

Eric Sams: The Linguistic Evidence

Musicologist Eric Sams, awarded an honorary PhD by Cambridge, was also the author of more than one hundred articles, essays and reviews on the subject of dating and identifying Shakespeare's plays. He pioneeringly edited and published *Shakespeare's Edward III: An Early Play Restored to the Canon* (Yale, 1996), now routinely included in the *Collected Works*, and *Shakespeare's Lost Play Edmund Ironside* (St Martin's Press, 1985), still pending acceptance. *The Real Shakespeare: Retrieving the Early Years 1564-1594* (Yale, 1995) is a major contribution to early Shakespeare studies. The following commissioned essay was completed shortly before his death in 2004.

The genius of Sams' approach lies in showing not only that Anon's and Shakespeare's vocabularies coincide, but that they use the same words in the same way about the same objects and intentions. This extends to phrases and sentence fragments. Later Sams employs a similar method when discussing parallel thoughts, behaviors and attitudes.

The case for Shakespeare as the author of *Woodstock* is made up of a thousand little pieces which gradually cohere like pixels into a recognizable image. Sams' overwhelming linguistic detail is an integral part.

Shakespeare's Language and *Woodstock*/1 *Richard II*, by Eric Sams (2004)

This powerful drama is known solely from an untitled, undated and unscribed manuscript in the British Library collection, Egerton 1994, which also contains *Edmund Ironside*. It was certainly among Shakespeare's sources, and thus qualifies as an 'early source-play,' like *Troublesome Reign*, *The Taming of A Shrew*, and others.

But those may well be early Shakespeare, by dozens of strong arguments (*The Real Shakespeare*, 136-153). Otherwise, for example, he was just a shameless thief. So his well-evidenced 'early start' compels consideration of the corollary that *1 Richard II*, as we may fairly call it, belongs to the 'lost years,' 1582-91, the era when an unnamed annotator made a marginal reference in a volume of Hall's *Chronicle* to the 'murder of... Thomas Woodstock the duke [of] gloceser.' If this play too were written by the young Shakespeare, its vocabulary and diction might well overlap with the canonical *Richard II*; otherwise not.

Shared Words and Phrases

The two texts are, however, interlinked and interlocked.¹ To save space, the following samples are restricted to those shared words which begin with A, excluding those of frequent occurrence, such as *a*, *am*, *all*, *an*, and *and*. Indeed, most of them occur only once or twice in either play. So the nuggets now brought for assay cannot have been specially mined; they lie on the surface, in full view. Nor can they be entirely explained as emanating from same terrain; these are two different plays, with different characters including a different King Richard. Further, all the contexts cited are different. So unless Shakespeare wrote both plays, there is no reason for any congruence.

Both texts repeatedly offer the same answers to the same questions. Who is *abroad* in these times? (malefactors, whether knaves, *1 Richard II*, III.iii.74, 190, 192, or robbers, *2 Richard II*, III.ii.39); in whose *absence* will Richard relate to his uncles, for well or ill? (in our [own], *1 Richard II*, V.iii.67 or that of ourself, *2 Richard II*, II.1.219); what will the King's uncle or his interlocutor *accept*? (an offer, *1 Richard II*, IV.i.85, *2 Richard II*, II.iii.162); what was *accomplished*? (King Richard's age, *1 Richard II*, II.ii.165, *2 Richard II*, II.i.177-8); of what were two different uncles of the king *accused* by various characters? (of

¹ *1 Richard II* has been helpfully concorded (Ule 1987, ii 849-965).

treason, *1 Richard II*, IV.i.109, V.i.73, 115; *2 Richard II*, I.i.17, 144); what *act* will cause the spilling of blood? (this foul act, *1 Richard II*, V.i.43, *2 Richard II*, IV.I.138); what word occurs in the same line as *add*? (worth, *1 Richard II*, I.iii.190, *2 Richard II*, V. vi. 12); to what is *adieu* a preliminary? (banishment, *1 Richard II*, III.ii.103, *2 Richard II*, I.iii.309); who will receive or give an admonition? (the King, *1 Richard II*, V.i.186, *2 Richard II*, II.1.117); with what verb is *ado* associated? (with much ado...we got, *1 Richard II*, IV.ii.127; [I] have gotten, *2 Richard II*, V.v. 74); what *affairs* are to be considered? (of government, *1 Richard II*, II.i.149; great, *2 Richard II*, II.i.159); what is lamented *afore* [my] *god*? (the King's excesses, *1 Richard II*, I.i.128, 135, 187, etc., *2 Richard II*, II.i.200, etc.); in what sense is *after* used? (to mean afterwards, *1 Richard II*, IV.i.184, *2 Richard II*, III.i.44, though *afterwards* itself also appears, *1 Richard II*, II.ii.200, *2 Richard II*, V.iii.112); in what shared contexts does *again* occur (once again, *1 Richard II*, I.ii.70, *2 Richard II*, III.ii.5, return again *1 Richard II*, III.i.110, I.iii.178); what word is associated with *aim*? (malice, *1 Richard II*, V.i.146, *2 Richard II*, I.i.14); what ideas are inspired by *air*? (well-being, *1 Richard II*, III.ii.10, malaise *2 Richard II*, I.iii.284); what with *alack*? (the day, *1 Richard II*, I.i.121, etc., *2 Richard II*, III.iii.8 or good *1 Richard II*, IV.i.16, etc., *2 Richard II*, 1.ii.67); with *alas*? (poor, *1 Richard II*, III.iii.91, 198, *2 Richard II*, II.ii.145); with *alive*? (see, *1 Richard II*, V.iv.33, *2 Richard II*, II.iii.118); *along*? (with us, *1 Richard II*, III.i.82, *2 Richard II*, II.ii.140); *ambush*? (the governor of Calais, *1 Richard II*, IV.i.95, *2 Richard II*, 1.i.137); *amongst*? (talk, *1 Richard II*, III.ii.7-8, *2 Richard II*, IV.i.14); *anointed*? (the king, *1 Richard II*, V.iii.59, *2 Richard II*, II.iii.96, III.ii.55); what shall *answer* it? (your heads and hearts, *1 Richard II*, V.iii.92, your lives, *2 Richard II*, 1.i.198); what associates with *apparent*? (sight, *1 Richard II*, V.i.108, seen, *2 Richard II*, 1.i.13); who has *argued* and how? (you, well *1 Richard II*, III.iii.212, *2 Richard II*, IV.i.150); what associates with *ascend*? (ladders *1 Richard II*, I.i.177; *2 Richard II*, IV.i. 111, 113, V.i.55-6, throne, *1 Richard II*, II.ii.61, 108, and both together *2 Richard II*, V.i.55-6).

Even discounting the common collocations *long ago* (*1 Richard II*, II.ii.107, *2 Richard II*, V.i.42) and *armed* soldiers (*1 Richard II*, IV.ii.159, *2 Richard II*, III. ii.25), and even without the other twenty-five initial letters, this conspectus may suffice to suggest identity, especially since none of these links can be accounted for by similarity of context. The same applies to longer shared phrases and ideas, as follows:

1. 'heaven...place[d] him with a royal crown in heaven' (*1 Richard II*, I.i.40); 'the heavens ...add an immortal title to your crown' (*2 Richard II*, I.i.23-4). The former is said of the Black Prince; the latter is addressed to his son, Richard II.
2. 'mildly calm his headstrong youth' (*1 Richard II*, I.i.190); 'deal mildly with his youth' (*2 Richard II*, II.i. 69). Each remark is made by a different uncle of King Richard, in the latter's absence; the first is a hope and the second a command.
3. 'tax and pill the commons so' (*1 Richard II*, I.iii.113); 'the commons hath he pill'd with...taxes' (*2 Richard II*, II.i.2(6)). Again, these are different speakers in different contexts.
4. '... farewell forever. / I have a sad presage comes suddenly / That I shall never see these brothers more / on earth, I fear, we [three] never more shall meet.' (*1 Richard II*, III.ii.103-5); 'Farewell. If heart's presages be not vain, / We three part here that ne'er shall meet again. ...Farewell at once, for once, for all and ever. / Well, we may meet again. / I fear me, never.' (*2 Richard II*, II.ii.14-2-3, 14-8-9). This is not a memory of the same sad scene; in *1 Richard II* the three who sunder are the King's uncles, pillars of the realm, sons of Edward III, whereas in *2 Richard II* they are the King's toadies, the 'caterpillars' of the realm (as they are un-flatteringly called in both plays) Bushy, Green and Bagot.
5. 'become a landlord to this...realm / Rent out our kingdom like a pelting farm' (*1 Richard II*, IV.i.135-6, V.i.89); 'realm... land...leas'd out / Like to a tenement or pelting farm' (*2 Richard II*, II.i.50, 57, 59-60), 'landlord of England art thou now, not king' (*ibid.*, 113), which is anticipated in *1 Richard II* as 'thou art

no king but landlord now become / To this great state' (V.iii. 107-8). Despite the plain parallels, these passages are again contextually distinct; in *1 Richard II*, IV.i.135-6 King Richard accuses himself, then by the ghost of Edward III, finally by John of Gaunt before the battle of Radcot Bridge. In the canonical tragedy he is famously denounced only by John of Gaunt, on his deathbed, and much earlier in the action. 6. 'traitors!' 'Again we double it: rebellious traitors!' (*1 Richard II*, V.iii.122-4); 'traitor'... 'those terms of treason doubled down his throat' (*2 Richard II*, I.i.39, 44, 57). Again the two passages are entirely disparate; the former is an exchange between King Richard and his enemies, at the end of the play, while the latter is Mowbray's response to Bolingbroke's accusation, at the beginning.

7. 'His youth is led by flatterers much astray' (*1 Richard II*, IV.ii.144); 'The king is...basely led / By flatterers' (*2 Richard II*, II.1.241-2). The young king is thus described by different characters in different contexts, though in the same terms.

8. 'I have nightly waked for England's good' (*1 Richard II*, V.i.124); 'For sleeping England long time have I watch'd' (*2 Richard II*, II.i.77). These highly Shakespearean utterances are offered by two different uncles to the King, neither of whom had much justification for any such sleeplessness.

Similar supposedly displaced parallels have been noted between so-called 'Bad Quartos' and their counterparts. The fashionable dogma of 'memorial reconstruction' (*The Real Shakespeare*, passim) identifies them as 'anticipations' or 'recollections' by venal, disaffected and forgetful actors, never as the artist's own recycling (conscious or not) of earlier ideas. Before long it will be noticed that the latter explanation economically applies to all such phenomena. This can be verified in *2 Richard II*, itself, which can hardly be understood without *1 Richard II*—exactly as if Shakespeare's earlier play had remained in his mind while he was writing a new work on the same theme.

9. 'My brother Gloucester, plain well-meaning soul...may be a precedent and witness good / That thou respect'st not spilling Edward's blood'; so says John of Gaunt (*2 Richard II*, II.i.128, 130-1). Shakespeare is not writing history at all, still less citing a chronicle with which he expects his audience to be familiar. Yet he gives a special place to the accusation that King Richard was responsible for the death of the Duke of Gloucester, his own uncle, who was not only the son of Edward III but a brother to John of Gaunt and also to Richard's own father the Black Prince. Nothing else in this play so much as hints at King Richard's complicity in Gloucester's death. So Shakespeare's statement relies on some *other* source, *prima facie* the play of *1 Richard II*, which is about that character's tragic assassination. The identification is explicit; the early play not only calls him 'plain' but repeatedly refers to his plainness in dress, speech and manner. This plainness, furthermore, is unhistorical; it belongs to the current Tudor dramatic character, not the actual Duke who had died two centuries before.

10. Shakespeare does not explain to his public what Richard means by his resolve to 'farm our royal realm,' reinforced at need by 'blank charters,' thus becoming a mere 'landlord,' as at 5 above. The former procedure is however 'explained by a passage in *1 Richard II*, (Wells, 1969, 185), namely IV.i.52f., where the favorites discuss their plan to lease England from the King's for £7,000 a month. *1 Richard II* also features and explicates the 'blank charters' in great detail (III.i. 7f.).

11. The villainous Tresilian is a lawyer and Richard has signed a legal and binding contract handing over his kingdom to Bushy, *et al*; hence the force of Gaunt's final accusation, 'Thy state of law is bond-slave to the law,' *2 Richard II*, II.i.114. But only an acquaintance with *1 Richard II*, IV.i.164f. can properly explain that reference, which Wells for example (*op. cit.*, 192) apparently misconstrues.

12. Again, *2 Richard II* thrice mentions 'Plashy' (I.ii.66, II.ii.90, 120). Only those familiar with *1 Richard II*, III.ii. would know that it had been Woodstock's Essex home.

13. Some editors have found obscure Mowbray's admitted neglect (2 *Richard II*, I.i.134) of his 'sworn duty' to Gloucester (Wells, *op.cit.*, 168). But Mowbray was the Governor of Calais, who in *1 Richard II*, V.i.1f.) guides two murderers to his prisoner, Gloucester.

All these associations, common or not, are characteristically Shakespearean. Thus there are not only knaves, thieves and robbers abroad, but *villainy* (*Love's Labor's Lost*, I.i.188) and *cozeners* [=cheats] (*Winter's Tale*, IV.iv.253) as well as news (*passim*); and the news is often bad (*Edward III*, 1245²), or indeed villainous (*1 Henry IV*, II.iv.333). To be *accused* in early Shakespeare is to stand trial for treason (*Contention*, TLN 412, 416, 424 429, 433). The horrible (*Othello*, V.ii.203) or horrid (*Cymbeline*, II.i.61); *acts* as in Shakespeare begin as foul acts (*Rape of Lucrece*, 199, 1704. 1824). 'Added worth' reappears (*Timon*, I.ii.149); *afore* god (instead of before) is typical early Shakespeare (*Romeo and Juliet*, II.iv.161, IV.ii.31; *Merry Wives*, III.i.112). The immediate association of *aims/ malice*, *air/health*, *alive/see*, *apparent/sight* are not as clear in the concordance as *alack/day*, or *alas/poor* (e.g., Yorick); but the connection is still close and characteristic, as in *amongst/talk* (cf. *amongst/ muttered*, *1 Henry VI*, I.i.70), or *ascend/ladder/ throne* (*2 Henry IV*, III.i.71), with separate components in *Edward III* (*ascend/ throne*, TLN 2530).

Style

Admittedly, *1* and *2 Richard II* are readily distinguishable in style as well as content. The first is much less poetical than the second, and it presents the King far less sympathetically. But such changes are to be expected from a young and evolving artist. As a distinguished style-critic has said, after a detailed discussion which is well worth separate study, the two plays 'read as if they came from the same mind at different moments of its development' (Robinson, 1988, 46). So they do.

In that interest, some of the play's stylistic characteristics may be summarized as follows, using the categories already defined in *The Real Shakespeare*, 116-20 and *passim*. Thus alliteration is frequent: 'funeral...mournful France,' (I.i.36-8) and antithesis pervasive: friends/foes (I.i.124-5); brambles/cedars, coarse/fine, wild/grape/vine (I.iii.45f); kites/eagles, (I.iii.186); body/mind, (II.i.91-2); right/ wrong (II.i.270, II.ii.85); rich/poor (II.ii.86); place/displace (II.ii.123); wake/sleep (II.iii.15-16); wealth/poor (III.iii.45-6); virtuous queen/wanton king, (III.iii.62); feast/ starve, (III.iii.104-50; fall/rise (V.i.287); peace/war (V.ii.32); dark clouds/sparkling stars (V.iii.85); mountain/molehill (V.iv.43); pleasant meads/ barren hills (V.vi.5).

There are touches of overt bawdry (I.iii.63-6, III.i.154-162, V.ii.9-10), references to the Bible (e.g., the judgment of Solomon) and the law 270, 272 (cf. Cade) 291, 298, 321, 330, 341, 654, etc. 1195, 1265, 1627f., 1876, 2172, 2978, etc. and several examples of chiasmus (374, 1632, etc.). The typical fauna abound, whether as illustrations or images. The references to animals include typical allusions to enemies of the state as vipers (V.iii.31) or cankers and caterpillars (I.i.163, III.iii.119), together with bears, bees, birds and lions (III.iii.39-43, III.iii.209, etc.), boar (IV.i.109, IV.ii.108-9, 137, etc.), calves (III.iii.219f.), choughs (III.iii.2, IV.i.24.), codsheads (IV.i.35), cormorants (III.i.8), crow (III.iii. 209), dogs (V.i.230, V.ii.12), dragons (III.ii.165), eagle (I.iii.186), eel (I.ii.69), elephants (II.i.20), fish and fowl (III.88), hunting (V.iv.11), geldings (V.i.265), goose (III.iii.142) hog'sface (IV.i.30), harebrain (I.iii.29), hellhound (V.i.236), horse (I.iii.98f., III.ii.116f. IV.ii.2), kites (I.iii.186), lion (II.i.18, III.iii.42, IV.ii.21, 215), monsters (IV.ii.106), mouse (V.v.12), ox and oxen (III.i.87, III.ii.158, III.iii.115, V.i.10), raven (III.iii.208), serpents (I.i.142) sheepskins (III.i.11, III.iii. 95), sheep (III.i.82, III.ii.30, 158, etc.), sheep-biter (III.iii.236), vultures (III.ii.84, V.i.29), wolves (IV.ii.21, 33, 215), yoke (I.i.55, II.i.97, III.i.69).

The flora include grass (I.i.142), ivy (I.i.170), fruit (I.i.177, I.iii.160, 245), blossom (I.iii.30), brambles, cedars, wild grape, vine (I.iii.45-6), pasture (III.iii. 219), plants, planting and good husbandry (I.iii.161,

² All *Edward III* references to Sams (1996).

II.ii.22), oaks (I.i.170 I.iii.96, II.i.20, 21, IV.iii.174), the shedding of leaves (III.ii.21), hay (IV.i.11), toadstool (IV.i.147), weeds in a field (V.vi.4-5), root and ground (V.vi. 14), trees (III.ii.11).

Weather is a vital source of imagery, including the Shakespearean frost that blasts (I.iii.199), sweet and pleasant air (III.ii.10), stormy winds that nip (III.ii. 14), a clear night (IV.ii.125), dark ...lights of heaven shut in pitchy clouds...flakes of fire run tilting through the sky...the very heavens troubled (IV.ii.64-72).

Among the clearest fingerprints is the so-called 'blot'-cluster identified in the canon and in *Edward III* (Muir 1960, 22-23) and also in *Ironside* (Jackson 1963; see also Sams, 1985, 248-51 and 1996, 156-1, 111-8. 209-12). The 2 *Richard II* passage (I.iii. 201f.) instanced by Muir is about inconstancy or change of mind; it begins with the key word 'blotted' and proceeds, within twenty-two lines, to mention *heaven, King, eyes, frozen winters, change their moons, lamp, taper, endless night, blindfold*. The associative Lockean thought-process is clear enough; light and warmth are withdrawn when one's sun is eclipsed, as in Sonnet 33 (Sams, 1996, 209-12).

The same pattern is anticipated in *1 Richard II*, I.i.191f. where the shadow cast over the King is finally defined as 'the stains that blurs his majesty.' The passage begins with murmurs 'against the dissolute king,' and proceeds to say 'treason ...heaven...gaze up to the sky...sun shine clear or no...small light...blind man... eyes...false embraces...flatterers...'.

The writer of *1 Richard II* also has only a smattering of classical learning, like the disadvantaged Shakespeare (*The Real Shakespeare*, passim) but is anachronistically well-informed about Tudor law, including details of the law-clerk's buckram garb (*The Real Shakespeare*, 39-43) and the procedures of *Habeas Corpus* and *surrsararis*, (*1 Richard II*, I.ii.117-18, V.vi.26-7), neither of which the law-clerk character can spell, as well as *demurrer* and *writ of error* (V.ii.28).

There are several other Shakespearean signs in *1 Richard II*, such as losing blood in drops (I.i.44), nightly waking for England's good (V.i.124), the association between 'blood' and 'wash' (IV.ii.243), and the many references to Edward III and his son, the Black Prince, their French campaign and its disparity of casualties (II.i75.). Flattery is mentioned, with characteristic loathing, some two dozen times.

The provincial characters include a Bailiff, a Butcher and a Farmer. Shakespeare's father was recorded as all three, while the writer himself is well aware how to kill an ox (V.i.10; *The Real Shakespeare*, 'butcher-boy'). The Bailiff, like John Shakespeare, cannot write (III.iii.9-10) but signs with a mark depicting a sheephook with a tarbox at the end of it (III.iii.14-17; *The Real Shakespeare*, 'illiterate'); John Shakespeare was a wool-dealer who signed with a mark. The provincial noun-verb discords (wrongly amended in the Ule version) are common, even in the mouth of the high-born hero, his equally exalted brother, and the King himself. The language of marriage ritual is typically high-flown: *solemn nuptial day* (I.i.181), *this solemn day* (I.i.216), *high nuptials* (I.ii.52), *nuptial day* (I.iii.82)

Proverbs and aphorisms abound (e.g., I.i.177, I.ii.67, III.ii.70), while the text itself teems with typically Shakespearean puns, quibbles and word-play—*cousin/cozen*, I.i.9-10; *Lord Protector/ Lord protect*, I.i.25-7; *praise/prize* I.i.83-4; *served/sir*, I. ii.78; *crowns*, II.ii.73-88; *staff/staves*, II.ii.130-5; *chains*, III.i.115-16; *blank*, III.ii.55-7; *pick/picked*, III.ii.196-200; *tendered/tend*, III.ii.211; *darkly/ night*, III.iii.96-7; *deed*, III.iii.111-12, IV.i.192-3; *sheep/dogs*, IV.i.236; *press*, V.ii.8-10; *plodded in Plowden*, V.vi.34.

Rhymed couplets are copious, often linking into longer chains. Equally notable is the sustained and continuous verbal invention, as in *enthronished* for *enthroned* (II.ii.115) and the use, duly acknowledged by the OED, of *sumpter* as a verb (I.i.217).

The Ule word/line ratio (1987 ii, 964), though not so high as the 1.41 common to *Ironside* and *Edward III* (Sams, 1996, 213), nevertheless stands at the impressive level of 1.08. There are many unusual or unprecedented words beginning with *un* including one (*uncaput*, I.ii.81) unknown to the OED, another (*unsophisticated*, I.i.105) unknown there until the next century, and a third (*unwillingness*, IV.ii.65) first cited from Shakespeare's *2 Richard II*. Other examples include *unserved*, (I.i.15) *unlike* (I.i.47), *undone* (I.ii.5, III.iii.102, IV.iii.45), *unskillful* (II.ii.151), *unloving* (II.iii.10), *unluckily* (IV.i.43), *unjust* (IV.ii.209) and *ungracious* (V.iii.80).

This verbal invention persists in the typical use of certain words as different and unaccustomed parts of speech; examples include the noun *invoke* (I.i.57), the adjective *nonage* (I.i.155) and the verb *terror* (V.iii.108). Many epithets are compounded, such as *all-accomplished* (I.iii.37) (in a category described by the OED as 'rare before Shakespeare') *homespun*, (I.iii.198, 581), which both antedate the OED's first recorded use, *now-intended*, (V.iii.50), which is altogether unknown to the OED, *smooth-faced* (IV.i.45), first cited from *King John* (1594-6), and *white-headed* (II.ii.150), first cited from Scott in 1815. Again, the typical rich diction, where several synonyms are employed in a single line, is well exemplified (e.g., 'gentle, mild and generous,' II.i.125, 'shivered, cracked and broke,' II.ii.164, or 'perish, rot, consume and die,' IV.iii.48).

At the level of single words or short phrases, the following are first recorded from Shakespeare as *prima facie* his own coinages by the OED (although it collated *1 Richard II*, as the *Tragedy of Richard II*, with the date c. 1590): *curvet*, I.iii.91 (*Merchant of Venice*); *bacon-fed*, III.iii.95 (*1 Henry IV*); *blur* (= sully), I.i.191 (*2 Henry VI*); *equivocation*, III.iii.160 (*Macbeth*); *eruptions*, I.iii.249 (*Love's Labor's Lost*); *frowardness*, II.iii.32 (*As You Like It*); *habited*, III.ii.38 (*Titus Andronicus*); *nicely*, III.ii.177 (*Lear*); *presage sb.*, III.ii.104 (*2 Richard II*); *ruinate vb.*, II.ii.19 (*3 Henry VI*); *schoolboy*, I.ii.99 (*Love's Labor's Lost*); *securely*, I.i.177, IV.i.81 (*Titus Andronicus*, *2 Richard II*); *scandaled* (= defamed), I.iii.125 (*Julius Caesar*); *smooth-faced*, IV.i.45 (*King John*); *spleen*, I.i.58 (*2 Richard III*); *sprightly*, IV.ii.120 (*Antony and Cleopatra*); *stratagem*, I.i.119 (*Henry V*); *turkey-cock*, IV.i.125 (*Twelfth Night*). Compounds, such as 'all-accomplished' (I.iii.37) and 'all-commanding' (III.ii.47) are said to be 'rare before Shakespeare,' and are first cited from that source.

Further, *1 Richard II* contains neologisms, such as *kneefy* and *toefy*, among other words and phrases unrecorded until later (often much later) than 1590: *Castilian*, *Cynthia*, *fantastic*, *fantasticly*, *frenchified*, *high-priced*, *homespun*, *intendiments*, *misgovernment*, *numbers*, *numberless*, *pestiferousness*, *seamstry*, *sfoot* (= God's foot), *signior*, *terror* (vb), *unheard-of*, *unsettled*, *unsophisticated*, *unwillingness*.

Expressions in *1 Richard II* itemized in the *Onions Shakespeare Glossary* (Sams 1996, 90-2), as unrecorded before Shakespeare, again *prima facie* his own coinages, include: 'bestow myself' (I.i.129) in the sense of 'behave myself,' with an example (*Two Gentlemen of Verona*, III.i.87) which is almost literally the same as here; 'choice' (I.iii.24), meaning 'person chosen'; 'content' (III.ii.100, meaning be calm, not uneasy; metaphorical darkness, as in 'all shall sink to dark confusion' (V.iii.37); 'fling defiance' (V.iii.125), as a declaration of aversion or rejection; 'eminence' (I.ii.115); 'fairly' (IV.ii.198) meaning 'courteously, respectfully'; 'form' (IV.ii.38, V.i.116) if it means 'image'; 'fretful' (II.i.50) meaning 'peevish, ill-tempered'; 'gone' (V.i.83) meaning 'dead'; 'grovel' (IV.iii.108), as the OED confirms; 'habited' (III.ii.38) in the sense of 'dressed, attired'; 'a hall' (IV.ii.153) meaning 'a cry to...make sufficient room, e.g. for a dance'; 'hit it' I.ii.84); 'home-ly' (I.i.109) = 'plain'; 'humor' (IV.i.60) and 'hurry' (IV.i.97) as verbs.

'Remain' (IV.i.166) meaning 'dwell' is said to be 'not post-Shakespeare,' i.e., it was his usage, but never caught on. Other ideas fared better, e.g., the ironic references to a 'tragic scene' (*1 Richard II*, IV.ii.71, IV.iii.143) and the perpetual use of drums, with which the acting company concerned must have been well provided.

Further, a brief search through the text discloses a number of rare Shakespeare words (only 10 or fewer occurrences in the canon) used in the same sense or context. Thus ‘accomplish’d’ (*1 Richard II*, II.i.165,

2 Richard II, II.i.177) refers to one’s age in years; ‘admonish/ admonition’ (*1 Richard II*, V.i.186, *2 Richard II*, II.i.117) means an avuncular rebuke to Richard about his kingship; ‘ambush’ (*1 Richard II*, IV.i.95, *2 Richard II*, I.i.137) is used of the same *Richard II*, II.iii.166 / III.iv.47) applies to the King’s favorites because they eat wholesome plants; Richard is called ‘degenerate’ because he is so unlike his ‘noble father’ (*1 Richard II*, I.i.31), the Black Prince, whether expressly as there, or by plain implication (*2 Richard II*, II.i.262, Ure, 1956, 66); the verb ‘determinate’ means terminate by time, whether a day (*1 Richard II*, V.iii.33) or an hour (*2 Richard II*, I.iii.150); ‘doubled’ (item 5 above); ‘hardhearted’ is applied to the Duke of York, whether *solus* (*2 Richard II*, V.iii.87, 121) or with his brothers (*1 Richard II*, 3243); ‘parchment’ is expressly applied (*1 Richard II*, III.i.11, III.iii.100) to the actual ‘rotten parchment bonds’ (*2 Richard II*, II.i.64) of which Gaunt so bitterly complains (item 10, above); England is compared to a ‘pelting farm,’ i.e. one which is leased and poverty-stricken, in both contexts (*1 Richard II*, IV.i.136, *2 Richard II*, II.i.60); ‘pill / pill’d’ as in 3 above; each faction calls the other ‘vipers,’ i.e., enemies to the state (*1 Richard II*, V.iii.31, *2 Richard II*, III.ii.129).

There are striking pre-echoes of scenes and episodes famously found in *Hamlet*. At V.i.55f. the ghost of the hero’s father appears and urges him to avenge the ruination of his kingdom. The opening scene follows a threat of poison with a call for lights (I.i.1) and a ‘bane dissolved in wine’ to be ‘caroused’ to a monarch’s ‘health’ (I.i.16-17). Tresilian proposes to trick the populace with ‘parchment, innocent sheepskins’ (III.i.11), anticipating the answer to Hamlet’s question, ‘is not parchment made of sheepskins?’, posed immediately after a meditation on the tricks of a shyster lawyer (*Hamlet*, V.I.99, 114). The ‘fantastically-attir’d’ courtier (V.ii.130f.) is put down by our hero, again as in *Hamlet*, V.ii.81.

Other canonical echoes are also relevant. A character is comically called ‘monsieur,’ ‘signior,’ (I.ii.72, 75) and ‘monstrously translated’ (I.ii.76), as in *Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Woodstock’s horse (I.iii.89) was ‘wont to tread the ground...as if he kicked it scornfully,’ as roan Barbary ‘disdained the ground’ in *2 Richard II*, V.v.83. Impressive additional examples include aspects of Falstaff in the character of Tresilian, well-summarized thus: ‘The principal misleader of the young King, he basks in his favor but is finally brought low; he is completely unscrupulous; he lets men escape his ‘justice’ by ransoming themselves...he has his hangers-on with whom he bandies words in a garrulous way; he is a coward.’³

In particular, there is a scatter of verbal similarities which suggest that when Shakespeare was portraying the ambush of the travelers in *1 Henry IV*, II.ii he recalled the scene in *1 Richard II* where Tresilian’s charter-servers ambush country-folk. In the terms of abuse used by Falstaff, ‘whoreson caterpillars,’ ‘fat chuffs,’ and ‘bacon-fed knaves,’ there is apparent reminiscence of the *1 Richard II* scene of ‘humorous villainy.’⁴ To be precise, the latter has ‘bacon-fed’ (III.iii.95), ‘caterpillars’ (I.iii.163), ‘choughs’ (III.iii.2, IV.i.24). ‘fat whoreson’ (IV.i.28), ‘knave(s); III.iii.38, 74, 101, 190, 192, 211, IV.iii.67), ‘whoresons’ (III.iii.19). In addition, the victims call each other ‘neighbour’ (III.iii.38, etc.), stand on a ‘hill’ (III.iii.220), appeal to Jesus (III.iii.89), are called ‘villain’ (III.iii.197), as they are ‘undone’ (III.iii.102), and repeatedly told they will ‘hang’ (III.iii.62, 126, 177, etc.). All this occurs in a dozen Shakespeare lines (*1 Henry IV*, II.ii.78-89)—not, surely, because he is stealing from *1 Richard II*, but because he wrote it.

If then both plays had the same author, his style would remain recognizable, for all its comparative plainness in the earlier work—a characteristic entirely predictable in an early play about a plain man.

³ Bullough (1962), 178

⁴ *Ibid.*

Hence the rhetorical question, ‘*Who else but Shakespeare writes like this?*’ (Robinson, 1988, 41), applied among others to:

Queen: My sovereign lord, and you true English peers,
Your all-accomplish’d honors have so tied
My senses by a magical restraint
In the sweet spells of these your fair demeanors,
That I am bound and charm’d from what I was.
My native country I no more remember
But as a tale told in my infancy,
The greatest part forgot; and that which is,
Appears to England’s fair Elysium
Like brambles to the cedars, coarse to fine,
Or like the wild grape to the fruitful vine.

— I.iii.36-46

1 *Richard II and Edward III*

The *Riverside* edition still classifies *Edward III* as ‘collaborative’; and on any analysis most of its text as published in 1596 post-dates *1 Richard II*, ca.1590. Nevertheless, certain parallels are worth citing. Again, to save space, only those words are noted that occur extremely rarely (10 times or fewer) in canonical Shakespeare as concorded by Spevack. The question is therefore how likely they would be to appear in both plays at all, let alone in a comparable context, unless as a result of shared authorship.

In fact there are some 160 of them. The following tabulation of the most notable gives *Edward III* first, in Sams, 1996 lineation,⁵ followed by *1 Richard II* referenced to Rossiter’s edition.

1. *afar*: used of battle-noises (‘afar off’) in stage-directions (1163, IV.ii.157 s.d.).
2. *apprehended*: taken into custody before the death penalty (2374, V.vi.20, 32).
3. *certified*: reliably informed (1707, III.ii.26).
4. *clemency*: King Edward and King Richard both congratulate themselves on ‘our princely clemency,’ (1811, V.iii.61).
5. *conquering*: describes the hand of Edward III and the arm of his son the Black Prince, during their invasion of France (1704, I.i.38). The adjective is first cited from Shakespeare, *1 Henry VI*, II.i.26 dated 1591; cf. also *ibid.* I.i.16, ‘he ne’er lift up his hand but conquered.’
6. *decline*: used as a metaphor of sunset, in association with dimness or darkness (287, II.i.14).
7. *derived*: connoting a legal entitlement (19, I.i.158; cf. *1 Henry VI*, II.v.74: ‘by my mother I derivéd am,’ —as in *Edward III*, a reference to that monarch’s genealogy).
8. *digest*: swallow, in the modern sense of ‘put up with’ (769, IV.i.67); cf. *Love’s Labor’s Lost*, V.ii.389.
9. *dissolved*: connoting imminent death (994, I.i.45).
10. *distract*: an intermediate state between confusion and insanity (2216, V.i.43).

⁵ Eric Sams (ed.): *Shakespeare’s Edward III* (Yale U.P., 1996)

11. *distresséd*: this describes ‘poor inhabitants’ and the ‘poverty’ of the populace, a connotation unrecorded in the OED (1756, II.iii.18).
12. *enacted*: used in association with statutes (622-3, IV.i.158); the verb is not cited until 1437, so that both these usages are apparently anachronistic.
13. *ensues*: the verb denotes the following of great deeds by glory (2443), so that ‘virtuous deeds. What next ensues?’ (II.i.93) sounds like a subconscious association.
14. *gliding*: this describes the movement of ghosts, in both contexts (1752, V.i.118)—a usage frequent in Shakespeare, but unknown to the OED.
15. *hew*: the action applies to men, with swords (937, V.i.260).
16. *infringe*: means to renege on an undertaking, in both contexts, whether ‘an oath’ (1867-9, as also in *Love’s Labor’s Lost*, IV.iii.142) or ‘our word’ (III.i.65).
17. *inner*: connotes an invitation to a domestic interior, whether ‘house’ or ‘gate’ (327, III.ii.123, 125).
18. *mournful*: not merely sad, but connoting actual obsequies, as in the canon (2310, I.i.36).
19. *nip [ped]*: thus cold winds or frosts kill off blossoms and the like, a thought first recorded in *Love’s Labor’s Lost*, V.ii.802 (1258, III.ii.13).
20. *overthrown*: vanquished in combat (918, V.iii.57).
21. *prevention*: forestalling a threat of death (1006, I.i.8).
22. *puissant*: describes an armed force, whether a legion, a host (*1 Richard II* II.i.76, IV.i.141,) or an army, usually the enemy (French) army, as also in *3 Henry VI*, V.ii.31
23. *rancor*: associated with hearts, in the same line (1178, III.ii.88); cf. also *1 Richard II* V.vi.4.
24. *redoubled*: used of displeasures (2584, IV.iii.115).
25. *scouts*: look-outs before a battle, whether alert (1132) or, as in *3 Henry VI*, V.i.19, apparently asleep (V.vi.11).
26. *shared*: applied to one’s own treasure when distributed among several other people (1312, II.iii.23).
27. *smothered*: killed by suffocation (2206, V.i.15, 235) as in *Richard III*, iii.14-6, *Othello*, V.ii.85 s.d.
28. *stirrup*: ‘lowly at his stirrup comes afoot’ (2535), ‘at my stirrup lowly footing by’ (V.i.93); with this obsequious posture, cf. ‘dismount and...trot like a servile footman’ (*Titus Andronicus*, V.ii.54-5).
29. *surrendered*: to his hands (1704), to their hands (IV.i.168).
30. *type(s)*: of chivalry (1497), of honour and nobility (II.iii.2), meaning the distinguishing marks or signs, a usage cited first from Shakespeare (*3 Henry VI*, I. iv.121).
31. *veil*: shadow [an illicit passion] with a veil (406), a veil to shadow mischief (I.i.121-2).

Other signs suggesting Shakespeare include his characteristic use of noun-verb discords. As I note in *Shakespeare's Edward III*, this idiosyncrasy has been featured (Abbott 1869, 235) as typical of Shakespeare—'storms makes' (*Richard III*, II.iii.35), for example, survived into the 1973 Spevack concordance. Abbott notes that the form 'is generally altered by modern editors, so that its commonness has not been duly recognized,' adding that Shakespeare's general predilection for it 'may well have arisen from the Northern English third person plural in -s.' *I Richard II* contains 'those stains that blurs his majesty,' (I.i.192); 'These cuts the columns...' (I.iii.124); 'Worse than consuming fires / That eats up all their furies falls upon,' (I.iii.164-5); 'Beshrew the churls that makes my queen so sad,' (I.iii.205); 'Four hundred archers in a guard attends them,' (II.iii.102); 'if any disturb ye, we four comes presently,' (IV.i.140-1); 'So many wild boars roots and spoils our lands,' (IV.ii.139); and 'What, dares the slaves refuse their sovereign?' (V.ii.13).

Objections

The born style-critic is rarely also a born editor; the approaches are almost opposite. Shakespeare's authorship of *I Richard II* was thus opposed by A.P. Rossiter, an excellent editor: 'There is not the smallest chance that [its writer] was Shakespeare. His verse too rarely rises, it is (in Dryden's phrase) too little "pestered with figurative expressions," his mind never moves fast enough.' (Rossiter, 1946, 73). In other words, we scholars know exactly how Shakespeare must have written at every stage of his career. However, that typically personal verdict has to be considered in the light of Schoenbaum's Law: 'Intuitions, convictions and subjective judgments generally, carry no weight as evidence. This no matter how learned, respected or confident the authority' (1966, 178).

Further, Rossiter is much more modest than he seems; he begins by saying that the future may decide he is wrong. Hence, perhaps, his instant withdrawal of his own infallible pronouncement: even a very early *I Richard II* would be 'unrecognizable as "Shakespeare"...unless transition-works were discovered.' This is a vital proviso: such works have indeed been discovered. So Rossiter's retraction is very relevant: 'Yet there is something of a simplified Shakespeare in [the writer of *I Richard II*.]' The following further excerpts from his description of that writer are selected because each of them should now shout out 'Shakespeare!' at the top of its voice, to those with ears to hear:

He tries to see History in a big way (unlike Peele, Greene or Hey-wood's): has a marked sense of humor...an interest in human pride of gesture in dramatic situations: much in politics and the common people —of whom he is not afraid. He knows something of the law and can turn a point with legal jargon...and he can read a long story and make a case of it. He had studied chronicles extensively, [but] he is fallible on names and dates...even when they could easily have been got right...he is not un-understanding with the half-feminine caprice of Richard... despite his sense of social injustice, he has observed [an illiterate rural bigwig] with detached amusement...he has an appreciation of the irony of things, and the good sense not to overstress it...H.B. Charlton aptly remarks that he had 'a much more humane and moral mind [than Marlowe]; indeed, if he wrote under that influence, it must have been a strong mind, to resist the fascinations of the Will-to-Power in that dramatic demiurge...None the less, he enjoys his violent murder immensely...He was a dramatist. He knew how a plot should run, beginning middle and end, and he saw his way to uniting elements as far apart as the clown-vice of Morality and the list of Articles of Objection brought against Richard when he was deposed. His [work] also suggests the trained advocate...[he] knew what made a scene. Each part—and he mainly planned the play in determinate parts—hangs together and leads to his point. Neither in structure nor in the passing episode nor in the details of touches of character and wry humor did the man write like a hack.⁶

Rossiter adds further details about the author's style; his taste for neologism, his visual metaphors, his stage effects, his penchant for rhyme, his 'noteworthy' and 'unusually uncomplicated' prose, and so on. Each of these *aperçus* looks sharply at the young Shakespeare. So even when there was a gap, the least spark could easily leap it; now there is none, the strong current of inference can run un-impeded, through

⁶ Rossiter, *Woodstock*, 73.

the new lead of *Edward III*, now at last officially accepted as authentic (Sams 1996, *Riverside Shakespeare*, 1997).

Let the necessary correctives now be applied. Thus for Rossiter's *2 Henry VI*, a play unknown before 1623, substitute the actual extant text of its first version, *The Contention*, c. 1590, as published in 1594. Then consider the manifold affinities of these two plays. Both begin with a royal wedding (as also in *Ironsides* after only 450 lines), at which the new queen makes a gracious speech. Then the protector Gloucester surrenders his staff because the King needs no more protection. Soon a parliament is arranged, as a chief character is told to his surprise.

The relationship becomes clearer when the texts are arranged in their proper order: *Contention* first, then *1 Richard II*; then (at some unknown later date) *2 Henry VI*. Now Rossiter's observations appear in sharper focus than ever before. The business of Woodstock's surrender of his staff is indeed 'unmistakably derived from Shakespeare'; the treatment of chronicle sources in *1 Richard II* is indeed 'the same', and 'Shakespearean in its preferring moral pattern to temporal sequence'; the part played in dramatic history by the 'able constructor' of *1 Richard II* is clearly 'far greater than our standard text-books lead us to suppose'; the humor in the play does indeed derive from Miracle and Morality plays and 'attains its full scope' only in [later] Shakespeare; the author of *1 Richard II* had indeed 'gone quite as far as Shakespeare in showing what subtleties could be worked on his rather unpromising frame,' etc.

The main source for *2 Richard II* was the second edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, with further reference to the earlier history by Edward Hall. The dramatist read and studied these sources very carefully, down to the last painstaking detail, so it could prove helpful to compare the annotations on the copy of Hall's *Chronicle* with *1 Richard II* as well as *2 Richard II*, (McLaren 1949, Sams 1996, 194). But Shakespeare is often unconcerned about historical details, and he regularly supplements the chronicle material with his own free invention of character and incident. The same is true of *1 Richard II*, which also uses an additional chronicle source, namely John Stow.

Such resemblances, in such profusion, lead to another explanation for the supposed 'dependence' of *1 Richard II* upon *2 Henry VI* (Rossiter, 66-71). It is that both of those plays, the latter in the form of *The Contention* 1594, were written by Shakespeare in his twenties.