

MacDonald P. Jackson: The Case for Samuel Rowley

MacDonald P. Jackson's 'Shakespeare's *Richard II* and the Anonymous *Thomas of Woodstock*' (2001) is the principal statement of what might be called the Jacobean thesis—that Egerton 1994 represents the author's original, composed and presumably fair-copied ca. 1610. Supported by F.S. Boas and D.J. Lake, whom he cites extensively in the article below, Jackson rejects the idea of an Elizabethan *Woodstock* and certainly any notion of Shakespeare's hand, whose absence he considers so 'obvious' that it requires no further proof. It's an axiom, self-evident. Jackson suggests instead that the anonymous playwright might be, probably was, Samuel Rowley, author of *When You See Me You Know Mee* (1605). The multiple Shakespeare lines and echoes in the text are simply plagiarisms—like *Hamlet*, *Woodstock* is a play made up of quotations, though in this case it's not a joke. According to Jackson, *Woodstock* is comprised of 'shreds and patches' literally stolen from Shakespeare. The verse's stylometric counts, such as caesura placement and feminine line-endings, used as temporal markers, are characteristic of dramatic practice during King James' early years, and are certainly typical of later Shakespeare, but since he is 'obviously' not a candidate, despite being alive and seriously kicking in 1608, *Woodstock* must have been written by someone else. Jackson's anti-Shakespeare argument is circular.

Jackson also makes a great deal of the marginal additions of actors' names, many identified by Frijlinck, almost all of whom were active in the first and second decades of the 17th Century. I willingly grant the point, together with all Jackson's overwhelming data, including the use of 'cornets,' placing the MS. clearly where Partridge puts it, about 1610. The question however is whether someone, I would say Shakespeare himself, updated an almost forgotten 1590s script, most probably for use, as we've seen, on the provincial tour. The play's dramatic brilliancies, the depth and seriousness of its political thought and the skill with which they are all brought together, point to a greater theatrical mind than Rowley's. The authorial revision hypothesis resolves all the drama's dictions and contradictions, including its evocation of two distinct theatrical eras.

Like Boas, Jackson is impressed by the deletion of the king's allusion to himself as 'Superior lord of Scotland,' which must have been excised after the union of the English and Scottish crowns. This is certainly true, though like the deletion of profanities throughout, it seems to me to confirm that someone removed what had become politically incorrect from a time when it was not, the early 1590s. This applies also to the excision of the deposition at the end, which became problematical only after the comparable scene in *2 Richard II* was famously banned. I would add that much of Jackson's data is ambiguously interpreted in this same way, as is his failure to account for Rowley's deep knowledge of *2 Henry VI* and Marlowe's *Edward II*.

In 2007, partly responding to my four-volume *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One* (2006), Jackson published 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*: Evidence and its Interpretation' (*Research Opportunities in Medieval and Renaissance Drama* 46 (2007), 67-100). He summed up his objections:

The basic weakness in Egan's case for Shakespeare's authorship of *Woodstock* is that he adopts the old methods of 'parallel hunting,' and lists dozens of verbal parallels between *Woodstock* with Shakespeare that are the stock of early modern drama. I explain what is wrong with this procedure and how its defects can be remedied, in a couple of paragraphs introducing my article, 'The Date and Authorship of Hand D's contribution to Sir Thomas More: Evidence from Literature Online,' (*Shakespeare Survey* 59 (2007) 69-78 and in 'Shakespeare in the Quarrel Scene in *Arden of Faversham*' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 57 (2006) 249-93 (255-8). There I distinguish between (a) the mere accumulation of verbal 'parallels' between a disputed play and the plays of a scholar's favored candidate for its authorship and (b) a comprehensive search with the aid of an electronic database, for phrases and collocations that the disputed play shares with five or fewer plays, whoever their author, first performed within a predetermined

period.¹

I can only say that Jackson appears not to have read my four-volume annotated study of Eg. 1994, which goes far beyond the ‘mere accumulation’ of stock phrases, though there are plenty and most are far from ‘stock.’ Jackson himself notes several, pursuing his charges of plagiarism. Readers may judge my actual case for themselves from the concluding essay in this anthology.

Much of Jackson’s argument hangs on his Major Premise, *Not Shakespeare*, which he considers to be self-evident, together with his speculative Minor, *Samuel Rowley*. His Conclusion is, *Ca. 1610*.

At the same time, he is arbitrary about the stylistic analogies he will accept and those he rationalizes away. For example, in his text he says both *Woodstock* and *When You See Mee* use the oath *zounds* (‘four times in each’), suggesting identity of authorship. In his end-notes however he provides a rather different emphasis:

Lake, ‘Three Seventeenth-Century Revisions,’ 138, notes that the preferred spelling for *Zounds* in *Woodstock* is *Zounes*, but in *When You See Mee* it is *Sownes*. He also mentions, on the level of style, that *Woodstock* lacks phrases in the form noun + adjective in *-al*, to which Rowley is supposed to have been partial. But the evidence for Rowley’s partiality is, in any case, of doubtful worth. The one striking discrepancy between *Woodstock* and *When You See Me* in the use of contractions is that *When You See Me* has no examples of *th’are*, which *Woodstock* employs thirteen times. But most dramatists use in their later plays certain forms that they had avoided in earlier ones.

Elsewhere he observes:

An interesting point is that both *sheep-biter* (as in *Woodstock*, line 1748) and *turkey-cock*, are terms of abuse applied to Malvolio in a single scene, and within twenty-five lines of one another, of *Twelfth Night* (2.5.5, 29): this scene, the gulling of Malvolio, is the most unforgettable in the play, and it seems likely that the author of *Woodstock* had witnessed it. *LION* yields no other play in the whole of English drama in which both *sheep-biter* and *turkey cock* are used figuratively of persons.

A likelier explanation, at least in my view, is common authorship, especially in light of the uniqueness of the example. Alternative hypotheses to Jackson’s, including Partridge’s, reconcile the data more completely. If we look beyond spellings, which can change or be altered by copyists, word counts, or the number of syllables in a line, we may come to a more radical and exciting conclusion. Based on Jackson’s own data, I see no reason to reject the notion that Shakespeare himself reworked his own plot and story, as he did in *King John* and other plays. Jackson himself says about the revision process, ‘it was only when a playwright revised his own work that he was apt to introduce a steady stream of verbal variants.’²

Prof. Jackson prefers end notes to foot notes and I respect his preference. End Notes 78 and 82 are duplicates, as in his original. The seminal article below is published with his permission and my thanks.

¹ MacD. P. Jackson: ‘The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*: Evidence and Interpretation,’ (*Research Opportunities in Medieval and Renaissance Drama* XLVI (2007) pp. 99-100.

² See my *Shakespeare’s Hand in The Troublesome Raigne of John King of England* (2021).

Macdonald. P. Jackson: 'Shakespeare's *Richard II* and the Anonymous *Thomas of Woodstock*,' in *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, Vol. 14 (2001) pp. 17-65

'He also made use of the anonymous play *Woodstock* for the first two acts dealing with Richard's injustices,' writes Andrew Gurr in a section on Shakespeare's 'sources' in the introduction to the New Cambridge edition of *King Richard II* (1984).¹ As he says, *Woodstock* is 'usually dated 1592 or 1593,' while the first performance of *Richard II* is most likely to have taken place in 1595. Arden editor Peter Ure (1956) came to the same conclusions about the composition date of *Woodstock* and the relationship between the two plays, discussing the parallels at some length.² These have, in fact, been the prevailing views, ever since *Woodstock* was first printed in 1870 by J.O. Halliwell in a privately issued edition limited to eleven copies. He called the anonymous play a 'composition anterior to Shakespeare's tragedy.'³ Later editors have concurred, notably Wilhelmina P. Frijlinck in her invaluable Malone Society Reprint (1929) and A. P. Rossiter in his modern-spelling edition (1946).⁴ Commentators on Elizabethan history plays have, almost without exception, continued to argue or assume that *Woodstock* was among Shakespeare's sources.⁵ The purpose of this article is to show that orthodox opinion is mistaken—that *Woodstock* was written in the seventeenth century and must therefore echo Shakespeare's *Richard II*, rather than the other way around.

On one point, at least, we may be confident: the British Library manuscript in which *Woodstock* is preserved cannot have been penned before 1600. Frijlinck, who considers it not the author's draft but a scribal copy that had long been used 'as a prompt-copy in the playhouse,' finds the handwriting might belong to 'as early as c. 1590' or 'a full generation later' (vi-vii). This conclusion was evidently acceptable to her expert general editor, W. W. Greg. Neither the Secretary nor the Italic hand on display is datable within narrower limits.

That the extant manuscript was inscribed within the seventeenth century has, however, since been demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt by D. J. Lake.⁶ His careful investigation of hundreds of early modern English plays revealed a definite shift in the nature of the 'linguistic forms' used in dramatic texts from the turn of the century onward.

Certain colloquialisms and contractions that had seldom or never appeared before 1599 quickly became common thereafter. These include 'em (for 'them'), *I'm, i'th', o'th', a'th'*, the use of *has* and *does* rather than *hath* and *doth*, and the oath '*sfoot* (for 'God's foot'). The frequency of such forms in *Woodstock* is a sure sign that the scribe's penning of the surviving manuscript must have been carried out in the seventeenth century. Lake claims that the oath '*sfoot* first appeared in a stage play in John Marston's *Antonio and Mellida* of 1601 and suddenly became fashionable over the next ten years. Since fourteen instances of '*sfoot* are sprinkled through the text of *Woodstock*, being used by several different speakers, the manuscript is clearly 'not Elizabethan but Jacobean, probably dating from 1604-10' (137). The Chadwyck-Healey *Literature Online: English Drama* electronic data base (hereafter *LION*) confirms the basic truth of Lake's assertions about '*sfoot*: a search of all plays composed before 1642 reveals 290 instances of the oath (including nineteen spelled *sfut*), only one earlier than Marston's, in Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour* (1598).⁷

Lake's findings with regard to contractions were, with less impressive backing, anticipated by A. C. Partridge, who noted other forms in *Woodstock* that were rare before the seventeenth century.⁸ Again *LION* authenticates Partridge's claims. For example, *shall's*, spelled with or without the apostrophe, colloquially contracting *shall us*, and meaning 'shall we,' appears in *Woodstock* and turns up 146 times in the period 1576-1642, the earliest solitary example being in *The Thracian*

Won der (1599), with *Antonio and Mellida* (1601) yielding the next. Similarly, *LION*'s earliest examples of *byth* or *bith* (meaning 'by the' and spelled as a single word without apostrophe) occur in *A Larum for London* (1599), which has two, and *1Edward IV* (1599), which has one; but thereafter it is common, appearing eighty-two times altogether before 1642. In *Woodstock* there are no fewer than twelve occurrences. It is the frequency in *Woodstock* of another of Partridge's items that would be so anomalous in a sixteenth-century play. This is *th'are* ('they are'), of which there are over 300 instances in *LION*, 1576-1642. Only three are in early plays: the multi-authored *Misfortunes of Arthur* (1588), *Selimus* (1592), and Daniel's *Cleopatra* (1593) have one each. But usage of the contraction only begins in earnest with Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour* (1598), followed by *Every Man out of his Humour* (1599), *Sir John Oldcastle* (1599), and Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (1599): all four plays have only single instances, but *Woodstock* has thirteen.⁹ Partridge's data, as refined by *LION*, thus support Lake's view that *Woodstock* exhibits 'a typical pattern of contractions for a colloquial play of the period 1604-10, indeed rather similar to the pattern of Middleton's early comedies and *The Revenger's Tragedy*' (137).

But Lake finds the linguistic pattern of *Woodstock* to be even more like that of Samuel Rowley's *When You See Me You Know Me* (Q 1605), 'a play acted by the Prince's Men, and certainly not earlier than 1604, since it deals intimately with Elizabeth's father, Henry VIII' (137). Especially striking links are the exceptional fondness in each play for *ye* (231 times in *Woodstock*, 220 times in *When You See Me*), the use in both of the unusual spelling variant *eth* (seven times in *Woodstock*, fifteen times in *When You See Me*) for the contraction *i'th*, and resort to the oath *zounds* (four times in each play). In view of some stylistic similarities between *Woodstock* and *When You See Me You Know Me*, Lake suggests that *Woodstock* was revised by Rowley in the first decade of the seventeenth century.

We will return to the question of Samuel Rowley's possible involvement with *Woodstock*. For the moment, it is Lake's dating of the manuscript that concerns us. The importance of Lake's finding lies in the fact that it relates to the basic playscript, as distinct from features that might stem from adjustments associated with revivals in the second, third, or fourth decades of the seventeenth century. Frijlinck, distinguishing as many as ten inks not used by the original scribe, identified eight hands that had in one way or another augmented his script. From their annotations she attempted to reconstruct the play's stage history, but her assessment of the evidence has its vulnerabilities. She first connects *Woodstock* with the Queen's Revels Children on the flimsy grounds that the manuscript's Hand G, evidently that of a stage manager, also appears in *Charlemagne*, which belongs to the same Egerton MS volume as *Woodstock*; that *Charlemagne* 'has been assigned by critics to Chapman and dated about 1600' (xxviii); and that early in the seventeenth century Chapman began writing for the Chapel Children and the Queen's Revels. The chief flaw in Frijlinck's argument is that the attribution of *Charlemagne* to Chapman has proved completely unconvincing.¹⁰ Besides, that a boy's troupe would ever have contemplated performing a script so obviously intended for adult actors as is *Woodstock* is most improbable.

One contribution by Hand G further subverts her argument for connecting *Woodstock* with the Queen's Revels. It reads 'fflorish Cornetts: Dance & musique: cometts' (2093-4). Since the basic play text, in the original scribe's hand, had called for trumpets to sound at lines 913-14 and 1012-13, the manuscript in its surviving form demands the use of both comets and trumpets in production. This is significant because W. J. Lawrence showed that 'All pre-Restoration texts whatsoever (whether of new and original or revised old plays) calling for the separate or concurrent employment of both comets and trumpets must have been texts made for use after the autumn of 1609.'¹¹ He also averred that the King's Men first used comets when they began playing at the Blackfriars in 1609, and that texts associated with them are the only ones to use both trumpets and comets before 1619.¹² Hand G's addition of a direction for the sounding of comets to a play text in which flourishes of trumpets were

also required would thus appear to have been made after 1609, at the earliest, and after 1619 if he was not preparing the script for the King's Men. So, if Frijlinck is correct in also finding Hand G in the Egerton collection's manuscript of *Charlemagne*, she is almost certainly wrong in supposing that this 'stage reviser' was annotating either that play or *Woodstock* in the years when Chapman was writing for the Queen's Revels (1601, and then 1605-10).¹³

Another hand, labeled H by Frijlinck, inserted the actor's name 'Toby' at line 2088. Frijlinck points out that an Edward Tobye was included in a confirmation, dated 9 April 1624 and shown in Exeter and Norwich, of a patent of 31 October 1617 for 'the Children of the Revels to the late Queen Anna.' On the strength of this she assumes that *Woodstock* underwent a second revival within the period 1623-27. Bentley says of the company documented at Exeter and Norwich: 'There is no adequate evidence that this organization was ever anything but a provincial one.'¹⁴ Nothing is heard of Edward Tobye before or after this single reference. It is possible that—like Thomas Bond (also mentioned in the confirmation), Ellis Worth, and others connected with the London Queen Anne's Company/Players of the Revels before they disbanded—he eventually became a member of the second Prince Charles's Company (licensed in December 1631) and that, if *Woodstock*'s 'Toby' is indeed this actor, the annotation relates to a much later date.¹⁵

Conceivably, however, Toby is the Christian name of a player otherwise unknown: the annotation is to the bit-part of a servant. Frijlinck is cautious in interpreting the 'George' and 'G[r]ad' added, along with marginal directions for properties, by Hands E and F. *Woodstock* is part of Egerton MS 1994, a collection of fifteen plays perhaps compiled by actor William Cartwright (active throughout the first half of the seventeenth century) and passed on to his actor-book seller son, also William, who bequeathed it to Dulwich College.¹⁶

F. S. Boas contended that the interlacing of actors' names in four of the Egerton plays—*The Captives*, *The Two Noble Ladies*, *Edmond Ironside*, and *Thomas of Woodstock*—points to their having been played at some time by the same company. He identified the 'George' of *Woodstock* with George Stutfield (or Stutville), whose name appears in *The Two Noble Ladies* and *Edmond Ironside*, and 'G[r]ad' with the Henry Gradwell whose surname is given both in a similarly abbreviated form and in full (as 'M'· Gradell') in *Edmond Ironside*.¹⁷ Frijlinck, differing from earlier scholars, judges that neither of the scribes E and F who added the names in *Woodstock* penned the names in the other Egerton plays, and so concludes that there is no good reason for supposing that the same actors are intended (xvi, xxix).¹⁸

But even if she is right in her verdicts on the handwriting, her conclusion does not follow. It seems, on the whole, probable, that 'G[r]ad,' in particular, is the Henry Gradwell whose name is abbreviated in the same way in *Edmond Ironside*. Boas noted that the names of several of the actors mentioned in the four Egerton plays (including Thomas Bond and Edward May) are brought together in a cast list for Shakerley Marmion's *Holland's Leaguer*, published in 1632, after having been entered in the Stationers' Register on 26 January of that year, as having been 'lately and often acted' by Prince Charles's Men at Salisbury Court Theatre.¹⁹ Gradwell played the part of Capritio in *Holland's Leaguer*. Henry Gradwell and George Stutfield are both recorded as Prince Charles's Players in a Lord Chamberlain's warrant of May 1632 (as also is Thomas Bond). Among all the Jacobean and Caroline actors listed by Bentley, Gradwell is one of only two who fit the *Woodstock* annotation 'G[r]ad,' and the second Prince Charles's Company brings together a 'G[r]ad' and a 'George.'²⁰

However, the second letter of *Woodstock*'s 'G[r]ad' is admittedly indistinct, and Frijlinck (xxix) suggests that the actor indicated may have been Christopher Goad, the one other available candi-

date.²¹ Goad is known to have acted with Queen Henrietta's in the period 1630-34 and a cast list for Nathaniel Richards's *Messalina* (published in 1640, and perhaps first performed some five years earlier) has him playing the major role of Silius for the King's Revels.²² The interactions among companies at this time are complex. By 1634 Prince Charles's Men had moved to the Red Bull, and their place at Salisbury Court was taken by the King's Revels Company, which acted Richard Brome's *The Sparagus Garden* there in 1635.

Apart from the *Messalina* cast list, two documents of 1634 and 1635 appear to name King's Revels personnel, but the first calls them simply 'The Company of Salisbury Court' and the second leaves the troupe, on tour in Norwich, without a title. The diary of Thomas Crosfield, a fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, records the names of nine Salisbury Court players given him on 18 July, 1634, by the visiting Richard Kendall, wardrobe-keeper at that theater, and a Norwich Mayor's Court Book of 10 March 1635 names twenty-eight actors, of whom nine appear in either the *Messalina* cast or Kendall's list or both. Both Christopher Goad and George Stutfield are included in the Kendall and Norwich lists, so that here again a 'G[.]ad' and a 'George' are juxtaposed. The Norwich Court Book also mentions two more of the Egerton MS actors, Edward May and Antony Bray (probably identical to the Anthony Brew named in *The Two Noble Ladies*). Stutfield, the spokesman for the Norwich group, appears to have stayed at Salisbury Court when the King's Revels resumed occupation, rather than moving to the Red Bull with Prince Charles's Men. But the touring Norwich troupe was clearly an amalgamation of two or more companies, and the affiliations of many of its members are obscure. It must further be conceded that Stutfield is not the only George in the Norwich list, which also names a George Williams (or Willans), who had been a member of a touring Red Bull company in 1629. *Woodstock's* marginal 'George' seems to anticipate the entry of a mere servant, and Frijlinck thought it unlikely that the prominent Stutfield should have taken such an unimportant part, and so suggested that Williams may have been intended (xxix). However, in *The Two Noble Ladies*, Stutfield played a spirit and a Triton, and in *Edmond Ironside* the son of an English noble, while in 1635 he was allocated the role of a soldier (as well as of Bostar) in Nabbes's *Hannibal and Scipio*, presented by Queen Henrietta's Company at Drury Lane. If he did indeed ever act in *Woodstock*, the servant need not have been his only role.

The actors' names added to the *Woodstock* manuscript thus suggest a revival about 1632-35, either by the second Prince Charles's Men or by the King's Revels Company or touring troupe of which they formed the nucleus.²³ Frijlinck does accept that the play was probably revived in the 1630s. The likelihood that *Woodstock* came into the hands of Prince Charles's or the King's Revels will prove pertinent to later discussion of its authorship.

Perhaps even more significant are certain crosses and deletions in pencil that closely resemble marks in the manuscripts of *Charlemagne*, *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, and *Sir John Barnavel*, where they 'are pretty certainly the work of the censor, Sir George Buc,' (Frijlinck, xxi). The natural assumption is that they are Buc's in *Woodstock* too. But two of these penciled deletions in *Woodstock* are of the word 'cuss' (a spelling of the colloquial abbreviation for 'cousin'), where *Woodstock* is addressing the King, and in one instance, at line 832, it has been replaced with 'my leege' in a hand tentatively identified by Frijlinck as D, 'that, it would seem, of the prompter of the original performance. Whence it would, of course, follow that the original performance was not before about 1603 when Buc became active as Tilney's deputy, which is considerably after the date usually assigned to the play and the manuscript' (xxi). The penciled mark for the deletion of the King's allusion to himself as 'Superior lord of Scotland' at line 908, also in Buc's style, must also have been made 'after the union of the English and Scottish crowns.'²⁴

Frijlinck assumes that the basic extant manuscript of *Woodstock* was prepared for ‘the original performance,’ which she accepts as having been in the early 1590s. So she dismisses her own evidence, disclaiming any certainty that the words ‘my leege’ were written by hand D and suggesting that Buc may have worked on the play for a revival or that Tilney may earlier have used a lead pencil in much the same manner as Buc. But the argument that she puts forward and then finds reasons to distrust would neatly reinforce Lake’s subsequent demonstration that the *body* of the *Woodstock* manuscript, let alone its minor accretions, cannot have been written out before 1600. The question remains whether this undoubtedly seventeenth-century inscription was for ‘the original production’ or was, as Lake proposes, associated with a major revision, whether by Samuel Rowley or another.

II

Metrically, the play, as we have it, can hardly be a composition of the early 1590s. Frijlinck rejected F. S. Boas’s claim that some passages had the ring of Jacobean verse, arguing that his impression could carry little weight against ‘the internal evidence of the monotonous end-stopped verse and the considerable proportion of rhyme which points to an early date’ (xxiii). But in fact the verse is, as Rossiter remarks, ‘less end-stopped than was usual in the early ’90s and often overruns into rough alexandrines, sometimes beyond’ (75). It is certainly not more end-stopped than Middleton’s in his early seventeenth century comedies or in *The Revenger’s Tragedy*. In Rossiter’s edition of *Woodstock*, some 28 percent of full-verse lines have no end-of-line punctuation. Comparisons between authors in the matter of enjambment or overflow or run-on lines must be made with caution, because modernizing editors differ in their notions of how texts should be punctuated, but the most reliable counts show that the earliest Shakespeare play to contain a similar percentage of unstopped lines is *1 Henry IV* (1596-97), which is unusually advanced among Shakespeare’s plays in this respect, a proportion of 28 percent run-on lines being more characteristic of a somewhat later period surrounding *Measure for Measure* (1603).²⁵ Likewise, the proportion of rhyme in *Woodstock*—21 percent of verse lines—is matched by early Middleton plays and far surpassed by seventeenth-century plays of Dekker, for example.²⁶ Many Jacobean playwrights—Day, Wilkins, both Samuel and William Rowley, Heywood, and Marston—continued to make considerable use of rhyme. On the other hand, Marlowe, with whose plays Frijlinck supposes *Woodstock* to be contemporary, largely avoided it, pointedly announcing his disdain for ‘rhyming mother wits.’

Moreover, the percentage of feminine endings within blank-verse lines would be thoroughly anomalous in a play composed around 1592 or 1593. Some basic data were meticulously accumulated by Philip W. Timberlake for his study entitled *The Feminine Ending in English Blank Verse* (1931), which covers plays of 1580-95.²⁷ Confining his investigation to full blank verse lines, he gave figures for percentages of feminine endings according to both a strict and a loose count: the strict count ignores endings in proper names and in words such as ‘heaven’ and ‘prayer,’ where a monosyllabic pronunciation is possible. Timberlake shows that George Peele’s *The Old Wives’ Tale* is the only undoubted play by Robert Greene, Thomas Kyd, Thomas Lodge, John Lyly, Christopher Marlowe, Thomas Nashe, or George Peele, in which the percentage of feminine endings, on a strict count, rises above four, and in *The Old Wives’ Tale* it is only five; otherwise, outside Marlowe, the range for the plays of those ‘University Wits’ is zero to two. Robert Wilmot’s *Tancred and Gismund* and the multi-authored *The Misfortunes of Arthur* (by Thomas Hughes and others) have none. The percentage for Robert Wilson’s *The Three Lords and Ladies of London* is one, but for his *The Cobbler of Canterbury* it reaches seven. Shakespeare is more liberal in his use of feminine endings within his early plays: most of the percentages remain within the range from four to eight, but for *2 Henry VI* and *3 Henry VI* they are ten and eleven, and for *The Comedy of Errors*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and *Richard III* they are as high as fifteen, sixteen, and seventeen. Most of the many anonymous plays yield single-figure percentages. Those with 10 percent or more are *A Larum for London* (10), *Soliman and Perseda* (10), *King Leir* (11), *Al-*

phonsus Emperor of Germany (11.5), *John a Kent and John a Cumber* (14), *Jeronimo, Part 1* (19), *Sir Thomas More* (21), and *Woodstock* (21). Timberlake investigated all these plays as potentially falling within his period, but the results of his study led him to question some of the datings.

Only one play considered by Timberlake, namely *Sir Thomas More*, employs feminine endings as frequently as *Woodstock*, and only five others approach this rate, with percentages of fourteen or more. Three of the five are by Shakespeare, who is obviously not a candidate for the authorship of *Woodstock*. The date of composition of *Jeronimo* is uncertain. In the *Annals of English Drama* and in the chronological table appended to *The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama* it is entered under 1604, which represents a current consensus. Andrew Cairncross won no converts to his belief that the earliest printed text (1605) is a 'bad quarto' of a play written by Kyd himself.²⁸ The date of *Sir Thomas More*, which survives in a British Library manuscript, is also in dispute. Perhaps the most common view is that the basic script, in the handwriting of Anthony Munday, was written 1592-95, but that the 'additions' by Henry Chettle, Thomas Dekker, Thomas Heywood, and (probably) Shakespeare belong to 1603-4, though some scholars assign all the material to either the early 1590s or the early seventeenth century.²⁹ Timberlake's tally is for the complete play in its revised form, but he comments that the 'uniformly high percentage of feminine endings' strengthens the arguments for dating the initial version 'after rather than before 1596' (80).

Interestingly, Munday is agreed to have been, with Chettle, the author of the original script that he penned, and Munday's *John a Kent and John a Cumber* (dated 1589 in the *Annals*) is the remaining play with a relatively high proportion of feminine endings. This means that, apart from Shakespeare, Munday is—so far as Timberlake's very thorough investigation can tell us—the only dramatist of 1580-95 who was anything like as partial to feminine endings in his blank verse as was the anonymous playwright responsible for *Woodstock*.

It is, however, less than perfectly clear that *John a Kent* was composed as early as 1589. The theory that it was so rests on I. A. Shapiro's decipherment of a date following Munday's signature on the last leaf of his manuscript of the play: previously read as '1596,' it was read by Shapiro as '1590.' Shapiro's interpretation of the evidence has, however, been challenged, so that we cannot be absolutely sure that Munday had acquired his fondness for feminine endings before about 1595.³⁰ Besides, there is a fair gap between the 14 percent of *John a Kent* and the 21 percent of *Woodstock*. There are, in any case, other features of *Woodstock* that make Munday's authorship of this chronicle play most improbable. The high proportion of feminine endings in *Woodstock*—and the play is remarkably homogeneous in this regard—strongly suggests that the verse belongs to the seventeenth century, when many dramatists were making quite liberal use of this metrical variation.³¹

Another feature of the verse of *Woodstock* seems conclusive. Among the most impressive work on dramatic blank verse ever reported is Ants Oras's analysis of pause patterns in English plays of the Renaissance period.³² Basing his calculations on the original sixteenth and seventeenth-century texts, Oras counted the incidence of pauses, as registered by punctuation, falling at different positions within the iambic pentameter lines of hundreds of plays—after the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, or ninth syllable. He produced figures for (a) all pauses, (b) heavier pauses, marked by a stop stronger than a comma, and (c) pauses created by the division of a verse line between two or more speakers. C-type pauses have the advantage of being wholly authorial, but many plays contain too few to yield reliable results. Although type-a pauses might seem dependent on the whims of scribes and compositors, the patterns formed by counts of the positions in which they fall always closely resemble those for C-type pauses, when these are sufficiently frequent: agents of transmission may prefer heavy or light punctuation, but they tend not to differ significantly in where they place the stops. Tallies for the proportion of all pauses in the nine positions display clear authorial and chronological patterns. In

brief, over the period 1576-1642 there is a marked chronological tendency for the majority of pauses to shift from earlier to later in the line and for the predominance of pauses in even numbered positions to become less marked, but individual playwrights responded to the changing rhythmic climate in their own distinctive ways. Oras produced for the numerous plays examined not only raw figures but graphs showing the percentage of the total number of pauses that fell in each position within the line. He did not analyze *Woodstock*, but a count, employing his methods, of pauses within the first 500 lines gives the following figures for the nine positions: 5, 7, 5, 58, 50, 63, 16, 2, 1.³³ As percentages of the total of 207 these workout at: 2.4, 3.4, 2.4, 28.0, 24.2, 30.4, 7.7, 1.0, 0.5.

It is easy enough to graph these percentages, and one may also compare the figures themselves with those presented by Oras. No plays written in the 1580s or early 1590s show a remotely similar configuration. Greene, Kyd, Lodge, Lyly, Marlowe, Peele, the early Shakespeare, Wilmot, and the anonymous contemporary playwrights whose verse Oras scrutinizes all have very different graphs, with peaks at position four. The Shakespeare graphs begin to resemble that for *Woodstock* only in the period from *Julius Caesar* to *Timon of Athens* (1599-1605). The first Shakespeare play in which the percentage of pauses within the first half of the line is as low as the 47.8 of *Woodstock* is *Hamlet* (1600-1601), and the first Shakespeare play in which the percentage of pauses after the sixth syllable is as high as *Woodstock*'s 30.4 is *Measure for Measure* (1603). Among plays by other dramatists the first to have a graph resembling *Woodstock*'s (whether for a-type, b-type, or c-type pauses) is Ben Jonson's *The Case Is Altered* (1597), though the proportion of pauses after the sixth syllable is lower (23.3 percent). The closest fits tend to be with later plays, such as John Marston's, William Barkstead's, and Lewis Machin's *The Insatiate Countess* (1607), Ben Jonson's *Catiline* (1611) and even *The New Inn* (1629), Thomas Dekker's *If This Be Not a Good Play* (1611), Thomas Heywood's *If You Know Not Me* (1605), John Fletcher's *The Faithful Shepherdess* (1608), Francis Beaumont's *The Maid's Tragedy* (1610), and Thomas Middleton's *Your Five Gallants* (1607).

What this means is that if *Woodstock* was written, as is generally supposed, in '1592 or 1593,' its anonymous author was streets ahead of any other playwright, including Shakespeare, in developing his metrical style: at a time when Marlowe—an innovator whose *Tamburlaine* (1587-88) ensured, by the grandiloquence of its rhythms, that blank verse would become the staple of the poetic drama of Shakespeare's age—eschewed feminine endings and placed the great majority of pauses after the fourth syllable, this unknown practitioner not only surpassed Shakespeare in experimenting with feminine endings but anticipated the evolution of dramatic verse in the seventeenth century in respect of pause patterns by placing his caesuras after the sixth syllable at a rate unmatched in the 1590s. This is highly unlikely. It is much easier to believe that *Woodstock* is a seventeenth-century play.

III

A study of the vocabulary reinforces this conclusion. The *Oxford English Dictionary* is by no means perfect in its citation of first usages of words and their various senses, but when its entries are supplemented by information derived from *LION* we can gain some sense of when a play was written. If *Woodstock* was composed about 1592 or 1593, we might expect that its dialogue would contain words and meanings first recorded in written English in the 1560s, 1570s, and 1580s, but few words and meanings first recorded as entering the language from 1593 onward: there should be a marked tailing off of *OED* first citations later than 1593. We ought to find words and phrases that were current in the early 1590s but had dropped out of theatrical use by the Jacobean years.

If, on the other hand, *Woodstock* was composed during the Jacobean years, we might expect the 'tailing off' of first citations to occur at least a decade later, from about 1603 onward, and the play ought to contain words that were in vogue on the stage in the early Jacobean period. Of course, we cannot

know the anonymous playwright's attitude to the linguistic inventiveness of his age: he may have been conservative in his adoption of new usages, or he may have been quite adventurous. But a thorough examination of *Woodstock's* vocabulary should turn up clues of the kind afforded by the expletive 'sfoot. This, as we have seen, first appeared in an English stage play in 1598 and became popular throughout the next decade. Do words more intrinsic to *Woodstock's* dialogue, and to the story it dramatizes, display a similar pattern?

The answer is that a significant number of words in *Woodstock* are indeed unknown to the English stage before the turn of the century and are common thereafter. The reading of Halliwell's 1870 edition of *Woodstock* for *OED* (under the title *The Tragedy of King Richard the Second*) was perfunctory, and the play is assigned dates as widely variant as 1560 and 1630, though the bibliography gives 'c 1590.' Even were we to adopt the 1630 date, *Woodstock* contains a few *OED* antedatings.³⁴ For instance, *OED's* first citation for *pestiferousness*, which occurs at line 1706 of *Woodstock*, is dated 1727; in the play, use of the noun is a natural outgrowth of Simon Ignorance's obsession with the adjective *pestiferous*, which *OED* records as early as 1542. Similarly, at line 109 mention is made of Thomas of Woodstock's 'unsophisticated plainness,' and *OED's* first record of the adjective in the appropriate sense (*ppl.a* 3: 'not sophisticated in habits, manners, or mind') is dated 1656, while the earliest citation of the word itself (meaning 'unadulterated') is dated 1630. The word *grumbler*, line 1626, is first recorded by *OED* in 1633. When Bagot urges his cronies, 'On with your soothest faces,' the adjective evidently means 'most cajoling, flattering, and plausible'; the closest *OED* sense is *sooth, a. 4.*, described as 'poetic,' meaning 'soothing,' and illustrated from Keats in 1819, though, interestingly, *OED, sooth, sb.* 111.8 records the substantival sense associated with the verb *soothe*, 'blandishment, flattery; a smooth or plausible word or speech,' and quotes Shakespeare's *Richard II*, 3.3.135, 'words of sooth.' The parallel reinforces the connection between *Richard II* and *Woodstock*, without telling us which playwright is the debtor, even though *OED's* first citation of the past participial adjective *soothing* is also from Shakespeare—from the *Passionate Pilgrim* version of Sonnet 138, where 'a soothing tongue' is flattering, blandishing, and specious.³⁵

However, clear *OED* antedatings are exceptional in *Woodstock*, and so too are words unrecorded by *OED*. One such instance is *uncaput* for 'nitwit' at 306: neither *OED* nor *LION* recognize this word, though *caput* is used for 'head' in astronomical contexts from 1649 and, in *caput mortuum*, 'death's head, skull,' from 1641 in alchemical contexts, and from 1658 in others. Also unknown to *OED* is *fifteens* at 1922 and 2232, with reference to a tax of one-fifteenth on the rated value of property, as Rossiter notes. *LION* has no other example of this word, either. Nor does *OED* record *invoke* as a substantive meaning 'invocation,' as at 61. Of eighty-three instances of the verb and its inflexions in *LION*, the earliest is in Mary Herbert's *Antonius* (1590), the next is in Daniel's *Cleopatra* (1593), and all the rest are in plays from 1599 onward, beginning with the Shakespeare's *Henry V* (1598-99) and the anonymous *Look About You* (1599).³⁶

This brings us to consideration of the substantial group of words for which *OED's* first citation or the first theatrical use according to *LION* falls within the period 1595-1615. These are listed below. *LION* searches are, unless otherwise noted, for the period 1576-1642.

Staled (94) in 'plenty hath staled our palates': *stale* here means 'sated, cloyed'; *OED* offers no sense that is perfectly appropriate; the nearest are *v*² 2 *trans.*, 'to render stale, out of date or uninteresting,' for which the first citation is 1599, and *v*² 3. *Sc.*, 'to affect with loathing or satiety,' with examples in 1709 and 1717.

Ulcerous (158): *OED* records from 1577, in the sense 'of the nature of an ulcer or ulcers,' and from 1599 in the sense 'afflicted with an ulcer or ulcers,' which is the meaning in *Woodstock's*

warning that the diseased body of the state may grow ulcerous. *LIONs* earliest uses, of which there are twenty-one altogether, are in Jonson's *Every Man out Of his Humour* (1599), Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1600-1), and Marston's *Jack Drum's Entertainment* (1600) and *Antonio's Revenge* (1601), with further examples in Jonson's *Sejanus* (1603), Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens* (1605) and *Macbeth* (1606), Barnes's *The Devil's Charter* (1606), Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* (1606), and Barry's *Ram Alley* (1608).

Discountenance (191): *OED*'s first example (v. 2) is from Sidney's *Arcadia*, which it dates 1580, while recording publication in 1611. Its next is from Jonson's *Cynthia's Revels* (1600). *LION* adds only Jonson's *Catiline* (1611), Chapman's and Shirley's *Chabot Admiral of France* (1612), and Marmion's *A Fine Companion* (1633).

Sumpter (219): *Woodstock*'s is *OED*'s sole instance of the verb, meaning 'to put on one's back; to wear.' But *Woodstock*, in saying that for once he will 'sumpter a gaudy wardrobe,' is comically likening himself to a pack-horse or 'sumpter horse.' *LION*'s 11 instances of *sumpter*, nearly all relating to sumpter horses, begin with Dekker's *Satiromastix* (1601), followed by Dekker's and Middleton's *I Honest Whore* (1604), Marston's *The Fawn* (1605), and Shakespeare's *King Lear* (1605). One other instance—in Addition IV to *Sir Thomas More*—may antedate all these plays except *Satiromastix*.

Limbo Patrum (234): the Limbo of the Fathers (of the Church); a place on the edges of Hell where the unbaptized were to remain till Judgement Day. *OED* records, under *Limbo* 2, use of the phrase in 5.4 (a Fletcher scene) of the Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration *Henry VIII* (1613). *LION* adds examples in Fletcher's *The Captain* (1612) and Randolph's *Hey for Honesty, Down with Knavery* (1627).

Frenchified (297): the *Woodstock* usage is verbal: 'unless you'll be frenchified.' *OED*'s first record of the verb is dated 1592, while Jonson's *Every Man out of his Humour* (1599) provides the first instance of the past participial adjective, which is also *LION*'s earliest example of either verb or participial adjective, the next being from Jonson's *Cynthia Revels* (1600), Chapman's *Sir Giles Goosecap* (1602), Heywood's *If You Know Not Me* (1605), and the Chapman-Jonson-Marston collaboration *Eastward Ho* (1605). There are five further examples from 1617 to 1638.

Buckram bags (320): these are lawyers' bags, and 'in buckram' is applied to 'a pleading lawyer' in lines 330-31. The fabric is recorded as early as the thirteenth century. *OED* (*sb.* 2.b) notes *buckram*, meaning a lawyer's bag in *The Revenger's Tragedy* (1606), for which it gives the publication date of 1608, and (*sb.* 5. *comb.*) *buckram-bag* for a lawyer's bag or, in this case the lawyer himself, in Lording Barry's *Ram Alley*, assigned to 1611 but probably first performed in 1608. *LION* shows *buckram* being used attributively or quasi-adjectivally and associated with the legal profession in Chapman's *All Fools* (1601), Marston's *The Malcontent* (1603), and Dekker's *If This Be Not a Good Play* (1611), as well as in three later plays.

Highway lawyer (321): *OED*'s first citation under *highway* 4. *attrib.* and *comb.* is 1611, though the specific *highway lawyer* is not given.

Certiorari (341, 2982): a special kind of writ from a supreme court. *OED*'s first example is dated 1523 and its next 1641. The term occurs in some bizarre phonetic spellings, such as the *Woodstock* manuscript's 'surssararys' and 'sursseraris,' and is identified by Lake as a potential pointer to Middleton.³⁷ *LION*'s sole examples are from Middleton's *The Phoenix* (1604), 3 times, *The Puritan* (1606), and *The Revenger's Tragedy* (1606), Barry's *Ram Alley* (1608), and Brome's *The Weeding of the Covent Garden* (1632).

Westminster Hall (344 and 3 times elsewhere): this is not an item of vocabulary, but it is worth noting that of seven other *LION*, 1576-1642, plays in which Westminster Hall is alluded to, the earliest is *The Puritan* (1606).

Infinities (365): *OED*'s first citation of the plural substantive is dated 1587. *LION*'s fourteen examples begin with the anonymous *Charlemagne* (1604), Samuel Rowley's *When You See Me You Know Me* (1604), and Chapman's *Caesar and Pompey* (1605).

Englised (401): *OED*'s first example of *english* v. 3, 'to make English, to anglicize,' which is the sense relevant here, is dated 1824-29, but the verb had been used since 1388 to mean 'translate into English,' and the step from language to person is a natural one. Of the seven *LION* plays in which *englised* appears, Warner's *Menaechmi* is dated 1592, Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor* 1597-8, William Rowley's *A Shoemaker A Gentleman* 1608, while the remaining four all belong to 1627-28. But in every case translation into the English language is involved.

Homespun (430, 1180): *OED*'s first figurative usage (a. 2*fig.*) is in Dekker's *Old Fortunatus*, which it dates 1600 but was performed in 1599. Shakespeare had used the word figuratively as a noun in Puck's mockery of the mechanicals in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595) as 'hempen homespuns.' The *Old Fortunatus* in stance is the earliest figurative use of the adjective in *LION*, followed by that in Haughton's *Grim the Collier* (1600).

Canonical (433): *OED* records this adjective from 1570-76, but the earliest of *LION*'s eighteen dramatic uses is in Marston's *Antonio's Revenge* (1601), and the next is in Heywood's *If You Know Not Me* (1604).

Scandalled (477): meaning 'disgraced, brought into ill repute or obloquy.' *OED*'s first instance of the verb (v. 1. *trans.*) is from the anonymous play *Nobody and Somebody*, which it wrongly dates 1592: the *Annals* and *Cambridge Companion* assign it to 1605. *LION* records only two more uses of *scandalled*, in *The Tempest* (1611) and Heywood's *A Maidenhead Well Lost* (1633).

White-headed (947) in 'white-headed age': although *OED*'s first example (a. 2, 'white-haired, especially from age') is as late as 1815, *LION* offers 'white-headed counsellors' in Dekker's *Old Fortunatus* (1599), 'white-headed age' in *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* (1607) by Day, William Rowley, and Wilkins, and 'white-headed squire' in Middleton's *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, now known as *The Lady's Tragedy* (1611).

French hose (1107): not specially listed in *OED*, the collocation occurs in *LION* in Shakespeare's *Henry V* (1599) and *Macbeth* (1606).

Italian cloaks (1107): not specially listed in *OED*; *LION*'s sole example is in Tomkis's *Lingua* (1607), but a 'short Italian hooded cloak' is mentioned in Marlowe's *Edward II* (1592).

Polonian (1108, 1493): *OED* records use of the adjective (as in *Woodstock*'s 'Polonian shoes' and 'Polonian peaks') from 1585 and of the noun (meaning 'a Pole') from 1599, but *LION* reveals that in English drama Polonians—Poles are mentioned as early as *Edward III* (1590) and *Selinus* (1592), whereas the adjective suddenly becomes current at the turn of the century, in *Thomas Lord Cromwell* (1600), *Wily Beguiled* (1602), and Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One* (1605) and *Your Five Gallants* (1607). The adjective is usually associated with fashions, particularly footwear, as in *Woodstock*. (In *Cromwell*, the word may be an error, the servant Hodge's mysterious 'Polonian Casiges' perhaps being Bolognian sausages.)

Sempstry or *seamstry* (1169): ‘needlework’; *OED*’s first citation is from Florio in 1598, its next being this one from *Woodstock*, in this case dated 1630. *LION* affords no further examples.

Coherence (1186, 1500, 1506): *Woodstock*, on this occasion dated 1580, yields *OED*’s first example of sense 2. *transf* and *jig.* of association other than material, with the next coming from Florio in 1598. Thus within a few lines of the play, there are two words, *sempstry* and *coherence*, for which the first *OED* citation, outside *Woodstock*, is Florio in 1598. In at least some of the *Woodstock* contexts, the coherence (‘cohesion, connection’) is, however, material, but *OED* does not record this sense (1. *lit.*) before 1613. As a technical term in logic or discourse (*OED* 3, 4, and 5) the word goes back to 1581. *LION* yields only six instances of the noun in any sense, one in 1633 and the other five belonging to the period 1597-1608: 2 *Henry IV* (1597-8), Jonson’s *Every Man out of his Humour* (1599), Marston’s *Antonio and Mellida* (1601), Dekker’s and Webster’s *Westward Ho* (1604), and Chapman’s *Byron’s Conspiracy* (1608).

Whisperer (1264, and eight more times): *OED* distinguishes two senses, which tend to merge: ‘one who speaks in a whisper,’ of which the first example is dated 1567, and ‘a secret slanderer or tale-bearer,’ of which the first example is dated 1547-50. The second sense is more apt to the *Woodstock* contexts. *LION* lists eight instances of the word outside *Woodstock*, the three earliest belonging to the first few years of the seventeenth century: one in Heywood’s *The Royal King and the Loyal Subject* (1602) and two in Jonson’s *Sejanus* (1603).

Bum.fiddle (1274): in the spellings *bumfeage*, *bumfeagle*, and *bum feg*, *OED* cites examples of the verb from 1589 onward, but the earliest example of the spelling *bum.fiddle*, apart from this from *Woodstock* (which *OED* here dates 1560), is in 1611. *LION* offers instances in Fletcher’s *The Chances* (1617), Field’s and Massinger’s *The Fatal Dowry* (1618), and Brome’s *The Jovial Crew* (1641).

Ignoramus (1281): the noun is used attributively in the phrase ‘ignoramus fellows,’ meaning ‘ignorant fellows, illiterates, ignoramuses.’ *OED* notes use of the word in a specialized legal sense (connected with the rejection of a bill or indictment because of insufficient evidence) from 1577, but its first instance of the sense ‘an ignorant person’ is dated 1616. *LION* affords seven other uses of the word, all in the legal sense or in relation to the character Ignoramus in George Ruggle’s play of that title (1615). The first *LION* use of the word is in the anonymous *Charlemagne* (1604).

Hermaphrodite (1286): the word goes back to 1398, but the earliest of *LION*’s thirty-six examples are in Marston’s *Antonio and Mellida* (1601) and *What You Will* (1601) and Dekker’s *Satiromastix* (1601), followed by Chapman’s *Monsieur d’Olive* (1605) and Middleton’s *A Mad World My Masters* (1606), Jonson’s *Volpone* (1606), Beaumont and Fletcher’s *Love’s Cure* (1606), Beaumont’s *Knight of the Burning Pestle* (1607), and Sharpham’s *Cupid’s Whirligig* (1607).

All-commanding (1343): *OED* notes (under *all*. E.1.7 *advb.* with *pr.* *ppl.*) that, with the exception of *all-wielding*, no examples of *all* combinations occur much before 1600. Its earliest citation for *all commanding* is from the Chettle-Dekker-Haughton play, *Patient Grissel* (1600). *LION*’s fifteen instances confirm this precedence. Its next earliest examples are from the anonymous *The Fair Maid of the Exchange* (1602) and Alexander’s *Croesus* (1604).

Apostata (1372): though the word is very old, *LION*’s fourteen examples begin with Marston’s *The Dutch Courtesan* (1604), Barnes’s *The Devil’s Charter* (1606), Marston’s and Barkstead’s *The Insatiate Countess* (1607), the Day-Rowley-Wilkins play *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* (1607), in which the word occurs twice, and Day’s *Humour out of Breath* (1608).

Dunstable (1525, 1533, and later): this is not strictly a matter of vocabulary, but allusions to Dunstable, associated with rustic simplicity by virtue of a quibble on ‘dunce,’ begin in *LION* with *Sir John Oldcastle* (1599), followed by Dekker’s and Webster’s *Northward Ho* (1605), three times.

Sheep-biter (1748): *OED* (2.fig. a and b) defines as a ‘malicious or censorious fellow’ or a ‘shifty, sneaking, or thievish fellow,’ its first example being from Nashe in 1589 and the next from *Twelfth Night* (1601). *LION* reveals that the word occurs in the anonymous *Edmond Ironside*, of unknown date but assigned to 1593 by the *Cambridge Companion* and to 1595 by the *Annals*, and in the anonymous *Mucedorus*, conjecturally dated 1590 but first published in 1598. Otherwise most of *LION*’s instances cluster within the period 1601-1605: besides *Twelfth Night*, there are Heywood’s *How a Man May Choose* (1602), Chapman’s *May Day* (1602), Dekker’s and Webster’s *Westward Ho* (1604), and Dekker’s *2 Honest Whore* (1605).

Masking-suit (1840): although *OED* does not record this compound, *LION* affords five further examples, of which four are of the period 1605-1607: Dekker’s *2 Honest Whore* (1605) and Middleton’s *A Mad World My Masters* (1606), *The Revenger’s Tragedy* (1606), and *Your Five Gallants* (1607); the fifth is in a play of 1641.

Turkey-cock (1877): *OED*’s first example of the appropriate sense (2.b. fig. and allusively) is from *Twelfth Night* (1601). *LION* reveals that the term is also applied to a person in Chettle’s, Dekker’s and Haughton’s *Patient Grissel* (1599) and Dekker’s *Satiromastix* (1601). Persons are likened to turkey-cocks in *Henry V* (1598-99) and Dekker’s *2 Honest Whore* (1605). An interesting point is that both *sheep-biter* (as in *Woodstock*, line 1748) and *turkey-cock*, are terms of abuse applied to Malvolio in a single scene, and within twenty-five lines of one another, of *Twelfth Night* (2.5.5, 29): this scene, the gulling of Malvolio, is the most unforgettable in the play, and it seems likely that the author of *Woodstock* had witnessed it.³⁸ *LION* yields no other play in the whole of English drama in which both *sheep-biter* and *turkey cock* are used figuratively of persons.

Torturing (2368), adjectivally in the phrase ‘torturing grief’: *OED* dates the present participial adjective from 1611, but *LION* gives examples in Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus* (1592), in ‘torturing pain,’ and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (1595), in ‘a torturing hour,’ *A Larum for London* (1599), Chapman’s *The Gentleman Usher* (1602), Alexander’s *Croesus* (1604), and the anonymous *Nobody and Somebody* (1605), as well as in later plays.

Withdrawing-chamber (2411): although this is a very old word, *LION*’s only examples for the whole of English drama fall into two small clusters: Chapman’s *May Day* (1602) and Heywood’s *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (1603); and two plays by Shirley and one by Mabbe of 1629-35.

Elate (2443): the Ghost of Edward the Black Prince warns Woodstock, having come ‘from my tomb elate at Canterbury.’ *OED* gives the past participial adjective a literal meaning, ‘lifted, raised,’ dating its first citation 1730, and a figurative one, ‘exalted, lofty,’ which it connects with persons and feelings and records as early as 1386. *LION* is more helpful, its six instances revealing the adjective to be, in drama at least, a Marstonism occurring in *Histrionmastix* (1599), *Antonio and Mellida* (1601), *Antonio’s Revenge* (1601), which has ‘your elate spirit,’ and *The Insatiate Countess* (1607). The one other example is in John Tatham’s *The Distracted State* (1641).

Miching (2648), as a participial adjective meaning ‘skulking,’ in the phrase ‘miching rascal’: *OED*’s first citation is dated 1581, but the only *LION* instances (outside *Woodstock*) are in *Hamlet* (1600-1), Heywood’s *2 If You Know Not Me* (1605), Chapman’s *The Widow’s Tears* (1605), and Goffe’s *The Raging Turk* (1618). So three of the four plays, apart from *Woodstock*,

that contain the adjective belong to 1600-1605, and the one verbal use in *LION* is in Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (1603).

Trampler (2979): this occurs in the phrase 'a trampler in the law,' where it means 'a go-between, intermediary; an attorney' (*OED* sense b). *OED*'s first citation is from Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One* (1605, printed 1608), with its second coming from the Middleton-Rowley collaboration *The World Tossed at Tennis* (1620). *LION*'s only additional example is from Brome's *The Sparagus Garden* (1635)

Plowden (2989): this is not strictly a matter of vocabulary, but *LION*'s only other reference to the lawyer Plowden, whose French law reports had been printed in 1571, is in Jonson's *Every Man out of his Humour* (1599).

No doubt a more time-consuming investigation could lengthen the above list. But there is enough evidence here to suggest rather strongly that *Woodstock* was written no earlier than the period of 1598-1608, when most of the words came into vogue in the London theaters. Acknowledged lovers of neologisms, such as Marston and the Dekker of *Satiromastix*, are likely to have led the way, rather than been influenced by the unknown author of *Woodstock*. The *LION* dates given are those of probable first performance, appearance in print often coming several years later. Much of *Woodstock*'s diction has an Inns of Court flavor associated with the early Jacobean years (*buckram bags, certiorari, trampler, Plowden*). Lake found the colloquial contractions like those of 'Middleton's early comedies and *The Revenger's Tragedy*,' and the legal diction has precisely the same connexions. The pause patterns, as we have seen, also indicate composition at about this date, though possibly later. The obsession with modish dress, especially imported styles, also enters English drama at the turn of the century (*sumpter, French hose, Italian cloaks, Polonian shoes, masking-suit*). The contrast is, of course, with Thomas of Woodstock's 'simple clothing' with 'coat of English frieze' (106-108). Sir Thomas Cheyney mocks the 'wild and antic habits' of the court in the space of a few lines:

French hose, Italian cloaks, and Spanish hats,
Polonian shoes with peaks a hand full long (1107-9)

As we have seen, *French hose* is recorded in *LION* in 1599 and 1606, and *Italian cloak* in 1607 (though Marlowe had referred to a 'short Italian hooded cloak' in 1592), while the adjective *Polonian* first appears (perhaps mistakenly) in 1600, with further references in 1602, 1606, 1607, and later. The 1602 allusion (in *Wily Beguiled*) is to strutting 'in a pair of Polonian legs,' while Holiday in 1618 (*Technogamia*) writes that 'the creaking of his high-heeled shoe would articulate exact Polonian' and Randolph in 1627 (*Hey for Honesty, Down with Knavery*) refers to a 'heel' that is 'a Polonian or a French heel.' Middleton in *Your Five Gallants* (1607) brings together 'the Italian kiss, the French cringe, with the Polonian waste.' *LION* does not have a *Spanish hat* or *hats*, but the Beaumont and Fletcher play *Love's Cure* (1606) offers the words 'though now your blockhead be covered with the Spanish block,' where 'block' is a hat. Cheyney's two lines thus exhibit diverse signs of having been composed several years after Shakespeare's *Richard II* (1595), and the fact that the earliest four of *LION*'s five allusions to a *masking-suit*, outside *Woodstock*, belong to the period 1606-7 and that *LION*'s instances of the word *sumpter* start in 1601, leads to the same conclusion.

In considering language related to clothing we must, however, distinguish between stage use of particular words and the historical wearing of particular garments or accoutrements. French hose and Italian cloaks were certainly worn in England in the sixteenth century.³⁹ The only instances that *LION: English Prose Fiction* affords of *Spanish hat* are in Thomas Nashe's *Lenten Stuff*

(1599) and the anonymous *The Merry Conceited Jests of George Peele* (1607), for which Peele, who died in 1596, is unlikely to have been in any way responsible; and the only citations from *LION: English Poetry* are dated 1600 (Samuel Rowlands) and 1602 (Ralph Byrchensha). *Woodstock*'s 'Polonian shoes with peaks a hand full long' raise more complicated issues. The playwright seems to have been attempting accurate historical detail. Peaked shoes, 'with long spear-like points extending beyond the toes,' became fashionable during Richard II's reign, and were known as *crakows*, after Cracow in Poland.⁴⁰ Yet *Woodstock*'s adjective *Polonian* was not applied to footwear until the seventeenth century. In *Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*, M. Channing Linthicum cites two allusions to *Polonian*, *Polonia*, or *Polony* shoes, or to their high heels, in 1611, and two more in 1617 and 1618.⁴¹ One of the 1611 instances is recorded by *OED* under *Polonia heel*—in Samuel Rowlands's *More Knaves Yet*—and Rowlands (or pseudo-Rowlands) also supplies *OED* with its first example of the attributive or adjectival use of *Polony*, in 'a Polony shoe' in *Martin Marke-all* (1610). A search of *LION: English Poetry* finds the collocation *Polonian shoes* in George Wither's *Abuses Stript and Whipt* (1613) and a reference to *Polony* shoemaking in John Taylor's *Superbae Flagellum* (1621). So the author of *Woodstock* evidently uses seventeenth-century terminology, even as he evokes a fourteenth-century fashion. It may be relevant that pointed toes in footwear, though not of the extreme fourteenth-century kind, were replacing more square and round shapes in the first two decades of the seventeenth century.⁴²

Talk about Thomas of Woodstock's hose may be more specific to the time of composition. To honor Richard's coronation, Woodstock reluctantly decks himself out with uncharacteristic extravagance: 'Ten acres of good land are stitched up here,' he protests, adding that 'Should this fashion last' he would need to 'raise new rents,' whereas 'There's honest plain dealing in my tother hose' (452-58). Apparently the distinction drawn is between the close-fitting trunk hose of Elizabeth's reign and the more bulky, baggy hose fashionable in James's.⁴³

Woodstock prefers the clothing of an older generation. The king's gibes at his 'tother hose' would make much better sense around 1610, let us say, than around 1590, when the tight round Elizabethan hose were still normal.

But, to return to vocabulary, while *Woodstock* contains many words first heard on the English stage in the seventeenth century, it is, in contrast, notably deficient in words typical of 'the Marlowe years' but later falling into disuse.⁴⁴ Editors have noted verbal parallels with Shakespeare's Henry V plays, particularly 2 *Henry VI*, and with Marlowe's *Edward II*.⁴⁵ But a reader without preconceptions about the dating of *Woodstock* is as likely to be struck by apparent echoes of later Shakespeare plays, notably *Much Ado About Nothing* (1598). In particular, the self-important but illiterate malaprop Master Simon Ignorance, Bailiff of Dunstable ('You shall find me most pestiferous to assist ye,' 1649), seems to owe more than a little to Dogberry and his henchmen. The Bailiff who says, 'Mine ears have heard your examinations, wherein you uttered most shameful treason, for ye said 'God bless my lord Tresilian' ' (1695-96) sounds very like Dogberry or Verges, and such orders from Bailiff Ignorance as 'Come, sir, stand close' (1649) and 'I charge ye in his Highness' name' (1607-1608) or from Nimble as 'I charge ye in the King's name to stand till we have done with you' (1603) may be paralleled in the scenes with Dogberry and the Watch: 'You are to bid any man stand, in the Prince's name' (3.3.24-25), 'Yet stand close' (3.3.103-104), 'We charge you in the Prince's name. Stand' (3.3.157-58), 'I charge you in the Prince's name, accuse these men' (4.2.35-36). Nimble's question, 'But how if we meet with some ignoramus fellows, my lord?' (1281), his declaration that he and his colleagues will not 'meddle with' women (1284), and his 'Well, sir' (1291), seem influenced by memories of the queries of Dogberry's Watchmen and his instructions: 'How if a will not stand?' (3.3.26), 'How if they will not?' (3.3.43), 'How if the nurse be asleep and will not hear us?' (3.3.64-5), 'Well, sir' (3.3.47), 'meddle...with' (3.3.50).

Less strikingly, the plain-speaking Kent who proclaims that he does not fear to speak up in Lear's best interests, even at the risk of losing his life, and whose rebuke, 'whilst I can vent clamour / From my throat I'll tell thee thou dost evil,' provokes the King's 'Hear me; on thy allegiance hear me!' (*The History of King Lear*, 1.155-57), seems to be recalled in the plain-speaking Thomas of Woodstock's 'Afore my God I'll speak, King Richard,/ Were I assured this day my head should off: / I tell ye, sir, my allegiance stands excused / In justice of the cause. Ye have done ill' (527-30); and, on the level of vocabulary, not only is there the possible reminiscence of *Twelfth Night*, 2.5, but Nimble's complaint that Tresilian is 'monstrously translated' (301) sounds like a distant echo of Peter Quince in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595): 'O monstrous!...Bless thee, Bottom, bless thee. Thou art translated' (3.2.99-112), since *LION* detects no other juxtaposition in English drama of the verb 'translate' with 'monstrous' or its derivatives. The 'spruce courtier' who enters *Woodstock* at 1426 'out-Osrics Osric,'⁴⁶ of whom he must surely be a descendant, as he expatiates on court fashion before making his exit at 1524. One wonders too about the lines in *Woodstock* in which York proclaims that 'This house of Plashey, brother/ Stands in a sweet and pleasant air, ifaith' (1306-1307), since he goes on to say that the surrounding trees 'in summer serve for pleasant fans/ To cool ye' (1309-10). Among the most haunting lines of *Macbeth* (1606) are those in which Duncan comments on the site of Macbeth's castle: 'This castle hath a pleasant seat. The air/ Nimbly and sweetly recommends itself/ Unto our gentle senses' and Banquo adds his image of the breeding habits of the 'guest of summer, / The temple-haunting martlet,' mentioning 'heaven's breath' and the delicate air (1.6.1-10). In each case an ancestral home evokes 'sweet,' 'pleasant,' 'air,' 'summer,' and the idea of gentle breezes.⁴⁷

IV

In its extant form, *Woodstock* is thus markedly later than Shakespeare's *Richard II* (1595) in its linguistic forms, its metrical characteristics, and in much of its vocabulary. Could it have acquired all these attributes through having been revised in the early Jacobean years, as Lake suggested? Whereas Frijlinck considered the main text of the *Woodstock* manuscript to be a scribal copy, Rositer, noting one or two alterations apparently made *currente calamo*, toyed with the idea that it may have been in the hand of the playwright himself. 'Both views could be reconciled,' writes Lake, if the man responsible 'was in fact a creative reviser, both copying out an older text and in places making his own alterations.'⁴⁸ Because of the linguistic forms linking *Woodstock* to *When You See Me You Know Mee*, he proposed Samuel Rowley for the role of reviser.

Mere copying, with some tinkering, could not, however, have changed the whole metrical character of the verse: the pause patterns, for example, are built into its very structure, and to convert masculine endings to feminine endings a revising scribe would have had to use quite different words and phrases. Nor is all that seventeenth-century vocabulary a mere veneer on the surface of the play: it too is intrinsic to the dialogue. Moreover, the rewriting of other dramatists' plays was not a normal feature of the Elizabethan, Jacobean, or Caroline theater industry. John Kerrigan has shown that during this period refurbishments of old plays fall into two categories: when one man modified another's play text he made insertions or deletions or substituted discrete blocks of dialogue without venturing any pervasive overhaul of the original wording; it was only when a playwright revised his own work that he was apt to introduce a steady stream of verbal variants.⁴⁹ This means that Samuel Rowley is unlikely to have revised a *Woodstock* first written in 1592 or 1593, since there is no record of Rowley's employment in the theater—as a member of the Admiral's Men—before late in 1594, and his earliest known duties as playwright were carried out in 1601.⁵⁰

It remains to consider whether Rowley might have been the one and only author of *Woodstock*,

composing it at about the time he wrote the sole undoubted surviving product of his dramatic art, *When You See Me You Know Me* (1604).⁵¹ Lake certainly showed that *Woodstock* and *When You See Me* are intimately connected by their linguistic forms. For both plays he tabulated counts of the following forms (figures for *Woodstock* precede figures for *When You See Me*): ‘em (1/2), *I’m* (15/ 2), *ye* (231/220), *has* (20/41), *hath* (25/47), *does* (7/6), *doth* (6/14), *i’t’h*’ (9/10), *eth* (7/15), *o’t’h*’ (3/3), *a’t’h*’(3/0), *I’d* (6/5), ‘*sfoot* (14/2), and *zounds* (4/4). Though the absolute numbers for *has* and *hath* differ, the *has/hath ratios* (20:25 and 41:47) are almost identical. And not only are the overall profiles similar, but at least two items provide highly significant evidence. The large totals for *ye* are truly exceptional: in the whole of *LION*, 1576-1642, they are matched (or nearly matched) only by plays associated with Fletcher, whose fondness for *ye* is well-known, and by Robert Wilson’s *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* (1588), William Warner’s *Menaechmi* (1592), Henry Porter’s *The Two Angry Women of Abingdon* (1599), and Robert Chamberlain’s *The Swaggering Damsel* (1640). Even more distinctive is the liking for the contraction *eth*, which, as a search of *LION* reveals, is used in no other English play of the period 1576-1642. Lake notes that in *When You See Me eth* occurs within the stints of at least three different compositors, so must have been in their copy, which appears to have been autograph.

Lake further observes that both *Woodstock* and *When You See Mee*—‘historical (and somewhat sentimental) plays’—give characterizing oaths to their leading characters. Thomas of Woodstock twenty times has *afore my God* and five times ‘*fore God*, while King Henry VIII has nineteen instances of *mother a God* (or *mother of God*) and seven of *God’s holy mother* (besides three of *God’s mother*). Both of the main characterizers are, according to *LION*, unique to their plays. ‘Both plays,’ furthermore, ‘make copious use of phrases of assurance, such as *I warrant you* and *I assure you*, which have been noted in the past as marks of Rowley’s style.’⁵² For *I warrant* or *I assure* plus personal pronoun Lake’s figures are seventeen for *When You See Mee*, twenty-one for *Woodstock*:

In fact the two plays share an unusual number of expletives: *a God’s name*, *by my crown*, *by my faith*, *by my troth*, *by the mass*, *by the rood*, *faith*, ‘*fore God*, *god boy*, *good faith*, *ha*, *i’faith*, *law ye*, ‘*sblood*, ‘*sfoot*, *tro*, *tush*, *what ho*, and *zounds*. For his study of the Middleton canon, Jackson kept a record of all expletives in over a hundred plays, mainly of the Jacobean period. No single one of these shares as many with *Woodstock* as does *When You See Me*.⁵³

Of particular significance is that both King Richard and King Henry swear *by my crown*, and that each play has at least one example of the hyphenated *fore-god* (as well as unhyphenated forms), of the spelling *god boy* for the farewell that has become our *goodbye*, and of *law(e) ye(e)*, so spelt. Richard II and Henry VIII both swear *by my crown* four times. No other play contains as many instances: Carrell’s *The Deserving Favourite* (1629) uses the asseveration twice, and a dozen plays use it once. Hyphenation of the oath *fore-god* (or *fore-God*) is confined to six other dramatic works among the 689 processed by *LION* for the period 1576-1642: Barnes’s *The Devil’s Charter* (1606), Day’s *The Isle of Gulls* (1606), which has seven instances, Dekker’s and Webster’s *Northward Ho* (1605) and *Westward Ho* (1604), Field’s *A Woman is a Weathercock* (1609), and Heywood’s *2 If You Know Not Mee* (1605). Outside *Woodstock* and *When You See Mee*, there are sixty-five cases altogether of ‘*fore God*, with or without the hyphen, in *LION* plays of 1576-1642, and, if we ignore the problematical *Sir Thomas More*, the earliest is in Jonson’s *The Case is Altered* (1597), with the next coming in Shakespeare’s *Much Ado About Nothing* (1598) and *Henry V* (1598-9), and all but two falling within the period 1597-1611. *God boy(e)*, without a following pronoun, occurs in only five other plays in the whole of *LION*, from medieval times to the early twentieth century, and all were written within the period 1598-1605: Day’s *Law Tricks* (1604), Dekker’s and Webster’s *Northward Ho* (1605), where the components are hyphenated, Marston’s *What You Will*, Chapman’s, Jonson’s, and Marston’s *Eastward Ho* (1605), where the hyphen is again employed, and Porter’s *Two*

Angry Women of Abingdon (1598-99). In addition, *God boy(e) ye* is used in Armin's *Two Maids of More-Clacke* (1606), Jonson's *The Case Is Altered*, and *Two Angry Women*, and *God boy you* in *Northward Ho*, where the components are hyphenated, Webster's *The White Devil* (1612), and Woods's *The Conflict of Conscience* (1572). *Law(e) ye(e)* is found in only six *LION*, 1576-1642, plays, besides *Woodstock* and *When You See Mee*.

An unusual feature of the expletives in both *Woodstock* and *When You See Me* is the prominence of appeals to the Virgin Mary. King Henry's *mother of God*, *God's holy mother*, and *God's mother* are supported in *When You See Me* by *God's dear lady*, *byth' blessed lady*, and *berlady*, while *Woodstock* has *by the blessed virgin*, *by blessed Mary*, and *by Mary*. Apart from *berlady*, which is fairly common, only two of these oaths appear in any *LION* play: *God's mother* is exclamatory in the anonymous *Look About You* (1599), in Dekker's and Webster's *Sir Thomas Wyatt* (1602), and in Heywood's *2 If You Know Not Me* (1605), with the variation *by God's mother* occurring once in each of Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI* (1591) and *3 Henry VI* (1591) and in Chettle's and Munday's *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon* (1598); *God's holy mother*, which is used once in Heywood's *I If You Know Not Me* (1604) and, in the form *by God's holy mother*, once in Shakespeare's *Richard III* (1592-93). There are further similarities between *Woodstock* and *When You See Me* that do not involve exact correspondence. *God a mercy* in *When You See Me* (five times) is given the fuller form in *Woodstock*: *God for thy mercy* and *God for his mercy*. In *When You See Me*, Will Summers instructs his cousin Patch, 'when thou com'st close to him, cry bah' (740), and Patch duly cries 'Boe' twice (753, 755). In *Woodstock*, the Schoolmaster expresses confidence that his deviously satirical verses will not get him into trouble—that potential informants 'shall not boe to a goose for't' (1658). In *LION*, characters exclaim *hoe* or *boh* (spelt in one of those two ways) in only three other plays, Killigrew's *The Conspiracy* (1635) and Shirley's *The Sisters* (1642), each with *hoe*, and Phineas Fletcher's *Sicelides* (1615), with *boh*; while only Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (1603) uses the *Woodstock* colloquialism, 'boe to a goose.'

From the above details it is clear not only that the expletives indicate Samuel Rowley's involvement with *Woodstock*, but that they furnish yet more confirmation of a date of composition much later than 1592 or 1593, the evidence tending to converge on the period 1598-1609, within which *god boy(e)* without a following pronoun and hyphenation of *fore-god* are found. Two more exclamations, which each occur once in *Woodstock* but not in *When You See Me*, and which have not previously been discussed, are also unknown in English drama of the early 1590s. One is *passion of me*, which *LION* shows to have been first used in the anonymous *Captain Thomas Stukeley* (1596), followed by *A Warning for Fair Women* (1599) and Marston's *Histriomastix* (1599). Of the dozen plays that contain examples, nine were written in 1599-1608. There is also a solitary instance of *passion a me* in May's *The Heir* (1620). The other significant evidence comes from *good troth*. This occurs in thirteen *LION*, 1576-1642, plays, besides *Woodstock*, beginning with Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595), Jonson's *Poetaster* (1601), and Dekker's *Blurt Master Constable* (1601).

The liberal use in both *Woodstock* and *When You See Mee* of *I warrant* and *I assure* may seem of little significance—these are common colloquialisms. But the frequency of their occurrence in these two plays is truly exceptional. According to *LION*, a total of twenty or more for *I warrant* and *I assure* (whether followed by a personal pronoun or not) is attained by only twelve of the 689 dramatic works written between 1576 and 1642. *Woodstock* has twenty-two and *When You See Mee* twenty-nine. The ten other plays have totals ranging from twenty to thirty-one. Seven of them belong to the period 1598-1609, and the other three are dated 1614, 1619, and 1635. So this evidence contributes to the case for dating *Woodstock* after *Richard II*, independently of its efficacy as a pointer to Rowley's authorship.

Lake's table of contractions and other linguistic forms suggesting an association between *Woodstock* and *When You See Me* may also be appreciably augmented. In the following list figures for *Woodstock* are again followed by figures for *When You See Me*: *ne'er* (7/19), *on's* (2/3), *at's* (2/1), *h'as* (1/5), *e'en* (3/2), *I'd* (6/5), *if't* (1/1), *an't* (5/1), *on't* (1/1), *in't* (1/1), *for't* (11/6), *is't* (10/6), *toth'* (7/2), *byth'* (3/3), *th'adst* (2/1), *th'ast* (2/1), *th'art* (6/4), *y'are* (11/7). *Woodstock* has *lend's* and *When You See Me* *eat's*, and *Woodstock* has four further contractions of 't after a verb, and *When You See Me* eight. Though contractions are more frequent in *Woodstock*, the plays tend to favour the same ones. A few are rare. *On's* and *at's* (as these contractions have been normalized above) are fairly common in the seventeenth century, but the unapostrophized forms are very much less so. In the whole of *LION: English Drama*, covering some four thousand plays, only three plays have both *ons* and *ats*, without apostrophes: *Woodstock*, *When You See Mee*, and Robert Taylor's *The Hog Hath Lost his Pearl* (1613), in which each contraction occurs once.

Preferences among connectives are tolerably similar in the two plays. *Woodstock* employs both *betwixt* (five times) and *between* (three times), and in *When You See Mee* the ratio is much the same: eleven *betwixt*, eight *between*. Both texts favor *amongst* over *among* (*Woodstock* 12/0, *When You See Me* 61/2) and *whilst* over *while* (*Woodstock* 5/2, *When You See Me* 61/2); but *Woodstock* also has *whilse*, which survives in no other *LION* play. In both texts the affirmative particle *Ay* (spelt *I*), predominates over *Yes*: *Woodstock* 18/6, *When You See Mee* 22/8.

When You See Mee affords one very striking link with *Woodstock* in having a Constable and his Watch who seem no less derivative from Dogberry and his men than are Bailiff Simon Ignorance, Nimble, and their friends. They are introduced in scene v (line 944): 'Enter the Constable and Watch, Prichall the Cobbler, being one bearing a Lantern.' Similarly, *Much Ado*, 3.3, begins with the entry 'Enter Dogberry and his copartner Verges, with the Watch.' The *Much Ado* Watch also carry a lantern, to signify a night-time scene. Rowley's worthies repeatedly address one another as 'neighbour(s),' just as Verges addresses his leader as 'neighbour Dogberry' (3.3.7) and Dogberry his men as 'honest neighbours' (3.3.88), and Leonato calls Dogberry 'honest neighbour' (3.5.1, 40) and Dogberry and Verges together 'Neighbours' (3.5.17). The First Watchman in *When You See Me* refers to 'goodman Dormouse...an honest and quiet soul' (1006-1008), as Dogberry refers to 'Goodman Verges...honest as the skin between his brows' (3.5.9-12) and tells another member of his team that he 'speaks like an ancient and most quiet watchman' (3.3.38-39). Just as Dogberry carries out Verges's suggestion that he give the Watch 'their charge' (3.3.7) and then bids them good night, so Rowley's Constable exhorts his men, says 'I need not to repeat your charge again' (972), and bids them good night. More importantly, Rowley's First Watchman matches Dogberry's bunglings of the English language, as when he endorses Master Constable's view that the stews 'are places of much slaughter and redemption, and many cruel deeds of equity and wickedness are committed there' (958-60), or assures neighbour Prichall 'every sensible watchman is to seek the best reformation to his own destruction' (989-90). In fact, the confounding of redemption and damnation is reminiscent of the very opening exchange between Verges and Dogberry, when Verges says of the Watch that 'it were pity but they should suffer salvation' and Dogberry demurs 'Nay, that were a punishment too good for them if they should have any allegiance in them' (3.3.2-5). Dogberry's malapropisms continue to muddle virtue and vice. And the Watch in *Much Ado* who, knowing 'what belongs to a watch,' 'will rather sleep than talk' (3.3.36-37) and resolve to 'sit here upon the church bench till two, and then all to bed' (3.3.86-87) have their counterparts in the *When You See Me* crew, who determine to 'steal a nap' (1013).

In its metrical features, *When You See Mee* is not so dissimilar to *Woodstock* as to rule out the likelihood of common authorship. Some 24 percent of verse lines are rhymed, compared with the 21 percent of *Woodstock*. The proportion of lines with feminine endings is, however, lower in

When You See Me than in *Woodstock*. In order to ensure that my figures were comparable with those of Timberlake, I made my own personal count for *Woodstock*, obtaining almost exactly the same results, in terms both of actual tallies and of percentages. My figures of 15 percent for a strict count of *When You See Mee* and 17 percent for a count that includes proper names may thus confidently be set beside Timberlake's for *Woodstock*. The percentages for the two plays are appreciably different, but not overwhelmingly so. The somewhat higher proportion of rhyme in *When You See Me* might have slightly inhibited use of feminine endings, even in unrhymed lines. Some 17 percent of *Woodstock*'s feminine endings, and 13 percent of *When You See Me*'s, consist of monosyllables, such as *us, me, thee, it, them*. The pause patterns of *When You See Me* are also compatible with Rowley's responsibility for *Woodstock*. The play's first 700 lines yield the following percentages for pauses within the nine syllabic positions: 6.4, 7.7, 5.0, 30.5, 19.5, 22.7, 5.0, 2.7, 0.5. A graph again shows twin peaks for pauses after the fourth and sixth syllables, but in this play the first is the higher. The verse of *When You See Me* is, therefore, in all respects less 'advanced' than that of *Woodstock*: it has more rhyme, fewer feminine endings—of which a lower proportion are monosyllabic and a pause pattern less exclusively associated with the seventeenth century, though Marston's *The Malcontent* (1604), *The Dutch Courtesan* (1605), and *Sophonisba* (1605) provide the closest matches. So, if Samuel Rowley wrote *Woodstock*, he almost certainly did so sometime after 1604, when he evidently composed *When You See Me*.

Woodstock is undoubtedly the better play, though *When You See Mee* has its points of interest, beyond its foreshadowings of the Shakespeare-Fletcher collaboration, *Henry VIII or All Is True*. Both these chronicle histories mix orthodoxy and subversiveness. If 'On the matters of civil war and obedience to the king, the author of *Woodstock* is example, explicit, and scrupulously orthodox,' while accepting the 'doctrine that a man must not obey the king to the danger of his immortal soul,'⁵⁴ *When You See Mee* is no less 'politically correct' in toeing a Protestant line. Yet *Woodstock* boldly 'highlights the grievances of the common people' and 'finds so much justification for the rebellion led by the Council' after the loyal hero's murder as to compromise the conventional pieties for which he had been spokesman, while *When You See Mee* 'challenges patriarchal assumptions more emphatically than does Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*.'⁵⁵ In dramatizing Holinshed's chronicle, the author of *Woodstock* 'handled his historical sources very freely, frequently shifting the order of events belonging to this period of fifteen years,' and in *When You See Mee*, Rowley, working from Holinshed and Foxe, 'flouts chronology with a freedom unusual even in the chronicle plays of his age.'⁵⁶ *Woodstock* is built on a Morality Play struggle between Richard II's sage uncles and his dissolute young favorites for dominance over the king and his government of the realm, and *When You See Me* dramatizes the conflict between Catholic and Protestant interests, represented by Wolsey and Cranmer, for influence over King Henry VIII. In *Woodstock*, Richard's Queen Anne-a-Beame (Ann of Bohemia), although a dutiful wife, speaks up for the uncles and denounces the favorites, and in *When You See Me* Henry's Queen Katherine Parr debates against the Catholics.

The verse of the two plays has further similarities. Rossiter's point that in *Woodstock* it 'often overruns into rough alexandrines, some times beyond' also applies to *When You See Me*. Whether or not Samuel Rowley was, as has been conjectured, the brother of William Rowley, he shares his hit-or-miss attitude to iambic pentameters, often overloading a line with syllables that disturb the iambic beat or dealing out the requisite ten with little regard for stress. Nine-syllable lines are common in both plays, and the dovetailing of part lines at the ends and beginnings of speeches is the exception rather than the rule.

But the most striking characteristic of the verse of these two histories is the penchant for jingles involving -y endings to words of three or more syllables, as in the following lines from *When You See Mee*:

I'll go and fetch them to your majesty,
And pray your highness view them graciously.
(2269-70)

One is reminded of the Prologue to *The Murder of Gonzago*, which Hamlet mockingly likens to 'the posy of a ring':

For us and for our tragedy
Here stooping to your clemency
We beg your hearing patiently
(3.2.142-44)

In *Woodstock* and *When You See Me* the rhymes are in pentameters, not tetrameters, but, as in the Hamlet play-within-the-play, they may extend beyond the couplet, as when in *Woodstock* Tresilian continues, with 'Law must extend unto severity,' the rhyming with which Greene's speech ends:

But as a tyrant unto tyranny
And so confound them all eternally
(652-53)

At one point in *When You See Mee*, five consecutive verse lines end with 'speedily,' 'Landersey,' 'Burgundy,' 'majesty,' and 'amity' (1761-65). The rhyming of the polysyllable with a monosyllable such as 'me' or 'see' or 'fly' or 'die' is also common, as in the *Woodstock* sequence 'eye,' 'cruelly,' 'me,' 'contrary' (2008-11), where the manuscript spellings 'cruellye' and 'contrarye' help show up the rhymes. These jingles may even incorporate the unstressed endings of dissyllabic words, as when 'merry' rhymes with 'already' in *Woodstock* (2080-81) or 'duty' with 'majesty' in *When You See Mee* (1536-37), and plurals sometimes half-rhyme with singulars, as when 'enemies' is followed by 'felicity' in *When You See Mee* (162-63). A few cases may have been unintentional. Altogether some 116 polysyllabic words in -y or -ies in *When You See Mee* and fifty-nine in *Woodstock* contribute to such rhyming or half-rhyming. In no fewer than forty-one of the *When You See Mee* cases, the polysyllabic word is 'majesty.' However, for the purposes of comparing *Woodstock* and *When You See Mee* with a range of plays by other dramatists, it is simpler to concentrate on lines in which a polysyllable in -y or -ies rhymes with at least one other. There are twenty-three such lines in *Woodstock*, seventy-four in *When You See Mee*. In this respect, too, one might say that *Woodstock* represents an advance on *When You See Mee*, since the jingling effect becomes less obtrusive. Furthermore, in *Woodstock* a potential jingle is sometimes interrupted by a normal line, as in the sequence of line-endings 'deputy,' 'us,' 'clemency' (2778-80) or 'company,' 'stars,' 'nobility' (2803-2805). This avoidance of the blatant also seems like progress.

A careful search through thirty plays of the period 1587-1608 reveals that Rowley's liking of jingles involving polysyllables ending in -y or -ies is unusual, though not unique. The majority even of plays that make substantial use of rhyme have few of the Rowleyan jingles. George Wilkins's *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* (1606), for example, has considerably more rhymed lines than either *Woodstock* or *When You See Mee* but is completely devoid of polysyllabic rhymes in -y or -ies. Altogether nineteen of the plays surveyed have only four or fewer examples, six plays have six to ten, and five plays have more than ten.⁵⁷ We may concentrate on this last small group, for which the figures are:

Christopher Marlowe, *I Tamburlaine* (1587) 16
Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy* (1587) 22

Thomas Dekker, <i>Old Fortunatus</i> (1590)	16
John Marston, <i>Histrionomastix</i> (1599)	21
Barnabe Barnes, <i>The Devil's Charter</i> (1606)	47

The one play that comes closer than *Woodstock* to matching *When You See Me's* extraordinarily high figure is *The Devil's Charter*. This even has a sequence of ten lines ending in polysyllables in -y, when the First Gentleman's litany of 'sodomy,' 'adultery,' 'perfidy,' 'gluttony,' and (lack of) 'integrity' is completed by the Second Gentleman's 'verity,' 'cruelty,' 'treachery,' 'apostasy,' and 'dexterity,' after which the two speakers alternate five endings in -ation. Barnes's is an extravagant, almost parodic style, and the polysyllabic jingles are self-consciously introduced. In Barnes's verse an exceptionally large number of unrhymed lines also end in words of three or more syllables. Nobody could mistake Barnes's verse for Rowley's. *Histrionomastix* also has its element of deliberate burlesque. Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* was probably the main influence on Rowley's adoption of this 'ornament.' In Kyd's play, after the Ghost of Andrea has delivered his long exposition, Revenge adds six lines that end:

Here sit we down to see the mystery,
 And serve for Chorus in this tragedy.
 (1.1.90-91)⁵⁸

And Revenge concludes the play with the couplet:

For here though death hath end their misery,
 I'll there begin their endless tragedy.
 (4.5.47-48)

Most of Kyd's other such polysyllabic rhymes are no less strategically placed. Kyd differs from Rowley and the author of *Woodstock*, however, in using relatively few rhymes between a polysyllable in -y or -ies and a monosyllable, so that the total number of cases of rhyming lines ending in polysyllabic words in -y or -ies is thirty-four, not much more than half as many as the fifty-nine of *Woodstock*. *I Tamburlaine*, *Old Fortunatus*, and *Histrionomastix* are more like *Woodstock* in this respect, but it remains true that none offers figures that *more* nearly approach those for *When You See Me* than *Woodstock* does. So this item of evidence does tend to strengthen the suspicion that Samuel Rowley was the author of *Woodstock*.

There is one more possible link in the case for Rowley's authorship. As we have seen, the chances are that *Woodstock* was revived by Prince Charles's Men, or their successors at Salisbury Court, the King's Revels. Boas believed that the infant Charles, born 29 May 1630, became nominal patron of the famous company known in turn as the Admiral's, Prince Henry's, and Palsgrave's.⁵⁹ Throughout his long career in the theater, this was Samuel Rowley's company, by which, in its guise as Prince Henry's, *When You See Me* was played, as the Quarto title-pages of 1605 and 1613 aver. There is ample record of Rowley's exclusive association with the Admiral's-Prince Henry's-Palsgrave's under each of its patrons.⁶⁰ This might seem to allow *Woodstock* a credible progress from composition by Rowley in the early Jacobean years to performance around 1632-35 by Prince Charles's or the King's Revels.

Unfortunately the matter is not so simple. Boas's view that Palsgrave's (*alias* the King of Bohemia's) became the players of the infant Prince Charles was the orthodoxy of his day, having been enshrined in John Tucker Murray's *English Dramatic Companies 1558-1642*,⁶¹ but Bentley questioned it. He found evidence that in 1626 a new company was formed called the King and Queen of Bohemia's Men, which 'probably included several former Palsgrave's men and played at the

Fortune,' but 'was not the old organization,' and which was in turn 'depleted for the formation of the King's Revels company and completely destroyed when the new Prince Charles's company was formed.'⁶² The King and Queen of Bohemia's Men would thus have served as a kind of intermediary between Palgrave's, on the one hand, and Prince Charles's and the King's Revels, on the other.

To this minor complication must be added a major obstacle. On 9 December 1621 fire consumed the Palgrave's theater, the Fortune, together with their playbooks. Rowley was evidently foremost among those who labored to provide a new repertoire. Sir Henry Herbert licensed three plays by him for the company from July 1623 to 6 April 1624: *Richard III, or The English Prophet*, *Hard-shift for Husbands*, or *Bilboe's the Best Blade*, and *A Match or No Match*. Nothing what soever is known of them. Bentley wondered whether they might have been the actors' 'memorial reconstructions' of old Rowley plays destroyed in the fire.⁶³ This theory would leave us without evidence that Rowley remained attached to the Admiral's-Prince Henry's Palsgrave's company after 1613, unless we were to picture him helping to reconstruct his lost scripts. More probably he was on hand to write new ones. But it is unlikely that Rowley composed *Woodstock* as part of the same rescue operation. The indications that the play was written not many years after *When You See Me* are perhaps not decisive: we can be less sure of a *terminus ad quern* than of a *terminus a quo*. But in March 1622 the senile Sir George Buc, who died in December, had been obliged to quit his job as Master of the Revels in favor of Sir John Astley, so if the censor's marks on the *Woodstock* manuscript are indeed Buc's, we would have to imagine Rowley writing his play, and the company submitting the playbook for licensing, within an interval of a couple of months.⁶⁴

A more plausible scenario is that the manuscript survived the fire, perhaps through being with an offshoot of the company that was on tour at the time. William Cartwright, whom Boas considered responsible for forming the Egerton MS collection as a touring repertoire, was an Admiral's-Prince Henry's-Palsgrave's man, who appears to have become a member of the King and Queen of Bohemia's company, and then of its successors, and is named in the miscellaneous traveling group at Norwich in 1635. But the *Woodstock* playbook's precise pedigree is a secondary issue. The likelihood is that it originated with seventeenth-century playwright Samuel Rowley.

It is not, however, in Rowley's hand. Lake, it will be recalled, accounted for the similarities of the colloquialisms and contractions in *Woodstock* and *When You See Me* by conjecturing that Rowley had served as 'creative copyist' of the hypothetical old *Woodstock* play. He thought that this theory might reconcile Frijlinck's evidence that the *Woodstock* manuscript was scribal with Rossiter's suspicion that some amendments to the script reflected changes of authorial intention. Rossiter was, however, ultimately unwilling 'to lay the burden some laurels of authorship on the man who wrote the body of this MS' (180). Frijlinck's case for scribal copy is far too strong, including, as it does, a large number of mis-writings and the deliberate leaving of space for half a line that the copyist evidently found illegible in the draft (vi-vii). But the crucial point is that examples of Rowley's autograph survive, in the form of short notes to Henslowe, written in 1601.⁶⁵ The hand is bold and individual, and it is not the hand that inscribed *Woodstock*. So Rowley cannot have imposed his linguistic preferences on *Woodstock* in the course of creating the extant manuscript by copying out an earlier playwright's play. The logical corollary is that the distinctive pattern of linguistic forms linking *Woodstock* and *When You See Me* must have originated in common authorship. This in turn makes it even less surprising that, although the two plays share many highly significant linguistic features, there are a few minor differences. Lake explained discrepancies by positing that Rowley as copyist was influenced by the hypothetical original, but we must reverse this explanation: the scribe would naturally have modified some of the forms in Rowley's draft, just as the compositors of the printed Quarto of *When You See Me* would sometimes have superimposed their own orthographical preferences.⁶⁶

Rowley's short notes to Henslowe nevertheless contain spellings that constitute possible links to *Woodstock*. Interestingly, Rowley repeatedly uses *ye* in addressing Henslowe, and the exceptional frequency of *ye* in *Woodstock* and *When You See Mee* is among the most significant similarities between the two plays. The 'irregular' and 'somewhat archaic' spelling of *Woodstock* is matched by Rowley, with his '<low' ('do'), 'shyllynges' ('shillings'), 'thaye' ('they'), 'dyscressyon' ('discretion'), 'dayshe' ('dash'), 'crose' ('cross'), 'boouke' ('book'), 'reseved' ('received'), 'thurtye' ('thirty'), 'dew to' ('due to'), and 'syx' ('six'). Rowley uses a capital *I* in *Jn*, *ls*, and *ft*, and a fondness for capital *I* observable in the frequency in *Woodstock* of such spellings as 'imediately,' 'lust,' 'inioyd,' and so on, even extends, as Frijlinck notes, to the occasional use of *I* in the middle of a word: 'conlecture,' 'enloy,' 'vnlust' (viii). *Woodstock's* 'more or less peculiar' (ix) use of *a* in such words as 'royatous' ('riotous') and 'quiat' ('quiet') is paralleled in Rowley's 'tharefore' ('therefore'), 'papars' ('papers') and 'cartayne' ('certain'), and a liking for medial *y* that is a marked characteristic of Rowley's notes to Henslowe also shows up in *Woodstock*: among shared spellings are 'agayne,' 'monyne,' and 'tyme,' and, although *Woodstock* has no example of 'cartayne,' it does have 'certayne.' The man who wrote 'shyllynges' and 'dyscressyon' might easily have been responsible for *Woodstock's* 'byssye' ('busy'), for example (line 137). The evidential value of these details is admittedly not great. But of one thing we can be sure: there is no need to assign odd or antiquated spellings in *Woodstock* to some amateur playwright of the early 1590s since Rowley's orthography was almost as eccentric as that of Henslowe himself.

V

What, then, are the arguments that have been put forward for supposing *Woodstock* to have preceded Shakespeare's *Richard II*? They were most fully marshaled by Rossiter, and Bullough, while acknowledging 'the very judicious doubts' of Peter Ure in his Arden edition of *Richard II*, repeats them, and concludes that '*Woodstock* preceded *Richard II* and slightly affected [Shakespeare's] handling of the reign'-which was the opinion to which Ure himself finally inclined.⁶⁷ As Ure said, it is perfectly clear from the number and nature of the verbal echoes that a relationship exists between the two plays, but the evidence fails to establish unequivocally that Shakespeare borrowed from *Woodstock*, rather than the other way about. Ure regarded as a clue to the direction of the influence the way that the idea of Richard as 'landlord' of his realm appears in the two plays. In *Richard II* John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, reproaches the king with the lines:

Landlord of England art thou now, not king.
Thy state of law is bondslave to the law.
(2.1.114-15)

In *Woodstock*, Richard is called 'landlord' five times-twice by himself and once by each of Greene, the Ghost of Edward III, and John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, whose lines come closest to those of his counterpart in *Richard II*:

And thou no king, but landlord now become
To this great state that terror'd chistendom.
(2826-27)

The term does not derive from Holinshed or other sources. Ure comments: 'It is of course more likely that Shakespeare remembered the word because it is repeated so often in the other play than that the author of *Woodstock* expanded the single reference in *Richard II* into so abundant a treatment in his own work' (xxxviii). One can only disagree. Shakespeare's Gaunt makes the antithesis between 'Landlord' and 'king' the two nouns set against each other at either end of the line-the culmination of the elaborate rhetorical pattern of his powerful rebuke, before he is interrupted by Richard. The accusation that the king has become a mere 'landlord' has a boldly inventive quality

in the context, and Gaunt's lines are undeniably memorable. It seems not at all unlikely that the author of *Woodstock* should have been struck by the term and repeated it several times in his own relatively ineffectual way. His Gaunt's 'great *state*' even appears to be a confused recollection of Shakespeare's 'Thy *state* of law is bonds slave to the law,' where the point is that Richard's legal status as monarch has been jeopardized by his leasing of the land.⁶⁸ Ure deals well with Rossiter's claims that there are passages in the opening two acts of *Richard II* that become fully intelligible only to spectators or readers already familiar with *Woodstock*. Modern audiences have no difficulty following Shakespeare's story without the alleged advantage of acquaintance with an anonymous chronicle play of doubtful origins, and, as Ure says, references that might be held puzzling in the study, if not in the theater, have plausible origins in Holinshed, *The Mirror of Magistrates*, or tradition.⁶⁹

As Ure remarks, 'There is certainly no warrant for thinking that our play [*Richard II*] was deliberately designed as a sequel to *Woodstock*: it contradicts and overlaps in a way that no sequel would' (xxxix). The fact that Shakespeare concentrates on the last two years of Richard's reign (1398-99), whereas *Woodstock* ranges more widely over events between 1382 and 1399 and dramatizes the assassination of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, which is merely alluded to in *Richard II*, is neither here nor there, so far as the question of priority is concerned. Shakespeare takes from the chronicles whatever bears most directly on the deposition and death of King Richard, with its consequences in the civil strife handled in *Henry IV*. Bolingbroke's usurpation of the crown, and the execution of his rival, are the cataclysmic events of Richard's reign, and Shakespeare focuses on their immediate causes. Arguably, the author of *Woodstock* builds his play out of shreds and patches that remain, amalgamating circumstances and happenings widely separated in historical fact, and making a largely imaginary Thomas of Woodstock the centre of the struggle between the degenerate king's uncles and various 'minions and machiavels.'⁷⁰ Instead of Richard's murder, he gives us Woodstock's.

What eventually persuades Ure of the probable priority of *Woodstock* is that a dozen of the closest parallels connect scattered portions of the anonymous play with a single scene in Shakespeare's, 2.1. Ure accepts Rossiter's reasoning that 'The writer who uses the *general idea* or a *recurrent theme* in an earlier play tends unwittingly to collect his 'echoes' into the place or places where that idea or theme is treated,' the theme being 'Richard's relation with his favourites, his financial exactions, and the attitude of graver persons...to his behaviour.'⁷¹ But the principle outlined by Rossiter is dubious in the extreme. Might not one vivid sequence impact on a reader's or spectator's imagination to disperse over his own writing?

In *Richard II*, 2.1 is the great scene in which the dying John of Gaunt delivers his marvelous oration on his native land and castigates the king for mismanaging it; in which Richard, despite the Duke of York's protests, determines to seize the inheritance of Gaunt's son, Henry Bolingbroke; and in which Northumberland begins to foment rebellion. Again, this whole scene is undoubtedly memorable, and phrases from it might well have stayed in another playwright's head. Gaunt's 'royal throne of kings' speech was already considered anthologizable by 1600, when Robert Allott's *England's Parnassus* collected passages from many English poets. Seven of these come from *Richard II*, and of the thirty-six and a half lines excerpted, twenty-five are from 2.1.⁷² Three excerpts, amounting to seven lines, are from act 1, which yields most of the other *Richard II*-*Woodstock* parallels. Allott was not even constrained, as was the author of *Woodstock*, by a chosen dramatic design, but in drawing on Shakespeare's *Richard II* he quarried those very scenes in which verbal correspondences with *Woodstock* are most numerous. Allott was indebted to Shakespeare; the author of *Woodstock* may have been so too. He would naturally have been influenced by phrases in *Richard II*, 2.1, about Richard's farming out the realm, inflicting excessive taxes, toadying to favourites, and so on, because his own play was centrally concerned with such matters.

One parallel between *Woodstock* and *Richard II*, 2.1, deserves special attention. In his great deathbed oration, Gaunt complains that England has been ‘leased out .../ Like to a tenement or pelting farm’ (2.1.59-60) and in *Woodstock*, Richard predicts that he will be censured for his willingness to ‘rent out our kingdom like a pelting farm’ (1889). The middle letters of the adjective ‘pelting’ have undergone some slight amendment and are not perfectly legible in the *Woodstock* manuscript, the scribe possibly having begun writing ‘peltry’ (a variant of ‘paltry’), but ‘pelting’ is common in the period, and there can be no doubt, given the full context, that one play echoes the other: *LION* uncovers no other instance of the collocation ‘pelting farm,’ though in *King Lear* Edgar speaks of ‘low farms / Poor pelting villages’ (*The History of King Lear*, 7.83-84). The phrases shared by *Richard II* and *Woodstock* are much more germane to Gaunt’s castigatory rhetoric in the former than to Richard’s uncharacteristic qualms of conscience in the latter. But the important point is that the passage in *Woodstock* in which the phrase occurs, namely lines 1879-98, has been marked for deletion in the same ink as used for the speakers’ names, ‘and presumably therefore at the time these were added.’⁷³ As was fairly common practice, marginal speech prefixes were added to the *Woodstock* playscript after the dialogue had been written, but their addition must, of course, have followed almost immediately upon the writing out of the dialogue, which means that the phrase ‘pelting farm’ was deleted from *Woodstock* during an early phase of the preparation of the extant script, not during its refurbishment for a late revival. This in turn implies that in the play as we know it the phrase was never spoken on stage. Gurr, noticing this anomaly but accepting that *Richard II* echoes *Woodstock*, suggests that Shakespeare may have ‘served as his company’s reader of play-texts submitted for possible purchase, and read the play under these circumstances but did not recommend it for performance.’⁷⁴ The theory that Shakespeare was creditor, not borrower, obviates the need for such *ad hoc* conjecture and permits Rowley or another to have both attended performances of *Richard II* and read it in the Quarto of 1597, in one of the two reprints of 1598, or conceivably in the Quarto of 1608, which first printed the deposition scene.⁷⁵

Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, was neither Lord Protector nor a blunt Morality figure of homespun virtue, as the anonymous play makes him, and Holinshed provides no hint of the patriot, prophet, and sage that John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, becomes in *Richard II*. So Rossiter contended that Shakespeare’s Gaunt owed something to the fictitious Woodstock and that when Shakespeare has Gaunt accuse King Richard of the murder of ‘My brother Gloucester, plain well-meaning soul’ (2.1.129) he is remembering the fictitious ‘Plain Thomas’ of *Woodstock*. But the evidence is again inconclusive. Let us begin with the second and smaller point. Gaunt’s characterization of his dead brother, Woodstock/ Gloucester, as ‘plain well-meaning soul’ doubtless strains the historical record, but it is not true that, as Rossiter claims (47), ‘there is no earthly reason,’ apart from a Shakespearean allusion to *Woodstock*, why Gaunt should speak in this way. The noblemen in Shakespeare’s histories habitually revise the past, as when in *1 Henry IV* the Percies, who had been instrumental in the deposition of Richard and elevation of Bolingbroke, depict Richard as a ‘sweet, lovely rose’ and revile ‘this thorn, this canker Bolingbroke’ (1.3.173-74). Gaunt’s brother is dead, and Richard was responsible, so the turbulent, severe, and self-seeking baron of the chronicles becomes, in rose-tinted retrospect, a ‘plain well-meaning soul.’ Besides, as Ure notes, ‘the fainter tradition of Gloucester’s virtuousness and the injustice of his end’ is at least glanced at by Holinshed, who is generally antagonistic to him, and is emphasized by *The Mirror of Magistrates* (xxxvi, n. 1).⁷⁶ As for the suggestion that Shakespeare’s steadfast John of Gaunt himself was, in part, modeled on *Woodstock*’s Plain Thomas, the ‘type of virtuous Englishry’: (a) Shakespeare could have found the germ of his unhistorical Gaunt in Berners’ translation of Froissart; (b) Gaunt’s exploits in Spain had won him some popular repute as heroic patriot; and (c), as Ure writes, Shakespeare may simply have invented a good counselor, ‘whose most important moral and dramatic function is to be rejected by the wanton king, who must indeed be so rejected if the causes of Richard’s fall are to be laid open to the audience’

(xxxix-xl).⁷⁷ And, as Ure insists (xl), since we cannot assume that *all* the traits of either *Woodstock's* hero or Shakespeare's Gaunt were present in lost historical traditions, we are, in the end, 'forced back upon somebody's literary invention,' and why should we suppose that the author of *Woodstock* was more capable of such inventiveness than Shakespeare? The identikit from which the anonymous playwright fabricated his Thomas of Woodstock clearly included elements from a nobleman who really *was* Lord Protector, the good Duke Humphrey of Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI*,⁷⁸ and *Woodstock* is also, as Rossiter observed 'a Thomas-More like humorist' (26). Why should not Shakespeare's John of Gaunt have also gone into his making?

VI

Rossiter was a fine scholar-critic, whose lucid and lively prose remains a tonic for readers jaded by the vapid abstractions of so much recent Shakespeare criticism. But his enthusiasm for *Woodstock* betrayed him into a fundamental error that has been perpetuated by virtually all subsequent commentators. *Woodstock* exerted no influence whatever upon *Richard II*, because *Woodstock* was written after *Richard II*, probably at least ten years after Shakespeare's play had first been performed and at least eight years after it had been first published in a Quarto of 1597. The evidence for this assertion seems to me conclusive. It cannot be coincidental that *Woodstock's* contractions and linguistic forms, expletives, metrical features, and vocabulary all point independently to composition in the first decade of the seventeenth century. While contractions might have been imposed by a copyist on a play originally written in the early 1590s, verse structure and language are intrinsic, so that nothing short of total rewriting could have created the version that has come down to us. And if *Woodstock* was ever totally rewritten, we have absolutely no means of knowing whether the hypothetical original contained phrases or characters that might have influenced Shakespeare. This is a case for Occam's razor which would also leave Samuel Rowley as original and sole author rather than creative scribe. Metrical matters are poorly understood these days, even by otherwise able scholars. But the evolution of English dramatic verse has been fully charted: nobody was producing iambic pentameter with the pause patterns of *Woodstock's* while Marlowe was alive, or for several years after his death in 1593. and the Chadwyck-Healey *Literature Online* database enables us to identify in *Woodstock* so many words not used in English drama until close to the end of the century that vocabulary and metre corroborate each other. In the face of their combined testimony, the arguments that have been advanced for the precedence of *Woodstock* over *Richard II* can be exposed as specious.

The case for Samuel Rowley's authorship of *Woodstock* is less overwhelming, but nevertheless very strong. Those linguistic, metrical, and lexical details that undermine the theory of a 1592-93 date of composition also connect the play with Rowley's *When You See Me You Know Me*. *Woodstock* and *When You See Me* are the only two of nearly seven hundred *LION* plays of 1576-1642 to employ the contraction *eth*, while their use of *ons* and *ats* without apostrophes is found in only one other *LION* play, and in their linguistic profiles generally *Woodstock* and *When You See Me* are remarkably similar. In a sample of over one hundred Jacobean plays none shares as many expletives with *Woodstock* as does *When You See Me*, and some of those that the two histories have in common are rare. Besides having significant stylistic similarities—such as a frequent recourse to rhyme and to polysyllabic jingles—the two plays treat historical matter in much the same way, and each has a comic constabulary apparently modeled on Dogberry and his Neighborhood Watch. More intensive investigation—of verbal parallels, with the aid of *LION*, for example—might consolidate the case,⁷⁹ but here Rowley is offered simply as an alternative to the unknown contemporary of Marlowe previously supposed to have written *Woodstock*. Whether Rowley or another Jacobean dramatist was the author of *Woodstock*, almost everything that has been said about Shakespeare's alleged debt to it and about its place in the development of English historical drama requires drastic revision. Shakespeare owed nothing to *Woodstock*. But whoever wrote *Woodstock*

certainly knew *Richard II*. Margot Heinemann judged *Woodstock* to be 'in some ways the boldest and most subversive of all Elizabethan historical plays.'⁸⁰ But it is not Elizabethan. If we are to read it in new historicist ways, we must place it, for the first time, within its rightful context.⁸¹

Notes

1. Andrew Gurr, ed., *King Richard II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 10-11.
2. Peter Ure, ed., *King Richard II* (London: Methuen, 1956), xxiv-xl.
3. I have not seen Halliwell's transcription, but the words are quoted by Wilhelmina P. Frijlinck, ed., *The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second or Thomas of Woodstock* (Malone Society Reprints, 1929), xxx. Frijlinck also describes and evaluates Wolfgang Keller's edition of 1899 and mentions Chambers, Bullen, and Fleay as among the majority of critics 'in favour of an early date between 1591 and 1593' for the play's composition (xxiii, xxx-xxxii).
4. A. P. Rossiter, ed., *Woodstock: A Moral History* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1946), 71-72. *Woodstock* is included in *Six Early Plays Related to the Shakespeare Canon: Anglistica XIV* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1965), ed. E. B. Everitt and R. L. Armstrong, and in *Elizabethan History Plays*, ed. William A. Armstrong (London: Oxford University Press, 1965); and George Parfitt and Simon Shepherd edited it as *Thomas of Woodstock* (Nottingham: Nottingham Drama Texts, 1977).
5. This is the view taken by Geoffrey Bullough in his monumental *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, 8 vols. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957-75), 3:351-97. Matthew W. Black summarizes opinion in his New Variorum Shakespeare *The Life and Death of King Richard the Second* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1955), 473-77, as do Anne Lancashire and Jill Levenson within their chapter on 'Anonymous Plays' in *The Predecessors of Shakespeare*, ed. Terence P. Logan and Denzell S. Smith (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1973), 288-301. The many entries indexed under '*Woodstock*' in Josephine A. Roberts's *Richard II: An Annotated Bibliography*, 2 vols. (New York and London: Garland, 1988) show how prevalent the early dating of *Woodstock* has been. The only sceptics have been Israel Gollancz, ed., *Shakespeare's Tragedy of King Richard II* (London: Dent, 1895; Temple Shakespeare), F. S. Boas (doubtfully) in *Shakespeare and the Universities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923), 143-66, and G. Lambrechts, 'Sur Deux Pretendues Sources de *Richard II*,' *Etudes Anglaises* 20 (1967): 118-39.
6. D. J. Lake, 'Three Seventeenth-Century Revisions: *Thomas of Woodstock*, *The Jew of Malta*, and *Faustus B*,' *Notes and Queries* 228 (1983): 133-43. Like Lake, I have standardized all contractions, expletives, and other linguistic forms, except when making a point about a particular spelling.
7. I agree with Lake (137 n. 16) that *Antonio and Mellida* cannot be earlier than 1600. In fact new evidence points to 1601. See Michael Neill and Mac Donald P. Jackson, 'Morphew, Leprosy, and the Date of Marston's *Antonio and Mellida*,' *Notes and Queries* 243 (1998): 358-60. I therefore assign both *Antonio and Mellida* and its sequel, *Antonio's Revenge* to 1601. My dates for other plays are, unless otherwise indicated, those given in Alfred Harbage's *Annals of English Drama 970-1600*, revised S. Schoenbaum and S. Wagonheim (London and New York: Methuen, 1989), except that for Shakespeare I have relied on the Oxford chronology, in Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor with John Jowett and William Montgomery, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (1997).
8. A. C. Partridge, *Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama* (London: Arnold, 1964), 34-42. Like Lake, Partridge believed that, while the manuscript had been prepared 'not earlier than about 1607,' the play had existed since the early 1590s (34, 40).
9. The figures for *shall's* and *shalls* in this paragraph also include the spellings *shat's* and *shals*. Those for *th'are* include *thare*, *th'ar*, and *thar*. An apparent instance of *thare* in *Common Conditions* (1576) turns out to be a spelling of 'there,' and an apparent instance of *Thar* in *Fair Em the Miller's Daughter* (1590) is a foul case misprint for *That*. The LION search also catches abbreviated speech prefixes for Tharsalio in Chapman's *The Widow's Tears*. Naturally, all these bogus finds have been discounted, but the total of 'over 300' may include one or two further intruders that were not detected. I have ignored four instances of *th'are* (one of which is spelt *thar*) in *Sir Thomas More*, because its date is so problematical. *More* also contains one *byth*, within the putatively Shakespearean addition.
10. For a summary of subsequent opinion, see the entry under *Charlemagne* in the chapter by Anne Lancashire and Jill Levenson on 'Anonymous Plays' in *The Popular School*, ed. Terence P. Logan and Denzell S. Smith (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1975), 181-83. In *Internal Evidence and Elizabethan Dramatic Authorship* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1966), S. Schoenbaum

pointed out that although the manuscript of *Charlemagne* had been assumed, probably correctly, to be holograph, the handwriting is not Chapman's (173). See also John Henry Walter, ed., *Charlemagne or The Distracted Emperor* (Malone Society Reprint, 1938 for 1937), x-xi.

11. W. J. Lawrence, *Shakespeare's Workshop* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1928), 60.
12. *Ibid.*, 73. Lawrence specifically mentions *Thomas of Woodstock*.
13. E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), 3:249-62; Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage, 1574-1642*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 217-18.
14. G. E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 7 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941-68), 1:168 n. 1.
15. For Thomas Bond, Edward Tobby, and Ellis Worth see Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 2:382, 601, 625-27; for Prince Charles's, Bentley, 1:302-23, especially 308 for the five members who had once belonged to Queen Anne's. No Jacobean-Caroline actor with the Christian name Toby is listed by Bentley. Boas discusses the whole Egerton MS collection in *the Universities*, 96-142: for Cartwright, see especially 106-9; also Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 2:402-4.
16. *Shakespeare and Boas, Shakespeare and the Universities*, 104; see also Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 1:303-8, 321.
17. Among those with whom Frijlinck disagrees is Eleanore Boswell, who edited *Edmond Ironside* for the Malone Society Reprints (1928 for 1927); see Boswell, vii-viii.
18. Boas, *Shakespeare and the Universities*, 105.
19. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 1:303, 321. For Henry Gradwell, see Bentley, 1:450. I discount Richard Gradwell, who is known only from parish records (Bentley, 2:450-51).
20. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 2:444-45.
21. Boas, *Shakespeare and the Universities*, 106. For the King's Revels, see Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 1:283-301, where documents mentioned in this paragraph are cited. For Stutfield/Stutville and Williams/Willans, see Bentley, 2:580-82, 619-20. Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Playing Companies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), gives further information on the companies of the period.
22. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 1:323, concluded that *Edmond Ironside*, one of the four Egerton MS plays linked by actors' names, had been revived by the second Prince Charles's Men in 1631-32. On the other hand, the Egerton MS *The Two Noble Ladies* has a title page claiming that the play had been performed at the Red Bull by the Company of the Revels, and the Malone Society editor, Rebecca G. Rhoades (1930), dates these performances to 1622-23, and suggests that the actors named in the manuscript, though later associated with Prince Charles's, were once all hired men with the Red Bull (Queen Anne's) Revels company. What seems improbable is Frijlinck's notion of separate revivals of *Woodstock*, one associated with the Queen Anne's Revels group and one with Prince Charles's, the King's Revels, or an associated touring group. The three actors' names are much more likely to relate to a single period, and 'G[.]ad' suggests the later one.
23. Boas, *Shakespeare and the Universities*, 165.
24. See Donald W. Foster's table in his *Elegy by WS.: A Study in Attribution* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989), 85-86.
25. The count for *Woodstock* is my own, based on Frijlinck's edition. Figures for rhyme in Dekker and Middleton are supplied in MacD. P. Jackson, *Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare* (Salzburg: University of Salzburg, 1979), 208.
26. Philip W. Timberlake, *The Feminine Ending in English Blank Verse* (Menasha, Wis.: George Banta, 1931). Lambrechts recognized the significance of Timberlake's research for the dating of *Woodstock*.
27. Andrew S. Caimcross, ed., *Thomas Kyd: The First Part of Hieronimo and The Spanish Tragedy* (London: Arnold, 1967) in the Regents series.
28. See *Textual Companion*, 124-25; T. H. Howard-Hill, ed., *Shakespeare and 'Sir Thomas More': Essays on the Play and its Shakespearean Interest* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); *Sir Thomas More: A Play by Anthony Munday and Others*, eds. Vittorio Gabrieli and Giorgio Melchiori (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1990) in the Revels series, I. A. Shapiro, 'The Significance of a Date,' *Shakespeare Survey* 8(1955): 100-105; E. A. J. Honigmann, 'John a Kent and Marprelate,' *Year book of English Studies* 13 (1983): 288-93.
29. Timberlake's table on p. 72 shows the variation between the fourteen verse scenes in their percentages of feminine endings to be, on a strict count, 12.9 percent to 33.8 percent, but ten scenes fall within the range 15.7-24.7. In the body of this article I have rounded off percentages to whole numbers. There is a little more to be said about Kyd's and Marlowe's use of feminine endings. Timberlake noted that in

Kyd's *Cornelia* translation the percentage is 9.5, and in Marlowe's *Lucan* translation 14.5. As he explained, the extra syllable gives a translator a little more flexibility in tailoring the original to fit his own verse lines. In 'Lucan-Marlowe-? Chapman,' *Review of English Studies* 24 (1948): 317-21, L. C. Martin argued that Chapman wrote the *Lucan* translation. Although the percentage of feminine endings in *Soliman and Perseda*, often attributed to Kyd, is ten, and it was certainly written before the entry in the Stationers' Register of 20 November 1592, which led to publication of an undated quarto, ten is, after all, less than half of twenty-one, and Kyd's authorship of *Soliman and Perseda* is not certain. The evidence is outlined and assessed by Arthur Freeman, *Thomas Kyd: Facts and Problems* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), 140-46. Timberlake was probably wrong to include *A Larum for London* in his survey: the *Annals* and *Cambridge Companion* date it 1599.

30. Ants Oras, *Pause Patterns in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*

31. Oras details his methods in *Pause Patterns*, 1-6. It is worth recording that of thirteen *Woodstock* pauses created by the splitting of a line between two speakers eight fall after the sixth syllable. These pauses are certainly the author's, and they point even more clearly than the a-type pauses to a seventeenth-century date of composition.

32. References to *Woodstock* are to Frijlinck's Malone Society edition and to her line-numbering, but in quoting the text and in citing individual words I have modernized spelling and punctuation, unless a particular point about orthography is at issue, or some detail of the manuscript has significance. Citations from *OED* and *LION* have also been modernized. But in searching *LION* for words, phrases, expletives, contractions, and so on, I have tried all spellings current in Early Modern English, or at least all of which I am aware: no doubt a few relevant items have been missed, because they are spelled so anomalously.

33. For the full *Passionate Pilgrimage* text of Sonnet 138, see John Kerrigan, ed., *William Shakespeare: The Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986), 446-47.

34. *OED*'s first citation of an attributive use of *nonage* (as in *Woodstock*'s 'the nonage king' at 161, meaning that he is 'below age') is dated 1619, though the substantive is recorded from 1399 and *nonaged* from 1601. The word *enthronished* (912) is either a nonce coinage or a slip for *enthronised*, which dates from 1393. The *Woodstock* verbs *toeify* (1504) and *kneefify* (1506) are comic creations by an affected courtier: *OED* does not record the former, but notes this sole instance of the latter. *OED* ignores the compound *bacon fed* (1615), and its only example of *pudding-eater*, *sb. III. II. attrib.* and *Comb.* is dated 1726, but of course *OED* made no attempt at a comprehensive treatment of such formations. Thus *ox-jaw* (1634), a dismissive term for a butcher, seems not to be recorded. *OED*'s first citation of *belated* (1998) in the sense 'benighted' is dated 1618, and in the sense 'coming or staying too late' 1670. The *Woodstock* instance is the only one in *LION*, 1576-1642. Nor does *LION* offer a parallel for *Woodstock*'s *terrered* (spelt *terror'd*), which is *OED*'s *v. obs.* or *arch. trans.* 'to terrify,' with a citation from the anonymous *Hierarchomachia*, dated 1635 by *OED*, though performed 1629.

35. David J. Lake, *The Canon of Thomas Middleton's Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975); see 115 and the tables between 252 and 253.

36. Line-references and quotations for Shakespeare are from *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, general eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).

37. See C. Willett Cunningham and Phillis Cunningham, *Handbook of English Costume in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Fabers, 1954) and *A Dictionary of English Costume* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960).

38. Cunningham and Cunningham, *Dictionary*, under 'piked shoe, peaked shoe'; also *OED* under 'crakow.'

39. M. Channing Linthicum, *Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1972; first published Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), 241 n. 3, 242 n. 1.

40. *Ibid.*, 241.

41. See Cunningham and Cunningham, *Handbook of English Costume in the Sixteenth Century*, 114, *Handbook of English Costume in the Seventeenth Century*, 43, and David Carnegie and David Gunby, 'Webster's *The Devil's Law-Case* 2.1.149-51,' *The Explicator* 57 (1998): 17-19.

42. One Marlowe parallel turns out to be double-edged. The *Woodstock* phrase 'steepy rock' (2916) occurs in *Doctor Faustus* and sounds Marlovian. However, Marlowe's only other use of 'steepy' is in the 'steepy mountain' of 'The Passionate Shepherd,' and 'steepy rock' falls within a scene of the 1616 Quarto of *Faustus* (4.3, TLN 1465 in W.W. Greg's parallel-text edition) that is absent from the 1604 Quarto; while the relationship between the texts remains problematical, William Bird and Samuel Rowley were paid by Philip Henslowe to make additions to Marlowe's play (Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, 3:423), and this

scene may have been written by them.

43. These are discussed by Rossiter, *Woodstock*, 47-71.

44. Boas, *Shakespeare and the Universities*, 155.

45. It is reassuring to find that the apparent echo of *Macbeth* was independently noticed by Paul Reyher, according to Lambrechts, 'Sur Deux Pretendues de *Richard II*,' 125. Lambrechts also mentions (124) that in 'The Non Shakespearean *Richard II* and Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Part I*,' *Studies in Philology* 32 (1935): 177-88, John James Elston listed some verbal parallels between *Woodstock* and *I Henry IV* and detected a connection between the cowardly rogue Tresilian and Falstaff, of whom he supposed Tresilian to be a 'fore-runner.'

46. Lake, 'Three Seventeenth-Century Revisions,' 136.

47. John Kerrigan, 'Revision, Adaptation, and the Fool in *King Lear*,' in Gary Taylor and Michael Warren, eds., *The Division of the Kingdoms: Shakespeare's Two Versions of 'King Lear'* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 195-245. Relationships like that of *King Lear* to the old *Leir* play are, of course, of an entirely different order. *Leir* qualifies as one of the 'sources' for *Lear*; but it would be misleading to say that it was 'revised' by Shakespeare. If the extant *Woodstock* bears this kind of relationship to a play of the early 1590s, we can deduce next-to-nothing about the hypothetical original.

48. For Rowley's career, see Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 5:1009-14; Gurr, *Shakespearean Playing Companies*, 237, cites a list in Henslowe's *Diary* that names 'same' (which he interprets as Samuel Rowley) as one of the Admiral's Company's hired men in December 1594 or January 1595, though on 251 he dates Rowley's start with the Admiral's in 1598. The date at which Henslowe inscribed the names that include 'same' is doubtful: see R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert, *Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), xxxvi.

49. I have studied *When You See Me You Know Me* in the Malone Society Reprint of the Quarto of 1605, edited by F. P. Wilson (1952). As with *Woodstock*, in quoting the play I modernize spelling and punctuation, unless calling attention to some orthographical detail.

50. Lake, 'Three Seventeenth-Century Revisions,' 138.

51. Jackson, *Studies in Attribution*. *When You See Me* shares nineteen expletives with *Woodstock*. The play that comes closest to matching this total is Marston's *What You Will* (1601), with fourteen.

52. E. M. W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1944), 118-19.

53. Margot Heinemann, 'Political Drama,' in *Cambridge Companion*, 184-85; Kim H. Noling, 'Woman's Wit and Woman's Will in *When You See Me, You Know Me*,' *Studies in English Literature* 33 (1993): 327-42.

54. Frijlinck, *The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second*, xxvi; Wilson, *When You See Me You Know Me*, x.

55. The nineteen are Barry's *Ram Alley* (1608), Beaumont's, Fletcher's and Massinger's *Love's Cure* (1606), Chapman's *All Fools* (1601), Chapman's, Jonson's, and Marston's *Eastward Ho* (1605), Day's, William Rowley's, and Wilkins's *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* (1607), Dekker's *Satiromastix* (1601), Greene's *James IV* (1590), Greene's and Lodge's *A Looking Glass for London* (1588), Heywood's *I Fair Maid of the West* (1604), Jonson's *Volpone* (1606), Marston's *The Fawn* (1605), Marston's *The Malcontent* (1604), Middleton's *A Mad World My Masters* (1606), Middleton's *The Revenger's Tragedy* (1606), Peele's *David and Bethsabe* (1587), Shakespeare's *All's Well That Ends Well* (1604-5), Shakespeare's *Richard II* (1595), Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI* or *The First Part of the Contention* (1591), and Wilkins's *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* (1606). The six are Chettle's, Dekker's, and Haughton's *Patient Grissel* (1600), Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (1603), Lodge's *The Wounds of Civil War* (1588), Marlowe's *Edward II* (1592), Marston's *Antonio and Mellida* (1601), and Nashe's *Summer's Last Will and Testament* (1592). The texts were scrutinized in modern-spelling editions, normally in those of the Revels, Regents, Mermaid, or Penguin series.

56. Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. Philip Edwards (London: Methuen, 1959), Revels series.

57. Boas, *Shakespeare and the Universities*, 105.

58. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 5:1009-14. The mystery of Rowley's career is that he disappears from the records during the period 1613-22.

59. John Tucker Murray, *English Dramatic Companies 1558-1642*, 2 vols. (London: Constable, 1910).

60. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 1:151-53, 268-69. Bentley is endorsed by Gurr, *Shakespearean Playing Companies*, 437-48.

61. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 5:1011. For the Fortune fire, see Bentley, 1:141 and Gurr, *Shakespearean Playing Companies*, 249.

62. N. W. Bawcutt, ed., *The Control and Censorship of Caroline Drama: The Records of Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels 1623-73* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 27.

63. R. A. Foakes, ed., *The Henslowe Papers*, 2 vols. (London: Scolar Press, 1977), 2:32-35; Foakes and Rickert, eds., *Henslowe's Diary*, 294-5.

64. Lake, 'Three Seventeenth-Century Revisions,' 138, notes that the preferred spelling for *zaunds* in *Woodstock* is *Zounes*, but in *When You See Me* it is *Sownes*. He also mentions, on the level of style, that *Woodstock* lacks phrases in the form noun + adjective in *-al*, to which Rowley is supposed to have been partial. But the evidence for Rowley's partiality is, in any case, of doubtful worth. The one striking discrepancy between *Woodstock* and *When You See Me* in the use of contractions is that *When You See Me* has no examples of *th'are*, which *Woodstock* employs thirteen times. But most dramatists use in their later plays certain forms that they had avoided in earlier ones.

65. Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources*, 3:358.

66. In his commentary, Ure convincingly counters Rossiter's view that this line in *Richard I* is 'hopelessly obscure' unless the audience is expected to have in mind the scene in *Woodstock* (1751-1995, 4.1 in Rossiter's edition) where Richard signs bonds prepared by his new Lord Chief Justice Tresilian. His notes on all the lines listed in xxxviii n. 5 are worth consulting.

67. Ure's note on 2.1.202-4 (Arden line-numbering) is especially good on a slight obscurity that arises directly from Shakespeare's use of Holinshed.

68. The phrase is Ure's, Arden *Richard I*, xxxvi.

69. Rossiter, *Woodstock*, 50; Ure, *King Richard I*, xxxix. In his comments on 2.1, Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources*, (3:361) strangely muddles it with 1.2, and so sabotages his argument.

70. They are reproduced by Gurr, New Cambridge *King Richard II*, 221-24.

71. Frijlinck, *The First Part of the Reign of Richard the Second*, 65.

72. Gurr, *Richard II*, 12. Gurr is wrong, incidentally, in stating (11) that *Woodstock* has a stage direction for 'a tucket.' The direction is in the Folio text of *Richard II*, as Gurr's note to 1.3.25 SD (his numbering) makes clear.

73. If Shakespeare, in his putative capacity as assessor of scripts (an improbable job for the tyro dramatist of 1592-93), rejected *Woodstock*, all arguments that *Richard I* deliberately recalls events from that play, with which his own audience would be familiar, immediately collapse. Of course, a *Woodstock* written in 1592-93 might then have been submitted to, and accepted by, another company, but why would Shakespeare refer in *Richard I* to a play performed by a rival troupe, a play, moreover, that he had judged unfit for the stage? Presumably Gurr made his suggestion without thinking over its implications.

74. See also Ure's excellent note on 2.1.128, *Richard II*.

75. Points 'a' and 'b' are also covered by Ure, *King Richard II*, xxxiv xl, and especially xl n. 2. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays*, 122.

76. One striking parallel between *Woodstock* and Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* (1604) is worth mentioning as another indicator of the date of *Woodstock*. *Woodstock* speaks of 'dim ostents to some great tragedy' (2061) and *Bussy D'Ambois* of 'dim ostents of tragedy' (Q 1607, F4', modernized). No other UON play has anything similar. The portents are alike in the two passages, consisting of 'pitchy clouds / and flakes of fire through the sky' (*Woodstock*, 2059-60) and 'the smoke/ Of ... clouds' hiding the 'sky' (*Bussy D'Ambois*, F4'). The word *ostent* (in the sense of 'prodigy') is a Chapman favourite, *OED*'s second and third examples coming from his continuation of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* (1598), written before *Bussy D'Ambois*, and his *Iliad* translation (1611), written later. So *Woodstock* is very much more likely to be echoing *Bussy D'Ambois* than vice versa.

77. Heinemann, 'Political Drama,' 184. Heinemann asserts that 'Shakespeare undoubtedly knew *Woodstock*' (186).

78. A short paper drawing on the findings presented here was delivered at the Sixth Biennial Conference of the Australia and New Zealand Shakespeare Association, Auckland, July 2000. I am grateful to David Carnegie and Richard Madelaine for helpful comments.

79. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays*, 122.

80. One striking parallel between *Woodstock* and Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* (1604) is worth mentioning as another indicator of the date of *Woodstock*. *Woodstock* speaks of 'dim ostents to some great tragedy' (2061) and *Bussy D'Ambois* of 'dim ostents of tragedy' (Q 1607, F4', modernized). No other UON play has anything similar. The portents are alike in the two passages, consisting of 'pitchy clouds /

and flakes of fire through the sky' (*Woodstock*, 2059-60) and 'the smoke/ Of ... clouds' hiding the 'sky' (*Bussy D'Ambois*, F4'). The word *ostent* (in the sense of 'prodigy') is a Chapman favourite, *OED*'s second and third examples coming from his continuation of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* (1598), written before *Bussy D'Ambois*, and his *Iliad* translation (1611), written later. So *Woodstock* is very much more likely to be echoing *Bussy D'Ambois* than vice versa.

81. Heinemann, 'Political Drama,' 184. Heinemann asserts that 'Shake speare undoubtedly knew *Woodstock*' (186).

82. A short paper drawing on the findings presented here was delivered at the Sixth Biennial Conference of the Australia and New Zealand Shakespeare Association, Auckland, July 2000. I am grateful to David Carnegie and Richard Madelaine for helpful comments.