton manuscript and MS I-II, I regard the current location and/or existence of the former as uncertain. See also Woudhuysen, Sir Philip Sidney, pp. 88-91, 104-105 and 291-292, for features of authorial manuscripts, including Daniel’s.

breached many times on most pages. There is no standardization to the number of lines or stanzas included on pages in MS III and page-breaks are frequently within stanzas. The text on some pages is cramped (page 265r includes 28 lines – three and a half stanzas, with no break between two of them) while others leave excess room between lines (268v has 22 lines – fewer than three stanzas). While MS III does exhibit many variants from Q1595:I-IV, few are apparent corrections, indicating that MS III was a fair copy and not a working draft. MS III lacks the neatness and uniformity of MS I-II, although it does show evidence of someone (probably Daniel) spending money to have a portion of the poem professionally transcribed for some form of circulation.

MS I-II includes autograph notations in a hand different from that of the principal scribe that appear to be authorial (referred to herein as “MS I-II:D”). Such notations include the addition of nine marginal glosses and substantive revisions to approximately twenty stanzas within the body of the work. All three Daniel scholars that have commented on MS I-II:D have concluded that the majority of these notations are in Daniel’s hand. I have compared the handwriting to both Daniel’s autograph manuscript of his 1603 Panegyrick congratulatorie to

12 See Appendix 2 for images.
14 For examples of autograph notations see Appendix 1, noted as “MS I-II: D”.
the Kings most sacred maiestie and his 1605 letter to the Earl of Devonshire and agree with the assessment.¹⁶

Variants between MS I-II and Q1595:I-IV are catalogued in Michel’s critical edition of The Civil Wars (295-312). Those between MS III and Q1595:I-IV are listed in Seronsy’s and Krueger’s article “A Manuscript of Daniel’s Civil Wars Book III” (160-162). Variants are shown in Appendix 1, with additional details not noted in Michel’s or Seronsy and Krueger’s analyses. For lines with substantive variants from the printed edition, the footnotes of the appendix include the full alternate MS versions of the line, including minor spelling and punctuation differences, whereas Michel and Seronsy/Krueger show only the individual words that differ.¹⁷ My readings of MS I-II rely heavily on Michel and Seronsy; readings of MS-III rely heavily on Seronsy and Krueger. In most instances where they note no variants between the manuscripts and Q1595:I-IV, I accept their readings of the manuscript. In all instances where they reflect variants between the manuscripts and Q1595:I-IV, I have closely read the manuscript versions to verify their readings. Differences between my readings of the manuscripts and those of Michel (The Civil Wars, 295-312), Seronsy (“Daniel’s Manuscript Civil Wars”, 153-160) and Seronsy and Krueger (“A Manuscript of Daniel’s Civil Wars Book III”, 157-182) are described in the footnotes of Appendix 1.

¹⁶ See Appendix 2 for images of select pages from manuscripts. Daniel’s autograph manuscript of Panegyrick Congratulatorie is held by the British Library (BL, Royal MS 18 A. LXXII; CELM: DaS 21). Daniel’s letter to Devonshire is held at The National Archives, (TNA SP 14/11, Folio 7; CELM: DaS 59). A facsimile appears at the beginning of the large-paper format copies of volume 1 of Grosart, ed., Samuel Daniel. See also Pitcher’s article, “Samuel Daniel’s Letter to Sir Thomas Egerton”, Huntington Library Quarterly, 47 (1984), 55-61 (p. 55), for a reproduction of Daniel’s letter and an example of what Pitcher calls Daniel’s “distinctive and attractive Italian court hand”.
¹⁷ Lines with only minor, non-substantive, variants in spelling and punctuation are not noted.
The articles by Seronsy (with respect to MS I-II) and Seronsy and Krueger (MS III) conclude that both manuscripts precede the 1595 publication of *The First Four Books*; however, given the importance of dating of the manuscripts, I will reassess and supplement their evidence, highlighting some variants that lead to this conclusion. The variants highlighted provide insight into Daniel’s process of revision in sections of the poem central to my analysis.

**Variants Between Manuscripts of *The Civil Wars* and *FFB Q1595***

As described by Seronsy, MS I-II exhibits “one hundred and fifty or so differences in reading between the MS and the edition of 1595”.¹⁸ Within stanzas that appear in both MS I-II and Q1595:I-IV, I count approximately 190 variants between the two, significantly more than Seronsy; however, it is unclear how Seronsy made his count.¹⁹ Alternate methods of enumerating variants might potentially find between 150 and 200 variants. Of those 150+ differences, I have noted only six instances where the later 1601 (*The Works of Sam. Danyel Newly Augmented*) and 1609 (*The Civil Wars*) editions of the poem preserve readings from MS I-II rather than Q1595:I-IV, all of them minor variants or corrections of errors.²⁰ The

---


¹⁹ Seronsy does not provide a comprehensive list of MS I-II variants. He notes, “These differences are all material variants in which occur important changes in grammar, syntax, rhyme, meter, and idea” (p. 153), implying that he may exclude minor variants, arguments and marginal glosses. In my count, variants in each line count as one variant, as do additions of glosses. See footnotes to Appendix 1, most of which effectively document one variant each.

²⁰ Three of the six examples where the later editions follow MS I-II are identified as “faults escaped” in an errata page included in some copies of the 1595 *First Four Books* (including BL Ashley 537, the copy-text for the fifth book in Appendix 1). The six instances where later editions are closer to MS I-II than to Q1595:I-IV, including these three “faults escaped”, are:

1. I.3.5 (Q1595) reads “then vnite” where MS I-II (fol. 1') reads “then to unite”. The correction was made in 1601 and followed in 1609 (phrase changed to “but to vnite”).

2. I.91.5 (Q1595) reads “Tho sinne” where MS I-II (fol. 16') reads “The sinne”. The correction was made in 1601 and followed in 1609.

3. II.5.5 (Q1595) reads “th'amazing” where MS I-II (fol. 21') has “Th’amusing”. The correction was not made in 1601, which agrees with 1595. The correction was made in 1609, which reads “th’amuzing” and, therefore, is closer to MS I-II than to 1595.
agreement of MS I-II with later editions in cases of apparent errors in Q1595:I-IV suggests that MS I-II was not derived or set from Q1595:I-IV. For nearly all variants between Q1595:I-IV and MS I-II, both the 1601 and the 1609 editions agree with Q1595:I-IV, not MS I-II. This rules out the possibility that the manuscript was transcribed from either of the later printed editions and suggests that it is a version of the poem independent of any of those published.

An evaluation of the nature of differences between MS I-II and Q1595:I-IV demonstrates that they document authorial revision. Many variants are substantively different versions of the lines involved, with both versions representing viable alternatives. An example of this is a difference in the rhyme scheme of the final couplet of I.35. In MS I-II (fol. 6v), the couplet appears as:

I know not; but as now he lendes his eare  
And youthfull counsell willingly doth heare.

The Q1595:I-IV version is:

We will not saie: but now his eare he lendes  
To youthfull counsel, and his lusts attends.

The two versions retain the sense but change the rhyme, an apparent authorial stylistic change.

The Q1595:I-IV rhyme scheme (lendes/attends) appears in both 1601 and 1609 (I.30 in 1609),

4. II.19.1 (Q1595) has the phrase “as let in lease” with no parentheses. MS I-II (fol. 24v) has parentheses. The 1601 edition followed 1595 but 1609 agrees with MS I-II.

5. II.27.5 (Q1595) has the word “magnanim’ous” with an apostrophe within it. MS I-II (fol. 25v) shows the word with no apostrophe, as do 1601 and 1609.

6. II.76.5 (Q1595) has the word “i’st” with an apostrophe within it. MS I-II (fol. 34v) shows the word with no apostrophe, as do 1601 and 1609.

21 Of the approximately 190 instances that I count of differences between MS I-II and Q1595:I-IV, 181 of the readings from 1601 and 155 of the readings from 1609 agree with Q1595. The remaining differences between the later editions and 1595 are explained as revisions that effectively superseded both Q1595:I-IV and MS I-II, especially stanzas deleted or substantially revised in 1609.
suggesting that MS I-II represents an earlier version, one that was abandoned in Q1595 and not taken up again. Although not documented by an autograph correction, the difference suggests an authorial revision between MS I-II and Q1595:I-IV, with the manuscript preceding the printed edition.

Another more complicated example of a change in rhyme, one reflected in Daniel’s hand, confirms the conclusion that such differences document authorial revision. The manuscript version of the stanza that became II.36 in 1595 (MS I-II, fol. 27r) includes three end-rhyming words that have been crossed out in the manuscript and changed to words that change the rhyme scheme and subtly alter the meaning of the lines involved. The new words are documented by autograph corrections in Daniel’s hand. The stanza as it appears in MS I-II is as follows (with the appropriate words crossed out as in the manuscript and the substituted word next to it):

What hope haue you that ever Bullingbrooke
Will live a subject that hath tride his might [MS I-II:D: fate?]
Or what good reconcilement can you looke
Where he must alwayes feare, and you must spight [MS I-II:D: hate?]24
And never thinke that he this quarrell tooke
To reobtain there by his private right [MS I-II:D: state.]
Twas greater hopes that hereto did him call
And he will thrust for all or els loose all.

---

22 The 1595 version of the final couplet was retained in 1601 and was revised slightly in 1609 (I.30) though with the same rhyme as in Q1595:I-IV.
23 See Appendix 2 for image of MS I-II, fol. 27r.
24 Michel offers “slight” for the last word (Michel, ed., Civil Wars, p. 305) while Seronsy suggests “fight” (Seronsy, “Manuscript”, p. 156). My reading of the manuscript, albeit unclear as the word is crossed out, is “spight”, based both on the appearance and the greater similarity of the word “spight” to its replacement “hate”. “Fright” is another possible reading. See Appendix 2 for image of MS I-II, fol. 27r.
The three substituted words – “fate”, “hate” and “state” – are the ones used in Q1595 and subsequent editions. The changes made to the manuscript document the poet revising his work between the date of the preparation of the manuscript and the publication of the poem. The appearance of the revision in Daniel’s own hand demonstrates that he used this specific manuscript at some point while revising the poem and that it preceded Q1595:I-IV.

Substantially all Daniel’s autograph annotations in MS I-II are reflected in Q1595:I-IV. There are many variants between Q1595:I-IV and MS I-II, however, for which there are no authorial notations to document revision, indicating that MS I-II does not include the final pre-publication version of the poem. Rather MS I-II seems to be an early version of a portion of the poem used by the author as he was revising his work – possibly a presentation copy that became a working draft. The variants between MS I-II and Q1595:I-IV document a work in progress, a poem revised between the preparation of the manuscript and the printing of the quarto.

While it is reasonable to conclude that variants in stanzas that appear in both MS I-II and Q1595:I-IV document authorial revision, caution is warranted before forming a similar conclusion for stanzas included in Q1595:I-IV but not MS I-II, stanzas that I refer to as “additions” to the poem. The inclusion of 43 such stanzas (I.94-100, II.72, II.97-131) in Q1595:I-IV indicates Daniel’s authorship and intent to include them in the printed version; however, it is possible that they were written earlier and omitted from MS I-II, either

---

25 Michel, ed., Civil Wars, p. 55. See Woudhuysen, Sir Philip Sidney, p. 95, for other examples of fair copies that were revised by their authors during the drafting of their works. For a discussion of Daniel’s treatment of manuscript versions of his work see John Pitcher, “Benefiting from the Book: The Oxford Edition of Samuel Daniel”, The Yearbook of English Studies, 29 (1999), 69-87 (pp. 84-86).
intentionally or accidentally. I will address these added stanzas in the next chapter and evaluate evidence of when they were written.

It is easier to form some conclusion on the six stanzas that appear in MS I-II but not Q1595:I-IV (two on MS I-II, fol. 23v; one on fol. 31r; one on 31v; two on fol. 36v), stanzas that I refer to as having been “deleted”. These deletions almost certainly reflect a change of heart by Daniel during the period between the production of the manuscript and the poem’s publication. The lack of inclusion of such stanzas in subsequent editions rules out accidental omission from Q1595:I-IV. We can only speculate on Daniel’s reason for striking these stanzas, but their inclusion in the manuscript allows us to see that they had been part of the poem at some earlier date and could have been accessed by a reader of that or a similar manuscript. After analyzing the variants between MS III and Q1595:I-IV, I return to these deleted stanzas.

MS III does not exhibit as many variants from Q1595:I-IV as does MS I-II, and there are no autograph annotations. Seronsy and Krueger document 47 variants between MS III and Q1595:I-IV (one for approximately every two and a half stanzas), not quite the “one hundred and fifty or so” in MS I-II (one for approximately every one and a half stanzas using Seronsy’s count). As with the MS I-II, the majority of the readings from Q1595:I-IV that differ from MS III, 42 out of 47, are retained in the next edition of 1601. There are only three examples of 1601 and 1609 editions returning to readings from MS III, all apparent corrections of

---

26 See Appendix 2 for image of fol. 36r.
27 In counting Seronsy and Krueger’s variants, I count only those within stanzas that appear in both MS III and Q1595:I-IV. The 15 stanzas added (III.116-130) are not counted.
28 Count of readings from 1595 retained in 1601 based on my own count. With respect to the 1609 edition, despite its significant revisions to Book III (including the deletion of 8 stanzas from 1595 and the complete revision of many others) 30 of the 47 readings from 1595 that differ with MS III are retained.
printing errors in Q1595:I-IV. MS III does not appear to be a transcription from any printed edition of the poem. As with MS I-II, the nature of many variants in MS III suggests that the manuscript documents an early version of the poem. Given the lack of revisions in Daniel’s hand such a conclusion is more tentative than for MS I-II; however, minor wording and stylistic differences that present alternate versions of lines, versions that appear in MS III but no printed edition, indicate that they precede the poem’s publication. One difference offers a glimpse into Daniel’s revision process.

In the stanza that became III.32, the Abbot of Westminster and others plan the murder of Henry IV. In MS III (fol. 266v) the first four lines of the stanza appear as,

Then of the manner howe t’effect the thinge
Consulted was and in the end agreed
That at a maske and solempe revelinge
which should b’ordaind, they would performe the deede;

The description is similar to Hall’s version of the same episode,

And for the expedicion of this enterprise he deuised a solempe iustes to be enterprised . . . to the whiche triumpe, Kyng Henry should be inuited and desired, and when he were moste busely regardyng the marciall playe and warly disporte, he sodainly should bee slain and destroyed.29

29 The three examples of readings from MS III that are adopted in 1601 and 1609 rather than the version from 1595 are as follows:
1. III.10.8: The phrase “they loathd the old” in Q1595 is shown as “they loath the old” in MS III (fol. 263r). The latter reading is used in 1601 and 1609 (III.9.8).
2. III.22.5: The phrase “By subjects two” in Q1595 is shown as “By subjects too” in MS III (fol. 265v). The latter reading is used in 1601 and 1609 (III.23.5).
3. III:29.8: The phrase “To chaste th’usurper” in Q1595 is shown as “To chase th’usurper” in MS III (fol. 266r). In 1601 and 1609 (III.30.8 in 1609) the word used was “chace”.
30 Hall, Union, fols. XIv – XIIr.
Both Daniel and Hall describe the conspirators planning an event at which Henry’s murder would be performed. Hall’s spelling of the word “solemn” in “solempne iustes” is retained in this stanza whereas the word is spelled “solemne” two stanzas later (III.34) in both Q1595:I-IV and MS III (fol. 267r). In writing the MS III version of the poem, Daniel changed the nature of the event from Hall’s jousts to revelling, perhaps for metrical reasons. In Q1595:I-IV, however, “solempne revelinge” becomes “common reuelling” and that version is followed in subsequent editions. It seems that at some point Daniel decided against the wording “solempne revelinge”, possibly thinking the phrase unintentionally paradoxical. He changed it to “common reuelling”, emphasizing the large group of people that would attend the event. In doing so, revising his poem for stylistic changes, he moved further from his source. Even if this conjectured explanation is not correct, the revision from “solempne” to “common” seems to be an authorial revision; MS III precedes Q1595:I-IV.

Many stylistic variants in MS III, some minor some substantive, similarly provide evidence of Daniel revising the poem. For most of them, it is difficult to speculate on the reason for the change, other than the fact that Daniel was a famously inveterate reviser.31 The poet, himself, commented on that aspect of his creative process in his introductory “To the Reader” from the 1607 Certaine Small Workes Heretofore Divulged by Samuel Daniel (no sig. or page number):

Behold once more with serious labor here
Haue I refurnisht out this little frame,
Repaird some parts defectiue here and there,
And passages new added to the same,
Some rooms inlargd, made some les then they were
Like to the curious builder who this yeare
Puls downe, and alters what he did the last
As if the thing in doing were more deere
Then being done, & nothing likes thats past.

31 Pitcher, “Benefiting from the Book”, pp. 74-75; Michel, ed., Civil Wars, p. 28.
None of the sections of the third book that include parallels with *Richard II* differs significantly between the MS III and Q1595:I-IV. As a result, unlike the analysis of MS I-II, the variants themselves do not play an important role in my analysis. The most significant conclusion yielded from MS III is that a version of Book III existed in manuscript prior to the publication of *The First Four Books*. The entire section of the poem on the reign of King Richard II, from his accession to his death, is included in the first three books and, therefore, was available prior to Q1595:I-IV. I do not suggest that Shakespeare used these specific manuscripts while writing *Richard II*. Rather, I point out that versions of all three books that served as Shakespeare’s source existed in manuscript prior to the appearance of Q1595:I-IV. He could have used these or other similar manuscripts based on the same text. The survival of these two manuscripts of separate portions of the poem, prepared for different purposes, suggests that other such manuscripts may have existed, in addition to the printer’s copy.\(^{32}\)

The dating of the preparation of the manuscripts is important for evaluating their relationship to both Shakespeare’s play and Daniel’s revisions to his poem. It can be assumed that they precede the appearance of Q1595:I-IV.\(^{33}\) One might also assume that both precede the October 11, 1594 entry of the work in the Stationers’ Register, however, Cyndia Susan Clegg points out that the entry of a work in the Stationers’ Register does not provide assurance that the work was complete or not revised between licensing and printing.\(^{34}\) The entry in the Stationers’

---

\(^{32}\) See footnote 10 of this chapter for comment on possible additional manuscript held by Margaret Clifford.

\(^{33}\) The title page of the quarto is dated 1595. Further evidence for the precise timing during 1595 of the appearance of the volume is discussed later in this chapter (pp. 143-144).

Register was conditional, stating “that before yt be printed he shall procure sufficient aucthority for the printinge of yt”, increasing the possibility of changes between registration and printing. It is possible that the manuscripts were prepared and revisions made to them after the entry, although it is probable that one or both preceded it.

The date of MS I-II can be established with greater precision than that of MS-III as the *terminus post quem* can be established from the text. The fourth stanza of the first book in both the manuscript and the published edition (MS I-II: 1v; Q1595:I-IV, I.4) includes the line “And thou Charles Mountjoy borne the worldes delight”. Charles Blount became Baron Mountjoy on June 27, 1594 on the death of his brother. This establishes the first date when Daniel would have referred to Blount as Mountjoy and so determines the earliest possible date of preparation of the manuscript.

The *terminus post quem* for the manuscript of the third book is undetermined. The final stanza of the manuscript includes a reference that may provide a clue:

```
Help o soveraigne muse helpe on my course
If these my toyles be gratefull in thy eyes; . . .
And you o worthie you, that take remorse
Of my estate, and helpe my thoughts to rise
Continue still your grace that I may giue
End to the worke, wherein your worth may liue.
(MS I-II, 280v; FFB Q1595:I-IV, III.132)
```

---

37 Line in Q1595:I-IV is “Help on o Sou’raigne *Muse*, helpe on my course”. Variant in italics.
In this stanza, Daniel makes clear that the principal muse of the poem is Queen Elizabeth, his
“soveraigne”.38 This is consistent with the stanza of MS I-II (I.4, fol. 1v) that refers to the
“sacred Goddesse” that Daniel invokes as his muse. By the time both manuscripts were
prepared, the Countesss of Pembroke, Mary Sidney, was not the intended dedicatee of Daniel’s
poem.39 Further, the stanza refers to “you o worthy you, that take remorse / Of my estate”.
This is an apparent nod to Mountjoy who, as noted in chapter 2 (pp. 68-70), had given Daniel
refuge after some financial misfortune, hence the reference to the poet’s remorseful “estate”.40
The inclusion in the third book of extensive complimentary references to Mountjoy’s
ancestors, Thomas Blunt (MSIII: III.36-46) and Walter Blunt (MSIII: III.97, 111), provides
further evidence that the third book was drafted with Daniel’s potential new patron in mind.41
The third book includes the only references to Blunts in the first four books of the poem.
These stanzas seem to have been written after Daniel’s financial condition had deteriorated and
he contemplated leaving the Countess, who apparently did not agree to support his efforts in
writing the historical poem. The manuscript of the third book was prepared after Daniel left
the Pembroke household and had been taken in by Mountjoy. The exact date of the beginning
of Daniel’s association with Mountjoy is unknown, but is unlikely to have been long before
October 9, 1593, when Cleopatra, a work dedicated to the Countess, was entered in the
Stationers’ Register. Based upon its references to the Blunt family and its expression of
gratitude to Charles Blount (“you o worthie you”), this manuscript was probably prepared

38 McCabe, Ungainefull Arte, p. 255. McCabe points out the similarity of this stanza to
“appeals made that same year [1595] in Spenser’s Colin Clouts Come Home Againe” and notes
it as a reflection of “Daniel’s ambition”.
39 See p. 71 for Daniel’s attempt to solicit the Countess’s support for The Civil Wars in the
1593-4 dedication to Cleopatra.
40 Michel also believes this refers to Mountjoy, Civil Wars, p. 352.
41 Wright, “Politics of Revision”, pp. 467-468.
between that date and June 1594, when Blount became Lord Mountjoy. Unlike MS I-II, MS III includes no use of the title Mountjoy.

MS I-II was, therefore, produced after June 1594 but before the 1595 printing of *The First Four Books* and at least some of the text, the stanza referring to Mountjoy, was written during that period. MS III was probably produced between October 1593 and June 1594, after Daniel parted from the Countess but before Blount became Mountjoy. Both present early versions of sections of the poem that were revised after the preparation of the manuscripts. The revisions would have to be made by early 1595, given the time that it would have taken to typeset the poem, including such extensive revisions, prior to its printing in that year.

**MS I-II and Richard II: Which Came First?**

I have demonstrated that MS I-II preceded Q1595:I-IV; however, I have not yet evaluated evidence of which came first, the manuscript version of the poem or *Richard II*. If *Richard II* preceded Daniel’s composition of MS I-II, then all parallels between the two are potential evidence of Shakespeare’s influence on Daniel. If *Richard II* followed the manuscript version of *The Civil Wars*, then the printed version of the poem may have influenced the play. The inclusion of material in MS I-II depicting an unhistorically mature Queen Isabel indicates that the second chronology is probable.

As noted earlier, the likelihood of influence between the first edition of Daniel’s poem and *Richard II* has been debated for many years. Over the past 40 years, substantially all critical analysis accepts that influence is indicated and that the direction of influence was from Daniel
to Shakespeare.⁴² This second conclusion was “confirmed” (quoting a word used by Taylor and Loughnane in “Canon and Chronology”, p. 513) by George M. Logan in two essays published during the 1970s.⁴³ In those essays, Logan discusses the relationship between The Civil Wars, Richard II and Lucan’s Pharsalia. Logan demonstrated that Daniel used Lucan’s epic on the Roman civil wars as a central model for his poem and that instances where Shakespeare echoes Lucan reflect elements adapted first by Daniel.⁴⁴ Based on Logan’s analysis, portions of Richard II that both echo Daniel and reflect Lucan’s influence can be taken has having been written after the corresponding section of The Civil Wars.

Logan asserts that Daniel’s narration of Queen Isabel waiting to greet her returning husband and meeting with him in prison are “an integral part of the modeling of his poem on Lucan’s epic”.⁴⁵ The historically inaccurate episodes are based on Lucan’s account of the relationship between Pompey and his wife, Cornelia. Logan shows close parallels between this section of Daniel’s poem and Richard II, establishing that Shakespeare adopted a Lucan-inspired relationship for his king and an inaccurately mature queen based upon Daniel. Since the time of Logan’s analysis, literary criticism of Richard II has almost universally accepted Daniel’s origination of the character of Queen Isabel.

Most of the material from The Civil Wars that overlaps with Shakespeare’s portrayal of Richard and Isabel in Richard II is included in Book II of Daniel’s poem and substantially all

⁴² Taylor and Loughnane, “Canon and Chronology”, p. 513, “And it is generally accepted that Richard II draws on Samuel Daniel’s The First Four Books of the Civil Wars”.
of it appears in MS I-II. This establishes the probability that MS I-II preceded Shakespeare’s play. It does not answer the question of whether Shakespeare used a manuscript or printed edition of Daniel’s poem, but it does argue against the possibility of Richard II being written before this manuscript version of the poem.

An episode included in MS I-II illustrates how Daniel adapted Lucan and Shakespeare picked up the expanded version from Daniel. In Pharsalia, Cornelia has forebodings of her husband’s defeat and plans to meet him on his return from the battle of Pharsalia. In Lucan’s poem, the poet addresses the conquered warrior’s wife and asks her to weep for her husband:

\[
\text{Victis adest coniunx. Quid perdis tempora luctus?} \\
\text{Cum possis iam flere, times.}^{47} \\
\text{[Here is your husband in defeat. Why waste this time of grief?} \\
\text{You are afraid, when already you should weep.]^{48}
\]

In stanzas 91-92 of Book II, Daniel turned this into Isabel’s observation on sharing her husband’s woe; by weeping together they make their grief complete. The version of the stanzas quoted is that from MS I-II with variants from Q1595:I-IV footnoted (none of which sheds light on whether the manuscript or printed edition served as Shakespeare’s source):

\[
\text{But what doe I heere lurking idly mone} \\
\text{And wayle a part and in a single part} \\
\text{Make severall griefe which should goe both in one}^{49} \\
\text{The touch being equall of each others hart} \\
\text{And no deere Lord thou must not morne alone}^{50} \\
\text{For without me thou art not all thou art} \\
\text{Nor my teares without thine are fully teares,}
\]

---

46 This example is not one of the many described by Logan, but it is one that describes well how Daniel’s portrayal of Isabel and Richard is informed by Lucan.  
49 Q1595:I-IV shows line as, “Make severall griefe which should be both in one”. Variant in italics.  
50 Q1595:I-IV shows line as, “And no sweete Lord thou must not mone alone”. Variants in italics.
For thus vnioynd sorrow but halfe appeares.

Ioine then our plaints and make our griefe ful griefe,
Our state being one o letts not part our care, . . .
No no my Lord I come to helpe thee rue.

(MS I-II, sigs. 36v-37r; FFB II.91-92)

Shakespeare takes up Daniel’s conceit of Richard and his queen sharing their grief in his scene of their parting:

Queen And must we be diuided? must we part?
King I hand from hand (my loue) and heart from heart.
Queen Banish vs both, and send the King with me.
King That were some loue, but little pollicie.\footnote{An apparent error in the quarto. The line should be Northumberland’s.}
Queen Then whither he goes, thither let me go.
King So two togither weeping make one woe,
Weepo thou for me in Fraunce, I for thee heere.

(Q1597, sig. H4\textsuperscript{v}; R2, V.1.81-87)

Shakespeare’s conceit that “two togither weeping make one woe” is very close to Daniel’s “Make seuerall griefe which should goe both in one” and “Ioine then our plaints & make our griefe ful griefe”. Influence is probable, and Daniel’s adaptation of Lucan suggests that he is the originator. The existence of the stanzas in MS I-II establishes that the manuscript preceded Shakespeare’s play. It is possible for Shakespeare to have picked up the idea from the printed version, but implausible for his play to have preceded the manuscript.

I have reviewed evidence that the text of MS I-II preceded both the printed version of Daniel’s poem and Richard II. That still leaves open the question of whether Shakespeare used such an early manuscript of Daniel’s poem or the printed edition as his source when writing Richard II. To answer that I look to the six stanzas that appear in MS I-II but not Q1595:I-IV, the
“deleted” stanzas.\(^{52}\) If there were evidence of material from those stanzas influencing *Richard II*, it would indicate that Shakespeare had seen an early version of the poem and call into question the dating of *Richard II*.

**Deleted Stanzas and *Richard II***

All six stanzas that appear in MS I-II and not any printed edition of *The Civil Wars* are from Book II. They include two from Richard’s lament on finding that his subjects have joined Bolingbroke (MS I-II, fol. 23\(^v\), after II.16), two from Richard’s apostrophe to his rebel cousin as he prepares to meet him (MS I-II, fol. 31\(^\prime\), after II.59; MS I-II, fol. 31\(^v\), after II.60) and two from Isabel’s complaint as she seeks to meet Richard on his return to London (MS I-II, fol. 36\(^\prime\), after II.88). The last of these encompasses a stanza that parallels imagery from *Richard II*. The assessment of that parallel for possible influence is central to the analysis of whether MS I-II offers evidence that Shakespeare had access to a pre-publication version of the poem.

One of the most memorable images in *Richard II* is the description of the captive king being ignored as if he were a tedious actor on the stage of the London streets (*R2*, V.2.23-28). The use of the theater metaphor invokes a meta-theatrical conceit, making us aware of how we regard the player speaking the lines.\(^ {53}\) It seems appropriate, therefore, that the image should be invented by the actor-playwright, Shakespeare. Daniel, however, included similar imagery in a stanza describing the same event, a stanza that appeared in MS I-II (fol. 36\(^r\)) but in no printed edition of the poem. Daniel states that Richard received “not the least applause” and

---

\(^{52}\) The influence of a “deleted” stanza from M I-II would not prove that Shakespeare did not use both an early manuscript and the printed edition of the poem. It does, however, establish that *Richard II* could have been written earlier than Q1595:I-IV.

that the London streets were “the stage vnto this wicked act”. Is the shared use of theatrical imagery to describe the same event coincidence or did Shakespeare, the dramatic playwright, get inspiration for the metaphor from Daniel, his courtly counterpart?

In both MS I-II and Q1595:I-IV, Daniel describes Richard’s entry into London through the eyes of Isabel. In both versions, she is overcome with grief and addresses him in her mind (MSI-II with variants from Q1595:I-IV, II.88 footnoted):

O dost thou thus retorne againe to mee?
Are these the triumphes for thy victories
Is this the glory thou dost bring with thee
From that unhappie Irish Enterprise?
O have I made so many vowes to see
Thy safe [MS I-II:D: retorne] and see thee in this wise,54
Is this the lookt for comfort thou dost bring
To come a captive and wentst out a king?55

(MSI-II, fol. 36r FFB Q1595:I-IV, II.88)

This stanza is followed in MS I-II by two that do not appear in Q1595:I-IV:

Our sad attempt was that to take in hand,
To conquere otheres, and to loose thyne owne
And seeking more to add vnto thy land
To leave thy land and to forgoe thy crowne
Whiles thou their mischiefe didst not understand
Being there victorious heere are overthrowne
Wicked vngratefull people so to deale
Against your faith your king and common weale.

O was there none that with respective eye
would once vouchsafe to looke vpon their Lord?
Deservd hee no regard in passing by?
No not the least applause by signe or word?
well London thou that sawst this iniury
Thy streetes may rue the grace they did afford,
To bee the stage vnto this wicked act
And curse the causes and bewaile the fact.

---

54 In MS I-II the word “retorne” is missing from this line as originally written but is careted in Daniel’s hand.
55 Q1595:I-IV: To come a captiue that wentst out a king?
In the second of these Daniel employs theater imagery to illustrate Richard’s plight, stating that he received “no regard . . . not the least applause” on “the stage vnto this wicked act”.

In the equivalent section of Richard II, the scene of the captured king entering London is not presented onstage but is related by York, something that Marjorie Garber evocatively labels an “unscene”.57 As with Isabel’s narrative in MS I-II, York’s depiction of the event includes a theater metaphor. After describing the throngs cheering Bolingbroke’s victorious entry into the city, York is asked by his wife, “Alack, poor Richard, where rode he the whilst?” (Q1597, sig. H4r; R2 V.2.22). He replies:

As in a Theater the eies of men,
After a well-graced Actor leaues the stage,
Are ydly bent on him that enters next,
Thinking his prattle to be tedious;
Euen so, or with much more contempt mens eies
Did scowle on gentle Ric. no man cried, God saue him,
No ioyfull tongue gaue him his welcome home,
(Q1597, sig. H4r; R2, V.2.23-29)

Although the words differ, the conceit is analogous to Daniel’s. Shakespeare’s Richard is an unregarded actor who received welcome from “No joyful tongue” while Daniel’s garnered “not the least applause by signe or word”. Both use the word “stage” in their descriptions and both emphasize the eyes of the spectators, Shakespeare’s “with much more contempt mens eies” paralleling Daniel’s “none . . . with respective eye”.

56 See appendix 2 for image of fol. 36r from the manuscript.
57 Marjorie Garber, Shakespeare After All (New York: Random House, 2005), p. 255, “The form of this report is what I call an ‘unscene,’ a scene that the audience does not actually see, but that is so vividly described it seems almost to be engraved upon the memory.”
The similarity does not prove influence; it could be coincidence. There is no extended verbal echo to confirm such influence. Further, the idea of monarchs as actors performing their actions on the world stage, the *Theatrum Mundi* concept, was a common one. An illustrative example from a work that both Daniel and Shakespeare would have been familiar with is Thomas More’s *History of King Richard III*:

> these matters bee Kings games, as it were stage-playes, and for the most part played upon scaffolds, in which poore men bee but lookers on . . .

As with Daniel and Shakespeare, More emphasizes the importance of the role of the observers in monarchs’ “stage-plays”. Queen Elizabeth was similarly quoted by Holinshed as observing:

> For we princes, I tell you, are set on stages, in the sight and view of all the world duly observed; the eyes of many behold our actions;

The common idea of princes acting on the world stage, playing a role in the eyes of their subjects, suggests that Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s shared use of similar imagery may be coincidental. Yet, the stanzas of *First Four Books* in which Richard’s queen watches him return in disgrace behind Bolingbroke are in a section where Shakespeare’s familiarity with the poem is clear. As reflected in both MS I-II and Q1595:I-IV, Daniel provided details in his description of Bolingbroke and Richard’s entry into London that were taken up by Shakespeare.

In York’s description, Bolingbroke, the triumphant rebel, rides through streets to the cheers of supporters while the captive Richard follows him, dejected and scorned. The description has

---


little basis in the chronicle sources. As reported by the chroniclers, the two entered the city on different days and, contrary to Shakespeare’s description, Richard was not ignored. As described by Holinshed, one group of angry citizens sought to attack the captured king while another came to his rescue:

Manie euill disposed persons, assembling themselues togither in great numbers, intended to haue met with him, . . . that they might haue slaine him. But the maior and aldermen gathered to them the worshipfull commoners . . . by whose policie, and not without much adoo, the other were reuoked from their euill purpose.

Shakespeare’s account of Bolingbroke and Richard entering London together closely mirrors Daniel’s poem. Although the two depictions share few verbal echoes, parallels confirm influence. Daniel vividly describes how the London homes were emptied of their inhabitants; all took to the streets to cheer the returning rebel as he humbly thanked them:

And manifold confusion running, greetes
Shootes, cryes, claps, hands thrusts strives and presses neere
Houses impovrisht were t’inrich the streetes, . . .

Hee that in glory of his fortune sate,
Admiring what he never thought could bee
Did feele his bloud within salute his state,
And lift vp his reioycing soule to see
So many handes and harts congratulate
Thadvancement of his long desired degree
When prodigall of thankes in passing by
Hee resalutes them all with cheerefull ey.

(MS I-II, 32v-33r; FFB Q1595:I-IV, II.68-69)

---


62 Version in Q1595:I-IV reads, “Admiring what he thought could neuer be”.
Shakespeare’s description of Bolingbroke’s entry similarly contrasts the enthusiasm of the crowds with the returning rebel’s modest expression of gratitude:

Then (as I said) the Duke great Bullingbrooke
Mounted upon a hote and fierie steede,
Which his aspiring rider seemd to know,
With slow, but stately pase kept on his course,
Whilst all tongues cried, God save the Bullingbrooke,
You would haue thought the very windows spake:
So many greedy lookes of yong and old
Through casements darted their desiring eies . . .
Whilst he from the one side to the other turning
Bare-headed, lower than his proud steedes necke
Bespake them thus; I thanke you countrymen:

(R2, Q1597, H3v-H4r; R2 V.2.7-20)

Similarities in Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s descriptions of the raucous joy of the crowds, the shared emphasis on the homes of the citizenry and the expression of Bolingbroke’s modest thanks suggest influence.63 Such influence is confirmed by a detail included in another stanza where Daniel describes Bolingbroke proudly mastering his horse, this time through the eyes of Isabel who mistakenly takes the distant rider for her husband. In that stanza, as in York’s description, Bolingbroke bows to his future subjects. This detail, included in none of the English chronicle sources, seems to confirm influence.64 Since the stanza appears in both manuscript and published edition, the direction of influence is from Daniel to Shakespeare:


64 Bate, Soul of the Age, p. 253, “the close concentration on Bullingbrook’s management of his proud horse makes a point about his strong stagecraft: good horsemanship was a traditional image of effective government.” Bate also cites Shakespeare’s play as a likely source for Hayward’s use of a similar image of Bolingbroke bowing to the crowds. Soul of the Age, pp. 260-261. Bate apparently misses the possible source for both Shakespeare’s and Hayward’s descriptions in Daniel’s poem. Forker considers the possibility that Froissart, rather than Daniel, provided the detail of Bolingbroke bowing from his horse (Forker, ed., Richard II, p.
Lo yonder now at length he comes saith shee
Looke my good women where hee is in sight:
Do you not see him? yonder that is hee
Mounted on that white courser all in white,
There where the thronging troupes of people bee
I know him by his seate, he sitts s’vpright:
Lo now hee bowes (Deere Lord) with what sweete grace?
How long haue I longd to behould that face.

(MS I-II, 33`; FFB Q1595:1-IV, II.74)

Daniel’s “Lo now hee bowes (Deere Lord) with what sweete grace” becomes Shakespeare’s “Bare-headed, lower than his proud steedes necke.” Although there are no clear verbal echoes, there are enough shared details in the description of Bolingbroke entering London to confirm influence. Even Michel, generally reluctant to admit the probability of influence, says of this description that “the likeness between the poem and the play (V.ii) is remarkable, in detail and sentiment.”⁶⁵ In this section of Richard II, Shakespeare uses details suggested by Daniel but varies them enough to make them his own. While the variation obscures the debt, remaining traces imply influence.

The same is true for Shakespeare’s description of Richard trailing behind Bolingbroke. As in Richard II, Daniel in The First Four Books contrasts the treatment of the scorned king with that of the victorious rebel:

Behinde him all aloofe came pensive on
The vnregarded king that drooping went
Alone, and but for spight scarce lookt vppon
Iudge if hee did more envy or lament
O what a wondrous worke this day is don
Which th’imag of both fortunes doth present
In th’one to shew the best of glories face
In thother worse then worst of all disgrace.

(MS I-II, 33`; FFB Q1595:1-IV, II.70)

⁴³⁰ though he ultimately concludes that the French chronicles are unlikely direct sources for Shakespeare’s description (p. 501-2).
⁶⁵ Michel, ed., Civil Wars, p. 12.
Again, although it shares no clear verbal echoes, Daniel’s depiction is so similar “in detail and sentiment” (to borrow Michel’s words) to York’s description of Richard as an unregarded actor who “mens eyes / did Scowl on” to make influence more likely than coincidence. Shakespeare was familiar with this section of the poem. If that is the case, it is at least plausible that an element of the depiction that has closer parallels, a theatrical metaphor emphasizing the “eyes” of the spectators and the London streets as a “stage”, is further evidence of influence. If the stanza that includes these parallels were part of Q1595:I-IV, not just MS I-II, its status as a Shakespeare source would be accepted; the possibility of coincidence would be dismissed.

The existence of the stanza in only MS I-II should not rule out Shakespeare’s use of it, rather it should prompt a review for further evidence of either influence or coincidental use of the imagery.

One factor that would support the idea that the shared use of theater imagery is coincidence would be if the imagery of Richard as an actor were a recurring one in Richard II. This would demonstrate that the concept was in Shakespeare’s mind as he composed the entire work, not just in this section where it was similarly used by Daniel. The use of a theatrical metaphor to describe Richard, however, appears only in this section of Richard II. Shakespeare’s Richard, who employs numerous poetic images to illustrate his plight, never refers to himself as an actor – nor does anyone else in the play. The lack of explicit stage imagery is surprising given Shakespeare’s Richard’s theatrical nature.66 The words “actor” and “stage” appear only in in this section of the play, the same episode where Daniel employs similar imagery and the word

---

66 Scott McMillin notes, “The theatre is often taken to be the perfect place for Richard himself, on grounds that such a histrionic man belongs on a stage.” “Shakespeare’s Richard II: Eyes of Sorrow, Eyes of Desire”, Shakespeare Quarterly, 35 (1984), 40-52 (p. 43).
“stage”. Although this is not conclusive, the corollary that would have helped dismiss the similarity as coincidence can be ruled out; Shakespeare did not use theatrical imagery in this section to expand on a central image of the play. While Richard’s self-conscious theatricality is a recurring theme, the language of theater is not.

Daniel’s deleted stanza includes the unique phrase “respective eye”. In the context of the description this refers to an eye that shows respect. The use of the word “respective” to mean showing respect is unusual. In the OED, it is the third definition of the word, “Characterized by, expressive of, or showing respect or deference”. The first describes the relationship between two things and the second the act of being attentive. Shakespeare used the word “respective” infrequently, only four times in total – *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, IV.4.192; *Romeo and Juliet*, III.1.123; *King John*, I.1.188; *The Merchant of Venice*, V.1.156. Three of these use the word to mean “showing respect”: *R&J*, *KJ*, *Merchant*. All three are thought to have been written soon after Shakespeare wrote *Richard II* using Daniel’s poem as a source.

Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s shared use of theatrical imagery to illustrate the plight of the captive king may be coincidence. The well-established idea of princes as actors on the world

---

67 One of Shakespeare’s other rare uses of the word “actor” is in Sonnet 23, *Shake-speares sonnets Neuer before imprinted* (London, 1609), sig. C1v, “As an vnperfect actor on the stage”, a sonnet with a relationship to this section of *Richard II*. That sonnet includes a line, “And domb presagers of my speaking breast” (line 10), that echoes Daniel’s *Delia* 8 (1592a, sig. B4v), “Told the dumbe message of my hidden griefe”. Claes Schaar, *An Elizabethan Sonnet Problem* (Lund, Copenhagen: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1960), p. 158. It is possible that Shakespeare was reading Daniel as he wrote both *Richard II* and some of the sonnets during this period. See also chapter 8 (pp. 272-273).

68 OED Online.

69 Taylor and Loughnane, “Canon and Chronology”: *Romeo and Juliet* - Date Range: 1593-6, Best Guess: late 1595 (p. 517); *King John* - Date Range: 1587-1598, Best Guess: mid-1596 (p. 521); *Merchant of Venice* - Date Range: 1596-8, Best Guess: early 1597 (p. 522).
stage supports this conclusion. At the same time, a wide-range of evidence suggests that Shakespeare found inspiration for his stage metaphor from Daniel. The imagery is included in a section of the poem with which Shakespeare was very familiar, a section that has been used to confirm that he used Daniel as a source. The imagery is employed similarly by both artists to illustrate the idea that Richard was ignored by his subjects, an idea unsupported by the English chronicles. Shakespeare’s explicit reference to Richard as an actor is restricted to this scene and does not expand upon imagery used elsewhere in the play. A distinctive word included in Daniel’s deleted stanza is used in a similar context in other works by Shakespeare believed to have been written soon after Richard II.

Evidence that Shakespeare may have read a version of Daniel’s poem that included the stanza describing Richard’s entry into London using a theater metaphor is, admittedly, circumstantial. A clear verbal parallel would make it more conclusive. Nevertheless, it would be a notable coincidence if Shakespeare, independently, with no knowledge of Daniel’s deleted stanza describing the lack of “applause” that Richard received on “the stage unto this wicked act”, chose a similar theatrical conceit to describe the same event in a section of the poem that he clearly knew well and used as a source. A wide range of evidence suggests it plausible that Shakespeare did see a version of the poem that included imagery of Richard as an unregarded actor and that it inspired his own use of a theatrical metaphor to elucidate Richard’s plight. As with other elements that Shakespeare borrowed from this section of the poem, he may have varied his use of the metaphor to make it his own, but not enough to completely obscure his source. Interestingly, the first Shakespearean scholar to identify the similarities between The Civil Wars and Richard II, Charles Knight, cited this section of Daniel’s poem, “the entry of Richard and Bolingbroke into London”, as one that epitomizes Shakespeare’s use of Daniel’s
work. Although Knight almost certainly did not know the stanza from MS I-II which illuminates Richard’s plight using a theatrical metaphor, his description of Shakespeare’s use of Daniel could easily apply to the stanza that was never published:

Shakespere [sic] . . . it appears to us, took up Daniel’s “Civil Warres” as he took up Hall’s, or Holinshed’s, or Froissart’s “Chronicles” and transfused into his play, perhaps unconsciously, a few of the circumstances and images that belonged to Daniel in his character of poet.\(^\text{71}\)

At a minimum, the existence of a manuscript with the deleted stanza calls into question the assumption that Shakespeare used the printed edition while writing \textit{Richard II}. The parallel imagery that appears in only a manuscript makes this section of \textit{Richard II} more like the manuscript than the published poem, suggesting that Shakespeare could have had access to such an early manuscript and may have written \textit{Richard II} before the appearance of \textit{The First Four Books}. This possibility should be evaluated relative to other evidence used to date the play.

\textbf{Dating \textit{Richard II}}

There exists more evidence for the date of \textit{Richard II} than for many other plays by Shakespeare. Two external pieces of evidence have led Shakespeare scholars to place the play to mid- to late 1595. The first is the publication of Daniel’s \textit{First Four Books} in that year and the second is a letter from Edward Hoby that may refer to a commissioned performance of the play. Both pieces of evidence, however, are surrounded by uncertainty. What they say about the date of composition of \textit{Richard II} may also be contradictory.


As discussed earlier, few Shakespeare scholars now deny that there is apparent evidence of influence between the *The First Four Books* and *Richard II*. The Hoby letter is more problematic. On December 7, 1595, Edward Hoby wrote to his cousin, Robert Cecil, a member of the privy council and son of Lord Burghley, inviting him to his home to “vewe” King Richard. What Hoby meant has been debated. While many believe him to be referring to a private performance of *Richard II*, others hold that it may refer to a performance of *Richard III* or not to a play at all, but rather a painting. Accordingly, it is uncertain whether this letter provides any evidence about the date of *Richard II*. One of the factors indicating that the letter could refer to a play is that Hoby was the father-in-law of Henry Carey, the Lord Chamberlain and patron of the acting company that owned and performed the play. The connection between Hoby and the acting company combined with the high-profile status of his invitee suggests that it may be a performance of a recently staged and controversial play that Hoby is referring to. The conclusion of these debates remains uncertain, but the current consensus is that the letter does refer to *Richard II* and indicates that the play had relatively recently been staged, allowing it to gain recognition and Hoby to want to commission a private performance for his high-profile cousin.

---


75 Taylor and Loughnane, “Canon and Chronology”, p. 512, “It has usually been assumed that the play is referred to in a letter of 7 December 1595 by Sir Edward Hoby to Sir Robert Cecil (in Hatfield ‘MS xxxvi.60’) . . . This interpretation of the letter has been challenged (Kittridge 1941; Shapiro 1958; Bergeron 1975) but a new play seems more likely than an old one (*Richard III*), or a book, or a painting.”
This dating of a performance of the play, however, is inconsistent with an interpretation of another letter dated a month earlier. On November 3, 1595, Rowland Whyte sent Robert Sidney a copy of the printed edition of Daniel’s poem, writing in the postscript of a letter to him, “I send your Lordship the 4 Books of the Civil War imprinted”. Whyte was Sidney’s agent, writing to him frequently about the goings-on at court while Sidney served as Governor of Flushing. Some scholars have taken the Whyte letter to indicate that The First Four Books had only recently appeared, perhaps in the late summer to fall of 1595.

There is an inconsistency in the conclusions drawn around these pieces of evidence that has never been addressed. If it is believed that Shakespeare used the published version of The First Four Books as a source, there is not enough time for him to have written the play after reading a work that first appeared in late 1595, for it to be performed in London and for a private performance to be commissioned by December of that year. Even if Shakespeare had already written the bulk of Richard II before reading Daniel’s poem, and merely revised it, there would be insufficient time for the playwright to have obtained and read the printed work, incorporated elements throughout his play, inserted episodes with a mature Isabel and have had

---

77 Hammer, Polarisation, pp. 135, 145-148. See also p. 96 for Whyte letter to Sidney on 1598 dinner that Mountjoy attended.
78 Pitcher, “Essays, works and small poems”, p. 10, “His [Daniel’s] ambition to achieve a variety and copiousness in his poetry reached its proper height . . . with the publication, late in 1595, of the first four books of The Civil Wars, . . .” Pitcher, “New and Future Research”, “In 1595, within weeks of Daniel’s publishing the first installment of his heroic poem The Civil Wars, . . . Shakespeare had lifted material from it for his tragedy Richard II . . .” Gurr, ed., King Richard II, 1, “A letter of 3 November 1595 mentions them as one of the currently interesting new works available in London, which suggests a date of publication towards the middle of that year.”
the play performed. One or both conclusions drawn from the Hoby and Whyte letters would seem to be wrong – either the former does not indicate a performance of *Richard II* or the latter does not imply that Daniel’s poem had only recently been printed.

This inconsistency could be resolved, however, if it was not the printed edition of Daniel’s poem that had served as Shakespeare’s source but if the playwright had used an earlier manuscript version of the poem. As with the possible influence of a stanza that never appeared in a printed edition of *The Civil Wars*, this suggests that Shakespeare had access to such a manuscript and that he could have written *Richard II* earlier than late 1595, leaving enough time for it to be performed and gain notoriety before Hoby’s letter. Other solutions are possible. Rowland Whyte could be referring to and enclosing a book that had been printed much earlier in the year. *Richard II* could have been originally performed before the appearance of *The First Four Books* and then revised between the date of initial performance and Q1597 to reflect the influence of the poem. Either of these fact patterns could explain the inconsistency between the interpretations of the Hoby and Sidney letters; however, another possible explanation, one for which evidence exists, is that Shakespeare could have used an early manuscript of Daniel’s poem to write *Richard II*. Such manuscripts are extant and one of them includes a textual parallel with the play not documented in the printed edition.

Taylor and Loughane provide a best guess for Shakespeare’s composition of *Richard II* of mid-1595.⁷⁹ Based on stylistic analysis, they place it among three other plays – *Love’s Labour’s Lost* (best guess: late 1594 to early 1595), *Romeo and Juliet* (late 1595) and *Midsummer Night’s Dream* (early 1596) – noting that such analysis “cannot inform us whether

---

it belongs to the end, middle, or beginning of that group.”80 The existence of Daniel’s manuscripts opens up the possibility that it could belong to the beginning of the group.

The dating of Richard II is based on evidence subject to alternate interpretations; however, the possibility that Shakespeare could have had access to a manuscript version of The Civil Wars better comports with the conclusions suggested by such evidence than does the idea that he picked up a copy of the published version of the poem and began writing, or revising, Richard II in mid to late 1595. This, combined with the textual evidence considered in this chapter, leads me to conclude it more likely that Shakespeare used an early manuscript of The Civil Wars to write Richard II. The Daniel manuscript with the deleted stanza, evidence not previously considered, supports that scenario. Assessments of the date of the play, such as that in the recent New Oxford Shakespeare, typically offer a date range that begins in 1595 based on the publication of Daniel’s poem.81 At a minimum, the existence of extant Daniel manuscripts that cover the entirety of Richard II’s reign should move forward the earliest date in the range to 1594.

There was precedent for a popular playwright having access to an early version of a poem that circulated in manuscript; it is believed that Marlowe used a manuscript of The Faerie Queene while writing Tamburlaine.82 In Tamburlaine the Great, Part II, Marlowe includes six lines

80 Taylor and Loughnane, “Canon and Chronology”, p. 513 for quotation on Richard II; pp. 510, 517 and 519 for the other plays.
82 There are also analogous examples from later in Shakespeare’s career. He may have used a manuscript of William Strachey’s account of the shipwreck of the Sea Venture while writing The Tempest. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan, eds., The Tempest (London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 2011), pp. 309-310. It is also possible that he used a manuscript version of John Florio’s translation of Montaigne’s Essays before the volume’s publication;
(IV.3.119-124) closely modeled on a section of Spenser’s poem (I.vii, 32.5-9), both beginning with the line “Like to an almond tree ymounted high”.  

Book I of *The Faerie Queene* first appeared in print in 1590 whereas the two parts of Marlowe’s play were performed in 1587-8 by the Lord Admiral’s Men. Roy W. Battenhouse considered Marlowe’s echo of the unpublished Spenser poem and speculated on how the playwright may have gained access to it, considering the possibility that it was through the Countess of Pembroke:

> Since none of *The Faerie Queene* appeared in print before 1590 – the year in which *Tamburlaine* was given to the press – we have to suppose that Marlowe had access to a manuscript copy of at least some of Spenser’s work. . . . Might we suppose, then, that perhaps Marlowe, like [Abraham] Fraunce, was a member of the Countess of Pembroke’s circle; that perhaps both men became acquainted with Spenser’s poem in a manuscript sent by the author to the Countess’ brother, Philip Sidney? 

As with the details of much of Marlowe’s life, the circumstances that gave rise to his access to a Spenser manuscript remain a mystery, although the textual evidence of such access is accepted as proof that it did occur.

The textual evidence of the potential influence of a manuscript version of Daniel’s poem, like Battenhouse’s consideration of Marlowe’s access to a pre-publication version of *The Faerie Queene*, calls for an assessment of Shakespeare’s possible connection to Daniel and those in his circle at the time that MS I-II was produced between 1594 and 1595, a period when Shakespeare’s reputation as a poet and playwright was developing. It also calls for a

---


reassessment of the direction of influence in areas that overlap between *Richard II* and Daniel’s poem that appear in the printed edition but not MS I-II; Shakespeare’s play could have preceded and influenced these additions. These issues are addressed in the next chapter.
Chapter 5

The Civil Wars, The Essex Circle, The State of Christendom and Richard II

In chapter 4, I concluded that two extant manuscripts of portions of The Civil Wars preceded the 1595 published edition of The First Four Books and that Shakespeare could have used a manuscript version of the poem as a source while writing Richard II. In this chapter I will consider connections that Daniel and Shakespeare had to the circle of noblemen, courtiers, secretaries and advisors surrounding Robert Devereux, the Earl of Essex, during the period 1594 to 1595. ¹ I will also review parallels that both The First Four Books and Richard II exhibit to a work written by and circulating among members of the Essex circle at the time, a treatise entitled The State of Christendom.² These parallels suggest that both Daniel and Shakespeare were engaging with issues being debated within the Essex circle as Daniel revised his poem and Shakespeare composed his play, issues that included the right of an oppressed populace to oppose a tyrannical monarch. A comparison of Daniel’s revisions to Shakespeare’s play reveals differing reactions to those issues and potentially to each other. Evaluating the nature of that engagement may help answer the question of which came first.

Daniel, Mountjoy and Wanstead: 1594 to 1595

References in The Civil Wars document Daniel’s connections to the Essex circle as he revised and supplemented his poem. In a stanza from the 1595 quarto of The First Four Books that does not appear in MS I-II, Daniel provides a clue as to where he was working between the

---

preparation of the manuscript and the appearance of the printed work. In a section of the poem that envisions what might have been if Bolingbroke’s overthrow of Richard “Had had as lawfull and as sure a ground” as the rebel’s “vertues” (Q1595:I-IV, II.121.6-7), Daniel imagines that there would have been no civil wars and no need for him to write of the conflict:

Nor had I then at solitary brooke  
Sate framing bloudy accents of these times,  
(FFB Q1595:I-IV, II.129-1-2)

Daniel’s reference to a “solitary brooke” in a stanza added between the manuscript and the publication of the poem suggests that he had been working in a remote location near a stream or small river while revising The Civil Wars. The added stanza can be combined with another that appears in both MS I-II and Q1595:I-IV to lead to the conclusion that where Daniel had been working, both while preparing the manuscript and as he revised it, was Mountjoy’s home.³ I cited this stanza in chapter 3 (pp. 68-70) as evidence of Mountjoy giving Daniel shelter and support; here my focus is on the specific location, Mountjoy’s “quiet shore”:

And thou Charles Mountjoy borne the worldes delight,  
That hast receiu’d into thy quiet shore . . .  
(FFB Q1595:I-IV, I.5.1-2)

The “quiet shore” where Mountjoy “receiu’d” the poet prior to the production of the manuscript could be by the “solitary brooke” where Daniel worked as he revised the poem.⁴ A marginal gloss and stanza that Daniel added in 1601, when he expanded his poem to six books, seems to confirm the identity of the “solitary brooke” and Mountjoy’s home:

³ Michel, ed., Civil Wars, p. 341.
⁴ As noted by John Pitcher and quoted earlier (p. 70) Daniel’s reference to Mountjoy’s “quiet shore” may be metaphorical, “the metaphor was borrowed from Tasso, but even so his difficulties were probably real enough”, “Daniel, Samuel”, ODNB. The later addition seems more literal and makes the earlier reference seem likely to be physical as well as metaphorical.
Daniel’s description of “Montioyes solitarie rest”, in 1601, echoes the “solitary brooke” where he worked when he augmented the poem in 1594 to 1595, suggesting that the estate referred to in the earlier year is Wanstead, and the “solitary brooke” is “humble Rodon”, the River Roding.\(^5\) Daniel scholars have inferred that the poet worked at Mountjoy’s home, Wanstead, while writing *The First Four Books*.\(^6\) There is one issue with this inference; in 1595, when *The First Four Books* was published, Wanstead was owned by Essex.\(^7\) Mountjoy bought it from Essex in late 1598.\(^8\) When Daniel refers to Mountjoy’s “quiet shore”, in MS I-II, and a “solitary brooke”, in Q1595:1-IV, he does not name Wanstead or the River Roding. He does not do so until 1601, after Mountjoy had bought the property.

Wanstead remains the likely location of the “solitary brooke” where Daniel worked in 1594 to 1595, even though the estate was then owned by Essex.\(^9\) Mountjoy was one of Essex’s closest

---

\(^5\) While the River Roding is likely Daniel’s “solitary brooke”, it had tributaries that flowed near Wanstead. Winifred Eastment describes now dried up “Local tributaries of the Roding”, including “The little River Holt” which was “supposed to have flowed into New Wanstead”, *Wanstead Through the Ages* (Letchworth, Herts: Winifred Eastment, 1969), pp. 113-114.

\(^6\) Pitcher, “Daniel, Samuel”, *ODNB*, “the first instalment of The Civil Wars appeared without a dedication. This was . . . tactical, since Daniel had already secured another patron, Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy, . . . Daniel got from him . . . access to a well-stocked library (in this case, at Mountjoy’s home, Wanstead House).” See also Pitcher, “Essays, Works and Small Poems”, p. 12 and Michel, ed., *Civil Wars*, p. 360.

\(^7\) Davies, *2nd Earl of Essex*, p. 188. Michel also notes Essex’s ownership of the property in 1595, *Civil Wars*, pp. 33, 341, 360.


\(^9\) Michel reaches a similar conclusion, *Civil Wars*, p. 33.
friends and trusted advisors, as well as the paramour of his sister, Lady Penelope Rich.

Mountjoy could have obtained license for Daniel to work at Wanstead. At that time, Mountjoy’s home was in the Holborn area of London, an unlikely location for a “solitary brooke”. The reference is included in a section of The First Four Books paying tribute to both Essex and Mountjoy, calling them “two worthies bewties of our state” (Q1595:I-IV, II.130.2; stanza mislabeled 136). Around that same time, Daniel penned a dedicatory verse to Essex that was included in William Jones’s translation of Nennio, or A Treatise of Nobility, published in 1595. A wide range of evidence supports the current consensus that the “solitary brooke” referred to in the preceding stanza is the River Roding on Essex’s estate. Daniel expressed gratitude toward Essex for years thereafter, even after Essex’s execution, when such an attitude would gain him little. In his “Apology” for Philotas, penned three years after Essex’s death, he continued to acknowledge his debt to the earl, recognizing that he was “perticularly beholding to his bounty”, perhaps hearkening back to this period when Essex, along with Mountjoy, took him in.

---

10 In June 1594 when Charles Blount became Lord Mountjoy, upon the death of his brother, he inherited little wealth or property. The two remaining family estates in Dorset, Hooke and Canford Magna, had been the subject of lawsuits for many years and, if still owned by Mountjoy, would have been unlikely to serve as Mountjoy’s home or locations for him to host Daniel. See Maginn, “Blount, Charles”, ODNB, and Varlow, Lady Penelope, pp. 124-126, 155. A 1594 letter from Father John Gerard describes Mountjoy as “a nobleman in London”; Falls, Mountjoy, p. 64; Varlow, Lady Penelope, p. 153. A letter from Rowland Whyte to Robert Sidney dated December 5, 1595 notes Mountjoy agreeing to serve as godparent to Sidney’s son, stating, “Thence I went to Holborn and found my Lord Mountjoy at his house. I said my Lady took the boldness to send me unto him, to desire him . . . to christen your son that was newly born, which he very honorably promised to do, and when I told him my Lady Rich was godmother, he was much pleased at it”. Whyte, The Letters of Rowland Whyte, p. 105.


The conclusion that Daniel worked at Essex’s estate, Wanstead, as he revised the manuscript version of his poem between 1594 and 1595 establishes a close connection between the poet and the earl during this period. Wanstead was not merely one of Essex’s many properties, most of which he visited rarely.\(^{13}\) It was the location, approximately fifteen miles northeast of central London, to which he retreated when escaping the intrigues of court, his second home after Essex House in London.\(^{14}\) It was the site of frequent entertainments of visiting foreign dignitaries.\(^{15}\) Perhaps most importantly, as it may have provided the basis of Daniel’s residence there, Wanstead was a second home for Essex’s sister, Penelope Rich.\(^{16}\) It was at Wanstead where the married Lady Rich could meet discreetly with her unmarried lover, Mountjoy.\(^{17}\) Daniel’s proximity to Mountjoy, Lady Rich and Essex at Wanstead would have given the poet insight into debates within the Essex circle and access to Essex’s closest associates as he supplemented his poem between 1594 and 1595.

**Shakespeare, Daniel and the Essex Circle**

In 1594, as Daniel worked at Wanstead, Shakespeare also had connections to the Essex circle that explain how he could have gained access to a manuscript of *The Civil Wars* and, like Daniel, become familiar with discussions among Essex and his associates. As with most details of Shakespeare’s life, there is limited documentation of his connections to Essex. During 1594, however, Shakespeare had at least one documented link to the Essex circle. The

\(^{13}\) Hammer, *Polarisation*, p. 277.


\(^{15}\) Hammer, *Polarisation*, pp. 131, 160.

\(^{16}\) Varlow, *Lady Penelope*, pp. 86, 129-130.

\(^{17}\) Varlow, *Lady Penelope*, p.132.
patron of his second narrative poem, *The Rape of Lucrece*, entered in the Stationers’ Register on May 9, 1594 was Essex’s friend, Henry Wriothesley, the Earl of Southampton.\(^{18}\)

Southampton had been the dedicatee for Shakespeare’s first printed work, *Venus and Adonis*, published a year before *Lucrece*. The dedication of the two poems to Southampton suggests that the first was well received and that by the time of the second Shakespeare had met his patron.\(^{19}\) Although debated by some Shakespeare scholars, the difference in tone between Shakespeare’s dedication for the 1593 *Venus and Adonis*, which begins, “Right Honourable, I know not how I shall offend” and that of the 1594 *Lucrece*, opening with “The loue I dedicate to your Lordship”, indicates that between the two Shakespeare had gained a more familiar relationship with Southampton.\(^{20}\) As Park Honan posits in the *ODNB* entry on Southampton, “In all probability, Shakespeare’s meetings with his patron were few”.\(^{21}\) If any such meetings did occur, however, it is probable that at least one would have been in 1594, when Shakespeare’s second poem was printed and when Daniel’s pre-publication manuscripts of *The Civil Wars* were produced and may have been circulating within the Essex circle.

---


\(^{19}\) Duncan-Jones and Woudhuysen, eds., *Shakespeare’s Poems*, p. 28.


Mountjoy, Daniel’s patron, was close to Southampton and a father figure to the young earl.\textsuperscript{22} It is plausible that Mountjoy would share Daniel’s work with Southampton, the admirer of poetry to whom Shakespeare had dedicated \textit{Lucrece}. It is also possible that Southampton would inform Shakespeare, whose \textit{Lucrece} was influenced by Daniel’s \textit{Rosamond}, about the poet’s latest work.\textsuperscript{23} Although this sequence is speculative, it highlights a means by which Shakespeare could have seen Daniel’s poem as he was contemplating a play depicting the deposition of \textit{Richard II}. If the textual evidence evaluated in chapter 4 indicates that Shakespeare used a manuscript version of \textit{The Civil Wars} as a source, this sequence provides a plausible explanation for how the playwright gained access to such a manuscript.

While it is possible that Shakespeare could have gained access to a Daniel manuscript directly from the poet, there are no known instances of Daniel circulating his manuscripts to individuals other than dedicatees, potential patrons and members of the aristocracy. There is extensive evidence, however, of him circulating manuscripts of his works among those groups.\textsuperscript{24} Indirect connections through Southampton, therefore, seem a more plausible explanation of how Shakespeare could have seen an early manuscript of \textit{The Civil Wars}. There were a number of mutual connections between Daniel and Southampton in 1594 to 1595 that potentially explain how the young earl could have seen such a manuscript. Rather than indicating that any one is most likely, these suggest multiple possibilities. Daniel was writing

\textsuperscript{22} When Southampton got into financial difficulties in 1597, the earl’s mother turned to Mountjoy to get her son to sign a covenant not to sell certain of the Wriothesley family properties. Akrigg, \textit{Southampton}, p. 59.


in the context of a closely-knit network of associates of Essex as he revised his poem. Any
could have shared it with Southampton. As described by those who study network theory,
tracing how ideas get communicated within a network is an uncertain undertaking; multiple
paths are plausible.\textsuperscript{25}

In addition to Mountjoy, the network of individuals connecting Daniel, Southampton and
Shakespeare included Fulke Greville and John Florio. Either could have had access to a
manuscript of \textit{The Civil Wars} and shared it with Southampton. Fulke Greville, Daniel’s
supporter, in 1595 asked Robert Cecil to give his fellow poet a source of income (see pp. 68-
69).\textsuperscript{26} Greville was Southampton’s friend, a man who encouraged him in 1595 to seek the
queen’s favor.\textsuperscript{27} Greville, to whom Daniel dedicated his 1599 \textit{Musophilus}, is a candidate to be
a recipient of an early version of \textit{The Civil Wars} and to have shared it with Southampton.
Florio had a longstanding relationship with Daniel dating back to the 1580s when Daniel was a
student and Florio a teacher at Oxford.\textsuperscript{28} In 1594, Florio was Southampton’s Italian tutor.\textsuperscript{29}
Again, Florio could have seen Daniel’s poem and shared it with Southampton. These are two
connections between Daniel and Southampton about whom we know; there are almost

\textsuperscript{25} For a description of network theory see Mark Newman, Albert-Laszlo Barabasi and Duncan
J. Watts, eds., \textit{The Structure and Dynamics of Networks} (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2006),
chapter 1, especially section 1.2, “The ‘New’ Science of Networks”, pp. 4-8. An interesting
application of network theory to early modern literary figures can be found on the website \textit{Six
Degrees of Francis Bacon} <www.sixdegreesoffrancisbacon.com>. See also Meghan
Andrews’ application of network theory to Shakespeare and Michael Drayton, “Michael
Drayton, Shakespeare’s Shadow”, pp. 275-277.
\textsuperscript{26} Rees, \textit{Samuel Daniel}, p. 63.
\textsuperscript{27} Akrigg, \textit{Southampton}, p. 47; Gajda, \textit{Earl of Essex}, pp. 11-12.
\textsuperscript{28} Rees, \textit{Samuel Daniel}, p. 5; Frances A. Yates, \textit{John Florio: The Life of an Italian in
\textsuperscript{29} Akrigg, \textit{Southampton}, p. 45. During 1594, Florio defended his pupil against insult related to
him harboring suspected murderers Charles and Henry Danvers.
certainly others about whom we do not. There were many paths for Southampton to gain access to a Daniel manuscript and share it with the poet writing under his patronage in 1594, especially if that poet was contemplating writing a play on the reign of Richard II, the principal topic of the first three books of Daniel’s poem. There were very few degrees of separation between Daniel and Shakespeare in 1594 to 1595 and multiple paths connecting them.

Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s connections to the Essex circle through their patrons, Mountjoy and Southampton, explain how Shakespeare could have seen an early version of Daniel’s poem. Another prominent member of the Essex circle provides a link that may explain how both came to engage with debates among Essex’s followers surrounding the right of subjects to oppose a tyrannical monarch. Antonio Perez, a Spanish exile who had formerly been secretary to Philip II of Spain, resided at Essex House from 1594 to 1595 as Essex’s guest. Perez was a frequent companion of Mountjoy’s mistress, Lady Rich. The relationship between Perez and Lady Rich may have provided opportunities for Daniel to encounter the Spanish exile at Wanstead. Perez was also friendly with both Southampton and Mountjoy. In January 1595, the two noblemen were among the few recipients of personalized presentation copies of Perez’s autobiographical work, *Pedacos de Historia, o Relaciones, assy llamadas por sus Auctores los Peregrinos* (translated loosely as *Fragments of History or Relations by its Author*)

---

32 Akrigg, *Southampton*, pp. 36-37.
the Pilgrim – a work often referred to as Perez’s Relaciones).\(^{33}\) Another connection between Shakespeare and Perez is Richard Field, Shakespeare’s fellow Stratfordian and the printer of his poems.\(^ {34}\) Field was also the printer for Perez’s Relaciones.\(^ {35}\)

Don Armado in Love’s Labours Lost is believed to be modeled on Perez and may reflect Shakespeare’s personal familiarity with him.\(^ {36}\) The fictional Spanish nobleman exhibits many similarities to Perez and is described in the play as “peregrinate”, a word coined by Shakespeare based on Perez’s pseudonym, Raphael Peregrine. The New Oxford Shakespeare provides a best guess for the date of composition of Love’s Labours Lost of late 1594 to early 1595, the same period when Perez sent a presentation copy of his autobiographical work to Southampton and the book was in Richard Field’s shop.\(^ {37}\) Through either or both of Southampton and Field, Shakespeare could have become familiar with Perez and his book.

Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s links to Perez may explain how common themes and concerns pervaded their work in 1594 to 1595, Daniel’s additions to the first two books of The Civil Wars and Shakespeare’s Richard II. The Spanish exile’s Relaciones includes extensive discussions of the actions that establish a monarch as a tyrant and the rights of an oppressed

\(^{33}\) Ungerer, Spaniard, vol. 2, pp. 264-270; Gajda, Earl of Essex, pp. 87-88. Other recipients included: Essex, Robert Sidney, Henry Wotton, Henry Howard and William Cecil. Perez’s letters to Mountjoy and Howard indicate that the two had requested copies of the work.


\(^{35}\) Ungerer, Spaniard, vol. 2, p. 249, “so many contemporary references to the printing of the London edition have come down to us that it is even possible to determine that the book was in R. Field’s press in November and December 1594.”

\(^{36}\) Ungerer, Spaniard, vol. 2, pp. 380-386, 390-392; Akrigg, Southampton, pp. 210-211.

populace to resist a tyrannical king. Those discussions provided the basis for the supplement to a work circulating in the Essex circle at the time, a treatise called *The State of Christendom*. The treatise cites Richard II multiple times in different contexts, reflecting varying interpretations of his deposition. *The State of Christendom* provides context for both Daniel’s poem and Shakespeare’s play.

*The State of Christendom*

*The State of Christendom* was first printed in 1657, when it was posthumously attributed to Henry Wotton, one of Essex’s secretaries in the 1590s. Research by Alexandra Gajda has suggested, however, that the treatise was written by Anthony Bacon and other members of the Essex circle between 1594 and early 1595. *The State of Christendom* consists of two parts, the body of the work and a supplement, which, while related, have varying purposes and reach significantly different conclusions on appropriate forms of resistance.

The bulk of *The State of Christendom* is a defense of Elizabeth’s policies against her critics, especially English Catholics living in exile. A fictionalized narrator defends Elizabeth’s sanctioning of the death of Mary Queen of Scots and her support for the Netherlands’ resistance against Spain as just reactions to the oppressive rule of Philip II. The body of the work comprises an appeal to potentially loyal English exiles, seeking to turn them from Philip

---

40 Gajda, “State of Christendom”, pp. 423-426, “The author refers to the plot of Rodrigo Lopez to poison the queen in February 1594, while the Archduke Ernestus, who died in Feb. 1595, is described as living (*State of Christendom*, pp. 144, 257).” Extant manuscripts confirm a date of 1594 for the work, including one that shows evidence of having been used for a potential printing in late 1594 or early 1595. The early manuscripts are substantially identical to the ultimate printed version. See also Gajda, *Earl of Essex*, p. 88.
and assure them that their true monarch, Elizabeth, will treat them more fairly than the Spanish king. The body of the work describes the greedy, cruel methods that Spain has employed to gain and retain power, concluding that Philip’s supposed subjects are justified in resisting their king. It asks whether subjects must quietly endure his “Cruelties and Tyrannies” and answers, emphatically, no:

May Princes offend as often as they will, and never be punished? No; Must their Subjects endure all their Cruelties and Tyrannies? No; . . ., What course is then to be taken to bridle their Appetites, and restrain their Insolency?  
(State of Christendom, p. 204)

In answering its own question about the appropriate course in resisting a tyrant, the body of the work emphasizes the role of parliament:

there is an High Court of Parliament, unto which Princes either can be contented, or be constrained to submit themselves, and wherein Subjects may speak unto their King freely, . . .  
(State of Christendom, p. 205)

The narrator admits that it is difficult to get a monarch, without whose consent a parliament cannot be called, to call a parliament if he suspects that “any thing shall be debated . . . to his prejudice”. If the protestations of the commons are not heeded, discretion must be exercised. Violence is not justified and subjects must patiently await “better minded” nobles and less “evil-disposed Princes”:

so I talk much of a Parliament, but I conceal how difficult it will be to have a Parliament, especially when a Prince, without whose consent and commandment the same cannot be called, knoweth, or mistrusteth that any thing shall be debated and determined therein to his prejudice. I cannot but acknowledge this difficulty, and therefore if the wrongs that are offered be not too great, it is better to suffer them with patience, then to seek to reform them by violence. . . . Then will he that ruleth Princes, . . . raise up some better disposed then others, better minded then the common sort of men are, better able then the Commonality is to judge of wrongs, to redress injuries, and to repress evil-disposed Princes.  
(State of Christendom, pp. 205-206)
Although the body of *The State of Christendom* allows for resistance, it advocates patience and eschews violence:

Thus it appeareth, that if Princes offend, they may be chastened according to the nature and quality of their offences; . . . by an high Court of Parliament, from whence all or most Laws have their beginning, their foundation, their strength. Neither can this manner of correction embolden Subjects to conspire against the life of their Soveraign. For either the Majesty of their Prince, or the remembrance of their duty towards him, . . . or the hope of Reformation by employing the aid of the Peers and Nobility will alwayes restrain their insolvency . . .

*(State of Christendom, p. 207)*

Within this context, the work considers Richard II, including him in a list of kings who were deposed for crimes such as “not tendring the Weal, and publick Welfare of their Subjects”.

The body of *The State of Christendom* concludes that these crimes provided inadequate justification for his deposition:

some Princes have been deposed for their insufficiency, . . . others for their negligence, . . some for not tendring the Weal, and publick Welfare of their Subjects, as Richard King of England; . . .

But if all these Depositions were examined and tried by the Touchstone of Law, I think the most part of them will be found scant lawful. For all these crimes in private men, are not capital, and therefore why should they be so severely punished in Princes?

*(State of Christendom, p. 203)*

Later, the narrator acknowledges that “many Historiographers” regard Henry IV as a “wrongful Usurper”:

*Henry the Fourth of England*, whom many Historiographers hold rather for a wrongful Usurper then a lawful King, . . . sent divers Ambassadors into *Spain, Germany*, and *Italy*, with such instructions, and so forceable reasons, that he made a bad cause seem just and equitable.

---

41 It is clear that this citation of “Richard King of England” is a reference to Richard II, not Richard III. The body of the work takes the position that Richard II was deposed for petty crimes whereas Richard III was a murderer and usurper. It states that “the unlawful and tyrannical Usurpation of Richard the Third, our Histories make it so manifest, that I need not to trouble you with the recital thereof” *(State of Christendom, p. 241).*
The body of *The State of Christendom* adopts the position that Henry’s usurpation was “a bad cause” and does not affirm the deposition of Richard II as a rightful and appropriately executed removal of a monarch. In this, it differs from the supplement to the work which endorses a more radical approach, one informed by Perez’s *Relaciones*.42

The supplement covers much of the same ground as the body of the work, the tyranny of Philip, but with a different focus. The supplement is structured as a summary of and reaction to “a Book called *Podaces de Historia*”:

> AFter that I had thorowly (as I thought) finished my task, . . . I hapned upon a Book called *Podaces de Historia*; . . . The Fragments of an History: The which was lately Imprinted and Written (as it is supposed) by Antonio Peres, sometimes Secretary unto the King of Spain, and now residing in London; (State of Christendom, Supplement, p. 1)

The book referred to is Perez’s autobiographical *Relaciones*. Much of the supplement comprises a summary of the Spaniard’s account of his assassination of Philip’s political enemy, John de Escovedo, at the behest of Perez’s monarch. When Perez was accused of the crime, Philip turned on his secretary and had him imprisoned. Perez ultimately escaped, first to France and then to England, where he lived in exile.

Virulently opposed to Philip, Perez became the most hawkish advocate in the Essex circle for aggressive military action against Spain.43 Perez’s position is documented in the supplement’s

---

justification for foreign intervention in restraining a tyrannical monarch who ignores the
plaints of his oppressed subjects:

the best course is, to admonish such a prince of his duty, \ldots{} But who shall
admonish him? His best subjects, and other princes; and if after such
admonition he shall still remain incorrigible, then may his actions, his cruelties,
his tyrannies be made known unto the world; and after this Declaration duly
justified, and truly certified to all Christian princes, it may be lawful to implore,
and employ their help and assistance for the speedy suppressing such a manifest
and incorrigible oppressor and tyrant.

(State of Christendom, Supplement, p. 26)

The supplement to *The State of Christendom* embraces a more radical view of resistance theory
than the conservative body of the work, contending that oppressed subjects are “authorized to

Moreover, because there is no other Law and Obligation wherewith to binde a
King, then with an Oath, an Oath is taken of the King at his Coronation to keep
those Laws, \ldots{} Here you see Laws broken, a King forsworn, and subjects
authorized to depose such a King, or rather, a King *de facto* deposed, and not
only deprivable if he shall break those Laws, \ldots{}

(State of Christendom, Supplement p. 17)

Within this context, the supplement asks four questions about Philip’s actions in directing
Perez to murder Escovedo. The fourth explicitly looks for examples of other tyrannical
monarchs who have been rightfully deposed:

The Questions are these,
1. *First*, Whether the King commanding *Escovedo* to be murthered in this
manner, may not worthy be accompted and called a Murtherer? \ldots{}
4. *Lastly*, Whether this Excommunication and Deposition may be warranted by
the example of other Princes, who having committed the like offences, have
endured and undergone the like punishment?

(State of Christendom, Supplement p. 4)
In answering the fourth question, whether Philip’s deposition is warranted, the supplement cites examples of princes appropriately deposed for murder including “Edward and Richard both the second, Kings of England”:

Now followeth the fourth, . . . many Princes who were deposed, or excommunicated, or censured by the Pope for murther. The Princes deposed were Ptolemeus Phisco King of Egypt, Tarquinus superbus King of Rome, Philip King of Macedonia, Herdanus King of Castile, and Edward and Richard both the second, Kings of England.

(State of Christendom, Supplement p. 14)

Reflecting its radical stance on resistance, the supplement to The State of Christendom reaches a different conclusion than the body of the work as to the propriety of Richard’s deposition. In the body of the work, Richard was among the kings unduly punished for crimes that “are not capital” whereas in the supplement, he is a tyrant who was justifiably deposed for murder. In part, this reflects the differing purposes of the body and the supplement, the former seeking to bring English exiles back to their true monarch, Elizabeth, the latter advocating English military action against Spain. Consistent with this difference, the supplement concludes by justifying “wars of what nature soever” in displacing a tyrannical monarch such as Philip:

the Spanish monarch may be lawfully excommunicated and deposed, because all these crimes concur in him together, and that no wars of what nature soever, can be held unjust and unlawful, that shall be enterprised and exercised against him, . . .

(State of Christendom, Supplement, p. 32)

The supplement to The State of Christendom advances Perez’s stance in 1594 and 1595, advocating that England ally with France and attack Spain. In doing so, it endorses a contractual theory of monarchy and sanctions violence as a justifiable form of resistance in achieving the deposition of a tyrant. The Spanish exile’s advocacy of such action was far

---

45 Gajda, Earl of Essex, pp. 74-75.
from secret; he debated it with Elizabeth herself. Unsurprisingly, Elizabeth disagreed with Perez, holding that violence and regicide are not appropriate forms of resistance. As documented in the body of *The State of Christendom*, some in the Essex circle agreed with Elizabeth, while others, as demonstrated by the supplement, did not. The difference reflects debates within the group as *The State of Christendom* and Perez’s *Relaciones* circulated among its members. Those debates included alternating interpretations of the removal of Richard II – one as a wrongfully executed usurpation, the other as a rightful deposition of a tyrant.

The supplement states that it is based on Perez’s work which “was lately Imprinted”. *Relaciones* was printed, in Spanish, between November and December 1594, making the probable date of the supplement early 1595. The body of *The State of Christendom* was apparently written earlier and may have circulated without the supplement. Regardless of when each circulated, the body of *The State of Christendom* and the supplement reflect debates within the Essex circle between 1594 and 1595. These debates provide context for Daniel’s additions to *The Civil Wars*, written as he worked at Wanstead during that period.

*The State of Christendom* and Daniel’s Additions to *The Civil Wars*

Sections that Daniel added to the first two books of *The Civil Wars* include numerous parallels to *The State of Christendom*. These parallels suggest that the sections added were composed after the production of MS I-II, between 1594 and 1595, and that they reflect the influence of the Essex circle on Daniel’s work during that period. One of the points of overlap is in stanzas

---

48 Ungerer, *Spaniard*, vol. 1, p. 213.
added to the second book, referred to earlier (p. 151), where Daniel imagines what would have occurred if Bolingbroke’s overthrow of Richard had not resulted in civil war. In Daniel’s formulation, England under Elizabeth would be a stronger kingdom and the Spanish king, the “proud Iberus Lord”, would not be expanding his powers:

So should his [Henry VIII’s] great imperall daughter now
Th’admired glory of the earth, hereby
Haue had all this nere bordering world to bow
To her immortalized maiestie:
Then proud Iberus Lord not seeking how
T’attaine a false-conceiued Monarchie,
Had kept his barrass boundes and not haue stood
In vaine attempts t’inrich the seas with bloud.

Nor interposd his greedy medling hands
In other mens affaires t’aduance his owne,
Nor tyrannisd ouer so manie landes
From late obscurity so mighty growne:

(FFB Q1595:1-IV, II.124-125.1-4)

Daniel’s denunciation of the “Iberus Lord” who has “tyrannised ouer so manie lands / From late obscurity so mighty growne” echoes the view of Philip espoused in *The State of Christendom*. While Daniel’s condemnation of Spain could have come from many sources, the emphasis on the “late obscurity” of Philip’s ancestry and his tyranny over “many lands” closely parallels descriptions in *The State of Christendom*:

How the King of Spain his Predecessors grew from mean Earls to be mighty Kings

The first point they wonder is, why the King of Spain (whose Predecessors not much more than 320 years agoe, were but very poor Earls of Hapsburg in Swizzeland . . . ) is grown to be a King of more might greater wealth, and larger Dominions, then either the Emperour, or any other Christian Prince . . .

(State of Christendom, pp. 51-52)

The Spaniard is in the opinion of all men, the terrour of princes . . . It is he that maketh Italy to tremble; . . . that terrifieth the proud and invincible Germans; that molesteth the valiant and variable Frenchmen; . . . that overlooketh with an eye of ambition, . . . the whole face, and the large precincts of Christendom.

(State of Christendom, p. 84)
Although other works, not all associated with Essex, may have documented English disdain for or fear of Spain, most texts did not exhibit the vehemence exhibited by Essex and reflected in *The State of Christendom*, a text which asked:

> why should not men sufficiently seen in matters of State, and thoroughly furnished with all good qualities, requisite in a good and worthy Writer . . . depict the Spaniard and his tyranny so lively and so truly, that their reasons . . . penetrate even to the hearts of his best friends and his most assured Allyes?

(*State of Christendom*, p. 242)

Daniel’s colorful depiction of Philip’s “greedy medling hands” (II.125.1) could easily qualify as one of the “lively” depictions sought by *The State of Christendom*.

Daniel’s description of England’s role in a world of unified Christendom is distinctly Essexian; England would provide the military might, led by Essex, to conquer the Ottomans:

> But we with our vndaunted conquering bandes
> Had lent our Ensignes vnto landes vnknowne,
> And now with more audacious force began
> To march against th’earths-terror Ottoman.

> Where thou (*O worthy Essex*) whose deare blood
> Reseru’d from these sad times to honour ours,
> Shouldst haue conducted Armies and now stood
> Against the strength of all the *Easterne Powres*:

*(FFB Q1595:1-IV, II.125.5-8, II.126.1-4)*

I do not suggest that *The State of Christendom* is an explicit source for Daniel, although it might be. Rather, I believe that the treatise documents discussions that Daniel was aware of as he worked at Wanstead and demonstrates how issues of concern to Essex informed Daniel’s additions to his poem during 1594 to 1595, when he was working at Wanstead. The parallels

---

51 Also quoted by Gajda, *Earl of Essex*, p. 91.
between the sections added and *The State of Christendom* support dating Daniel’s additions to the period between the manuscript and printed edition, a period when members of the Essex circle debated appropriate forms of resistance. Those debates encompassed an analysis of the process by which Richard II was deposed, a process depicted in the longest section that Daniel added to the poem (Q1595:I-IV, II.99-121). This section documents Daniel’s engagement with the issues being actively discussed by Essex and his followers during 1594 to 1595, providing evidence that it was written during that period, after the production of MS I-II. I will analyze Daniel’s section on Richard’s deposition after evaluating the potential influence of issues addressed in *The State of Christendom* on Shakespeare’s *Richard II*.

*The State of Christendom* and *Richard II*: Gloucester’s Death

Shakespeare’s use of Mowbray’s murder of Gloucester in *Richard II* parallels the description of Perez’s assassination of Escovedo in the supplement to *The State of Christendom*. Although not depicted in *Richard II*, Gloucester’s death effectively opens the play and sets the action in motion. Beginning with Bolingbroke’s accusation, the question of whether Richard is a tyrant who authorized his uncle’s murder and therefore deserves to be deposed becomes one of the play’s central issues. In making Gloucester’s murder part of Bolingbroke’s initial challenge of Mowbray, Shakespeare alters the history and, I believe, reflects an engagement with issues raised by Perez’s *Relaciones*, as related in the supplement to *The State of Christendom*. Like Perez’s assassination of Escovedo, Mowbray’s murder of Gloucester becomes central to the determination of the monarch’s tyranny. This reflects a conscious revision on the playwright’s part, altering the history related by his sources.

53 “The play is very careful to demonstrate with almost forensic clarity just how and why Richard is guilty of tyranny. The first evidence of this is his direct responsibility for the death of Gloucester”, Lake, *How Shakespeare Put Politics on the Stage*, p. 238.
Shakespeare highlights Richard’s role in his uncle’s death in the opening two scenes of
Richard II. In the first Bolingbroke accuses Mowbray of murdering Gloucester while in the
second Gaunt identifies Richard as the man who ordered the assassination. Unlike the play,
Shakespeare’s principal source, Holinshed, does not include the duke’s murder in
Bolingbroke’s initial challenge of Mowbray. In the chronicles, Bolingbroke accused Mowbray
of speaking treasonous words against the king:

Henrie duke of Hereford accused Thomas Mowbraie duke of Norfolke, of
certeine words which he should vter in talke had betwixt them, . . . sounding
highlie to the kings dishonor. And for further proove thereof, he presented a
supplication to the king, wherein he appealed the duke of Norfolke in field of
battell, for a traitor, false and disloiall to the king, and enimie vnto the realme.
(Holinshed, Third Volume of Chronicles, p. 493)

Gloucester’s murder is not included in Bolingbroke’s challenge. In part, this reflects facts
related earlier by Holinshed. While the chronicler does implicate Mowbray and the king in the
duke’s death, he also states that Gloucester was, in part, responsible for his own death:

Wherevpon the king sent vnto Thomas Mowbraie earle marshall and of
Notingham, to make the duke secretlie awaie. . . . This was the end of that noble
man, fierce of nature, hastie, wilfull, and giuen more to war than to peace: and
in this greatlie to be discommended, that he was euer repining against the king
in all things, . . .

(Holinshed, Third Volume of Chronicles, p. 489)

Holinshed’s characterization of Gloucester is adopted by Daniel, who says of the duke that he
had “a working stirring mind / Which neuer was content the warres should cease” (FFB I.46.3-
4). Shakespeare, on the other hand, changes both the charges made by Bolingbroke and the
characterization of the murdered duke in the opening scenes of Richard II. In the play,
Bolingbroke’s emotional invocation of his uncle’s death and his protestation of Gloucester’s
innocence belies the chronicler’s portrayal of Gloucester:
That he [Mowbray] did plotte the Duke of Glocesters death,
Suggest his soone beleewing aduersaries,
And consequently, like a traitor coward,
Slucte out his innocent soule through streames of bloud,

(R2 I.1.100-103; Q1597, sig. A3v)

The duke, who Holinshed describes as “fierce of nature” and “euer repining against the king”,
becomes an “innocent soule” in the opening of Richard II. That characterization of Gloucester
is reinforced in the invented second scene of the play, where the duke’s widow laments his
death and asks Gaunt to avenge her husband’s murder. Gaunt’s reply introduces one of the
principal themes of the play, the question of whether the divine right of God’s anointed can be
challenged:

Gods is the quarrell for Gods substitute,
His deputy annointed in his sight,
Hath causd his death, the which if wrongfully,
Let heauen reuenge, for I may neuer lift
An angry arme against his minister.

(R2, I.2.37-41; Q1597, sig. B1v)

Both Shakespeare’s description of Gloucester’s murder and his use of that political
assassination to question the limits of subjects’ duties closely parallel the description of
Perez’s assassination of Escovedo in the supplement to The State of Christendom. The treatise
introduces the murder by emphasizing the innocence of the victim:

There is not therefore any one just cause to excuse this murther, but many to
aggravate the same.

For first, A King commanded it to be committed; and Kings ought to preserve,
not murther their subjects.

Next, an innocent man was murthered; and it is better to save many offenders,
then to condemn one innocent.

(The State of Christendom, Supplement, p. 9)
The murder itself is then described in terms that mirror Bolingbroke’s invocation of Gloucester’s innocent blood:

> When poyson took no effect, he was killed with a sword; . . . so it is sin in a Prince to think on such a murther, wickedness to command it to be done, cruelty to thirst after innocent blood, . . .

(*The State of Christendom, Supplement, p. 9*)

Bolingbroke’s description of how Mowbray “Slucte out” Gloucester’s “innocent soule through streames of bloud” more closely parallels this depiction of Escovedo’s murder than Holinshed’s description of the actual Gloucester’s death. In the chronicles, Gloucester is strangled or smothered, not stabbed or killed by sword.\(^54\)

Like *Richard II*, the supplement to *The State of Christendom* quickly follows the description of the political assassination with the question of whether subjects must obey a monarch who authorizes such a murder. The treatise, however, echoing the radical position of Perez, the man who murdered Escovedo and penned the account on which the supplement is based, reaches a very different conclusion than Gaunt in Shakespeare’s play:

> For although a King be called God’s Minister, and his judgements seem to proceed from God’s own mouth, yet when he doth wrong, and breaks God’s commandments, he is not then God’s minister, but the divel’s . . .; and he that obeyeth not his King in such commandments, obeyeth God;

(*The State of Christendom, Supplement p. 12*)

*The State of Christendom* and Shakespeare’s play both engage with theories of kingship and specifically with the concept of divine right, the monarch as God’s anointed deputy, in their discussions of the implications of the king authorizing a murder. They also both describe the

\(^{54}\) Holinshed, *Chronicles*, p. 489, “he was brought to Calis, where he was at length dispatched out of life, either strangled or smothered with pillowes . . . The earle . . . caused his seruants to cast featherbeds vpon him, and so smother him to death, or otherwise to strangle him with towels . . .”
murders involved in similar ways. It is possible that these parallels between *Richard II* and the supplement to *The State of Christendom* are coincidence. Richard’s implied authorization of Mowbray’s murder of Gloucester and Philip’s order of Perez’s assassination of Escovedo are inherently analogous. Shakespeare, however, independently altered the details of Gloucester’s death and made them closer to Escovedo’s, including an appeal for his innocent blood that has no basis in the chronicles, while engaging with questions explicitly raised by a text circulating in the Essex circle at the exact time that he was writing his play, 1594 to 1595. These factors should be considered in the context of Shakespeare’s probable awareness of Antonio Perez, the friend of Southampton, client of Richard Field and model for Don Armado. This evidence supports the possibility that the parallels reflect the playwright’s engagement with the issues being debated among Essex’s supporters, issues surrounding the limits to subjects’ rights to resist a tyrannical king.

If Shakespeare was engaging with the debates within the Essex circle in 1594 to 1595, it is unclear if his ambiguous play aligns with the conservative stance of the body of *The State of Christendom* or with the more radical supplement. Richard is never definitively implicated in Gloucester’s death and his removal is not presented as a clearly rightfully executed deposition. To both evaluate Shakespeare’s engagement with these issues and assess the relationship between *Richard II* and *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*, it is helpful to compare Shakespeare’s depiction of Richard’s deposition with Daniel’s, both having been written between 1594 and 1595 and, plausibly, both subject to shared influence of the Essex circle.

---

Richard’s Resignation in Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s Deposition Scenes

Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s depictions of Richard’s deposition both have complicated bibliographic histories, making it difficult to ascertain which came first and whether Shakespeare’s existed in the play as originally written and performed. I believe that a comparison of the scenes and a consideration of them in the context of the Essex circle can illuminate both artists’ works, provide insight into their engagement and suggest solutions to questions surrounding the timing of their composition.

Daniel provides details of Richard’s deposition in two locations in The First Four Books of the Civil Wars as printed in 1595 (FFB Q1595:I-IV). In a section of the third book included in both Q1595:I-IV and MS III (III.18-24) he describes a parliament held after Henry IV was crowned. In the second book as published, but not in MS I-II, Daniel includes 23 stanzas (II.99-121) that describe the parliaments that led to Richard’s resignation of the crown. Shakespeare’s dramatization of the parliament that deposed Richard does not appear in the 1597 quarto of Richard II (Q1597), or any printed edition that appeared during Elizabeth’s reign. It was first printed in the 1608 quarto (Q1608) which, on its title page, advertised the

---

56 The use of the imprecise term “deposition scene” is not intended to bypass complex discussions of what is included in either Daniel’s or Shakespeare’s depiction of the process by which Henry IV succeeded Richard II. It is used for convenience, a shorthand way of referring to sections of the works. The details of the depictions and questions as to what was presented will be covered later in this chapter.

“new additions of the Parliament Sceane and the deposing of King Richard”. It also appears in the 1623 First Folio (F1623) version of the play. Whether the “Parliament Sceane” was included in Richard II as originally performed remains a topic of scholarly debate. In this chapter I will consider both the version of the play without the scene (the version in Q1597) and that with it (F1623), to determine which seems the more likely version to have existed in 1595. If the scene existed in 1595, it could have either preceded or followed Daniel’s depiction of the same event; it if was added later then Daniel’s version clearly came first.

There are many parallels between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s depictions of Richard’s deposition that indicate influence. Among those most often cited by literary scholars are similarities between Carlisle’s speech in Richard II (IV.1.115-150) and Daniel’s version in the third book of The Civil Wars (FFB III.2-24). The two speeches include echoes that have led most scholars to conclude influence despite similarities to shared sources. In this instance, direction of influence is clear, from Daniel to Shakespeare, as Daniel’s version existed in a manuscript of the third book that preceded the play. The most complicated areas of overlap are those that appear in neither Daniel’s manuscripts nor Shakespeare’s Q1597. In these instances, the possible relationships include: no influence; Daniel’s version coming first and influencing Richard II written in 1594 to 1595; Daniel’s First Four Books influencing Shakespeare’s

58 The Tragedie of King Richard the Second With new additions of the Parliament Sceane, and the deposing of King Richard. . . (London, 1608); Clegg, “By the choise”, p. 432. As noted by Clegg, “a variant title page exists for Q4 [1608] which lacks the advertisement.”
60 As noted by Clegg, “In textual matters modern editors accept Q1 as the authoritative text of the play except for 4.1.154-318, “By the choise”, p. 433. Smith notes that no modern edition considers Q1597 as an independent, viable text, a circumstance that she argues is based upon a misreading of the politics of Q1597 as printed, “Richard II’s Yorkist Editors”, pp. 38-39.
revisions made years later; and, Shakespeare’s version preceding and influencing Daniel’s revisions to the manuscript version of the poem. One such area of overlap is the dramatic moment when Richard relinquishes his title and personally hands his crown to his successor.

Daniel describes Richard’s resignation in two stanzas that appear in the printed edition of The First Four Books but not MS I-II:

There he his subiects all in generall  
Assoyles and quites of oth and fealty,  
Renounces interest, title, right and all  
That appertained to kingly dignity;  
Subscribes thereto and doth to witness call  
Both heauen and earth, and God and saints on hie,  
And all this did he but t’haue leave to liue  
The which was all he crau’d that they would giue.

Tis said with his owne hands he gaue the crowne  
To Lancaster, and wisht to God he might  
Haue better ioy thereof then he had knowne,  
And that his powre might make it his by right:  
And furthermore he crau’d of all his owne  
But life to liue apart a priuate wight;  
(FFB Q1595:1-IV, II.118-119.1-6)

Daniel’s description closely follows Hall’s relation of Richard resigning the crown:

I of my owne mere mocion and freewill, do putte and depose my self out of all royall dignitie, preheminence and sofferaigneite, and resigne the possession, title and use of this realme, with all rightes there unto apperteignyng, into his handes and possession. And then with a lamentable voyce and a sorowfull countenance, deliuered his sceptre and croune to the duke of Lancastre, requiryng euyer persone seuerally by their names, to graunte and assente that he might liue a priuate and a solitarie life, . . .  
(Hall, Union, 1548, fol. IX’)

Daniel adopts Hall’s description of Richard resigning his “title and use of this realme, with all rightes there unto” (Daniel: “title right and all”) and asking “that he might liue a priuate and a solitarie life” (“But life to liue apart a priuate wight”). He also may have adapted Hall’s
assertion that Richard “deliuered his sceptre and crowne to the duke of Lancastre” (“with his owne hands he gaue the crowne”), although if he took this from Hall, he omitted the scepter and added the element that Richard gave his crown to Henry with his own hands.

Daniel also adopted elements from “the instrument whereby king Richard resigneth the crowne to the duke of Lancaster”, as described by Holinshed:

> I Richard by the grace of God, . . . acquit and assoile all . . . from their oth of fealtie and homage, and all other deeds and priuileges made vnto me, . . . so God me helpe and all saints, . . . here openlie I subscribe and signe this present resignation with mine owne hand. . . .

> And in token heereof, he tooke a ring of gold from his finger being his signet, and put it vpon the said dukes finger, desiring and requiring the archbishop of Yorke . . ., to shew and make report vnto the lords of the parlement of his voluntarie resignation, and also of his intent and good mind that he bare towards his cousin the duke of Lancaster, to haue him his successour . . .

(Holinshed, *Third Volume of Chronicles*, p. 504)

From the official instrument of Richard’s resignation, as described by Holinshed, Daniel took Richard’s statement that he would “acquit and assoile all . . . from their oth of fealtie and homage” (Daniel: “Assoyles and quites of oth and fealty”) and his appeal to “God me helpe and all saints” (Daniel: “God and saints on hie”). He may have also picked up the phrase “with mine owne hand”, although in Holinshed it describes Richard signing his resignation, not handing the crown to his successor. Holinshed describes Richard giving Henry a signet ring, not the crown.

Daniel was reading closely his chronicle sources as he added a section describing Richard’s resignation of the crown. In the scene from *Richard II* dramatizing the same event, Shakespeare similarly relies heavily on the chronicles. Like Daniel, his description describes Richard renouncing his title and absolving his subjects of their
duties. He includes some details from Hall and Holinshed that Daniel did not – for
instance, Richard delivering both crown and scepter:

I giue this heauie Weight from off my Head,
And this vnwieldie Scepter from my Hand, . . .
With mine owne Hands I giue away my Crowne,
With mine owne Tongue denye my Sacred State,
With mine owne Breath release all dutious Oathes; . . .
Make me, that nothing haue, with nothing grieu’d,
And thou with all pleas’d, that hast all atchieu’d. . . .
God saue King Henry, vn-King’d Richard sayes,
And send him many yeeres of Sunne-shine dayes.

(R2, IV.1.204-221; F1623, sig. D2v)62

Another potential source could have inspired both the wording “his owne hands” in Daniel and
a gesture described by Shakespeare’s Richard. Jean Froissart, the French chronicler and
contemporary of Richard II who was sympathetic to the deposed king, describes Richard
taking the crown “with bothe his hands” and setting it before his “Fayre cosyn” who “tooke it”:

Than kynge Rycharde toke the crowne fro his heed with bothe his handes, and
set it before hym, and sayd: Fayre cosyn, Henry duke of Lancastre, I gyve and
delyver you this crowne, . . . The duke of Lancastre tooke it, and the
archebyshop of Caunterbury toke it out of the dukes handes.63

The reference to Richard taking the crown with “bothe his hands” could have inspired Daniel’s
statement that “Tis said with his owne hands he gaue the crowne”. The sense also closely
parallels Richard’s taunting rejoinder to his successor in Shakespeare’s play, “Here Cousin,
seize the Crown” (R2 IV.1.182; F1623, sig. D2v).

In this miasma of common sources and poetic license, it is difficult to separate influence from
coincidence – though not impossible. Seemingly small overlapping details shared by Daniel

63 Bullough, Narrative and Dramatic Sources, vol. 3, p. 431. For a description of Froissart,
see also Forker, ed., Richard II, pp. 152-154.
and Shakespeare that are not included in common sources can provide guidance. While it is easy to dismiss such details as coincidence, their inclusion in two works so closely related makes that explanation less likely. In their joint depiction of Richard resigning his crown, there are at least two details where Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s descriptions are closely aligned in ways only partially supported by the chronicles – Richard giving his successor the crown with his own hands and calling on God to give Henry better fortune than he had enjoyed:

Daniel
Tis said with his owne hands he gaue the crowne
To Lancaster, and wisht to God he might Haue better ioy thereof then he had knowne,

(FFB Q1595:1-IV, II.119.1-3)

Shakespeare
With mine owne Hands I giue away my Crowne, . . .
Make me, that nothing haue, with nothing grieu’d,
And thou with all pleas’d, that hast all atchieu’d . . .

God saue King Henry, vn-King’d Richard sayes,
And send him many yeeres of Sunne-shine dayes.

(R2, IV.1.208-221; F1623, sig. D2v)

There is only limited basis for the dramatic gesture of Richard handing Henry the crown “with his/mine owne hands”. In Hall, Richard “deliuered his sceptre and croune to the duke of Lancastre”, in Holinshed he signed his resignation with his “owne hand” and in Froissart he “toke the crowne fro his heed with bothe his handes, and set it before hym”. None say that Richard handed Henry the crown “with his/mine own hands”, a gesture and wording shared by Daniel and Shakespeare. Similarly, none of the chronicles provide a basis for the shared description of Richard wishing Henry “better ioy therof then he had knowne” (Daniel) or to be “all pleas’d” and enjoy “many yeeres of Sunne-shine dayes” (Shakespeare). The closest is Holinshedd’s statement that in handing him his ring, Richard signified the “intent and good mind that he bare towards his cousin the duke of Lancaster, to haue him his successour”. These details are included in sections of The First Four Books of the Civil Wars and Richard II
where Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s joint depiction of the same event parallel each other in numerous ways, both choosing many of the same elements from their varying sources. Even Michel comments of Richard’s delivery of the crown to Bolingbroke that “the dramatization of the idea in the two poems is close”.

It remains possible that the many similarities between the two depictions are coincidental; however, it is plausible that one author borrowed from the other the dramatic gesture and poignant wording of Richard delivering the crown “with his/mine own hands”. One of the two may have adapted a description from the chronicles and the other picked it up from that adaptation. Since the sections involved are included in neither the early manuscript of Daniel’s first two books nor the 1597 quarto of Shakespeare’s play, that raises the question of who potentially borrowed from whom and when. A comparison of Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s depiction of the parliamentary process by which Richard was deposed may help answer that question. Even if the two depictions of the same event are not directly related and similarities are coincidental, the analysis provides context for both.

Daniel’s Deposition Scene

My analysis of Richard’s deposition in *The Civil Wars* starts with a consideration of Daniel’s poem as included in MS I-II and MS III. Those two manuscripts do not include a section that provides details of the parliament at which Richard resigned his crown, a section included in Book II of the printed edition of *The First Four Books* (*FFB* Q1595:I-IV, II.99-121). Although the two manuscripts appear to have been prepared separately, for different purposes, and do not necessarily document a continuous narrative, both seem to have preceded Daniel’s

---

64 Michel, ed., *Civil Wars*, p. 13.
addition of the details of Richard’s resignation, a section written after the preparation of MS I-II. I believe that taken together, these manuscripts include a relation of Richard’s deposition that was effectively complete, fully addressing the process by which Henry IV ascended the throne. This raises the question of why Daniel expanded it. Possible answers to that question may be provided by some of the same issues that informed other additions to the second book, issues being discussed within the Essex circle and documented in *The State of Christendom*.

The manuscript of the second book ends with Isabel visiting Richard in prison and the two commiserating in silence (MS I-II 37v; Q1595:I-IV II.96). The final stanza is followed in the manuscript by the word “finis” and a spiral flourish, indicating that it is the end of a complete book.\(^{65}\) The second book ends with Richard as Bolingbroke’s prisoner. Although not technically deposed, he has effectively been replaced. The third book, in both the extant manuscript and the 1595 printed edition, begins with the aftereffects of Richard’s capture. In the first stanza, Daniel relates that there are effectively two kings, “two strong heads, two crownes, two rights” as Henry frames “Meanes to establish, and to hold” his sole title:

Now risen is that head, by which did spring
The birth of two strong heads, two crownes, two rights; . . .
Now is attain’d that dearely purchas’d thing
That fild the world with lamentable sights:
And now attain’d, all care is how to frame
Meanes to establish, and to hold the same.

(*FFB* Q1595:I-IV III.1; MS III, fol. 262r)\(^{66}\)

In the next stanza, Daniel elaborates on Henry’s efforts to establish his title, stating that he claimed all three of “Succession, conquest and election”:

Striuing at first to build a strong conceit
Of his weake cause, in apt-abused mindes,

\(^{65}\) See Appendix 2 for image of MS I-II, fol. 37v.

\(^{66}\) Versions quoted from this and next two stanzas are those in *FFB* Q1595, which include only minor variants (accidentals) from MS III. See Appendix 2 for image of MS III, fol. 262r.
He deckes his deed with colours of deceit
And ornaments of right, which now he findes:
Succession, conquest, and election straight
Suggested are, and prou’d in all three kindes:
More then inough he findes, that findes his might
Hath force to make all that he will haue, right.

(FFB Q1595:1-IV III.2; MS III, fol. 262r)

In this stanza, Daniel describes a process that encompasses all the parliaments surrounding Richard’s deposition, including the one that accepted Richard’s resignation (“Succession”) and the one that officially deposed Richard and appointed Henry as heir (“election”). The poet also takes the position that Henry’s claims to the crown were obtained by the threat of force, “his might / Hath force to make all that he will haue, right” (“conquest”).

He follows this with his judgment on titles obtained by force; Henry strived to “make one good of manie bad”:

All these he hath when one good would suffize
The worlds applause, and liking to procure, . . .
These selfe-accusing titles all he had
Seeking to make one good of manie bad.

(FFB Q1595:1-IV III.3; MS III, fol. 262r)

Later in the third book, Daniel addresses the parliamentary process followed in confirming Henry’s crown. A parliament was held that “decreed / What euer pleas’d the king”, confirming his title and appointing his heirs as successors:

The parliament which now is held, decreed
What euer pleas’d the king but to propound:
Confirm’d the crowne to him and to his seed,
And by their oth their due obedience bound:
And o b’it sinne t’examine now this deed
How iust tis done and on how sure a ground?
Whether that Court maie change due course or no
Or ought the realme against the realme can do?

(FFB Q1595:1-IV, III.18; MS III, fol. 264v)

---

67 Richard abdicated on September 29, 1399 and his resignation was accepted at a parliament held on September 30. Henry IV was crowned by parliament on October 13. See Forker, ed., Richard II, p. 372 and Hall, Union, fols. VIIIr – Xi.
The parliament that Daniel refers to is one that was held after Richard resigned and Henry was crowned. It was the parliament at which Carlisle objected to Richard’s deposition, objections included in the third book. With this parliament, Daniel covers the entire process to the extent necessary to show that Henry became king through a questionable process. The earlier parliaments that detailed articles about Richard’s crimes and accepted his resignation are superfluous. In this stanza, he demonstrates that the English parliament enacted anything Henry demanded, making it unclear “How iust tis done and on how sure a ground”. Henry’s might, cited by Daniel earlier, prevailed. He further raises the question of whether parliament has the right to alter the succession, “to change due course or no”.

Later in the third book, both in the manuscript and the printed edition, Daniel pronounces his judgment on the process followed, stating that it lacked validity. It is only with Richard’s death that Henry became the sole monarch and “plurality doth cease”:

And thus one king most nere in bloud allide  
Is made th’oblacion for the others peace:  
Now onely one, both name and all beside  
Intirely hath, plurality doth cease:  
He that remaines, remaines vnterrifide  
With others right; this day doth all release:  
And henceforth is absolutely king,  
No crownes but one, this deed confirmes the thing.  

("FFB Q1595:I-IV, III.85; MS III, fol. 275v")

Daniel’s description in the third book of the parliamentary process by which Richard was deposed, a description that remained unchanged between the manuscript and printed versions of the poem, provides sufficient detail for him to conclude that the deposition was wrongly executed. Why, in the printed version of the work (Q1595:I-IV), did he add details of earlier

68 This parliament was held on October 22, 1399. Daniel’s description of what transpired closely follows Hall’s description, *Union*, fols. Xr – XIr.
parliaments to a work that had, seemingly, already fully addressed the parliamentary process? In considering this question, we need to look at the details he added and his commentary.

In the section of Book II on Richard’s deposition in Q1595:1-IV, but not MS I-II, Daniel emphasizes two aspects of the process. The Parliament that deposed Richard was inappropriately called by Henry in Richard’s name and Richard was forced to resign his crown under the threat of violence. Daniel introduces the parliamentary process with a new stanza, not in MS I-II, that segues from the encounter between Isabel and Richard in prison:

And now the while these Princes sorrowed,
Forward ambition comes so nere her ende, . . .
A parlament is foorthwith summoned
In Richards name, whereby they might pretend
A forme to grace disorder and a shew
Of holie right, the right to ouerthrow.

(FFB Q1595:1-IV, II.99)

In Q1595 but not MS I-II, Daniel highlights the fact that the parliament was called “In Richard’s name”, a detail included in Hall and Holinshed, giving the process a pretended “forme to grace disorder”. In the next three stanzas, Daniel asserts that Bolingbroke’s use of Richard’s name to call parliament gave the appearance of order to a process that might as well have been effected by force:

Ah could not Maiestie bee ruined
But with the fearefull power of her owne name? . . .
Must they who his authority did hate,
Yet vse his stile to take away his state?

Order, o how predominant art thou!
That if but only thou pretended art, . . .

---

Hall, *Union*, sig. VI", “When the Duke had thus possessed his longe desyred praye, he came to London in solemne estate and there called a Parliament, in the kynges name”. Holinshed, *Chronicles*, p. 502, “After this was a parlement called by the duke of Lancaster, using the name of king Richard in the writs directed foorth to the lords, and other states for their summons. [Gloss: A parlement in the kings name.]”
So ill did they that in this formall course  
Sought to establish a deformed right:  
Who might as well effected it by force, . . .  

*(FFB Q1595:I-IV, II.100-102.1-3)*

Daniel’s objections recall the section of the body of *The State of Christendom*, quoted earlier (p. 161), that noted “how difficult it will be to have a Parliament, especially when a Prince, without whose consent and commandment the same cannot be called”, refuses to do so. Paralleling the advice endorsed in that section of *The State of Christendom*, a section that advocated patience and discretion, Daniel goes on to describe how “the better few” objected to the process and advised waiting till “better yeares might work a better care”:

Yet must we thinke that some which saw the course  
The better few, whom passion made not blind  
Stood carefull lookers on with sad commorse, . . .  
And did or might their grieued harts to ease  
Vtter their sorrowes in like termes as these.

What dissolute proceedings haue we here?  
What strange presumptuous disobedience? . . .

Since better yeares might worke a better care,  
And time might well haue cur’d what was amisse;  
Since all these faults fatall to greatnes are,  
And worse desertes haue not beene punisht thus, . . .  

*(FFB Q1595:I-IV, II.108-111.4)*

Daniel’s statement that “worse desertes have not been punisht thus” recalls the assertion in the body of *The State of Christendom* that “these crimes in private men, are not capital, and therefore why should they be so severely punished in Princes?”. Daniel endorses a conservative interpretation of resistance theory, one that does not reject resistance outright but prescribes that it must follow due process. This echoes the body of *The State of Christendom* and perhaps some in the Essex circle who advocated similar restraint, conservative men like Daniel’s patron, Mountjoy, who, unlike Southampton, would ultimately neither endorse nor
participate in Essex’s 1601 rising. It also contradicts the supplement to *The State of Christendom*, which stated that Richard was appropriately deposed for murder; in Daniel’s formulation, Richard was removed by a faulty application of parliamentary process.

Daniel’s addition of the details of the parliament that deposed Richard addressed Bolingbroke’s claim to the crown through “election”, one of three claims that he ascribed to the new king, “Succession, conquest, and election”. What of succession? Henry’s assertion that he succeeded to the throne was dependent on Richard’s voluntary resignation of the crown; if Richard resigned and appointed Henry as heir then the crown could be claimed through succession. In three added stanzas Daniel contends that Richard’s resignation was based on fear for his life:

> Thus grieued they: when to the king were sent
> Certaine that might perswade and vrge him on
> To leaue his crowne, and make with free consent
> A voluntarie resignation, . . .
>
> And yet this scarce could worke him to consent
> To yeeld vp that so soone men hold so deare: . . .
>
> Thus resolute a while he firmely stood,
> Till loue of life and feare of being forst
> Vanquisht th’innated valour of his minde;
> And home and friends, so wrought that he resignd.

(*FFB* Q1595:1-IV, II.112-114)

Here, again, Daniel’s commentary on Richard’s deposition recalls the process described in the body of *The State of Christendom*; subjects must appeal to parliament to encourage the monarch to reform and may not “conspire against the life of their Soveraign”. In this section

---


71 Ignoring, of course, the Mortimers’ claim, which Daniel addresses in Book III (III.89-90).
of the poem, Daniel asserts that Richard did not resign willingly, he did so based on “loue of life and feare of being forst”. Earlier Daniel had objected to Henry’s claim of election, pointing out that he was elected by a parliament inappropriately called by Henry in Richard’s name. Of Henry’s three claims to the crown, this leaves only “conquest”, the attainment of the crown through force. In Daniel’s poem, this is how Henry IV came to the throne, by might, a faulty process that created two kings until Richard’s death.

Daniel’s contention that Henry came to the crown by force had already been included in the manuscript version of the third book. Why did he need to return to the parliament that preceded Richard’s resignation and the resignation itself in the second book? Part of the answer to this question may lie in the disagreements within the Essex circle during 1594 and 1595, disagreements documented in the difference between the body and supplement of *The State of Christendom*. The body of the work advocates discretion in opposing a tyrannical monarch and prescribes a peaceful process to be followed while the supplement endorses any form of rebellion. The supplement also offers the example of Richard II as an English king who was appropriately deposed. Daniel’s poem effectively endorses the position advocated in the body of the work and contradicts the assertions made in the supplement. It is an open question whether this reflects coincidence or an active engagement with the discussions surrounding *The State of Christendom*. Daniel may have independently decided to expand his description of Richard’s deposition and resignation or he may have sought to contradict the radical stance advocated in the supplement to *The State of Christendom*, affirming his alignment with those who supported the more conservative approach of the body of the work.
Discussions and disagreements among members of the Essex circle in 1594 to 1595 may offer a context for Daniel’s addition of the deposition scene, a scene he added during that year, along with other stanzas in the section appended to the end of the second book, such as those praising Essex and Mountjoy. It is less clear when the deposition scene in Shakespeare’s play was written. I believe, however, that a comparison of Shakespeare’s depiction to Daniel’s suggests that it was included in the play as originally performed and offers solutions to questions surrounding which depiction came first and why Shakespeare’s may have been censored while Daniel’s was not.

Shakespeare’s Deposition Scene

There exist two different versions of Act IV of Richard II, one in Q1597 and another in Q1608/F1623. The latter version includes 166 lines not in Q1597 dramatizing the parliament that deposed Richard.\(^ {72}\) As noted by Emma Smith, the Q1597 version of Richard II was one of the most popular editions of Shakespeare’s plays during the 1590s, being reprinted twice in 1598; it should be evaluated as a version of the play independent of the much later edition.\(^ {73}\) The two versions of Shakespeare’s play, with and without the additional lines, can be compared to Daniel’s depiction of Richard’s deposition, both as represented by the manuscript version of his poem and the published 1595 edition. Such comparisons shed light on whether Shakespeare’s deposition scene existed in 1595 and its relationship to the parallel depiction in Daniel’s poem. I begin with Q1597, which allows for a simpler comparison.

---


\(^{73}\) Smith, “Richard II’s Yorkist Editors”, p. 40.
In Q1597, Richard’s deposition and Henry’s accession is introduced by York entering and announcing that Richard has resigned the crown:

Great Duke of Lancaster I come to thee,
From plume-pluckt Richard, who with willing soule,
Adopts the heire, and his high scepter yeeldes,
To the possession of thy royall hand:
Ascend his throne, descending now from him,
And long liue Henry fourth of that name.

(R2, IV.1.108-113; Q1597 sig. H1’)

This portion of the scene exists in Q1597 and Q1608/F1623 and, in both, is followed by Henry’s statement that he will “ascend the regal throne” and Carlisle’s objection (a long speech heavily influenced by Daniel). In the Q1597 version, this is followed by Henry’s announcement that “on wendesday next, / We solemnly proclaime our Coronation.” This differs from Daniel’s assertion in his third book that Henry’s claim was based on what he “could compell”. There is nothing in the Q1597 version of the play to suggest that Henry compelled his predecessor’s resignation. York’s announcement of Richard’s voluntary resignation is unambiguous, “Richard . . . with willing soule, / Adopts the heire, and his high scepter yeeldes”.74 If the Q1597 version is what was originally written and performed, Shakespeare represents a different interpretation of Richard’s deposition than Daniel in the third book; Richard was not deposed, he resigned of his own will. If this is the version that was originally written and performed, it may reflect the playwright’s compression of events, with no intent to change the history, or an intentional attempt to present a different interpretation of the event, one in which Richard resigned willingly.

74 Emma Smith asserts that it is “at least possible that Richard’s entry” in the F1623 version “makes the scene not more transgressive but more orthodox”. In her formulation the Q1597 version “does not require Richard’s tacit, albeit reluctant, agreement, nor even his presence”, “Richard II’s Yorkist Editors”, p. 40. I note, however, that she does not include York’s Q1597 line stating that Richard “with willing soule / Adopts the heire, and his high scepter yeeldes” in her analysis.
In the Q1608/F1623 version of Shakespeare’s play, York’s announcement of Richard’s resignation and Carlisle’s speech are followed by Richard being summoned to parliament, handing his crown to Bolingbroke and being asked to read the articles enumerating crimes by which he was “worthily depos’d” (quoting Northumberland in that scene). This version of the scene undermines and subverts York’s announcement that Richard has resigned, leaving the interpretation of Richard’s deposition more ambiguous. Does Richard resign of his own free will? Is he deposed? I believe that the deposition scene in F1623 intentionally makes it difficult to answer these questions. Despite multiple attempts on Henry’s part to get his predecessor to state that he resigns of his own free will, Richard never does:

*Bull.* I thought you had been willing to resign.
*Rich.* My Crowne I am, but still my Griefes are mine:
You may my Glories and my State depose,
But not my Griefes; still am I King of those.

 (*R2, IV.1.190-193; F1623, sig. D2v*)

*Bull.* Are you contented to resigne the Crowne?
*Rich.* I, no; no, I: for I must nothing bee:
Therefore no, no, for I resigne to thee.

 (*R2, IV.1.200-202; F1623, sig. D2v*)

In the first instance, Richard seems to answer that he is willing to resign the crown but then immediately says that he is being deposed. In the second he answers especially ambiguously. Although he ultimately resigns the crown to Henry, he never uses the words “of my owne mere mocion and frewill” (the words reflected in Hall and Holinshed), or any variation thereof. The Q1608/F1623 version of Richard’s deposition is ambiguous in a way that Q1597 is not.

It is also unclear whether Richard was deposed in Shakespeare’s scene included in F1623. Just as Henry tries to get Richard to state that he is resigning of his own free will, Northumberland
attempts, multiple times, to get Richard to read the crimes justifying his deposition. He gives up when Henry instructs him to stop urging the articles:

\[\text{Bull. Vrge it no more, my Lord Northumberland.} \]
\[\text{North. The Commons will not then be satisfy’d.} \]

\[(R2, IV.1.271-272; F1623, sig. D2v)\]

Richard never reads the articles and there is no motion by the nobility to depose Richard. In the F1623 version of the play, Richard does not willingly resign and is not deposed; nor is he conquered. At the same time, it is not evident that his resignation or deposition was executed improperly, as Daniel claims. It is simply ambiguous.

Henry’s line, quoted above, directing Northumberland to “Vrge . . . no more” the articles of deposition, includes an interesting parallel to Daniel, one that, like Richard handing his crown with his “owne hands”, is included in the section that the poet added to the second book of The Civil Wars. In a stanza that appears for the first time in Q1595:I-IV, Daniel describes how the “articles in parlament” were “vrgd so hard”:

\[\text{Vpon these articles in parlament} \]
\[\text{So haynous made, inforst, and vrgd so hard,} \]
\[\text{He was adiudged vnfit for gouerment} \]

\[(FFB Q1595:I-IV; II.107.1-3)\]

Although the chronicles all include descriptions of the articles, none state that they were “vrgd so hard”, a description that fits Northumberland’s repeated exhortations and echoes Henry’s direction for Northumberland to “Vrge it no more”. Like Richard handing over his crown with

---

75 See Forker, ed., Richard II, pp. 21-22 and Clegg, “By the choise”, pp. 444-446.
76 Lake also argues for the ambiguity of Shakespeare’s deposition scene. In Lake’s formulation, this is part of Shakespeare’s process of moving the deposition scene away from “the overt ‘language of resistance’, election or deposition” and toward a process of tyranny, “usurpation and regicide”, How Shakespeare Put Politics, pp. 276-277. My interpretation of Shakespeare’s deposition scene, like Lake’s, leaves the validity of the process ambiguous.
his own hands, this may be coincidence or it may be part of the interaction between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s depictions of the deposition scene.

If Shakespeare’s deposition scene was added long after 1597, the playwright almost certainly revisited Daniel’s poem and used portions of it to dramatize his version of Daniel’s deposition scene. Shakespeare borrowed the depiction of Richard handing his crown to Bolingbroke and Northumberland urging the articles of deposition. He differs from Daniel, however, on two key aspects surrounding both – Richard is not forced to resign and the articles are not invoked at a parliament called in Richard’s name. Daniel demonstrates that Richard’s resignation and deposition were wrongly executed, Shakespeare does not.

If Shakespeare’s deposition scene was included in the play as performed in 1594 to 1595, it is uncertain how it relates to Daniel’s depiction of the same event. Based on my assessment that Shakespeare’s play could have been written using an early Daniel manuscript as a source, the scene should be compared to both versions of Daniel’s poem, that before and that after his revisions/additions to evaluate the relationship.

If Shakespeare wrote the scene after the publication of The First Four Books in 1595, then the analysis parallels that if the scene was added years later. Shakespeare may have reacted to and contradicted elements of Daniel’s version of Richard’s deposition, especially his contention that Richard’s deposition was wrongly executed. This could reflect Shakespeare’s engagement with a contemporaneous artistic work, presenting an alternate version of a controversial event included in it. Like Daniel, he may have been engaging with debates within the Essex circle as to the appropriateness of Richard’s deposition. His contradiction of Daniel, however, does not
imply agreement with the view endorsed in the supplement to *The State of Christendom*. In the play, Richard’s deposition was neither clearly rightly or wrongly executed. Possibly for dramatic effect or possibly reflecting a political stance, Shakespeare’s version was more ambiguous than any side of the debates documented in *The State of Christendom*.

Perhaps the most intriguing feasible sequence of events is the possibility that Shakespeare’s deposition scene followed Daniel’s manuscript version of *The Civil Wars* but preceded the version included in *The First Four Books*. The manuscript version of the third book of Daniel’s poem contended that Richard’s displacement by “Succession, conquest, and election” was wrongly executed without presenting the details of Henry’s claims. If Shakespeare’s deposition scene was engaging with this manuscript version of Daniel’s poem, the playwright may have reacted to Daniel’s contention by dramatizing the details of Richard’s resignation and contradicting his fellow poet, demonstrating that no aspect of it was obviously wrongly executed. His version comes closer, though still does not quite correspond to, the position held by the supplement to *The State of Christendom*, that Richard was deposed for murder. He does not endorse the assertion in the supplement that Richard was appropriately deposed, although he also does not adopt the position that the deposition was faulty. If this were the sequence of events – Shakespeare using a Daniel manuscript as a source and writing *Richard II* before Daniel added to his poem – Daniel’s detailed depiction of Richard’s deposition becomes a possible reaction to Shakespeare. Daniel may have taken Shakespeare’s dramatization of Richard’s ambiguous resignation/deposition and responded, using details from the chronicles, to demonstrate that the playwright had omitted the key elements of Richard resigning out of fear for his life and the parliament being called by Henry in Richard’s name.
Of course, a last possibility is that both Shakespeare’s and Daniel’s deposition scenes were written independently, perhaps both engaging with the debates among members of the Essex circle surrounding the issues raised in *The State of Christendom*. If this were the case, the two coincidentally incorporated Richard handing over his crown “with his own hands”, the deposed king wishing to God that Henry enjoyed better success than him and the articles of deposition being “urged” so hard. It would also mean that they had independently, in 1594 to 1595, decided to provide similar details of Richard’s deposition and resignation to support differing views of the same event. Even if not reacting to each other, it is plausible that their shared connections to the Essex circle informed both depictions. Given the short timeframe during which each wrote works on the same topic subject to common influences, it may be difficult to distinguish influence from shared context.

Having described all the possible relationships between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s deposition scenes, I admit that they all remain possible. Two aspects of the relationship between Daniel’s addition and Shakespeare’s deposition scene, however, lead me to conclude it more plausible that Daniel’s followed and was inspired by Shakespeare’s – the theatrical aspects of elements Daniel added to the poem and the fact that the additions were unnecessary.

Richard handing the crown with “his own hands” and Northumberland urging the articles enumerating Richard’s crimes are dramatic elements of Shakespeare’s play that come across emphatically in performance. The first is particularly memorable in the play, emphasized by the extended dramatic moment when Richard and Bolingbroke hold the crown between them. Daniel’s inclusion of the term “Tis said” in his statement, “Tis said with his owne hands he gaue the crowne”, makes sense as a relation of an event viewed in this theatrical version of the
scene. None of the chroniclers “said” that Richard handed Bolingbroke the crown with his own hands, whereas the deposed king in Shakespeare’s dramatized version states, “With mine owne Hands I giue away my Crowne”.

In the pre-publication version of *The Civil Wars* documented by the two surviving manuscripts of portions of the poem, Daniel’s description of Richard’s deposition was already effectively complete. Something prompted him to go back and add the details. This is the only example of him adding an entire episode to the first two books between MS I-II and Q1595:I-IV; in all other additions, he adds details to episodes already included. Seeing a dramatic representation of Richard’s deposition that inappropriately excluded the details of parliament being called in Richard’s name and Richard being compelled to resign the crown may have encouraged him to write an alternate version. My conclusion regarding the theatrical nature of Daniel’s additions implies that it was an acted, not written, version that Daniel encountered between 1594 and 1595.\footnote{Harold Love and Bart van Es both speculate that manuscript versions of Shakespeare’s plays may have circulated in manuscript prior to their publication (Love, *Scribal Publication*, pp. 67-68; van Es, *Shakespeare in Company*, pp. 73-74). It is possible that such a manuscript could have been available to Daniel, however, given the lack of existence of such a manuscript and the theatrical nature of elements potentially borrowed by Daniel, a performance seems a more plausible source.} This moves the original performance of the play to a year or more before the December 1595 Hoby letter and would make *Richard II* one of the first new plays enacted by the Lord Chamberlain’s Men, formed in May 1594.\footnote{van Es argues that *Richard II* is one of the first plays to demonstrate the influence of the formation of the Chamberlain’s Men on Shakespeare’s development as a playwright, *Shakespeare and Company*, pp. 116-124.}

My conclusion on the order of composition does not reach the level of probable; rather, it is plausible. Based on my analysis, however, I do believe it probable that Shakespeare’s and
Daniel’s deposition scenes are closely related and that they reflect a level of engagement that has not been previously accorded them. They reflect an active dialogue between two artists debating the meaning of the same event in the context of common access to a group that was conducting debates on the very subject about which they were writing.

Potential Censorship of the Deposition Scene in *Richard II*

Although the issue is still unresolved, the consensus of most literary scholars is that the deposition scene in *Richard II* was included in the play as originally written and that it was omitted from the 1597 quarto due to censorship. As far as I know, no one has ever included in their analysis of the potential censorship of the scene a comparison to Daniel’s depiction of the same event. This is surprising, as elements of Shakespeare’s scene that parallel Daniel’s, such as the spectacle of an English monarch resigning and handing the crown to his successor, are sometimes used to explain the excision from *Richard II*. Such explanations are inconsistent with the reprinting of Daniel’s poem in 1599. If the printing of Shakespeare’s deposition scene was objectionable in 1597, why was Daniel’s acceptable in both 1595 and 1599? Even more noteworthy is the inclusion of Richard’s deposition in the edition of *The
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79 *New Oxford Shakespeare: Critical Reference Edition*, vol. 1, pp. 357-358; Clegg, “By the Choise”, pp. 432-434; Following from his theory that longer versions of Shakespeare’s plays reflect additions made for court performances, Dutton has recently revived the view, that the deposition scene was added later. See Dutton, *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist*, pp. 262-263.

80 Charles Forker offers a typical explanation of the potential censorship of the scene: “It seems probable that the ‘woeful pageant’ (4.1.321) of Richard’s dethronement was considered too dangerous to print in 1597 . . . but that the episode was nevertheless performed from its inception in 1595.” Forker, ed., *Richard II*, p. 165. Forker’s contention that the deposition scene could be performed but not printed is inconsistent with the repeated printing of the scene in Daniel’s poem. Janet Clare attributes censorship to the “staging of the actual dethronement, an elaboration from the bare mention in Holinshed” and an instance of Shakespeare abandoning “his cautious handling of the material”; Janet Clare, “The Censorship of the Deposition Scene in *Richard II*, *The Review of English Studies*, 41 (1990), 89-94 (p. 94). Again, Daniel’s depiction of the same event speaks against this explanation of potential censorship.
Civil Wars in the 1601 Works of Samuel Daniel Newly Augmented. That version of the poem omitted stanzas praising Essex (Q1595:I-IV, II.126-127), indicating that they were removed due to the earl’s rising and his trial in February of that year, a trial that featured discussions of Henry IV’s overthrow of Richard II. The description of Richard resigning the crown “with his owne hands” would have been more controversial in 1601, in the immediate aftermath of Essex’s execution, than in 1597, when the first quarto of Shakespeare’s play appeared. Based on the reprinting of Daniel’s poem, the spectacle of a monarch being deposed does not seem to have been the offending element resulting in the omission of Shakespeare’s deposition scene from Q1597. The scene may have been more objectionable when acted than printed, but the depiction of Richard handing over his crown, in of itself, does not seem to have resulted in print censorship.

Cyndia Susan Clegg provides a thorough analysis of the debate surrounding the censorship of Shakespeare’s deposition scene. Clegg suggests that Shakespeare’s representation of the role of parliament in Richard’s deposition became controversial after the appearance of Robert Parsons’s treatise, A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Inglande, an inflammatory tract scandalously dedicated to Essex, in late 1595. I believe that a variation of this explanation, based on a comparison of Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s scenes, can refine Clegg’s analysis and suggest an impetus for the scene’s censorship.

---

82 Clegg, “By the Chois”, pp. 432-448.
Clegg asserts that in compressing the parliaments surrounding Richard’s deposition, Shakespeare implies that Richard was deposed by parliament before he resigned. This affirmation of parliament’s authority became an issue after Parsons’s *Conference* contended that “the king was deposed by act of parlement”. As she points out, representing “Parliament as an agency of deposition might not in itself provoke censorship”, as similar representations are included in other literature of the time. The situation changed, however, after the appearance of Parsons’s *Conference* which argued that the propriety of Richard’s deposition validated a claim to the English throne by the Spanish Infanta, Isabella Clara Eugenia. After Parsons’s *Conference*, it became controversial to present Richard’s deposition as having been validly executed, resulting in the censorship of the scene.

Shakespeare’s ambiguous representation of the propriety of Richard’s deposition could explain why his scene was excised while Daniel’s survived. Daniel states in *The First Four Books* that Richard’s deposition was not properly executed; therefore, his poem could not be taken as affirming the Spanish Infanta’s claim. I believe, however, that this conclusion misses two subtle points that arise in comparing the multiple versions of Shakespeare’s play to Daniel’s poem. The first is that the version of *Richard II* printed in 1597 did not take the position that Henry’s accession was improperly executed and invalid. If anything, Q1597 is clearer than Q1608 or F1623 in its affirmation of Henry’s claim. In Q1597, Richard resigns willingly and appoints Henry as his heir; he is not deposed. It is unclear why Q1597 would be any less inflammatory than the later editions of the play, if the central issue is the validity of Henry’s claim. The second point is that Daniel’s poem, as reprinted multiple times, affirms

---

84 Clegg, “By the Choise”, p. 444.
Parliament’s authority to depose a monarch as strongly as Shakespeare’s play. Like the play, the parliamentary section of Daniel’s deposition scene precedes Richard’s resignation and the poet does not question the body’s authority to strip Richard of his title:

Vpon these articles in parlament  
So haynous made, inforst, and vrgd so hard,  
He was adiudged vnfit for gouerment  
And of all regall power and rule debarr’d

(FFB Q1595:1-IV, II.107)

Daniel does not argue that Richard was wrongfully deposed because parliament lacks the authority to depose a king. If anything, his statement that upon “articles in parlament”, Richard was “adjudged vnfit” and of “rule debarr’d” seems to affirm parliament’s authority to judge the fitness of the monarch, a view consistent with the conservative stance of the body of The State of Christendom. Rather, he argues that the parliament deposing Richard was inappropriately called by Bolingbroke, a subject, using the king’s name; this aspect of the parliamentary process invalidated its actions. This critical point may explain the difference in treatment between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s deposition scenes, the former reprinted multiple times and the latter censored. The portion of Shakespeare’s scene missing from Q1597 begins with Northumberland’s request:

May it please you, Lords, to grant the Commons Suit?

(R2, IV.1.155; F1623, sig. D2’)

Northumberland appeals to the lords in a parliament that has not been called by the king. The issue with a parliament being called by a subject, without the king’s consent, is amplified when Bolingbroke, at this point a subject, sends the order to summon the king:

Fetch hither Richard, that in common view
He may surrender:
Immediately there is an issue with this scene; a parliament that does not include the monarch is being asked to grant the suit of the commons and to summon that monarch. Read in this context, the line recalls the section of *The State of Christendom* quoted earlier:

I conceal how difficult it will be to have a Parliament, especially when a Prince, without whose consent and commandment the same cannot be called, knoweth, or mistrusteth that any thing shall be debated and determined therein to his prejudice.

(*The State of Christendom*, p. 205)

The problem with Shakespeare’s deposition scene is not that it dramatizes the “woefull pageant” of a king resigning or a parliament deposing its king, both elements included in Daniel’s poem. The problem is its depiction of a parliament being called by a subject and the king being summoned to that parliament. Once the entire section that includes the demands of parliament and appearance of the monarch is excised, the scene ceases to be objectionable, even though it represents that Richard resigned willingly and Henry appropriately replaced him. The censored scene still differs from Daniel’s, but both are acceptable and can be printed multiple times in 1595 (*FFB*), 1597 (*R2 Q1*), 1598 (*R2 Q2 & Q3*), 1599 (Daniel, *Poetical Essays*) and 1601 (Daniel, *Works Newly Augmented*).

The question of a subject’s right to call a parliament was as important to Elizabeth as questions surrounding the limits of parliament’s authority; both were directly related to the succession.

---

87 Clegg (“By the Choise”, pp. 443-444) points out that the Q1608 version of this line follows immediately from Northumberland’s line that precedes it, with no speech prefix. This could be a printing error or could indicate that Northumberland is requesting that Richard be fetched, an even more offensive formulation than the order coming from the future king. Either explanation would have been unacceptable from the standpoint that I suggest, that of a king being summoned to parliament by a subject.
Its importance is demonstrated in the section quoted from *The State of Christendom*, above, and Daniel’s treatment of it in the section he added to his poem. It was a question actively debated by political theorists, as noted by Alexandra Gajda describing the writings of the Protestant monarchomach Theodore Beza, a man with whom Essex follower, Anthony Bacon had studied:

> In his list of the various European representative institutions, Beza had described the English parliament as a bastion of the subject’s liberty, but pointed out that representative institutions were problematic because they met at the will of the monarch. If a monarch refused to call the estates/parliament, Beza recommended that the nobility should summon the institution themselves, using force if necessary.\(^{88}\)

Beza’s position recalls the difference between the body and supplement to *The State of Christendom*, with the former advocating restraint in opposing a tyrannical monarch and the latter endorsing resistance by any means. In this context, Shakespeare’s play with the deposition scene intact could be regarded as affirming the radical stance, a subject could call a parliament to depose a king.

If the representation of a parliament being called by a subject without the monarch’s consent was, in fact, the issue with Shakespeare’s deposition scene, it is an open question whether it would take Parsons’s *Conference* to point out the problem. If the play preceded Daniel’s additions to *The First Four Books*, then it could have been the appearance of the printed edition of Daniel’s poem in 1595 that caused the issue. Daniel’s version contradicts Shakespeare’s, making it clear that the parliament deposing Richard was inappropriately called by a subject. I believe it more plausible, however, that the difference in the treatment of the

---

two artistic representations of the deposition of Richard II is, in fact, explained by the appearance of *Conference.* Parsons made the process surrounding Richard’s deposition central to a debate on Elizabethan succession; Daniel’s version, a faulty process, was acceptable while Shakespeare’s, an ambiguous one, was not. This would be especially true if the two works could in any way be associated with Essex, the man to whom Parsons’s work had been dedicated, or his followers. It is possible that both Daniel’s poem and Shakespeare’s play were regarded as carrying such associations, one with Mountjoy and the other with Southampton. While very speculative, this suggests to me a mechanism for the censorship of Shakespeare’s work. Hoby’s letter to Cecil in December 1595, inviting him to “vewe” Richard, closely followed the November appearance of Parsons’s *Conference* at court. It is possible that Hoby was alerting Cecil to a play that dramatized the process by which Richard was deposed, a play indirectly associated with Essex. In this context, it is Essex himself who would have wanted the scene excised, ideally before the performance for Cecil, and he would not want to see it printed in 1597. This is more plausible than most explanations for the censorship of a scene that closely paralleled Daniel’s depiction of the same event, a depiction allowed to be reprinted in 1599 and 1601.

While Essex may have regretted the inclusion of the deposition scene in Shakespeare’s play, there is one indication that he preferred the playwright’s depiction to Daniel’s. We do not have examples of the earl commenting directly on the poem or play, but we can infer his preference based on his relationship with Shakespeare and the political context of the time. However, as with many aspects of early modern censorship, the exact motivations and mechanisms behind the excising of the scene remain largely speculative.

---

89 Gajda points out that the appearance of Parsons’s *Conference* likely curtailed Essex’s efforts to have works printed that related to the topic of Catholic religious toleration, including *The State of Christendom.* Gajda, *Earl of Essex,* pp. 135-139. It is possible that the treatise could have also resulted in him wanting to halt the printing of materials associated with his followers that seemed to validate the parliamentary process followed in Richard’s deposition.
based on Gabriel Harvey’s relation of Mountjoy’s and Essex’s opinions on two literary
treatments of English history:

The Earle of Essex much commendes Albions England: and not vnworthily for
diverse notable pageants, before, & in the Chronicle. . . . The Lord Mountjoy
makes the like account of Daniels peece of the Chronicle, touching the
Vsurpation of Henrie of Bullingbrooke. which in deede is a fine, sententious, &
politique peece of Poetrie: as proffitable, as pleasurable.  

Harvey’s comment points out two aspects of how Daniel’s poem was viewed. First, despite its
coverage of a wide range of English history, the poem’s most outstanding feature was “the
Vsurpation of Henrie of Bullingbrooke”. Second, Essex was not as impressed with Daniel’s
work as Mountjoy or Harvey was. The earl apparently preferred William Warner’s Albion’s
England. That preference could have many bases, but may have included Warner’s
assessment of Richard’s deposition.  

In his verse history, Warner states that Richard was “by
Parlament put downe” and Henry “elected to the Crowne”, an assessment much closer to the
supplement of The State of Christendom and Shakespeare’s ambiguous deposition scene than
to Daniel’s poem.  

Regardless of whether this is an accurate answer to the question of why Shakespeare’s
deposition scene does not appear in early printed versions of Richard II, my analysis suggests

---

90 Michael J. Hirrel, “When Did Gabriel Harvey Write His Famous Note?”, Huntington
Library Quarterly, 75 (2012), 291-299, pp. 294-296; Gabriel Harvey, Gabriel Harvey: His
The quotation is from Harvey’s handwritten marginalia in a 1598 edition of The works of our
Antient and lerned poet, Geffrey Chaucer. Hirrel dates this note to “before September 1599.”
91 Gajda posits that “Essex’s enthusiasm for Albion’s England may well have been fired by the
prose synopsis of the Aeneid appended to Warner’s verse history, which drew attention to the
connected foundation myths of Rome and Britain, and lavished praise on Elizabeth’s own
‘valiant Warriors, whose Laudes might special Pens allure’.” Gajda, Earl of Essex, pp. 220-
221.
that any consideration of the censorship of Shakespeare’s play should encompass a comparison of it to Daniel’s poem. Explanations offered for the scene’s excision from Q1597 must also explain why Daniel’s version could be reprinted in 1599 and 1601. Daniel’s inclusion of the fact that the parliament deposing Richard was called by a subject and Shakespeare’s omission of that element from his deposition scene offers such an explanation.
Chapter 6
The Fifth Book of The Civil Wars

After having considered the relationship between The First Four Books of the Civil Wars and Richard II in chapters 4 and 5, in this chapter and the next I return to the relationship between the poem and the Henry VI plays. The reason for revisiting that relationship is the uncertain dating of both the addition of the fifth book of The Civil Wars and the composition of portions of the Henry VI plays that appear in F1623 but not early printed editions. Determining the direction of influence, if any, between the fifth book and such portions of the plays is dependent on establishing which preceded the other. Answering the seemingly simple question of which came first, Daniel’s use of wind-wave imagery in describing Talbot’s defeat (FFB V.96) or the analogous description of the battle of Towton in 3H6 (3H6, II.5; see Chapter 2, pp. 44-45), raises the complicated issues of when Daniel wrote the fifth book and whether the First Folio versions of the Henry VI plays reflect revisions made after their initial composition and performance. In this chapter I address the dating of Daniel’s fifth book. In the next chapter I consider the issue of potential revisions to the Henry VI plays.

Addition of the Fifth Book

Between 1595 and 1599, a fifth book of The Civil Wars was printed and added to unsold copies of The First Four Books. As noted in chapter 1, the 1595 edition of The First Four Books exists in two states, with and without the fifth book. The fifth book is also included in

---

1 McManaway, “Some Bibliographical Notes”, pp. 34-37. The 1595 First Four Books was printed in two issues, one that McManaway describes as the “Royal Arms issue” based on its title-page border (STC 6244) and the other as the “IHS issue” (STC 6244.3); see McManaway, “Some Bibliographical Notes”, pp. 31-32. The title-page of STC 6244 includes the spelling “warres” and “betweene”, whereas STC 6244.3 spells the words “wars” and “between”. Since extant copies of both issues exist with and without the fifth book, the STC numbers cannot be used to designate the inclusion or exclusion of the book.
some, though oddly not all, copies of the poem in the 1599 *The Poeticall Essayes of Sam. Danyel*.² Most, if not all, of the fifth book was probably written between the printing of the first 1595 edition of *The First Four Books* and the 1599 publication of *Poeticall Essayes*.

Two pieces of external evidence have been used to date the fifth book. James G. McManaway analyzed bibliographical evidence related to a head ornament used on the first page of the book and concluded that the book was first printed by John Windet “in or shortly after 1595”.³ Subsequently, John Pitcher identified a quotation from the fifth book used by William Camden in a draft of *Remaines of a Greater Worke Concerning Britaine*, which he believes indicates that Daniel wrote the fifth book “about the time of Cadiz in 1596”.⁴ In this chapter, I evaluate textual elements of the poem that I believe confirm McManaway’s and Pitcher’s dating of the book to between 1595 and 1596, while providing evidence of when within that range the book may have been written.

Two portions of the fifth book include matter that may help date Daniel’s composition of the addition to the poem. One is in a section where Daniel comments on the reign of Queen Elizabeth (stanzas V.48-51). A stanza within this section (V.49) includes unusual terms that seem to refer to specific contemporary events. I believe that a comparison of the poem to *The State of Christendom*, a treatise analyzed in chapter 5, and other writings of the Essex circle,

---

² Some copies of the poem included in *Poeticall Essayes* include the 1595 title page *The First Fowre Bookes* while others include a 1599 cancel, *The Civill Wars of England, Betweene the two Houses of Lancaster and Yorke*. The text is identical, regardless of title page, and exists in two states, both with and without the fifth book, in both. McManaway, “Some Bibliographical Notes”, pp. 32-34; Sellers, “Bibliography”, pp. 34-35.
³ McManaway, “Some Bibliographical Notes”, pp. 35-38. McManaway also concludes that a second edition of the fifth book was printed by James Roberts in 1599 along with a page of errata labeled “faults escaped”.
⁴ Pitcher, “Daniel, Samuel”, *ODNB*. 
can help contextualize those contemporary references. The second section involves an episode from Daniel’s narrative where he varied from his chronicle sources for a reason that is not immediately apparent (V.78-79). Again, I believe that a consideration of the concerns of Essex and his followers illuminates now obscure elements of the poem. In addition to helping date the fifth book, the analysis of these sections demonstrates how it may have been informed by the politics of the Essex circle during the period 1595 to 1596.

“A sacred branch”

The fifth book of *The Civil Wars* describes events towards the end of the reign of Henry VI. It encompasses Cade’s rebellion, the beginning of York’s opposition to Henry, infighting between Somerset and York, Talbot’s defeat at Bordeaux and the first battle of St. Albans – all episodes depicted in the *Henry VI* plays (in both F1623 and early printed versions), principally *Henry VI Part 2*. As with most of *The Civil Wars*, the bulk of the fifth book is firmly based on the English historical chronicles, especially Hall’s *Union*.\(^5\) It covers the period 1450-1455 which is detailed in the section between the “XXVIII Yere” and the “XXXIII Yere of Kyng Henry the vj” in Hall.\(^6\) In the middle of his description of York’s first armed challenge to Henry, Daniel interrupts his historical narrative with 24 stanzas (V.30-53) that cover a variety of topics including the state of Europe in the late fourteenth to early fifteenth centuries, the influence of learning at that time and the waning of religious devotion. His wide-ranging treatment of the material includes a mythological conceptualization of cyclical change; Nemesis directs Pandora to set Europe in turmoil by introducing artillery and printing. These

---

\(^5\) For Daniel’s use of sources throughout *The Civil Wars*, see Wright, “Samuel Daniel’s Use of Sources”, pp. 61-65. For the fifth book (sixth book in 1609) see Probst, *Samuel Daniel’s Civil Wars*, pp. 30-34.

\(^6\) Hall, *Union*, fols. CLVI\(^v\) to CLXIX\(^r\).
stanzas are more reflective than the historical matter surrounding them. The poet’s philosophical perspective in this section of *The Civil Wars* has been analyzed by Daniel scholars who have shown that he was influenced by the thinking of early modern historians and political thinkers, such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Jean Bodin and Louis LeRoy.7

Among these stanzas are four (V.48-51) that explicitly address Daniel’s own time. The content of those four stanzas reflects general impressions of England’s then current superiority relative to her neighbors and Elizabeth’s privileged position as a monarch protected by the almighty. These impressions are consistent with much of the nationalistic literature of the period and akin to views expressed in *The State of Christendom*, the treatise that circulated within the Essex circle as Daniel revised his manuscript version of the poem, preparing it to be published as *The First Four Books* in 1595 (see p. 166). As with portions of the poem added to the first two books in 1594 to 1595, I do not suggest that *The State of Christendom* is explicitly a Daniel source. Rather I suggest that, with its parallels to wording and themes of portions of the poem written in the mid 1590s, it provides context for the fifth book and may aid in identifying some of the more obscure elements of Daniel’s commentary on contemporary events. Unless otherwise noted, quotations from *The State of Christendom* are from the body of the work, not the supplement.

---

The first stanza of the section that comments on Elizabeth’s reign (V.48) sets the stage for how the poet will address his own time. The stanza notes that Elizabeth is “A sacred branch” of the “blessed vnion” (obviously with a nod to Hall) that gave rise to England’s present protected state. Nemesis speaks to Pandora and predicts that despite their efforts to use all their “power” to disturb Elizabeth’s reign, “no distress shall touch her Diadem”:

Out of which blessed vnion shall arise
A sacred branch, with grace and glory blest,
Whose vertue shall her Land so patronize,
As all our power shall not her dayes molest:
For shee, fayre shee, the Minion of the skyes,
Shall purchase of the highe’st to hers such rest,
(Standing betweene the wrath of heauen and them)
As no distresse shall touch her Diadem.
(FFB Q1595:I-V, V.48)

*The State of Christendom* provides context for the way that Daniel’s readers may have interpreted the stanza’s reference to Pandora’s attempts to “molest” Elizabeth’s days. It describes how she is surrounded by schemers who have tried to have her murdered and subvert her state but have never succeeded, due to God’s protection:

she ruleth in a world full of Machiavelists, pestered with deceitful Hanibals, . . .
and yet neither the policy of the wisest, nor the deceit of the craftiest; . . . hath
ever drawn her into any small inconvenience, . . . and we for her Highness, are
greatly bound to pray to the Almighty, who hath so many ways, so many times,
and so miraculously preserved her.
(State of Christendom, pp. 85-86)

In two stanzas, Daniel expands on Nemesis’s assertion that Elizabeth occupies a privileged status. He describes how the countries around her have experienced turmoil while she has preserved peace in her state, due to the divine protection that only she enjoys:

And from the Rocks of safety shall discry
The wondrous wracks that wrath layes ruined,
All round about her, blood and misery,
Powers betrayd, Princes slaine, Kings massacred,
States all-confusd, brought to calamitie,
And all the face of kingdoms altered.
Yet she the same inviolable stands,
Deere to her owne, wonder to other Lands.

But let not her defence discourage thee,
For neuer none but shee, shall haue thys grace
From all disturbs to be so long kept free,
And with such glory to discharge that place:
And therefore, if by such a power thou be
Stopt of thy course, reckon it no disgrace;
Sith shee alone (being priuiledg’d from hie)
Hath thys large Patent of eternitie.

(FFB Q1595:I-V, V.50-51)

Similar sentiments are reflected in The State of Christendom, which provides context for Daniel’s “All round about her, blood and misery”. It describes the “divisions amongst her Neighbors” and contrasts Elizabeth’s “peace” to their “wars”, her “abundance” to their “many wants”, her “dutiful subjects” to their “rebellious” people:

Time hath greatly favoured her by sending divisions amongst her Neighbours;
The Almighty hath strengthened her, by impairing the strength of her adversaries; both have set her many degrees above all the Princes of Christendom, by giving her peace, when they have had wars; her abundance, when they have suffered many wants; her loving and dutiful Subjects, when their people have been unkind and rebellious; . . .

(State of Christendom, p. 83)

The praise of Elizabeth included in both Daniel’s poem and The State of Christendom reiterates themes common in literature and oratory of the time. Both works, however, include other parallels that were less common, for instance criticisms of Philip II that share a high

---

8 Paulina Kewes describes how Henry Savile “exploited the principle of laudando praecipere” in a 1592 address delivered at Oxford “casting Elizabeth as a protectress of Christendom”, “Henry Savile’s Tacitus and the Politics of Roman History in Late Elizabethan England”, Huntington Library Quarterly, 74 (2011), 515-551 (p. 541). See also Alison Shell, Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558-1660 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999), pp. 107-140, for examples of literature by Catholic loyalists, such as Henry Constable and Thomas Wright, praising Elizabeth.
degree of specificity. *The State of Christendom* singles out Philip II as an example of a monarch who has been especially subject to turmoil. It describes the many murders associated with the Spanish king, highlighting the murder of “the last king of France” (Henry III killed in 1589), providing context for Daniel’s references in V.50, quoted above, to “Princes slaine, Kings massacred”:

Is it likely think you, that any man will spare him [Philip] when he is dead, since during his life we reade in some histories, that his own Sonne, his French wife, the Prince of Orange, . . . and the last King of France with many other Princes and Potentates have been unnaturally Murthered, cruelly Poysoned, wrongfully done to Death, and horribly Massacred by his consent and Counsell, Commandement or Approbation?

* (The State of Christendom, p. 143)

Again, this is not to say that *The State of Christendom* is a specific source for Daniel, but rather that it provides context for interpreting topical references in the fifth book.

“Fayth disguisd”

One stanza within this section (V.49) states that Pandora (“thou” in the stanza) will employ “fayth disguisd” and “the power of Pluto” to disturb Elizabeth’s reign:

Though thou shalt seeke by all the means thou may,  
And Arme impiety and hell and all;  
Styrre vp her owne, make others to assay,  
Bring fayth disguisd, the power of Pluto call,  
Call all thy crafts to practice her decay,  
And yet shall thys take no effect at all:  
For shee secure, (as intimate with Fate)  
Shall sit and scorne those base dissignes of hate.

*(FFB Q1595:1-V, V.49)*

It is unclear exactly what threats to the English monarch are being invoked with these unusual phrases that do not show up in other works of the 1590s.\(^9\) In the context of the stanza they

\(^9\) Based on a search for the words “faith” near “disguised” and “power” near “Pluto” on EEBO and Literature Online (LION).
seem to refer to specific concerns, perhaps ones more easily identifiable at the time of the poem. In his critical edition of *The Civil Wars*, Laurence Michel offered the following possible explanation of “bring fayth disguisd” [parentheticals and question marks are Michel’s]:

cause loyalty (and/or keeping one’s word?) to be so disfigured through dissimulation as to be unrecognizable (?). Or perhaps an allusion to the activities of the Jesuits, who worked clandestinely in England after being outlawed; they were regularly denounced as impious, crafty hellhounds in the pay of the devil.10

Michel first suggests a general explanation of Daniel’s terminology. As implied by his own question marks, this explanation is itself unclear and does little to contextualize or elucidate the phrase. It is possible that Daniel’s meaning was intended to be ambiguous and widely open to interpretation; however, in a section of the poem that provides commentary on Daniel’s own time, this interpretation seems inadequate. Michel’s second explanation is more specific, suggesting that Daniel was alluding to the Jesuits. Again, this is possible; however, the poem’s deferential attitude toward Essex and Mountjoy makes this explanation less plausible. In the mid-1590s Essex and those around him came to be associated with the cause of religious toleration.11 In spite of his own firm Protestant loyalty, Essex sought to appeal to English Catholics, especially those in exile; he strived to bring together English subjects in joint loyalty to Elizabeth, regardless of the confessional divide. In 1594, while Daniel was working at Wanstead, Penelope Rich considered adopting Catholicism.12 Those who found refuge at Essex House included the Catholic Antonio Perez and, beginning in June 1595, the Jesuit priest Thomas Wright.13 Mountjoy, exhibiting sympathy for Catholics, was among the last to

10 Michel, ed., *Civil Wars*, p. 357.
visit the Jesuit poet Robert Southwell in prison. At Southwell’s execution, in February 1595, Mountjoy humanely hastened the poet’s death, preventing the extended torture the executioner was prepared to administer. Both Essex’s provision of refuge to Wright and Mountjoy’s sympathetic actions on behalf of Southwell were during 1595, the year The First Four Books of the Civil Wars was published. Mountjoy’s and Essex’s sympathy exhibited toward Jesuits are inconsistent with the hypothesis that Daniel would refer to them disparagingly in a book added soon thereafter. Although possible, there may be a more plausible explanation of the phrase “fayth disguisd”.

As described above, The State of Christendom provides useful guidance for interpreting some of the poem’s contemporary references. Perhaps it can similarly elucidate the meaning of “fayth disguisd”. The treatise does not include that phrase or variations of it, but it does provide context for other elements of the stanza. For example, Nemesis’s prediction that Pandora will “Styrre vp her owne, make others to assay”, seems to refer to the threats to Elizabeth’s life that are similarly described in The State of Christendom as having been “plotted abroad” but “intended at home”:

For many men and women, learned and unlearned, . . . courtiers and counsellors have sought her death, and committed treasons against her . . . Their treason was plotted abroad, and intended at home; invented in Spain, and should have been executed in England.

(The State of Christendom, p. 86)

The treatise describes one such threat as particularly “impious”, providing possible context for Daniel’s phrase “Arme impiety”,

14 Christopher Devlin, The Life of Robert Southwell: Poet and Martyr (London: Longman’s Green, 1956), pp. 318, 323-324, 358-359. Devlin (p. 359) notes three contemporary accounts of the final twenty-four hours of Southwell’s life and states that “all three accounts mention Mountjoy’s presence.”
It is common in every man’s mouth that he [the king of Spain] maketh no Conscience to rid his hands of his enemies by any manner of Wickedness, be it never so execrable and impious. His late intent to poysone our gracious Soveraign (whose life God long preserve) testifieth thus much; and as many as shall hear of his purpose of Dr. Lopes and his Complices, cannot but esteem him worthy of everlasting Ignominy.

(State of Christendom, pp. 143-144)

The State of Christendom refers to the case of Roderigo Lopez, Elizabeth’s physician who was accused of plotting to poison her in 1594 and was executed in June of that year. Lopez’s alleged plot was identified and actively pursued by Essex, over the objections of Burghley, and Elizabeth herself, between January and March of 1594. Essex’s success in getting Lopez convicted and executed was a key inflection point in the young Privy counselor’s career, one that turned him from a favorite of the queen’s into a potent political force. As described in chapter 5 (pp. 150-153), during this period Daniel was working at Essex’s estate, Wanstead, and would have been privy to discussions of the case as it unfolded.

15 Lopez’s treason was “discovered” in January 1594, he was tried and convicted in February to March of that year and executed in June. Hammer, Polarisation, pp. 159-163. A recent thorough account of Lopez’s trial and execution is by Dominic Green, The Double Life of Doctor Lopez (London: Century, 2003).

16 Hammer, Polarisation, pp. 160-161. Peter Lake, Bad Queen Bess? (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2016), p. 449. According to Lake, Lopez’s prosecution “was a product of the earl of Essex’s attempts, first, to establish himself as a statesman and intelligencer of real standing . . . Certainly, it was Essex who made the running in assembling the case against Lopez, often in the face of withering contempt of the queen and the scepticism of Lord Burghley.”

17 Hammer, Polarisation, p. 138.

18 Interestingly, Wanstead itself figures into the Lopez case, as the doctor was alleged to have met with his conspirators at the estate when Essex hosted a reception there for the Vidame de Chartres in June 1593 (Hammer, Polarisation, p. 160). It is likely, however, that Daniel was not yet working at Wanstead at that date. His Tragedie of Cleopatra, dedicated to the Countess of Pembroke, was entered in the Stationers’ Register on October 19, 1593 and it is probable that he was working at the Pembroke estate during most of 1593.
Three writers penned contemporary accounts of the Lopez conspiracy. William Waad, the clerk who conducted many of the interrogations leading to Lopez’s conviction, wrote two accounts of the case, neither of which was published although both exist in manuscript. Burghley wrote the official version, the one printed at the time, based heavily on Waad’s accounts. Finally, Francis Bacon, a member of the Essex circle and brother of Anthony, possible part-author of The State of Christendom, wrote a version that circulated in manuscript but was not printed until 1657, when it was included in a book of Bacon’s previously unpublished works, Resuscitato. While Waad’s and Burghley’s accounts represented the official party line, Bacon’s may have been written as part of Essex’s campaign to promote his success in prosecuting Lopez.

All the contemporary narratives include parallels to Daniel’s stanza – condemnations of the devilish nature of the plot that may provide context for Daniel’s “arme impiety and hell and all”, descriptions of the way Lopez hid his Jewish faith that may elucidate the phrase “fayth disguisd” and gratitude for the divine providence that protected the queen paralleling “shee

---

19 Contemporary accounts are reviewed by Peter Lake in Bad Queen Bess?, pp. 449-467.
20 BL, Additional MSS 48029, fols. 148’-184’ . TNA, PRO SP 12/248, item 7, fols. 12’-26’ . Waad’s second account, included in PRO SP 12/248, is printed as “An Account of Dr. Lopez Treason, January 1593-4” in William Murdin, Collection of State Papers Relating to Affairs in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth From the Year 1571 to 1596 (London, 1759), pp. 669-675.
23 Green, Double Life of Doctor Lopez, p. 382. Gajda, Earl of Essex, p. 73. Lake, Bad Queen Bess?, pp. 460-461. Hammer, Polarisation, p. 315; Hammer comments on Essex’s strategy of writing or commissioning “semi-public documents . . . which were circulated in manuscript . . . By circulating documents in manuscript, Essex and his adherents were able to circumvent the censorship of printed works and to target their audience more precisely . . .”
secure, (as intimate with Fate)”. Bacon’s description comes closest, as it includes the word “disguised”, the same word used by Daniel, in his description of Lopez. It also provides the closest connection to the Essex household where Daniel could have encountered discussions of the case. Excerpts from Bacon’s account provides context for the elements of Daniel’s stanza noted:

Context for “Arme impiety”:
a course . . . Odious to God, and Man; Detested by the Heathen themselves; which is, to take away the Life, of her Majesty, . . . A Matter, which mought be proved to be, not onely against all Christianity, and Religion, but against Nature, the Law of Nations, the Honour of Arms, The Civil Law, The Rules of Morality, and Pollicy:  

(Bacon, “True Report”, p. 152)

Context for “fayth disguisd” (my emphasis in bold):
there was none, so much built, and relied upon, by the Great Ones, of the other side, as was this Physician Lopez: Nor, None so dangerous: whether you consider the Aptnesse of the Instrument; Or the subtilty, and secrecy, of those, that practised with him:. . .this Proteus of a disguised, and Transformed, Treason, did at last, appear, in his own Likeness, and Colours; which were as Foul, and Monstrous, as have been known, in the world. . . This Lopez, of Nation, a Portugeze, and suspected, to be In sect, secretly, a Jew; Though here he conformed Himself, to the Rites of Christian Religion; 

(Bacon, “True Report”, pp. 153-154)

Context for “shee secure, (as intimate with Fate)”:
by Gods marvellous Goodness, her Majesty, hath been preserved. And surely, if a Man do truly consider, it is hard to say; Whither God, hath done greater things, By her Majesty, or For Her . . .how mightily God hath protected her, . . . against the many secret Conspiracies, that have been made against her Life: 

(Bacon, “True Report”, p. 161)

Although it includes limited direct verbal parallels, other than the specific word “disguised”, there are similarities between Daniel’s stanza on “fayth disguisd” and Bacon’s description of the Lopez affair. The same is true for Waad’s and Burghley’s accounts.²⁴

²⁴Waad, “An Account of Dr. Lopez Treason”: “There never was so wicked, dyvellishe, and hatefull a Treason so closely, conningly and smoothly conveyed by such, as had Meanes with least Suspicion to carry it” (p. 673); “But what may be thought of them, that use so highe, so holie, and reverent a Thing, to cloke Ambition, Revenge and wicked Practyses?” (p. 675).
The Lopez affair achieved a high degree of prominence in 1594, a prominence that continued in the subsequent two years. This is demonstrated by a reference to the case in Lewis Lewkenor’s *The Estate of English Fugitives under the King of Spain and His Ministers*, a work initially published in 1595 and reprinted in both 1595 and 1596 in revised versions. In it, Lewkenor describes Lopez and the conspiracy in terms consistent with Bacon’s emphasis on the devilish nature of the plot, God’s protection of Elizabeth and Lopez’s secretive devices to mask his intent:

*Lopes* that damnable Physition, who like his predecessour *Iudas* had for money consented to betraye innocent blood. . . . But it hath pleased the Lorde our God of his endlesse mercie, . . . to preuent the tragicall intended issue of theyr most barbarous and bloody practise, being such, as well in regarde of the secrecie of handling, as the imagined facilitie of the performaunce, . . .

(Lewkenor, *Estate of English Fugitives*, sigs. N4v-O1r)

Lewkenor goes on to describe both the continuing memory of the case and the debt of gratitude owed by the English people to Essex. Lewkenor was a member of parliament who was not one of Essex’s followers. His description can be taken as a representation of how the Lopez case and the earl’s involvement were perceived outside of the Essex circle:

of manie [plots] which he, the diuell and their adherents haue set abroach since the beginning of her Maiesties glorious reigne, neuer any (to mans iudgement) was halfe so daungerous; the manner & memorie whereof is so fresh, that the recitall of any particularities would be but superfluous.

---

Anonymous [William Cecil, Lord Burghley], *A True Report of Sundry Horrible Conspiracies*. . . (London, 1594), “Many other good proofes there are by manifest circumstances expressed . . . that might further confirme their originall intent for this foule vnchristian and heathenish Act to haue comen from the K. of Spaine, and his Counsellors” (sig. B3r).

Lewes Lewkenor, *The Estate of English Fugitives under the King of Spain and His Ministers* (London, 1595). See also Lake, *Bad Queen Bess?*, p. 446.

Onely let vs not forget to be thankefull vnto . . . that worthie and honourable Lord, by whose watchfull industrie and zealous care of her Maiesties saftie, it was first suspected, and finally, by his wisdome and discreete handling fully discouered, . . .

(Lewkenor, *Estate of English Fugitives*, sigs. O1r-v)

At a time when, as noted by Lewkenor, “the recital of any particulars” surrounding the Lopez case “would be but superfluous”, it is plausible that Daniel’s reference to “fayth disguisd” in the context of a threat to Elizabeth would be recognized as a reference to the murderous Jew who had disguised his religious beliefs and tried to poison the queen.27

It remains possible that Daniel’s stanza refers to some other threat to Elizabeth or England. For instance, during 1595 and early 1596 there were growing fears of a second Spanish Armada.28 The phrase “arme impiety” could refer to Spain, although it is unclear how “fayth disguisd” fits with that explanation. It is also possible that Daniel is referring to a threat that is now obscure. An analysis of the rest of the line “Bring fayth disguisd, the power of Pluto call” may offer evidence supporting or refuting the possibility that the phrase refers to Lopez. What is “the power of Pluto”?

“The power of Pluto”

Pluto is the Roman god of the underworld with powers over the dead. In the early modern context, he was often invoked interchangeably with or seen as an associate of the Devil.29 In

---

27 See also Hammer, *Polarisation*, pp. 138-139, 161-163 for a description of the continuing prominence of the Lopez case and the political capital that Essex gained from it.
29 For contemporaneous references to Pluto as god of the underworld, see Tasso, *Godfrey of Bulloigne*, trans. by Richard Carew (London, 1594), pp. 49 (sig. G1’), 145 (sig. T1’).
this regard, it is possible that this is simply another reference to the impious, devilish nature of various threats to the divinely protected Elizabeth and her state. Evidence from Essex’s correspondence, however, demonstrates that “the power of Pluto” may have had a more specific connotation for those in the Essex circle around the time when Daniel was writing the fifth book.

In the summer of 1595, Essex sent Antonio Perez to France to act as his emissary to the French king, Henri IV. Perez was to assist in negotiating an alliance between Henri and England during a period when the French king was seeking Elizabeth’s support in defending against Spain. Essex was strongly in favor of such an alliance while Elizabeth, Burghley and Robert Cecil, were against it. In September 1595, Essex wrote a letter to Perez, in Latin, in which he analogized Elizabeth to Juno. Essex referred to a section of The Aeneid where Juno threatens to turn to Acheron/Hell for assistance, quoting a line from the epic:

Juno autem, cum saepius frustra opem implorasset, tandem erupit: “Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo”

[But Juno herself, after she had in vain implored help, at last broke out: “If I cannot sway Heaven, I will awaken Hell”].

30 Hammer, Polarisation, pp. 131-132.
Essex was commenting on his and Perez’s attempts to negotiate an alliance with France/Heaven while Elizabeth contemplated making peace with Spain/Hell. Immediately after the quotation from *The Aeneid* Essex writes:

“ad Plutonem illum Hispaniae, qui a diuitijs nomen obtinet”
[alluding to that Pluto of Spain, who has his name from his riches].

Essex was invoking the god of the underworld in referring to Philip II as “that Pluto of Spain”. Essex’s use of that name for Philip without explicit identification implies that it was an accepted way of referring to the Spanish king within the Essex circle, equating him with the devilish Roman god. Members of the Essex circle regularly adopted coterie names for themselves and others, often finding their sobriquets in mythology. As described by Gustav Ungerer, “Greek and Roman mythology were ransacked in search of appropriate gods with whom to identify” Essex and those around him. Elizabeth, for example, was Juno, the Roman queen of the gods, and Burghley was Aeolus, the ruler of the winds. Essex’s knowing use of the term “Plutonem illum Hispaniae” in his letter to Perez indicates that Philip of Spain was identified with the god of hell. This provides context for Daniel’s use of the enigmatic phrase “the power of Pluto”. He may be referring to Philip who was identified in all contemporary accounts of the Lopez affair as the source of the alleged conspiracy.

---

38 Searches for contemporary references to Pluto or use of the word “power” near “Pluto” on EEOB and LION yield no results that provide a context for Daniel’s phrase.
Both Essex’s and Daniel’s artistically cloaked references to Philip, equating him with Pluto, could include a dual use of the god’s name. Although Pluto was often invoked as the god of the underworld, he was sometimes conflated with Plutus, the god of wealth. Francis Bacon demonstrates such a dual use of the god’s name in his essay “Of Riches”,

The Poets faigne that when *Plutus*, (which is *Riches*) is sent from *Jupiter*, he limps, and goes slowly; But when he is sent from *Pluto*, he runnes, and is Swift of Foot. . . . But it mought be applied likewise to *Pluto*, taking him for the Deuill. For when *Riches* come from the Deuill, (as by Fraud, and Oppression, and vniust Meanes,) they come vpon Speed.39

Essex’s reference to Pluto explicitly combines the two uses of the god’s name, the god of the underworld and the god of riches. He attaches the name to his quotation from *The Aeneid* where Juno vows to move hell, invoking the devilish aspect of Pluto, while also saying that Philip, the Spanish king of hell (“*ad Plutonem illum Hispaniae*”) gets his name from his riches (“*qui a diuitijs nomen obtinet*”). Daniel’s use of the name Pluto similarly may allude to its dual nature. Nemesis is predicting that during Elizabeth’s reign, Pandora will “Bring fayth disguisd, the power of *Pluto call*”. If the line invokes the Lopez case, “the power of *Pluto*” can refer either to the hellish nature of the plot or to the belief that Lopez was lured by Spanish money. The title-page of Bacon’s account of the Lopez affair explicitly makes the connection: “A True Report, Of the detestable Treason, Intended, By *Doctor Roderigo Lopez*, A Physician, attending upon the Person of the *Qveenes Maiesty*, Whom He, for a Sum of Money, promised, to be paid him, by the King of Spain, did undertake to have destroyed by Poyson . . .”40

Daniel may have intended his enigmatic, poetic reference to the Roman god to invoke the association of devilish devices and money, an association that the general reader might or might not connect to Philip. For knowing readers within the Essex circle, however, it could have been a clear reference to the Spanish king, referred to as Pluto within the group, who had used his wealth to tempt the “impious” Lopez who “disguised” his faith.

The possibility that Daniel was alluding to Lopez and Philip in stanza 49 of the fifth book as first printed is strengthened by the later history of revisions to The Civil Wars. In 1609, Daniel deleted the stanza that included “fayth disguisd” and “the power of Pluto”. In the entire section of the poem involving Nemesis’s instructions to Pandora, it was the only stanza so deleted. This may attest to its topicality in the mid-1590s and the fact that it was no longer relevant fifteen years after the Lopez affair. In 1609, Daniel retained most of the references to Elizabeth throughout the poem, seemingly deleting only contemporary allusions that either would not be recognized or had taken on different meaning. Daniel’s deletion of the “fayth disguisd . . . power of Pluto” stanza could reflect the improved relations between England and Spain after James’s ascension in 1603. In the 1609 edition of The Civil Wars, Daniel deleted all direct references to Spain, including the disparaging stanzas on the “Iberus Lord” (II.124-125, 1595) previously included in the second book. Daniel’s deletion of stanza V.49, with its allusions to the Spanish king as Pluto, the god of hell, is consistent with this pattern of omitting references to England’s former enemy.

41 Green describes the fading of the memory of Lopez and his infamous plot (Double Life, p. 6), “Yet despite his theatrical celebrity, Lopez’s notoriety faded with time. The name ‘Roderigo Lopez’ became one among many, an Elizabethan footnote, a minor figure on the roll of Tudor treasons and, like a popular but tired repertory piece, his story became hackneyed and archaic. Nine years after his execution, the Tudor dynasty expired with Elizabeth I, and two years after that the Lopez Affair’s remaining topicality was obscured by a far more spectacular attempt at regicide, the Gunpowder Plot.”
While other interpretations remain possible, a range of evidence suggests it likely that Daniel was referring to the Lopez case. That interpretation also supports the probability that the fifth book was written soon after the 1595 appearance of *The First Four Books*, when the Portuguese doctor’s 1594 trial and execution were still a recent memory, rather than closer to the 1599 publication of *The Poeticall Essayes*. This is consistent with external evidence identified by McManaway and Pitcher, both of whom believe the book was written between 1595 and 1596. Daniel’s possible use of a coterie name for Philip also suggests that the Essex circle was an intended audience for the fifth book and that other sections of the book might be best understood in the context of political issues being discussed among Essex and his supporters in the mid-1590s. One such issue may help us understand a section where Daniel departed from his historical sources, his description of Talbot’s defeat at Bordeaux.

**Talbot’s Defeat**

A significant portion of the fifth book (V.77-104) of *The Civil Wars* depicts Talbot’s final battle with the French at Bordeaux, the same battle dramatized in *Henry VI Part 1* (IV.2-IV.7). Echoes and parallels between the poem and the play are discussed in chapter 2 (pp. 41-45). The present discussion will explore Daniel’s variation from the English chronicles and consider the possibility that this section of the fifth book provides political commentary on contemporary events.

The Talbot section of the fifth book is preceded by disagreements among the English nobility in which Somerset argues for York to be executed for challenging Henry. This infighting is interrupted by a plea from Bordeaux for support in rebelling against the French. Daniel
describes how this request for aid provided an “interpause” to the “pride and spight” of the internal disagreements:

For now had *Burdeaux* offered vpon ayd
Present revolt, if we would send with speed.
Which fayre aduantage to haue then delayd
Vpon such hopes, had been a shamefull deed:
And therfore this, all other courses stayd,
And outwardly these inward hates agreed:
Giuing an interpause to pride and spight,
Which breath’d but to break out with greater might.

(*FFB Q1595:I-V, V.76*)

Daniel’s depiction of York’s and Somerset’s disagreement being interrupted by the war follows his principal source for Talbot’s defeat, Hall’s *Union*. 42 Immediately before the section on Talbot, Hall states:

The kyng assembled together a great counsaill at Westminster to here the accuseions of the ij dukes, . . . the same very daye came Ambassadours from the heades and Magistrates of the citie of Burdeaux . . . which signified to the counsaill, that if they woulde send an armye into Gascoyne, the Gascoyns wolde reuerte & turne agayne to the English part. . . . These ij thinges sore troubled the heades of the kings counsaill, whiche leste this discencion betwene two persones, might be the let of outward conquest, set the duke of Yorke at libertie . . .

(*Hall, Union, fols. CLXIII*- CLXIIIIP*)

In Hall, as in Daniel’s poem, Somerset’s objections are temporarily quelled in favor sending aid to Gascony. Both Hall and Daniel push aside internal divisions within England until after the description of Talbot’s battle. After the battle, both authors take up such divisions again. In a stanza that immediately follows Talbot’s defeat (V.105) Daniel reports that “loosing war abroad; at home lost peace” mirroring Hall’s account of the aftermath of the English defeat:

When foren warre and outward battailes, were brought to an end and finall conclusion: domesticall discord and ciuill discension began anew to arise, within Engelande . . .

---

42 Probst, *Samuel Daniel’s Civil Wars*, pp. 33-34. Probst notes that Hall’s and Grafton’s descriptions of Talbot’s defeat are similar and both are more detailed than Holinshed. It is likely that Hall was Daniel’s source.
In the sections before and after his description of Talbot’s defeat, Daniel relies heavily on Hall. Within the section on the English hero’s loss, however, Daniel varies significantly from any known source. He begins by foreshadowing the French victory and explaining its cause, stating that the English troops did not enjoy the support of England’s neighbors, Brittany and Burgundy, support that could have changed the course of the battle:

For both the Britayne and Burgonian now
Came altred with our luck, & won with theirs
Those bridges and gates that dyd allow
So easie passage vnto our affayres.
Juding it safer to endeouer how
To linke with strength, then leane vnto dispayres;
And who wants frends, to back what he begins
In Lands far of, gets not, although he wins.

Which too well prou’d thyss fatall enterprize,
That last that lost vs all we had to lose:
Where, though aduantag’d by some mutenies,
And petty Lords that in our cause arose,
Yet those great fayld; whose ready quick supplyes
Euer at hand, cheerd vs, and quaild our foes:
Succors from far, come seldom to our mind,
For who holds league with Neptune, or the wind?
*(FFB Q1595:I-V, V.78-79)*

Daniel states that it was a lack of “ready quick supplyes” from Brittany and Burgundy that caused Talbot’s downfall. The poet emphasizes this by commenting that “who wants frends, to back what he begins / In Lands far of, gets not, although he wins”, building a broad generalization based on Talbot’s loss being due to a lack of backing from foreign allies.

In Hall, Brittany and Burgundy are not mentioned as factors in Talbot’s defeat. Hall states that the English forces had offers of support as “townes & cities farre distaunte from Burdeaux sent
messengers to the erle, promisyng to him both seruice & obeysaunce.”  
Daniel seemingly dismisses this assistance in stanza 79, referring to it as “some mutenies, And petty Lords that in our cause arose” while “those great fayld” that would have helped the English defeat the French. Nowhere does Hall minimize the potential impact of the “seruice & obyesaunce” offered to Talbot or mention that a lack of support from others was a contributing factor. Rather, Hall attributes Talbot’s loss to the French “hauyng a greater company of men, & more abundaunce of ordinaunce then before had bene sene in a battayle”. It is noteworthy that Daniel does not refer to the French “abundaunce of ordinaunce”. Earlier in the same book he had commented that with artillery “basest cowards from a far shall wound / The most coragious” (V.43.5-6). This would seem to be a perfect opportunity for him to demonstrate such an instance where firepower helped determine the outcome of a battle, overcoming a valiant, English hero. Instead he ignores Hall’s statement that a dominance of weaponry contributed to the French victory.

Daniel’s later addition of a gloss to this stanza demonstrates the lack of basis for the idea that the refusal of support from Brittany or Burgundy was a contributing factor to Talbot’s defeat. In 1609, he added the following note beside this stanza (then VI.74): “The Dukes of Brittany and Burgundy were great meanes in times past for the Conquering of France.” In substantiating this stanza, the best that Daniel could muster was that “in times past” England had enjoyed the support of Brittany and Burgundy. There was no such request for or refusal of such aid at the time of Talbot’s defeat for Daniel to cite, at least not as described by the

---

43 Hall, *Union*, fol. CLXVr.  
44 Hall, *Union*, fol. CLXVIr.
English chroniclers, including Stow, Daniel’s frequent source for historical details added to the notes in the 1609 edition of *The Civil Wars*.45

Daniel seems to have invented a lack of support from England’s neighbors as a reason for the English defeat. An atypical circumstance for the poet who claimed to “versifie the troth, not poetize” (I.6.8). Although Daniel’s problematic claim runs at odds with numerous artistic elements of *The Civil Wars*, he rarely included historical details completely unsupported by his sources; more typically he silently made choices between conflicting sources.46 Why did Daniel attribute Talbot’s defeat, unhistorically, to a lack of support from Brittany and Burgundy? The answer to this question may lie in contemporary events. Throughout 1595 and into 1596, leading up to the English attack on Cadiz, Essex sought to convince Elizabeth and Burghley to align with France and the Netherlands in opposing Spain. Specifically, he wanted Elizabeth to provide the troops requested by Henri to defend against the Spanish who had taken Picardy by force during the summer of 1595.47 This is the issue being discussed in his “Pluto” letter to Perez, described earlier. Elizabeth (whom Essex analogizes to Juno) opposed providing such support, seeing it as increasing French dominance of the continent. Instead she threatened to negotiate peace with Spain. Essex (like Aeneas) was seeking a foreign alliance on behalf of his queen which she herself opposed but which he believed was in England’s best interest. Daniel’s emphasis on the need for such alliances parallels arguments

45 Wright, “Daniel’s Use of Sources”, pp. 66-67.
46 Wright, “Daniel’s Use of Sources”, pp. 61-64. Daniel’s distinction shares something with Hayden White’s analysis of the concerns of expressing history in narrative form: “Thus conceived, the literary aspect of the historical narrative was supposed to inhere solely in certain stylistic embellishments . . . rather than in the kind of poetic inventiveness presumed to be characteristic of the writer of fictional narratives.” Hayden White, *The Content of the Form* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987), p. x. See also Paleit, *War, Liberty and Caesar*, pp. 65-69, for analysis of Daniel’s approach to balancing historical narrative and poetry.
being made by Essex and his supporters in 1595 and early 1596; a lack of foreign support had undone the English hero Talbot, when “those great fayld” to provide “ready quick supplyes”, and similarly France could fall to Spain if England did not come to Henri’s aid.  

Essex’s position on the alliance with France, however, began to shift in early 1596 and had fully changed by April of that year. It became increasingly apparent that Essex’s and Perez’s efforts to broker an alliance were failing as Elizabeth demanded that the French return Calais, the former English stronghold, to her control. When Spain attacked Calais in April 1596, Elizabeth refused to come to Henri’s aid, and it was clear that no English-French alliance would materialize. At this point, the earl reversed his position and now advocated an English solo attack on Spain under his leadership. In April 1596, two months before he set sail for Cadiz, Essex endorsed English offensive action and contrasted it with his former position. As described by Paul Hammer, Essex addressed a letter to Elizabeth explicitly promoting a solo English attack on Spain:

In part, the message was a reiteration of his familiar plea for bold endeavours . . . However, there was one important novelty. In arguing for the expedition, Essex explicitly advanced it as a greater priority than any new undertaking in France: ‘in the Frenche [actions] you ar but an auxiliarie or coadjutor after the

---

48 Shenk, in “Essex’s International Agenda”, pp. 81-83, makes some interesting connections between Essex’s political position in late 1595 and two entertainments, the Ascension Day entertainment titled Of Love and Self-Love performed on November 17, 1595 and the entertainment that has come to be called “the device of the Indian prince”, possibly performed in December 1595. Shenk argues that these “directly served his international agenda, revealing that the political and the poetical parts of Essex are two sides of the same coin” (p. 83).


50 For Essex’s changed position see Hammer, Polarisation, pp. 244-250; MacCaffery, Elizabeth I, pp. 495-497; Gajda, Earl of Essex, p. 72. Hammer also notes that Essex’s “Aeneas” letter, described earlier (pp. 216-217), relates to the period when Essex was shifting his position, partially reflecting his frustration with failing to get Elizabeth to support France. See Hammer, Polarisation, pp. 242-243, 245-246, and Paul Hammer, “The Smiling Crocodile: The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan ‘Popularity’ ”, in The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England, ed. by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007), pp. 95-115 (p. 103).
proportion of Switserland or pettie commonweales, [but] in this, lyke a princesse of power, you make the warr your self.¹⁵¹

By the time he shipped for Cadiz in June 1596, Essex was aggressively advocating for solo English military action. In a letter to the Privy Council, written as he was about to depart, Essex stated (spelling and punctuation modernized, see footnote):

You know it hath been the wisdom of all times rather to attempt and do something in another country, than to attend an enemy, . . . to have made a continual diversion, and to have left as it were a thorn sticking in his [Spain’s] foot had been a work worthy of such a Queen and of such a preparation; for then Her Majesty . . . should have delivered all Christendom from his fearful usurpation; . . . she should be head of the party; she only might be said to make the wars with Spain, because she made them to purpose, and they all but as her assistants and dependents.⁵²

Essex’s new position was in direct opposition to his former support for France; an unassisted English attack obviated the strategy of a unified alliance among England, France and the Netherlands. It is possible that Daniel would not have been aware of Essex’s new stance by April or May 1596, but by the time of the Cadiz attack in June, Daniel would have certainly been aware that the earl now supported offensive action. After the attack, when the earl’s supporters attempted to promote the success of the expedition and advocated for England to maintain a stronghold in Cadiz, Daniel’s statement that an English hero “who wants frends, to back what he begins / In Lands far of, gets not although he wins” could be interpreted as an endorsement of the Cecils’s position that Essex had achieved little at Cadiz.⁵³ This sentiment would have been unwelcome among those in the Essex circle, who in 1596 and 1597

surreptitiously circulated pamphlets promoting the victory, such as the descriptively titled, “The advantage her Majesty hath gotten by that which passed at Cadiz”. Before Cadiz, on the other hand, Daniel’s observation would be taken as an endorsement of Essex’s advocacy of aligning with France. The evidence suggests it plausible that Daniel was commenting on English politics and supporting the Essexian position of a French alliance as he wrote the fifth book of *The Civil Wars*.

Daniel may have begun work on the fifth book before the publication of the first four. His additions and revisions to the manuscript version of the first two books, evaluated in chapter 4, indicate that he did not always write sequentially, sometimes going back and revising work already partially completed. Yet the publication of a partial edition of the poem, *The First Four Books*, in 1595 indicates that the fifth book was not completed at the time of the printing of the poem’s initial published instalment. It seems reasonable to assume that the bulk of the fifth book was written after the first four books were submitted for printing, in late 1594 to early 1595, although admittedly portions could have been written earlier. If it was intended, in part, as contemporary political commentary, the section on Talbot seems especially likely to have been written as Essex’s negotiations with France were ongoing in mid to late 1595.

The attachment of the fifth book of *The Civil Wars* to the politics of 1595-6 establishes it as an “Essexian” text, one where history is used to guide current actions. The Essex circle was recognized for its repeated use of history, especially Roman history, to provide such practical

---

55 Lake summarizes this in *How Shakespeare Put Politics* (p. 30), “Essex was attempting to mobilise various levels of opinion to force certain policies or agendas on the queen; policies and agendas that he took to be crucial for the safety of the queen and state, but which Elizabeth herself was often anything but keen to adopt.”
This practical application of the lessons of history was already consistent with Daniel’s perspective on the instructional value of reviewing the past, as expressed in stanza I.28, a stanza that existed by the time of Daniel’s 1594 manuscript of the first two books:

In this mans raigne began this fatall strife
The bloudy argument whereof we treate;
That dearely cost so many’a Prince his life;
That spoid the weake, & euen consum’d the great,
That, wherein all calamitie was rife
That memory euen grieues her to repeate
And would that time would now this knowledge lose,
But that tis good to learne by others woes.

(FFB Q1595:I-IV, I.28)

Daniel comments that the value of studying the strife of Richard II is “to learne by others woes”. This application of the lessons of history, however, is general, differing from the provision of commentary on a specific contemporary issue. As described in chapter 5, Daniel seems to have been influenced by the Essex circle as he added material to his first four books during 1594 to 1595. I believe it likely that when Daniel came to write the fifth book, he was more strongly engaging with very specific topical issues. His writing came closer to that of Essex’s advisors who penned treatises that more explicitly interpreted their historical narratives as having pointed contemporary applications.

---

56 Numerous essays and chapters of scholarly books on Essex provide commentary on the use of history by Essex and those around him. Perhaps the most comprehensive coverage is Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, ‘‘Studied for Action’: How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy”, Past and Present, 129 (1990), 30-78. For a useful summary of essays on the topic, see Gajda, “Earl of Essex and ‘politic history’ ”, p. 252. See also Kewes, “Roman History”, pp. 250-268. Kewes describes two lesser works of Roman history informed by Essex’s agenda during the 1590s and demonstrates how they “shared their ideological underpinnings and polemical agenda” with “the sophisticated writings of Essex’s scholarly clientele” (p. 258), writings which would include Daniel’s Civil Wars.
Dating the Fifth Book

Both the identification of “fayth disguisd” with Lopez and the association of the stanzas on Talbot with Essex’s position on a French alliance support dating the fifth book of *The Civil Wars* to the period between Lopez’s execution in June 1594 and early to mid-1596, a period when the Lopez affair was still a recent memory and Essex was attempting to broker the alliance. A wide range of evidence supports the likelihood that Daniel wrote most of the fifth book during 1595 to early 1596, after he had finalized *The First Four Books*. Daniel’s potential commentary on contemporary politics also suggests that the fifth book was available in print by the June 1596 attack on Cadiz. After that date Daniel would have deleted the assertion that, “who wants frends, to back what he begins / In Lands far of, gets not although he wins”, as well as other elements of the Talbot episode that supported the desirability of seeking foreign aid. In evaluating potential influence between the fifth book of *The Civil Wars* and the *Henry VI* plays, I will consider the addition to the poem to have most likely been written between mid-1595 and early 1596, and to have been printed and made publicly available by June 1596.

In his essay on bibliographical issues surrounding *The First Four Books*, McManaway makes the case that dating the fifth book is critical for assessing the development of Daniel’s political thought and evaluating it relative to other literary works of the time:

> until we know with the greatest possible certainty how much time elapsed between the writing of Books I-IV and Book V of *The Civil Wars* it is impossible to estimate Daniel’s development as a poet. . . . If there was a long interval before the writing of Book V, were Daniel’s thought or his verse modified by the English historical plays being acted on the London stage or by the various complaints and heroic epistles being published by other poets?57

---

McManaway implies that a “long interval” between Daniel writing the first four books and the fifth is required for there to be a shift in thinking that reflects the influence of “the English historical plays being acted on the London stage”. The timeframe that I suggest between Daniel’s completion of the first four books and his writing of the fifth is short, less than a year. Nevertheless, I believe it possible that the fifth book was influenced by some of those contemporary English history plays, specifically the *Henry VI* plays. It is also possible that the nature of the influence of those plays shifted from that in the first four books as the plays were revised over time. Those possibilities will be considered in the next chapter.
Chapter 7
The First Four Books of the Civil Wars and
Theories Surrounding Revision of the Henry VI Plays

In chapter 6, I analyzed elements of the fifth book of The Civil Wars that suggest it was written between mid-1595 and early 1596. That dating makes it possible to assess influence between the fifth book and portions of the Henry VI plays that appear in F1623 but not early printed editions. Theories suggesting the plays were revised in the mid- to late 1590s imply that such revisions, as reflected in F1623, could have followed and been influenced by Daniel’s poem, rather than inspiration flowing the other way. In this chapter, I revisit textual parallels reflected in only the 1623 Folio versions of the plays and assess what theories of revisions to the plays imply about the direction and nature of influence, if any, in those parallels.

Theories Surrounding Revision of the Henry VI Plays

After suffering centuries of derision and neglect, the Henry VI plays have attracted much scholarly attention in recent years. Arguably, the most hotly debated question currently being discussed by Shakespeare scholars is “Who wrote the Henry VI plays and when?”. The plays even made headlines in the popular press when the editors of the New Oxford Shakespeare announced in late 2016 that they were attributing all three plays, in part, to Christopher Marlowe. While the press focused on authorship of the plays, the editors of The New Oxford

---

1 As cited earlier (p. 22), Michel and Seronsy reflect a dismissive attitude toward the Henry VI plays in their comment that “one can applaud” Daniel’s “discrimination” for ignoring the plays (“Shakespeare’s History Plays”, p. 569). For an overview of critical assessments of the plays, see the “Bricolage” sections that accompany the plays in the New Oxford Shakespeare: Modern Critical Edition, pp. 251-254, 331-334, 923-926.
Shakespeare adopted a similarly strong and potentially controversial stance on revisions to the plays. Embracing a hypothesis advanced by Steven Urkowitz and supplemented by Randall Martin, they assert that the Folio versions of all three plays include revisions made by Shakespeare between 1594 and 1596. Their assertion implies that the quarto of *Contention* and octavo of *True Tragedy* represent versions of two of the plays closer to those originally performed in the early 1590s. This position conflicts with the theory, generally accepted for most of the twentieth century, that the plays as printed in the First Folio represent the versions originally written and performed. The printed editions of *Contention* (Q1594) and *True Tragedy* (O1595) were believed to represent mangled and/or abridged versions of *Henry VI Parts 2 and 3* as they appeared in F1623. Theorists who held otherwise, including those who advocated multiple authorship or revision, were referred to, disparagingly, as “disintegrators.”


I will not review the full range of theories surrounding the *Henry VI* plays or the history of those theories, as there exist many fine summaries of them. Instead, I group the theories based on their assessment of potential revisions to the *Henry VI* plays and the timing of such revisions. Within each category I cite particularly influential or recent analyses and describe elements that inform, or may be informed by, an analysis of parallels between the plays and *The First Four Books*.

The explanations of differences between the earliest printed editions of the *Henry VI* plays and those in F1623 can be grouped into three categories that imply different potential relationships between the plays and *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*. The first are theories asserting that *Contention* and *True Tragedy* represent accidentally or intentionally shortened versions of two of the plays and that the three plays included in F1623 more accurately portray the plays as originally performed. These theories imply that the direction of any influence between the plays and *The First Four Books* was from the versions of the plays in F1623 to Daniel. Included in this category are advocates for memorial reconstruction (Alexander, 1929), abridgement for touring (Doran, 1928; Hattaway, 1991) and adaptation when two of the plays passed from one acting company to another (Manley and MacLean, 2014). At the opposite end of the spectrum, with respect to timing and direction of influence, are theories that the

---


F1623 versions of the plays reflect revisions made by Shakespeare in 1596 or later. These theories imply that parallels between Daniel’s poem and sections of the plays that appear in only F1623 provide possible evidence of Daniel’s influence on Shakespeare’s revisions to the plays. Among the proponents of this view are those who believe the plays were revised for revivals at the time of the initial performance of *Henry V* (Warren, 2000, 2002) or for court performances in 1596 or later (Dutton, 2016). A third category suggests the most complex interaction between *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* and the *Henry VI* plays, theories asserting that the plays were revised between 1594 and 1596 (Martin, 2001; Taylor and Loughnane, 2016). These imply that Shakespeare revised the *Henry VI* plays around the same time that Daniel was putting the finishing touches on his first four books and writing the fifth. In this instance, parallels between the poem and areas of the plays not included in the early printed editions could reflect influence in either direction or both.

I will evaluate what each of these three categories implies for the parallels that are uncertain with respect to direction of influence, including all overlap involving *Henry VI Part 1*, a play first printed many years after its initial performance. I do not intend to prove that one theory is correct and others wrong; based on the information currently available, it is not possible to reach such a definitive answer. I believe, however, that the comparison of Daniel’s poem to the plays should be an important part of the assessment of hypotheses regarding revisions to the plays.

---


As far as I know, no one has included a consideration of the relationship between Daniel’s *First Four Books* and the *Henry VI* plays in their analyses of issues surrounding the plays. This is probably due to the generally accepted assumption that Daniel was not aware of the plays and that there is, effectively, no relationship between his narration of the reign of Henry VI and that in the plays as performed in the early 1590s. Yet, even if one accepts this assumption, those who believe in revision of the plays after 1595 should take account of the parallels between Daniel’s poem and sections of the plays thought to be revised by Shakespeare. Taylor and Loughnane, for instance, contend that between 1594 and 1596 Shakespeare was making “efficient use of his reading of many of the same historical sources” to write *Richard II* and revise the *Henry VI* plays. If this was the case, Daniel’s *First Four Books of the Civil Wars*, widely accepted as a work that Shakespeare read as he wrote *Richard II*, becomes a probable source for the revisions to the *Henry VI* plays. The consideration of the relationship of such revisions to Daniel’s poem should especially inform any analysis that concludes the plays to have been revised later than the appearance of *The First Four Books* in 1595. In his book *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist*, Richard Dutton speculates that the *Henry VI* plays may have been revised in 1596 for a revival of the plays at court. If Shakespeare was revising plays about the reign of Henry VI for a court performance a year after the publication of the initial installment of Daniel’s poem, he almost certainly would have taken account of a work on the same topic that was both widely-praised among the aristocracy and familiar to him.

---

10 Dutton proposes that “the rewriting might have been connected with the anomalous 1596/7 Revels season, when the Chamberlain’s Men were the only troupe at court, performing a then-unprecedented six plays”, *Shakespeare, Court Dramatist*, p. 209.
It should be noted that theories holding that the F1623 texts of the *Henry VI* plays include revisions do not necessarily imply that the quarto/octeto versions of *Contention* and *True Tragedy* represent accurate versions of the plays as originally performed. Randall Martin has concluded that *True Tragedy* represents both an earlier, pre-revision, version of *3H6* and an imperfect, memorially reported text. Nevertheless, where early printed versions of the plays exist, I use the differences between those versions and those in F1623 as the best indicator of areas revised, if, in fact, F1623 reflects revisions. It remains possible that some of the differences may be explained as the result of faulty reporting in the early editions.

Lastly, my categorization of theories surrounding the *Henry VI* plays focuses on the question of possible revision of the plays, not authorship. The possibility that the plays were revised is more critical to my analysis than the consideration of who wrote them; I am assessing the direction and nature of influence between the plays and Daniel’s poem regardless of authorship. In my analysis, however, I identify areas where Shakespeare’s authorship has been questioned and evaluate how authorship impacts the analysis.

In considering questions surrounding authorship and revision of the *Henry VI* plays and their relationship to Daniel’s poem, it is also useful to keep in mind Michael Baxandall’s observation that the artist who engages with another’s work is the active participant in the exchange. Recognizing this, one has a basis to assess the intent behind the engagement. Assessments of possible intent – contradiction, expansion, appropriation, adaptation, etc. –

---

play a role in my investigation as to whether one chronology (and resulting direction of influence) has a higher probability than another.

Analysis of Parallels, “Kaleidoscope Principle”, and Wind-Wave Imagery

In Chapter 2, I detailed nine parallels between the Henry VI plays and The First Four Books of the Civil Wars. For four of them the direction of potential influence was clear: from the plays to Daniel. The elements being analyzed were substantially identical in the early printed versions of the plays and those in the First Folio. Those four, as numbered in Chapter 2 (p. 49) are as follows:

1. Suffolk’s woeful parting from Margaret (FFB, IV.107; Contention Q1594, sigs. F1r-v; 2H6, III.2.293-416),
2. Suffolk’s murder by pirates (FFB, IV.Argument, IV.103; Contention Q1594, sigs. F2r-v; 2H6, IV.1),
3. Gloucester as Henry’s crutch (FFB, IV.92; Contention Q1594, sigs. D4r-v; 2H6, III.1.189-190),
4. York’s instigation of Cade’s rebellion (FFB, IV.112; Contention Q1594, sigs. E1v-E2v; 2H6, III.1.355-381).

The remaining five parallels enumerated in Chapter 2 each have elements that complicate the analysis of potential influence (as noted parenthetically below):

2. Margaret’s reaction to Suffolk’s death (FFB, IV.104 parallels Contention, sigs. H4v-G1v, but is more similar to Henry VI Part 2, IV.4),
4. Suffolk compared to Paris (FFB, IV.64 parallels Henry VI Part 1, V.6.103-108),
5. Death of young Talbot (FFB, V.100 parallels Henry VI Part 1, IV.7.1-16),
8. Heroic feats of the reinvigorated Talbot (FFB, V.97-98 parallels Henry VI Part 1, V.5.12-26),
9. Wind-wave imagery to describe a battle (FFB, V.96 parallels True Tragedy, C2v, but is much closer to Henry VI Part 3, II.5.1-13).

In the following sections of this chapter, I consider the implications that the three categories of theories of revisions to the Henry VI plays have on the assessment of these five parallels.
Obviously, this makes for many moving parts and numerous potential permutations. The analysis is reminiscent of something that Andrew Gurr, in evaluating the membership of the acting companies of the early 1590s, describes as “the kaleidoscope principle”:

Sorting out the evidence . . . is a tortuous exercise in what might be called the kaleidoscope principle. Shake the fragments of evidence and you make one pattern, then shake them up again and find a different one.\(^{13}\)

The differing perspectives on revision of the *Henry VI* plays offer greatly varying answers to the pattern suggested by the parallels identified in Chapter 2. To assist in keeping the analysis straight, I will focus especially on one parallel, one fragment within the kaleidoscope: the wind-wave imagery (parallel #9) from Daniel’s fifth book and *Henry VI Part 3*. The relationship between Daniel’s use of the imagery of winds battling waves in stanza V.96 and that in Henry’s observations on the molehill at the Battle of Towton (*3H6* II.5) embodies the full range of questions surrounding the poem and the plays. Daniel employed the imagery in the fifth book, printed between 1595 and 1599; it, therefore, could precede or follow revisions to the *Henry VI* plays. It is a parallel with some of the closest verbal echoes among those evaluated in chapter 2, suggesting that influence is probable. Lastly, the imagery from *Henry VI Part 3* has been analyzed extensively and is considered by some to be central to the play.

Randall Martin, following the lead of an earlier analysis by Alvin Kernan, identifies the imagery as strong evidence of Shakespeare’s revision and re-imagination of the play:

> When he [Henry] . . . describes the Battle of Towton at the beginning of 2.5, he compares it to the everyday ebb and flow of elemental forces . . . Henry’s perspective becomes all the more fascinating when one compares Shakespeare’s two versions of the play. For this class of metaphors is almost completely absent in *True Tragedy* . . . The introduction of wind, sea, and tide imagery not only suggests Shakespeare revised the play reported by *True Tragedy*, but also sheds light on his evolved historical interpretation of the Wars of the Roses.\(^{14}\)

\(^{13}\) Andrew Gurr, “The Chimera of Amalgamation”, *Theatre Research International*, 18 (1993), 85-93 (pp. 87-88).

Kernan, who similarly believes that 3H6 reflects Shakespeare’s revisions, describes the imagery as “the comprehensive symbol in” the newly revised play:

the comprehensive symbol in 3 Henry VI is a sea-wind-tide figure in which the sea is now forced toward the land by the tide and now blown back by the wind.\(^\text{15}\)

Kernan cites ten examples of the use of the imagery in 3H6 that do not appear in The True Tragedy.\(^\text{16}\) In only two instances are there hints in O1595 for the imagery employed in the F1623 version of the play. The “mastless ship” (see pp. 48-49) in The True Tragedy version of Henry’s observations at Towton (O1595, sig. C2\(^{v}\)) bears some relationship to his description of the tide combatting the wind in 3H6 (II.5) and Margaret’s use of ship-faring imagery in rallying her troops in True Tragedy (O1595, sig. E3\(^{v}\)) includes a much shorter, less-detailed version of a long invocation of the elements in the Folio version of the play (3H6, V.4).\(^\text{17}\)

Because his analysis covers only 3H6, Kernan does not cite an analogous instance of the use of the imagery in 2H6 that is only hinted at in Contention. In the quarto version of the play, Margaret briefly describes how the “sea” and “winds” impeded her approach to England:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Was I for this nigh wrackt vpon the sea,} \\
\text{And thrise by awkward winds driuen back from Englands bounds,} \\
\text{What might it bode, but that well foretelling} \\
\text{Winds, said, seeke not a scorpions neast.} \\
\text{(Contention, Q1594, sig. E2\(^{v}\))}
\end{align*}
\]


\(^{16}\) Kernan, “Comparison of the Imagery”, pp. 433-440. Kernan cites the following sections of 3H6: (1) I.4.1-4, 19-21; (2) II.5.5-9; (3) II.6.32-35; (4) III.2.135-140; (5) III.3.4-6, 48-49; (6) IV.3.58-59; (7) IV.8.54-56; (8) V.1.153-58; (9) V.3.10-11; (10) V.4.3-38.

In the Folio version of the play, Margaret’s speech continues for another 35 lines and includes multiple invocations of the powers of the “winde” and the “Sea”, personifying the efforts of the natural elements that played a role in her journey:

Was I for this nye wrack’d vpon the Sea,
And twice by awkward winde from Englands banke
Droue backe againe vnto my Natiue Clime.
What boaded this? but well fore-warning winde
Did seeme to say, seeke not a Scorpions Nest,
Nor set no footing on this vnkinde Shore.
What did I then? But curst the gentle gusts,
And he that loos’d them forth their Brazen Caues,
And bid them blow towards Englands blessed shore, . . .
The pretty vaulting Sea refus’d to drowne me,
Knowing that thou wouldst haue me drown’d on shore
With teares as salt as Sea, through thy vnkindnesse. . . .
As farre as I could ken thy Chalky Cliffes,
When from thy Shore, the Tempest beate vs backe,
I stood vpon the Hatches in the storme: . . .
I tooke a costly Iewell from my necke,
A Hart it was bound in with Diamonds,
And threw it towards thy Land: The Sea receiu’d it. . . .

(2H6, F1623, sig. N3v; 2H6 III.2.82-110)

Even if one does not agree with Martin and Kernan that the wind-sea imagery reflects Shakespeare’s revision of earlier plays, it is clearly an important element of the Folio versions of 2H6 and 3H6. Accordingly, the question of whether Shakespeare’s imagery inspired Daniel or vice-versa gains prominence in evaluating the relationship between the two writers. If Martin is correct that the imagery reflects Shakespeare’s “evolved historical interpretation of the Wars of the Roses”, is the influence of Daniel’s poem part of that evolution? Alternatively, was Shakespeare’s poetic vision one that garnered enough of Daniel’s attention for him to appropriate the imagery from the battle of Towton in 3H6 and transplant it to Talbot’s defeat in his fifth book? It is an important fragment within the kaleidoscope, one to be tracked as the pieces move about and one that may help identify the most likely pattern formed around it.

Each of the three sections below, therefore, begins with this parallel.
Theories That F1623 Versions of Henry VI Plays Represent the Plays as Originally Written

Theories based on the presumption that the F1623 versions of the Henry VI plays were written and performed in the early 1590s imply that any influence between the Henry VI plays and The First Four Books of the Civil Wars flowed from the plays to Daniel. These theories suggest that the wind-wave imagery in 3H6 existed in the play as originally performed and was omitted, for some reason, from O1595. This would mean that Daniel recalled and borrowed the imagery for his fifth book years after seeing Henry VI Part 3 in performance. It is possible that he could have written a description of winds battling waves soon after seeing the play and reserved it for later use.\(^\text{18}\) It is also possible that there was a revival of the play closer to Daniel’s composition of the fifth book. Although these possibilities exist, theories that the imagery was included in the scene as originally performed suggest that Daniel had seen a version of 3H6 in 1592, that he retained a detailed memory of the wind-wave imagery and that he used it much later while writing the fifth book of his poem.

If the F1623 versions of the Henry VI plays preceded the early printed editions, the plays’ influence on the fourth and fifth books of Daniel’s poem was extensive. That influence would include all nine parallels analyzed in chapter 2, parallels that demonstrate how Daniel may have used the plays to help him shape the unwieldy material that comprises the 39 years of Henry VI’s reign. He borrowed Margaret and Suffolk’s relationship depicted in 1H6 and 2H6,

\(^{18}\) Note taking at theatrical performances was not unusual, as theater-goers would sometimes record quotations from plays in commonplace books. For an example see Blair Worden’s reference to Edward Pudsey’s commonplace book which includes “pithy statements from plays by Jonson and others” recorded “alongside quotations from historical chronicles.” Worden, “Historians and Poets”, p. 86. See also Mack, Elizabethan Rhetoric, pp. 44-45 and Woolf, Reading History, pp. 96-100, 106-107, for descriptions of note taking and commonplace books in early modern England.
the pair’s woeful parting, Suffolk’s murder by pirates and the queen’s reaction to her lover’s death. He adopted the plays’ characterization of the loyal Gloucester and of the scheming York who secretly instigated Cade’s rebellion. He incorporated multiple elements of Talbot’s defeat from *1H6* into the fifth book, a work he wrote years after he may have first seen the plays. The extent of the plays’ impact would encompass not only the nine areas of overlap analyzed in chapter 2, but also the six further similarities identified but not reviewed (see p. 50), for instance Daniel’s reference to Warwick as the “King-maker” who “Monarchs makes, and made, againe puts downe”. In that chapter I mentioned those six parallels but did not assess them in detail as they were supported by common sources. If Daniel was heavily influenced by the plays, however, those also become areas of plausible influence. This would suggest that Daniel found inspiration in fifteen or more areas of *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* from plays that he saw performed years before writing parts of his poem that reflected their influence. This level of engagement implies great familiarity with all three plays and with sections that span scenes debated with respect to authorship, some thought potentially to be by Marlowe (Suffolk’s death by pirates; Margaret with Suffolk’s decapitated head) and others widely accepted to be Shakespeare’s (Henry’s dismissal of Gloucester; Margaret and Suffolk’s parting). If the First Folio versions of the plays preceded the first edition of Daniel’s poem, the poet’s engagement with the plays was deep and pervasive, regardless of the authorship of individual scenes and sections.

---

Theories That the *Henry VI* Plays Were Revised in the Late 1590s

Theories contending that the *Henry VI* plays were revised in 1596 or later imply that differences between the printed versions of the plays document revisions influenced by Daniel’s poem. The most apparent reflection of this is the wind-wave imagery in *3H6* that is only hinted at in *True Tragedy*. These theories suggest that Shakespeare read Daniel’s poem, was inspired by the poet’s description of a battle as a war between wind and waves, closely mirrored it in Henry’s philosophical speech at Towton in *3H6*, and embraced the imagery as a dominant theme for his revisions to *2H6* and *3H6*.

If the plays were revised after 1596, Shakespeare may have also read Daniel’s version of Margaret’s complaint upon learning of Suffolk’s death and decided to add lines for his queen as she lamented over her lover’s decapitated head in *2H6*. In the revised play, the formerly silent, grieving queen now addresses Suffolk as Daniel’s did after learning of her lover’s death in the fourth book of *The First Four Books*. If this addition indicates revisions inspired by Daniel, it may reflect the influence that Daniel’s characterization of Margaret had on Shakespeare’s development of his queen between the first version of the play and its revision. In her 2000 essay “Bad Memories of Margaret? Memorial Reconstruction versus Revision in *The First Part of the Contention* and 2 *Henry VI*”, Barbara Kreps points out that differences between Margaret’s character in *2H6* and *Contention* reflect a significantly different interpretation of the queen in the two works.20 Among the changes that Kreps highlights is an

---

increased emphasis in 2H6 on Margaret’s intellectual abilities, emphasizing her “minde”, “wit” and “wisdome” that causes Henry to fall to “wondring”.\textsuperscript{21} She cites, for instance, the introductory exchange between Margaret and Henry in 2H6 that includes references to her intellect absent from Contention, the earlier play portraying a more respectful, submissive queen (both versions presented below, my emphasis in bold):

\begin{quote}
Queene. Th’excessiue loue I beare vnto your grace,  
Forbids me to be lauish of my tongue, 
Least I should speake more then beseemes a woman:  
Let this suffice, my blisse is in your liking, . . .  
King. Her lookes did wound, but now her speech doth pierce,  
Louely Queene Margaret sit downe by my side: . . .  
\textit{(Contention, Q1594, sig. A2\textsuperscript{v})}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Queen.} The mutuall conference that my minde hath had . . .  
With you mine Alder liefest Soueraigne,  
Makes me the bolder to salute my King,  
With ruder termes, such as my wit affoords. . . .  
And ouer ioy of heart doth minister.  
King. Her sight did rauish, but her grace in Speech,  
Her words yclad with wisedomes Maiesty,  
Makes me from Wondring, fall to Weeping ioyes,  
\textit{(2H6, F1623, sig. M2\textsuperscript{v}; 2H6, I.1.25-34)}
\end{quote}

The revised version of Margaret’s character bears a resemblance to Daniel’s description of the queen when he introduces her in Book IV, similarly highlighting the “mind” and “wit” that the poet “must wonder at” (again, my emphasis in bold):

\begin{quote}
Deare didst thou buy o king so faire a wife,  
So rare a spirit, so high a minde the while: . . .  
I grieue that I am forst to say thus much,  
To blame her, that I yet must wonder at;  
Whose so sweet beauty, wit and worth were such,  
As euerlasting admiration gat: . . .  
\textit{(FFB Q1595:l-IV, IV.64.1-2 . . . IV.65.1-4)}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{21} Kreps, “Bad Memories of Margaret?”, p. 164.
Kreps points out the more active role the Queen exerts in 2H6, relative to that in *Contention*. She cites changes in the scene (2H6 I.3) where Margaret and Suffolk encounter petitioners who erroneously hand their complaints to Suffolk, thinking him to be Gloucester. In the quarto version of that scene, Margaret’s frustration with Gloucester focuses on the personal affront to her and “immediately gives way to her greater fury against ‘Elanor’ ”.22 In the F1623 version, on the other hand, Margaret expresses her frustration that Gloucester treats Henry as a “Pupill” and that she is “a Queene in Title and Stile” but “must be made a Subject to a Duke”, focusing on her role in the government. Again, the new emphasis mirrors Daniel’s treatment of her character in a section where he describes her ambitious resentment of Gloucester’s role and her scheming to have him pushed aside. In the section, Daniel uses the word “pupillage” a variation of the word “Pupill”, used in 2H6 but not *Contention*:

For this *Duke as Protector* many yeares
Had rul’d the land, during the kings young age:
And now the selfe same charge and title beares
As if he still were in his pupillage:
With such disgrace vnto the Queene appeares
That all incensd with an ambitious rage
She doth conspire to haue him made awaie,
As who the course of her maine will doth staie.

(*FFB* Q1595:I-IV, IV.72)

And taking all the rule into her hand
(Vnder the shadowe of that feeble king)
The *Duke* sh’excludes from office and command, . . .

(*FFB* Q1595:I-IV, IV.80.1-3)

The characterization of Margaret in 2H6 mirrors Daniel’s depiction of a strong queen who assumes political power upon her arrival in England, a characterization only hinted at in *Contention*. If Shakespeare’s revisions followed the appearance of *The First Four Books*, his development of Margaret’s character seems to be influenced by Daniel’s poem.

---

22 Kreps, “Bad Memories of Margaret?”, p. 166.
The analysis of potential revisions to *Henry VI Part 1* is more complicated than that of the other two plays. For *Parts 2* and *3*, variants between the early printed editions and the versions in F1623 point to areas where the plays may have been revised. That is not the case with *Part 1*, for which only one printed edition exists, that in F1623. As a result, it is less clear what, if any, sections of the play may have been revised. Theories regarding revisions to *1H6* generally focus on two areas—scenes thought to be by Shakespeare, rather than other playwrights, and sections that provide clear links to *Parts 2* and *3*.

The least complicated analysis for an element included in *1H6* is for the echo of Suffolk being compared to Paris as he fetches Margaret from France. This is from the final scene of the play, a scene considered by some to be of uncertain authorship. The scene provides one of the clearest links with *Henry VI Part 2*; it ends with Suffolk introducing his adulterous relationship with Margaret and his scheming for political power, the storylines that begin *Part 2*. If *1H6* was adapted from the standalone play *harey the vj*, to become part of the trilogy of plays about Henry VI, this section of the final scene of the play may have been part of that revision. As such, it could have been influenced by Daniel’s fourth book, which includes a similar analogy at the same point in its narrative. Daniel’s question “What Paris brought this booty of desire / To set our mighty Ilium on fire” became Shakespeare’s “thus he goes / As did the youthful Paris once to Greece”. If the scene was lightly revised to serve as an introduction to *2H6*, it is unlikely that any test will definitively identify authorship or detect Shakespeare’s hand. In this regard, it is helpful to keep in mind Taylor and Loughnane’s comment on revisions to *1H6*:

---

Many exact details of Shakespeare’s alterations of the original ‘harey the vj’ will remain uncertain, even when larger chunks of added text can be attributed confidently.\textsuperscript{24}

I believe that the link between the end of the scene in 1H6 and the opening of 2H6 provides evidence of revision, if 1H6 was, in fact, revised. The parallel with Daniel, further, indicates the influence of his poem if the play was revised in 1596 or later, since the comparison of Suffolk to Paris was included in Daniel’s 1595 fourth book.

The overlap between Daniel’s depiction of Talbot’s defeat and that in 1H6 is less clear as to direction of influence, because of uncertainty surrounding both the timing of Daniel’s fifth book and revisions to the play. The section of the play depicting Talbot’s death clearly existed in the play as originally performed, as evidenced by Nashe’s 1592 reference to it. It is uncertain, however, if that section of the play was originally performed exactly as included in F1623. The fourth act of 1H6, which includes Talbot’s defeat, is among the most vigorously debated sections of the play, with statistical analyses not clearly identifying any one author and literary scholars disagreeing about authorship of individual scenes, and even portions of scenes, based on literary merits (as described below). It is, therefore, necessary to assess individually the elements shared between Daniel’s poem and the play and consider criticism of the specific scene from 1H6 involved.

The section of 1H6 where Talbot describes his newfound vigor and heroic feats is from IV.6, a scene that has often been regarded as a possible duplicate of the scene traditionally labeled IV.5 (IV.4 in the New Oxford Shakespeare), with one perhaps being intended as a replacement

\textsuperscript{24} Taylor and Loughnane, “Canon and Chronology”, p. 516.
for the other. In all such analyses, however, IV.6 is considered the inferior scene, the one intended to be replaced by IV.5.25 No analysis identifies IV.6 as a revision or addition. The New Oxford Shakespeare cites John Jowett’s speculation that the scenes traditionally labeled IV.4 and IV.5 were additions to the play, made on a leaf whose opposing sides were accidentally transposed when inserted into the First Folio; hence the reversal of those two scenes in the New Oxford Shakespeare critical edition of the play.26 Under all these scenarios, IV.6 existed in the original version of the play. The tenor of the scene, with its description of Talbot’s heroic feats, is also consistent with Nashe’s description of how Talbot “should triumphe againe on the Stage”.27 The scene, in its form included in F1623, seems to have existed in the play as originally performed and could have served as part of Daniel’s inspiration to include Talbot’s defeat in his poem. I consider this a plausible example of the play influencing Daniel and not the poet inspiring revisions to the play, regardless of when those revisions were made.

The description of young Talbot rushing on the French, a description paralleled between Daniel’s fifth book and 1H6, is included in the beginning of IV.7, a section of the scene that also includes Talbot’s death. Some (E. Pearlman, Paul J. Vincent, Hugh Craig) have regarded this section of the scene as Shakespearean and evidence of a revision while Brian Vickers argues that IV.7 was written by the same author as IV.6, a scene he sees as non-

27 Nashe, Pierce Penniless, sig. F3r.
Regardless of whether all, part or none of IV.7 was by Shakespeare, I agree with Vickers’ assessment that IV.6 and the opening of IV.7 are linked. The unhistorical description in IV.6 of Young Talbot fighting with the Dauphin and being rescued by his father from “Alanson, Orleance” and “Burgundie” introduces the theme completed in IV.7 when Talbot describes his son being killed as he rushed “Into the clustring Battaile of the French”. The fact that both IV.6 and IV.7 include parallels to Daniel, supports the idea that the two are related. Either both influenced him or the two were revised based on his descriptions of Talbot’s feats and young Talbot’s death. Since no analysis identifies IV.6 as a revision to the play, I believe that both existed in harey the vj as originally performed and that this is an unlikely area for Daniel’s fifth book to have influenced a revision reflected in Henry VI Part 1.

In summary, if the Henry VI plays were revised in 1596 or later, it appears that Daniel was influenced by elements of Acts III and IV of Contention and by the depiction of Talbot’s defeat in Act IV of Henry VI Part 1 as they were originally performed. His poem, in turn, seems to have inspired revisions to all three plays – the introduction of the wind-wave theme (in Parts 2 and 3), changes to Margaret’s character (in Part 2) and the comparison of Suffolk to Paris (in Part 1).

Theories That the Henry VI Plays Were Revised between 1594 and 1596

Theories that the Henry VI plays were revised between 1594 and 1596, soon after the formation of the Chamberlain’s Men, offer three possible scenarios for the timing of revisions relative to the composition of sections of Daniel’s poem. Revisions could have preceded

---

Daniel’s completion of the first four books of the poem; they could have been made between the dates of his completion of those books and his composition of the fifth book; or they could have followed the fifth book. The first of these scenarios implies the same direction and type of influence as that if the F1623 versions of the plays were those originally performed. The third scenario duplicates that as if revisions were made in the late 1590s. It is the second of these scenarios that is distinct – the possibility that the plays were revised, in part, based upon Daniel’s first four books and that he adopted elements of those revised plays while writing the fifth book.

If the revisions adding wind-wave imagery to Henry VI Parts 2 and 3 were made after the first four books but before the fifth, those revisions were quickly taken up by Daniel in his narration of Talbot’s defeat. It would imply that Henry VI Part 3 had been revised and performed as Daniel was writing the fifth book, in 1595 to 1596, soon after completing the first four. This could account for the close parallels in wording between Daniel’s poem, in its use of wind-wave imagery, and the play. The poet may have seen a revival of the plays staged just as he was adding a fifth book to his poem.

The parallels between the fourth book of The First Four Books and Henry VI Part 2 in their depictions of Margaret’s reaction to Suffolk’s death offer an intriguing possibility of mutual influence if the play was revised between 1594 and 1596. Daniel’s inclusion of the queen’s reaction could have been prompted by the original play in which she carried Suffolk’s severed head and wordlessly grieved over it. The scene may have inspired him to write a complaint for Margaret, one in the vein of his Complaint of Rosamond. That complaint appeared in The First Four Books of the Civil Wars and then gave rise to Shakespeare’s addition of Margaret’s
lines in 2H6 IV.4. This could explain the mixed elements in Act IV identified by authorship studies. Craig asserts that the emphasis on severed heads in Act IV “recalls stagecraft like Marlowe’s at the end of Edward II” while Taylor and Loughnane assign IV.4 to Shakespeare but note that “Act 4 is almost as Marlovian as it is Shakespearean”.29 The original version of the scene, with a severed head but no lines for Margaret, could be Marlowe’s and the addition Shakespeare’s, inspired by Daniel. Based upon my suggestion of Shakespeare’s possible access to a manuscript version of the poem, the playwright’s inspiration could have feasibly come from a manuscript of the first four books. The existence of such a manuscript that included the fourth book, however, is speculative, since no such extant manuscript exists (only manuscripts of the first three books). Accordingly, the more plausible case, if this scenario does accurately describe the relationship between the works, is that Henry VI Part 2 was revised after the appearance of The First Four Books in 1595 but before the addition of the fifth book, a book that reflects the influence of revisions made to the plays.

Steven Urkowitz believes that changes in stage directions and implied characters’ actions between the early printed editions of the Henry VI plays and the First Folio versions reflect Shakespeare’s development of characters between the two versions of the plays, especially the characterization of Margaret.30 He notes that the seated queen in the opening scene of The Contention presents a different image than the stronger standing one in the same scene of Henry VI Part 2.31 In Contention, Henry asks Margaret to sit by his side whereas in 2H6 he

29 Craig, “Three Parts of Henry VI”, p. 73; Taylor and Loughnane, “Canon and Chronology”, p. 496.
30 Steven Urkowitz, “‘I am not made of stone’: Theatrical Revision of Gesture in Shakespeare’s Plays”, Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme, 10 (1986), 79-93.
31 Urkowitz, “I am not made of stone”, pp. 80-82.
does not (see 2H6 I.1, quoted on p. 247). A similar development may be implied by the change from a queen who wordlessly weeps in *Contention* (a stage action implied by Henry’s question, “How now madam, still lamenting and mourning for Suffolkes death”, *Contention* Q1595, sig. G1r) to one who says she will “Thinke therefore on reuenge, and cease to weepe” in 2H6 (2H6 F1623, sig. N6v; 2H6, IV.4.3). As with the increasing focus on Margaret’s “wit” and “mind”, this could reflect an evolution of the character influenced by Daniel’s first four books. In the fourth book of his poem, after having the dead Suffolk accuse Margaret, in her mind, of not strenuously defending him, Daniel has the queen conclude, “No Suffoke, none of this, my soule is cleere” (*FFB* IV.110.1). Daniel’s queen is intellectually strong, a character closer to the Margaret of *Henry VI Part 2* than the queen of *Contention*. If the play was revised between 1594 and 1596, just as if it was revised thereafter, the revisions to Margaret’s character may reflect the impact of Daniel’s poem.

Due to the nature of the specific areas of overlap, the analysis of parallels to *Henry VI Part 1* is similar whether it is believed that the play was revised between 1594 and 1596 or after 1596. Suffolk’s line in the final scene, where he compares himself to Paris, is a possible revision to the play inspired by the analogy in Daniel’s fourth book. The descriptions of the elder Talbot’s vigor and of young Talbot rushing on the French, included in Daniel’s fifth book, may reflect the play’s influence on the poet, since those elements of 1H6 seem to have been included in the play as originally performed.

If the plays were revised between 1594 and 1596, influence flowed in both directions. In this scenario, *Contention* influenced Daniel’s first four books which, in turn, inspired revisions to that play, especially in its depiction of Margaret. The wind-wave imagery in the revised
version of *Henry VI Part 3* influenced Daniel’s fifth book. *Henry VI Part 1*, likely as originally performed, inspired Daniel’s description of Talbot’s defeat in the fifth book, while his comparison of Suffolk to Paris in the fourth book influenced a revision to that play. During this period, the two authors were writing in tandem, both influencing each other.

**Which Scenario Seems Most Likely?**

I have described three scenarios that imply different relationships between *The First Four Books* and the *Henry VI* plays, based on differing theories of revisions to the plays: that the plays were not revised, that they were revised after 1596 and that they were revised between 1594 and 1596. As noted earlier, one parallel illustrates the relationship implied by each scenario – the wind-wave imagery included in Daniel’s fifth book and in the folio version of 3H6 but not True Tragedy. If the plays were not revised, then Daniel picked up the imagery from a performance of the play in the early 1590s or a later revival and used it in a book that he wrote much later, transferring the imagery from the battle of Towton to Talbot’s defeat. If the plays were revised after 1596, Shakespeare was inspired by Daniel’s imagery to incorporate it throughout his revisions to the plays and make it a dominant theme. If the plays were revised and performed between 1594 and 1596, then Daniel saw them just as he was writing his fifth book and their influence on that book became more direct and closer than the influence of the earlier versions of the plays on his first four books. Of course, a further possibility, one that spans all scenarios, is that the overlap in wind-wave imagery is coincidence, reflecting two authors of similar minds writing descriptions of battles that happen to use the same personification of the elements and many of the same words.
Of these four possibilities, I find most plausible the scenario that encompasses revisions to the plays between 1594 and 1596, after Daniel’s first four books but before the fifth. If the wind-wave imagery existed in *Henry VI Part 3* as originally performed and Daniel saw it in the early 1590s, it would be surprising that he could recall so many of the specific words from it for a book he added years later, even if he had recorded part of Henry’s speech at the time he saw it performed. Considering the other extreme, revisions to the plays in the late 1590s, after Daniel’s fifth book, it would also be surprising if Daniel’s sole use of the imagery in the fifth book of his poem inspired pervasive revisions to *Henry VI Parts 2* and *3*. Using Schoone-Jongen’s framework (possible, plausible, probable), these alternative explanations remain possible, but the addition of the imagery to the plays between 1594 and 1596, influencing Daniel’s fifth book, seems most plausible. Further factors support this conclusion.

Kernan’s and Martin’s analyses of the differences between *The True Tragedy* and *Henry VI Part 3* suggest that the wind-wave imagery represents an important revision of that play, one that reflects a sustained, progressive evolution in Shakespeare’s thinking about the English civil wars of the fifteenth century. This indicates that the plays were, in fact, revised and contradicts theories that the Folio versions of the plays preceded the early printed editions.\(^{32}\) It is implausible that the ten instances of that imagery in *3H6* were somehow forgotten or purposely excised from the play to become *True Tragedy*. There is no good explanation why someone would remove substantially all uses of the imagery given its poetic and dramatic value. Henry’s philosophical observations at Towton, for instance, are less effective without it. I note that Manley and MacLean’s analysis, in which they assert that various elements of...
the F1623 versions of the plays were integral parts of the original plays written for Strange’s Men, does not address this pervasive imagery.

The idea that the wind-wave imagery represents Shakespearean revisions is also supported by recent authorship studies of the plays, especially 3H6. Most of the scenes that include such imagery are widely agreed to be Shakespeare’s and none are clearly identified as being by Marlowe or any author other than Shakespeare. In chapter 2 (p. 47), I identified an analogue for the description of winds guiding the waves in Christopher Marlowe’s translation of the first book of Lucan’s *Pharsalia*. If many instances of the use of the imagery in the plays were in scenes thought to be Marlowe’s that would support the possibility that he, inspired by Lucan, had introduced the imagery to the play. Instead, the overwhelming evidence is that the imagery is Shakespeare’s. Taylor and Loughnane divide individual scenes of 3H6 into three categories, those where different statistical analyses agree the scene to be by Shakespeare, those agreed to be Marlowe’s, and those where such analyses differ. Scene II.5, the scene with Henry on the molehill at Towton, is agreed to be by Shakespeare, as are six more (I.4, II.6, III.2, V.1, V.3, V.4) of the scenes cited by Kernan as including wind-wave imagery. None of the three scenes agreed to be Marlowe’s (I.1, II.3 and V.2) are among those cited by Kernan. Three of the scenes (III.3, IV.3, IV.8) included in Kernan’s analysis are unclear as to authorship. The imagery of wind and waves in those scenes, however, is extremely limited, consisting of the following two sections from III.3 and one each from IV.3 and IV.8:

*Margaret:* No, mightie King of France: now *Margaret*
Must strike her sayle, and learne a while to serue,
Where Kings command.

(3H6, F1623, sig. P4v; 3H6, III.3.4-6)

*Margaret:* I now begins a second Storme to rise,

---

For this is hee that moues both Winde and Tyde.

(3H6, F1623, sig. P5r; 3H6, III.3.47-48)

Edward: What Fates impose, that men must needs abide;
It boots not to resist both winde and tide.

(3H6, F1623, sig. Q1r; 3H6, IV.3.58-59)

Edward: You are the Fount, that makes small Brookes to flow,
Now stops thy Spring, my Sea shall suck them dry,
And swell so much the higher, by their ebbe.

(3H6, F1623, sig. Q2v; 3H6, IV.8.54-56)

The wind-wave imagery used in ten scenes of 3H6 is almost certainly Shakespeare’s. The extended use of it in 2H6 is also in a section of the play (Act III) unanimously identified as Shakespeare’s. It remains possible that these represent Shakespearean revisions that followed Daniel’s poem, but it is unlikely that they are Marlovian or that they existed in the original versions of the plays and were excised from Contention and True Tragedy.

I similarly find it implausible that Daniel’s one use of wind-wave imagery to describe a battle in his fifth book inspired Shakespeare’s wholesale revisions to Parts 2 and 3. Rather, it seems that Daniel found in the revised version of 3H6 an appropriately poetic way to express the violence of battle, an area for which his more reserved style was ill-suited. Ben Jonson, famously, and somewhat inaccurately, quipped that “Daniell wrott the civill warres & yett hath not one batle in all his Book”. George M. Logan describes how Daniel borrowed in this section of the poem from Lucan’s description of Caesar at Pharsalia. He calls the “heroic last stand of Talbot . . . Daniel’s greatest success in this kind” and states that “Lucan’s striking

34 Taylor and Loughnane, “Canon and Chronology”, p. 496.
36 Logan, “Daniel’s Civil Wars and Lucan’s Pharsalia”, pp. 63-64.
descriptions of combat . . . were obviously valuable to the very unmartial Daniel”. I agree with Logan and believe that Shakespeare’s invocation of the war between the elements was similarly valuable to Daniel. The section of *Pharsalia* that Logan cites includes no wind-wave imagery, but dialogue in *3H6* did.

My conclusion that the wind-wave imagery originated with the *Henry VI* plays and not Daniel is also supported by the fact that the earlier versions of *Contention* and *True Tragedy* included traces of the imagery, the seeds of the later revisions. Margaret’s description of her voyage to England (*Contention* E2v; *2H6*, III.2), Henry’s description of a mastless ship (*True Tragedy*, sig. C2v; *3H6*, II.5), and Margaret’s ship-faring imagery in her rallying cry to her troops (*True Tragedy*, sig. E3v; *3H6* V.4), all include hints that were expanded to become the later versions. This suggests that these scenes in the early plays were by Shakespeare and that the imagery was already in his mind as he participated in writing *Contention* and *The True Tragedy*. This conclusion is supported by Burrows and Craig, who tested, as a group, the octavo versions of the scenes they identified as Shakespearean in *3H6* and found that their tests similarly assigned the earlier printed versions of those scenes to Shakespeare.

I also note one further trace of the imagery in the early history plays that I believe has gone unnoted. The opening lines of *Richard III* use it to indicate that the civil wars have ended as that play begins:

> And all the cloudes that lowr’d vpon our house  
> In the deepe bosome of the Ocean buried.  
> (*Richard III*, I.1.3-4; F1623, sig. Q5r)

---

37 Logan, “Daniel’s Civil Wars and Lucan’s *Pharsalia*”, pp. 63, 68.
These lines indicate that the complex use of the wind-wave imagery was in Shakespeare’s mind as he wrote *Richard III* in mid- to late 1592. The “cloudes”, the source of the winds, have been “buried” in the “bosome of the Ocean”, the home of the waves. Kernan does not note this use of the imagery in his analysis, but it fits with his assertion that Shakespeare’s wind-wave imagery reflects varying interpretations of the natural forces that are used to illustrate the changing fortunes of each side in the civil wars. This part of the opening lines of *Richard III* indicates that the wavering advantages of the two houses of Lancaster and York have ended and a new force has taken over – the vaunting, evil ambition of Richard III. The imagery was in Shakespeare’s mind as he wrote *Richard III*, before he revised *Henry VI Parts* 2 and 3, incorporating it.

As noted earlier, the fixing of the direction and timing of influence for this one parallel, from Shakespeare to Daniel during 1594 to 1596, helps determine the pattern for the rest. I believe it most plausible that Daniel’s first four books were influenced by early versions of the *Henry VI* plays, especially by the depiction of the relationship between Margaret and Suffolk in *Contention*. The appearance of *The First Four Books*, in print or manuscript, influenced revisions to the plays, including the addition of lines for Margaret addressing Suffolk’s severed head in *2H6* and the comparison of Suffolk to Paris in *1H6*. Revisions to the *Henry VI* plays influenced Daniel’s fifth book, especially in its description of a battle as a war between wind and waves. Both Manley and Taylor/Loughnane, each supporting a differing theory of the relationship between the First Folio versions of the plays and the early printed editions, infer a revival of the plays during the mid-1590s, citing the possible censorship of a reference to “wild

---

Onele” included in Contention (Q1594, sig. E1’) but absent from 2H6 (III.1.283). The reference would have become topical after Hugh O’Neill’s 1595 rebellion. Such a revival of the revised plays during the period between Daniel’s completion of The First Four Books and the appearance of the fifth book of the poem provides an explanation of how Daniel could have seen the plays.

Different readers of Daniel and Shakespeare will reach varying conclusions and unfortunately there are too many moving parts and uncertainties for any one solution to be definitive. In the future, some parts may become more fixed. For instance, if there were discovered firmer documentary evidence that the plays were revised and if such evidence helped date the revisions, that discovery would fix many moving pieces in the kaleidoscope. Based on that, a more confident analysis could be done of the relationship between those revisions and Daniel’s poem. Absent such documentary evidence, literary analysis of parallels between Daniel’s poem and multiple versions of the plays can serve as one of the semi-fixed points; they provide guidance on the likelihood and direction of influence. Such an analysis indicates to me that the revised versions of the Henry VI plays informed Daniel’s fifth book, written in 1595 to 1596. Again, I recognize that others may interpret this potential influence differently, but the conclusion that I hope will be reached by anyone analyzing possible revisions to the plays is that the relationship to Daniel’s poem should be included in the analysis.

---

I opened this thesis with the assertion that William Shakespeare used the 1595 edition Samuel Daniel’s *First Four Books of the Civil Wars* as a source for *Richard II*. This statement would likely not be contested by current Shakespeare scholars who would regard it as a fair and complete analysis of the relationship between the works and their authors as of late 1595. The evidence considered in this thesis, however, indicates that it is an incomplete representation of the interaction between Daniel and Shakespeare during the early to mid-1590s.

Textual overlap between early printed versions of the *Henry VI* plays and *The First Four Books* provides evidence that influence between the works is plausible, while an echo of the title of one of those plays in the registration of Daniel’s poem increases the likelihood of influence. Biographical details of Daniel’s life indicate that he was almost certainly aware of the plays as he wrote *The First Four Books* between 1592 and 1594. An extant early manuscript of the first two books of *The Civil Wars* suggests that Shakespeare may have used such a manuscript as he wrote *Richard II* between 1594 and 1595, not having to wait for the publication of the poem to be influenced by it. During that period, the authors shared connections to the Essex circle that explain how they could have become aware of each other’s work as both wrote descriptions of Richard’s deposition; influence is likely but direction of influence uncertain. Soon after the publication of the first four books of his poem, Daniel added a fifth that includes a description that seems inspired by Shakespeare’s revisions to the *Henry VI* plays. Evidence indicates that Shakespeare’s use of Daniel’s poem as a source for *Richard II* is only one part of an engagement between these two artists as they concurrently
wrote and revised works in the early to mid-1590s on the English civil wars of the fifteenth century.

**Chronology of Shakespeare’s and Daniel’s Writing Processes**

Assessing details of the relationship between Daniel’s *First Four Books* and Shakespeare’s early history plays depends on forming a chronology of Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s writing processes. In this thesis, I have analyzed textual and bibliographical evidence that helps trace the works through their development and establish such a chronology. The existence of some steps in the process may be subject to scholarly debate. For instance, I concluded it likely that differences between the early printed editions of the *Henry VI* plays and the First Folio versions indicate authorial revision. Some scholars would disagree with that conclusion, holding that the F1623 versions represent the plays as originally written and performed. I further concluded that revisions were made by Shakespeare between 1594 and 1596. Some might quibble with that dating. I suggest, however, that any scholarly study of issues surrounding Shakespeare’s early works should take account of the interaction between those works and Daniel’s. Theories proposed should include an assessment of the interaction and an evaluation of the implied direction and timing of influence between the works.

In chapter 3, I suggested that the interaction between Daniel’s poem and Shakespeare’s history plays most likely began with the poet seeing the plays performed in the early 1590s (p. 92).

After parting from the Countess of Pembroke in late 1593 to early 1594, Daniel joined

---

1 Having considered the implications of questions surrounding authorship for sections of the *Henry VI* plays evaluated in chapter 7, and encompassed possible co-authorship of the original versions of the plays, I believe I am now justified in including these plays in the category “Shakespeare’s early history plays”. As noted in chapter 1, my use of the phrase does not imply his sole authorship of the plays.
Mountjoy (pp. 68-70, 150-153), worked on completing the first four books of the poem and circulated manuscripts of portions of them in mid- to late 1594 (pp. 127-129). The first four books included episodes influenced by early versions of the *Henry VI* plays, especially episodes surrounding Margaret and Suffolk’s romantic relationship. Shakespeare read a manuscript version of the poem that included theater imagery describing Richard’s entry into London during 1594 (pp. 143-147), and wrote *Richard II* using the manuscript as a source.

Daniel saw the play as he was revising the second book of *The Civil Wars*, between late 1594 and early 1595 (pp. 128-129, 195) and added a depiction of Richard’s deposition influenced by Shakespeare’s play. Shakespeare revised the *Henry VI* plays between late 1594 and 1596 (pp. 256-257), and included changes in Margaret’s character inspired by the fourth book of Daniel’s poem. Daniel saw a performance of *Part 3*, and possibly one or both others, and incorporated wind-wave imagery into his fifth book, a book which appeared in print by mid-1596 (p. 232). A summary of the chronology of the composition and revision of the works implied by this interaction is as follows (the order is more important than the specific dates):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition and Revision of Works</th>
<th>Approximate dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare participates in writing <em>Contention, True Tragedy</em> and possibly <em>harey the vj</em></td>
<td>Before April 1592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel finishes early versions of the first four books of <em>The Civil Wars</em> and circulates manuscripts of portions of them.</td>
<td>Before early 1595. Best guess: Early 1594 (MS III) June-Dec. 1594 (MS I-II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare writes <em>Richard II</em>.</td>
<td>Range: Mid-1594 to early 1595. Best guess: Mid- to late 1594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel revises his manuscript version of <em>The Civil Wars</em> and prepares it for publication as <em>The First Four Books of the Civil Wars</em>.</td>
<td>Range and best guess: Late 1594 to early 1595.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare revises <em>harey the vj, Contention</em> and <em>True Tragedy</em>, turning them into <em>Henry VI Parts 1, 2 and 3</em>.</td>
<td>Range: Late 1594 to early 1596. Best guess: Early to mid-1595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel writes the fifth book of <em>The Civil Wars</em>.</td>
<td>Range: Mid-1595 to mid-1596. Best guess: late 1595 to early 1596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternate chronologies may suggest different relationships between the works. I believe, however, that any chronology should encompass an interaction more complex than that currently comprehended and should help elucidate textual parallels not explained by shared sources, parallels such as Suffolk’s woeful parting from Margaret, Richard II handing his crown to his successor and shared descriptions of a battle as a war between wind and waves.

Daniel and Shakespeare as Creative and Imaginative Sources: From Henry at Towton to Richard in Prison and Back

Chains of inspiration can be traced through the works – themes, characterization and wording that were shared and reinterpreted by the two artists. I will trace one such chain that begins with Henry observing the battle of Towton in True Tragedy. On my reading, that scene influenced Daniel’s depiction of Richard II in prison, included in the manuscript version of the third book of his poem. From there, inspiration flowed to Shakespeare’s version of the imprisoned king in his Richard II and the playwright’s revision of the original scene in True Tragedy/3H6. It ultimately ends with Daniel adopting elements of the revised scene from 3H6 in later books added to his poem. In tracing this chain of creative inspiration, I am not trying to demonstrate that Daniel and Shakespeare consciously and explicitly used each other as sources. Rather, I believe that the two were “creative and imaginative sources” for each other, as that phrase is used by Stuart Gillespie in Shakespeare’s Books, his excellent compendium of Shakespearean sources. Following on the work of Hal Jensen and Robert S. Miola, Gillespie describes how creative and imaginative sources differ from our understanding of narrative and dramatic ones:

we may think of ‘creative and imaginative’ sources as opposed to ‘narrative and dramatic ones’, as Hal Jensen has recently distinguished them . . . Scholarly ideas of how one work may leave its mark on another, of the range of possible things a ‘source’ may be, are changing. What Robert S. Miola calls ‘our
recently expanded understanding of sources’ involves the assumption, generally made now, that a text may derive from a source quite obliquely, when it is part of a ‘tradition’ or ‘context’ for a work; and the understanding, now common enough, that evidence about a source can be derived from ‘scenic form, thematic figuration, rhetorical strategy, structural parallelism, ideational or imagistic concatenation’ as well as more straightforward ‘verbal iteration’. . . . In other words, it is based on a broader sense of how literary texts relate to one another than is reflected in the standard earlier studies.2

In tracing a thread of creative thought through Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s works on English history, I am applying Gillespie’s “broader sense of how literary texts relate to one another”. Admittedly, this is a dangerous prospect, risking license to infer connections that do not exist. I believe that the application of this approach to evaluating influence is justified by the close relationship that existed between Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s early works on English history. Further, I am not trying to “prove” influence in this concluding section of the thesis. To the extent that I have tried to evaluate the probability of influence between the works, it is included in chapters 2 through 7. Rather, I am demonstrating the insights that can be gained into the works and the creative process of their authors once influence is accepted. Such insights include the ability to assess Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s possible intent in engaging with the other’s work. It remains possible, however, that parallels cited are coincidental and reflect similarities in the thinking of two (or more) writers contemporaneously writing on the same topic.

In The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York, Henry VI removes himself from the battle of Towton and contemplates his role in the war that rages around him. He concludes that he

would have been better off to have been born a commoner, offers to relinquish his crown and wonders if his death could halt the conflict:

O would my death might staie these ciuill iars!
Would I had neuer raund, nor nere bin king, . . .
Would God that I were dead so all were well,
Or would my crowne suffice, I were content
To yeeld it them and liue a priuate life.

*(True Tragedy, O1595, sig. C2v)*

Henry’s philosophical musings are interrupted by the entry of a soldier who has killed his own father and another who has killed his own son. The scene is shorter than that in *Henry VI Part 3*, but, as in that play it is a dramatic highlight. Ultimately Henry wishes that his death would satisfy his subjects but realizes that the most he can do is share their woe:

How will the people now misdeeme their king,
Oh would my death their mindes could satisfie. . . .

Weepe wretched man, Ile lay thee teare for tear,
Here sits a king as woe begone as thee.

*(True Tragedy, O1595, sigs. C3r-v)*

The playwright(s) of *True Tragedy* borrowed from multiple sources for this invented scene. Hall, for instance, provides inspiration for the tableau of the soldiers who have killed their own kin:

This conflict was in manner vnnaturall, for in it the sonne fought against the father, the brother against the brother, the nephew against the vncle, . . .

None of the chroniclers, however, mention Henry’s role, or lack thereof, at Towton. Rather, inspiration for the philosophical king watching the battle may have come from Lucan. In Book VII of his poem on the Roman civil wars, Lucan describes what Pompey was thinking as he overlooked the battlefield of Pharsalia, contemplating his defeat:

He stood upon a mound in the plain
from a distance to gaze at all the destruction scattered

---

3 Hall, *Union* 1548, fol. CIr.
through the fields of Thessaly, otherwise hidden from view by warfare. He saw so many weapons aimed at his own death, so many bodies laid low and himself dying in so much blood. . . .
‘Refrain, gods,’ he says, ‘from overthrowing all the peoples.
With the world still standing and with Rome surviving, Magnus can be ruined.₄

The fact that Lucan may have served as a partial inspiration for the scene in *True Tragedy* calls into question Shakespeare’s authorship of the scene and suggests that Marlowe, the translator of Book I of *Pharsalia*, may be the original author. The borrowing from *Pharsalia* recalls Andrew Hadfield’s thesis, cited in chapter 2 (p. 25) that the *Henry VI* plays “were inspired by Lucan” and that they “had the crucial influence on the vogue for Lucanizing English history.”₅

If Hadfield is correct, Marlowe, with his extensive knowledge of the Roman poet, is a more plausible candidate for the Lucan-inspired elements of the original plays than Shakespeare. As noted by Taylor and Loughnane this scene in *3H6* (II.5) is among those which “two independent statistical methods” (Craig/Burrows and Segarra, et. al) assign to Shakespeare.₆

The version of the scene in *3H6*, however, includes 145 lines, relative to 67 in the equivalent scene in *True Tragedy* and many of the lines from *True Tragedy* were replaced by wholly new ones in *3H6*. The scene in *3H6*, if a revised version of that from *True Tragedy*, may be a substantially new scene, with most of its lines potentially written by a different author than its precursor.₇

---

₇ Of the 67 lines in the scene in *True Tragedy*, I count 20 that have no close equivalent in *3H6* (e.g., “How like a mastlesse ship vpon the seas / This woeful battaile doth continue still” and “Or would my crowne suffice, I were content / To yeeld it them and liue a priuate life”, sig. C2; all four lines have no close equivalent in *3H6*) and 12 that were substantially revised (e.g., “Now leaning this way, now to that side driue”, sig. C2’, becomes “Now swayes it this way, like a Mighty Sea / . . . Now swayes it that way, like the selfe-same Sea”, *3H6* F1623, sig.
scene in 3H6 could still be identified as Shakespeare’s, if the latter playwright revised the former’s scene. I leave the ultimate assessment of authorship to those who perform statistical and other studies, but I note that the author(s) of the original scene in True Tragedy found inspiration from multiple sources for an invented dramatic representation of the horrors of civil conflict and its impact on a contemplative king. The transplanted elements from one of those sources, Lucan’s Pharsalia, would probably be recognized by Daniel.

In my proposed chronology, Daniel saw The True Tragedy in 1592 to 1593, “as it was sundrie times acted by the Right Honourable the earle of Pembrooke his seruants”.

It would be years before he would set the historical incidents in that play to verse in his sixth and later books (including the battle of Towton, as will be described later, in his eighth book). But I believe that he found inspiration in the contemplative king from True Tragedy for a more immediate purpose, an invented scene of Richard II in prison in the third book of his poem. The connection to Lucan helped trigger his recognition of the value of the image of a king, removed from the action, ruminating on the meaning of his role and life.

In a section of the third book of The Civil Wars that existed in both Daniel’s early manuscript version of the poem and the printed edition, he describes Richard II in prison:

The morning of that day, which was his last,  
After a weary rest rysing to paine  
Out at a little grate his eyes he cast  
Vppon those bordering hils, and open plaine,  
And views the towne, and sees how people past,  
Where others libertie makes him complaine  
The more his owne, and grieues his soule the more  
Conferring captiue-Crownes with freedome pore.

That leaves 35 lines of the 145 lines in 3H6 (24%) that have equivalent precursors in True Tragedy. Most of the lines in 3H6 are, effectively, not in True Tragedy.

8 True Tragedy, O1595, title-page.
Daniel’s exposition of Richard’s thoughts continues for eight stanzas. He compares his life to that of a common man, “Grazing his cattel in those pleasant fields”. He considers if he would have been better off to have foregone his crown and enjoyed a life of “sweet retires”, as Dioclesian did. Ultimately, he concludes that his resignation of the crown will neither satisfy Bolingbroke’s quest for power nor prevent his own death:

But what do I repeating others good
To vexe mine owne perplexed soule the more?
Alas how should I now free this poore bloud
And care-worne body from this state restore?
How should I looke for life or liuely-hood
Kept here distrest to die, condemnd before,
A sacrifice prepared for his peace
That can but by my death haue his release?

Are kings that freedome giue themselues not free,
As meaner men to take what they maie giue?
O are they of so fatall a degree
That they cannot discend from that and liue?
Vnlesse they still be kings can they not bee,9
Nor maie they their autority surviue?
Will not my yeelded crowne redeeme my breath?
Still am I fear’d? is there no way but death?

The exact logic followed by Daniel’s imprisoned king differs from Henry’s at Towton in True Tragedy. Both, however, realize that their yielded crown will buy neither peace nor their lives. Richard’s “Will not my yeelded crown redeem my breath?” has its origin in Henry’s “would my crowne suffice, I were content / To yeeld it them and liue a priuate life”. Both recognize their mortality and realize that their death, a certain end, has limited meaning and effect. Richard’s “is there no way but death?” in Daniel’s poem resonates with Henry’s “Oh would

---

9 MS III (fol. 273r): Vnlesse they still be kings cannot they bee,
my death their mindes could satsifie” from True Tragedy. I believe that Daniel saw in True Tragedy an opportunity to include a dramatic moment of human self-realization for a king commenting on the action in which he has played a part.

The section of Daniel’s poem describing Richard’s thoughts in prison ignited Shakespeare’s imagination; he found inspiration from it for at least four different purposes. He adopted the scene itself, deciding to dramatize his own version of the imprisoned king and his philosophical musings in Richard II. He used imagery from it elsewhere in that same play. He transplanted some of Richard’s thoughts to a revised version of the scene that had been the original source of inspiration, Henry at Towton. And, finally, he borrowed phrasing from it for one of his sonnets. Obviously, this section of Daniel’s poem was one of Shakespeare’s most important “creative and imaginative” sources as he quickly borrowed from it for multiple works he was writing. I will provide details of each.

The most obvious borrowing from Daniel’s depiction of Richard in prison is the invention of the scene itself. None of the chroniclers describe Richard’s thoughts and there is no known precedent for the scene in any of Shakespeare’s other sources. It is also interesting to note that there is no equivalent section dramatizing a captive king’s internal monologue in 3H6, a play that includes a philosophically-inclined, imprisoned monarch (3H6 V.6) who is given no opportunity to disclose his inner thoughts. Shakespeare seems to have gotten the idea for Richard’s soliloquy from Daniel. The beginning of Daniel’s section and that of Shakespeare’s scene demonstrate how the playwright used the poet’s king as a starting point. Daniel’s Richard looks out of his window, surveying the world, lamenting his own imprisonment and comparing it to other men’s freedom:
Out at a little grate his eyes he cast . . .
Where others libertie makes him complaine
The more his owne, and grieues his soule the more
Conferring captiue-Crownes with freedome pore.

(FFB Q1595:1-IV, III.63.3-8)

This is a similar starting point for Shakespeare’s imprisoned king who contemplates how he can convert his prison cell into a world of men and change places with them in his mind:

I haue beene studying how I may compare
This prison where I liue, vnto the world:
And for because the world is populous,
And here is not a creature but my selfe,
I cannot do it: yet Ile hammer it out,

(R2 V.5.1-5; Q1597, sig. I3v)

Like Daniel’s Richard, after a long, convoluted train of philosophical thoughts, the memory of Bolingbroke and his usurpation ultimately brings Shakespeare’s imprisoned king back to reality. The thought of Bolingbroke reminds him of his lack of power and spurs the realization that his own death is the only end:

Then am I kingd againe, and by and by,
Thinke that I am vningd by Bullingbrooke,
And strait am nothing. But what ere I be,
Nor I, nor any man, that but man is,
With nothing shall be pleasde, till he be easde,
With being nothing.

(R2 V.5.36-41; Q1597, sig. I4v)

This resonates with Daniel’s Richard who thinks that only his own death, his “sacrifice”, will satisfy “his [Bolingbroke’s] peace”:

How should I looke for life or liuely-hood
Kept here distrest to die, condemnd before,
A sacrifice prepared for his peace
That can but by my death haue his release? . . .
Will not my yeelded crowne redeeme my breath?
Still am I fear’d? is there no way but death?

(FFB Q1595:1-IV, III.70.5-8 . . .71.7-8)
The conclusions of the two kings are not directly analogous, with Shakespeare’s finding a deeper sense of acceptance and of his humanity than Daniel’s. But the similarities are there and one can see Shakespeare’s “creative and imaginative source” in Daniel’s poem for the shared invention of the scene.

Shakespeare’s use of this section of Daniel’s poem is more direct and obvious in other scenes of *Richard II*, including examples of the ‘verbal iteration’ that Gillespie cites as being the foundation of traditional source studies. Daniel’s king ponders how the common man outside his prison window will tell woeful tales of him:

> Thou sit’st at home safe by thy quiet fire
> And hear’st of others harmes, but feelest none;
> And there thou telst of kings and who aspire,
> Who fall, who rise, who triumphs, who doe mone:
> Perhappes thou talkst of mee, and dost inquire
> Of my restraint, why here I liue alone, . . .
> *(FFB Q1595:1-IV, III.65.1-6)*

Shakespeare used variations of this theme and wording twice in *Richard II*. The closest version is the scene of Richard’s and Isabel’s parting, in which Richard details the image of common people sitting “by the fire” and telling his tale, an obvious borrowing from Daniel:

> In winters tedious nights sit by the fire,
> with good old folkes, and let them tell the tales,
> Of woefull ages long agoe betidde:
> And ere thou bid good night to quite their griefes,
> Tell thou the lamentable tale of me,
> And send the hearers weeping to their beds:
> *(R2 V.1.40-45; Q1597, sigs. H2v-H3r)*

The passage from Daniel also informs Richard’s instructions earlier in the play for his followers to “sit vpon the ground, / And tell sad stories of the death of Kings” (III.2.155-156).
Shakespeare found in the thoughts of Daniel’s deposed king a fundamental character trait for his Richard, the importance to him of how others will tell his story.

Another verbal echo between this section of Daniel’s poem and one of Shakespeare’s works demonstrates how the playwright/poet found inspiration for multiple works. As noted earlier, Daniel’s Richard contemplates changing places with a common man. He reflects how that man would not accept the exchange if he knew what it was like to be king:

O if he knew his good, how blessed hee
That feeles not what affliction greatnes yeeldes,
Other then what he is he would not bee,
Nor change his state with him that Scepters weildes:

(FFB Q1595:I-IV, III.64.3-6)

Shakespeare closely paralleled the last of these lines in the final couplet of sonnet 29:

For thy sweet loue remembred such welth brings,
That then I skorne to change my state with Kings.10

Searches on EEBO for the phrase “change his/my state” or the word “change” near “state” yield many examples prior to these but only one involves a king trading places with a commoner, a reference to King Midas in Arthur Golding’s 1567 translation of Ovid’s Metamorphosis.11 It is possible that both Daniel and Shakespeare picked up the conceit and wording from a common source or invented it independently. As with many of the parallels described in this chapter, however, if Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s familiarity with each other’s works is accepted, the very close wording seems to reflect influence. Given the strong

---

11 Ovid, The. xv. bookes of P. Ouidius Naso, entytuled Metamorphosis, trans. by Arthur Golding (London, 1567), sig. L1r, “Amazed at the straunge Mischaunce, and being both a wretch and rich, he wisht too chaunge His riches for his former state, and now he did abhorre The thing which euen but late before he cheefly longed for.”
influence of this section of Daniel’s poem on Richard II, including close verbal echoes, I conclude the direction of that influence to be from Daniel to Shakespeare. During this period, Shakespeare was also using Daniel’s Delia sonnets as a model for his own. He may have borrowed elements from multiple Daniel sources for them, including this section of The First Four Books. The link may help date sonnet 29 to the period Shakespeare was writing Richard II and using Daniel’s poem as a source.

Finally, Shakespeare also found inspiration in this section of Daniel’s poem to revise the scene of Henry at Towton in True Tragedy, turning it into the version in Henry VI Part 3. As Daniel’s imprisoned king unfavorably compares his existence to a common man’s, he enumerates the phases of his woeful life, seeing each period, “childhood . . . youth . . . farther years”, as cause for pain:

But looke on mee, and note my troubled raigne,  
Examine all the course of my vext life;  
Compare my little ioyes with my long paine,  
And note my pleasures rare, my sorrows rife,  
My childhood spent in others pride, and gaine,  
My youth in daunger, farther yeares in strife,  
My courses crost, my deedes wrest to the worst,  
My honour spoild, my life in daunger forst.  

(FFB Q1595:1-IV, III.67)

Shakespeare used Daniel’s enumeration of periods of time but turned the comparison around, showing how preferable a shepherd’s “minutes, hours, days, months and years” were to a king’s:

So many Houres, must I tend my Flocke, . . .  
So many Dayes, my Ewes have bene with yong, . . .  
So many yeares, ere I shall sheere the Fleece,  
So Minutes, Houres, Dayes, Monthes and Yeares . . .

12 Duncan-Jones, ed., Shakespeare’s Sonnets, pp. 43, 89-90; Kerrigan, ed., The Sonnets and A Lover’s Complaint, pp. xviii-xix. See also footnote 67 of chapter 4 this thesis (p. 141).
Would bring white haires, vnto a Quiet graue.
Ah! what a life were this? How sweet? how louely?
Gives not the Hawthorne bush a sweeter shade
To Shepheards, looking on their silly Sheepe,
Than doth a rich Imbroider’d Canopie
To Kings, that feare their Subiects treacherie?

(3H6 F1623, sig. P2v; 3H6, II.5.31-45)

The version of the scene in True Tragedy included the brief mention of Henry yielding his crown and living “a priuate life”, but nothing of this detailed comparison. The brief mention seems to have prompted Daniel’s observations on the miseries of kingship compared to the bucolic vision of the man “Grazing his cattel”, which in turn was reinterpreted by Shakespeare and inserted into the scene that had been Daniel’s original inspiration. The chain of inspiration had come full circle. Then it continued.

As described in chapter 7 (pp. 256-257), evidence suggests that Daniel saw the revised version of the scene with Henry observing the battle of Towton and adopted its wind-wave imagery for his description of Talbot’s defeat. His use of that imagery differed from his earlier borrowings from Contention, True Tragedy and harey the vj, reflecting his evolving relationship with the works. From those earlier plays, he took elements of characterization and theme but little actual wording, perhaps a consonant word, like “battle/battalion” or an occasional specific one, like “woeful”. But in lifting the imagery from Henry’s monologue at Towton, he wrote a stanza in which 28 of its 59 words were from his source. Perhaps reflecting a stronger appreciation for the poetic artistry of the revised scene, or an increasing level of comfort in borrowing from dramatic works, or a personal knowledge of Shakespeare, he became more fully engaged with Shakespeare’s plays as he wrote his fifth book in 1595 to 1596.
Daniel would return to the scene of Henry at Towton many years later. In 1609, when he added an eighth book to what would be the final version of his poem, he included the unhistorical episode:

Vnhappy Henrie, from a little Hill,
Plac’t not far off (whence he might view the fight)
Had all th’intire full prospect of this ill,
With all the scattered slaughter in his sight:

(The Civil Wars, 1609, VIII.22.1-4)

Daniel’s placement of Henry on “a little Hill” seems to be an echo of the emotional scene in Henry VI Part 3. That scene includes Henry’s line, “Heere on this Mole-hill will I sit me downe” (3H6 F1623, P2v), a line that did not appear in print until the 1623 First Folio. Daniel appropriated an element of a play that he had seen performed 13 to 14 years earlier.

In invoking the scene from 3H6, Daniel gave his philosophical king an understanding of a monarch’s role in a commonwealth, an understanding that had eluded both the Henry VI of that play and the imprisoned Richard of his poem and Shakespeare’s Richard II. Daniel’s version of Henry’s thoughts seems to build on those creative and imaginative sources while expanding it to encompass a monarch who understands that his role is to protect his people:

We are not worth so much, nor I, nor he,
As hath beene spent for vs, by you this day,
Deare people, said he: therefore, O, agree,
And leaue off mischief, and your malice stay.
Stay, Edward, stay. They must a People bee,
When we shall not be Kings: and it is they,
Who make vs wth their miseries.

(The Civil Wars, 1609, VIII.23.1-7)

Daniel’s “We are not worth so much, nor I, nor he” echoes Richard’s musings in Shakespeare’s Richard II:
But what ere I am,  
Nor I, nor any man, that but man is,  
With nothing shall be pleas’d, till he be eas’d  
With being nothing.

(R2 F1623, sig. D4v; R2, V.5.38-41)

Daniel’s king’s self-realization builds on Shakespeare’s, recognizing his responsibility as a monarch to protect his state, while still acknowledging his own humanity and the misconception that his life has a higher value than that of other men. It also completed the chain of creative inspiration that had flowed from *True Tragedy* to Daniel’s *First Four Books*, then to Shakespeare’s *Richard II* and his revisions to *Henry VI Part 3*, and finally to Daniel’s last version of *The Civil Wars*.

By tracing the chain of creative inspiration between Daniel and Shakespeare we can see how the two artists engaged in a dialogue through their works for many years. I believe that dialogue began with Daniel’s use of the early versions of the *Henry VI* plays in the first manuscript version of his poem in 1594 to 1595 and that the mutual influence followed the chronology proposed earlier in this chapter. For those who see a different chronology, I invite them to interpret the “creative and imaginative” influence evidenced in the passages quoted above in a manner consistent with their own version. And for those who dismiss such influence, I invite them to contemplate the surprising similarities in themes, characterization, structure, narrative and (occasionally) wording between these two writers concurrently composing works on the same topics – the reigns of Richard II and Henry VI.

I also invite scholars of other writers of the time to extrapolate from the interaction between Daniel and Shakespeare that I identify. I recognize that by focusing on this specific relationship, it may, at times, seem as if I believe they were the only people writing at the time. Clearly, they were not; they were not even the only ones writing on some of the subject matter included in the works covered by this thesis. In all instances where I analyzed parallels, I researched others works of the time for possible context. Whenever identified, for instance *The Mirror for Magistrates* or Marlowe’s translation of Lucan’s *Pharsalia*, they have been cited. Other works, however, include elements that were outside the scope of this thesis that would make for interesting analyses of potential mutual influence. Christopher Marlowe’s play *Edward II* preceded both *The First Four Books* and *Richard II*. It includes subject matter covered in the first book of Daniel’s poem (material on the English kings that preceded Richard II) and has been identified as partial inspiration for Shakespeare’s play. A comparison of Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s potential use of that play would make an interesting analysis. Similarly, Michael Drayton’s epic poem *Mortimeriados*, published in 1596, a year after the appearance of *The First Four Books*, covers the reign of Edward II. Daniel’s poem may have been influenced by Marlowe’s *Edward II* and then, in turn, served as a model for Drayton’s poem. Again, an analysis could be done of influence among the three works. A particularly interesting analysis would assess the influence among Drayton’s *Heroicall Epistles*, published in 1597, Daniel’s poem, the *Henry VI* plays and *Richard II*. Among the historical relationships that Drayton fictionalizes is the romantic entanglement of Margaret and Suffolk and the ahistorically mature marriage of Richard II and Isabel. Drayton’s use of Shakespeare’s plays as a source for *Heroicall Epistles* has been analyzed, but, as far as I know, no one has assessed
the extent of the influence of Daniel’s *First Four Books* on the work.\textsuperscript{14} The relationships among all these works was outside of the scope of this thesis, which focused on textual overlaps between Daniel’s *First Four Books* and Shakespeare’s early history plays. Nevertheless, much of the methodology employed could also be applied to these complex combinations of works and authors.

**Conclusion**

Samuel Daniel’s *First Four Books of the Civil Wars* presents a unique opportunity for Shakespeare scholars. It is a work written effectively alongside Shakespeare, simultaneously influencing and being influenced by him as the playwright revised his early plays and wrote one of his first mature ones, *Richard II*. Daniel’s poem is a Shakespeare source for which authorial revisions can be traced, as we have early manuscripts that help document them. Daniel’s revisions and additions to the poem were composed at substantially the same time that Shakespeare was writing and revising his plays. If they are not related, it is a rare glimpse into Shakespeare’s writing process alongside that of another author contemporaneously writing on the same topic. If they are related, they offer a chance to see two authors influencing each other in real time. I know of no other literary works related to Shakespeare’s that give us the ability to do that.

The consideration of the relationship between *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* and Shakespeare’s early history plays has been almost entirely absent from scholarly analyses of issues surrounding Shakespeare’s works. Such a consideration, instead, should be central to many of them. Did Shakespeare revise the *Henry VI* plays and, if so, when? The answers to

those questions are buried in analyses of parallels between the multiple versions of those plays and Daniel’s poem. Was Shakespeare’s deposition scene in *Richard II* censored and, if so, why and when? The comparison to Daniel’s similar depiction, printed in 1595 and reprinted in 1599, calls into question some currently-held answers to these questions. In the world of Shakespeare scholars, these are big questions that should be impacted by the consideration of a work that is now substantially forgotten. Anyone studying those questions should be familiar with Daniel’s poem.

*The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* should also be of interest to Shakespeare enthusiasts who do not concern themselves with these scholarly issues but enjoy reading works that bring a fuller understanding of and appreciation for Shakespeare’s plays. It is interesting that the gruesome scene of Margaret carrying Suffolk’s head had a corollary in an epic, courtly poem of the time. Perhaps there is more psychological impact involved in such a scene than currently understood. It is instructive that Shakespeare’s potentially inflammatory deposition scene in *Richard II* was not so controversial when included in Daniel’s poem; the varying contemporary treatment encourages one to consider differences between the scenes. Both offer an image of the king handing over the crown with his own hands, humanizing the narrative; however, in Daniel’s poem, it is part of a procedurally flawed process. In Shakespeare it is a dramatic highlight of an ambiguous depiction of the same event. These are just a couple of the points of interest and insights offered by a comparison between the poem and Shakespeare’s plays.

Finally, the analysis calls for a revival of interest in Daniel and his works. The poem in question, *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*, is currently not available in print. Only the
1609 version of *The Civil Wars* has been printed in the past century, and that in an obscure, out-of-print edition. It is worth reading both for its own merits and for a better understanding of Shakespeare. Now, having made this assertion, I will admit that reading Daniel is not the easiest task. He can be long-winded and his verse has sometimes been described as prosaic, perhaps a euphemism for not-very-poetic.\(^{15}\) I will not deny that this can accurately describe portions of his works. But at his best, he is clear and fascinating. Coleridge, the literary critic who dubbed Daniel “prosaic”, also called him “one of the golden writers of our golden Elizabethan age”, a man “whose diction bears no mark of time, no distinction of age”.\(^{16}\) Daniel’s poetry is the poetry of thoughtful reflection.\(^{17}\) It is often worth pausing and deeply considering what he is saying. I hope that many of the sections I have quoted in this thesis demonstrate that and inspire the reader to give him a chance. Someone interested in reading Sidney, Marlowe, Spenser or Jonson should be interested in Daniel. Those names are recognizable to the average college student of English literature; however, Daniel’s is not. It should be.

While the analysis in this thesis recommends a reconsideration of Daniel’s poem, I believe it does the same for some of Shakespeare’s less appreciated plays. The comparison of *The First


Four Books and Shakespeare’s early history plays elevates all the works involved. It demonstrates that the early versions of the Henry VI plays – The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York – were works that garnered the attention of the up-and-coming courtly poet Samuel Daniel while he was part of the household of the Countess of Pembroke. These plays comprised something new to historical drama in 1592 and were noted as such by at least two of the leading literary figures of the early to mid 1590s, Daniel and Mary Sidney. Although today they seem stilted and flawed, it may be time to view them in a different light, as works that, taken together as The Whole Contention, broke from the historical dramas that preceded them. They did not show the depth of Shakespeare’s later works, but they were significant advances from plays like The Famous Victories of Henry V, The Troublesome Reign of King John and The True Tragedy of Richard III, even from the two-part play by Marlowe, Tamburlaine, with which they may have shared an author. They deserve to be studied today and performed with a new appreciation for their merit. It would be interesting to see a production of the play The Whole Contention Between the Two Famous Houses of Lancaster and York, a combined version of The First Part of the Contention and True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York, as printed in 1619.

I conclude it likely that Daniel saw Contention, True Tragedy and harey the vj as he was reading his chronicles and sketching out his epic poem. From them he borrowed a romantic relationship between Margaret and Suffolk and found a way to elicit sympathy for the grieving queen as she lamented her lover’s death. At the same time, he found material in the depiction of the contemplative king from The True Tragedy to transfer to his version of Richard II in prison. These were all included in a poem that he circulated in manuscript among the members of the Essex circle, just as Shakespeare was writing Richard II. Shakespeare quickly adopted
numerous elements of Daniel’s epic and turned it into a play that was both political and personal. That play prompted a response from Daniel in the form of revisions to his manuscript that disputed Shakespeare’s account of Richard’s deposition. Shakespeare then embraced aspects of Daniel’s poem as he adapted the *Henry VI* plays. It helped him deepen his characterization of Queen Margaret in *Henry VI Parts 2 and 3* as he turned the earlier plays into something more poetic and thoughtful. He did this as he expanded his own hints of wind-wave imagery in the earlier plays to make the raging war of the uncontrollable elements a central theme of his work. In turn, this inspired Daniel as he came to describe a battle in his fifth book.

Perhaps the scenario that I describe above is not exactly what happened. But the analysis shows that there is value in considering these works in tandem. It gives insight into the creative process of two artists while helping answer scholarly questions actively debated about the *Henry VI* plays, works that are only now garnering the attention they deserve. It is time to consider them in a more favorable light and at the same time to look at a work that has been effectively unavailable, *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*.

The consideration of the interaction between *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*, the *Henry VI* plays and *Richard II* calls into question our understanding of Daniel’s and Shakespeare’s status and attitude toward each other as they reacted to each other’s works. To the extent that Daniel is included in literary studies, which is not extensively, he is still considered the “prestigious courtly poet” who would not have borrowed from “a professional playwright like Shakespeare” (Taylor and Loughnane), essentially the image of him solidified
by T. S. Eliot in 1927.\textsuperscript{18} It is time to recognize that this is an outdated vision of the poet who turned to a wide range of sources, including the popular \textit{Henry VI} plays, for inspiration in interpreting the meaning of the civil wars about which he was writing. It is also time to reevaluate Shakespeare’s attitude toward the literary status of his plays and their relationship to other works of the time. As implied by recent studies, such as Erne’s and van Es’s analyses of Shakespeare as a literary artist, Dutton’s contention that the playwright adapted his plays for the court, and Lake’s assessment of him as a contemporary political commentator, Shakespeare was concerned about more than the reception of his plays on the popular stage. In his interactions with Daniel, we see him actively engaging with a contemporary non-theatrical poet, one of the leading literary figures of the day, writing plays that could stand alongside Daniel’s epic poem and compete with it for attention. Daniel and Shakespeare engaged in a dialogue through their works. The traces of that dialogue elucidate the works involved and improve our ability to appreciate and understand the artistry of their authors.

In his 1599 \textit{Poeticall Essayes}, Daniel’s \textit{Civil Wars} was followed by one of the poet’s most powerful works, the deeply contemplative eclogue \textit{Musophilus}. In that poem, a colloquy between a courtier and a poet, Daniel’s alter-ego, Musophilus, extolled the power of words to provide a connection to writers from the past, to allow us to “confer with who are gone” and experience what they thought and felt. I believe that this is what is afforded by the study of the extant versions of \textit{The First Four Books of the Civil Wars}, the \textit{Henry VI} plays and \textit{Richard II}. Although \textit{Musophilus} is not a work covered in the body of this thesis, I would like to end with a quotation from that poem. I hope it will help spur the reader to turn to Appendix 1 and begin

reading *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars* in a new light, as a work worthy of study and
one that allows us to “confer with” Samuel Daniel and William Shakespeare:

O blessed letters that combine in one
All ages past, and make one live with all,
By you we do confer with who are gone,
And the dead living unto council call:
By you th’vnborne shall have communion
Of what we feel, and what doth vs befall.

*(Musophilus, in The Poetical Essayes of
Sam. Danyel Newly corrected and augmented, 1599, sig. B3v)*
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APPENDIX 1

The First Fowre Bookes of the Ciuile Wars (1595)
With Notes on Variants from Manuscripts of Books I-II and III

Introductory Note

This appendix includes the text of The First Fowre Bookes of the Ciuile Wars as printed in 1595, including the fifth book, which was added to unsold copies of the first edition of the poem between 1595 and 1599. Extant copies of The First Fowre Bookes with a title-page dated 1595 exist in two states, with and without the fifth book.1 The text of Books I-IV is based upon a copy that includes only those books (Q1595:I-IV) while the text of Book V is based upon a copy that includes all five (Q1595:I-V).2

Footnotes note variants between the printed edition and extant manuscripts of the first three books: MS I-II (BL: Sloane MS 1443) and MS III (BL: Harley MS 7332, fols. 262r-280v). Lines from the manuscripts that differ substantially from Q1595:I-IV are quoted, in their entirety, in the footnotes (with parenthetical references to the folio page in the manuscripts). For lines footnoted, substantive (non-accidental) variants are color coded. Substantive variants in the printed edition but not the manuscripts are in red; variants in the manuscripts but not the printed edition are in blue (succinctly: Red = Q1595:I-IV, not MS; Blue = MS, not Q1595:I-IV). Lines with only accidentals (variants in punctuation or spelling that do not change meaning of a word or scansion of a line) are not footnoted.3

---

1 The ESTC includes the work under the title The first fowre bookes of the ciuile wars between the two houses of Lancaster and Yorke (STC 6244). A second edition, one with a different title-page still dated 1595 (STC 6244.3) includes a slightly different spelling for the title, The First Fowre Bookes of the ciuile warres betweene the two houses of Lancaster and Yorke, but identical text. Copies with each title-page exist in both states, with and without the fifth book. Both editions are listed in the ESTC with the uniform title “Civil wars. Book 1-5”. See also James G. McManaway, “Some Bibliographical Notes on Samuel Daniel’s Civil Wars,” Studies in Bibliography, 4 (1951/1952), 31-39 (pp. 31-32).

2 Copies used are as follows:
   - Q1595:I-IV (For Books I-IV) - The first fowre Bookes of the ciuile wars between the two houses of Lancaster and Yorke. By Samvel Daniel. Aetas prima canat veneres postrema tumultus. At London, Printed by P. Short for Simon Waterson. 1595. (STC 6244.3; EEBO 494:01. Reproduction of the original in Harvard University Library).
   - Q1595:I-V (For Book V) - The First Fowre Bookes of the ciuile warres betweene the two houses of Lancaster and Yorke. 1595. (STC 6244; EEBO 2283:05. Reproduction of original in British Library, General Reference Ashley 537).

For analysis of MS I-II, see Laurence Michel, Civil Wars (1958), pp. 52, 55-56 and Cecil Seronsy, “Daniel’s Manuscript Civil Wars with Some Previously Unpublished Stanzas”, Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 52 (1953), 153-160. For analysis of MS III, see Cecil Seronsy and Robert Krueger, “A Manuscript of Daniel’s Civil Wars Book III”, Studies in Philology, 63 (1966), pp. 157-162. See also entries in Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts (CELM): DaS1, DaS4. My readings of MS I-II rely heavily on Seronsy (“Daniel’s Manuscript”, pp. 153-160) and Michel (Civil Wars, pp. 295-312); readings of MS-III rely heavily on Seronsy and Krueger (“A Manuscript of . . . Book III”, pp. 160-162). In most instances where they note no variants between the manuscripts and the printed edition, I accept their readings. In all instances where they reflect variants between the manuscripts and the printed edition, I have closely read the manuscript versions to verify their readings. Differences between my readings of the manuscripts and those of Michel, Seronsy and Krueger are described in the footnotes. See Appendix 2 for selected images from MS I-II and MS III.

In the section on “Variants” for Books I and II in his edition of The Civil Wars (pp. 295-312), Michel notes autograph annotations and revisions in MS I-II that appear to be in Daniel’s hand (noted as “MS-D” therein). I have noted such annotations in the footnotes to this appendix (as “MS I-II:D”) by first showing the line as it appears in MS I-II, before the autograph edits, and then describing the annotations shown in the manuscript. In each case, I compared the handwriting of such autograph edits to Daniel’s letter to Devonshire and the manuscript of Daniel’s Panegyrick Congratulatorie (BL, Royal MS 18 A. LXXII; CELM: DaS 21) to confirm Michel’s assessment. Any differences of opinion or points of uncertainty are noted. MS I-II also includes corrections that were made at the time it was prepared, the original scribe seemingly noticing an error and correcting as he wrote. These are noted by Michel as “MS-not D” and are noted as such in this appendix.

While I have attempted to be thorough in documenting substantive variants between the manuscripts and first printed edition of Daniel’s poem (including verifying those documented by others), this appendix is not intended as a fully-annotated, scholarly edition of The First Four Books or a complete transcription of the extant manuscripts. Rather, it is a somewhat informal (hopefully user-friendly), modern print version of the poem as originally published that supports the thesis to which it is appended. It provides context for the sections of the poem quoted, illustrates the extent of the revisions made by Daniel and allows the reader to quickly get a sense of the nature of variants. I apologize for any errors and for variants missed. I hope that the usefulness of having the complete text The First Four Books of the Civil Wars in modern type outweighs any distractions or difficulties caused by such errors and omissions.

---

THE

FIRST FOWRE

Bookes of the ciuile wars
between the two houses of Lancaster
and Yorke.\(^5\)

By Samvel Daniel.

Aetas prima canat veneres
postrema tumultus.

AT LONDON,
Printed by P. Short for Simon Waterson. 1595.

\(^5\) There were two separate title-pages for *The First Fowre Bookes* in 1595, one described by Peter McManaway as the “IHS issue” and the other as the “Royal Arms issue” (McManaway, “Some Bibliographical Notes on Samuel Daniel’s *Civil Wars*,” *Studies in Bibliography*, vol. 4 (1951/1952), 31-32). The spelling shown above is based upon the IHS issue. The spelling of the title of the work on the title-page of the Royal Arms issue is “THE FIRST FOWRE | Bookes of the ciuile | warres betweene the | two houses of | Lancaster and | Yorke.” Other than the differences in title-pages, there are no differences in the texts, both seemingly from the same printing. For further details see Sellers, Harry, “A Bibliography of the Works of Samuel Daniel, 1585-1623 With an Appendix of Daniel’s Letters”, *Proceedings and Papers of the Oxford Bibliographical Society*, 2 (1927), 29-54 (p. 34). MS I-II includes no separate title-page but includes the title “The ciuile warrs / betweene the hou: / ses of york & / Lanaster [sic]” on the first page (fol. 1'), which also includes the first two stanzas. See Appendix 2 for image of MS I-II, fol. 1'.
Book I

The Argument of the first Booke.

What times forgoe Richard the seconds raigne:
The fatall causes of this ciuile warre
His Vnckles pride, his greedie Minions gaine,
Glosters reuolt, and death deliuered are:
Herford accusd, exild, calld backe againe,
Pretends t’amend what others Rule did marre.
The King from Ireland hastes, but did no good,
Whilst strange prodigious signes foretoken bloud.

I.1
I Sing the ciuil warrs, tumultuous broyles,
And blody factions of a mighty land:
Whose people hauty, proud with forain spoyles
Vpon themselues, turne back their conquering hand:
Whilst Kin their Kin, brother the brother foyles,
Like Ensignes all against like Ensignes band:
Bowes against bowes, the Crowne against the crowne,
whilst all pretending right, all right throwen downe.

I.2
What furie, o what madnes held you so
Deare people to too prodigall of bloud?
To wast so much and warre without a foe,
Whilst France to see your spoyles, at pleasure stood;
How much might you haue purchasd with lesse wo?
T’haue done you honor and your Nephewes good,
Yours might haue beeene what euer lies betweene
The Perenei and Alps, Aquitayne, and Rheine.

I.3
And yet o God wee haue no cause to plaine
Since hereby came, the quiet calme we ioye
The blisse of thee ELIZA, happie gaine
For all our losse; for that no other waye

---

6 MS I-II and MS III include no prefatory arguments.
7 MS I-II and MS III include no stanza numbers whereas the 1595 edition designates the book number (“The First Booke”, “The Second Booke”, etc.) at the top of each page and includes a stanza number before each stanza. Book and stanza numbers are included above, for reference.
8 MS I-II (1r): Whilst all pretending right all right thrown downe.
9 MS I-II (1r): How much might you haue purchast with lesse woe
10 MS I-II (1r): The blisse of you ELIZA happie gaine
The heauens could find, then vnite againe\textsuperscript{11}
The fatall seu'red families; that they
Might bring forth thee; that in thy peace might grow
That glory which no age could euer show.

I.4
O sacred Goddesse, I no muse but thee
Invoke in this great worke I now entend,
Do thou inspire my thoughts, infuse in mee
A power to bring the same to happie end:\textsuperscript{12}
Raise vp a work for latter times to see
That may thy glorie and my paines commend:
Strengthen thy subiect strang thinges to rehearse
And giue peace to my life, life to my verse.

I.5
And thou Charles Mountioy borne the worldes delight,
That hast receiu’d into thy quiet shore
Me tempest-driuen fortune-tossed wight,
Tir’d with expecting and could hope no more:
And cheerest on my better yeares to write
A sadder Subiect then I tooke before,
Receiue the worke I consecrate to thee
Borne of that rest which thou dost giue to mee.

I.6
And Memorie, preseruresse of thinges done,
Come thou, vnfold the wounds, the wracke, the wast,
Reueale to me how all the strife begunne
Twixt Lancaster and Yorke in ages past.\textsuperscript{13}
How causes, counsels and euents did runne
So long as these vnhappie times did last,
Vnintermixt with fictions, fantasies;
I versifie the troth, not poetize.

I.7
And to the end we maie with better ease
Iudge the true progresse; here bigin to showe
What weare the times foregoing nere to thease,

\textsuperscript{11} MS I-II (1\textsuperscript{v}): The heauens could find, then to vnite againe
The omission of the word “to” in Q1595 is one of the “faults escaped” noted in Q1595:I-V: “then vnite, read then to vnite”. See p. 460 of this appendix. Michel (Civil Wars, p. 295) erroneously shows both MS I-II and Q1595 as “finde then vnite”.
\textsuperscript{12} MS I-II (1\textsuperscript{v}): A power to bring that same to happy end
MS I-II:D - Change from “that” to “the” (the “th” from “that” is left intact, “at” is crossed out and “e” is substituted).
\textsuperscript{13} MS I-II (2\textsuperscript{r}): Twixt Lancaster and Yorke and how it past.
That these we maie with better profit knowe:
Tell how the world fell into this disease
And how so great distemperature did growe,
So shall we see by what degrees it came
How thinges grown full, do sone grow out of frame

I.8
Ten kings had now raignd of the Norman race
With variable fortune turning chaunce,
All in two hundreth sixtie one yeares space,
When Edward third of name and first of Fraunce
Possest the crowne in fortunes highest grace;
And did to greatest state, his state aduaunce,
When England might the largest limits see
That euer any king attaingd but hee.

I.9
For most of all the rest, toyld in vnrest
What with wrong titles, what with inward broyl,
Hardlie a true establishment possest
Of what they sought with such exceeding toyle:
For why their power within it self opprest,
Scarce could breake forth to greatnes al that while;
Such wo the childhood of this state did passe
Before it could attaine to what is wasse.

I.10
For first the Norman conquering all by might,
By might was forst to keepe what hee had got:
Altring the lawes, chaunging the forme of Right,
And placing barbarous Customes he had brought:
Maistring the mighty, humbling the poorer wight
With grieuous taxes tyranie had sought,
Scarce laide th’assured groundes to build vpon
The chaunge so hatefull in such course begon.

*William the Conquerour.*°

---

14 MS I-II (2’): For all the rest toild in their owne unrest
15 MS I-II (2’): No gloss.

MS I-II includes more limited marginal notes/glosses than the published edition and all are in a hand different from that of the principal scribe. Sellers states of MS I-II that “marginalia are added in the handwriting of Daniel’s letter to Devonshire” (*Bibliography*, p. 49). I have verified that the handwriting of the glosses in MS I-II appears to be Daniel’s and note such glosses as MS I-II:D. Other than glosses seemingly added by Daniel, the original MS I-II does not include any glosses.
William his sonne tracing the selfesame wayes
The great outworne with war, or slaine in peace
Onely vpon depressed weaknes prayes,
And treads down what was likeliest to increase,
Those that were left, being left to wofull daies,
Had onely powre to wish for some release:
whilst giuing beastes what did to men pertaine
Tooke for a beast himselfe was after slaine.

William Rufus.\textsuperscript{16}

Henrie his brother raignes when he had donne
(who Roberts title better to reiect)
The Norman Duke the Conquerours first sonne,
Lightens in shew, rather then in effect
Those greeuances, his fatall race begunne
Reformes the lawes which soone he did neglect:
Whose sons being drownd for whom he did prepare
Leaues crowne & strif to Maud his daughters care.

Henry 1.\textsuperscript{17}

Whom Stephen his Nephew (falsifying his oath)
Preuents; assailes the Realm; obtaines the crown:
Raising such tumults as torment them both
Whil’st both held nothing certainlie their owne.
Th’afflicted Realme deuided in their troth,
And partiall faith; most miserable growne,
Endures the while; till peace and Stephens death
Conclude some hope, of quiet; to take breath.

King Stephen.\textsuperscript{18}

The sonne of Maud (from Saxon bloud deriu’d
By mothers line) succeeds th’vnrightfull king
Henrie the second, in whose raigne reiu’d
Th’oppresed state, and first began to spring,
And o if he had not beene too long liu’d
T’haue seene th’affliction that his age did bring
By his vngodly sonnes; then happie man.

\textsuperscript{16} MS I-II (2\textsuperscript{v}): No gloss. See footnote 15.
\textsuperscript{17} MS I-II (3\textsuperscript{r}): No gloss. See footnote 15.
\textsuperscript{18} MS I-II (3\textsuperscript{r}): No gloss. See footnote 15.
For they against him warr’d, for whom he wan

*Henry 2.* 19

I.15
All *Ireland, Scotland, the’Illes of Orcades, 20*
*Poytiers, Guienna, Brittany* hee got,
And leads forth sorrow from its selfe to thease,
Recouers strength at home so feeble brought:
Giues courage to the strong, to weaker ease;
Ads to the state what *England* neuer sought:
Who him succeed (the forraine bloud out growne)
Are home born kings by speech and birth our owne. 21

I.16
Lo hitherto the new borne state in teares
Was in her raw and wayling infancie,
During a hundred two and twentie yeares
Vnder the hand of straungers tyranny:
And now some better strength and youth appeares
Which promises a glad recouery:
For hard beginnings haue the greatest states
What with their owne, or *neighbourers debates.* 22

I.17
Euen like to *Rheine* which in his birth opprest,
Strangled almost with rocks and mightie hils,
Workes out a way to come to better rest,
Wars with the mountaines, striues against their wils:
Bringes forth his streames in vnitie possest
Into the quiet bed he proudlie fils,
Carrying that greatnes which he cannot keepe
Vnto his death and buriall in the deepe:

I.18
So did the worldes proud *Mistres Rome* at first
Striue with a hard beginning, warr’d with need;
Forcing her strong Confiners to the worst,
And in her bloud her greatnes first did breed:
So *Spaine* at home with *Moores* ere forth it burst
Did practize long and in it selfe did bleed;
So did our state begin with her owne woundes

---

19 MS I-II (3r): No gloss. See footnote 15.
20 In MS I-II (3r), the “c” in “Scotland” is missing and is inserted with a caret. It is difficult to tell if the correction is by the original scribe or Daniel.
21 MS I-II (3r): Are home-borne kings by speech by birth our owne.
22 MS I-II (3r): What with their owne or *neighbors fierce* debate.
To try her strength ere it enlarg’d her boundes.

I.19
But now comes Richard to succeed his sire,
Who much the glorie of our armes increast,
His fathers limits bound not his desire
He spreads the English Ensignes in the East:
And whilst his vertues would haue raisd him hyer
Treason, and malice his great actions ceast:
A faithless brother and a fatall king
Cut off his growth of glory in the spring.

Rich. 1.23

I.20
Which wicked brother contrarie to course
False John vsurpes his Nephew Arthurs right,
Gets to the crowne by craft, by wrong, by force,
Rules it with lust, oppression, rigor, might:
Murders the lawfull heire without remorse,
Wherefore procuring all the worldes despight,
A Tyrant loth’d, a homicide conuented
Poysoned he dies, disgrac’d and vnlamented.

K. John.24

I.21
Henrie his sonne is chosen king, though young
And Lewes of Fraunce (elected first) beguilde,
After the mightie had debated long,
Doubtfull to choose a straunger or a child:
With him the Barons (in these times grown strong)
Warre for their auncient lawes so long exild.
He graunts the Charter that pretended ease
And kept his owne, yet did his owne appease.

Henry 3.25

I.22
Edward his sonne a martaill king succeedes
Iust, prudent, graue, religious, fortunate:
Whose happy ordred raigne most fertile breeds
Plentie of mightie spirits to strength his state,
And worthy mindes, to manage worthy deeds

23 MS I-II (4r): No gloss. See footnote 15.
24 MS I-II (4r): No gloss. See footnote 15.
25 MS I-II (4r): No gloss. MS I-II:D: Hen. 3. See footnote 15.
Th’experience of those times ingenerate:
For euer great imployment for the great
Quickens the bloud and honour doth beget.

*Edwa. 1.*

I.23
And had not his mis-lead lasciuious sonne
*Edward* the second, intermitted so
The course of glorie happilie begunne
Which brought him, and his favorites to woe:
That happy current without stop had runne
Vnto the full of his son *Edwards* flo:
But who hath often seene in such a state,
Father and sonne like good, like fortunate.

*Edward 2.*

I.24
But now this great succeeder all repaires,
And rebrings-backe that discontinued good,
He buildes vp strength and greatnes for his heires
Out of the vertues that adornd his bloud:
He makes his subiects Lords of more then theirs,
And sets their bounds farre wider then they stood:
Could greatnes haue but kept what he had gote
It was enough he did, and what he wrought.

*Edward 3.*

I.25
And had his heire survi’d him in due course,
What limits England hadst thou found, what barre?
What world could haue resisted so great force?
O more then men! two thunderbolts of warre;
Why did not time your ioined worth diuorse
T’haue made your seuerall glories greater farre?
Too prodigall was nature thus to doe,
To spend in one age, what should serue for two.

*Edward the black prince who died before his father.*

---

26 MS I-II (4r): No gloss. MS I-II:D: Ed. 1. See footnote 15.
27 MS I-II (4r): No gloss. MS I-II:D: Ed. 2. See footnote 15.
28 MS I-II (5r): No gloss. MS I-II:D: Ed. 3. See footnote 15.
29 MS I-II (5r): O more then men two thunderbolts of warre, Michel does not note the addition of an exclamation point in Q1595.
30 MS I-II (5r): No gloss. MS I-II:D: Ed. the black prince, who dyed before his father.
I.26
But now the scepter in this glorious state
Supported with strong powre and victorie
Was left vnto a child, ordain’d by fate
To stay the course of what might grow too hie:
Here was a stop that greatnes did abate
When powre vpon so weake a base did lie,
For lest great fortune should presume too farre
Such oppositions interposed are.

Rich. 2.\footnote{31}

I.27
Neuer this Iland better peopled stood,
Neuer more men of might, and minds addrest,
Neuer more Princes of the royall bloud,
(If not too many, for the publique rest)
Nor euer was more treasure, wealth and good,
Then when this Richard first the crowne possest
Second of name, a name in two accurst.\footnote{32}
And well we might haue mist all but the first.

I.28
In this mans raigne began this fatall strife
The bloudy argument whereof we treate;
That dearely cost so many’a Prince his life;
That spoild the weake, & euen consum’d the great,
That, wherein all calamitie was rife
That memory euen grieues her to repeate
And would that time would now this knowledge lose,
But that tis good to learne by others woes.

I.29
Edward the third being dead, had left this child
Sonne of his worthy sonne deceasd of late\footnote{33}
The crowne and Scepter of this Realm to wield,
Appointing the protectors of his state
Two of his sonnes to be his better shield,

\footnote{See footnote 15.}
\footnote{31 MS I-II (5'): No gloss. See footnote 15.}
\footnote{32 MS I-II (5'): Second of name a man in two accurst
In MS I-II there is a mark under the word “man”, possibly an underline, in an ink and hand different from the body of MS. It is possibly Daniel’s hand, but difficult to ascertain with certainty. Mark is not noted by Michel.}
\footnote{33 MS I-II (5'): (Sonne of his worthy sonne deceast of late) Variant not noted by Michel.}
Supposing vnckles free from guile or hate
Would order all things for his better good,
In the respect and honour of their bloud.

I.30
Of these John Duke of Lancaster was one,
(Too great a subiect growne, for such a state
The title of a king and what h’had done
In great exploits his mind did eleuate
Aboue proportion kingdomes stand vpon,
Which made him push at what his issue gate)
The other Edmond Langley, whose milde sprite
Affected quiet and a safe delight.

I.31
With these did interpose his proud vnrest
Thomas of woodstocke, one most violent,
Impatient of command, of peace, of rest,
Whose brow would shew, that which his hart had ment:
His open malice and repugnant brest
Procur’d much mischiefe by his discontent:
And these had all the charge of king and state,
Till by himselfe he might it ordinate.

I.32
And in the first yeares of this gouernement
Things past, as first; the warres in Fraunce proceeide
Though not with that same fortune and euent
Being now not followed with such carefull heed, 34
Our people here at home growne discontent
Through great exactions insurrections breed,
Priuate respectes hindred the common weale,
And idle ease doth on the mightie steale. 35

I.33
Too many kings breed factions in the court,
The head too weake, the members grown too great:
O this is that which kingdomes doth transport,
This plague the heavens do for iniustice threat 36
When children rule, who euer in this sort
Confound the state their auncestors did get;
For the ambitious once inur’d to raigne
Can neuer brooke a priuate state againe.

34 MS I-II (6r): Being now not followed with so carefull heede
35 MS I-II (6r): And idle ease upon the mightie steale.
36 MS I-II (6r): This plague the heavens for iniustice threat
I.34
And kindomes euer suffer this distresse,
For one or manie guide the infant king,
Which one or manie, tasting this excessse
Of greatnes and command; can neuer bring
Their thoughts againe t’obay or to be lesse:
From hence these insolencies euer spring,
Contempt of others whom they seeke to foile,
Then follow leagues, destruction, ruine, spoile.

I.35
Whether it were that they which had the charge
Suffred the king to take a youthfull vaine,
That they their piuate better might inlarge:
Or whether he himselfe would farther straine
(Thinking his yeares sufficient to discharge
The gouernment) presumd to take the raigne,
We will not saie: but now his eare he lendes
To youthfull counsel, and his lusts attends.

I.36
And courts were neuer barren yet of those
Which could with subtle traine and apt advise
Worke on the Princes weaknes, and dispose
Of feeble frailtie easiest to intice:
And such no doubt about this king arose,
Whose flattery (the daungerous nurse of vice)
Got hand vpon his youth to pleasures bent
Which lead by them did others discontent.

I.37
For now his vnckles grew much to mislike
These ill proceedings: were it that they saw,
That others fauor’d did aspiring seeke
Their nephew from their counsels to withdraw,
Seeing his nature flexible and meeke,
Because they onely would keepe all in awe:
Or that indeed they found the king and state
Abusde by such as now in office sate.

I.38
Or rather else they all were in the fault,

37 MS I-II (6v): Now whether twere that they which had the charge
38 MS I-II (6v): Suffer the king to take a youthfull vaine
39 MS I-II (6v): I know not; but as now he lends his eare
40 MS I-II (6v): And youthfull counsell willingly doth heare.
41 MS I-II (7v): The kinges proceedings were it that they saw,
Th’ambitious vnckles, th’indiscreet young king,  
The greedy counsell and the Minions naught,  
And all togeth’r did this tempest bring;  
Besides the times withall inujustice fraught,  
Concurr’d in this confus’d disordering,  
That we may truly say this spoild the state;  
Youthfull Counsell, priuate gaine, partiall hate.

I.39
And sure the king plainly discouereth  
Apparent cause his vnckles to suspect;  
For John of Gaunt was said to seeke his death  
By secret meanes, which came not to effect:

The Duke of Gloster likewise practiseth  
In open world that all men might detect

And leagues his Nobles, and in greatest strength  
Rises in armes against him too at length.

I.40
Vnder pretence from him to take away  
Such as they said the states oppressors weare,
To whom the Realme was now become a pray;  
The chiefe of whom they nam’d was Robert Vere

Then Duke of Ireland; bearing greatest sway  
About the king, who held him only dere,
Him they would haue remou’d and diuers more,  
Or else would neuer lay downe armes they swore.

I.41
The king was forst in that next Parliament  
To grant them what he durst not well refuse,  
For thither arm’d they came and fully bent  
To suffer no repulse nor no excuse:

And here they did accomplish their intent  
Where iustice did her sword, not balance vse:  
For euen that sacred place they violate  
And there arest the Iudges as they sate.

I.42
Which soone with many others had their end,  
Cruelly slaine without the course of right,  
And still these warres that publique good pretend  
Worke most injustice being done for spight:

---

42 MS I-II (7'): In open world that all men may detect
43 MS I-II (7'): Rises in armes against him too at the length.
44 MS I-II (7'): The chiefe of whome they namd Robte De Vere
45 MS I-II (7'): And their arest the judges as they sate.
For the agriued euermore doe bend\textsuperscript{46}
Against those whom they see of greatest might,
Who though themselues are wrong’d & often forst,
Yet for they can doe most are thought the worst.

I.43
And yet I doe not seeme herein to excuse\textsuperscript{47}
The Iustices, and Minions of the king
Which might their office and their grace abuse,
But onely blame the course of managing:
For great men too well grac’d much rigor vse;
\textbf{Presuming favorites} mischiefe euerm bring\textsuperscript{48}
So that concluding I may boldly speake,
Minions too great, argue a king too weake.

I.44
Now that so much was granted as was sought,
A reconcilement made although not ment
Appeasd them all in shew, but not in thought
Whilst euery one seem’d outwardlie content:\textsuperscript{49}
Though hereby king, nor peeres, nor people got
More loue, more strength, \textbf{or} easier gouernment,\textsuperscript{50}
But euery day things now succeeded worse,
For good from kings must not be drawne by force.

I.45
And this it lo continued till by chance
The Queene (which was the emperours daughter) dy’de;
When as the king t’establish peace with \textit{Fraunce}
And better for home quiet to prouide,
Sought by contracting marriage to aduance
His owne affaires against his unckles pride:
Tooke the young daughter of king \textit{Charles} to wife
Which after in the end raisd \textbf{greater} strife.\textsuperscript{51}

I.46
For now his vnckle Gloster much repin’d
Against this french aliance and this peace,
Hauing himselfe a working stirring mind

\textsuperscript{46} MS I-II (8\textsuperscript{r}): for the agriued evermore \textit{doh} bend
\textsuperscript{47} MS I-II (8\textsuperscript{r}): And yet I doe not seeme herein \textit{t’excuse}
\textsuperscript{48} MS I-II (8\textsuperscript{r}): \textit{And wanton fauorits} mischiefe euerm bring
\textsuperscript{49} The world “outwardlie” in MS I-II (8\textsuperscript{r}) is spelled “outwedlie”; the “e” has been crossed out and “ard” is inserted with a caret. The correction appears to be in Daniel’s hand, but it is difficult to ascertain with certainty.
\textsuperscript{50} MS I-II (8\textsuperscript{r}): More love more strength, \textbf{nor} easier gouernment
\textsuperscript{51} MS I-II (8\textsuperscript{r}): Which after in the end raisd \textbf{mortal} strife.
Which neuer was content the warres should cease:
Whether he did dishonourable finde
Those articles that did our boundes decrease,
And therefore storm’d because the crown had wrong;
Or that he fear’d the king would grow too strong;

I.47
Or whatsoeuer mou’d him; this is sure\(^{52}\)
Hereby he wrought his ruine in the end,
And was a fatall cause that did procure
The swift approching mischiefes that attend:
For lo the king no longer could indure
Thus to be crost in what he did intend,
And therefore watcht but some occasion fit
T’attach the Duke when he thought least of it.

I.48
And fortune now to further this intent
The great Earle of S. Paule doth hither bring,
From Charles of Fraunce vnto the young Q. sent
To see both her and to salute the king:
To whom he shewes his vnckles discontent
And of his secret dangerous practising,
How he his subiects sought to sulleuate
And breake the league with Fraunce concluded late.

I.49
To whom the suttle Earle forthwith replies,
Great Prince it is within your power with ease,
To remedy such feares, such ielousies,
And rid you of such mutiners as thease;
By cutting off that which might greater rise,
And now at first preuening this disease,
And that before he shall your wrath disclose,
For who threates first means of reuenge doth lose.

I.50
First take his head, then tell the reason why,
Stand not to finde him guilty by your lawes,
Easier you shall with him your quarrell try
Dead then alive who hath the better cause:
For in the murmuring vulgar usuall
This publique course of yours compassion drawes,
Especially in cases of the great
Which worke much pitty in the vndiscreat.

---

\(^{52}\) MS I-II (8\(^{v}\)): Wee cannot certaine gesse, but this is sure
I.51
And this is sure though his offence be such,
Yet doth calamitie attract commorse,
And men repine at Princes bloodshed much.
How iust-soeuer iudging tis by force:
I know not how their death giues such a tuch
In those that reach not to a true discourse;
That so shall you obseruing formall right
Be still thought as vniust and win more spight.

I.52
And oft the cause, may come preuented so,
And therefore when tis done, let it be heard;
So shall you hereby scape your priuate wo
And satisfie the world to, afterward:
What need you weigh the rumors that shall go?
What is that breath being with your life compard?
And therefore if you will be rul’d by me
Strangled or poison’d secret let him be.

I.53
And then araigne the chiefe of those you find
Were of his faction secretly compact,
Whom you maie wisely order in such kind
That you maie such confessions then exact,
As both you maie appease the peoples mind
And by their death much aggrauate the fact:
So shall you rid your selfe of dangers quite
And shew the world that you haue done but right.

I.54
This counsell vttred vnto such an eare
As willing listens to the safest waies,
Workes on the yeelding matter of his feare,
Which easelie to any course obeies:
For euerie Prince seeing his daunger neere
By anie meanses his quiet peace assaies:
And still the greatest wronges that euer were
Haue then bin wrought when kings were put in fear.

I.55
And long it was not ere he apprehendes
The Duke, who close to Calice was conuei’d
And th’Earles of Arundell and Warwicke sendes,
Both in close prisons strongly to be laid;
And soone the Duke his life vnquiet endes,

53 MS I-II (9v): And men require at princes bloodshed much
Strangled in secret ere it was bewraide;
And Arundell was put to publike death,
But Warwick by great meanes he banisheth.

I.56
And for his person he procures a guard
A thousand Archers daily to attend,
Which now vpon the act he had prepard
As th’argument his actions to defend:
But yet the world had now conceiu’d so hard
That all this nought auaild him in the end:
In vaine with terror is he fortified
That is not guarded with firme loue beside.

I.57
Now storme his vnckles albeit in vaine,
For that no remedy they could deuise,
They might their sorrowes inwardly complaine,\(^{54}\)
But outwardly they needs must temporise:
The king was great, and they should nothing gaine
T’attempt reuenge or offer once to rise,
This league with Fraunce had made him now so strong
That they must needs as yet indure this wrong.

I.58
For like a Lion that escapes his bounds\(^{55}\)
Hauing bin long restraind his vse to straie,
Raunges the restles woods, staies on no ground,
Riottes with bloodshed, wantons on his praie:
Seekes not for need but in his pride to wound,
Glorying to see his strength and what he may;
So this vnbridled king freed of his feares
In libertie himselfe thus wildly beares.

I.59
For standing on himselfe he sees his might
Out of the compasse of respectiue awe,
And now beginnes to violate all right
While no restraining feare at hand he saw.\(^{56}\)
Now he exactes of all, wasts in delight,
Riots in pleasure, and neglects the law;
He thinks his crowne is licensd to do ill

---

\(^{54}\) Michel (Civil Wars, p. 300) shows a variant for “inwardly” of “uttwardlie” in MS I-II. I read the word in MS I-II (10\(^{v}\)) as “inwardlie”, the same as Q1595:I-IV with a slightly different spelling.

\(^{55}\) MS I-II (10\(^{v}\)): For like a Lyon that escapes his bounde

\(^{56}\) MS I-II (10\(^{v}\)): Whilst no restraining feare at hand he saw
That lesse should list, that may do what it will.

I.60
Thus b'ing transported in this sensuall course\(^{57}\)
No frend to warne, no counsell to withstand,\(^{58}\)
He still proceedeth on from bad to worse,
Sooth’d in all actions that he tooke in hand
By such as all impiety did nurse,
Commending euer what he did commaund:
Vnhappy kings that neuer may be taught
To know themselues or to discerne their fault.

I.61
And whilst all sylent griene at what is donne,\(^{59}\)
The Duke of Herford then of courage bold
And worthily great Iohn of Gaunts first sonne
Vtters the passion which he could not hold,
In sad discourse vpon this course begun,
Which he to Mowbray Duke of Norfolke told;
To th’end he being great about the king
Might doe some good by better counselling.

I.62
The faithles Duke that presentlie takes hold
Of such aduantage to insinuate
Hastes to the king, peruerting what was told,
And what came of good minde he makes it hate:
The king that might not now be so controld\(^{60}\)
Or censur’d in his course, much frets thereat;
Sendes for the Duke, who doth such wordes deny
And craves the combate of his enemy.

_Froissart. Pol. Virg. & Hall deliuer it in this sort._\(^{61}\)

I.63
Which straight was granted, and the daie assign’d
When both in order of the field appeare
To right each other as th’euent should find,
And now both euen at point of combate were

---

\(^{57}\) MS I-II (11r): Thus _being_ transported in this sensuall course

\(^{58}\) MS I-II (11r): (No frend to warne no counsell to withstand)

\(^{59}\) MS I-II (11r): And whilst all _in themselues_ griene what is donne

\(^{60}\) MS I-II (11r): The king that might not _so_ now be so controld

\(^{61}\) No gloss. See footnote 15. See also Michel, ed., _Civil Wars_, p. 1; Wright, “Samuel Daniel’s Use of Sources in _The Civil Wars_”, pp. 63-65; Wright, “Daniel and Holinshed”, pp. 560, 563-565, for commentary on this gloss in Q1595 and Daniel’s later revisions to it.
When lo the king changd sodenly his mind,
Casts downe his warder and so staies them there,\(^62\)
As better now aduisd what waie to take
Which might for his assured safety make.

I.64
For now considering (as it likely might)\(^63\)
The victorie should hap on Herfords side,
A man most valiant and of noble sprite,
Belou’d of all, and euer worthy tride:
How much he might be grac’d in publique sight
By such an act as might advancoe his pride,
And so become more popular by this,
Which he feares, too much he already is.

I.65
And therefore he resolues to banish both,
Though th’one in chiefest fauour with him stood,
A man he dearely lou’d and might be loth
To leaue him that had done him so much good:
Yet hauing cause to do as now he doth
To mitigate the enuie of his bloud,
Though best to loose a friend, to rid a foe,
And such a one as now he doubted so.

I.66
And therefore to perpetuall exile hee
Mowbray condemnes; Herford but for ten yeares:
Thinking (for that the wrong of this decree
Compar’d with greater rigour lesse appeares)
It might of all the better liked be:
But yet such murmuring of the fact he heares,
That he is faine foure of the ten forgiue,
And iudg’d him sixe yeares in exile to liue.

I.67
At whose departure hence out of the land,
O how the open multitude reueale
The wondrous loue they bare him vnderhand,
Which now in this hote passion of their zeale
They plainelie shewde that all might vnderstand,
How deare he was vnto the common weale:
They feard not to exclaime against the king
As one that sought all good mens ruening.

\(^62\) MS I-II (11\(^r\)): Gives signe, proclaymes, they cease, and staies them there.
Michel (Civil Wars, p. 300) misses the word “and” in MS I-II version of line.
\(^63\) MS I-II (11\(^r\)): For now considring as it lightlie might,
I.68
Vnto the shore with teares, with sighes, with mone
They him conduct, cursing the bounds that staie
Their willing feete that would haue further gone
Had not the fearefull Ocean stopt their way:
Why Neptune hast thou made vs stand alone
Deuided from the world, for this say they?⁶⁴
Hemd in to be a spoile to tyranny
Leauing affliction hence no way to flie?

I.69
Are we lockt vp poore soules, here t’abide
Within the watery prison of thy waues,
As in a fold, where subiect to the pride
And lust of rulers we remaine as slaves?
Here in the reach of might, where none can hide
From th’eie of wrath, but onely in their graues?
Happy confiners you of other landes
That shift your soile and oft scape tyrants hands.

I.70
Ah must we leaue him here; that here were fit
We should retaine the pillar of our state;
Whose vertues well deserue to gouerne it,
And not this wanton young effeminate?
Why should not he in regall honour sit,
That best knows how a realme to ordinate?
Yet one daie o we hope thou shalt bring backe
Deare Bullingbrooke the iustice that we lacke.

I.71
Thus muttered lo the malcontented sort
That loue kings best before they haue them still,
And neuer can the present state comport,
But would as oft change as they change their will:
For this good Duke had wonne them in this sort
By suckring them and pittyng of their ill,
That they supposed straight it was one thing,
To be both a good man, and a good king.

I.72
When as the grauer sort that saw the course
And knew that Princes maie not be controlde,
Likt wel to suffer this for feare of worse;
Since many great, one kingdome cannot hold:

⁶⁴ MS I-II (12r): Devided from the world for this saide they?
For now they saw intestine strife of force
The apt-deuided state intangle would,
If he should stay whom they would make their head
By whom the vulgar body might be lead.

I.73
They saw likewise that Princes oft are faine\(^\text{65}\)
To buy their quiet with the price of wrong:
And better twere that now a few complaine
Then all should morne, as well the weake as strong:
Seeing how little Realmes by change doe gain,
And therefore learned by obseruing long
T’admire times past, follow the present will
Wish for good Princes, but t’indure the ill.

I.74
For when it nought auailes what folly then
To striue against the current of the time?
Who will throw downe himselfe for other men
That make a ladder by his fall to clime?
Or who would seeke t’imbroile his country when\(^\text{66}\)
He might haue rest; suffering but others crime?
Since wisemen euer haue preferred farre
Th’uniustest peace, before the iustest warre.\(^\text{67}\)

I.75
Thus they considered that in quiet sate,
Rich or content, or else vnfit to striue:
Peace louer-wealth, hating a troublous state
Doth willing reasons for their rest contriue:
But if that all were thus considerate
How should in court the great, the fauour’d thriue?
Factions must be and these varieties,\(^\text{68}\)
And some must fall that other some may rise.

I.76
But long the Duke remaind not in exile
Before that Iohn of Gaunt his father dies,
Vpon whose state the king seasd now this while
Disposing of it as his enemies:
This open wrong no longer could beguile
The world that saw these great indignities,

\(\text{65}\) MS I-II (13\(^r\)): They saw likewise that Princes ought are faine
MS I-II:D: “ought” is crossed out and “oft” written above it. A similar edit is made in II.3.

\(\text{66}\) MS I-II (13\(^r\)): Or who will seeke t’imbroile his country when

\(\text{67}\) MS I-II (13\(^r\)): Th’uniustest peace before thvniustest warr.

\(\text{68}\) MS I-II (13\(^r\)): Factions must be at these varieties
Which so exasperates the mindes of all
That they resolu’d him home againe to call.

I.77
For now they saw twas malice in the king
Transported in his il-concieued thought,
That made him so to prosecute the thing
Against all law and in a course so naught:
And this aduantage to the Duke did bring
Fitter occasions whereupon he wrought:
For to a man so strong and of such might
He giues him more, that takes away his right.

I.78
The king, in the meane time, I know not how
Was drawne into some actions forth the land,
T’appease the Irish that reuolted now;
And there attending what he had in hand
Neglects those parts from whence worse daungers grow,
As ignorant how his affaires did stand:
Whether the plot was wrought it should be so,
Or that his fate did draw him on to go.

I.79
Certaine it is that he committed here
An ignorant and idle oursigh,
Not looking to the Dukes proceedings there,
Being in the court of Fraunce where best he might,69
Where both the king and all assured were
T’haue stopt his course being within their right:
But being now exild he thought him sure
And free from farther doubting liu’d secure.

I.80
So blindes the sharpest counsels of the wise
This ouershadowing providence on hie,
And dazeleth the clearest sighted eies,
That they see not how nakedly they lie:
There where they little thinke the storme doth rise,
And ouercasts their cleare security:
When man hath stopt al waies saue only that70
That (least suspected) ruine enters at.

I.81
And now was all disorder in th’excesse

69 MS I-II (14r): Be’ing in the court of fraunce where best he might
70 MS I-II (14r): When man haue stopt al wayes save only that
And whatsoever doth a change portend,
As idle luxury, and wantonnes,
*Proteus*-like varying pride, vaine without end:
Wrong-worker *Riot*, motiue to oppresse,
Endles exactions, which the idle spend,
Consuming vury and credits crackt,
Cald on this purging warre that many lackt.

I.82
Then ill perswading want in martiall minds,
And wronged patience, long opprest with might,
Loosenes in all, which no religion bindes,
Commanding force the measure made of right,
Gaue fuell to this fire, that easie findes
The way t’inflame the whole indangerd quite:
These were the publique breeders of this warre,
By which stil greatest states confounded are.

I.83
For now this peace with *Fraunce* had shut in here
The ouergrowing humours warres doe spend,
For where t’euacuate no employments were
Wider th’vnwildy burthen doth distend;
Men wholy vsd to warre, peace could not beare;
As knowing no course else whereto to bend;
For brought vp in the broiles of these two Realmes,
They thought best fishing still in troubled streames.

I.84
Like to a riuver that is stopt his course
Doth violate his bankes, breakes his owne bed,
Destroies his bounds and ouer-runs by force
The neighbour fields irregularly spread:
Euen so this sodaine stop of warre doth nurse
Home broiles within it selfe, from others lead:
So dangerous the change hereof is tride
Ere mindes come soft or otherwise imploid.

I.85
And all this makes for thee, o *Bullingbrooke*,
To worke a waie vnto thy Soueraintie;
This care the heauens, fate and fortune tooke
To bring thee to thy scepter easily:
Vpon the fals that hap *which* him forsooke
Who crownd a king, a king yet must not die,

71 MS I-II (15r): Uppon the falls that hap that him forsooke
Thou wert ordaind by prouidence to raise\(^{72}\)
A quarrel lasting longer than thy daies.

I.86
For now this absent king out of his land,
Where though he shew’d great spirit and valor then,\(^{73}\)
(Being attended with a worthy band
of valiant Peeres, and most courageous men)
Gave time to them at home that had in hand
Th’vngodly worke and knew the season when;
Who faile not to advise the Duke with speed,
Soliciting to what he soone agreed.

I.87
For presently vpon so good report,
He doth with cunning traine and pollicy
Conuay himselfe out of the French kings court
Vnder pretence to go to Brittanie:
And with his followers that to him resort
Landed in England. Welcom’d joyfully
Of th’alttring vulgar apt for changes still
As headlong caried with a present will.

I.88
And com’d to quiet shore but not to rest,
The first night of his joyfull landing here
A fearfull vision doth his thoughts molest,
Seeming to see in wofull forme appeare,
A naked goodly woman all distrest,
Which with ful-weeping eies and rent-white haire,
Wringing her hands as one that grieued and praid,
With sighes commixt, with words it seem’d shee said.

I.89
O whither doth thou tend my vnkind sonne?\(^{74}\)
What mischiefe dost thou go about to bring
To her whose Genius thou here lookst vpon,
Thy mother countrey whence thy selfe did spring?
O whither dost thou in ambition run,\(^{75}\)
To change due course by foule disordering?
What bloodshed, o what broyles dost thou commence

---

\(^{72}\) MS I-II (15\(^{s}\)): Thou wast ordaind by providence to rayse
\(^{73}\) MS I-II (15\(^{s}\)): Where though he shew’d great spirit and valor then
\(^{74}\) MS I-II (15\(^{s}\)): O whither doth thou tend my vnkind sonne?
\(^{75}\) MS I-II (15\(^{s}\)): O whether dost thou in ambition run?

Michel (Civil Wars, p. 301) notes this line as “O whither thus” in Q1595. It appears as above, “thou” not “thus”, in Q1595:I-IV and Q1595:I-V.
To last for many wofull ages hence?

I.90
Stay here thy foote, thy yet vnguilty foote,
That canst not stay when thou art farther in,
Retire thee yet vnstaind whilst it doth boote,
The end is spoile of what thou dost begin:
Inujustice neuer yet tooke lasting roote,
Nor held that long impiety did win:
The babes vnborne, shall o be borne to bleed
In this thy quarrell if thou doe proceede.

I.91
Thus said shee ceast, when he in troubled thought
Grieu’d at this tale and sigh’d, and this replies:
Deare Country o I haue not hither brought
These Armes to spoile but for thy liberties:
Tho sinne be on their head that this haue wrought76
Who wrongd me first, and thee doe tyrannise;
I am thy Champion and I seeke my right,
Prouokt I am to this by others spight.

I.92
This this pretence saith shee, th’ambitious finde
To smooth iniustice, and to flatter wrong:
Thou dost not know what then will be thy mind
When thou shalt see thy selfe aduan’c’d and strong:
When thou hast shak’d off that which others binde
Thou soone forgettest what thou learnedst long:
Men doe not know what then themselues will be
When as more then themselues, themselues they see.77

I.93
And herewithall turning about he wakes,
Lab’ring in sprite, troubled with this strange sight:78
And musd a while, waking aduisement takes
Of what had past in sleepe and silent night.
Yet hereof no important reck’ning makes

---

76 MS I-II (16v): The sinne be on their head that this haue wrought
“Tho” in line 5 is one of the “faults escaped” in Q1595:I-V: “Tho, reade the”. See p. 460 of this appendix.
77 MS I-II (16v): Second “themselues” is inserted with a caret on MS I-II, appears to be same hand as principal scribe, not Daniel’s hand. Michel does not note the possible edit.
78 MS I-II (16v): Laboring in spiritt troubled with this straunge sight
But as a dream that vanisht with the light:79
The day designes, and what he had in hand
Left it to his diuerted thoughts unskand.

I.9480
Doubtfull at first, he warie doth proceed
Seemes not t’affect, that which he did effect,
Or els perhaps seems as he ment indeed,
Sought but his owne, and did no more expect:
Then fortune thou art guilty of his deed,
Thou didst his state aboue his hopes erect,
And thou must beare some blame of his great sin
That left’st him worse then when he did begin.

I.95
Thou didst conspire with pride, and with the time
To make so easie an assent to wrong,
That he that had no thought so hie to clime,
(With fauoring comfort still allur’d along)
Was with occasion thrust into the crime,
Seeing others weaknes and his part so-strong:
And o in such a case who is it will
Do good, and feare that maie liue free with ill.

I.96
We will not say nor thinke O Lancaster,
But that thou then didst meane as thou didst swere
Vpon th’Euangelists at Doncaster,
In th’eie of heauen, and that assembly there
That thou but as an vpright orderer
Sought’st to reforme th’abused kingdome here,
And get thy right, and what was thine before,
And this was all, thou would’st attempt no more.

I.97
Though we might say & thinke that this pretence
Was but a shadow to th’intended act,
Because th’euent doth argue the offence
And plainlye seems to manifest the fact:
For that hereby thou mightst win confidence
With those whom els thy course might hap distract,
And all suspition of thy drift remoue,
Since easily men credit whom they loue.

79 MS I-II (16’): “which” corrected to “that”. Michel (Civil Wars, p. 301) shows this as “MS-not D” and I concur. The correction seems to have been made in the body of the line at the time the manuscript was prepared.
80 Book I, stanzas 94 to 100 (Q1595:I-IV) do not appear in MS I-II.
I.98
But God forbid we should so nerely pry
Into the low deepe buried sinnes long past
T’examine and conferre iniquity,
Whereof faith would no memory should last:
That our times might not haue t’exemplifie
With aged staines, but with our owne shame cast,
Might thinke our blot the first not done before,
That new-made sins might make vs blush the more.

I.99
And let unwresting charity beleue
That then thy oth with thy intent agreed,
And others faith, thy faith did first deceiue,
Thy after fortune forc’d thee to this deed:
And let no man this idle censure giue
Because th’euent proues so, twas so decreed:
For o what counsels sort to other end
Then that which frailty did at first intend?

I.100
Whilst those that are but outward lookers on,
That cannot sound these misteries of state,
Deemes things were so contriu’d as they are done,
Holding that policie, that was but fate:
Wondring how strange twas wrought, how close begun,
And thinke all actions else did tend to that,
When o how short they come, or cast too fare
Making the happy wiser than they are.

I.101
But by degrees he venters now on blood,81
And sacrifiz’d vnto the peoples loue,
The death of those that chiefe in enuy stood
As th’Officers, who first these dangers proue:
The treasurer and those that they thought good,
_Bushy_ and _Greene_ by death he must remoue,
These were the men the people thought did cause
Those great exactions and abusd the lawes.

I.102
This done, his cause was preacht with learned skil,
And th’Archbishop of Canterbury shew’d
A pardon sent from Rome, to all that will
Take part with him, and quit the faith they ow’d

81 MS I-II (16v): _The morning sonne he first salutes with blood_
To Richard, as a Prince vnfit and ill, 
On whom the crowne was fatally bestow’d: 
And easie-yielding zeale was quickly caught 
With what the mouth of grauity had taught.

I.103
O that this power from euerlasting giuen 
The great alliance made twixt God and vs, 
Th’intelligence that earth doth hold with heauen, 
Sacred religion, o that thou must thus 
Be made to smooth our waies vniust, vneuen, 
Brought from aboue earth-quarrels to discusse, 
Must men beguile our soules to winne our wils, 
And make our zeale the furtherer of ils?

I.104
But the ambitious to advance their might 
Dispence with heauen and what religion would, 
The armed will finde right, or else make right, 
If this meanes wrought not, yet another should: 
And this and other now doe all incite 
To strength the faction that the Duke doth hold; 
Who easily obtained what he sought, 
His vertues and his loue so greatly wrought.

I.105
The king still busied in this Irish warre 
Which by his valour there did well succeede, 
Had newes how here his Lords reuolted are, 
And how the Duke of Herford doth proceed: 
In these affaires he feares are growne too farre, 
Hastes his returne from thence with greatest speed; 
But was by tempests, windes, and seas debarr’d 
As if they likewise had against him warr’d.

I.106
But at the length, though late, in wales he landes, 
Where thorowly informed of Henries force,82 
And well aduertisd how his owne case stands, 
Which to his griefe he sees tendes to the worse: 
He leaues t’Aumerle, at Milford all those bands 
He brought from Ireland; taking thence his course 
To Conwaie all disguisd with fourteene more

---

82 MS I-II (17v): Where thorowlie informed of Henries force 
The “e” in “informed” seems to be crossed out and an apostrophe placed above it. Michel (Civil Wars, p. 302) reports this edit as MS-D. Given the very small change, I find it difficult to ascertain if this is Daniel’s hand.
To th’Earle of Salisburie thither sent before.

The Duke of Aumarle sonne to the Duke of Yorke.83

I.107
Thinking the Earle had raisd some forces there84
Whom there he findes forsaken all alone,
The people in those partes which leuied were
B’ing closely shronke away dispersd and gone;85
The king had stayd too long, and they in feare
Resolued euery man to shift for one,
At this amasd such fortune he laments,
Foresees his fall whereto each thing consents.

I.108
In this disturb’d tumultuous broken state,
Whilst yet th’euent stood doubtfull what should be,
Whilst nought but headlong running to debate
And glittering troupes and armor men might see:
Fury, and feare, compassion, wrath and hate
Confusd through all the land no Corner free:
The strong all mad, to strife, to ruine bent;
The weaker waild, the aged they lament,

I.109
And blame their many yeares that liue so long
To see the horrour of these miseries:
Why had not we (said they) dyde with the strong
In forraine fields in honourable wise?
In iust exploit, and lawfull without wrong,
And by the valiant hand of enemies?
And not thus now reserued in our age
To home confusion and disordered rage.

I.110
Vnto the Temples flocke the weake deuout,
Sad wailing women, there to vow and pray
For husbands, brothers, or their sonnes gone out
To bloodshed, whom nor tears, nor loue could stay:
Here graue religious fathers which much doubt
The sad euents these broyles procure them may,
As Prophets warne, exclaime, disswade these crimes
By the examples fresh of other times.

83 MS I-II (17v): No gloss. See footnote 15.
84 MS I-II (17v): Thinking the Earle raisd some forces there
MS I-II:D: “had” inserted with a caret.
85 MS I-II (17v): Being closely shronke away dispersd and gone:
I.111
And o what doe you now prepare said they,
Another conquest by these fatall waies?
What must your own hands make your selues a pray
To desolation, which these tumults raise?
What Dane, what Norman, shall prepare his way
To triumph on the spoile of your decaies?
That which nor France nor all the world could doe
In vnion, shall your discord, bring you to?

I.112
Conspire against vs neighbor nations all
That enuy at the height whereto w’are growne;
Coniure the barbarous North, and let them call
Straunge fury from far distant shores vnknown,
And let them altogether on vs fall;
So to diuert the ruine of our owne,
That we forgetting what doth so incense
May turne the hand of malice to defence.

I.113
Calme these tempestuous spirits O mighty Lord,
This threatening storme that ouer hangs the land,
Make them consider ere they’vnsheath the sword
How vaine is th’earth, this point whereon they stand,
And with what sad calamities is stoor’d
The best of that, for which th’Ambitious band:
Labor the end of labor, strife of strife,
Terror in death and horrour after life.

I.114
Thus they in zeale whose humbled thoughts were good:
Whil’st in this wide spread volume of the skies,
The booke of prouidence disclosed stood,
Warnings of wrath, foregoing miseries;
In lines of fire and caracters of blood,
There fearfull formes in dreadfull flames arise,
Amazing Comets, threatning Monarches might
And new-seene stares, vnkonwne vnto the night.

I.115
Red fiery dragons in the aire doe flie,
And burning Meteors, poyned-streaming lights,
Bright starres in midst of day appeare in skie,
Prodigious monsters, gcastly fearefull sights:
Straunge Ghosts, and apparitions terrifie,
The wofull mother her owne birth affrights,
Seeing a wrong deformed infant borne
Grieues in her paines, deceiu’d in shame doth morn.

I.116
The Earth as if afeard of bloud and woundes
Trembles in terror of these falling bloes:
The hollow concaues giue out groning sounds
And sighing, murmurs to lament our woes:
The Ocean all at discord with his boundes,
Reiterates his strange vntimely floes:
Nature all out of course to check our course,
Neglects her worke to worke in vs remorse.

I.117
So great a wracke vnto it selfe doth lo
Disordered mortality prepare:
That this whole frame doth euen labour so
Her ruine vnto frailty to declare;
And travailes to fore-signifie the wo,89
That weake improuidence could not beware:
For heauen and earth, and aire and seas and all
Taught men to see, but not to shun their fall.

I.118
Is man so deare vnto the heauens that they
Respect the waies of earth, the workes of sin?
Doth this great all this vniuersall weigh
The vaine designes that weaknes doth begin?
Or doe our feare father of zeale make way
Vnto this errour ignorance liues in?
Making our faults the cause that moue these powres90
That haue their cause from other cause then ours?

I.119
Or doe the conscience of our wicked deedes
Apply to sinne the terrour of these sights,
Hapning at the instant when commotion breedes91
Amazing only timorous vulgar wights,

89 MS I-II (19v): In fearefull signes to signify the woe
90 MS I-II (19v): Making faults the cause that move these powres
91 “Our” is lightly added to MS. Michel concludes this to be MS I-II:D, but it is not clear to me.
Who euer agrrauating that which feedes
Their feares, still find out matter that affrights,
Whilst th’impious fierce, neglecting feele no touch,
And weigh too light what other feare so much?

I.120
Ah no, th’eternall power that guides this frame
And serues him with the instruments of heauen
To call the earth and summon vp our shame,
By an edict from euerlasting giuen;
Forbids mortality to search the same,
Where sence is blind, and wit of wit bereauen:
Terror must be our knowledge, feare our skill,
T’admire his worke and tremble at his will.

I.121
And these beginnings had this impious warre,\textsuperscript{92}
Th’ungodly bloodshed that did so defile
The beauty of thy fields, and euen did marre
The flowre of thy chiefe pride o fairest Ile:
These were the causes that incensd so farre
The ciuil wounding hand inragd with spoile,
That now the liuing with afflicted eie
Looke backe with grief on such calamity.\textsuperscript{93}

\textsuperscript{92} MS I-II (20\textsuperscript{r}): And these beginings had theise ympious warr
\textsuperscript{93} The final line in Book I in the MS I-II (20\textsuperscript{r}) is followed by “\textit{finis}” and a spiral flourish.
Book II

The Argument of the second booke

King Richard mones his wrong and wailes his raigne:
And here betrayd to London he is led,
Basely attyrd attending Herfords traine,
Where th’one is skornd, the other welcomed.
His Wife mistaking him doth much complaine
And both together greatly sorrowed:
In hope to saue his life and ease his thrall
He yeelds up state, and Rule, and Crowne, and all

II.1
IN deearth of faith and scarcity of friends,
The late great mighty monarch on the shore
In th’vtmost corner of his land attends
To call backe false obedieience fled before:
Toyles, and in vaine, his toile and labour spends,
More hearts he sought to gaine he lost the more:
All turn’d their faces to the rising sunne
And leaues his setting-fortune night begun.

II.2
O Percy how by thy example lead
The household traine forsooke their wretched Lord,
When with thy staffe of charge dishonoured,
Thou brak’st thy faith, not steward of thy word,
And tookst his part that after tooke thy head:
When thine owne hand had strengthened first his sword;
For such great merits doe obraid, and call
For great reward, or thinke the great too small.

This Percy was Earle of Worster, and brother to the Earle of Northumberland.

II.3
And kings loue not to be beholding ought,
Which makes their chiepest friends oft speed the worst.
For those by whom their fortunes haue bin wrought

94 The second book in MS I-II (21r) begins with the title “The Second Canto” on a page that includes II.1-II.3. This is the only place where Daniel refers to any of the books as a “canto”. There are no prefatory arguments in MS I-II.
95 MS I-II (21r): No gloss. See footnote 15.
96 MS I-II (21r): Which makes their chiepest freindes ought speed the worst
MS I-II:D: “ought” is crossed out and “oft” written above it. A similar edit is made in I.74.
97 MS I-II (21r): for those by whome their fortune hath bin wrought
Variant not noted by Michel.
Put them in mind of what they were at first:
Whose doubtfull faith if once in question brought
Tis thought they will offend because they durst,
And taken in a fault are never spared
Being easier to revenge, then to reward.

II.4
And thus these mighty actors sons of change,
These partizanes of factions, often tried
That in the smoke of innovations strange
Build huge uncertain plots of unsure pride:
And on the hazard of a bad exchange
Have ventured all the stock of life beside,
Whilst princes raised, disdain to have been raised
By those whose helps deserve not to be praised.

II.5
O Majesty left naked all alone
But with th’unarmed title of thy right,
Those gallant troupes, thy fortune followers gone;
And all that pompe (the complements of might)
The’ amazing shadowes that are cast upon98
The cares of princes, to beguile the sight,
Are vanisht clean, and only frailty left
Thy selfe of all, besides thy selfe bereft.

II.6
Like when some great Colossus, whose strong base
Or mighty props are shronke or sunk away,
Fore-showing ruine, threatening all the place
That in the danger of his fall doth stay,
All straight to better safety flock apace,99
None rest to help the ruine while they may:
The perill great and doubtful the redresse,
Men are content to leave right in distress.

II.7
As stately Thames inricht with many a flood,
And goodly rivers that have made their graves
And buried both their names and all their good
Within his greatness to augment his waues;
Glides on with pompe of waters unsurpassed

98 MS I-II (21v): Th’amusing shadowes that are cast upon
“amazing” in line 5 is one of the “faults escaped” in Q1595:1-V: amazing, “read amuzing”. See p. 460 of this appendix.
99 MS I-II (21v): All straight to better fortune flocke apace
MS I-II:D: “fortune” is crossed out and “safetie” written above it.
Vnto the Ocean, which his tribute craues
And laies vp all his wealth within that powre,
Which in it selfe all greatnes doth deuour.

II.8
So flocke the mightie with their following traine
Vnto the all receiuing Bullingbrooke,
Who wonders at himself how he should gaine
So manie hearts as now his partie tooke,
And with what ease and with how slender paine,
His fortune giues him more then he could looke,
What he imagined neuer could be wrought\(^{100}\)
Is powrd vpon him, farre beyond his thought.

II.9
So often things which seeme at first in shew
Without the compasse of accomplishment,
Once ventred on to that successse do grow,
That euen the Authors do admire th’euent:
So manie meanes which they did neuer know
Doe second their designes, and doe present
Straunge vnexpected helpes, and chiefly then
When th’Actors are reputed worthy men.

II.10
And Richard who lookt fortune in the backe,
Sees headlong-lightnes running from the right,
Amazed stands to note how great a wracke
Of faith his riots causd, what mortall spight
That beare him, who did law and iustice lacke:
Sees how concealed hate breakes out in sight,
And feare-depressed enuy pent before
When fit occasion thus vnlockt the dore.

II.11
Like when some mastiue whelpe disposd to plaie
A whole confused heard of beastes doth chace,
Which with one vile consent run all awaie,
If any hardier than the rest in place
But turne the head that idle feare to stay,
Backe straight the daunted chaser turnes his face,
And all the rest with bold example led\(^{101}\)
As fast run on him as before they fled.

---
\(^{100}\) MS I-II (22r): What never he ymaginde could be wrought
\(^{101}\) MS I-II (22v): And all the rest by bold example led
II.12
So with this bold opposer rushes on
This many-headed monster *Multitude*:
And he who late was feared is set upon,
And by his own *Actaeon*-like pursuit,
His own that had all love and awe foregone;
Whom breath and shadows only did delude,
And newer hopes which promises persuade;\(^\text{102}\)
Though rare performed promises so made.

II.13
Which seeing this: thus to himself complaines:
O why do you fond false deceived so
Run headlong to that change that nothing gains
But gain of sorrow, only change of woe?
Which is all one if he be like that reigns:
Which will you buy with blood what you forgoe?
Tis nought but shewes that ignorance esteemes,
The thing possesed is not the thing it seemes.

II.14
And when the sins of *Bullingbrooke* shall be
As great as mine, and you unanswered
In these your hopes; then may you wish for me
Your lawfull Sou’reigne from whose faith you fled,
And grieved in your soules the error see
That shining promises had shadowed:
As th’humorous sickre remouing finde no ease,\(^\text{103}\)
When changed Chambers change not the disease.

II.15
Then shall you finde this name of liberty
(The watchword of rebellion euer vsd
The idle echo of uncertainty,
That euermore the simple hath abused)
But new-turnd servitude and misery,
And euen the same and worse before refusd,
Th’aspirer once attaint vnto the top
Cuts off those meanes by which himself got vp.

\(^{102}\) MS I-II (22°): And *neuer* hopes which promises persuade
MS I-II:D: “neuer” underlined; “= newer” written in margin. Michel indicates that this may be Daniel’s hand (“MS I-II:D?”, *Civil Wars*, 303). It is difficult to tell if this is Daniel’s hand, as it is in print, not script. The handwriting is similar to that of other edits on MS I-II (22°) although the ink is somewhat darker than most of the others. I deduce it to be Daniel’s.

\(^{103}\) MS I-II (23°): As the *humorous* sickre removing finde no ease.
II.16
And with a harder hand and straighter raine
Doth curbe that loosenes he did finde before,
Doubting th’occasion like might serue againe,
His owne example makes him fear the more:
Then o iniurious land what dost thou gaine
To aggrauate thine owne afflictions store?
Since thou must needs obay to gouerment,
And no rule euer yet could all content.

Two stanzas from MS not included in 1595.104

II.17
O if my youth hath offred vp to lust
Licentious fruits of indiscreet desires
When idle heate of vainer yeares did thrust
That fury on: yet now when it retires
To calmer state: o why should you distrust105
To reape that good whereto mine age aspires?106
The youth of Princes haue no bounds for sinne107
Vnlesse themselues do make them bounds within.

---

104 The following stanzas appear in MS I-II (23v) but not in Q1595:I-IV:

- What hath my raigne deservd to bee thus leaft?
- How could my faultes to so great measure rise?
- Who hath committed so iniurious theaft
- Vpon my Love t’abuse it in this wise?
- How came I so of honor cleane bereaft?
- Who hath made me so hatefull to yor eyes?
- Is all the good forgott that I haue done
- Onlie the bad if any thought vpon?

- O call to mynde that I am hee yor King,
- Whose bounty had no boundes, rewardes no end.
- Tis I that never spared any thing
- That might the Maiestie of Court commend:
- Tis I that all that which my Realme did bring
- Vpon my Realme most willingly did spend
- If any thing my officers did ill,
- Adiudg it as their fault not to my will.

105 MS I-II (24r): To calmer stay o why should you distrust
106 MS I-II (24r): The gaine of glory whereto age appiers
107 MS I-II (24r): The youth of Princes hath no bounds for synn
II.18
Who sees not sees ought (wo worth the while)\textsuperscript{108}
The easie way that greatnesse hath to fall
Enuirond with deceit, hem’d in with guile,
Sooth’d vp in flattery, fawned on of all.\textsuperscript{109}
Within his owne liuings, as in exile,
Heares but with others eares or not at all:
Euen made a pray onely vnto a few,
Who locke vp grace that would to others shew.\textsuperscript{110}

II.19
And who as let in lease doe farme the crowne,\textsuperscript{111}
And ioy the vse of Maiestie and might,
Whilst we hold but the shadow of our owne,
Pleasd but with shewes, and dalied with delight:
They as huge unproportion’d moutaines growne\textsuperscript{112} Betweene our land and vs, shadowing our light,\textsuperscript{113}
Bereaue the rest of ioy and vs of loue,
And keepe downe all so keep themsleues aboue.

II.20
Which wounds with grief poore vnrespected zeale
When grace holdes no proportion in the partes;
When distribution in the common weale
Of charge and honour due to good desarts
Is stopt, when others greedy hands must deale
The benefit that Maiestie imparts:
What good we ment come gleaned home but light
Whilst we are robd of praise, they of their right.

II.21
O hence I see, and to my grieve I see,
Th’vnreconcileable disunion
Is growne betweene m’aggriauved realme and mee,\textsuperscript{114}
And by their fault, whose faith I trusted on:
My easie nature tractable and free,

\textsuperscript{108} MS I-II (24'): Who knowes not that knowes ought (wo worth the whilst);
MS I-II:D: “whilst” crossed out and “while” written above it.
\textsuperscript{109} MS I-II (24'): Smoth’d vp in flattery fawned on of all.
\textsuperscript{110} MS I-II (24'): Who locke that grace that might to others shew
\textsuperscript{111} MS I-II (24'): And who (as let in lease) doe farme the Crowne
\textsuperscript{112} MS I-II (24'): They as huge unporportioned moutaines growne
The “e” in unproportioned is apparently deleted and an apostrophe put above it. Michel shows this change as MS I-II:D, as well as “misshapen letter at the end of ‘huge’ corrected” (Civil Wars, p. 304). Given very small changes I find it difficult to ascertain if this is Daniel’s hand.
\textsuperscript{113} MS I-II (24'): Betwixt our land and vs, shadowing our light,
\textsuperscript{114} MS I-II (24'): Is growne betwixt m’aggriued realme & mee
Soone drawne to what my councel would haue done
Is thus betraid by them and my neglect,
Easiest deceiud where least I did suspect.

II.22
Thus he complaind, when lo from Lancaster
(The new intituled Duke) with order sent
Ariu’d Northumberland, as to conferre
And make relation of the Dukes intent: 115
And offered there, if that he would referre
The controuersie vnto Parliament,
And punish those that had abusd the state
As causers of this vniuersall hate,

II.23
And also see that justice might be had
On those the Duke of Glosters death procur’d,
And such remoud from councell as were bad,
His cosin Henrie would he there assur’d
On humble knees before his grace be glad
To aske him pardon to be well secur’d,
And haue his right and grace restor’d againe,
The which was all he labored t’obtaine.

II.24
And therefore he a Parley doth exhort, 116
Perswades him leaue that vncooth place 117
And with a Princely hardines resort 118
Vnto his people, that attend his grace:
They ment the publique good and not his hurt,
And would most ioifull be to see his face:
He laies his soule to pledge, and takes his oth
The ost of Christ an ostage for his troth. 119

II.25
This profer with such protestations made
Vnto a king that so nere danger stood,
Was a sufficient motiue to perswade
When no way els could shew a face of good. 120
Th’vnhonourable means of safety bade

115 MS I-II (24v): And talk with him about the Dukes intent:
116 MS I-II (25r): And therefore he a ple doth exhort
117 MS I-II (25r): Perswades the King to leaue that vncooth place
118 MS I-II (25r): And with a comfortable cheere resort
119 MS I-II (25r): The host of Christ an Ostage for his trothe.
120 Michel (Civil Wars, p. 304) shows the word “of” being “so” in Q1595:I-IV, but it is “of” in both MS I-II (25r) and Q1595:I-IV.
Danger accept what Maiestie withstood:
When better choices are not to be had
We needs must take the seeming best of bad.

II.26
Yet stands h’in doubt a while what way to take,
And doth confer with that small staying troope
That fortune left; which never would forsake
Their poore distressed Lord, nor euer stoope
To any hopes the stronger part could make:
Good Carlile, Ferby and sir Stephen Scroope\footnote{MS I-II (25v): True Carlile, Ferby and Sir Stephen Scroope}
With that most worthy Montague were al,\footnote{MS I-II (25v): With that good Earle of Salisbury were al}
That were content with Maiestie to fall.

The Bishop of Carlile. Montague Earle of Salisbury.\footnote{MS I-II (25v): No gloss. See footnote 15. MS I-II:D: The Bishop of Carlile.}

II.27
O Time, commit not sacrilegious theft
Vpon the holy faith of these good men:
Let not succeeding ages be bereft
Of such examples worthy of our Pen:
Nor thou magnanim’ous Leigh shalt not be left
In darkenes for thy constant honour then,
That then to saue thy faith wouldst loose thy head,
That reuerent head that all men pittied.

II.28
Nor conscience would that I should injury
O Ienico thy memory so cleere,
For being not ours, though with that Gascony
Claimed not for hers the faith we hold so deere;\footnote{MS I-II (25v): Claimd not for hers that faith we hold so deere;}
So England should have this small companie\footnote{MS I-II (25v): So England should haue this poore companie}
Wholy her owne, and shee no partner heere;
But lets deuide this good betwixt vs both,\footnote{MS I-II (25v): But letts devide this fame betwixt us both.}
Thake shee thy birth and we will haue thy troth.

Ienico d’Artois a Gascoyn.\footnote{MS I-II (25v): No gloss. See footnote 15. MS I-II:D: Jenico a Gascoyn servant to King Ric. that wore his liuery when all men forsooke him.
II.29
Graue Montague, whom long experience taught
In either fortune; this aduisd his king:
Deare Sou'raigne know, the matter that is sought
Is onely now your Maiestie to bring
From out of this poore safety you haue got
Into their hands, that else hold euery thing:
Nothing but onely you they want of all,
And wanting you, they nothing theirs can call.

[Gloss in MS only]128

II.30
Here haue you craggy rockes to take your part
That neuer will betray their faith to you;
These trustie mountains here will neuer start
But stand t’obraid their shame that are vntrue,
Here maie you fence your safetie with small art
Against the pride of that confused Crew:
If men will not, these very cliffes will fight
And be sufficient to defend your right.

II.31
Then keepe you here, and here shall you behold
Within short space the sliding faith of those
That cannot long their resolution hold,
Repent the course their idle rashnes chose.129
For that same mercenarie faith they sold
With least occasions discontented growes,
And insolent those voluntarie bands,130
Presuming how by them he chieflie stands.131

II.32
And how can he those mightie troupes sustaine
Long time where now he is, or any where?
Besides what discipline can he retaine
Where as he dares not keepe them vnder feare,
For feare to haue them to reuolt againe?
So that it selfe when greatnes cannot beare
With her owne waight must needes confusedly fall
Without the helpe of other force at all.

128 MS I-II (26r): No gloss. See footnote 15. MS I-II: Th’Earle of Salisbury. This gloss is in extremely light ink and is more difficult to read than most others in MS I-II.
129 MS I-II (26r): Repent the course their idle rashness choose
130 MS I-II (26r): And insolent the voluntary bandes
131 MS I-II (26r): Presuming how by them hee only standes.
II.33
And hither to approach h’will neuer dare
Where deserts, rockes, and hils no succours giue,
Where desolation and no comforts are,
Where few can do not good, manie not liue:
Besides we haue the *Ocean* to prepare
Some other place if this should not relieue;
So shall you tire his force, consume his strength
And weary all his followers out at length.

II.34
Doe but referre to time and to small time,
And infinitt occasions you shall find,
To quaile the reble euin the prime
Of all his hopes beyond all thought of mind,
For manie with the conscience of the crime
In colder bloud will curse what they design’d;
And bad successe obraiding their ill fact
Drawes them that others draw from such an act.

II.35
For if the least imagin’d ouerture
But of conceiud revolt men once espie,
Straight shrinke the weake, the great will not indure,
Th’impatient run, the discontented flie,
The friend his friends example doth procure,
And altogither haste them presently
Some to their home, some hide, others that stay
To reconcile themselues, the rest betray.

II.36
What hope haue you that euer *Bullingbrooke*
Will liue a subiect that hath tride his fate?\(^{132}\)
Or what good reconcilement can you looke
Where he must alwaies feare, and you must hate?\(^{133}\)
And neuer thinke that he this quarrell tooke
To reobtainye thereby his priuate state,\(^{134}\)

---

\(^{132}\) MS I-II (27r): Will live a subject that hath tried his might
MS I-II:D: In lines 2, 4 and 6 of this stanza the words “might”, “spight” and “right” have been crossed out on the manuscript and the words “fate?”, “hate?” and “state”, respectively, substituted.

\(^{133}\) MS I-II (27r): Where he must alwaies feare, and you must spight
See footnote 15. Michel (*Civil Wars*, p. 305) offers “slight” for the last word while Seronsy offers “fight” (Seronsy, “Manuscript”, p. 156). My reading of the manuscript, albeit difficult as the word is crossed out, is “spight”, based both on the appearance and more apparent similarity of the word “spight” to its replacement “hate”.

\(^{134}\) MS I-II (27r): To reobtain thereby his private right
Twas greater hopes that hereto did him call
And he will thrust for all, or else loose all.

II.37
Nor trust this suttles Agent nor his oth,
You know his faith, you trie it before hand,
His fault is death and now to loose his troth,
To saue his life he will not greatly stand:
Nor trust your kinsmans proffer, since you both
Shew bloud in Princes is no stedfast band:
What though he hath no title, he hath might
That makes a title where there is no right.\(^{135}\)

II.38
Thus he: when that good Bishop thus replies
Out of a mind that quiet did affect,
My lord, I must confess as your case lies,
You have great cause your subiects to suspect
And counterplot against their subtelties,
You all good care and honestie neglect
And feare the worst what insolence maie doe,
Or armed fury maie incense them to.

*The Bishop of Carlile.*\(^{136}\)

II.39
But yet my Lord, feare maie as well transport
Your care beyond the truth of what is ment,
As otherwise neglect maie fall too short
In not examining of their intent:
But let us weigh the thing which they exhort,
Tis Peace, submission and a parlament,
Which how expedient tis for either part
Twere good we judged with an unpaitiall hart.

II.40
And first for you my Lord, in grieue we see
The miserable case wherein you stand
Void here of succour, help or maiestie,
On this poore promontory of your land,\(^{137}\)
And where how long a time your grace may be,
Expecting what may fall into your hand
We know not: since th’euent of things do lie
Clos’d vp in darknes far from mortall eie.

\(^{135}\) MS I-II (27v): That makes a title where there is no right
\(^{136}\) MS I-II (27v): No gloss. See footnote 15. MS I-II:D: *The Bishop of Carlile*
\(^{137}\) MS I-II (27v): In this poore promontorie of your land,
II.41
And how vnfit it were you should protract
Long time in this so dangerous disgrace,
As though that you good spirit and courage lackt
To issue out of this opprobrious place:
When euen the face of kings do oft exact
Feare and remorse in faulty subiects base,
And longer stay a great presumption drawes
That you were guilty or did doubt your cause.¹³⁸

II.42
What subiects euer so inragd would dare
To violate a Prince, t’offend the bloud
Of that renowned race, by which they are
Exalted to the glorie of this good?
What if some things by chance misguided were,¹³⁹
Which they haue now rebelliously withstood?
That neuer will proceed with that despight
To wracke the state, and to confound the right.¹⁴⁰

II.43
Nor doe I think that Bullingbrooke can be
So blind ambitious to affect the crowne,
Hauing himselfe no title, and doth see
Others, if you should faile, must keepe him downe:
 Besides the Realme, though mad will neuer gree
To haue a right succession ouerthrowne,
To raise confusion vpon them and theirs
By preiudicing true and lawfull heires.

II.44
And now it may be fearing the successe
Of his attempts, or with remorse of mind,
Or else distrusting secret practises,
He would be glad his quarrell were resigned,
So that there were some orderly redresse
In those disorders which the Realme did find:
And this I thinke he now sees were his best
Since farther actions farther but vnrest.¹⁴¹

¹³⁸ MS I-II (28r): That you were guilty or did doubt the cause.

¹³⁹ MS I-II (28r): What if some things by chance misguided were?
In MS I-II (28r) the question mark is inserted with a caret in what appears to me to be Daniel’s hand (not noted by Michel). It is unclear, however, if the caret relates to the question mark or to the word “were” which appears above the line but seems to be in the scribe’s hand.

¹⁴⁰ MS I-II (28v): To wracke the state and to confound all right.

¹⁴¹ MS I-II (28v): Since farther actions, further but unrest.
II.45
And for the‘impossibilty of peace
And reconcilement which my Lords obiects:
I thinke when doying iniury shall cease
(The cause pretended) then surcease th’effects:
Time and some other Actions may increase
As may diuert thought of these respects;
Others law of forgetting iniuries
Maie serue our turne in like calamities.

Lex Amnestiae

II.46
And for his oath my Lord I thinke in conscience,
True honour would not to be found vntrue
Nor spot his bloud with such a fowle offence
Against his soule, against his God and you:
Our Lord forbid that euer with th’expence
Of heauen and heauenly ioies that shall insue,
Mortality should buy this little breath
T’indure the horror of eternall death.

II.47
And therefore as I thinke you safely maie
Accept this proffer, that determine shall
All doubtfull courses by a quiet waie;
Needfull for you, fit for them, good for all:
And here my sou’raigne to make longer stay
T’attend for what you are vnsure will fall
May slippe th’occasion and incense their will,
For feare that’s wiser then the truth doth ill.

II.48
Thus he perswades euen of a zealous mind,
Supposing men had spoken as they ment,
And vnto this the king likewise inclined
As wholy vnto peace and quiet bent,
And yeelds himself to th’earle, goes, leaues behind
Safety, Scepter, honor, gouernment:
For gone, all’s gone, he is no more his owne;
And they rid quite of feare, he of crowne.

---

142 MS I-II (28v): I thinke when doeing iniury shall cease,
143 MS I-II (28v): No gloss. See footnote 15.
144 MS I-II (28v): Mortalitie should by this little breath
145 MS I-II (29v): Supposing all men spake but as they ment,
146 MS I-II (29v): And they all ridd of feare, he of crowne.
II.49
A place there is where proudly raisd there stands
A huge aspiring rocke neighboring the skies\(^{147}\)
Whose surly brow imperiously commands
The sea his bounds that at his proud feet lies:
And spurnes the waues that in rebellious bands\(^{148}\)
Assault his Empire and against him rise:
Vnder whose craggy gouerment there was
A niggard narrow way for men to passe.

II.50
And here in hidden clifles concealed lay
A troope of armed men to intercept
The unsupecting king, that had no way
To free his foote that into danger stept:
The dreadfull Ocean on th’one side lay,
The hard-incroching mountaine th’other kept\(^{149}\)
Before him he beheld his hatefull foes;
Behind, him traiterous enemies inclose.\(^{150}\)

II.51
Enuiron’d thus the Earle begins to cheere
His all-amased Lord by him betraide:
Bids him take courage, ther’s no cause of feare,
These troopes but there to guard him safe were laid:
To whom the king: what needs so many here?
This is against your oth my Lord he said:
But now he sees in what distresse hee stood,
To striue was vaine, t’intreat would do no good.

II.52
And therefore on with carefull hart he goes
Complaines (but to himself) sighes, grieues & freats,
At Rutland dines, though feedes but on his woes,
The griefe of mind hindred the minde of meats:
For sorrow, shame and feare, skorne of his foes,
The thought of what hee was and what now threats;
Then what he should, and now what he hath done,
Musters confused passions all in one.

\(^{147}\) MS I-II (29r): A huge aspiring rocke neighboring the skies
\(^{148}\) MS I-II (29r): And spurnes the waues that rebellious bands
\(^{149}\) MS I-II (29v): The hard incroching mountaine that other kept
\(^{150}\) MS I-II (29v): Behinde him traiterous enemies arose.
II.53
To Flint from thence vnto a restles bed
That miserable night he comes conuayd,
Poorly prouided, poorly followed,
Vncourted, vnrespected, vnobayd:
Where if vncertaine sleepe but hooerud
Ouer the drooping cares that heauy weigh’d,
Millions of figures fantasie presents
Vnto that sorrow, wakened griefe augments.

II.54
His new missfortune makes deluding sleepe
Say twas not so, false dreames the truth deny:
Wherewith he starts: feeles waking cares do creepe
Vpon his soule, and giues his dreame the lie:
Then sleepe againe, and then againe as deepe
Deceits of darknes mocke his misery:
So hard belieu’d was sorrow in her youth
That he thinks truth was dreames, & dreames were truth.\(^{(151)}\)

II.55
The morning light presents vnto his view
Walking vpon a turret of the place,
The truth of what he sees is prou’d too true;
A hundred thousand men before his face
 Came marching on the shore which thither drew:
And more to aggrauate his fowle disgrace,
Those he had wrongd or done to them dispight
As if they him obrayd, came first in sight.\(^{(152)}\)

\(^{(151)}\) MS I-II (30'): That he thinks dreams were truethe.
In MS I-II (30'), the words “truethe was dreames, &” are omitted but inserted with a caret in MS I-II:D. Michel (Civil Wars, p. 43) cites this edit as an example of Daniel’s “economy” in his method of making edits:

But more often, and more characteristically, I think, do we find Daniel retaining the original materials which flowed so readily from his pen, and then setting himself the task of putting the best words in the best order with the least number of moves, almost as in a chess problem. This economy is illustrated at its most thrifty in the manuscript corrections, where even in a fair copy Daniel salvages parts of words instead of rewriting them: in II.53.8 [numbering based on 1609] the scribe has telescoped the line, and ended “dreames was trueth.” Danielcaret in the missing phrase, then took the medial “e” out of “trueth” and added it on the end, “truethe”; and changed “was” to “were” by erasing the “s” to substitute “re” but salvaged the “w” and overwrote the “a” into an “e,” using part of the original letter.

Although I agree with Michel about Daniel’s method in making changes, it is odd that he chose this example, where the “e” he detects is barely legible and not used in the 1595 edition.

\(^{(152)}\) MS I-II (30'): As though they him o'braid came first in sight.
II.56
There might he see that false forsworne vile crue,153
Those shameless agents of vnlawfull lust,
His Pandars, Parasites, people vntrue
To God and man, vnworthy any trust:
Pressing vnto that fortune that was nue
And with vnblushing faces formost thrust
As those that liue in sun-shine of delights,
And flie the winter when affliction lights.

II.57
There he beheld how humbly diligent
New adulation was to be at hand,
How ready Falshood stept, how nimbly went
Base-pickthanke Flattery and preuents command:
He saw the great obay, the graue consent,
And all with this new-raised Aspirer stand,154
Which when he saw and in his sorrow waid155
Thus out of griefe vnto himselfe he said.

II.58
O faithlesse Cosen, here behold I stand
Spectator of that act my selfe haue plaid,
That act of rule which now vpon thy hand
This wauering mutability hath laid:
But Cosen, know the faith of this false land156
Stands sworne to me, that faith they haue betraid
Is mine, tis mine the rule, thou dost me wrong
'Tvsurpe the gouerment I held so long.157

II.59
And when thou hast but tride what I haue found,
Thou maist repent t'haue bought command so deare,
When thou shalt find on what vnquiet ground158

153 MS I-II (30v): There might you see that false forsworne vile crue
In MS I-II (30v), the “l” in “false” is missing in the original text and is inserted with a caret. It appears to me to be not MS I-II:D, but a change made by the original scribe. The correction is not noted by Michel.
154 MS I-II (30v): And all with this new false aspirer stand
The change in this line is not noted in Michel’s variants but is described in Seronsy, “Daniel’s Manuscript”, p. 155. Seronsy describes it as “a probable revision in which the diction gains immeasurably.”
155 MS I-II (30v): Which when he saw and with discretion weighd
156 MS I-II (30v): And cosin know the faith of this false land
157 MS I-II (30v): ’Tvsurpe the goverment I hould so long.
158 MS I-II (31r): When thou shalt find upon how slippery grounde
Greatnes doth stand, that stands so high in feare:
Where infinite occasions do confound
The peace of minde, the good thou look’st for here:159
O fatall is th’ascent vnto a crowne!160
From whence men come not downe, but must fall downe.

Stanza from MS not included in 1595.161

II.60
O you that cherish fat iniquity,
Inriching sinne, with store, and vice with gaine
\textit{By my disgrace}, see what you get thereby\textsuperscript{162}
To raise the bad, to make the good complaine:
These vipers spoile the wombe wherein they lie,
And haue but impudence a grace to gaine,
\textbf{But} bodies and bold browes no myndes within\textsuperscript{163}
But minde of ill, that knows but how to sin.\textsuperscript{164}

Stanza from MS not included in 1595.165

\textsuperscript{159} MS I-II (31\textsuperscript{r}): The peace of minde, the \textit{joy} thou look’st for here
\textsuperscript{160} MS I-II (31\textsuperscript{r}): O fatall is \textit{tha’ scent} vnto a crowne
\textsuperscript{161} The following stanza appears in MS I-II (fol. 31\textsuperscript{r}) but not in Q1595:I-IV:
\begin{itemize}
  \item And that corrupting breath of smooth deceipt
  \item That soothes the eare with choyce of pleasing thinges \textsuperscript{[see note below]}
  \item Did first inerr me, I perisht with that baite \textsuperscript{[see note below]}
  \item Which me this shame, and thee this fortune brings
  \item Thease daungerous guests that now vpon thee waite
  \item Thinking best living vnder newest kinges
  \item Will use thee thus, or labor so to doe
  \item And in short tyme will seeke to chaunge thee to
\end{itemize}

In MS I-II (31\textsuperscript{r}), the word “choyce” in the second line seems to have a mark through the letter “h”. Michel believes this to be in Daniel’s hand and notes the word as “coyce”. I find it difficult to ascertain if the handwriting is Daniel’s. The word “inerr” in the third line is offered by Michel (\textit{Civil Wars}, p. 306) as “marr”. Seronsy (“Daniel’s Manuscript”, p. 158) notes of this word in MS I-II, “The MS is not clear at this point. The word is hardly ‘indear’ and ‘inerr’ seems to make more sense, although the OED, which lists the form, does not cite its use as a verb.” While unclear, as noted by Seronsy, the word clearly begins with an “i” and is, therefore, not “marr” as offered by Michel. I accept Seronsy’s reading.

\textsuperscript{162} MS I-II (31\textsuperscript{r}): \textit{Bee learnt by mee} see what you gett thereby
\textsuperscript{163} MS I-II (31\textsuperscript{r}): Great bodies and bold browes no myndes within
\textsuperscript{164} MS I-II (31\textsuperscript{r}): But minde of lust that knowes but how to syn.
\textsuperscript{165} The following stanza appears in MS I-II (31\textsuperscript{r}) but not in Q1595:I-IV:
\begin{itemize}
  \item These doe preoccupate the heart the eye
  \item And grace of mighty men that might doe good
  \item And thesee doe put backe blushing honesty
  \item That grieves when vertue is not vnderstood
  \item Theas doe disgrace the grace whereon they ly
\end{itemize}
II.61
And for the good which now do take thy part
Thou maiste reioyce, for th’others I am glad
To thinke they may in time likewise subuart
The expectation which of thee men had:
When though shalt find how difficult an art
It is to rule and please the good and bad:
And feel the grievance of this fatall sort,
Which still are borne for court are made in court.

II.62
More grieue had said: when lo the Duke he saw
Entring the Castle come to parle there,
Which makes him presently from thence withdraw
Into a fitter place some other where:
His fortune now inforst an yeelding awe
To meete him, who before in humble feare
Would haue beeene glad t’haue staid, and to prepare
The grace of audience, with attendant care.

II.63
The Duke when come in presence of his king,
Whether the sight of maiestie did breed
Remorse of wrong which reuerence did bring,
Or whether but to formalize his deed,
He kneeles him downe euen at his entering,
Rose, kneeles againe (for craft will still exceed)
When as the king approcht, put off his hood
And welcomd him, though wishd him little good.

II.64
To whom the Duke thus said: my Lord I know
That both vnlookt for, and vnsent vnto
I haue presumed to come hither now;
But this your wrong and rigor draue me to,
And being come I purpose now to shew
You better how to rule, and what to doe:
You haue had time too much to worke our ill,
But now redresse is planted in our will.

And doe defile the worth of reverent bloud
And murder the opynion of the best
Which doe thease idle manners most detest

166 MS I-II (31v): More had hee said when lo the Duke he saw
167 MS I-II (31v): To meete him that before in humble feare
168 MS I-II (32r): You haue had tyme (to much) to worke our ill,
II.65
As you shall please deare cosin said the king,
You haue me in your power, I am content
And I am pleas’d, if my disgrace may bring
Good to my countrey which I euer ment.
But yet God grant your course held in this thing
Cause not succeeding ages to repent.
And so they left: the Duke had hast to go,
It was no place to end the matter so.

II.66
Straight towards London in this heate of pride
The Duke sets forward as they had decreed,
With whom the Captiue King constrain’d must ride,
Most meanely mounted on a simple steed:
Degraded of all grace and ease beside,
Thereby neglect of all respect to breed;
For th’ouer-spreading pompe of prouder might
Must darken weaknes and debase his sight.

II.67
Approaching nere the City he was met
With all the sumptuous shewes ioy could devise,
Where new-desire to please did not forget
To passe the usuall pompe of former guise;
Striuing applause as out of prison let,
Runnes on beyond all boundes to nouelties:
And voice and hands and knees and all do now
A straung deformed forme of welcome show.

II.68
And manifold confusion running greetes
Shootes, cries, claps hands, thrusts, striues and presses nere:
Houses impou’risht were t’inrich the streetes,
And streetes left naked that vnhappy were
Plac’d from the sight where ioy and wonder meets,
Where all of all degrees striue to appeare:
Where diuers-speaking zeale, one murmure findes
In vndistinguishing voice to tell their mindes.

\(^{169}\) MS I-II (32\(^{v}\)): And I reioyce if my disgrace shall bring
\(^{170}\) MS I-II (32\(^{v}\)): Good to my country which I never ment:
\(^{171}\) MS I-II (32\(^{v}\)): But yet God grant the course held in this thing
\(^{172}\) MS I-II (32\(^{v}\)): And towards London in this heat of pride
II.69
He that in glory of his fortune sate,
Admiring what he thought could never be,\(^{173}\)
Did feel his blood within salute his state,
And lift up his rejoicing soul to see
So many hands and hearts congratulate
Th’advancement of his long desired degree:
When prodigal of thanks in passing by
He resalutes them all with cheerful full eye.

II.70
Behind him all aloof came pensive on
The unregarded king, that drooping went
Alone, and but for spite scarce looked upon,
Judge if he did more envy or lament:
O what a wondrous work this day is done,
Which th’image of both fortunes doth present,
In th’one to show the best of glories face,
In th’other worse than worst of all disgrace.

II.71
Now Isabell the young afflicted Queene,
Whose years had never shewed her but delights,
Nor lovely eyes before had ever seen
Other than smiling joys and joyful sights:
Borne great, matcht great, liv’d great and ever been
Partaker of the worlds best benefits,
Had plac’d her selfe, hearing her Lord should passe\(^{174}\)
That way where she unseen in secret was.

II.72\(^{175}\)
Sick of delay and longing to behold
Her long mist love in fearful jeopardies,
To whom although it had in sort been told
Of their proceeding, and of his surprize,
Yet thinking they would never be so bold
To lead their Lord in any shameful wise,
But rather would conduct him as their king,
As seeking but the states reordering.

\(^{173}\) MS I-II (33r): Admiring what he never thought could bee

\(^{174}\) MS I-II (33r): And plac’d her selfe, hearing her Lord should passe

MS I-II:D: “And” is crossed out and “Had” is written in above it.

\(^{175}\) Stanza does not appear in MS I-II and was added to Q1595:I-IV.
II.73
And forth shee looks: and notes the formost traine
And grieues to view some there she wisht not there,
Seeing the chiefe not come, staiies, lookes againe,
And yet she sees not him that should appeare:
Then backe she stands, and then desires was faine
Againe to looke to see if he were nere,
At length a glittering troupe farre off shee spies,
Perceiues the thronge and heares the shoots & cries.

II.74
Lo yonder now at length he comes (saith shee)
Looke my good women where he is in sight:
Do you not see him? yonder that is hee
Mounted on that white courser all in white,
There where the thronging troupes of people bee,
I know him by his seate, he sits s’vpright:
Lo now he bows: deare Lord with what sweet grace:
How long haue I longd to behould that face?

II.75
O what delight my hart takes by mine eie
I doubt me when he comes but something neare
I shall set wide the window: what care I
Who doth see me, so him I may see cleare?
Thus doth false ioy delude her wrongfully
Sweet lady in the thing she held so deare;
For nearer come, shee findes shee had mistooke,
And him shee markt was Henrie Bullingbrooke.

II.76
Then Ennuie takes the place in her sweet eies
Where sorrow had prepard her selfe a seat,
And words of wrath from whence complaints should rise,
Proceed from egar lookes, and browes that threat:
Traytor saith shee: i’st thou that in this wise
To braue thy Lord and king art made so great?

176 MS I-II (33’): And forth shee looks: viewes the formost traine
MS I-II:D: “&” inserted with a caret.
177 MS I-II (33’): Then backe she stands and then desire was faine
178 MS I-II (33’): I know him by his seate, he sits vpright
MS I-II:D: “s’” inserted with a caret.
179 MS I-II (33’): Lo now he bowes (Deere Lord) with what sweet grace?
180 MS I-II (33’): How long haue I longd to behould that face.
181 MS I-II (33’): O what delight my hart takes by mine eye,
182 MS I-II (33’): Poore lady in the thing she held so deare,
183 MS I-II (34’): Traitor saith she ist thou that in this wise
And haue mine eies done vnto me this wrong
To look on thee? For this staid I so long?

II.77
O haue they grac’d a perjur’d rebell so?
Well for their error I will weepe them out,
And hate the tongue defiled that praisde my fo,
And loath the minde that gaue me not to doubt:
O haue I added shame vnto my woe?
Ile looke no more; Ladies looke you about,
And tell me if my Lord bee in this traine,
Least my betraying eies should erre againe.

II.78
And in this passion turnes her selfe away:
The rest looke all, and carefull note each wight;
Whilst she impatient of the least delay
Demaunds againe, and what not yet in sight?
Where is my Lord? what gone some other way?
I muse at this, O God graunt all goe right.\(^{184}\)
Then to the window goes againe at last\(^{185}\)
And sees the chiepest traine of all was past.

II.79
And sees not him her soule desir’d to see,
And yet hope spent makes her not leaue to looke,
At last her loue-quicke eies which ready bee,\(^{186}\)
Fastens on one whom though shee neuer tooke
Could be her Lord: yet that sad cheere which he
Then shew’d, his habit and his wofull looke,
The grace he doth in base attire retaine,
Causd her she could not from his sight refraine.

II.80
What might he be she said that thus alone\(^{187}\)
Rides pensiue in this vniuersall ioy:
Some I perceiue as well as we doe mone,
All are not pleas’d with euery thing this day,
It maie be he laments the wronge is done
Vnto my Lord, and grieues as well he may,
Then he is some of ours, and we of right
Must pitty him, that pitties our sad plight.

\(^{184}\) MS I-II (34\(^v\)): I muse at this? O God graunt all goe right.
\(^{185}\) MS I-II (34\(^v\)): Then to the window looke againe at last
\(^{186}\) MS I-II (34\(^v\)): At length loue sharpened eyes which ready bee
\(^{187}\) MS I-II (34\(^v\)): What might he be saide shee that thus alone
II.81
But stay, is’t not my Lord himself I see?
In truth if twere not for his base array,
I verily should thinke that it were he;
And yet his baseness doth a grace bewray:
Yet God forbid, let me deceiued be;
O be it not my Lord although it may:
And let desire make vowes against desire,
And let my sight approue my sight a liar.

II.82
Let me not see him, but himselfe, a king;
For so he left me, so he did remoue:
This is not he, this feeles some other thing,
A passion of dislike or els of loue:
O yes tis he, that princely face doth bring
The evidence of maiestie to proue:
That face I haue conferr’d which now I see
With that within my hart, and they agree.

II.83
Thus as shee stoode assur’d and yet in doubt,
Wishing to see, what seene she grieud to see,
Hauing beliefe, yet faine would be without;
Knowing, yet striuing not to know twas he:
Her hart relenting, yet her hart so stout
As would not yeeld to thinke what was, could be:
Till quite condemnd to open proofe of sight
Shee must confesse or else denie the light.

II.84
For whether loue in him did sympathize
Or chance so wrought to manifest her doubt,
Euen just before, where she thus secret prize,
He staies and with cleare face lookes all about:
When she: tis o too true, I know his eies
Alas it is my owne deare Lord, cries out:
And with that crie sinkes down vpon the flore,
Abundant griefe lackt words to vtter more.

---

188 MS I-II (35r): Let me not see himselfe, a king;
In addition to the word “him” missing in MS I-II (35r), the word “but” is inserted with a caret.
Correction appears to be hand of original scribe, not MS I-II:D (35r). Edit not noted by Michel
with his usual MS-not D.
189 MS I-II (35r): O yes tis he that louelie face doth bring
190 MS I-II (35r): When she: tis true tis hee I know his eyes
191 MS I-II (35r): Alas tis hee tis my owne Lord: cries out
II.85
Sorrow keeps full possession in her soule,
Lockes him within, laies vp the key of breath,
Raignes all alone a Lord without controule
So long till greater horror threateneth:
And euen in daunger brought, to loose the whole
H’is forst come forth or else to stay with death,
Opens a sigh and lets in sence againe,
And sence at length gies words leave to complaine.

II.86
Then like a torrent had beene stopt before,
Teares, sighes, and words, doubled togither flow,
Confusdly striuing whether should do more
The true intelligence of griefe to show:
Sighes hindred words, words perisht in their store,
Both intermixt in one together grow:
One would do all, the other more then’s part
Being both sent equall agents from the hart.

II.87
At length when past the first of sorrowes worst,
When calm’d confusion better forme affords
Her hart commands her words should past out first,
And then her sighes should interpoint her words;
The whilst her eies out into teares should burst,
This order with her sorrow she accords,
Which orderles all forme of order brake,
So then began her words and thus she spake.

II.88
O dost thou thus returne againe to mee?
Are these the triumphs for thy victories?
Is this the glory thou dost bring with thee
From that vnhappy Irish enterprise?
O haue I made so many vowes to see
Thy safe returne, and see thee in this wise?
Is this the lookt for comfort thou dost bring,
To come a captiue that wentst out a king?

192 MS I-II (35v): Teares sighes & words doubled together flow
MS I-II:D: “&” inserted with a caret.
193 MS I-II (35v): One would doe all thother more then his pt
194 MS I-II (35v): The whilst her eies out into teares should burst
195 MS I-II (36r): Thy safe returne, and see thee in this wise?
196 MS I-II (36r): To come a captive and wentst out a king?
[Two stanzas from MS not included in 1595.]¹⁹⁷

II.89
And yet deare Lord though thy vngratefull land¹⁹⁸
Hath left thee thus, yet I will take thy part,
I do remaine the same vnder thy hand,
Thou still dost rule the kingdom of my hart;
If all be lost, that gouerment doth stand
And that shall neuer from thy rule depart:
And so thou be, I care not how thou be,
Let greatnes goe, so it goe without thee.

II.90
And welcome come, how so vnfortunate,
I will applaud what others do dispise,
I loue thee for thy selfe not for thy state,
More then thy selfe is what without thee, lies:
Let that more go, if it be in thy fate,
And hauing but thy selfe it will suffize:
I married was not to thy crowne but thee,
And thou without a crowne all one to mee.

II.91
But what doe I heere lurking idlie mone
And waile a part, and in a single part
Make seuerall griefe which should be both in one,¹⁹⁹
The touch being equall of each others hart?

¹⁹⁷ The following stanzas appear in MS I-II (36r) but not Q1595:I-IV:
Our sad attempt was that to take in hand,
To conquere otheres, and to loose thyne owne
And seeking more to add vnto thy land
To leave thy land and to forgoe thy crowne
Whiles thou their mischiefe didst not vnderstand
Being there victorious heere are ouerthrowne
Wicked ungratefull people so to deale
Against your faith your king and common weale.

O was there none that with respective eye
would once vouchsafe to looke vpon their Lord?
Deservd hee no regard in passing by?
No not the least applause by signe or word?
well London thou that sawst this inury
Thy streetes may rue the grace they did afford,
To bee the stage vnto this wicked act
And curse the causes and bewaile the fact.

¹⁹⁸ MS I-II (36r): And o my Lord though thy vngratefull land
¹⁹⁹ MS I-II (36r): Make severall griefe which should goe both in one
And no sweete Lord thou must not mone alone,\(^{200}\)
For without me thou art not all thou art,
Nor my teares without thine are fullie teares,
For thus vnioyn’d, sorrow but halfe appeares.

II.92
Joine then our plaints & make our griefe ful griefe,
Our state being one, o lets not part our care,
Sorrow hath only this poore bare releife,
To be bemon’d of such as wofull are:
O should I rob thy griefe and be the thiefe
To steale a priuate part, and seuerall share,
Defrauding sorrow of her perfect due?
No no my Lord I come to helpe thee rue.

II.93
Then forth shee goes a close concealed way\(^{201}\)
As grieuung to be seene not as shee was;
Labors t’attaine his presence all shee maie,
Which with most hard a doe was brought to passe:
For that night vnderstanding where he laie
With earnest treating she procur’d her passe
To come to him. Rigor could not deny
Those teares, so poore a suite or put her by.

II.94
Entring the chamber where he was alone
As one whose former fortune was his shame,
Loathing th’obraiding eie or anie one
That knew him once and knows him not the same:
When hauing giuen expresse commaund that none
Should presse to him, yet hearing some that came
Turnes angerly about his grieued eies\(^{202}\)
When lo his sweet afflicted Queene he spies.\(^{203}\)

II.95
Straight cleeres his brow & with a borrowed smile
What my dere Queene, o welcome deare he saies\(^{204}\)
And striuing his owne passion to beguile
And hide the sorrow which his eie betraies,\(^{205}\)
Could speake no more but wrings her hands the while,

\(^{200}\) MS I-II (36r): And no deere Lord thou must not mone alone
\(^{201}\) MS I-II (37r): Then forth shee goes a close and secrete way
\(^{202}\) MS I-II (37r): Lookes angerlie about as bent to chide
\(^{203}\) MS I-II (37r): When lo his sweete afflicted queene he spied.
\(^{204}\) MS I-II (37r): What my dere Queene o welcome deere he sayes
\(^{205}\) MS I-II (37r): And hide the sorrow which his eyes betrays
And then (sweet lady) and againe he staiest.
Th’eexcesse of ioy and sorrow both affords
Affliction none, or but poore niggard words.

II.96
Shee that was come with a resolued hart
And with a mouth full stoor’d, with words wel chose,
Thinking this comfort will I first impart
Vnto my Lord, and thus my speech dispose:
Then thus ile say, thus looke, and with this art
Hide mine owne sorrow to relieue his woes,
When being come all this prou’d nought but winde,
Teares, lookes, and sighes doe only tell her minde.

II.97
Thus both stood silent and confused so,
Their eies relating how their harts did morne
Both bigge with sorrow, and both great with woe
In labour with what was not to be borne:
This mighty burthen wherewithal they goe
Dies vndeliuered, perishes vnborne;
Sorrow makes silence her best oratore
Where words may make it lesse not shew it more.

II.98
But he whom longer time had learn’d the art
T’indure affliction as a vsuall touch:
Straines forth his words, and throwes dismay apart
To raise vp her, whose passions now were such
As quite opprest her ouerchardged hart,
Too small a vessell to containe so much,
And cheeres and mones, and fained hopes doth frame
As if himself belieued, or hop’d the same.

II.99
And now the while these Princes sorrowed,
Forward ambition comes so nere her ende,
Sleepes not nor slippes th’occasion offered
T’accomplish what it did before intende:
A parlament is foorthwith summoned
In Richards name, whereby they might pretend
A forme to grace disorder and a shew
Of holie right, the right to ouerthrow.

206 MS I-II (37v): And then sweete Lady and againe he staiest.
207 The end of MS I-II; final line in MS I-II (37v) is followed by “finis” and a spiral flourish.
208 Book II, stanzas 97-131 (Q1595:I-IV) do not appear in the MS I-II.
II.100
Ah could not *Maiestie* bee ruined
But with the fearefull power of her owne name?
And must abusd obedience thus be led
With powrefull titles to consent to shame?
Could not confusion be established
But forme and order must confirme the same?
Must they who his authority did hate,
Yet vse his stile to take away his state?

II.101
Order, o how predominant art thou!
That if but only thou pretended art,
How soone deceiu’d mortality doth bow
To follow thine as still the better part?
Tis thought that reuerent forme will not allow
Iniquity: or sacred right peruart:
Within our soules since o thou dwell’st so strong
How ill do they that vse thee to do wrong.

II.102
So ill did they that in this formall course
Sought to establish a deformed right:
Who might as well effected it by force,
But that men hold it wrong what’s wrought by might:
Offences vrg’d in publique are made worse,
The shew of iustice aggrauates despight:
The multitude that looke not to the cause
Rest satisified, so it be done by lawes.

II.103
And now doth enuie articles obiect
Of rigor, malice, priuate fauourings,
Exaction, riot, falshood and neglect;
Crimes done, but not to b’anwered by kings:
Which subiects maie complaine but not correct:
And all these faults which *Lancaster* now brings
Against a king, must be his owne when he
By vrging others sinnes a king shall be.

II.104
For all that was most odious was deuisd
And publisht in these articles abrode,
All th’errors of his youth were here comprisd
Calamitie with obloquie to lode:
And more to make him publikely dispisd
Libels, inuectiues, rayling rimes were sow’d
Among the vulgar, to prepare his fall
With more applause and good consent of all.

II.105
Looke how the day-hater Mineruas bird
Whil’st priuiledg’d with darknes and the night,
Doth liue secure t’himselfe of others feard,
But if by chance discouered in the light
O how each little foule with enuy stirr’d
Cals him to iustice, vrges him with spight;
Summons the feathered flockes of all the wood
To come to scorne the tyrant of their blood.

II.106
So fares this king layd open to disgrace
Whilst euery mouth full of reproach iuaies,
And euery base detractor in this case
Vppon th’advantage of misfortune plaies:
Downe-falling greatnes vrged on a pace
Was followed hard by all disgracefull waies,
Now in the point t’accelerate an end
Whilst misery had no meanes to defend.

II.107
Vpon these articles in parlament
So haynous made, inforst, and vrgd so hard,
He was adiudged vnfit for gouernment
And of all regall power and rule debarr’d:
For who durst contradict the Dukes intent,
Or if they durst should patiently be heard?
Desire of change, old wrongs, new hopes, fresh feare
Being far the major part, the cause must beare.

II.108
Yet must we thinke that some which saw the course
The better few, whom passion made not blind
Stood carefull lookers on with sad commorse,
Amazd to see what headlong rage dessignd:
And in a more considerate discourse
Of tragicall euents thereof deuind,
And did or might their grieued harts to ease
Vtter their sorrowes in like termes as these.

II.109
What dissolute proceedings haue we here?
What strange presumptuous disobedience?
What vnheard fury void of awe or feare,
What monstrous vnexampled insolence?
Durst subiects euer here or any where
Thus impiously presume so fowle offence?
To violate the power commanding all
And into judgement maiestie to call.

II.110
O fame conceale and doe not carry word
To after-coming ages of our shame,
Blot out of bookes and rase out of Record
All monuments memorials of the same:
Forget to tell how we did lift our sword,
And enuious idle accusations frame
Against our lawfull sou’raigne, when we ought
His end and our release haue staid not fought.

II.111
Since better yeares might worke a better care,
And time might well haue cur’d what was amisse;
Since all these faults fatall to greatnes are,
And worse desertes haue not beeene punisht thus,
But o in this the heauens we feare prepare
Confusion for our sinnes as well as his,
And his calamity beginneth our:
For he his owne, and we abusd his power.

II.112
Thus grieued they: when to the king were sent
Certaine that might perswade and vrge him on
To leaue his crowne, and make with free consent
A voluntarie resignation,
Seeing he could no other way preuent
The daunger of his owne confusion,
For not to yeeld to what feare would constraine,
Would barre the hope of life that did remaine.

II.113
And yet this scarce could worke him to consent
To yeeld vp that so soone men hold so deare:
Why let him take (said he) the gouerment,
And let me yet the name, the title beare;
Leaue me that shew and I will be content,
And let them rule and gouerne without feare:
O can they not my shadowe now indure
When they of all the rest do stand secure?

II.114
Let me hold that, I aske no other good:
Nay that I will hold, Henrie doe thy worst,
For ere I yield my crowne ile loose my bloud,
That bloud that shall make thee and thine accurst:
Thus resolute a while he firmely stood,
Till loue of life and feare of being forst
Vanquisht th’innated valour of his minde;
And home and friends, so wrought that he resignd.

II.115
Then to the towre (where he remained) went
The Duke withal the Peeres attended on:
To take his offer with his free consent,
And testifie his resignation:
And thereof to informe the parlament
That all things might more formally be done:
And men might rest more satisfied thereby
As not done of constraint but willingly.

II.116
And forth h’is brought vnto th’accomplishment
Deckt with the crowne in princely robes that day,
Like as the dead in other lands are sent
Vnto their graues in all their best aray:
And euen like good did him this ornament,
For what he brought he must not beare away,
But buries there his glory and his name
Intombd for euermore in others blame.

II.117
And there vnto th’assembly of these states
His sorrow for their long indured wrong
Through his abusd authority relates,
Excuses with confessions mixt among:
And glad he saies to finish all debates
He was to leaue the rule they sought for long,
Protesting if it might be for their good
He would as gladly sacrifice his bloud.

II.118
There he his subjects all in generall
Assoyles and quites of oth and fealty,
Renounces interest, title, right and all
That appertaind to kingly dignity;
Subscribes thereto and doth to witness call
Both heauen and earth and God and saints on hie,
And all this did he but t’haue leaue to liue,
The which was all he crau’d that they would giue.

II.119
Tis said with his owne hands he gaue the crowne
To Lancaster, and wisht to God he might
Haue better ioy thereof then he had knowne,
And that his powre might make it his by right:
And furthermore he crau’d of all his owne
But life to liue apart a priuate wight;
The vanity of greatnes he had tride
And how vnsurely standes the foote of pride.

II.120
This brought to passe the lords returne with speed
T’acquaint the Parlament with what is done,
Where they at large publish the kings owne deed
And manner of his resignation:
When Canterbury vrgd them to proceed
Forthwith vnto a new election,
And Henry make his claime both by discent
And resignation to the gouerment.

Arundell Bishop of Canterbury.

II.121
Who there with full and generall applause
Is straight proclaimd as king and after crownd,
The other cleane reiected by the lawes,
As one the Realme had most vnworthy found.
And yet o Lancaster I would thy cause
Had had as lawfull and as sure a ground
As had thy vertues, and thy glorious worth
For Empire borne, for Gouernment brough forth:

II.122
Then had not o that sad succeeding age
Her fieldes engrain’d with bloud, her riuers dide
With purple streaming wounds of her owne rage,
Nor seene her Princes slaine, her Peeres distroide:
Then hadst not thou deare country come to wage
Warre with thy selfe, nor those afflictions tride
Of all-consuming discord here so long,
Too mighty now against thy selfe too strong.

II.123
So had the bloud of thirteene battels fought
About this quarrel, fatall to our land,
Haue beene reseru’d with glory to haue brought
Nations and kingdomes vnder our commaund:
So should all that thy sonne and thou had got,
With glorious praise haue still beene in our hand,
And that great worthy last of all thy name
Had joind the western *Empire* to the same.

**II.124**
So should his great imperiall daughter now
Th’admired glory of the earth, hereby
Haue had all this nere bordering world to bow
To her immortalized maiestie:
Then proud *Iberus* Lord not seeking how
T’attaine a false-conceiued Monarchie,
Had kept his barraine boundes and not haue stood
In vaine attempts t’inrich the seas with bloud.

**II.125**
Nor interposd his greedy medling hands
In other mens affaires t’aduance his owne,
Nor tyrannisd ouer so manie landes
From late obscurity so mighty growne:
But we with our vndaunted conquering bandes
Had lent our Ensignes vnto landes vnknowne,
And now with more audacious force began
To march against th’earths-terror *Ottoman*.

**II.126**
Where thou (*O worthy Essex*) whose deare blood
Reseru’d from these sad times to honour ours,
Shouldst haue conducted Armies and now stood
Against the strength of all the *Easterne Powres*:
There should thy valiant hand perform’d that good
Against the barbarisme that all deuoures,
That all the states of the redeemed *Earth*
Might thee admire, and glorifie thy birth.

**II.127**
Thence might thy valor haue brought in despight
Eternall *Tropheis* to *Elizas* name,
And laid downe at her sacred feete the right
Of all thy deedes and glory of the same.
And that which by her power, and by thy might
Thou hadst attaing to her immortall fame
Had made thee wondred here, admir’d a farre
The *Mercury* of peace, the *Mars* of warre.

**II.128**
And thou my Lord the glorie of my muse
Pure-spirited *Mountioy*, th’ornament of men,
Hadst had a large and mighty field to vse
Thy holie giftes and learned counsels then:
Whole landes and Prouinces should not excuse
Thy trusty faith, nor yet sufficient beene
For those great vertues to haue ordered
And in a calme obedience gouerned.

II.129
Nor had I then at solitary brooke
Sate framing bloudy accents of these times,
Nor told of woundes that grieued eies might looke
Vpon the horror of their fathers crimes,
But rather a more glorious subiect tooke
To register in euerlasting rimes
The sacred glories of ELIZABETH,
T’haue kept the wonder of her worth from death.

II.130
And likewise builded for your great designes
O you two worthies bewties of our state,
Immortall tombes of vnconsuming lines
To keepe your holie deedes inuiolate:
You in whose actions yet the image shines
Of ancient honor neere worne out of date,
You that haue vertue into fashion brought
In these neglected times respected nought.

II.131
But whither am I carried with the thought
Of what might haue beene, had not this beene so?
O sacred Fury how was I thus brought
To speake of glory that must tell of wo?
These acted mischiefs cannot be vnwrought
Though men be pleasd to wish it were not so.
And therefore leaue sad Muse th’imagin’d good,
For we must now returne againe to bloud.
Book III

The Argument of the third booke

Henry the fourth, the Crowne established,
The Lords that did to Glosters death consent,
Degraded doe rebell, are vanquished:
King Richard vnto Pomfret Castle sent
Is murthered there. The Percies making head
Against the king, receiue the punishment:
And in the end a tedious troublous raigne
A grieuous death concludes with care, and paine.

III.1
Now risen is that head, by which did spring
The birth of two strong heads, two crownes, two rights;
That monstrous shape that afterward did bring
Deform’d confusions to distracted wights:
Now is attain’d that dearely purchas’d thing
That fild the world with lamentable sights:
And now attain’d, all care is how to frame
Meanes to establish, and to hold the same.

III.2
Striuing at first to build a strong conceit
Of his weake cause, in apt-abused mindes,
He deckes his deed with colours of deceit
And ornaments of right, which now he findes:
Succession, conquest, and election straight
Suggested are, and prou’d in all three kindes:
More then inough he findes, that findes his might
Hath force to make all that he will haue, right.

III.3
All these he hath when one good would suffize
The worlds applause, and liking to procure,
But who his owne cause makes doth still deuise
To make too much to haue it more then sure:
Feare casts too deepe, and euer is too wise,
The doubtfull can no usuall plots indure:
These selfe-accusing titles all he had
Seeking to make one good of manie bad.

209 MS III (262') begins with “The third booke of the ciuile warrs” at the top of the first page, a
page which also includes the first three stanzas and the first three lines of the fourth stanza. MS III,
like MS I-II, does not include an argument.
III.4
Like foolish he that feares, and faine would stop
An inundation working on apace,
Runs to the breach, heapes mighty matter vp,
Throwes indigested burthens on the place,
Loades with huge waights, the outside and the top,
But leaues the inner parts in feeble case:
Thinking for that the outward forme seems strong
Tis sure inough, and may continue long.

III.5
But when the vnderworking waues come on
Searching the secrets of vnfenced waies,
The full maine Ocean following hard vpnon
Beares downe that idle frame, skorning such staies;
Prostrates that frustrate paines as if not done,
And proudly on his silly labors plaies,
Whilst he perceiues his error, and doth finde
His ill proceeding contrary to kind.

III.6
So fares it with our indirect disseignes\(^{210}\)
And wrong-contriued labors at the last,
Whilst working time or Iustice vndermines
The feeble ground-worke craft thought laid so fast:
Then when out-breaking vengeance vncombines
The ill-ioynd plots so fairely ouercast,
Turnes vp those strong pretended heapes of showes\(^{211}\)
And all these weake illusions overthowes.

III.7
But wel he thought his powre made al seem plain,
And now t’his coronation he proceedes,
Which in most sumptuous sort (to intertaine
The gazing vulgar whom this error feedes)
Is furnisht with a stately glorious traine,
Wherein the former kings he far exceeds:
And all t’amuse the world, and turne the thought\(^{212}\)
Of what, and how twas done, to what is wrought.

III.8
And that he might on many props repose
He strengths his owne, and who his part did take:
New officers, new counsellours he chose,

\(^{210}\) MS III (262\(^{v}\)): So fares it with our indiscreete disseignes
\(^{211}\) MS III (262\(^{v}\)): Turnes vp those strong pretendant heapes of showes,
\(^{212}\) MS III (263\(^{r}\)): And all amase the world, and turne the thought
His eldest sonne the Prince of Wales doth make,
His second Lord high Steward, and to those
Had hazarded their fortunes for his sake
He giues them charge, as merites their desart;
Seeking all meanes t’oppressse the aduerse part.

III.9
All Counsellers vnto the former king,
All th’officers, and judges of the state,
He to disgrace, or els to death did bring
Lead by his owne, or by the peoples hate:
Who euermore by nature mallicing
Their might whom not their vertues, but their fate
Exalted hath, who when kings do what’s naught
Because tis in their power, tis thought their fault.

III.10
And plac’d for these such as were popular
Belou’d of him, and in the peoples grace,
Learned graue Shirley he makes Chauncellor,
One of great spirit, worthy his worthy race:
And Clifford he ordaines Lord Treasuror,
A man whose vertues well deseru’d that place:
Others to other roomes (whom people hold
So much more lou’d how much they loathd the old)

III.11
Then against those he strictly doth proceed
Who chiefe of Glosters death were guilty thought,
(Not so much for the hatred of that deed)
But vnder this pretext the meanes he sought,
To ruine such whose might did much exceed
His powre to wrong, nor els could wel be wrought;
Law, Iustice, bloud, the zeale vnto the dead
Were on his side, and his drift shadowed.

III.12
Here manie of the greatest of the land
Accusd were of the act, strong proofes brought out
Which strongly were refell’d, the Lords all stand
To cleere their cause most resolutely stoute:
The king perceiuing what he tooke in hand
Was not with safety to be brought about
Desistes to vrge their death in anie wise,

213 MS III (263r): Their power whom not their vertues, but their fate
214 MS III (263r): So much more lou’d how much they loath the old,
215 MS III (263r): Law, Iustice, power, the zeale vnto the dead
Respecting number, strength, friends and allies.

The Duke of Surrey, Excester & Aumarle. The Earles of Salisbury and Gloster, the Bishop of Carlile, Sir Thomas Blunt and other were the parties accused.  

III.13
Nor was it time now in his tender raigne
And infant-young-beginning gouernment,
To striue with bloud when lenity must gaine
The mighty wight, and please the discontent:
New kings do feare, when old courts farther straine,
Establisht states to all things will consent:
He must dispence with his will, and their crime,
And seeke t’oppresse and weare them out with time.

III.14
Yet not to seeme but to haue something done
In what he could not as he would effect,
To satisfie the people that begun
Reuenge of wrong, and iustice to expect:
He causd be put to execution
One that to doe this murder was elect,
A base meane man whom few or none would misse,
Who first did serue their turne, and now serues his.

III.15
And to abase the too high state of those
That were accusd, and lessen their degrees,
Aumarle, Surry, Exceter, must lose
The names of Dukes, their titles, dignities,
And whatsoeuer honour with it goes:
The Earles their titles and their Signories,
And all they gote in th’end of Richards raigne
Since Glosters death, they must restore againe.

III.16
By this as if by Ostracisme t’abate
That great persumptiue wealth, wheron they stand;
For first hereby impou’rising their state
He kils the meanes they might haue to withstand :
Then equals them with other whom they hate,
Who (by their spoiles) are raisd to hie command,
That weake, and enuied if they should conspire
They wracke themselves, and he hath his desire.

217 MS III (264r): Then equals them with others whom they hate,
III.17
And by this grace which yet must be a grace
As both they, and the world, are made believe,
He doth himself secure and them deface,
Thinking not rigor that which life doth giue:
But what an error was it in this case
To wrong so many, and to let them liue?
But errors are no errors but by fate,
For oft th’euent make foule faults fortunate.

III.18
The parlament which now is held, decreed
What euer pleased the king but to propound;
Confirm’d the crowne to him and to his seed,
And by their oth their due obedience bound:
And o b’it sinne t’examine now this deed
How iust tis done and on how sure a ground?
Whether that Court maie change due course or no
Or ought the realme against the realme can do?

III.19
Here was agreed to make all more secure
That Richard should remaine for euermore
Close-prisoner, least the realme might chance indure
Some new reuolt, or any fresh vprore:
And that if any should such broile procure
By him or for him, he should die therefore.
So that a talke of tumult and a breath
Would serue him as his passing-bell to death.

III.20
Yet reuerent Carlile thou didst there oppose
Thy holy voice to saue thy Princes bloud,
And freely check’st this judgement and his foes,
When all were bad, yet thou dar’st to be good:
Be it inrold that time may neuer lose
The memory of how firme thy vertues stood,
When power, disgrace, nor death could ought diuart
Thy glorious tongue, thus to reueale thy hart.

218 MS III (264v): And if that any should such broile procure
219 MS III (264v): Would serue him as a passing-bell to death.
III.21
Graue, reuerent Lords, since that this sacred place
Our Auentine, Retire, our holy hill;\textsuperscript{220}
This place, soule of our state, the Realmes best grace
Doth priuiledge me speake what reason will:
O let me speake my conscience in this case
Least sin of silence shew my hart was ill,
And let these walles witness if you will not,
I do discharge my soule of this foule blot.

III.22
Neuer shall this poore breath of mine consent
That he that two and twenty yeeres hath raignd
As lawfull Lord, and king by iust descent,
Should here be iudged vnheard, and vnaraigned
By subiects\textsuperscript{two}: Iudges incompetent\textsuperscript{221}
To iudge their king vnlawfully detaind,
And vn-brought forth to plead his guiltles cause,
Barring th’annointed libertie of lawes.

III.23
Haue you not done inough? blush, blush to thinke,
Lay on your harts those hands; those hands too rash,
Know that this staine that’s made doth farther sinke\textsuperscript{222}
Into your soules then all your blouds can wash,
Leaue with the mischief done and doe not linke
Sin vnto sin, for heauen, and earth will dash
This ill accomplisht worke ere it be long,
For weake he builds that fences wrong with wrong.

III.24
Stopt there was his too vehement speech with speed,
And he sent close to warde from where he stood:
His zeale vntimely deem’d too much t’exceed
The measure of his wit and did no good:
They resolute for all this doe proceed
Vnto that iudgement could not be withstood:
The king had all he crau’d or could compell,
And all was done we will not say how well.

\textsuperscript{220} One of the “faults escaped” in Q1595:I-V, “read our Auentine retyre”. See p. 460 of this appendix. The comma should be after “retyre” rather than “Auentine”. MS III (265\textsuperscript{s}) has no punctuation in the line.

\textsuperscript{221} MS III (265\textsuperscript{s}): By subiects too, Iudges incomiptent

\textsuperscript{222} MS III (265\textsuperscript{s}): Knowe that the staine thats made doth farther sinke
III.25
Now Muse relate a wofull accident
And tell the bloodshed of these mighty Peeres
Who lately reconcild, rest discontent,
Griev’d with disgrace, remaining in their feares
How euerseeming outwardly content,
Yet th’inward touch that wounded honor beares
Rests closely rankling and can find no ease
Till death of one side cure this great disease.

III.26
Meanes how to feele, and learne each others hart
By the Abbot now of Westminster is found,²²³
Who secretly disliking Henries part
Inuites these Lords, and those he ment to sound,
Feasts them with cost, and drawes them on with art,
And darke, and doubtful questions doth propound:
Then plainer speakes, and yet uncertaine speaks,
Then wishes wel, then off abruptly breakes.

III.27
My Lords saith he, I feare we shall not finde
This long-desired king such as was thought:
But yet he may doe well: God turne his minde:
Tis yet new daies: but ill bodes new and nought:
Some yet speed well: though all men of my kind
Haue cause to doubt; his speech is not forgot,
That Princes had too little, we too much;
God giue him grace, but tis ill trusting such.

III.28
This open-close, apparent-darke discourse
Drew on much speech, and euery man replies,
And euery man ads heat, and words inforce
And vrge out words, for when one man espies
Anothers minde like his, then ill breedes worse,
And out breakes all in th’end what closest lies,
For when men well haue fed th’bloud being warme²²⁴
Then are they most improuident of harme.

III.29
Bewray they did their inward boyling spight
Each stirring other to reuenge their cause,
One saies he neuer should indure the sight
Of that forsworne, that wrongs both land and lawes:

²²³ MS III (265v): By the Abbot now of Westminster was found,
²²⁴ MS III (266r): For when men haue well fed th’bloud being warme
Another vowes the same of his minde right:
A third t’a point more nere the matter drawes,
Sweares if they would, he would attempt the thing
To chase th’vsurper, and replace their king.\(^{225}\)

III.30
Thus one by one kindling each others fire
Till all inflam’d they all in one agree,
All resolute to prosecute their ire,
Seeking their owne, and Countries cause to free:
And haue his first that their bloud did conspire,
For no way else they said but this could be
Their wrong-detained honor to redeeme,
Which true-bred bloud shoulde more then life esteeme.

III.31
And let not this our new-made faithless Lord
Saith Surry thinke, that we are left so bare
Though bare inough: but we will find a sword
To kill him with, when hee shall not beware:
For he that is with life and will but stoor’d,
Hath for reuenge inough, and needs not care,
For time will fit and furnish all the rest,
Let him but euen attend, and doe his best.

III.32
Then of the manner how t’effect the thing
Consulted was, and in the end agreed
That at a maske and common reuelling\(^{226}\)
Which should b’ordaind, they should performe the deed;\(^{227}\)
For that would be least doubted of the king
And fittest for their safety to proceed,
The night, their number, and the suddaine act
Would dash all order, and protect their fact.

III.33
Besides they might vnder the faire pretence
Of Tilts and Turnements which they intend,
Prouide them horse, and armour for defence,
And all things else conuenient for their end:
Besides they might hold sure intelligence
Among themselues without suspect t’offend:
The king would think they sought but grace in court

\(^{225}\) MS III (266’): To chase th’vsurper, and replace their king.
\(^{226}\) MS III (266’): That at a maske and solempe reveling
\(^{227}\) MS III (266’): Which should b’ordaind, they would performe the deed
Serysony and Krueger do not note this difference.
Withall their great preparing in this sort.

III.34
A solemne oth religiously they make
By intermutuall vowes protesting there
This neuer to reuale; nor to forsake
So good a cause, for daunger hope, or feare:228
The Sacrament the pledge of faith they take,
And euery man vppon his sword doth sweere
By knighthood, honor, or what els should binde,
To assecure the more each others minde.

III.35
And when al this was done, and thought wel done
And euery one assures him good successe,
And easie seemes the thing to euery one
That nought could crosse their plot or them suppresse:
Yet one among the rest, whose mind not wonne
With th’ouerweening thought of hot excesse,
Nor headlong carried with the streame of will,
Nor by his owne election lead to ill:

III.36
Sober, milde Blunt, whose learning, valor, wit
Had taught true judgement in the course of things,
Knew daungers as they were, and th’humorous fit
Of ware-lesse discontent, what end it brings:
Counsels their heat with calme graue words, & fit
Words wel forethought that from experience springs,
And warnes a warier cariage in the thing
Least blind presumption worke their ruining.

Sir Thomas Blunt.229

III.37
My Lords (saith he) I know your wisedomes such
As that of my aduise you haue no need,
I know you know how much the thing doth touch
The maine of all your states, your bloud, your seed:
Yet since the same concerns my life as much
As his whose hand is chiefest in this deed,
And that my foote must go as farre as his,
I thinke my tongue may speake what needfull is.

228 MS III (267’): The cause, for daunger hope, or feare
Seronsy and Krueger note this as “A metrically deficient manuscript line” (“Manuscript of Daniel’s Civil Wars Book III”, p. 161).
229 MS III (267’): No gloss. See footnote 241.
III.38
The thing we enterprize I know doth beare
Greate possibility of good effect,
For that so many men of might there are
That venter here this action to direct:
Which meaner wights of trust, and credit bare
Not so respected could not looke t’effect;
For none without great hopes will follow such
Whose power, and honor doth not promise much.

III.39
Besides this new, and doubtfull gouernment,
The wauering faith of people vaine, and light,
The secret hopes of many discontent,
The natural affection to the right,
Our lawfull sou’raignes life, in prison pent,
Whom men begin to pitty now, not spight,
Our wel laid plot, and all I must confesse
With our iust cause doth promise good successe.

III.40
But this is yet the outward fairest side
Of our disseigne: within rests more of feare,
More dread of sad euent yet vndiscride
Then o most worthy Lords I would there were:
But yet I speake not this as to deuide
Your thoughts from th’act, or to dismay your cheere,
Onely to adde vnto your forward will
A moderate feare to cast the worst of ill.

III.41
Danger before, and in, and after th’act
You needs must grant, is great, and to be waigh’d
Before: least while we doe the deed protract
It be by any of our selues bewraid:
For many being priuy to the fact
How hard it is to keepe it vnbetraid?
When the betrayer shall haue grace and life
And rid himslefe of danger and of strife.

III.42
For though some few continue resolute,
Yet many shrinke, which at the first would dare
And be the formost men to execute,
If th’act, and motion at one instant were:
But intermission suffers men dispute
What dangers are, and cast with farther care
Cold doubt cauils with honor, skorneth fame,
And in the end feare waighes down faith with shame.

III.43
Then in the act, what perils shall we finde
If either place, or time, or other course
Cause vs to alter th’order now assign’d?
Or that, then we expect things happen worse?
If either error, or a fainting minde,
An indiscreet amazement or remorse
In any at that instant should be found,
How much it might the act, and all confound?

III.44
After the deed the daungers are no lesse,
Least that our forwardness not seconded
By our owne followers, and accomplices
Being kept backe or slow or hindered:
The hastie multitude rush on t’oppresse
Confused weaknes there vnsuccored,
Or raise another head of that same race
T’auenge his death, and prosecute the case.

III.45
All this my Lords must be considered
The best and worst of that which maie succeed,
That valour mixt with feare, boldnes with dread,
May march more circumspect with better heed:
And to preuent these mischieves mentioned
Is by our faith, our secresie and speed.
For euen already is the worke begun
And we rest all vndone, till all be done.

III.46
And o I could haue wisht another course
In open field t’haue hazarded my bloud,
But some are heere whose loue is of that force
To draw my life, whom zeale hath not withstood:
But like you not of your disseigne the worse
If the successe be good your course is good:
And ending well our honor then begins,
No hand of strife is pure, but that which wins.

III.47
This said, a sad still silence held their minds

---

230 MS III (269r): Is but by our faith, our secresie and speed,
231 MS III (269r): And we rest all vndone, till it be done.
Vpon the fearefull project of their woe,
But that not long ere forward fury finds
Incouraging perswasions on to go:
We must said they, we will, our honour bindes,
Our safety bids, our faith must haue it so,
We know the worst can come, tis thought vpon,
We cannot shift, being in, we must goe on.

III.48
And on indeed they went, but o not farre,
A fatall stop trauersd their headlong course,
Their drift comes knowne, and they discouered are,
For some of many will be false of force:
*Aumarle became* the man that all did marre
Whether through indiscretion, chance or worse,
He makes his peace with offring others bloud
And shewes the king how all the matter stood.

III.49
Then lo dismayd confusion all possest
Th afflicted troupe hearing their plot discride,
Then runnes amazd distresse with sad vnrest
To this, to that, to flie, to stand, to hide:
Distracted terror knew not what was best
On what determination to abide,
At last despaire would yet stand to the sword,
To trie what friends would doe or fate affoord.

III.50
Then this then that mans ayd they craue, implore,
Post here for helpe, seeke there their followers:
Coniure the frendes they had, labor the more,
Sollicite all reputed fauorers,
Who Richards cause seem’d to affect before,
And in his name write, pray, send messengers;
To try what faith was left, if by this art
Anie would step to take afflictions part:

III.51
And some were found, & some againe draw backe
Vncertaine power could not it selfe retaine,
Intreat they may, autority they lacke,
And here, and there they march, but all in vaine:
With desp’rat course, like those that see their wracke
Euen on the Rockes of death, and yet they straine
That death maie not them idly find t’attend

---

232 MS III (269v): *Aumarle was* the man that all did marre
Their certaine last, but worke to meet their end.

III.52
And long they stand not ere the chiefe surprizd
Conclude with their deare bloud their tragedie:
And all the rest disperst, run some disguisd
To vnknowne costes, some to the shores do flie,
Some to the woodes, or whether feare aduisd,
But running from all to destruction hye,
The breach once made vpon a battered state
Downe goes distresse, no shelter shroudes their fate.

III.53
O now what horror in their soules doth grow?
What sorrowes with their frendes, and nere allyes?
What mourning in their ruin’d houses now?
How many childrens plaints and mothers cryes?
How many wofull widowes left to bow
To sad disgrace? what perisht families?
What heires of hie rich hopes their thought smust frame
To bace-downe-looking pouerty and shame!

III.54
This slaughter, and calamitie forgoes
Thy eminent destruction wofull king,
This is the bloudie comet of thy woes
That doth fortell thy present ruyning:
Here was thy end decreed when these men rose
And euen with their, this act thy death did bring
Or hastened, at the least vpon this ground;
Yet if not this, another had beene found.

III.55
Kinges (Lordes of time and of occasions)
May take th’aduantage, when, and how they list,
For now the Realme with these rebellions
Vext, and turmoylde, was thought would not resist
Nor feele the wound, when like confusions
Should by this meanes be stayd, as all men wist,
The cause be’ing once cut off, that did molest,
The land should haue her peace, and he his rest.

III.56
He knew this time, and yet he would not seeme
Too quicke to wrath, as if affecting bloud;
But yet complaines so far, that men might deeme
He would twere done, and that he thought it good;
And wisht that some would so his life esteeme\textsuperscript{233} As rid him of these feares wherein he stood: And therewith eies a knight, that then was by, Who soone could learne his lesson by his eie.

\textit{This Knight was Sir Pierce of Exton.}\textsuperscript{234}

III.57
The man he knew was one that willingly For one good looke would hazard soule and all, An instrument for any villanie, That needed no commission more at all: A great ease to the king that should hereby Not need in this a course of iustice call, Nor seeme to wil the act, for though what’s wrought Were his own deed, he grieues should so be thought.

III.58
So foule a thing o thou iniustice art That tortrest both the doer and distrest, For when a man hath done a wicked part, O how he striues t’excuse to make the best, To shift the fault, t’vnburthen his charg’d hart And glad to finde the least surmise of rest: And if he could make his seeme others sin, O what repose, what ease he findes therein?

III.59
This knight, but o why should I call him knight To giue impiety this reuuerent stile, Title of honour, worth, and vertues right Should not be giuen to a wretch so vile? O pardon me if I doe not aright, It is because I will not here defile My vnstaind verse with his opprobrius name, And grace him so to place him in the same.

III.60
This caitife goes and with him takes eight more As desperat as himself; impiously bold Such villaines as he knew would not abhorre To execute what wicked act he would, And hastes him downe to \textit{Pomfret} where before The restles king conuaid, was laide in hold:

\textsuperscript{233} MS III (270\textsuperscript{v}): And wisht that some would \textit{of} his life esteeme
\textsuperscript{234} MS III (270\textsuperscript{v}): No gloss. See footnote 241.
There would he do the deed he thought should bring\textsuperscript{235} To him great grace and fauour with his king.

III.61
Whether the soule receiue intelligence
By her nere \textit{Genius} of the bodies end,
And so impartes a sadnesse to the sense
Forgoing ruine whereto it doth tend:
Or whether nature else hath conference
With profonde sleepe, and so doth warning send
By prophetizing dreames what hurt is neere,
And giues the heauie carefull hart to feare:

III.62
How euer so it is, the now sad king
Tost here and there his quiet to confound,
\textit{Feeles a straunge waight of sorrowes gathering}\textsuperscript{236} Vpon his trembling hart, and sees no ground:
\textit{Feeles sodayne terror bring cold shiuering}\textsuperscript{237} Lifts not to eat, still muses, sleepevs vnsound,
His sences droope, his steedy eye vnquicke
And much he ayles, and yet hee is not sicke.

III.63
The morning of that day, which was his last,
After a weary rest rysing to paine
Out at a little grate his eyes he cast
Vppon those bordering hils, and open plaine,
And viewes the towne, and sees how people past,
Where others libertie makes him complaine
The more his owne, and grieues his soule the more
Conferring captiue-Crownes with freedome pore.

III.64
O happie man, saith hee, that lo I see
Grazing his cattel in those pleasant fields!
O if he knew his good, how blessed hee
That feeles not what affliction greatnes yeeldes,
Other then what he is he would not bee,
Nor change his state with him that Scepters weildes:
O thine is that true life, that is to liue,
To rest secure, and not rise vp to grieue.

\textsuperscript{235} MS III (271r): There he \textit{would} do the deed he thought should bring

\textsuperscript{236} MS III (271v): Feeles sodayne terror bring cold shiuering.

Lines 3 and 5 from MS III are reversed in Q1595:I-IV.

\textsuperscript{237} MS III (271v): Feeles a straunge waight of sorrowes gathering

Lines 3 and 5 from MS III are reversed in Q1595:I-IV.
III.65
Thou sit’st at home safe by thy quiet fire
And hear’st of others harmes, but feelest none;
And there thou telst of kings and who aspire,
Who fall, who rise, who triumphs, who doe mone:
Perhappes thou talkst of mee, and dost inquire
Of my restraint, why here I liue alone,
O know tis others sin not my desart,
And I could wish I were but as thou art.

III.66
Thrice-happie you that looke as from the shore
And haue no venter in the wracke you see,
No sorrow, no occasion to deplore
Other mens traualyes while your selues sit free.
How much doth your sweet rest make vs the more
To see our misery and what we bee?
O blinded greatnes! thou with thy turmoyle
Still seeking happie life, mak’st life a toyle.

III.67
But looke on mee, and note my troubled raigne,
Examine all the course of my vext life;
Compare my little joys with my long paine,
And note my pleasures rare, my sorrows rife,
My childhood spent in others pride, and gaine,
My youth in daunger, farther yeares in strife,
My courses crost, my deedes wrest to the worst,
My honour spoild, my life in daunger forst.

III.68
This is my state, and this is all the good
That wretched I haue gotten by a crowne,
This is the life that costes men so much bloud
And more than bloud to make the same their owne,
O had not I then better beeene t’haue stood
On lower ground, and safely liu’d vnknowne,
And beeene a heards man rather then a king,
Which inexperience thinkes so sweet a thing.

III.69
O thou great Monarch, and more great therefore
For skorning that whereto vaine pride aspires,
Reckning thy gardens in Illiria more
Then all the Empire; took'st those sweet retires:
Thou well didst teach, that o he is not poore
That little hath, but he that much desires:
Finding more true delight in that small ground
Then in possessing all the earth was found.

_Dioclesian the Emperor_

III.70
But what do I repeating others good
To vexe mine owne perplexed soule the more?
Alas how should I now free this poore bloud
And care-worne body from this state restore?
How should I looke for life or liuely-hood
Kept here distrest to die, condemn before,
A sacrifice prepared for his peace
That can but by my death haue his release?

III.71
Are kings that freedome giue themselues not free,
As meaner men to take what they maie giue?
O are they of so fatall a degree
That they cannot discend from that and liue?
Unlesse they still be kings can they not bee,
Nor maie they their autority surviue?
Will not my yeelded crowne redeeme my breath?
Still am I fear’d? is there no way but death?

III.72
Scarce this word death had sorrow vttered,
But in rusht one, and tells him how a knight
Is come from court, his name deliuered.
What newes with him said he that traiterous wight?
What more remoues? must we be farther lead?
Are we not sent inough yet out of sight?
Or hath this place not strength sufficient

---

240 MS III (272v): Reckning the gardens in Illyria more
241 MS III (272v): Dioclesian
This is the sole gloss in MS III. The handwriting appears to be a different hand than that of the body of the manuscript, however, it does not seem to be Daniel’s. At a minimum, the “D” in “Dioclesian” is distinctly different from the “D” in “Devonshire” and “Danyel” in the letter to Devonshire and the middle “l” in “Carlile” in MS I-II:D stanza II.26. It appears to be an addition to the original manuscript, though not one in Daniel’s hand. Seronsy and Krueger do not note the difference in handwriting between the gloss and the body of MS III.
242 MS III (273r): Vnlesse they still be kings cannot they bee,
To guard vs in? or haue they worse intent?

III.73
By this the bloody troope were at the dore,
When as a sodaine and a strange dismay
Inforst them straine, who should go in before;
One offers, and in offering makes a stay:
Another forward sets and doth no more,
A third the like, and none durst make the way:
So much the horror of so vile a deed
In vilest minds hinders them to proceed.

III.74
At length, as to some great assault the knight
Cheeres vp his fainting men all that he can,
And valiantly their courage doth incite
And all against one weake vnarmed man:
A great exployt worthy a man of might,
Much honour wretch therein thy valor wan:
Ah poore weake prince, yet men that presence feare
Which once they knew autoritie did beare.

III.75
Then on thrusts one, and he would formost be
To shead anothers bloud, but lost his owne;
For entring in, as soone as he did see
The face of maiestie to him well knowne,
Like Marius soldier at Minternum, hee
Stood still amazd his courage ouerthrowne:
The king seeing this, startes vp from where he sate
Out from his trembling hand his weapon gate.

III.76
Thus euen his foes that came to bring him death,
Bring him a weapon that before had none,
That yet he might not idly loose his breath
But die reuengd in action not alone:
And this good chaunce that this much fauoureth
He slackes not, for he presently speedes one,
And Lion-like vpon the rest he flies,
And here falles one, and there another lies.

III.77
And vp and downe he trauerses his ground,
Now wardes a felling blow, now strikes againe,
Then nimibly shiftes a thrust, then lendes a wound,

243 MS III (273v): So much the horror of so fowle a deed
Now backe he giues, then rushes on amaine,
His quicke and readie hand doth so confound
These shamefull beasts that foure of them lies slain,
And all had perisht happily and well
But for one act, that o I greiue to tell.

III.78
This coward knight seeing with shame and feare
His men thus slaine and doubting his owne end,
Leapes vp into a chaire that lo was there,
The whiles the king did all his courage bend
Against those foure that now before him were,
Doubting not who behind him doth attend,
And plies his hands vndaunted, vnafffeard
And with good hart, and life for life he stird.

III.79
And whiles he this, and that, and each mans blow
Doth eye, defend, and shift, being laid to fore
Backward he beares for more aduauntage now,
Thinking the wall would safegard him the more,
When lo with impious hand o wicked thou
That shamefull durst not come to strike before,
Behind him gau’st that wofull deadly wound,
That laid that most sweet Prince flat on the ground.

III.80
Monster of men, o what hast thou here done
Vnto an ouerpressed innocent,
Lab’ring against so many, he but one,
And one poore soule with care, with sorrow spent?244
O could thy eies indure to looke vpon
Thy hands disgrace, or didst thou then relent?
But what thou didst I will not here deuine
Nor straine my thoughts to enter into thine.

III.81
But leaue thee wretch vnto blacke infamie,
To darke eternall horror, and disgrace,
The hatefull skorne to all posterity,
The out-cast of the world, last of thy race,
Of whose curst seed, nature did then deny
She staies her hand, and makes this worst her last.

244 MS III (274v): And one poore sould with care, with sorrowes spent?
III.82
There lies that comely body all imbrude
With that pure bloud, mixt with that fowle he shed:
O that those sacred streames with such vile rude
Unshallowed matter should be mingled!
O why was grossness with such grace indude,
To be with that sweet mixture honoured?
Or serv’d it but as some vile graue ordaind,
Where an imbalmed corpes should be containd?

III.83
Those faire distended limmes all trembling lay,
Whom yet nor life nor death their owne could call,
For life remou’d had not rid all away,
And death though entring seas’d not yet on all:
That short-tim’d motion (that soone finish shall
The mouer ceasing) yet a while he doth stay,
As th’organ sound a time surviues the stop
Before it doth the dying note giue vp:

III.84
So holds those organs of that goodly frame
The weake remaines of life a little space,
But ah full soone cold death possest the same,
Set are those sun-like eies, bloudlesse that face,
And all that comely whole a lump became,
All that fair forme which death could scarce disgrace
Lies perisht thus, and thus vntimely fate
Hath finisht his most miserable state.\(^{245}\)

III.85
And thus one king most nere in bloud allide
Is made th’oblation for the others peace:
Now onely one, both name and all beside
Entirely hath, plurality doth cease:
He that remaines, remaines vnterrifide
With others right; this day doth all release:
And henceforth is absolutely king,
No crownes but one, this deed confirmes the thing.\(^{246}\)

III.86
And yet new Hydraes lo, new heades appeare
T’afflict that peace reputed then so sure,
And gaue him much to do, and much to feare,
And long and daungerous tumults did procure,

\(^{245}\) MS III (275\(‘\)): Hath finisht his most wofull sad estate.

\(^{246}\) MS III (275\(‘\)): No crowne but one, this deed confirmes the thing.
And those euen of his chiefest followers were
Of whom he might presume him most secure,
Who whether not so grac’d or so preferd
As they expected, these new factions stird.

III.87
The Percyes were the men, men of great might,
Strong in alliance, and in courage strong
That thus conspire, vnder pretence to right
That crooked courses they had suffered long:
Whether their conscience vrgd them or despiught,
Of that they saw the part they tooke was wrong,
Or that ambition hereto did them call,
Or others enuide grace, or rather all.

III.88
What cause soeuer were, strong was their plot,
Their parties great, meanes good, th’occasion fit:
Their practice close, their faith suspected not,
Their states far off and they of wary wit:
Who with large promises draw in the Scot
To ayde their cause, he likes, and yeeldes to it,
Not for the loue of them or for their good,
But glad hereby of meanes to shed our bloud.

III.89
Then ioyne they with the Welsh, who fitly traind
And all in armes vnder a mightie head
Great Glendowr, who long warr’d, and much attain’d,
Sharp conflicts made, and many vanquished:
With whom was Edmond Earle of March retain’d
Being first his prisoner, now confedered,
A man the king much fear’d, and wel he might
Least he should looke whether his Crown stood right.

Owen Glendor.247

III.90
For Richard, for the quiet of the state,
Before he tooke those Irish warres in hand
About succession doth deliberate,
And finding how the certaine right did stand,
With full consent this man did ordinate
The heyre apparent to the crowne and land:
Then iudge if this the king might nerely touch.248

---

247 MS III (276r): No gloss. See footnote 241.
248 MS III (276r): Then iudge if this the king might meerely touch,
Although his might were smal, his right being much.\textsuperscript{249}

\textit{Rich. 2.}\textsuperscript{250}

\textbf{III.91}
With these the \textit{Percyes} them confederate,  
And as three heads they league in one intent,  
And instituting a Triumuirate  
Do part the land in triple gouerment:  
Deuiding thus among themselues the state,  
The \textit{Percyes} should rule all the \textit{North} from \textit{Trent}  
And \textit{Glendowr Wales}: the \textit{Earle of March} should bee  
\textit{Lord} of the \textit{South} from \textit{Trent}; and thus they gree.

\textbf{III.92}
Then those two helpes which still such actors find  
Pretence of common good, the kings disgrace  
Doth fit their course, and draw the vulgar mind  
To further them and aide them in this case:  
The king they accusd for cruell, and vnkind  
That did the state, and crowne, and all deface;  
A periurde man that held all faith in skorne,  
Whose trusted othes had others made forsworne.

\textbf{III.93}
Besides the odious detestable act  
Of that late murdered king they aggrauate,  
Making it his that so had will’d the fact  
The he the doers did remunerate:  
And then such taxes daily doth exact  
That were against the orders of the state,  
And with all these or worse they him assaild  
Who late of others with the like preuaild.

\textbf{III.94}
Thus doth contentious proud mortality  
Afflict each other and it selfe torment:  
And thus o thou mind-tortring misery  
Restles ambition, borne in discontent,  
Turnst and retossest with iniquity  
The vnconstant courses frailty did inuent:  
And fowlst faire order and defilst the earth  
Fostring vp warre, father of bloud and dearth.

\textsuperscript{249} MS III (276\textsuperscript{r}): Although his \textit{owne} were small, his right being much.  
\textsuperscript{250} MS III (276\textsuperscript{r}): No gloss. See footnote 241.
III.95
Great seemd the cause, and greatly to, did ad
The peoples loue thereto these crimes rehearst,
That manie gathered to the troupes they had
And many more do flocke from costs disperst:
But when the king had heard those newes so bad,
Th’vnlookt for dangerous toyle more nearly perst;\(^{251}\)
For bent t’wards Wales t’appease those tumults there,
H’is for’st diuert his course, and them forbeare.

III.96
Not to giue time vnto th’increasing rage
And gathering fury, forth he hastes with speed,
Lest more delay or giuing longer age
To th’euill growne, it might the cure exceed:
All his best men at armes, and leaders sage
All he prepare he could, and all did need;
For to a mighty worke thou goest o king,
To such a field that power to power shall bring.

III.97
There shall young Hotspur with a fury lead
Meete with thy forward sonne as fierce as he;\(^{252}\)
There warlike Worster long experienced
In forraine armes, shall come t’incounter thee:
There Douglas to thy Stafford shall make head:
There Vernon for thy valiant Blunt shalbe:
There shalt thou find a doubtful bloody day,
Though sicknesse keepe Northumberland away.

\textit{The son to the Earle of Northumberland.}\(^{253}\)

III.98
Who yet reseru’d, though after quit for this,
Another tempest on thy head to raise,
As if still wrong reuenging Nemesis
Did meane t’afflict all thy continuall dayes:
And yet this field he happely might misse
For thy great good, and therefore well he staies:
What might his force haue done being ioynd there to,
When that already gaue so much to do?

III.99
The swift approach and vnexpected speed

\(^{251}\) MS III (277v): Th’vnlookt for dangerous toyles more nearly perst;
\(^{252}\) MS III (277v): Meet with this forward sonne as fierce as he:
\(^{253}\) MS III (277v): No gloss. See footnote 241.
The king had made vpon this new-raisd force
In th’vnconfirmed troupes much fear did breed,
Vntimely hindring their intended course;
The ioyning with the Welsh they had decreed
Was hereby stopt, which made their part the worse, Northumberland with forces from the North Expected to be there, was not set forth.254

III.100
And yet vndaunted Hotspur seeing the king So nere approch’d, leauing the worke in hand
With forward speed his forces marshalling,
Sets forth his farther comming to withstand:
And with a cheerfull voice incouraging
By his great spirit his well imboldned band,
Bringes a strong host of firme resolued might,
And plac’d his troupes before the king in sight.

III.101
This day (saith he) o faithfull valiaunt frendes,255
What euer it doth giue, shall glorie giue:
This day with honor frees our state, or endes
Our misery with fame, that still shall liue,256
And do but thinke how well this day he spendes
That spendes his bloud his countrey to relieue:
Our holie cuase, our freedome, and our right,
Sufficient are to moue good mindes to fight.

III.102
Besides th’assured hope of victory
That wee may euen promise on our side
Against this weake-constrained companie,
Whom force & feare, not will, and loue doth guide
Against a prince whose foule impiety
The heauens do hate, the earth cannot abide,
Our number being no lesse, our courage more,
What need we doubt if we but worke therefore.

III.103
This said, and thus resolu’d euen bent to charge257
Vpon the king, who well their order viewd
And carefull noted all the forme at large
Of their proceeding, and their multitude:

254 MS III (277v): Expected to be there, is unseet forth.
255 MS III (278r): This day (saith he) valiant faithfull frendes,
256 MS III (278r): Our misery with fame, which still shall liue,
257 MS III (278r): Thus said, and thus resolu’d euen bent to charge
And deeming better if he could discharge  
The day with safe tye, and some peace conclude,  
Great proffers sendes of pardon, and of grace  
If they would yeeld, and quietnes imbrace.

III.104
But this refusd, the king with wrath incensd  
Rage against fury doth with speed prepare:  
And o saith he, though I could haue dispensd  
With this daies bloud, which I haue sought to spare  
The greater glory might haue recompensd  
The forward worth of these that so much dare,  
That we might honor had by th’ouerthrown  
That th’wounds we make, might not haue bin our own.

III.105
Yet since that other mens iniquity\footnote{MS III (278\textsuperscript{v}): But since that other mens iniquity}  
Calles on the sword of wrath against my will,  
And that themselues exact this crueltie,  
And I constrained am this bloud to spill:  
Then on my maisters, on courageously  
True-harted subiects against traitors ill,  
And spare not them who seeke to spoile vs all,  
Whose fowle confused end soone see you shall.

III.106
Straight moues with equall motion equall rage  
The like incensed armies vnto blood,  
One to defend, another side to wage  
Foule ciuill war, both vowes their quarrell good:  
Ah too much heate to bloud doth now inrage  
Both who the deed prouokes and who withstood,  
That valor here is vice, here manhood sin,  
The forward’st hands doth o least honor win.

III.107
But now begin these fury-mouing soundes  
The notes of wrath that musicke brought from hell,  
The ratling drums which trumpets voice confounds,  
The cryes, th’incouragements, the shouting shrell;\footnote{MS III (279\textsuperscript{r}): The cryes, incouragements, the shouting shrell;}  
That all about the beaten ayre reboundes,  
Thundring confused, murmurs horrible,  
To rob all sence except the sence to fight,  
Well handes may worke, the mind hath lost his sight.\footnote{MS III (279\textsuperscript{r}): Well handes may worke, the mind hath lost her sight.}
III.108
O war! begot in pride and luxury,\textsuperscript{261}
The child of wrath and of dissention,
Horrible good; mischief necessarie,
The fowle reformer of confusion,
Vniust-iust scourge of our iniquitie,
Cruell recurer of corruption:
O that these sin-sicke states in need should stand
To be let bloud with such a boystrous hand!

III.109
And o how well thou hadst been spar’d this day
Had not wrong counsaild Percy bene peruers,
Whose yong vndanger’d hand now rash makes way
Vpon the sharpest fronts of the most fierce:
Where now an equall fury thrusts to stay
And rebeat-backe that force and his disperse,
Then these assaile, then those chace backe againe,
Till staid with new-made hils of bodies slaine.

\textit{The Prince of Wales}.\textsuperscript{262}

III.110
There lo that new-appearing glorious starre
Wonder of Armes, the terror of the field
Young Henrie, laboring where the stoutest are,
And euen the stoutest forces backe to yeild,
There is that hand boldned to bloud and warre
That must the sword in woundrous actions weild:
But better hadst thou learnt with others bloud
A lesse expence to vs, to thee more good.

III.111
Hadst thou not there lent present speedy ayd
To thy indaungerde father nerely tyrde,
Whom fierce incountring Dowglas ouerlaid,
That day had there his troublous life expirde:
Heroycall Couragious Blunt araid\textsuperscript{263}
In habite like as was the king attirde
And deemd for him, excusd that fate with his,
For he had what his Lord did hardly misse.

\textsuperscript{261} MS III (279\textsuperscript{r}): O war! begot of pride and luxury,
\textsuperscript{262} MS III (276\textsuperscript{r}): No gloss. See footnote 241. This gloss seems to be in the wrong place in Q1595:I-IV. It fits with the next stanza, III.110.
\textsuperscript{263} MS III (279\textsuperscript{r}): Heroycall Couragious Blunt that day
Which was Sir Walter Blunt\textsuperscript{264}

III.112
For thought a king he would not now disgrace
The person then supposd, but princelike shewes
Glorious effects of worth that fit his place,
And fighting dyes, and dying overthrowes:
Another of that forward name and race
In that hotte worke his valiant life bestowes,
Who bare the standard of the king that day,
Whose colours overthrowne did much dismaie.

Another Blunt which was the kings Standard bearer\textsuperscript{265}

III.113
And deare it cost, and o much bloud is shed
To purchase thee this loosing victory
O travauylde king: yet hast thou conquered
A doubtfull day, a mightie enemy:
But o what woundes, what famous worth lyes dead!
That makes the winner looke with sorrowing eye,
Magnanimous Stafford lost that much had wrought,
And valiant Shortly who great glory gote.

Sir Hugh Shorly\textsuperscript{266}

III.114
Such wrake of others bloud thou didst behold
O furious Hotspur, ere thou lost thine owne!
Which now once lost that heate in thine waxt cold,
And soone became thy Armie overthrowne;
And o that this great spirit, this courage bold,
Had in some good cause been rightly showne!\textsuperscript{267}
So had not we thus violently then
Haue termd that rage, which valor should haue ben.

III.115
But now the king retires him to his peace,\textsuperscript{268}
A peace much like the feeble sickemans sleepe,
(Wherein his waking paines do neuer cease
Though seeming rest his closed eyes doth kepe)
For o no peace could euer so release

\textsuperscript{264} MS III (279\textsuperscript{v}): No gloss. See footnote 241.
\textsuperscript{265} MS III (280\textsuperscript{o}): No gloss. See footnote 241.
\textsuperscript{266} MS III (280\textsuperscript{o}): Had not in some good cause been rightly showne
\textsuperscript{267} MS III (280\textsuperscript{o}): Nowe doeth the kinge retyre him to his peace,
\textsuperscript{268} MS III (280\textsuperscript{o}): No gloss. See footnote 241.
His intricate turmoiles, and sorrowes deepe,
But that his cares kept waking all his life
Continue on till death conclude his strife.

III.116 269
Whose harald sicknes, being sent before
With full commission to denounce his end,
And paine, and griefe, enforcing more and more,
Besiegd the hold that could not long defend,
And so consum’d all that imboldning store
Of hote gaine-striuing bloud that did contend,
Wearing the wall so thin that now the mind
Might well looke thorow, and his frailty find.

III.117
When lo, as if the vapours vanisht were,
Which heate of boyling bloud & health did breed,
(To cloude the sence that nothing might appeare
Vnto the thought, that which it was indeed)
The lightned soule began to see more cleere
How much it was abusd, & notes with heed
The plaine discovered falsehood open laid
Of ill perswading flesh that so betraid.

III.118
And lying on his last afflicted bed
Where death & conscience both before him stand,
Th’one holding out a booke wherein he red
In bloudie lines the deedes of his owne hand;
The other shewes a glasse, which figured
An ougly forme of fowle corrupted sand:
Both bringing horror in the hyest degree
With what he was, and what he straight should bee.

III.119
Which seeing all confusd trembling with feare
He lay a while, as ouerthrowne in sprite,
At last commaunds some that attending were
To fetch the crowne and set it in his sight,
On which with fixed eye and heauy cheere
Casting a looke, O God (saith he) what right
I had to thee my soule doth now conceiue;
Thee, which with bloud I gote, with horror leaue.

III.120
Wert thou the cause my climing care was such

269 Book III, Stanzas 116-130 (Q1595:I-IV) do not appear in MS III.
To passe those boundes, nature, and law ordain’d?
Is this that good which promised so much,
And seem’d so glorious ere it was attain’d?
Wherein was never joye but gave a touch
To checke my soule to thinke, how thou wert gain’d,
And now how do I leave thee vnto mine,
Which it is dread to keepe, death to resign.

III.121
With this the soule rapt wholly with the thought
Of such distresse, did so attentive weigh
Her present horror, whilst as if forgote
The dull consumed body senseles lay,
And now as breathles quite, quite dead is thought,
When lo his sonne comes in, and takes awaie
The fatall crowne from thence, and out he goes
As if vnwilling longer time to lose.

III.122
And whilst that sad confused soule doth cast
Those great accounts of terror and distresse,
Vppon this counsel it doth light at last
How she might make the charge of horror lesse,
And finding no way to acquit thats past
But onely this, to vse some quicke redresse
Of acted wrong, with giuing vp againe
The crowne to whom it seem’d to appertaine.

III.123
Which found, lightned with some small joy shee hyes,
Rouses her seruaunts that dead sleeping lay,
(The members of hir house,) to exercise
One feeble dutie more, during her stay:
And opening those darke windowes he espies
The crowne for whiche he lookt was borne awaie,
And all agrieu’d with the vnkind offence
He causd him bring it backe that tooke it thence.

III.124
To whom (excusing his presumteous deed
By the supposing him departed quite)
He said: O Sonne what needes thee make such speed
Vnto that care, where feare exceeds thy right,
And where his sinne whom thou shalt now succeed
Shall still vpbraid thy ’inheritance of might,
And if thou canst liue, and liue great from wo
Without this carefull trauaile; let it go.
III.125
Nay father since your fortune did attain
So hie a stand: I meane not to descend,
Replyes the Prince; as if what you did gaine
I were of spirit vnable to defend:
Time will appease them well that now complaine,
And rateifie our interest in the end;
What wrong hath not continuance quite outworne?
Yeares makes that right which neuer was so borne.

III.126
If so, God worke his pleasure (said the king)
And o do thou contend with all thy might
Such evidence of virtuous deeds to bring,
That well may proue our wrong to be our right:
And let the goodness of the managing
Race out the blot of foule attaining quite:
That discontent may all advantage misse
To wish it otherwise then now it is.

III.127
And since my death my purpose doth preuent
Touching this sacred warre I tooke in hand,
(An action wherewithal my soule had ment
T’appease my God, and reconcile my land)
To thee is left to finish my intent,
Who to be safe must neuer idly stand;
But some great actions entertaine thou still
To hold their mindes who else will practice ill.

III.128
Thou hast not that aduantage by my raigne
To riot it (as they whom long descent
Hath purchasd loue by custome) but with payne
Thou must contend to buy the worlds content:
What their birth gaue them, thou hast yet to gaine
By thine owne vertues, and good gouernment,
And that vnles thy worth confirme the thing
Thou canst not be the father to a king.

III.129
Nor art thou born in those calme daies, where rest
Hath brought a sleepe sluggish securitie;
But in tumultuous times, where mindes adrest
To factions are inurd to mutinie,
A mischiefe not by force to be supprest
Where rigor still begets more enmitie,
Hatred must be beguild with some new course
Where states are strong, & princes doubt their force.

III.130
This and much more affliction would have said
Out of th’experience of a troublous raigne,
For which his high desires had dearly paide
Th’interest of an euer-toyling paine:
But that this all-subduing power here staid
His faulting tongue and paine r’inforc’d againe,
And cut off all the passages of breath
To bring him quite vnder the state of death.

III.131
In whose possession I must leaue him now,
And now into the Ocean of new toyles,
Into the stormie Maine where tempests grow
Of greater ruines, and of greater spoiles
Set forth my course to hasten on my vow
O’re all the troublous deepe of these turmoiles:
And if I may but liue t’attaine the shore
Of my desired end, I wish no more.

III.132
Help on o sou’raigne Muse, helpe on my course
If these my toyles be gratefull in thy eyes;
Or but looke on, to cheere my feeble force
That I faint not in this great enterprize:
And you o worthy you, that take remorse
Of my estate, and helpe my thoughts to rise;
Continue still your grace that I may giue
End to the worke, wherein your worth may liue.

270 MS III (280v): But wee must leave him to his actions nowe
Seronsy and Krueger (“A Manuscript of Daniel’s Civil Wars, Book III”, p. 159) note of the missing stanzas, “They could not have been accidentally dropped from it, for the line following them in 1595 was obviously altered... to accommodate their insertion.”

271 MS III (280v): Set forth our course to hasten on our vow
Difference is not noted by Seronsy and Krueger.

272 MS III (280v): Help o soveraigne muse helpe on my course
A spiral flourish follows the final line in this stanza in MS III (280v). Seronsy and Krueger note (“A Manuscript”, p. 158), “the manuscript closes on the same line as the earliest printed version, 1595. Moreover, its last stanza is followed by the spiral flourish which Elizabethan scribes used to designate the end of a poem or section that they had copied.”
Book IV

The Argument of the fowrth booke.

Henry the fifth cuts off his enemy
The earle of Cambridge that conspir’d his death:
Henry the sixt maried vnluckely
His and his countryes glory ruineth:
Suffolke that made the match preferd too hie
Going to exile a pirat murthereth:
What meanes the Duke of Yorke obserud to gaine
The worlds goodwill, seeking the crowne t’attaine.

IV.1
Close smothered lay the low depressed fire,
Whose after-issuing flames confounded all
Whilst thou victorious Henry didst conspire
The wracke of Fraunce, that at thy feete did fall:
Whilst joyes of gotten spoiles, and new desire
Of greater gaine to greater deedes did call
Thy conquering troupes, that could no thoughts retaine
But thoughts of glorie all that working raigne.

Hen. 5.

IV.2
What do I feele o now in passing by
These blessed times that I am forst to leaue?
What trembling sad remorse doth terrefie
M’amazed thought with what I do conceiue?
What? doth my pen commit impietie
To passe those sacred tropheis without leaue?
And do I sin not to salute your ghostes
Great worthies, so renown’d in forraine coasts?

IV.3
Who do I see out of the darke appeare
Couered almost with clowdes as with the night,
That here presents him with a martaill cheere
Seeming of dreadfull, and yet louely sight?
Whose eye giues courage, & whose brow hath feare
Both representing terror and delight,
And staies my course, and off my purpose breakes,
And in obraiding wordes thus fiersly speakes.

IV.4
Vngratfull times that impiously neglect
That worth that neuer times againe shall shew,
What merites all our toile no more respect?
Or else standes idleness asham’d to know
Those wondrous Actions that do so object
Blame to the wanton, sin vnto the slow?
Can England see the best that shee can boast
Ly thus vngrac’d, vndeckt, and almost lost?

IV.5
Why do you seeke for fained Palladins
Out of the smoke of idle vanitie,
That maie giue glorie to the true dissignes
Of Bourchier, Talbot, Neuile, Willoughby?
Why should not you striue to fill vp your lines
With wonders of your owne, with veritie?
T’inflame their offspring with the loue of Good
And glorious true examples of their bloud.

IV.6
O what eternal matter here is found!
Whence new immortall Iliads might proceed,
That those whose happie graces do abound
In blessed accents here maie haue to feed
Good thoughts, on no imaginary ground
Of hungrie shadowes which no profit breed:
Whence musicke like, instant delight may grow,
But when men all do know they nothing know.

IV.7
And why dost thou in lamentable verse
Nothing but bloudshed, treasons, sin and shame,
The worst of times, th’extreame of ils rehearse,
To raise old staines, and to renew dead blame?
As if the minds of th’evill, and peruerse
Were not far sooner trained from the same
By good example of faire vertuous acts,
Then by the shew of foule vngodly facts.

IV.8
O that our times had had some sacred wight,
Whose wordes as happie as our swordes had bin
To haue prepard for vs Tropheis aright
Of vndecaying frames t’haue rested in:
Triumphant Arkes of perdurable might
O holy lines: that such aduauntage win
Vpon the Sieth of time in spight of yeares,
How blessed they that gaine what neuer weares.
IV.9
What is it o to do, if what we do
Shall perish nere as soone as it is donne?
What is that glorie we attaine vnto
With all our toile, if lost as soone as wonne?
O small requitall for so great a doo
Is this poore present breath a smoake soone gone;
Or these dombe stones erected for our sake,
Which formless heapes few stormie chaunges make.

IV.10
Tell great ELIZA since her daies are grac’d
With those bright ornamentes to vs denide,
That she repaire what darknes hath defac’d,
And get our ruyn’d deedes reedifide:
Shee in whose all directing eye is plac’d
A powre the highest powers of wit to guide,
She may commaund the worke and ouersee
The holy frame that might eternall bee.

IV.11
O would she be content that time should make
A rauenous pray vpon her glorious raigne;
That darknes and the night should ouertake
So cleare a brightnes, shining without staine?
Ah no, she fosters some no doubt that wake
For her eternity, with pleasing paine:
And if she for her selfe prepare this good,
O let her not neglect those of her bloud.

IV.12
This that great Monarch Henry seemd to craue;
When (weighing what a holy motiue here
Vertue proposd, and fit for him to haue,
Whom all times ought of dutie hold most deare)
I sighd, and wishd that some would take t’ingraue
With curious hand so proud a worke to reare,
To grace the present, and to blesse times past,
That might for euer to our glorie last.

IV.13
So should our well taught times haue learn’d alike
How faire shind virtue, and how foule vice stood,
When now my selfe haue driuen to mislike
Those deedes of worth I dare not vow for good:
I cannot mone who lose, nor praise who seeke
By mightie Actions to advaunce their bloud;
I must saie who wrought most, least honor had,
How euer good the cause, the deedes were bad.

IV.14
And onely tell the worst of euery raine
And not the intermedled good report,
I leaue what glorye vertue did attaine
At th’euermemorable Agincorte:
I leaue to tell what wit, what powre did gaine
Th’assiegéd Roan, Caen, Dreux, or in what sort:
How maiestie with terror did aduaunce
Her conquering foote on all subdued Fraunce.

IV.15
All this I passe, and that magnanimous King
Mirror of virtue, miracle of worth,
Whose mightie Actions with wise managing
Forst prouder boastinge climes to serue the North:
The best of all the best earth can bring
Skarse equals him in what his raigne brought forth,
Being of a mind as forward to aspire
As fit to gouerne what he did desire.

IV.16
His comely body was a goodly seate
Where vertue dwelt most faire as lodgd most pure,
A bodie strong where vse of strength did get
A stronger state to do, and to endure:
Making his life th’example to beget
Like spirit in those he did to good in vre,
Most glorying to aduaunce true vertuous bloud,
As if he greatnes sought but to do good.

IV.17
Who as the chiefe, and all-directing head,
Did with his subiects as his members liue,
And them to goodnes forced not, but lead
Winning not much to haue, but much to giue:
Deeming the powre of his, his powre did spread
As borne to blesse the world & not to grieue:
Adornd with others spoiles not subiects store,
No king exacting lesse, none winning more.

IV.18
He after that corrupted faith had bred
An ill inur’d obedience for commaund,
And languishing luxuriousnes had spred
Feeble vnaptnes ouer all the land,
Yet he those long vnordred troupes so led
Vnder such formall discipline to stand,  
That euen his soule seemd only to direct  
So great a bodie such exploys t'effect.

IV.19
He bringes abrode distracted discontent,  
Disperst ill humors into actions hie,  
And to vnite them all in one consent  
Plac’d the faire marke of glorie in their eye,  
That malice had no leasure to dissent,  
Nor enuiue time to practice treachery,  
The present actions do diuert the thought  
Of madness past, while mindes were so well wrought.

IV.20
Here now were pride, oppression, vsury,  
The canker-eating mischeifes of the state,  
Cal’d forth to praie vppon the enemie,  
Whilst the home burthened better lightned sate:  
Ease was not suffered with a gredie eye  
T’examine states or priuate wealthes to rate,  
The silent Courtes warr’d not with busie words,  
Nor wrested law gaue the contentious swords.

IV.21
Now nothing entertaines th’attentiue eare  
But stratagems, assaults, surprises, fights;  
How to giue lawes to them that conquered were,  
How to articulate with yeelding wights:  
The weake with mercie, and the proud with feare  
How to retaine; to giue desarts their right,  
Were now the Acts, and nothing else was thought  
But how to win and maintaine what was gote.

IV.22
Here o were none that priuately possest  
And held alone imprisoned maiestie,  
Proudly debarring entraunce from the rest  
As if the praie were theirs by victorie:  
Here no detractor woundes who merits best,  
Nor shameless brow cheers on impietie,  
Vertue who all her toyle with zeale had spent  
Not here all vnrewarded, sighing went.

IV.23
But here the equally respecting eye  
Of powre, looking alike on like desarts,  
Blessing the good made others good thereby,
More mightie by the multitude of harts:
The field of glorie vnto all doth lie
Open alike, honor to all imparts;
So that the only fashion in request
Was to bee good or good-like, as the rest.

IV.24
So much o thou example dost effect
Being far a better maister then commaund,
That how to do by doing dost direct
And teakest others action, by thy hand.
Who followes not the course that kings elect?
When Princes worke, who then will idle stand?
And when that dooing good is onely thought
Worthy reward; who will be bad for nought?

IV.25
And had not th’earle of Cambridge with vaine speed
Vntimely practizd for anothers right,
With hope t’adaunce those of his proper seed,
(On whom yet rule seem’d destined to light)
The land had seene none of her owne to bleed
During this raigne, nor no aggireued sight:
None the least blacknes interclouded had
So faire a day, nor any eye lookt sad.

IV.26
But now when Fraunce perceiuing from afar
The gathering tempest growing on from hence
Readie to fall, threatning their state to marre,
They labor all meanes to prouide defence:
And practicing how to preuent this warre,
And shut out such calamities from thence,
Do foster here some discord lately growne
To hold Ambition busied with her owne.

IV.27
Finding those humors which they saw were fit
Soone to be wrought and easie to be fed,
Swolne full with enuie that the crowne should sit
There where it did, as if established:
And whom it toucht in bloud to grieue at it,
They with such hopes and helps sollicited,
That this great Earle was drawne t’attempt the thing
And practises how to depose the king.
IV.28
For being of mightie meanes to do the deed
And yet of mightier hopes then meanes to do,
And yet of spirit that did his hopes exceed,
And then of bloud as great to ad thereto:
All which, with what the gold of France could breed
Being powers inough a climing mind to woo,
He so imploid, that many he had wonne
Euen of the chiefe the king relide yppon.

IV.29
The wel-known right of the Earle of March alurd
A leaning loue, whose cause he did pretend;
Whereby he knew that so himselfe procurd
The Crowne for his owne children in the end:
For the Earle being (as he was assurd)
Vnapt for issue, it must needes descend
On those of his being next of Clarence race,
As who by course of right should hold the place.

IV.30
It was the time when as the forward Prince
Had all prepar’d for his great enterprize,
And readie stand his troupes to part from hence
And all in stately forme and order lyes:
When open fame giues out intelligence
Of these bad complots of his enemies:
Or else this time of purpose chosen is
Though knowne before, yet let run on till this.

At Southhamton.

IV.31
That this might yeeld the more to aggrauate
Vpon so foule a deed so vilely sought,
Now at this time t’attempt to ruinate
So glorious great disseignes so forward brought:
Whilst carefull vertue seekes t’aduaunce the state
And for her euerlasting honor sought
That though the cause were right, and title strong
The time of dooing it, yet makes it wrong.

IV.32
And straight an unlamented death he had,
And straight were ioyfully the Anchors weighd
And all flocke fast aboord, with visage glad,
As if the sacrifize had now beene payd
For their good speed; that made their stay so sad
Lothing the least occasion that delayd.
And now new thoughts, great hopes, calme seas, fair windes
Whith present action intertaines their mindes.

IV.33
No other crosse o Henry saw thy daies
But this that toucht thy now possessed hold;
Nor after long, till this mans sonne assaies
To get of thine the right that now he controwld:
For which contending long, his life he paies;
So that it fatall seemd the father should
Thy winning seeke to staie, and then his sonne
Should be the cause to loose, when thou hadst won.

Richard Duke of Yorke.

IV.34
Yet now in this so happie a meane while
And interlightning times thy vertues wrought,
That discord had no leasure to defile
So faire attempts with a tumultuous thought:
And euen thy selfe, thy selfe didst so beguile
With such attention vppon what was sought,
That time affoordes not now with care or hate
Others to seeke, thee to secure thy state.

IV.35
Else o how easie had it beene for thee
All the pretendant race t’haue laid full low
If thou proceeded hadst with crueltie,
Not suffering anie fatall branch to grow:
But unsuspicious magnanimitie
Shames such effects of feare, and force to show:
Busied in free, and open Actions still
Being great; for being good, hates to be ill.

IV.36
Which o how much it were to be requir’d
In all of might, if all were like of mind;
But when that all depraued haue conspird
To be vniust, what saftie shall they find
(After the date of vertue is expird)
That do not practize in the selfe-same kind,
And countermine against deceite with guile?
But o what mischiefe feeles the world the while?

IV.37
And yet such wronges are held meete to be don,
And often for the state thought requisite,
As when the publicke good depends thereon,
When most injustice is esteemd most right:
But o what good with doing ill is won?
Who hath of bloud made such a benefite
As hath not fear’d more after then before,
And made his peace the lesse, his plague the more?

IV.38
Far otherwise dealt this vndaunted king
That cheerished the ofspring of his foes
And his competitors to grace did bring,
And them his frendes for Armes, and honors, chose:
As if plaine courses were the safest thing
Where vpright goodnes, sure, and stedfast goes
Free from that subtile mask’t impietie,
Which this depraued world calles policie.

IV.39
Yet how hath fate dispos’d of all this good?
What haue these vertues after times availd?
In what steed hath hy-raised valor stood,
When this continuing cause of greatnes faild?
Then when proud-growne the irritated bloud
Enduring not it selfe it selfe assaild,
As though that Prowesse had but learnt to spill
Much bloud abrode to cut her throte with skill.

IV.40
O doth th’Eternall in the course of thinges
So mixe the causes both of good and ill,
That thus the one effects of th’other brings,
As what seemes made to blisse, is borne to spill?
What from the best of vertues glorie springes
That which the world with miserie doth fill?
Is th’end of happines but wretchednesse,
Hath sin his plague, and vertue no sucesse?

IV.41
Either that is not good, the world holds good,
Or else is so confusd with ill, that we
Abused with th’appearing likelihood
Run to offend, whilst we thinke good to be:
Or else the heauens made man, in furious bloud
To torture man: And that no course is free
From mischiefe long. And that faire daies do breed
But storms, to make more foule, times that succeed.
IV.42
Who would haue thought but so great victories,  
Such conquests, riches, land, and kingdome gaind,  
Could not but haue establish’t in such wise  
This powrful state, in state to haue remaind?  
Who would haue thought that mischief could deuise  
A way so soone to loose what was attaingd?  
As greatnes were but shewed to grieue not grace,  
And to reduce vs into far worse case.

IV.43
With what contagion France didst thou infect  
The land by thee made proud, to disagree?  
T’inrage them so their owne swords to direct  
Vpon themselues that were made sharpe in thee?  
Why didst thou teach them here at home t’erect  
Trophees of their bloud which of thine should be?  
Or was the date of thy affliction out,  
And so was ours by course to come about?

IV.44
But that vntimely death of this Great King,  
Whose nine yeares raigne so mighty wonders wrought  
To thee thy hopes, to vs despaire did bring  
Not long to keepe, and gouerne what was gote:  
For those that had th’affaires in managing  
Although their countries good they greatly sought,  
Yet so ill accidents vnfitly fell  
That their desseignes could hardly prosper well.

IV.45
An infant king doth in the state succeed  
Skarse one yeare old, left vnto others guide,  
Whose carefull trust, though such as shewd indeed  
They waighd their charge more then the world beside;  
And did with dutie, zeale and loue proceed:  
Yet for all what their trauaile could prouide  
Could not woo fortune to remaine with vs  
When this her Minion was departed thus.

IV.46
But by degrees first this, then that regaingd  
The turning tide beares backe with flowing chaunce  
Vnto the Dolphin all we had attaingd,  
And fils the late low-running hopes of Fraunce,  
When Bedford who our onely hold maintained  
Death takes from vs their fortune to aduaunce,  
And then home strife that on it selfe did fall
Neglecting forraine care, did soone loose all.

IV.47
Nere three score years are past since Bullingbrooke
Did first attaine (God knowes how iust) the crowne:
And now his race for right possessors tooke
Were held of all, to hold nought but their owne:
When Richard Duke of Yorke, begins to looke
Into their right, and makes his title knowne:
Wakening vp sleeping-wrong that lay as dead
To witness how his race was injure.

IV.48
His fathers end in him no feare could moue
T’attempt the like against the like of might,
Where long possession now of feare, and loue
Seem’d to prescribe euen an innated right,
So that to proue his state was to disproue
Time, law, consent, oth and allegeance quight:
And no way but the waie of bloud there was
Through which with all confusion he must passe.

IV.49
O then yet how much better had it beene
T’indure a wrong with peace, then with such toyle
T’obtaine a bloudie right; since Right is sinne
That is ill sought, and purchased with spoile?
What madness vnconstrained to begin
To right his state, to put the state in broyle?
Iustice her selfe maie euen do wrong in this,
No war be’ing right but that which needfull is.

IV.50
And yet that opportunity which led
Him to attempt, seemes likewise him t’excuse:
A feeble spirited king that gouerned
Vnworthy of the Scepter he did vse;
His enemies that his worth maliced,
Who both the land and him did much abuse,
The peoples loue, and his apparant right,
May seeme sufficient motiues to incite.

IV.51
Beside the now ripe wrath (defer’d till now.)
Of that sure and vnfailing Justicer,
That neuer suffers wrong so long to grow
And to incorporate with right so farre;
That it might come to seeme the same in show,
“T’encourage those that euill minded are
By such successe; but that at last he will
Confound the branch whose root was planted ill.

IV.52
Else might the ympious say with grudging spright,
Doth God permit the great to riot free,
And blesse the mighty though they do vnright,
As if he did vnto their wrongs agree?
And only plague the weake and wretched wights
For smallest faults euene in the highest degree?
When he but vsing them others to scourge,
Likewise of them at length the world doth purge.

IV.53
But could not o for bloodshed satisfie
The now well-ruling of th’ill-gotten crowne?
Must euene the good receiue the penaltie
Of former sinnes that neuer were their owne?
And must a iust kings bloud with miserie
Pay for a bad vniustly ouerthrowne?
Then o I see due course must rightly goe
And th’earth must trace it or else purchase woe.

IV.54
And sure this king that now the crowne possest
Henry the sixt was one, whose life was free
From that commaund of vice, whereto the rest
Of many mighty soueraignes subiectes be:
And numbred might haue beene among the best
Of other men, if not of that degree:
A right good man, but yet an euill king
Vnfit for what he had in managing.

IV.55
Mild, meeke of spirit, by nature patient:
No thought t’increase or scarce to keepe his owne:
Apter for pardoning then for punishment,
Seeking his bounty, not his powre t’haue knowne;
Far from reuenge, soone won, soone made content:
As fitter for a cloyster then a crowne:
Whose holy minde so much addicted is
On th’world to come, that he neglected this.

IV.56
With such a weake, good, feeble, godly king
Hath Richard Duke of Yorke his cause to trie:
Who by th’experience of long managing
The warres of *Fraunce* with supræme dignitie;
And by his owne great worth with furthering
The common good against the enemie,
Had wrought that zeale and loue attend his might
And made his spirit equall vnto his right.

IV.57
For now the *Duke of Bedford* being dead,
He is ordaind the Regent to succeed
In *Fraunce* for five years, where he travailed
Whith ready hand and with as carefull heed
To seeke to turne backe fortune that now fled,
And hold vp falling power, in time of need:
And gote, and lost and reattaines againe
That which againe was lost for all his paine.

IV.58
His time expird, he should for five yeares more
Haue had his charge prolong’d, but *Sommerset*
That still had enuide his commaund before,
That place and honor for himself did get:
Which ads that matter to th’alreadie store
Of kindled hate, which such a fire doth set
Vnto the touch of that confounding flame
As both their blouds could neuer quench the same.

*The Duke of Somersit a great enemy to the Duke of Yorke & had euier euied his preferment.*

IV.59
And now the weaknes of that feeble head
That doth neglect all care, but his soules care,
So easie meanes of practice ministred
Vnto th’ambitious members to prepare
Their owne desires, to what their humors lead;
That all good Actions coldly followed are,
And seuerall-tending hopes do wholy bend
To other now then to the publique end.

IV.60
And to draw on more speedy misery,
The king vnto a fatall match is led
With *Rayners* daughter king of *Sicilie*,
Whom with unlucky starres he married:
For by the meanes of this affinitie
Was lost all that his Father conquered,
Euen as if *Fraunce* had some *Erynnis* sent
T’auenge their wrongs done by the insolent.
This Rainer was Duke of Aniou & only inoid the title of the K. of Sicilia.

IV.61
This marriage was the Duke of Suffolks deed
With great rewardes won to effect the same:
Which made him that he tooke so little heed
Vnto his countries good, or his owne shame:
Being a match could stand vs in no steed
For strength, for wealth, for reputation, fame:
But cunningly contriued for their gaine
To cost vs more then Aniou, Mauns, and Maine.

Which were deliuered vp to her father vpon the match.

IV.62
And yet as if he had accomplished
Some mighty benefit vnto the land;
He gote his trauailes to be registred
In Parliament, for euermore to stand
A witness to approue all what he did:
To th’end that if hereafter it were scand,
Autoritie might yet be on his side,
As doing nought but what was ratifide.

IV.63
Imagining th’allowance of that place
Would make that good the which he knew was naught,
And so would his negotiation grace
As none would thinke it was his priuat faut:
Wherein though wit dealt wary in this case,
Yet in the end it selfe it ouer raught,
Striuing to hide he opened it the more,
His after care shewd craft had gone before.

IV.64
Deare didst thou buy o king so faire a wife,
So rare a spirit, so high a minde the while:
Whose portion was destruction, dowry strife,
Whose bed was sorrow, whose imbracing spoile:
Whose maintenance cost thee, and thine their life,
And whose best comfort neuer was but toyle:
What Paris brought this booty of desire
To set our mighty Ilium here on fire?

IV.65
I grieue that I am forst to say thus much,
To blame her, that I yet must wonder at;
Whose so sweet beauty, wit and worth were such,
As everlasting admiration gat:
Yet doth my countries zeale so nerely touch
That I am drawne to say I know not what,
And yet o that my pen should euer giue
Staine to that sex by whom her fame doth liue.

IV.66
For sure those vertues wel deserud a crowne,
And had it not beene ours, no doubt she might
Haue matcht the worthiest that the world hath known
And now sate faire with fame, with glorie bright:
But comming in the way where sin was grown
So foule and thicke, it was her chance to light
Amidst that grosse infection of those times,
And so came staind with blacke disgracefull crimes.

IV.67
And some the world must haue on whom to lay
The heauie burthen of reproach, and blame,
Against whose deedes th’afflicted may inuay
As th’only Authors, whence destruction came:
When yet perhaps twas not in them to stay
The current of that streame, nor helpe the same;
But liuing in the eie of Action so
Not hindring it, are thought to draw on wo.

IV.68
So much vnhappie doth the mightie stand
That stand on other then their owne defence,
When as distruction is so neare at hand,
That if by weakenes, folly, negligence,
They do not comming miserie withstand
They shall be thought th’authors of the offence,
And to call in that which they kept not out,
And curst as those, that brought those plagues about.

IV.69
And so remaine for euer registred
In that eternall booke of infamie:
When o how many other causes lead
As well to that, as their iniquitie:
The worst complots oft ly close smothered,
And well ment deedes fall out vnluckily:
Whilst the aggrieued stand not t’waigh th’intent
But euer iudge according to th’euent.

IV.70
I say not this t’excuse thy Sinne o Queene,
Nor clear their faults that mightie Actors are:
I cannot but affirm thy pride hath beene
A special meanes this commonwealth to marre:
And that thy wayward will was plainly seene
In vain ambition to presume too farre,
And that by thee the onely way was wrought
The Duke of Gloster to his death was brought.

Humfrey Duke of Gloster.

IV.71
A man though seeming in thy thought to sit
Betweene the light of thy desires and thee,
Yet did his taking thence plainly permit
Others to looke to that they could not see
During his life, nor would adventure it:
When his remoue quite made that passage free;
So by his fall thinking to stand alone
Hardly could stand at all when he was gone.

IV.72
For this Duke as Protector many yeares
Had rul’d the land, during the kings young age:
And now the selfe same charge and title beares
As if he still were in his pupill age:
With such disgrace vnto the Queene appeares
That all incensd with an ambitious rage
She doth conspire to haue him made awaie,
As who the course of her maine will doth staie.

IV.73
Thrust thereinto not onely with her pride
But by her fathers counsel and consent,
That grieu’d likewise that any else beside
Should haue the honor of the gouernment:
And threfore he such deepe aduise applide
As forraigne craft and cunning could inuent,
To circumuent an unsuspecting wight
Before he should discerne of their despight.

IV.74
And manie ready hands shee straight doth find
To aide her deede, of such as could not brooke
The length of one mans office in that kind
That to himselfe th’affaires all wholly tooke:
And ruling all had neuer any minde
T’impairt a part with others that would looke
To haue likewise some honor in their hands,
And grieu’d at such ingrossing of commaunds.

IV.75
And had he not had such a greedy loue
Of still continuing of his charge too long,
Enuie had beene vnable to reprove
His acted life without shee did him wrong:
But hauing liu’d so many yeeres aboue
He grieues now to descend to be lesse strong,
And kils that fame that vertue did beget,
Chose to be held lesse good, then seene lesse great.

IV.76
O could the mighty but giue bounds to pride
And weigh backe fortune ere shee pull them downe,
Contented with inough, with honors satisfide,
Not striuing how to make so much their owne
As to leaue nothing for the rest beside,
Who seeme by their high spreading ouergrowne:
Whilst they themSELves remaine in all mens sight
The odious marke of hatred and dispight.

IV.77
Then should not o so many tragedies
Burthen our knowledge with their bloudy end,
Nor their digrac’d confounded families
From so hye pride to so low shame descend:
But planted on that ground where safety lies,
Their branches should to eternity extend:
But euer those that ouerlooke so much
Must ouersee themSELves; their state is such.

IV.78
Seuere he was, and strictly did obserue
Due forme of Iustice towards euery wight,
Vnmoueable, and neuer won to swerue
For any cause in what he thought was right:
Wherein although he did so well deserue,
In the licentious yet it bred despight;
So that euen vertue seemes an Actor too
To ruine those fortune prepares to vndoo.

IV.79
Those, thus prouided whom the Queene wel knew
Hated his might, and glad to innouate
Vnto so great, and strong a party grew
As easie t’was to ouerthrow his state:
And onely hope of alteration drew
Manie to yeeld that had no cause to hate:
For euen with goodnes men grow discontent
Where states are ripe to fall, and vertue spent.

IV.80
And taking all the rule into her hand
(Vnder the shadowe of that feeble king)
The Duke sh’excludes from office and command,
And in the reach of enmity doth bring
From that respected height where he did stand,
Whilst malice scarce durst mutter any thing:
When straight worst of him comes all reueald
Which former feare, or rigor kept conceald.

IV.81
Now is he taxed that he rather sought
His priuate profit then the publique good,
And many things presumptuously had wrought
Other then with our lawes, and customes stood:
As one that would into the land haue brought,
The ciuile forme in cases touching bloud,
And such poore crimes that shewd their spight was found,
But yet bewraide, their matter wanted ground.

IV.82
Yet seru’d they well the turne, and did effect
That which is easie wrought in such a case,
Where what suborned Justice shall object
Is to the purpose, and must passe with grace:
And what the wretched bring of no effect
Whose hainous faults his matter must deface:
For where powre hath decreed to find th’offence
The cause is better still then the defence.

IV.83
A Parlament at Berry summoned
Dispacht the deed more speedily then well,
For thither came the Duke without all dread
Or ought imagining of what befell:
Where as the matter is so followed
That he conuented is ere he could tell
He was in danger or had done offence,
And presently to prison sent from thence.

IV.84
Which quicke, and sodaine action gaue no time
For men to weigh the iustice of the deed,
Whilst looking only on the vrged crime
Vnto the farther drift they take no heed:
For these occasions taken in the prime
Of courses new, that old dislikes succeed,
Leaue not behind that feeling touch of wrong,
Society makes passions still lesse strong.

IV.85
And yet they seem’d some mutiny to doubt
For thus proceeding with a man of might,
Seeing he was most popular and stout
And resolute would stand vpon his right:
And therefore did they cast this way about
To haue him closely murdred out of sight,
That so his trouble, and his death thereby
Might come togethers and togethers dye.

IV.86
Reckning it better since his end is ment
And must be wrought, at once to rid it cleere
And put it to the fortune of th’euent,
Then by long doing to be long in feare:
When in such courses of high punishment
The deed and the attempt like daunger beare;
And oft things done perhaps doe lesse anoy
Then may the doing handled with delay.

IV.87
And so they had it straight accomplished,
For that day after his commiting he
Is dead brought foorth being found so in his bed,
Which was by sodaine sicknes said to bee
That had vpon his sorrowes gathered,
As by apparent tokens men might see:
And thus o Sicknes thou art oft belide,
When death hath many waies to come beside.

IV.88
Are these the deedes hye forraine wits inuent?
Is this the wisedome whereof they so boast?
O then I would it neuer had beene spent
Here amongst vs, nor brought from out their coast!
O let their cunning in their limits pent
Remaine amongst themselves that like it most!
And let the North they count of colder bloud
Beheld more grosse, so it remaine more good.

IV.89
Let them haue fairer citties, goodlier soiles,
And sweeter fields for beautie to the eie,
So long as they haue these vngodly wiles,
Such detestable vile impietie:
And let us want their vines, their fruities the whiles,
So that we want not faith and honestie,
We care not for those pleasures, so we may
Haue better harts, and stronger hands then they.

IV.90
Neptune keepe out from thy imbraced Ile
This foule contagion of iniquitie;
Drowne all corruptions comming to defile
Our faire proceedings ordred formally;
Keepe vs mere English, let not craft beguile
Honor and Iustice with strang subtiltie:
Let vs not thinke, that that our good can frame,
Which ruinde hath the Authors of the same.

IV.91
But by this impious meanes that worthy man
Is brought vnto this lamentable end,
And now that current with the maine fury ran
(The stop remou’d that did the course defend)
Vnto the full of mischiefe that began
T’a vniuersall ruine to extend,
That Isthmus failing which the land did keepe
From the intire possession of the deepe.

IV.92
And now the king alone all open lay,
No vnderprop of bloud to stay him by,
None but himselfe standes weakely in the way
Twixt Yorke and the affected sou’raignty:
Gone is that barre that would haue beene the stay
T’haue kept him backe from mounting vp so hie.
But o in what a state stand these men in
That cannot liue without, nor with their kin?

IV.93
The Queene hath yet by this her full desire
And now she with her minion Suffolke raignes,
Now shee hath all authority intire,
And all affaires vnto her selfe retaines:
And only Suffolke is aduanced hyre,
He is the man rewarded for his paines:
He that did her insteed most chiefly stand,
And more aduanc’d her, the he did the land.
IV.94
Which when they saw who better did expect,
Then they beganne their error to descry,
And well perceiue that only the defect
Was in their judgements, passion-drawne awry:
Found, formall rigour fitter to direct
Then pride and insolent inconstancie;
Better seuerity that’s right and iust
Then impotent affections led with lust.

IV.95
And thereupon in sorrow thus complaine:
O what great inconuenience do they feele,
Where as such imbecility doth raigne
As so neglectes the care of common weale?
Where euer one or other doth obtaine
So high a grace thus absolute to deale:
The whilst th’aggrieued subiect suffers still
The pride of some predominating will.

IV.96
And euer one remou’d, a worse succeedes;
So that the best that we can hope is warre,
Tumults and stirres, that this disliking breedes,
The sword must mend, what insolence doth marre:
For what rebellions, and what bloudy deedes
Haue euer followed where such courses are?
What oft remoues, what death of consailers,
What murder, what exile of officers?

IV.97
Witness the Spensers, Gaveston and Vere
The mighty minions of our feeblest kings;
Who euer subiects to their subiects were,
And only the procurers of these things:
When worthy Monarchs that hold honor deare
Maister themselues, and theirs; which euer brings
That vniuersall reuerence, and respect:
For who waighes him that doth himselfe neglect?

IV.98
And yet our case is like to be farre worse
Hauing a king though not so bent to ill,
Yet so neglecting good, that giuing force
By giuing leaue doth all good order kill:
Suffring a violent woman take her course
To manage all according to her will,
Which how she doth begin, her deedes expresse,
And what will be the end, our selues may gesse.

IV.99
Thus well they deem’d what after followed
When now the shamefull losse of Fraunce much grieues,
Which vnto Suffolke is attributed
As who in all mens sight most hatefull liues:
He with the enemy confedered
Bretaies the state, and secret knowledge giues
Of all our strength; that all which we did hold
By his corruptions is or lost or sold.

Articles obiected against de la Poole Duke of Suffolke.

IV.100
And as he deales abroad, so likewise here
He robs at home, the treasurie no lesse
Here, where he all authorities doth beare
And makes a Monopoly of offices:
He is inricht, h’is raisd, and placed neere
And only he giues counsaile to oppresse:
Thus men object, whilst many vp in armes
Offer to be reuenged of these harmes.

IV.101
The Queene perceiuing in what case shee stood,
To loose her minion or ingage her state;
(After with long contention in her bloud
Loue and ambition did the cause debate)
Shee yeeldes to pride, and rather thought it good
To sacrifice her loue vnto their hate,
Then to aduenture else the losse of all
Which by maintaining him was like to fall.

IV.102
Yet seeking at the first to temporize,
She tries if that some short imprisonment
would calme their heat; when that would not suffize,
Then to exile him shee must needes consent:
Hoping that time would salue it in such wise
As yet at length they might become content,
And shee againe might haue him home at last,
When the first fury of this rage was past.

IV.103
But as he to his iudged exile went,
Hard on the shore he comes encountered
By some, that so far off his honor sent,
As put his backe-returne quite out of dread:
For there he had his rightfull punishment
Though wrongly done, and there he lost his head,
Part of his bloud hath Neptune, part the sand,
As who had mischiefe wrought by sea and land.

IV.104
Whose death when swift-wingd fame at full conuaid
Vnto the trauaild Queen misdoubting nought,
Despight and sorrow such affliction laid
Vpon her soule as wondrous passions wrought:
O God (saith she) and art thou thus betraid?
And haue my fauours thy destruction brought?
Is this their gaine whom highnes fauoreth,
Who chiefe preferd, stand as preferd to death?

IV.105
O fatall grace without which men complaine
And with it perish, what preuailes that we
Thus beare the title of a soueraigne,
And suffred not to be that which we be?
O must our subiects limit and constraine
Our fauours where as they themselues decree?
Must we our loue at their appointment place?
Do we commaund, and they direct our grace?

IV.106
O will they then our powre, and will deuide?
And haue we might, but must not vse our might?
Poore maiestie that other men must guide
Whose discontent can neuer looke aright:
For euermore we see those that abide
Gracious in ours, are odious in their sight,
Who would all-maistering maiesty defeat
Of her best grace, that is to make men great.

IV.107
Deere Suffolke, o I saw thy wofull cheere
When thou perceiu’dst no helpe but to depart:
I saw that looke wherein did plaine appeare
The lamentable message of thy heart:
That seemd to say: O Queene, and canst thou beare
My ruine so? the cause whereof thou art:
Canst thou indure to see them worke their will
And not defend me from the hand of ill?

IV.108
Haue I for thee adventured so much,
Made shipwracke of my honor, faith and fame?
And doth my seruice giue no deeper touch
To thy hard heart better to feele the same?
Or dost thou feare, or is thy weakenes such
As not of force to keepe me from this shame?
Or else now hauing seru’d thy turne of me,
Art well-content my ouerthrow to see?

IV.109
As if my sight did read vnto thy minde
The lecture of that shame thou wouldst forget,
And therefore peraduenture glad to finde
So fit occasion dost it forward set:
Or else thy selfe from dangerous toile t’vnwinde
Downe on my necke dost all the burthen let;
Since kings must haue some hated worse then they,
On whom they may the waight of enuy lay.

IV.110
No Suffoke, none of this, my soule is cleere;
Without the thought of such impiety:
Yet must I needes confesse that too much feare
Made me defend thee lesse couragiously:
Seeing more Princes euer ruind were
By their immoderate fauoring priuately
Then by seueritie in generall,
For best h’is lik’t, that is alike to all.

IV.111
Thus in her passion lo shee vttered,
When as far greater tumults now burst out,
Which close and cunningly were practised
By such as sought great hopes to bring about:
For vp in armes in Kent were gathered
A mighty insolent rebellious rout
Vnder a daunegerous head; who to deter
The state the more, himselfe nam’d Mortimer.

IV.112
The Duke of Yorke that did not idle stand
But seekes to worke on all aduantages,
Had likewise in this course a secret hand,
And hartned on their chiefe accomplices,
To try how that the people of the land
Would (if occasion seru’d) b’in readines
To aide that line if one should come indeed
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To moue his right, and in due course proceed.

IV.113
Knowing himselfe to be the onely one
That must attempt the thing if any should,
And therefore lets the Rebel now runne on
With that false name t’effect the best he could
To make a way for him to worke vpon,
That but on certaine ground aduenture would:
For if the traitor sped, the gaine were his;
If not, yet he standes safe, and blameles is.

IV.114
T’attempt’ with others dangers, not his owne,
He countes it wisedome if it could be wrought:
And t’haue the honor of the people knowne
Was now that which was chiefly to be sought:
For with the best he knew himself was growne
In that account, as made him take no thought,
Hauing obseru’d in those he ment to proue
Their wit, their wealth, their cariage, and their loue.

IV.115
With whom and with his owne alliances
He first begins to open in some wise
The right he had, yet with such doubtfulnes,
As rather sorrow then his drift descries:
Complaining of his countries wretchednes
In what a miserable case it lies,
And how much it importes them to prouide
For their defence against this womens pride.

IV.116
Then with the discontented he doth deale
In sounding theirs, not vtering his intent,
As being sure not so much to reuale
Whereby they might be made againe content:
But when they grieued for the common weale
He doth preswade them to be patient,
And to indure there was no other course,
Yet so perswades as makes their malice worse.

IV.117
And then with such as with the time did run
He doth in most vpright opinion stand,
As one that neuer crost what they begun,
But seem’d to like what stil they tooke in hand:
Seeking all causes of offence to shun,
Praises the rule, and blames th’vnrule land:
Workes so with giftes, and kindlie offices
That euen of them he serues his turne no lesse.

IV.118
Then as for those that were his followers
Being all choice men for vertues or desarts,
He so with grace, and benefits prefers,
That he becomes the monarch of their harts:
He draws the learned for his Counsailers
And cherishes all men of rarest partes,
To whom good done doth an impression strike
Of ioye and loue in all that are alike.

IV.119
And now by meanes of th’intermitted warre
Manie most valiant men impou’rished,
Onely by him fed and relieued are,
Onely respected, grac’d and honoured:
Which let him in, vnto their hearts so farre,
As they by him were wholly to be led:
He onely treads the sure and perfect path
To greatnes who loue and opinion hath.

IV.120
And to haue one some certaine prouince his
As the maine body that must worke the feate,
*Yorkshire* he chose, the place wherein he is
By title, liuings, and possessions great:
No country he preferres so much as this,
Here hath his bountie her abiding seat,
Here is his Justice and relieuing hand
Ready to all that in destresse do stand.

IV.121
What with his tenants, seruants, followers, friends,
And their alliances, and amities,
All that *Shire* universally attendes
His hand held vp to any enterprize:
And thus farre vertue with her power extendes,
The rest touching th’euent in fortune lies.
With which accomplement so mighty growne
Forward he tendes with hope t’attaine a crowne.

*The end of the fourth booke.*
Book V

The fift Booke of the Ciuill warres
betweene the two Houses of Lancaster
and Yorke.²⁷⁵

The Argvment

The bad successe of Cades rebellion,
Yorks open practice and conspiracie
His comming in, and his submission,
Th’effect of Printing and Artillerie,
Burdeux revolts, craues our protection,
Talbot defending ours, dyes gloriously.
The French Wars end, & York begins againe,
And at S. Albones Sommerset is slaine.

V.1
The furious trayne of that tumultuous rout,
Whom close subayding powre & good successe,
Had made vnwisely proud, and fondly stout,
Thrust headlong on, oppression to oppresse:
And now to fulnes growne, boldly giue out
That they the publique wrongs meant to redresse;
Formlesse themselues, reforming doe pretend,
As if confusion could disorder mend.

V.2
And on they march, with theyr false-named head,
Of base, and vulgar birth, though noble fayn’d,
Who puft with vaine desires, to London led
His rash abused troupes, with shadowes trayn’d.
When as the King thereof assertained,
Supposing some small power would haue restrain’d
Disordred rage, sends with a simple crew
Syr Humfry Stafford, whom they ouerthrew.

Jack Cade.

V.3
Which so increasd th’opinion of theyr might,
That much it gaue to doe, and much it wrought,
Confirm’d their rage, drew on the vulgar wight,

²⁷⁵ There are two settings of the fifth book, one with the title “fift booke” and the other with “fyft booke”. For a description of the differences between the “fift” and “fyft” books, see McManaway, “Bibliographical Notes”, pp. 34-36. See also Sellers, “Bibliography”, p. 34, and Michel, ed., Civil Wars, p. 53.
Calld forth the timerous, fresh pertakers brought;
For many, though most glad theyr wrongs to right,
Yet durst not venture theyr estates for nought:
But see’ing the cause had such aduantage got,
Occasion makes them styr, that els would not.

V.4
So much he errs, that scornes or els neglects
The small beginnings of arysing broyles,
And censures others, not his owne defects,
And with a selfe conceite himselfe beguiles:
Thinking small force will compasse great effects,
And spares at first to buy more costly toyles:
When true obseruing prouidence in war
Still makes her foes, far stronger then they are.

V.5
Yet thys good fortune all theyr fortune mard
Which fooles by helping euer doth suppresse:
For warelesse insolence whilst vndebard
Of bounding awe, runnes on to such excesse,
That following lust, and spoyle, and blood so hard,
Sees not how they procure theyr owne distresse:
The better, lothing courses so impure,
Rather will like theyr wounds, then such a cure.

V.6
For whilst thys wilde vntrained multitude
(Led with an vnfore-seeing greedy minde
Of an imagin’d good, that did delude
Their ignorance, in theyr desires made blind,)
Ransack the Citty, and with hands imbrude,
Run to all out-rage in th’extreamest kind,
Heaping vp wrath and horror more and more,
Adding fresh guilt, to mischiefes done before.

V.7
And seeing yet all thys draw to no end
But to their owne, no promisd ayde t’appeare,
No such pertakers as they dyd attend,
Nor such successes as imagin’d were:
Good men resolu’d the present to defend
Justice against them with a brow seuere.
Themselfes, feard of themselfes, tyr’d with excesse,
Found, mischiefe was no fit way to redresse.
V.8
Like when a greedy Pyrat hard in chace
Pursuing of a rich supposed prize,
Works for the winds, plyes sayles, beares vp a pace,
Out-runnes the clowdes, scoures after her that flyes,
Pryde in his hart, and wealth before his face,
Keepes his hands wrought, & fixed keepes his eyes,
So long, till that ingag’d within some straight
He falls amid his foes layd close in wayt:

V.9
Where all too late discouering round about
Danger and death the purchase of his hast;
And no back flying, no way to get out,
But there to perrish, or to yeeld disgrast,
Cursing his error, yet in th’error stout:
Hee toyles for life, now charges, now is chast:
Then quailes, and then fresh courage takes againe,
Striuing t’vnwind himselfe, but all in vaine.

V.10
So stands thys rout in desperat comberment,
Eniurond round with horror, blood, and shame:
Crost of theyr course, dispayring of th’euent
When pardon, that smooth bayt of baseness came:
Pardon, (the snare to catch the impotent)
Beeing once pronounc’d, they straight embrace the same,
And as huge snowy Mountaines melt with heat,
So they dissolu’d with hope, and home they get.

V.11
Leauing their Captaine to discharge alone
The shott of blood consumed in theyr heat:
Too small a sacrifice for mischiefes done
Was one mans breath, which thousands dyd defeat.
Vnrighteous Death, why art thou but all one
Vnto the small offender and the great?
Why art thou not more then thou art, to those
That thousands spoyle, and thousands liues doe lose?

V.12
Thys fury passing with so quick an end,
Discloesd not those, that on th’aduantage lay,
Who seeing the course to such disorder tend,
With-drew theyr foote, asham’d to take that way;
Or els preuented whilst they dyd attend
Some mightier force, or for occasion stay,
But what they meant, ill fortune must not tell,
Mischief be’ing oft made good by speeding well.
V.13
Put by from thys, the Duke of Yorke dissignes
Another course to bring his hopes about:
And with those frends affinity combines
In surest bonds, his thoughts he poureth out,
And closely feeles, and closely vndermines
The fayth of whom he had both hope and doubt:
Meaning in more apparrant open course
To try his right, his fortune, and his force.

V.14
Loue and aliance had most firmly ioynd
Vnto his part, that mighty family
The fayre discended stock of Neuiles kind,\textsuperscript{276}
Great by theyr many issued progeny;
But greater by theyr worth, that cleerely shind
And gaue faire light to theyr nobilitie:
A mightie partie for a mighty cause
By theyr vnited amitie hee drawes.

V.15
For as the spreading members of the proud Po,
That thousand-branched Po, whose limmes embrace
Thy fertile and delicious body so
Sweet Lombardie, and beautifies thy face:
Such seemd this powreful stock; from whence did grow
So many great discents, spreading theyr race
That euery corner of the Land became,
Enricht with some great Heroes of that name.

V.16
But greatest in renowne doth Warwick sit,
That great King-maker Warwick, so far growne
In grace with Fortune, that he gouerns it,
And Monarchs makes, and made, againe puts downe;
What reuolutions his first mouing wit
Heere brought about, are more then too well known;
That fatall kindle-fire of those hote dayes,
Whose worth I may, whose worke I cannot prayse.

V.17
With him, with Richard Earle of Salisbury,
Courtney and Brooke, his most assured frends,
Hee intimates his minde, and openly,
The present bad proceedings discommends;

\textsuperscript{276} “faults escaped”: “discended, read distended”. See p. 460 of this appendix.
Laments the state, the peoples misery,
And that which such a pittyer seldom mends,
Oppression, that sharpe two edged sword\(^{277}\)
That others wounds, and wounds likewise his Lord.

V.18
My Lord, sayth he, how things are carryed heere\(^{278}\)
In thys corrupted state, you plainly see,
What burden our abused shoulders beare
Charg’d with the weight of imbecillitie;
And in what base account all we appeare
That stand without their grace that all must be:
And who they be, and how their course succeeds,
Our shame reports, and time bewrayes theyr deeds.

V.19
Aniou and Maine, (O maine that foule appeares,\(^{279}\)
Eternall scarre of our dismembred Land)
And, Guien’s lost, that did three hundred yeeres
Remaine subjected vnder our commaund.
From whence, me thinks, there sounds vnto our eares
The voyce of those deere ghosts, whose liuing hand
Got it with sweat, and kept it with theyr blood,
To doe vs, thankless vs, theyr of-spring good.

V.20
And seeme to cry; O how can you behold
Their hatefull feete vpon our graues should tread?
Your Fathers graues, who gloriously dyd hold
That which your shame hath left recouered.
Redeeme our Tombes, O spirits too too cold,
Pull backe these Towres our Armes haue honored:
These Towres are yours, these Forts we built for you,
These walls doe beare our names, and are your due.

V.21
Thus well they may obrayd our rechlesnes,
Whilst we, as if at league with infamie,
Ryot away for nought, whole Prouinces;

\(^{277}\) In the “faults escaped” (see p. 460 of this appendix) this line is cited as follows: “two edged, read double edged.” The line was not changed to read “double edged” in either the 1601 or the 1609 (VI.14) edition, possibly indicating that Daniel had changed his mind about the change.

\(^{278}\) “faults escaped”: “my Lord, read my Lords.” See p. 460 of this appendix.

\(^{279}\) “faults escaped”: “O Mayne, read O mayme.” See p. 460 of this appendix. Word appears as “maine” in V.19 but “Mayne” in “faults escaped”.
Giue vp as nothing worth all Normandy, 
Traffique strong holds, fell Fortresses, 
So long, that nought is left but misery: 
Poore Callice, and these water-walls about, 
That basely pownds vs in, from breaking out.

V.22
And which is worse, I feare we shall in th’end 
Throwne from the glory of invading war, 
Be forst our proper limmits to defend, 
Where euer, men are not the same they are 
Where hope of conquest doth their spyrits extend
Beyond the usuall powres of valor far: 
For more is he that ventureth for more, 
Then who fights but for what he had before.

V.23
Put to your hands therefore to reskew nowe 
Th’indangered state, dere Lords, from thys disgrace, 
And let vs in our honour, labour how 
To bring thys scorned Land in better case: 
No doubt but God our action will allow, 
That knowes my right, and how they rule the place, 
Whose weaknes calls vp our vnwillingnesse, 
As opening euon the doore to our redresse.

V.24
Though I protest it is not for a Crowne 
My soule is moou’d, (yet, if it be my right, 
I haue no reason to refuse myne owne) 
But onely these indignities to right. 
And what if God whose judgements are vnknowne, 
Hath me ordaynd the man, that by my might 
My Country shall be blest; if so it be, 
By helping me, you rayse your selues with me.

V.25
In those whom zeale and amity had bred 
A fore-impression of the right he had, 
These styrring words so much encouraged, 
That with desire of innovation mad, 
They seem’d to runne before, not to be led, 
And to his fire doe quicker fuell ad: 
For where such humors are prepar’d before, 
The opening them makes them abound the more.
V.26
Then counsel take they fitting theyr desire,
(For nought that fits not theyr desire is wayghd)
The Duke is straight advised to retyre
Into the bounds of Wales to leauy ayde;
Which vnnder smooth pretence he doth require
T’amoue such persons as the state betrayd,
And to redresse th’oppression of the land;
The charmè which weakenes seldom doth withstand.

V.27
Ten thousand straight caught with this bait of breth
Are towards greater lookt-for forces led:
Whose power the King by all meanes trauaileth
In theyr arising to haue ruined:
But theyr preuenting head so compasseth,
That all ambushments warilie are fled,
Refusing ought to hazard by the way,
Keeping his greatnes for a greater day.

V.28
And to the Citty straight directs his course,
(The Citty, seate of Kings, and Kings cheefe grace)
Where finding of his entertainement worse
By far then he expected in that place,
Much disappoynted, drawes from thence his force,
And towards better trust marches a pace;
And downe in Kent (fatall for disontents)
Nere to thy banks sayre Thames doth pitch his Tents.

V.29
And there intrencht, plants his Artillery,
Artillery th’infernall instrument,
New brought from hell to scourge mortality
With hideous roring, and astonishment:
Engin of horror, fram’d to terrifie
And teare the earth, and strongest Towers to rent;
Torment of Thunder, made to mock the skyes,
As more of power in our calamities.

V.30
O if the fire subtle Promethius brought
Stolne out of heauen, did so afflict mankind,
That euer since plagu’d wyth a curious thought
Of styrring search, could neuer quiet find;
What hath he done who now by stealth hath got
Lightning and Thunder, both in wondrous kind?
What plague deserues so proude an enterprize?
Tell Muse, and how it came, and in what wise.

V.31
It was at the tyme when fayre Europa sate
With many goodly Diadems addrest,
And all her parts in flourishing estate
Lay beautifull, in order at their rest:
No swelling member vnproportionate
Growne out of forme, sought to dissturbe the rest:
The lesse, subsisting by the greaters might,
The greater, by the lesser kept vpright.

V.32
No noyse of tumult euer wak’d them all,
Onely perhaps some priuat iarrs within
For tytles or for confines might befall,
Which ended soone, made better loue begin;
But no eruption dyd in generall
Breake downe theyr rest with vniuersall sin:
No publique shock disioynted thys fayre frame,
Tyll Nemesis from out the Orient came.

V.33
Fierce Nemesis, mother of fate and change,
Sword-bearer of th’eternall prouidence,
That had so long with such afflictions strange
Confounded Asias proude magnificence,
And brought foule impious Barbarisme to range
On all the glory of her excellence,
Turnes her sterne looke at last vnto the West,
As greeu’d to see on earth such happy rest.

V.34
And for Pandora calleth presently,
(Pandora, Ioues fayre gift, that first deceiu’d
Poore Epimetheus imbecillitie,
That thought he had a wondrous Boone receiu’d,
By meanes whereof curious mortalitie
Was of all former quiet quite bereau’d):
To whom being come, deckt with all qualities,
The wrathfull Goddesse breakes out in thys wise:

V.35
Doost thou not see in what secure estate
Those florishing fayre Westerne parts remaine?
As if they had made couenant with Fate
To be exempted free from others paine:
At one with theyr desires, frends with debate,
In peace with pride, content with theyr owne gaine,
Their bounds containe their minds, their minds applide
To haue their bounds with plentie beautified.

V.36
Devotion, (mother of Obedience,)
Beares such a hand on theyr credulity,
That it abates the spirit of eminence,
And busies them wyth humble pietie:
For see what works, what infinite expence,
What monuments of zeale they edifie,
As if they would, if that no stop were found,
Fill all with Temples, make all holy ground.

V.37
But we must coole thys all-beleeuing zeale,
That hath enioyd so fayre a turne so long,
And other revolutions must reueale,
Other desires, other designes among:
Dislike of thys, first by degrees shall steale
Vpon the soules of men perswaded wrong,
And th’abus’d power that such a power hath got,
Shall giue herselfe the sword to cut her throat.

V.38
Goe thou therefore with all thy styrring trayne
Of swelling sciences, (the gyfts of greefe)
Goe loose the lynks of that soule-binding chayne,
Inlarge thys vninquisitiue beleefe;
Call vp mens spirits, whom darknes doth detaine,
Enter thyr harts, and Knowledge make the theefe
To open all the doores to let in light,
That all, may all things see, but what is right.

V.39
Opinion Arme against opinion growne,
Make new-born contradiction still to rise
As if Thebes-founder Cadmus tongues had sowne
In stead of teeth, for greater mutinies.
Bring lyke defended fayth against fayth knowne,
Weary the soule with contrarieties:
Till all Religion become retrograde,
And that fayre tyre, the maske of sin be made.
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V.40
And better to effect a speedy end,
Let there be found two fatall instruments,
The one to publish, th’other to defend
Impious contention, and proud discontents:
Make that instamped Characters may send
Abroad to thousands, thousand mens intents,
And in a moment, may dispatch much more
Then could a world of pennes performe before.

V.41
Whereby all quarrels, tytles, secrecies,
May vnto all be presently made knowne,
Factions prepard, parties allur’d to rise,
Sedition vnder fayre pretentions sowne;
Whereby the vulgar may become so wise,
That will a selfe presumption ouer-grownne
Hee may of deepest misteries debate,
Controule his betters, censure acts of state.

V.42
And then, when this dispersed mischiefe shall
Haue brought confusion in each misterie,
Calld vp contempt of all states generall,
Ripened the humor of impietie,
Then haue they th’other Engin, where-with-all
They may torment theyr selfe-wrought misery,
And scourge each other, in the strangest wise
As tyme or Tyrants neuer could deuise.

V.43
For by this strategem they shall confound
All th’ancient forme and discipline of war:
Alter theyr camps, alter theyr fights, theyr ground,
Daunt migthy spirits, prowesse and manhood mar;
For basest cowards from a far shall wound
The most courageous, forst to fight a far;
Valor rapt vp in smoake, as in the night,
Shall perish without witnes, without sight.

V.44
But first, before thys generall disease
Breake forth into so great extreamity,
Prepare it by degress; fist kill thys ease,
Spoyle thys proportion, mar thys harmony;
Make greater States vpon the lesser seaze,
Ioyne many kingdoms to one soueraignty,
Rayse a few great, that may with greater power
Slaughter each other, and mankind deoure.

V.45
And first begin with factions, to deuide
The fayrest land, that from her thrusts the rest,
As if shee car’d not for the world beside;
A world within her selfe, with wonders blest;
Raise such a strife as tyme shall not decide,
Till the dere blood of most of all her best
Be poured forth, and all her people tost
With vnkind tumults, and almost all lost.

V.46
Let her be made the sable Stage whereon
Shall first be acted bloody Tragedies:
That all the neighbour States gazing thereon,
May make their profit by her miseries.
And those whom shee before had march’d vpon,
(Hauing by this both tyme and meane to rise)
Made martiall by her Armes, shall grow so great,
As saue their owne, no force shall them defeat.

V.47
That when theyr power vnable to sustaine
And beare it selfe, vpon it selfe shall fall,
Shee may (recouered of her wounds againe)
Sit and behold theyr parts as tragicall:
For there must come a tyme that shall obtaine
Truce for distresse. When make-peace Hymen shall
Bring the conioyned aduers powers to bed,
And set the Crowne made one, vpon one head.

V.48
Out of which blessed vnion shall arise
A sacred branch, with grace and glory blest,
Whose vertue shall her Land so patronize,
As all our power shall not her dayes molest:
For shee, fayre shee, the Minion of the skyes,
Shall purchase of the highe’st to hers such rest,
(Standing betweene the wrath of heauen and them)
As no distresse shall touch her Diadem.

V.49
Though thou shalt seeke by all means thou may,
And Arme impiety and hell and all;
Styrre vp her owne, make others to assay,
Bring fayth disguised, the power of Pluto call,
Call all thy crafts to practise her decay,
And yet shall thys take no effect at all:
For shee secure, (as intimate with Fate)
Shall sit and scorne those base dissignes of hate.

V.50
And from the Rocks of safety shall discry
The wondrous wracks that wrath layes ruined,
All round about her, blood and misery,
Powers betrayd, Princes slaine, Kings massacred,
States all-confusd, brought to calamitie,
And all the face of kingdoms altered.
Yet she the same inuiolable stands,
Deere to her owne, wonder to other Lands.

V.51
But let not her defence discourage thee,
For neuer none but shee, shall haue thys grace
From all disturbs to be so long kept free,
And with such glory to discharge that place:
And therefore, if by such a power thou be
Stopt of thy course, reckon it no disgrace;
Sith shee alone (being priuiledg’d from hie)
Hath thys large Patent of eternitie.

V.52
This charge the Goddesse gaue, when ready straight
The subtil messenger accompayned
With all her crew of crafts that on her wayt,
Hastes to effect what shee was consailed:
And out shee pours of her mimens conceit,
Vpon such searching spirits as trauailed
In penetrating hidden secrecies,
Who soone these meanes of misery deuise.

V.53
And boldly breaking with rebellious minde
Into theyr mothers close-lockt Treasury,
They mineralls combustible doe finde,
Which in stopt concaues placed cunningly
They fire, and fire imprisoned against kind,
Teares out away, thrusts out his enemy;
Barking with such a horror, as if wroth

---
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With man, that wrongs himself, and nature both.

V.54
And this beginning had this cursed frame,
Which Yorke hath now planted against his King,
Presuming by his power, and by the same,
His purpose vnto good effect to bring;
When diuers of the grauest Counsell came,
Sent from the King, to vnderstand what thing
Had thrust him into these proceedings bad,
And what he sought, and what intent he had.

V.55
Who with words mildly-sharpe, gently-seuere,
Wrought on those wounds that must bee toucht with heed,
Applying rather salues of hope then feare,
Least corasiues should desperat mischiefes breed.
And what my Lord, sayd they, should moue you here
In thys vseemely manner to proceed,
Whose worth being such, as all the Land admires,
Hath fayrer ways then these to your desires?

V.56
Will you whose meanes, whose many friends, whose grace,
Can work the world in peace vnto your wil,
Take such a course as shall your blood deface,
And make by handling bad, a good cause ill?
How many harts hazard you in thys case,
That in all quiet plots would ayde you still,
Hauing in Court a Partie far more strong,
(Then you conceiue) prest to redresse your wrong.

V.57
Fy, Fy, forsake thys hatefull course, my Lord,
Downe with these Armes that will but wound your cause
What peace may do, hazard not with the sword,
Fly from the force that from your force with-drawes,
And yeeld, and we will mediat such accord
As shall dispence with rigor and the lawes:
And interpose thyse solemne fayth of our
Betwixt your fault, and the offended power.

V.58
Which ingins of protests, and proffers kinde,
Vrg’d out of seeming greefe, and shewes of loue,
So shooke the whole foundation of his minde,
As it dyd all his resolution moue:
And present seem’d vnto theyr course inclind,
So that the King would *Sommerset* remoue;  
The man whose most intollerable pride,  
Trode downe his worth, and all good mens beside.

V.59  
Which they there vow’d should presently be done;  
For what will not peace-louers willing grant  
Where dangerous euents depend thereon,  
And men vnfurnisht, and the state in want?  
And if with words, the conquest will be won,  
The cost is small: and who holds breath so scant  
As then to spare, tho’ against his dignity,  
Better discend, then end in maiestie.

V.60  
And here-vpon the Duke dissolues his force,  
Submits him to the King, on publique vow.  
The rather to, presuming on thyss course,  
For that his sonne the Earle of *March* was now  
With mightier powers abroad, which would enforce  
His peace, which els the King would not allow.  
For seeing not all of him in him he hath,  
His death would but gyue life to greater wrath.

V.61  
Yet, comming to the King, in former place  
Hys foe, the Duke of *Sommerset* he finds,  
Whom openly, reproching to hys face,  
Hee charg’d with treason in the highest kinds.  
The Duke returnes lyke speeches of dysgrace,  
And fiery words bewrayd their flaming minds:  
But yet the tryall was for them deferd  
Till fitter tyme allow’d it to be heard.

V.62  
At Westminster a Counsell gathered,  
Deliberats what course the cause should end  
Of th’apprehended Duke of *Yorke*, whose head  
Doth now on others doubtfull breath depend;  
Law fiercely vrgd his deed, and found him dead,  
Frends fayld to speake where they could not defend:  
Onely the King himselfe for mercy stood,  
As prodigall of lyfe, nyggard of blood.

V.63  
And as if angrie with the Lawes of death,  
And why should you, sayd he, vrgge things so far?  
You, that invr’d with mercenary breath,
And hyred tongue so peremptory are?
Brauing on him whom sorrow prostrateth,
As if you dyd with poore affliction war,
And pray on frailty, folly hath betrayd,
Bringing the lawes to wound, neuer to ayd.

V.64
Dispence sometyme with sterne seueritie,
Make not the lawes still traps to apprehend,
Win grace vpon the bad with clemencie,
Mercy may mend whom malice made offend:
Death giues no thanks, but checks authority:
And lyfe doth onely maiestie commend.
Reuenge dyes not, rigor begets new wrath,
And blood hath neuer glory, mercy hath.

V.65
And for my part, (and my part should be chiefe)
I am most willing to restore his state;
And rather had I win him with reliefe
Then loose him with despight, and get more hate:
Pitty drawes loue, bloodshed as natures griefe,
Compassion, followes the vnfortunate.
And loosing him, in him I loose my power,
We rule who liue, the dead are none of our.

V.66
And should our rigor lessen then the same
Which we with greater glory should retaine?
No, let him lyue, his lyfe must giue vs fame;
The chyld of mercy, newly borne againe:
As often burials is Phisitions shame,
So, many deaths, argues a Kings hard raigne.
Why should we say, The law must haue her vigor?
The law kills him, but quits not vs of rigor.

V.67
You, to get more preferment by your wit,
Others, to gaine the spyoles of misery,
Labour with all your power to follow it,
Shewing vs feares, to draw on cruelty.
You vrge th’offence, not tell vs what is fit,
Abusing wrong-informed maiestie:
As if our power, were onely but to slay,
And that to saue, were a most dangerous way.
Thus out of pitty spake that holy King,  
Whom mylde affections led to hope the best.  
When Sommerset began to urge the thing  
With words of hotter temper, thys exprest:  
Deare soueraigne Lord, the cause in managing  
Is more then yours, ’timports the publique rest,  
We all haue part, it touches all our good,  
And lyfe’s ill spard, that’s spar’d to cost more blood.

Compassion here is cruelty, my Lord,  
Pitty will cut our throats for sauing so.  
What benefit shall we haue by the sword  
If mischiefe shall escape to draw on mo?  
Why should we gyue what Law cannot afford  
To’ be’accessaries to our proper wo?  
Wisdom must iudge twixt men apt to amend  
And minds incurable, borne to offend.

It is no priuat cause (I doe protest)  
That moues me thus to prosecute his deede,  
Would God his blood and myne had well releast  
The dangers that his pryde is lyke to breed:  
Although at me, he seemes to haue addrest  
His spight, tis not his end he hath decreed:  
I am not he alone, hee doth pursue  
But thorow me, he meanes to shoote at you.

For this course euer they deliberate  
Which doe aspyre to reach the gouernment,  
To take aduantage of the peoples hate,  
Which euer hate those that are eminent:  
For who can manage great affayres of state,  
And all a wayward multitude content?  
And then these people-minions they must fall  
To worke out vs, to worke themselues int’all.

But note my Lord, first, who is in your hand,  
Then, how he hath offended, what’s his end:  
It is the man whose race would seeme to stand  
Before your right, and doth a right pretend;  
Who (Traytor-like) hath raysd a mighty band  
With coullor your proceedings to amend:  
Which if it should haue hapned to succeed,
You had not now sate to adiudge hys deed.

V.73
If oftentimes the person not th’offence
Haue beene sufficient cause of death to some,
Where publique safety puts in evidence
Of mischiefe, likely by theyr lyfe to come;
Shall he, whose fortune and his insolence
Haue both deseru’d to dye, escape that doome?
When you shall saue your Land, your Crowne thereby,
And since you cannot lyue vnlesse he dye?

V.74
Thys spake th’aggreeued Duke, that grauely saw
Th’incompatible powers of Princes minds;
And what affliction his escape might draw
Vnto the State, and people of all kinds.
And yet the humble yeelding and the aw
Which Yorke there shew’d, so good opinion finds,
That, with the rumor of his sonnes great strength
And French affayres, he there came quit at length.

V.75
For euen the feare t’exasperat the heat
Of th’Earle of March, whose forward youth & might
Well followd, seem’d a proude reuenge to threat
If any shame should on his Father light:
And then desire in Gascoyne to reget
The glory lost, which home-broyles hinder might,
Aduauntaged the Duke, and sau’d his head,
Which questionlesse had els beene hazarded.

V.76
For now had Burdeux offered vpon ayd
Present reuolt, if we would send with speed.
Which fayre aduantage to haue then delayd
Vpon such hopes, had been a shamefull deed:
And therfore this, all other courses stayd,
And outwardsly these inward hates agreed:
Giuing an interpause to pride and spight,
Which breath’d but to break out with greater might.

V.77
Whilst dreadfull Talbot terror late of Fraunce
(Against the Genius of our Fortune) stroue
The down-throwne glorie of our state t’aduaunce;
Where Fraunce far more then Fraunce hee now doth proue.
For frends, opinion, & succeeding chaunce,
Which wrought the weak to yeld, the strong to loue,  
Werde not the same, as he had found before  
In happyer tymes, when lesse would haue done more.

V.78  
For both the Britayne and Burgonian now  
Came altred with our luck, & won with theirs  
Those bridges and gates that dyd allow  
So easie passage vnto our affayres.  
Judging it safer to endeouer how  
To linke with strength, then leane vnto dispayres;  
And who wants frends, to back what he begins  
In Lands far of, gets not, although he wins.

The Dukes of Britany and Burgundie.

V.79  
Which too well prou’d thys fatall enterprize,  
The last that lost vs all we had to lose:  
Where, though aduantag’d by some mutenies,  
And petty Lords that in our cause arose,  
Yet those great fayld; whose ready quick supplyes  
Euer at hand, cheerd vs, and quaild our foes:  
Succours from far, come seldom to our mind,  
For who holds league with Neptune, or the wind?

V.80  
Yet worthy Talbot, thou didst so impoy  
The broken remnans of disscattered power,  
That they might see it was our destiny  
Not want of spirit that lost vs what was our:  
Thy dying hand sold them the victory  
With so deere wounds as made the conquest sowre:  
So much it cost to spoyle who were vndon,  
And such a doe to win, when they had won.

V.81  
For as a fierce couragious mastiue fares  
That hauing once sure fastned on his foe,  
Lyes tugging on that hold, neuer forbeares  
What force soeuer force hym to foregoe;  
The more he feeles his wounds, the more he dares,  
As if his death were sweet in dying so;  
So held his hold thyss Lord, whilst he held breath,  
And scarce but with much blood lets goe in death.
V.82
For though he saw prepared against his side
Both unlike fortune, and unequall force,
Borne with the swelling current of their pride
Downe the mayne streame of a most happy course:
Yet stands he stiffe undaunted, unterrified,
His minde the same, although his fortune worse;
Vertue in greatest dangers being best shoune,
And though opprest, yet neuer ouerthrowne.

V.83
For, reskuing of besieged Chatillion
Where having first constrain'd the French to flye,
And following hard on their confusion,
Comes loe incountred with a strong supply
Of fresh-arriuing powers, that back thrust on
Those flying troupes, another chauce to try;
Who double Arm'd, with shame, and fury, straine
To wrekke their foyle, and win their fame againe.

V.84
Which seeing, th'undaunted Talbot with more might
Of spirit to will, then hands of power to doe:
Preparing t'entertaine a glorious fight,
Cheeres vp his wearied soldiers thereunto:
Courage, sayth he, those brauing troupes in sight
Are but the same that now you dyd vndoe.
And what if there be come some more then they?
They come to bring more glory to the day.

V.85
Which day must eyther thrust vs out of all,
Or all with greater glory back restore.
Thys day your valiant worth aduenture shall
For what our Land shall neuer fight for, more:
If now we faile, with vs is like to fall
All that renowne which we haue got before:
This is the last, if we discharge the same,
The same shall last to our eternall fame.

V.86
Neuer had worthy men for any fact
A more fayre glorious Theater then we:
Whereon true magnanimity might act
Braue deeds, which better witnessed could be.
For loe, from yonder Turrets yet vsnackt,
Your valiant fellowes stand your worth to see,
T'auouch your valour, if you liue to gaine,
And if we die, that we dyde not in vaine.

V.87
And euen our foes, whose proud & powrefull might
Would seeme to swallow vp our dignitie,
Shall not keepe backe the glory of our right
Which theyr confounded blood shall testifie:
For in theyr wounds our gored swords shall write
The monuments of our eternitie:
For vile is honor and a tytle vayne
The which true worth and danger doe not gayne.

V.88
For they shall see when we in carelesse sort
Shall throwe our selues on theyr desipesed speares,
Tis not dispaire that doth vs so transport,
But euen true fortitude, that nothing feares:
Sith we may well retire vs, in some sort,
But shame on him that such a foule thought beares;
For be they more, let Fortune take theyr part,
We’ill tugge her to, and scratch her, ere we part.282

V.89
Thys sayd, a fresh infusd desire of fame,
Enteres theyr warmed blood, with such a will
That they dee’d long they were not at the same:
And though they march’d, they thought they yet stood still,
And that their lingering foes too slowly came
To ioyne with them, spending much time so ill:
Such force had words fierce humors vp to call,
Sent from the mouth of such a Generall.

V.90
Who weighing yet his force and theyr desire,
Turnes him about in priuate to his sonne,
A worthy sonne, and worthy such a Sire,
Tells him the doubtfull ground they stood vpon,
Advising him in secrete to retyre;
Seeing his youth but euen now begun,
Would make it vnto him at all no staine,
His death small fame, his flight no shame could gaine.

The Lord Lisle.
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V.91
To whom th’aggreeued sonne as if dysgrac’d
Ah Father, haue you then selected mee
To be the man, which you would haue displac’d
Out of the role of immortalitie?
What haue I done thys day that hath defac’d
My worth: that my hands worke dispisd should bee?
God shield I should beare home a Cowards name,
I haue liu’d enough, if I can dye with fame.

V.92
At which the Father toucht with sorrowing-joy,
Turnes him about, shaking his head, and sayes:
O my deere sonne, worthy a better day
To enter thy first youth in hard assayes,
And now had wrath, impatient of delay
Begun the fight, and farther speeches stayes:
Furie thrusts on, striuing whose sword should be
First warmed in the wounds of th’enemie.

V.93
Hotely these small, but mighty minded Bands
(As if ambitious now of death) doe straine
Against innumerable armed hands,
And gloriously a wondrous fight maintaine:
Rushing on all what euer strength with-stands,
Whetting theyr wrath on blood and on disdaine;
And so far thrust, that hard ‘twere to discry
Whether they the more desire to kill, or dye.

V.94
Frank of theyr owne, greedy of others blood,
No stroke they giue but wounds; no wound but kills;
Neere to theyr hate, close to theyr worke they stood,
Hit where they would, their hand obeyes their wills,
Scorning the blow from far that doth no good,
Loathing the cracke vnlesse some bloud it spils:
No wounds could let out life that wrath held in,
Till others wounds reueng’d dyd first begin.

V.95
So much true resolution wrought in those
Who had made couenant with death before,
That theyr small number scorning so great foes,
Made Fraunce most happy that there were no more
Sith these made doubtfull how Fate would dispose
That weary day, or vnto whom restore
The glory of a conquest deerely bought,
Which scarce the Conqueror can think worth ought.  

V.96
For as with equall rage, and equall might
Two aduers winds combat with billowes proude
And neyther yeeld: Seas, skyes maintayne like fight,
Waue against waue opposd, and clowd to clowd.
So war both sides with obstinate despight,
With like reuenge, and neyther party bowd:
Fronting each other with confounding blowes,
No wound, one sword vnto the other owes.

V.97
Whilst Talbot, whose fresh spirit hauing got
A meruailous aduantage of his yeeres,
Carries his vnfelt age as if forgot,
Whirling about where any neede appeares:
His hand, his eye, his wits all present, wrought
The function of the glorious part he beares:
Now vrging here, now cheering there he flyes,
Vnlocks the thickest troupes where most force lyes.

V.98
In midst of wrath, of wounds, of blood and death,
There is he most whereas hee may doe best:
And there the closest ranks he seuereth,
Driues back the stoutest powres that forward prest:
There makes his sword his way, there laboreth
Th’infatigable hands that neuer rest,
Scorning vnto his mortall wounds to yeeld
Till Death became best maister of the field.

V.99
Then lyke a sturdy Oake that hauing long
Against the warrs of fiercest winds made head,
When with some forst tempestious rage, more strong,
His downe-borne top comes ouer-maistered,
All the neere bordering Trees hee stood among,
Crusht with his waighty fall, lye ruined:
So lay his spoyles, all round about him slayne
T’adorne his death, that could not dye in vaine.

V.100
On th’other part, his most all-daring sonne
(Although the inexperience of his yeeres

---
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Made him lesse skylde in what was to be done,  
Yet dyd it thrust him on beyond all feares)  
Flying into the mayne Battalion,  
Neere to the King, amidst the chiepest Peeres,  
With thousand wounds became at length opprest,  
As if he scornd to dye, but with the best.

V.101  
Who thus both hauing gaynd a glorious end,  
Soone ended that great day that set so red,  
As all the purple playnes that wide extend  
A sad tempestious season witnessed:  
So much a doe had toyling Fraunce to rend  
From vs the right so long inherited,  
And so hard went we from what we possesst,  
As with it, went the blood we loued best.

V.102  
Which blood, not lost, but fast lay’d vp with heed  
In euerlasting fame, is there held deere,  
To seale the memory of thys dayes deed,  
Th’eternall evidence of what we were:  
To which our Fathers, we, and who succeed,  
Doe owe a sigh, for that it toucht vs neere:  
Who must not sinne so much as to neglect  
The holy thought of such a deere respect.

V.103  
Yet happy haples day, blest ill-lost breath,  
Both for our better fortune, and your owne:  
For what foule wounds, what spoyle, what shamefull death,  
Had by this forward resolution growne,  
If at S. Albons, Wakefield, Barnet-heath,  
It should vnto your infamie be showne?  
Blest you, that dyd not teach how great a faute  
Euen vertue is in actions that are naught.

V.104  
Yet, would thys sad dayes losse, had now been all  
That thys day lost, then should we not much playne,  
If hereby wee had come but there to fall,  
And that day ended, ended had our payne.  
Then small the losse of Fraunce, of Guien small,  
Nothing the shame to be turnd home againe  
Compar’d with other shames. But now Fraunce lost  
Sheds vs more blood then all her winning cost.
V.105
For loosing war abroad; at home lost peace,
Be'ing with our vnsupporting selues close pent. 284
And no dissignes for pryde that did increase,
But our owne throats, & our owne punishment.
The working spyrit ceast not tho worke dyd cease,
Hauing fit time to practice dyscontent.
And styrr vp such as could not long lye still,
Who not imployd to good, must needs doe ill.

V.106
And now the greefe of our receiued shame
Gaue fit occasion for ambitious care,
They draw the chiefe reproche of all the same 285
On such as naturally hated are,
Seeing them apt to beare the greatest blame
That offices of greatest enuie beare.
And that in vulgar eares delight it breedes
To haue the hated, Authors of misdeedes.

V.107
And therefore easily great Sommerset
Whom enuie long had singled out before
With all the vollie of disgraces met,
As the maine marke Fortune had plac’d therefore:
On whose hard-wrought opinion spight dyd whet
The edge of wrath, to make it pierce the more.
Griefe being glad t’haue gotten now on whom
To lay the fault of what, must light on some.

V.108
Whereon th’againe out-breaking Yorke beginnes
To builde new models of his olde desire,
Se’ing the fayre bootie Fortune for him winnes
Vpon the ground of thys enkindled ire.
Taking th’aduantages of others sinnes
To ayde his owne, and helpe him to aspire:
And doubting peace should better scanne deeds past,
Hee thinks not safe, to haue his sword out last.

---
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V.109
Especially, sith euery man now prest
To innovation doe with rancor swell,
A stirring humor generally possest
Those peace-spylt tymes, weary of beeing well:
The weake with wrongs, the happy tyr’d with rest,
And many mad, for what, they could not tell.
The world euen great with change, thought it went wrong
To stay beyond the bearing tyme so long.

V.110
And therefore now these Lords confedered
Being much increasd in number and in spight,
So shap’d theyr course, that drawing to a head,
Began to grow to be of fearefull might;
Th’abused world so hastie gathered,
Some for reuenge, some for wealth, some for delight,
That Yorke from small-beginning troups soone drawes
A world of men to venture in hys cause.

V.111
Lyke as proud Seuerne from a priuate head,
With humble streames at first doth gently glyde,
Tyll other Riuers haue contrybuted
The springing riches of theyr store beside,
Wherewith at length high swelling shee doth spread
Her broad discended waters layd so wide,286
That comming to the Sea, shee seemes from far
Not to haue trybute brought, but rather war.

V.112
Euen so is Yorke now grewne, and now is bent
T’incounter with the best, and for the best.
Whose neere approch the King hastes to preuent,
Seeking t’haue had his power, far of supprest:
Fearing the Citty, least some insolent
And mutinous, should harten on the rest
To take his part. But h’is so forward set,
That at S. Albones both the Armies met.

V.113
Whether theyr hast far fewer hands dyd bring
Then els theyr better leysure would haue done:
And yet too many for so foule a thing
Sith who dyd best, hath but dishonor won:
For whilst some offer peace sent from the King,
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Varwicks too forward hand hath Warre begun:
A war that doth the face of war deforme
Which still is foule, but foulest wanting forme.

V.114
Neuer dyd valiant Leaders so well knowne
For braue performed actions done before
Blemish the reputation of renowne
In any weake effected service more,
To bring such powres into so straight a Towne
As to some Cityt-tumult or vprore:
Which slaughter, and no battle might be thought,
Where that side used their swords, & this theyr throat.

V.115
But thys on Warwicks wrath must needs be layd,
And vpon Sommersets desire t’obtayne
The day with peace, for which he longer stayd
Then wisdom would, or then was for his gayne:
Whose force in narrow streets once ouer-layd,
Neuer recouerd head, but there came slayne
Both he, and all the Leaders els besides:
The King himself alone a prisoner bides.

V.116
A prisoner, though not to the outward eye,
For that he must seeme grac’d with his lost day,
All things be’ing done for his commoditie,
Against such men as dyd the state betray:
For with such apt deceiving clemencie
And seeming-order, Yorke dyd so allay
That touch of wrong, as made him make great stealth
In weaker minds, with shew of Common wealth.

V.117
Long-lookt-for powre thus got into his hand,
The former face of Court now altered,
All the supreamest charges of commaund
Were to his ayders straight contributed:
Himselfe is made Protector of the land,
A tytle found, which onely couered
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All-working powre vnder another style,
Which yet the greatest part doth act the whyle.

V.118
The King held onely but an empty name
Left with his lyfe, whereof the proofe was such
As sharpest pryde could not transpers the same,
Nor once, all-seeking Fortune durst to tuch:
Impietie had not inlarged shame
As yet so wide as to attempt so much:
Mischiefe was not full ripe for such a deede,
Left for th’vnbounded horrors that succeed.

*The end of the fift Booke.*
Errata: “faults escaped”\(^{288}\)

Correct I beseech you gentle Readers, these faults escaped in the printing.

Fol. 16, line Tho, reade the.\(^{290}\)
Fol. 23, line 5, amazing, read amuzing.\(^{291}\)
Fol. 48, b. read our Auentine Retyre.\(^{292}\)
Fol. 88, line 11, the honor, read the humor.\(^{293}\)
Fol. 91, b. line 3, discended, read distended.\(^{294}\)
Fol. 92, line 7, two edged, read double edged.\(^{295}\)
Fol. 92, line 9, my Lord, read my Lords.\(^{296}\)
Fol. 92, line 17, O Mayne, read O mayme.\(^{297}\)
Fol. 105, line 8, can thinke worth ought, read could thinke well gote.\(^{298}\)
Fol. 106, line 18, they draw, read to draw.\(^{299}\)
Fol. 107, b. line 14, discended, read distended.\(^{300}\)

\(^{288}\) Errata sheet appears in the British Library copy of *The First Fowre Bookes* (BL Ashley 537; EEBO 2283:5). Below footnotes describe where the “faults” appear in Q1595:I-V and how they were treated in subsequent editions.

\(^{289}\) Line I.3.5. Appears correctly in MS I-II (1v). Corrected in 1601 (I.3.5) and 1609 (I.3.5).

\(^{290}\) Line I.91.5. Appears correctly in MS I-II (16r). Corrected in 1601 (I.94.5) and 1609 (I.90.5).

\(^{291}\) Line II.5.5. Appears correctly in MS I-II (23r), “amuzing” spelled “amusing”. Not corrected in 1601 (II.5.5), corrected in 1609 (II.5.5).

\(^{292}\) Line III.21.2. Correction reflects that there should be no comma after “Auentine” and before “Retire”, as there is in 1595. MS III includes sparse punctuation and, as such, shows no comma after “Aventine”. Both 1601 (III.21.2) and 1609 (III.22.2) have no comma but reflect the phrase as hyphenated, “Auentine-Retire”.

\(^{293}\) Line IV.114.3. This stanza appears on fol. 87, not 88, however fol. 87 is mis-numbered 88 in 1595. Corrected in 1601 (IV.114.3) and 1609 (V.109.3).

\(^{294}\) Line V.14.3. Corrected in 1601 (V.14.3) and 1609 (VI.12.3).

\(^{295}\) Line V.17.7. Corrected in neither 1601 (V.17.7) nor 1609 (VI.14.7).

\(^{296}\) Line V.18.1. Corrected in 1601 (V.18.1) and 1609 (VI.15.1).

\(^{297}\) Line V.19.1. Corrected in 1601 (V.19.1) and 1609 (VI.16.1).

\(^{298}\) Line V.95.8. Corrected in 1601 (V.95.8) and 1609 (VI.91.8).

\(^{299}\) Line V.106.3. Corrected in 1601 (V.106.3) and 1609 (VI.102.3).

\(^{300}\) Line V.111.6. Corrected in 1601 (V.111.6) and 1609 (VI.107.6).
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The little warrs betwixt the horses of York and Lancaster.

May the battle warrs tumultuously broyled
And blouds factions of a most two lands,
When people fangryd with forsaken profite
Eneysham stood herse where their conquering land
While I am givn in breve by most part of
That assynes all against his vsyse hand.
Hone against hene to be annone against the trumpe,
While all exceeding yet all vsyse flounddown.

What say ye my most madam for you so
Send people to to perdycall of blouds.
Twas a may and war not yet a se
Some fironry to be so profite at pleasure shewd
How now my true and purses in the new
Twill ye you how and ye yon grad gud.
Some thing of take him was ever liye between
St. Quentin and Alps Aquitaine and Rhone.
MS I-II, fol. 5v (I.24-26), includes Daniel autograph annotations (MS I-II:D)
The second Canto

In court of saints and sanctity of friends
The last great mystery Monastery on the scene
In holiest corner of this land attended
To tell false the true falsehood before
Toiled and in rain’s hot toil and labor
And most fasted for fame to last life more
Yet turned stern faced so fierce rising forms
And bravely setting fortune yet begun

Priestly son by the example lead
To teach to theme for hate’s most cruel end
Weird as the state of tyrants life
And mark the part that after such thee lead
By long the same land and strengthen the personward
For few great merits be abroad and none
For great reward or Eternity, for great to smite

A new begot here set to bee beholding ourself
And marked them rightest furnished sept field kinsfolk
Put them in mind of what they were at first
And doubt full parts ye once in question brought
To strength ye will of sound forever for ever
And taken in a fault are those spared
Blessing to thee do covenant after so reward
MS I-II, fol. 25v (II.26-28), includes Daniel autograph annotations (MS I-II:D)
Yet so far from me was the purest ambrosia
But of surrounding rebel men once aspy. Not endure.

Extrait: Trinke so weake as a great will
Timidly the run. He is not contented for
The friend so flattered example of his fortune,
And altogether ask them pretending.
Some as first some. Some live against y' stir
To remit. From flimsy jest betray.

Vo hat some saw you that ever Bullemshrocket.
Wilt live a subject that Sat's tried. So not fast
Or not good remembrance can you look for
Norse some times that ye first quarter food.
To obtain so by his private kept state.
Twas great joyed that secret did him call
And he will trust for all or else lose all

Nov trust for little Agent, nor fear it.
You trust to fast. You ride it before land
His fault to wals and now to loose his trust.
To use his life he will not guadice aand
Not trust to demand greater sum. You base.
Then blend in formed it. to it. He made
What service he sat no little to hard might
He made a title misere. food. no right.
O was there none that with respective eye
Dost thou fend returns again to me.
We didst set triumphs, for thy worth-woods
To set thy glory, so fast bring
We from that unsparing Sir i'nterprize.

to make a肉 angry to the

ye stedde, and he 3 mi dyd wish
To see the look for comfort. You do I bring
To take a captive and went out a king.
...strait. rilsest liis know ȝe. a bounned sime.
Wat my clair Duked o welromd downe ȝe sayes
And linke ȝis oune. posion to boynke
And ȝis же ȝow ȝis же ȝeke. betrayed
Could speke no more but vented ȝe. found ȝe.
And ȝis Proette ȝady. and agame ȝi ȝayes
Sepru ȝe clary. and ȝowm ȝe boke. afforced
And liistion nowe as but ȝoest ȝiuard ȝowest.

So ȝis. hatward ȝOME. net a resoluk sarto
And no. a mouth full fard. no wedde. wel ryse
Cuntig sted. romer. wyt. ȝis fift compart
Unto my lord. and. ȝis my sooyt disipec
ȝen God. ȝis ȝay. and boke ȝe. and ȝis art
Und my wer. ȝe bord to relie. ȝis wedd.
Und ȝen borg come all ȝe. proud. nuage. but ȝowe.
Tesar. boke. and. ȝis. ȝow. ony tell ȝe. oum.
Book III of *The Civil Wars* ("MS III")

MS III, fol. 262v (Book III title-page, stanzas III.1–4.3)
Panegyrick congratulatorie (1603)

Fol. 1r (title page)

A Panegyrick congratulatorie

To the Kinge most sacred Maiestie

by Samuel Daniel.
A Panegyrick congratulatorie

To his Sacred Majesty.

To have the glory of a greater day
Than ever England saw of happy
In all her ages, when she did most display
By conspicuously of her best success,
And spread her power the west and east and sang
Of her world abroad, yet was she never they
At home till now, nor ever could she proud
To be sire in her full order till now.

And now she is, and now in peace therefore
She takes bound set down in then mighty style
Now she not all great Britain, and no more
No queen, no regal rule, no servile rule
No Indies but the ocean to the shore,
No deadly feuds, no war, no insolence:
All Britain joins, all is, as, no difference,
The subject all of her imperial peace.

What herefore the order yet be wrought
By all the orders of pride, by hand by force
By name or nation here is brought
For peace, for love, for more.

No former blessed union hath Heray.
A greater Union, that is more sure.
It made or more. It makes, only, or at one.
It nature that order'd to be one.
Panegyrick congratulatorie (1603), fol. 4v (stanzas 20-23)
Daniel Letter to the Earl of Devonshire (1605)