Slurs, Nasal Rhymes and Amputations: A Reply to MacDonald P. Jackson

Michael Egan

In 2001, while I was working on *The Tragedy of Richard II*, *Part One*: *A Newly Authenticated Play by William Shakespeare* (2006), MacDonald P. Jackson published an article ascribing what he called '*Woodstock*' to Samuel Rowley, ca. 1608.[1] I disagreed with his evidence, analytical procedures and conclusions, explaining why in the course of my General Introduction. An edited version was published independently in the October, 2007 issue of *The Oxfordian*.[2]

Now Jackson has issued a two-tiered rejoinder: an article in an academic journal and an email attachment available from the author.[3] In what follows, I cite both documents as their points bear upon one another. Following Jackson's lead, a more detailed appraisal of his methodology and its outcomes is available from drmichaelegan@comcast.net.

Sir John Gielgud as Richard II

Jackson's avowed purpose in 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*' and 'Riposte to Egan,' his email, is to buttress his 2001 claim that the play is Jacobean and probably by Rowley. In practice, he concedes the debate. 'I wasn't to know that Egan was busy compiling an argument for Shakespeare's actual authorship of the play,' he writes, adding that he now thinks *1 Richard II*'s compositional years might well be either Elizabethan or Jacobean: 'But I should perhaps have been content to settle on my broader limits of the period 1598-1609.'[4]

Tentative though it is, I welcome this concession since it brings us closer together. However, a catchment of twelve years for the writing of a Renaissance play, especially 1598-1609, is virtually meaningless. Almost everything we have can be so dated.

Yet in an unexpected way Jackson gets it nearly right. *1 Richard II* is in fact of both dramatic epochs—written in the early 1590s, revised and freshly copied a decade or more later. Jackson is on the right track but, as we'll see, finds himself road-blocked by his own *a priori* assumptions about Samuel Rowley.

Stratifications

That *1 Richard II* was composed 1592-3 and reworked more or less extensively ca.1605, is accepted by every serious student of the manuscript, except Jackson. Modern agreement on this question is based on the research of the best scholars over several generations, including J.O. Halliwell, Wolfgang Keller, W.W. Greg, Wilhelmina Frijlinck, E. K. Chambers, A.P. Rossiter, E.P. Everitt, Geoffrey Bullough and others.[5] Its most forceful exponent is A.C. Partridge, who in 1964 published a close textual analysis of BL Egerton 1994 supported by a wealth of documented particulars.[6] Partridge showed that the orthographic asymmetries in the MS are collective instances of what he called 'stratification,' meaning that the text includes 'earlier contraction types overlaid by later ones.' [7]

Partridge's conclusion is that the MS is a 17th-century copy of a popular Elizabethan drama. Sometimes its scribe substitutes his personal habits for those of the original, especially when it comes to contractions. These speed along and simplify his task. But then sometimes he mindlessly reproduces what he sees, and sometimes leaves a space for an illegible word, and sometimes inverts lines or sets down verse passages as prose or vice versa, and makes other sleepy-eyed mistakes. It doesn't take much imagination to realize how fluidly inaccurate such a process might become. This is especially so when we consider that the copyist was working blindly, that is, without any real comprehension of what he was writing. His job was just to get the words down on the page. Later the author or the copyist under his direction would insert speech-heads, that is, assign speakers, and rule lines across the page clearly separating them. This is an important point we'll come back to in a moment.

> *Partridge showed that the orthographic asymmetries in the MS are collective instances of what he called 'stratification,' meaning that the text includes 'earlier contraction types overlaid by later ones.'*

An examination of the actual manuscript, which Jackson has not attempted, makes it clear that it is not the holograph he assumes it to be. This is confirmed by evidence of repeated editing, probably by the author himself. For example, someone heavily corrected the word *pelting* in 'like a pelting farm' (*1 Richard II*, IV.i. 136), tried various alternatives (*petty*, *paltry*, etc.), and then deleted the whole passage. This intervention has to be authorial, since it far exceeds any copier's prerogative. Nor can it be the work of a later hand (a 17th-century stage manager's, for instance), because the speaker, King Richard, has not yet been as-

signed. In other words, the editing took place at an intermediate point, between the MS's first draft and the insertion of speech-heads by or at the direction of the playwright.[8]

It also does not make sense to remove a passage and then return to fuss over a single word. We must assume therefore that the author spent some time attempting to alter *pelting*, finally canceling the whole speech and writing 'out' decisively in the margin. [9]

Here's what the manuscript looks like, using Malone Society type-conventions. The left vertical line indicates deletion, double carets <…> the site of MS damage plus conjectural emendation. The bold around *pelting* shows the repeated corrections, including *petty* and *paltry*:

	so sir. the loue of thee and these my dearest greene
	hath woñe king Richard to consent to that
	for wch all forrayne kings will poynt at vs.
	& of the meanest subiect of o^r land
out	we shalbe sensurd strangly, when they tell
	how o^r great ffather toyld his royall psone
	spending his blood to purchace townes in ffrance
	& we his sonne to ease o^r wanton youth
	become a landlord to this warlicke realme
	rent out <o>^r kingdome like a **pelting** ffarme
	that erst was held, as fair as Babilon
	the mayden conquerris to all the world.

One can only speculate about the reasons for the writer's behavior. *Pelting*, however, is a vivid word, especially in connection with *like* and *farm* and *England*. Indeed, it was the first clue to modern readers that the play might be Shakespeare's. The phrase immediately recalls a celebrated moment in *2 Richard II* (as I suggest the canonical play be retitled), perhaps encouraging its author to attempt a synonym, reject several alternatives, then decisively remove the whole passage. Twelve years after the original, John of Gaunt's more famous speech was well-enough known to be anthologized.[10] The textual fussing over *pelting* shows a Shakespearean sensitivity to language (*petty* and *paltry* are after all not that far apart phonically), in this case especially its legal implications.

To 'farm' in the *Richard II* (i.e. Elizabethan) sense was to lease for tax purposes. One 'farmed it out,' as we still sometimes say. A pelting farm was a particular form of taxable property, a village or group of villages owned by an aristocrat who rented out the area for financial exploitation. Obviously the lessee expected to gain more than he paid in monthly fees, and often did so by harassing the villagers. The resentment generated is vividly illustrated in another contemporary Richard II drama, *The Life and Death of Jack Straw* (1594), in which crude

tax-gathering provokes the Peasants' Revolt of 1381.

Tax farming is exactly what Richard does with his entire kingdom, scandalously leasing out England for £7,000 a month, converting his royal throne of kings into a pelting farm. As Bushy says, 'Rent it, ay, and rack it too...And it were seventy thousand pounds a month we'll make somebody pay for't!' (*1 Richard II*, IV.ii. 49-56). Calling this aggressive arrangement a 'paltry farm' or even a 'petty farm' completely misses the fiscal and jurisprudential nuances.

It was important to be technically right because Richard's handing over of Crown lands to 'men unworthie' led the bill of particulars against him in his second and final deposition, 1399.[11] Apparently we're dealing with a very serious writer, one for whom key legal and historical niceties were worth more than a quibble. The finer points are swept aside in a thoroughly Shakespearean drive for narrative coherence.

On the other hand, why would Samuel Rowley—who according to Jackson made a 'shred and patches' quilt of his play from Shakespeare—worry so much about 'pelting farm' that he eventually removed it and its whole containing speech (a rather good one)? Retention not only provides a political gloss on the big scene immediately following, Richard's 'farming out' of the kingdom to Bushy, Green, Bagot and Scroop, but elaborates the allusions in John of Gaunt's dying references in *2 Richard II* to Richard having become a landlord, his kingdom bound in by inky blots and rotten parchment bonds, etc. As Vickers notes, a successor to Shakespeare wanting to put himself in the same poetic league would retain references of this kind, 'in the expectation that readers will recognize the borrowing' and make the desired association.[12]

I don't deny, by the way, Shakespeare's influence on Rowley, quite noticeable in *When You See Me You Know Me*. For example, he blatantly pinches 'Kiss me, Kate,' from *The Taming of the Shrew*. But for these very reasons, 'pelting farm' would be exactly the kind of allusion he'd want to keep, assuming Rowley was *1 Richard II*'s author. It would establish his play as a direct precursor to one of the most famous dramas of its age and himself as a peer of the great Shakespeare.

Extensive Revisions

Jackson's case rests partly on the assumption that the manuscript is Jacobean, in the author's hand, and has been edited only lightly. But this is incorrect. For example, at IV.iii.93 we find evidence of substantial rewriting. The stage direction, *Enter Dutchess* [i.e., Woodstock's wife] *& a Gentleman*, is deleted along with Tresilian's 'heere comes the dutches' and replaced with *Enter Baggott* and 'heere comes Sʳ Edward Baggott.' The scene that follows announces Queen Anne's death, so it's likely that Woodstock's wife, earlier shown hurrying to the ailing queen, was the original bearer of that bad news. The surviving scene must thus have been redrafted or rewritten.

An equally unambiguous indication of editorial layering occurs at the end of V. iv, marked by *Exeunt omnes*, and the beginning of V.v, *Enter Trissillian disguisd & Nimble*. (Note: The original MS has no acts or scenes. Modern editions, including my own, follow Rossiter.) The MS is disordered:

Alarum;		each lend a hand to beare this load of woe	_____
& lancaster	*Bush*	that erst King Richard loud and tenderd soe	*Exeunt omnes*
Enter	*Enter*	*Trissillian disguisd & Nimble*,	

The speaker is Richard, not *Bush*[*y*], grieving over the slain Green. The scribal confusion in the sdd. (*Alarum; & lancaster Bush Enter Enter*) suggests an old continuation featuring Lancaster the author decided to omit, or the start of a new scene he later opted to delete. The copyist is unclear about his intentions, and so writes in everything. The long line after 'woe,' probably added later, indicates a pause as Green's corpse is lifted and carried off.[13]

Again, at the conclusion of II.i and the beginning of II.ii, as Rossiter was the first to observe, the deletions '[*Enter the queene*] / [*dutchess of gloster*] / *Ireland*] {*fflorish*}', have been displaced from the start of the next scene, II.iii, proving that the existing MS is a copy not in the author's hand. We may also note the deletion of 21 lines at IV.I.127-147, the substitution of *great* for *stronge* (I.i.126), *Reverent* for *vertiouse* (II.iii.3) *whissler* for *whisperer* (IV.iii.7) and the correction of Bagot's first name from *Thomas* to *Edward* at IV.iii. 92.[14]

All these are examples of stratification, confirming that the MS is a copy of a lost original. In addition, Partridge lists a score of verbal corollaries, including the contractions Jackson takes to be Jacobean indicators. He's partly right, but it's not the whole story.

I encourage readers to check or revisit Partridge's data. They lead to this:

> Thus in *Woodstock*, *shalls*, *th'are*, *hang um* and *I'me* are probably later than the other contractions, and so are the forms *has* and *does* for the author's *hath* and *doth*. These additions and revisions affected mainly the Nimble and Tresilian scenes, which provide comic relief.[15]

Partridge's analysis, together with his conclusion that 'the extant manuscript of this play was made by the copyist (not a professional scribe) probably ten or more years later than the original date of composition [1592-3],' [16] has never been contested. It is indeed one of the MS's few generally accepted truths.

Unfortunately, Jackson handles Partridge's findings in a most unsatisfactory and unscholarly way, dismissing them out of hand without further comment. 'Partridge's data provide no case for "stratification,"'[17] he merely says, dropping the matter and quickly moving on.

Unfortunately, it's a characteristic step: Jackson frequently substitutes his own judgment or opinion for the evidence, especially when it points in the 'wrong' direction. In Partridge's case, his unsupported rejection of the data is demonstrably self-serving. Jackson may dislike *Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama*, but the fact is Partridge most certainly does support a case for orthographic layers ten years or more apart.

It's worth observing too that Partridge's presentation is completely objective, since he has no stake in the current disagreement. His cautiously assembled evidence and close reasoning are models of scholarly impartiality.

Again I invite readers to check Partridge's Chapter Six, with Jackson's unsatisfactory treatment of it in mind. If Jackson has something specific against Partridge's documentation, analysis or conclusions, other than their inconvenience for his case, let's hear it. Dismissal is not argument.

Un-, *Re-* and Hendiadys

Among the many links connecting Anon to Shakespeare is a strong mutual preference for compounds and words beginning with *un-* and *re-*. Shakespeare coined over 300 words prefixed with *un*.[18] In my discussion of Jackson's 2001 essay, I wondered why he had not weighed these metrics in *1 Richard II* by way of providing a 'negative check' on Rowley. Jackson responds:

> Egan next takes me to task for not counting compounds and words beginning with 'un' and 're' in *Woodstock*. I had no reason to do so. He supplies some lists of his own, but gives no data from non-Shakespearean dramatists. Since he knows that I have argued for Rowley's authorship of *Woodstock* he might at least have made some counts for *When You See Me You Know Me*.[19]

Jackson has a point, so here are the results for *When You See Me You Know Me*. They do not help his case:

When You See Me You Know Me.

Compounds	Words prefixed by un-	Words prefixed by re-
bed-rid	undelayed, unseen, unless, undoing, unmarried, ungirt, untun'd, unexamined, unblemished, untimely	re-edify, receiving

Two unintelligible words, *vnterous* (2300) and *vnplus* (3034) must be compositorial errors of some sort since neither appears in the *OED*. Even counting them, this leaves one compound, twelve *un-* and two *re-*.

162

By comparison, there are 27 or 28 of each in *1 Richard II*, figures entirely consistent with early Shakespeare, as Jackson elsewhere acknowledges.[20] Not only are these forms almost non-existent in Rowley's work, but of the few he does use, *unless*, *unseen*, *undoing*, *unmarried*, *unexamined*, *unblemished*, *untimely* and *receiving*, are common terms included in our list only because technically they meet the criteria. In effect we have one compound and four rather conventional prefixes, *re-edify*, *undelayed*, *untun'd* and *ungirt*. Compare them with *1 Richard II*'s rare (and in the first example neologistical) *uncaput*, *unserv'd*, *unheard-of*, *unreveng'd*, *re-comfort* and *redeliver*, etc.

By no coincidence, *redeliver*, used by the Spruce Courtier in III.ii.174, occurs also in *Measure for Measure*, IV.iv.6, and twice in *Hamlet*, III.i.63 and V.ii.179. On the second occasion the word is even given to the same character, i.e., Osric, the Courtier's celebrated descendant. More telling still, *redeliver* functions in the same unusual sense, the recipient's response to a message (in both cases a dangerously polite invitation from a king to a prince).

A related measure, also undiscussed by Jackson, is the percentage incidence of the words *thou*, *thee* and *thy*, an established statistical marker expressed as a 'T index' for Shakespeare's plays. The 'T index' for *Hamlet* and *Coriolanus* is 7, for *Julius Caesar* and *Measure for Measure* 8, and for *Othello*, *Macbeth* and *All's Well that Ends Well*, 9. *1 Richard II* comes in at 8.26, right on target. The T index for *When You See Me You Know Me* is 3.5.[21] Based on these stylometrics alone, *1 Richard II* and *When You See Me* clearly issue from dissimilar linguistic minds.

This is further confirmed—and Shakespeare's presence in *1 Richard II* strongly suggested—by the writer's taste for hendiadys. Long recognized as characteristic of Shakespeare's style, hendiadys is a rhetorical figure in which two divergent adjectives, verbs or substantives (as opposed to paired synonyms) are disconcertingly coupled to achieve descriptive and dramatic purposes.

Vickers' *'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare* contains an illuminating discussion of Shakespeare's practice.[22] He cites among many illustrations

> her wanton spirits look out
> At every *joint and motive* of her body (*Troilus and Cressida*, IV.v.56-7)

and

> But as he is my kinsman, my dear friend,
> The *shame and fault* finds no excuse nor end. (*The Rape of Lucrece*, 237-8)

Kermode also notices Shakespeare's penchant for the figure, especially at the semantic level where

the meaning of the whole depends upon a kind of unnaturalness in the doubling, a sort of pathological intensification of the device...it can introduce unease and mystery into an expression.[23]

   Absent from *When You See Me You Know Me*, hendiadys is among *1 Richard II*'s most striking linguistic features. As elsewhere in Shakespeare, it is both per-formative and reflective of the organic contrasts (old/new, age/youth, etc.) struc-turing the action, another and related Shakespearean trademark. The play's 19 in-stances of hendiadys include 'to *see / And shun* those stains that blurs his majesty' (I.i.190-1), 'You must *observe and fashion* to the time' (I.ii.37), 'Of this *remiss and inconsiderate* dealing,' (I.iii.224), 'I never saw you *hatch'd and gilded* thus' (I.iii.78), '*Mount and curvet* like strong Bucephalus' (I.iii.91), 'The battle full of *dread and doubtful* fear' (II.i.72), 'A victory most *strange and admirable'* (II.i. 84), 'Woodstock and Gaunt are *stern and troublesome*' (II.i.124), 'And every hour with *rude and bitter* taunts' (II.i.130), 'The news to all will be most *wish'd and welcome*' (II.i.154), 'A *soldier and a faithful* councilor,' (II.ii.160), 'Thou'dst rid mine age of *mickle care and woe'* (II.ii.199), 'And suit themselves in *wild and antic* habits' (II.iii.91), 'In *state and fashion* without difference' (III.ii.42), 'Oth-ers there be *refuse and murmur* strong-ly' (III.ii.81), 'in *operation and quality* dif-ferent' (III.ii.205), 'All *rich and rare*' (IV.i. 52), 'We heard the people midst their *joy and moan*' (IV.ii.113), 'So full of *dread and lordly majesty*' (V.i.20).

The Masque

A central feature of the case for Shakespeare is *1 Richard II*'s masque scene (Woodstock's kidnapping), an intricate and highly wrought play-within-the-play. It's date and authorship are proclaimed not simply by its Elizabethan format—strolling players, a truchman, elaborate costumes, disguise, monologue, mime, dance, involvement of the audience, as against the Jacobean design one might expect from a Jacobean drama—but also by its overall subtlety, intellectual com-mand and creative deployment. The masque/abduction scene in *1 Richard II* is as finely rendered as any in Shakespeare, including *Hamlet*'s 'Mouse-Trap.'[24] Its details are scrupulously researched, closely resembling authentic masques per-formed in Queen Elizabeth I's presence.[25] Again, this is a level of artistic integrity beyond, or at least uncharacteristic of, Samuel Rowley.

   Jackson's evasive response to the above is that we

need to distinguish between the masque as an entertainment in its own right and the masque as something incorporated into a play. *Woodstock* is set in the early part of Richard II's reign. This is hardly the context in which we would expect to find anything like Jonson's *The Masque of Blackness*, for example. Besides, the masque in *Woodstock* is merely the instrument by which Richard and his followers

abduct Thomas of Woodstock, serving a function similar to the brief 'masque of revengers' and 'masque of intended murderers' in *The Revenger's Tragedy* (1606), [V.iii].[26]

But this is an insuficient answer. Richard II's reign (1377-99) is not a context in which we would expect to find any masque at all, never mind the sort of ahistorical stratagem Jackson implies. The suggestion moreover that the Elizabethan variety would be somehow less anachronistic in 1387 than its Jacobean successor is equally misplaced.[27]

The Wars of the Roses began with the Duke of Gloucester's secret arrest and assassination, at least according to our dramatist. This is among the reasons the masque-and-murder scenes are the action's centerpiece. Anon's analysis itself is challenging but well-argued and quite beyond Rowley's scope. As has been repeatedly demonstrated, *1 Richard II*'s conclusions, while only one side of a continuing historical debate, are extremely well supported and researched.[28] They are followed by a proposal that at almost any time before 1688 would have seemed radical, even revolutionary: Constitutional Monarchy (though the writer doesn't call it that). In effect, strict legal limits are put on the exercise of the ruler's power and his (more specifically, her) general conduct well-supervised. The sycophantic author of *When You See Me You Know Me* could never have conceived such a proposal, never mind write a play embodying it. Nor, we should add, was the political situation in England ca. 1608 conducive to such a confrontational stance.

Anon on the other hand provides both a vision and a means. Political change, increasingly an issue in the early/mid 1590s, was to be achieved by a 'loyal rebellion' led by disaffected nobles rescuing the monarch from the clutches of greedy flatterers. In a sense the Essex uprising was hatched in this highly political drama.

These claims are made good in the masque episode, its suffixes in V.ii (the murder itself) and the first scene of Shakespeare's acknowledged *Richard II*, which commences unhistorically after the Battle of Radcot Bridge and the king's 1387 deposition (the year of our play). Restored after the victors failed to agree on a successor, Richard spent the next ten years under his uncles' thumbs, effectively England's first constitutional monarch. This is the political arrangement Anon daringly advocates for the aging Elizabeth. Kirchner notes too that until 1397 Richard reigned as 'an exemplary constitutional monarch,' biding his time. It was his 1399 attempt to reimpose absolute rule that provoked Bullingbrook's civil war and the King's final deposition.[29]

Without even considering the possibility that the abduction masque in *1 Richard II* might be by the young Shakespeare, Janet C. Stavropoulos, Inga-Stina Ewbank, and Edgar Schell, among others, acknowledge its remarkable originality.[30] Stavropoulos makes a strong case for the scene's literary-historical importance, concluding that 'in its general outline and method, the masque in *Woodstock* heralds an

important development in English drama.'[31]

   Ewbank goes further, describing the moment as '...the first notable dramatic use of a masque to commit a murder.' She adds:

> [*1 Richard II*] thus forms a link between the use of a play-within-the-play to commit Revenge murder in *The Spanish Tragedy* (c. 1589) and the soon conventional use of a masque for this purpose in later Revenge tragedy.[32]

  Edgar Schell also vividly illustrates the masque's centrality, not only to the action but to the whole 'disappearance' of Richard as king and personality. It's a defining moment that looks powerfully ahead to *2 Richard II*.[33]

   Marie Axton takes the argument finally to this:

> King Richard appears in a masque of the goddess Cynthia and her attendants. Not Richard but one of his flatterers impersonates Cynthia, giving wordless support to the Duke of Lancaster's earlier accusation that the king no longer rules the realm: the vizarded figure of the immortal body politic is a sham. [34]

   Once more, these are quite extraordinary claims for a hack like Rowley. Even granting Jackson's case for *1 Richard II*'s compositional date, it's clear from IV. ii's artistic complexity that a second-rate dramatist could never have produced it. The only author capable of such a *tour de force*, in either the Elizabethan or Jacobean eras, was Shakespeare.

   Jackson again needs to respond to the above in an appropriate and scholarly manner. The case made by Ewbank *et al*. is well argued and replete with supporting evidence. On the horse-to-water principle, they (and I) can do no more than invite Jackson to drink more deeply of the Pierian spring. If our data and conclusions are inaccurate, let him demonstrate where and how and why.

Stylometrics

A small but revealing detail has to do with Jackson's handling of the stylometric measures for authorial attribution devised by Ward E. Y. Elliott and Robert J. Valenza. Jackson notes that Shakespeare fails their authorship test for *1 Richard II*, but keeps quiet about the fact that so does Samuel Rowley.[35] He also says nothing about the widespread doubts concerning Elliott's and Valenza's methodology,[36] and the fact that their style data suggest Middleton was the author, although disqualified for other reasons.[37]

   Scholarly integrity requires taking all the evidence into account, not just the bits that support conclusions determined in advance. Jackson needs to explain how Elliott and Valenza, using the same methods, manage to be right about Shakespeare

but wrong about Rowley. And how does he tell the difference?

The Poetry

I invite Jackson to reconsider his position in the light of the evidence actually produced, rather than the caricature he so carelessly dismisses. He has not given the case for Shakespeare the attention it deserves, and has nothing serious to say by way of rebuttal. The indicators accumulated by scholars over the past 150 years, however, are multifaceted and well argued. They absolutely do not rely on a few slight and common verbal parallels, as Jackson alleges, but upon a full appreciation of *1 Richard II*'s intellectual complexity and literary quality.

The data supporting this judgment are presented principally in my General Introduction, especially the section headed 'The Golden Metamorphosis.'[38] Elsewhere I cite a library, assembled by editors and critics since 1870, of extensive analogies between characters and their representation throughout Shakespeare; scenic, narrative and dramatic parallels; philosophic and intellectual correspondences; thematic similarities; equivalent uses of images and imagery; snatches of dialogue and phrase collocations; comparable depths of analysis and analogous political insights.

Equally revealing is the extensive historical research underpinning the play, again typical of Shakespeare but quite uncharacteristic of Rowley.[39] The author's demonstrable reading list includes Hall, Holinshed, Stow, Gower (in medieval Latin), Grafton, *The Mirror for Magistrates*, the works of George Buchanan and John Hardyng, the *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, numerous political folk songs (especially 'Ther Is A Busch That Is Forgrowe' and 'On the Times,' also known as 'On King Richard's Ministers'), Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana*, 'Richard the Redeless' and possibly also 'Mum and the Sothsegger.' These connections are all fully illustrated in my study.[40] By no coincidence, almost all of them are also recognized sources for *2 Richard II*, though at least one, John Gower's *Cronica Tripertita* (ca. 1400), a blistering contemporary history of Richard's deposition and murder, needs to be upgraded in importance.[41]

But it's the superiority of the play's poetry that clinches the matter, as it should, and is the ultimate justification for *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One.* In the words of Ian Robinson, the British critic and scholar who published the first sustained case for Shakespeare's authorship,[42] who else but he ever wrote like this? Certainly not Sam Rowley. I challenge Jackson to produce anything in *When You See Me* that compares in quality to the following. The speaker is Richard's bride, Anne of Bohemia, at their wedding reception:

> My sovereign lord, and you true English peers,
> Your all-accomplish'd honors have so tied
> My senses by a magical restraint

> In the sweet spells of these your fair demeanors,
> That I am bound and charm'd from what I was.
> My native country I no more remember
> But as a tale told in my infancy,
> The greatest part forgot; and that which is,
> Appears to England's fair Elysium
> Like brambles to the cedars, coarse to fine
> Or like the wild grape to the fruitful vine.
> And, having left the earth where I was bred,
> And English made, let me be Englished.
> They best shall please me shall me English call.
> My heart, great King, to you; my love to all!   (*1 Richard II*, I.iii.36-50)

Its individual poise and dignity aside, this graceful response plays elegantly with the trope introduced by 'magical restraint.' The theme runs henceforward through the play. Young Anne a' Beame (Anne of Bohemia) is at once caught up in the 'sweet spells' spun by England and its true peers. Later, not only Woodstock but a string of minor characters, like the Spruce Courtier, are also strangely metamorphosed ('Oh, strange metamorphosis! Is't possible that this fellow that's all made of fashions should be an Englishman?') The country itself is transformed, from an absolute to a constitutional monarchy, from a kingdom to a pelting farm and then back again.

Anne's hosts 'charm' her, a neat ambivalence—winning ways and necromancy —wiping away all memories of her former self and homeland, magically transforming her from a Bohemian into an Englishwoman. Language itself alters— nouns become verbs (*English* to *Englished* in a single line), while the tales of Anne's childhood evaporate in a trance-like oblivion. She grows up before our very eyes. Later in the play her unexpected death signals the beginning of the end for Richard's absolutist policies. It is said repeatedly that her goodness and queenly generosity alone kept rebellion at bay.

Underpinning everything is the transformation of Nature, a very Shakespearean theme, from uncultivated to cultivated—brambles to cedars, wild grape to fruitful vine, etc. There's so much going on in this near-sonnet of 15 lines, including the subtle pre-echo of Macbeth's tale told by an idiot, that obviously only one English dramatist could have created it.

Jackson's most serious claim is that Shakespeare's 'mature' style is nowhere visible in the verse of '*Woodstock*.'[43] But this is s a typically legalistic formulation, since my case is that the play is an early work. Nonetheless, the above clearly shows the master's presence, as do the other extended passages I quote in this article and elsewhere.

The Verse

The two most important sections of 'The Date and Authorship *of Thomas of Woodstock*' supplement and reiterate similar sections in Jackson's original essay, often word-for-word. Section IV has to do with the nature of the verse, stylometrically considered, Section V with Anon's alleged rhyming styles and preferences.

As before and elsewhere, Jackson relies heavily on a monograph by Ants Oras, an Estonian who in 1960 published *Pause Patterns in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama: An Experiment in Prosody.*[44] Deceptively slight, *Pause Patterns* is dense with numerical data, summarized in tabular and graphic form over 39 pages. A short Introduction describes the author's methods and objectives.

Oras was interested principally in pausation, that is, the rhythmic silences between words in blank-verse iambic pentameters. Working his way through hundreds of early modern English plays, including most but not all of Shakespeare, he counted pauses indicated by (a) any punctuation mark, (b) punctuation marks other than commas, and (c) the points at which iambic pentameters were split between two speakers. He called these A-Patterns, B-Patterns and C-Patterns, noting 'in what positions they appear in the verse, and in what ratios compared with other positions in the line.'[45]

Because 'pauses vary in emphasis and length,'[46] Oras combined these data with assumptions about punctuational strength: commas are the weakest (or in the jargon of his day, 'feminine'), full-stops more forceful ('masculine'), and split lines the most extended, whatever the punctuation employed. Since there are nine possible sites for pauses in each ten-syllable line (between syllables one and two, two and three, etc.) Oras computed their ratios to the overall total, expressed as a percentage. The length of a work, he claims, has therefore no effect on the comparative results:

> Plays with only a hundred internal pauses indicated by punctuation may thus present percentage patterns identical with those of plays—or poems—having thousands of such pauses. [47]

Punctuated Evolution

The data in *Pause Patterns* provide statistical confirmation of the well-established observation that 1576-1616 (Oras's study period) there was a 'gradual shift' of pauses from the earlier to the later parts of the line, and fewer pauses in the even positions. Another way of saying this is that over time speeches and sentences grew longer, overflowing from one line to the next. Declamation gradually gave way to more natural speech rhythms. Speakers interrupted one another. Pauses thus inevitably moved up, from approximately halfway through the initial line (the fourth or fifth positions) to somewhere in the latter half, depending on sentence length and content. Jackson summarizes and adapts Oras's results:

169

> The use of run-on lines in which the syntax flowed over from the end of one line to the beginning of the next became increasingly common, with an associated shift in pauses within lines: in the verse of earlier dramatists the caesura most often fell after the fourth syllable, in that of later dramatists after the sixth; gradually, more complex patterns of pausation emerged, with the more frequent employment of pauses after the uneven-numbered syllables. The proportion of lines split between speakers increased. Dramatists grew more partial to inversions of stress, in which a trochee replaces an iamb at the beginning of a line or after a mid-line pause. [48]

For unknown reasons, Oras did not include *1 Richard II* in his analysis. However, Jackson does. He claims that the play's pause-distribution pattern peaks at 34.1% for the fourth position and 32.2% for the sixth, and that this is at odds with Shakespeare's practice in the early 1590s: 'It is not until *Measure for Measure* (1603) that any Shakespeare play has a percentage of sixth-position pauses over 30, namely 30.9.'[49] He thus concludes that *1 Richard II* could never have been written as early as 1592-3 and certainly not by Shakespeare.

But Oras's figures, like Elliott's and Valenza's, also disqualify Jackson's candidate. By his own data, *When You See Me You Know Me* should have been written in the early 1590s, which certainly excludes Sam Rowley. It also makes a nonsense of stylometric analysis, since we know that in fact the play was written about 1604. Jackson reluctantly 'concedes' that

> the pause patterns in Samuel Rowley's *When You See Me* are not so very different from those in some of Shakespeare's early plays, so that this evidence might be thought to tell not only against an early date but against Rowley's authorship at a later one. But in my [2001] article I gave various reasons for suspecting that Rowley wrote *Woodstock* some time after he had written *When You See Me*, so that it is quite possible that his use of pause patterns developed, as did that of Shakespeare and others, but that he was, as it were, a slow developer in this regard.[50]

It's not clear what Jackson means when he says that early figures 'tell against an early date.' I'd have thought they would do the opposite. Whatever his understanding, it appears that he permits himself statistical exceptions and anomalies, and theoretical ones at that (Rowley 'was, as it were, a slow developer in this regard') when it suits his argument.

My own view is that not surprisingly the evolution of linear pausation is—pun intended—punctuated. There are bursts of Gouldian change followed by individual and collective plateaux of consolidation. Writers experiment, they learn from one another, etc. In the process a few strikingly anticipate the future while others apparently regress, catch up, then fall behind again, and so on. It's a dynamic and highly personal matter, not supported by Oras's sub-Jungian assertions about 'un-

conscious…rhythmical impulses' over which individual playwrights have little or no power, 'almost as people are unable to control their cardiograms.'[51] Indeed, it's this very unconsciousness of a collective kind, Oras says, which makes the practice so revealing.

Unevidenced assertions like these are easily refuted. Poets by trade are rhythmically aware and controlling, Shakespeare especially so. Over the past century it has been repeatedly demonstrated that the Elizabethan and Jacobean commitment to greater colloquialism, inward renderings of character and the perceived need for heightened psychological realism wrought rhythmic and expressive innovations in theater language. As dramatic verse drew closer to actual speech, lines lengthened and shortened, pauses moved up and down in syllabic rank, and split-level lines became more frequent. But the engine driving these changes was 'variable mimesis' of a conscious kind, not some sort of poetical *Zeitgeist*. [52]

Jackson's invocation of a 'changing rhythmical climate'[53] affecting all writers more or less equally (excepting 'slow developers' like Rowley, of course) is even less helpful. He seems to mean something like literary fashion, which inevitably some go along with and others buck egregiously. Either way, adopting or rejecting popular trends, especially when it comes to a commercial enterprise, is seldom unconscious. It is precisely not like a cardiogram or changes in the weather.

But beyond that, if Jackson is permitted to explain Rowley's anomalies by hypothesizing his 'slow development,' may the rest of us be allowed a less speculative and far likelier case for Shakespeare's more complex and varied evolution? There is at least some evidence for it.

The Numbers

Among the difficulties I have in accepting Jackson's thesis is that his numbers don't add up, by which I mean that I was unable to confirm them. He claims for example that his analysis of *1 Richard II* is based on 826 'pertinent' pauses in the text.[54] My count is 682, a significant statistical difference.

The problem lies in the slippery meaning of 'pertinent.' Jackson employs criteria derived from Oras, who admits:

> My treatment of the different periods is not uniform. For the period until about 1600 [i.e., during which *1 Richard II* was written]…even strong internal punctuation can be very scarce. Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, for instance, has within the line only six punctuation marks that are not commas. For cases like this I record only the A-patterns…From the seventeenth century, on the other hand, when line splits [C-patterns], became frequent, I examine only these splits except in a few special cases, notably that of Shakespeare.[55]

It's hard to see how this facilitates either comparison or generalization. The

data assembled for the two periods are incomplete and occupy distinct categories (A-patterns before1600, C-Patterns after, 'except in a few special cases,' unexplained and unspecified). Jackson later claims to overcome these obstacles by suggesting that his C-pattern count confirms his more doubtful A-pattern numbers. As we'll see, the evidence he cites does not support this.

Oras's Limitations

Pioneering as it was, *Pause Patterns in Elizabethan and Jacobean Dram*a (1960) has long been superseded. For Oras, all pauses were phonetic, though as David Crystal notes in his recent and more nuanced study, the 'big question' about punctuation chiefly exercising Elizabethan writers and typographical compositors

> was whether punctuation marks were there to help speaking or reading. If the former, then they had to be given clear phonetic values. If the latter, then it did not matter what length the marks represented as long as they made the sense clear…How we interpret the periods, colons, semi-colons and commas of a Shakespearean text thus *involves our judgment about whether their use is motivated by phonetic or grammatical considerations*.[56]

My italics: Oras and Jackson assume incorrectly that dramatic punctuation is always phonetic. Complicating matters even further, Elizabethan and Jacobean printing practice fluctuated from edition to edition, and even within individual texts when more than one compositor or printing company was involved. Crystal continues:

> The problem is very much greater in reading original Shakespearean texts because during his lifetime not just the conventions of using punctuation, but the marks themselves, were still in the process of being established...the basis of English punctuation practices was being established precisely at the time that Shakespeare was writing. New usages are inevitably prone to inconsistency and error. We must expect, then, to find a great deal of variation in the way writers, copyists, and compositors employed them.[57]

Oras's limiting assumptions level all texts phonetically, with correspondingly confused results. Jackson unfortunately takes them and his methodology at face value, with similar distortions in his own analyses and conclusions.

Smooth Developments

It also turns out that in order to achieve the apparent uniformity of development recorded in his graphs and statistics, Oras was forced to introduce important qua-

lifiers. He says that he 'confined [himself] to studying lines with five metrical stresses…the type commonly called iambic pentameter,' but this is not quite true. He also includes what he calls 'speech stresses,' an unsatisfactorily subjective category whose vagueness allows him to create and/or destroy pentameters at will:

> I include lines lacking the unstressed beginning, i.e. 'truncated' lines, and also lines lacking one or two internal syllables, as long as the five metrical stresses remain intact. Extrametrical unstressed syllables are not counted. In the case of 'epic caesuras,' i.e. trochaic pauses followed by a full iambic foot, the first unstressed syllable is disregarded in the statistics.[58]

Obviously there's a lot of including and disregarding of syllables going on, which strikes me as deeply problematic in a study based exclusively on syllabic enumeration.

One important distortion is that prose speeches find themselves arbitrarily reassigned as verse, fatally as we shall see in Jackson's case, skewing the numbers. Lines failing to meet the analyst's rhythmic expectations have feet removed or added to ensure that they do conform: 'Extrametrical unstressed syllables are not counted…the first unstressed syllable is disregarded…I include lines lacking one or two internal syllables, as long as the five metrical stresses remain intact,' and so forth.

Judged by the way Jackson applies Oras to 1 Richard II, however, the statistical variants are by no means inconsequential.

Oras frustratingly provides neither rationale (why these particular exceptions and/or additions?) nor any illustrations. We thus have no way of knowing when or how many times he added or subtracted, whether his decisions were correct, or how accurately and consistently his principles were implemented. Deciding whether a line is 'truncated' or not, whether it 'lacks' as many as two internal syllables, or includes an 'extrametrical unstressed syllable,' or if its stresses are more 'speech' than 'metrical,' depends crucially on the critic's (or more specifically the actor's) individual understanding of its semantics and delivery. Two or more interpretations might be equally valid, indeed up to seven types of analytic ambiguity.

The diagnostic dangers include imprecision and subjectivity. These undoubtedly account for the disparity between my results and Jackson's when it comes to *1 Richard II.* Not surprisingly, I have similar problems with Oras's figures, though this is not the place to pursue the matter. Suffice it to say that he himself notes: 'Few readers will pause in exactly the same places when reading the identical passages of verse…there doubtless still remains some margin of error.' He 'hopes' that the discrepancies may be too slight to affect the results.[59] Judged by

the way Jackson applies Oras to *1 Richard II*, however, the statistical variants are by no means inconsequential.

Jackson's Results

Here are just three of Jackson's 22 applications of Oras's methods to *1 Richard II*, labeled (i), (ii) and (iii).[60] I've selected them for representativeness. Note how the evidence is literally jammed into Oras's model. As A.E. Housman remarks in his critique of Victorian scholarship, 'Conclusion first, reasons afterwards…you write down at the outset the answer to the sum; then you proceed to fabricate...the ciphering by which you can pretend to have arrived at it.' [61]

> **(i)** *Woodstock*: In my apparel, you'll say.
>   *Lancaster*: Good faith, in all. (*1 Richard II,* I.i.160-1)

Jackson's task, the predetermined answer to the sum, is to show that this eleven-syllable exchange actually comprises ten syllables, i.e., is in reality a C-pattern (split-level) iambic pentameter with a caesura after the sixth syllable. Unfortunately, its first half (Woodstock's line) contains an extra syllable, bumping the caesura up a slot, so something has to be excised ('disregarded'). Jackson decides that the word *apparel* in 'In my apparel, you'll say,' contains one of Oras's 'extra-metrical unstressed syllables,' and may therefore be elided. *Apparel* magically becomes 'effectively disyllabic,' and the required count satisfactorily achieved.[62]

The trick is worked by divining the playwright's true but hidden purpose. Jackson 'knows' what Rowley's consciously unconscious rhythmic impulses really were, presumably by scholarly osmosis, and is thus able to inform us that his 'real' intent was for the word *apparel* to be 'slurred' in performance, that is, indistinctly articulated.[63]

But there's neither textual nor performative justification for any of this. On the contrary, slurring or mumbling *apparel* would have unexpectedly hilarious results, with the unlucky actor playing Woodstock forced to speak incomprehensibly of his 'apple':

> *Woodstock*: In my apple, you'll say.
> *Lancaster*: Good faith, in all!

It's not hard to imagine how this might bewilder an audience ('In his *what?*') or, worse yet, raise an unwanted laugh at Lancaster's now goggle-eyed response. No dramatist, not even third-rate Samuel Rowley, could possibly be insensitive to that.

Note too that a writer truly intent on a double count for *apparel* could easily have chosen among many non-slurred, semantically clear equivalents, achieving

both rhythm and coherence. Choices include *clothing*, *raiment*, *garment*, *vest-ment*, *costume*, *attire*, etc. 'In my attire, you'll say. / Good faith, in all.' Obvi-ously he went out of his way to give the word three beats, i.e., a cadenced empha-sis. He wanted it to stand out and be sharply articulated. Clothing is the drama's most developed metaphor, present and referred to in virtually every scene. Wood-stock's taste for plain dress represents honesty, integrity, tradition, stable govern-ance, the minions' foppery their insupportable lightness of being.

> **(ii)** *Scroop*: Excellent Tresilian!
>   *Bushy*: Noble Lord Chief Justice! (*1 Richard II*, III.i.24-5)

In this instance, the ten syllables Jackson needs add up to thirteen. The ex-change is plainly two exclamations in a prolonged prose section interrupted by the entrance of the queen. Turning them into an isolated split-level pentameter re-quires 'slurring' an entire line:

> Both the first two words are slurred so that 'Excellent' is effectively disyllabic and 'Tresilian' effectively trisyllabic.[64]

Try saying it. Apart from the fact that again there's no warrant for the claim, it is almost impossible to deliver *excellent* in two coherent syllables, *Tresilian* in three, and even harder in conjunction. Slurred, the phrase leaves the stage as an incomprehensible gargle, all for the sake of a theoretical rhythmic consistency the playwright, a plagiarizing hack, is supposed to have been mostly unaware of, like his own heartbeat or the western wind.

The dramatic situation at this climactic point (the devising of the Blank Char-ters) demands moreover clear articulation and appropriate weight. Forcing the rest of the supposed pentameter into rhythmic conformity requires emph*a*ses on all the wrong syll*a*bles: 'No*ble* Lord *Chief* Just*ice*.'

> **(iii)** *Duchess*: What have you seen, my lord?
>   *Woodstock*: Nay, nay, nothing, wife. (*1 Richard II* , I.iii.64-5)

Once again Jackson is thwarted by an extra beat, but this time there are no words easily declared 'slurred.' The only candidate, because it's the only multi-syllable, is *nothing*, which 'slurs' into what? Ning? Noth? Noing? So instead Jackson just deletes a word, on the grounds that it is 'metrically unstressed' (which it plainly is not):

> I take 'Nay, nay' as being metrically unstressed, so that the line has five metrical stresses, as it would if there were a single 'Nay.'[65]

He 'takes' it to be so. That's Jackson's privilege, but it's not evidence. Far from being unstressed, the doubly emphasized 'Nay' is the most powerful signifier in the entire exchange. It's a deliberate emphasis, the unsettling rhythmic bump part of the moment's comedic thrust. Elderly Woodstock is embarrassedly denying to his wife, in the presence of the whole court, that he has been looking at other women's legs. The intruding 'Nay' intentionally stands out by upsetting the Duchess's introductory iambs, while the gathering alliteration of Ns—*nay*, *nay*, *noth*—provides three heavily accented beats.

In other words, it's prose. Had the playwright wanted a pentameter, he could easily have obliged Jackson 400 years ago by providing a single *Nay*. 'What have you seen, my lord? / Nay, nothing wife.' It's perfectly effective and satisfies the unconscious rhythmic criteria supposedly not at work on slow-developing Sam Rowley.

A- and B-Pauses

Both Oras and Jackson ultimately concede that their A-pattern counts (punctuation totals and syllabic positioning) are not and can never be accurate. Even first editions, which they erroneously assume to be closest to the original, are 'not unaffected by the intervention of scribes and printers,' they say, and therefore 'by no means wholly in the author's control.'[66] This is even more so because, as Crystal shows, the earliest printed texts were often the least representative of the author's copy.[67]

In the special instance of *1 Richard II* this is demonstrably true also of the MS's B-pauses (that is, punctuation other than commas). As we've seen, the copyist barely indicates their presence and, in most cases, just leaves them out. According to Oras, this would confirm that the play originated during 'the period until about 1600,' where 'even strong internal punctuation can be very scarce.'[68]

Jackson's proposed dates are thus called into question by Oras himself, though he makes no attempt to come to terms with it. The difficulty is compounded by the play's relatively few C-pauses, twelve or so, the low numbers more typical of the 1590s than the 1610s. These are data Jackson himself adduces, discussed in more detail below.

Even more consequential, when the copyist does insert commas and periods it's hard to tell them apart. Frijlinck notes: 'The commas...are often indistinguishable from full-stops.' [69] And vice versa, I would add. Even magnifying and degraining the MS with Photoshop, etc., often proved unhelpful.

Punctuational ambiguities of this sort represent another problem Jackson fails even to acknowledge, let alone address. Obviously, if you can't tell the difference between a comma and a full-stop, you can't come up with credible numbers concerning either.

Here's an example. *1 Richard II*, II.ii.87 reads in MS: 'The Realmes of Eng-

land. ffrance. and Ireland'. Did Jackson count two periods or two commas? Or perhaps one of each? To which did he assign the caesura, and why? Plainly, this is not two sentences and a fragment, but a series punctuated by commas; however, that's an interpretation. Once you allow the observer to decide for him/herself what's 'really' there, whether it's a trisyllable 'slurred' into two, or a period 'taken' for a comma, you can prove anything.

   Jackson might argue in the case of 'The Realmes of England. ffrance. and Ireland' that 'obviously' we're dealing with commas, and so 'disregard' what the MS actually displays, two periods. The assumption is that other readers will—must—agree.

   But unfortunately, they don't. A.P. Rossiter and John Dover Wilson, for example, take the play's punctuation—including symbols and marks Jackson does not even notice because they're outside his paradigm—to be a kind of musical notation. Current in Shakespeare's day, the idea was first proposed in print by John Hart, whose 'influential' *An Orthographie* (1569) 'used a musical analogy: if a comma is a crotchet, then a colon is a minim.'[70] The notion was revived in 1921 when Dover Wilson suggested that 'The stops, brackets, capital letters in the Folio and Quartos are in fact stage-directions, in shorthand. They tell the actor when to pause and for how long, they guide his intonation, they indicate the emphatic word, often enough they denote "stage-business."'[71] This is a credible alternative Jackson needs to confront.

   The additional matter of the manuscript's errors and omissions is also critical for Jackson's analysis, since pauses are often implied, though rarely marked. The question is, should researchers include them in the count, that is, edit them in, or go with what the MS. actually shows?

   If you're interested in pausation, the answer is not an easy one. Consider the drama's opening sequence in MS (square brackets indicate deletion):

omnes:	lights, lights bring torches knaues,
lanc:	shutt to the gates, let no man out vntill the house be searcht
yorke:	call for oʳ Coches, letts away good brother
	now byth, blest Saints. I fear we are poysond all,
Arond:	poysond my lord
lanc:	I I good Arondell, tis hye time be gon
	may [god] heauen be blest for this preuentione (*1 Richard II*, I.i.1-7 MS)

Line 1: The implicit punctuation includes commas after the second *lights* and *torches*, and an exclamation point rather than the comma following *knaues*.
Line 2: An implied exclamation point ends the line, and one could make a case for another after *gates*.
Line 3: Implied commas after *away* and *good brother*, though there are many

possible ways to punctuate this line.

Line 4: The copyist mistakenly inserts a comma after *byth*, probably intending an apostrophe.[72] The period after *Saints* should be a comma, the punctuation at the end of the line a period or an exclamation point.

Line 5: Comma after *poysond*, question mark after *lord*.

Line 6: Commas after each *I* and a period or exclamation point after *gon*.

Line 7: Period after *preuentione*. The square brackets around *god* indicate a deletion, probably following the 1606 'Acte to restraine the Abuses of Players.'

That's 15 or more punctuation difficulties in just seven lines, quite typical of the MS. Each deserves a considered decision, and the play's several editors, myself included, have exercised their judgments with exegetical consequences, some quite serious. Among Jackson's errors is the assumption that there is a stable text on which to rest the statistical analyses he likes. But in this case it can't be done.

There's worse to come. In addition to its ambiguous commas, periods and absences, the MS in Egerton 1994 contains a wide variety of idiosyncratic marks which seem to have a lot to do with pausation. They include extended hyphens signifying long silences,[73] virgules set at the end of lines, periodic '+' signs and other diacritical indicators. The virgule (/) in particular, as Crystal emphasizes, was 'often used in manuscripts to mark major pauses.'[74] Mechanically following Oras, who either overlooked these data or didn't know about them, Jackson ignores them too and so they're not computed. His A- and B-pause data can thus be safely discounted—disregarded, one might say.

C-Pauses in *1 Richard II*

This leaves the manuscript's C-pauses, i.e. split lines where the verse is distributed between two or more speakers. These data are pivotal, Jackson notes, first because they tend to confirm the results of his uncertain A-pause numbers, and second because they could not have been interfered with by scribes or compositors. C-pauses are, he writes, 'entirely of the playwright's making, since he alone determines whether to split a line among two or more speakers and therefore wholly authorial.'[75] And again:

> While A-type pauses are marked by punctuation, which is by no means wholly in the author's control…C-type pauses, though occurring in far smaller numbers, are, on the other hand, determined by the author.[76]

However, Jackson then contradicts himself by adding:

> …though editors may differ in deciding whether separate speeches, or their beginning or ends, were intended to create shared blank verse lines.[77]

So split pentameters are *not* unequivocally authorial. Results depend on the edition used. I don't disagree, but note in passing how this again compromises Oras's results.

Luckily, in the case of *1 Richard II* we have the original manuscript, or at least a contemporary copy almost certainly checked, edited and sanctioned by the author himself. Frijlinck's 'diplomatic' print rendition, vetted by W.W. Greg, also lies easily to hand. It's about as authoritative and convenient a text as one can find in Elizabethan or Jacobean drama.

Here's the revealing point: *Jackson avoids it*. When it comes to his most critical data, 'entirely of the playwright's making,' he abruptly abandons the MS—which ironically he believes to be a holograph—in favor of Corbin and Sedge's 2002 edition. Jackson's stated reason is that their layout suits him better: 'lines shared by two or more speakers are "stepped" in the approved modern manner,' etc.[78]

But this of course begs the whole question of whether these lines are indeed rhythmically shared, and are not merely sequential prose arbitrarily 'taken' for verse. Jackson also makes it sound as though his rejection of the MS is merely a matter of design, a courtesy to his readers so that the underlying C-patterns may be more clearly discerned. However, like all editors, Corbin and Sedge review the evidence and make their calls. Among the most striking features of their version is a heavy preference for split-level exchanges far in excess of other editions and not always justified by the MS. I have considerable respect for their work, as my 'Variorum Notes' record, but also show in 'A Short History of the Text' (Vol. III), which I invite Jackson to review, that they 'often fiddle gratuitously and even irresponsibly with the text, creating difficulties where there were none before.'[79]

It would not be too strong to say that Jackson's entire case stands or falls by Corbin and Sedge's edition, something he himself recognizes. 'In view of the importance of this analysis,' he writes, 'I give all act, scene, and line references.'[80] This is additionally welcome because we finally get to examine some of Jackson's specifics and assess his analytical procedures. He typically presents percentages and proportions impossible to check.

Following is Jackson's list of what he claims to be the play's 22 split-line iambic pentameters, incidentally still a very low number for a supposedly Jacobean play. Indeed, Jackson himself acknowledges:

> This is a small number, but several of Shakespeare's early plays have fewer, and even *Much Ado About Nothing* (1598), *Henry V* (1598-9), *As You Like It* (1599-60) have only 31, 33, and 35.[81]

That's an unconsciously instructive comment, considering Jackson theoretically doesn't accept Shakespeare as our author, but let it pass. The figures below in square brackets are where, sometimes erroneously, he claims the caesura occurs:

I.i.1 [6], I.i.156 [6], I.i.209 [6], I.iii.64, I.iii.120 [7], I.iii.157 [2], I.iii.167 [5], II.i.101 [4], II.ii.220 [6], II.ii.144 [4], II.iii.73 [7], III.i.14 [5], 111.i.24 [5], III.i.63 [4], III.ii. 99 [6], IV.i.5 [4], IV.ii.180 [6], IV.ii.181 [4], V.i.136 [6], V.iii.5 [6], V.iv.8 [6], V.iv.23 [7].[82]

   Comparing these examples with the actual MS. tells its own devastating story. Most of the above *are not split lines at all*, though they are published as such by Corbin and Sedge. But these are edits—redraftings of the text, frequently in violation of the original.

  Note that the illustrations below are numbered 1-21 because Jackson silently counts one instance twice (number 17). I apologize for the detail of the next few pages, but close scrutiny is the only way to refute Jackson's generalizations. For clarity's sake, I reproduce Corbin and Sedge's 2002 text first, matching its layout, then immediately below a reproduction of the actual manuscript, using MSR type conventions. A comparative table below each entry indicates the way other editors have rendered the same text.

   The point is, had Jackson selected an alternative version, Frijlinck's or the original, or Rossiter's quirky edition which he resorts to elsewhere, or Ule's idiosyncratic rendering, or even mine, which would have given us a convenient common text, he'd have finished up with very different results.

1. Corbin and Sedge, I.i.1-3
All: Lights, lights! Bring torches, knaves!
Lancaster: Shut to the gates!

Let no man out until the house be searched.

Actual MS, I.i.1-2
omnes: lights lights bring torches knaues
lanc: shutt to the gates, lett no man out until the house be searcht

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough
Everitt	Egan
Keller	Halliwell
Rossiter	Parfitt and Shepherd

Comment: This dramatic opening is plainly prose, shouted in panic. The speakers believe an attempt has been made on their lives.

2. Corbin and Sedge, I.i.156-7

Woodstock: In my apparel, you'll say.
Lancaster: Good faith, in all.

Actual MS, I.i.156-7

Wood   In my apparell youle say
lanc   good faith in all

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	Parfitt and Shepherd
Keller	
Rossiter	

Comment: See my discussion of this entry above. Note too that splitting the line does not necessarily mean the editor accepts Jackson's dubious 'slur' hypothesis.

3. Corbin and Sedge, I.i.208-10

Lancaster: We'll have you brave, i'faith!
Woodstock: Well, well,
For your sakes, brothers, and this solemn day,
For once I'll sumpter a gaudy wardrobe, but 'tis more

Actual MS, I.i.208-10

lanc: …wele haue yo[u] braue i faith [83]
Wood: well well for yor sakes brothers & this sollome day
          for once Ile Sumpter a gawdye wardropp, but tis more

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough *no entry*
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	Keller
Rossiter	Parfitt and Shepherd

4. Corbin and Sedge, I.iii.63-4

Duchess of Gloucester: what have you seen, my lord?
Woodstock: Nay, nay, nothing, wife.

Actual MS, I.iii.63-4

Dutch: wo   what haue you seene my lord
Wood: nay nay nothing wife

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough *no entry*
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	Keller
Rossiter	Parfitt and Shepherd

Comment: Editors like myself who step these lines recognize Woodstock's embarrassed pause after 'my lord?' without necessarily reading a split-line pentameter. Rossiter, for example, who remarks upon almost everything, introduces it without note or comment.

5. Corbin and Sedge, I.iii.119-122:

Woodstock: …Here's better men to grace King Richard's chair
If't pleased him grace them so.
King Richard: Uncle, forbear.
Woodstock: These cuts the columns that should prop thy house.

Actual MS, I.iii.119-122:

Woodstock: …heres better men to grace king Richards chaire
Ift pleasd him grace them soe /
King   vncle forbeare
Woodstock: these cutts the collomes that should prop thy house

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough *no entry*
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	Parfitt and Shepherd
Keller	
Rossiter	

Comment: Jackson claims that the split occurs after the seventh syllable but, as readers can see, the MS count is actually six. Perhaps Jackson read Corbin and Sedge's 'pleased' as two syllables, though the MS ('pleasd') unequivocally gives one. This is an excellent example of the way ambiguous scholarship can skew stylometrical results.

6. Corbin and Sedge, I.iii.157-8

Greene, Bagot: Cankers!
York, Arundel: Ay, cankers! caterpillars!

Actual MS, I.iii.157-8

Greĕ: Bag: cankors
York: Aro: I cankors Catterpillers

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
	Armstrong
	Bullough *no entry*
	Egan
	Everitt
	Halliwell
	Keller
	Parfitt and Shepherd
	Rossiter

Comment: Nine syllables! How to turn them into ten so as to read these lines as a split-line iambic pentameter? Jackson's answer is: '*Ay* seems emphatic and therefore stressed, so that there are five metrically stressed syllables in the line, *caterpillars* having a primary stress on the first syllable and a secondary stress on the third.'[84] However, one could argue, as I do, that 'cankers' is the word more heavily stressed—'Aye, *cankers*!' However, Jackson's stylometric version reads thus (stressed syllables italicized): 'c*a*nkors *I* c*a*nkors C*a*tterp*i*llars.'[85]

   This is supposed to be an iambic pentameter. I'd like to hear Jackson speak it so that it scans with, shall we say, 'Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more!'

7. Corbin and Sedge, I.iii.167-8

Woodstock: Ye have done ill then.

King Richard: Ha, dare ye say so?

Actual MS, I.iii.167-8

Wod: ye haue don ill then,
King: ha dare ye say so

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough *no entry*
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	Keller
Parfitt and Shepherd	
Rossiter	

Comment: Note how forcing this exchange into iambics puts the stress on 'ye' in the second line. However, the context makes it clear that the semantic emphasis falls on 'dare.'

8. Corbin and Sedge, II.i.101-2
Bushy: It is, my lord.
King Richard: Prithee, let me hear't,

Actual MS, II.i.101-2
Bush: it is my lord
King: prethee. lett me hear't

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough *no entry*
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	Keller
Parfitt and Shepherd	
Rossiter	

9. Corbin and Sedge, II.ii.143-4
Woodstock: Hear me, King Richard.
King Richard: Plain Thomas, I'll not hear ye.

Actual MS, II.ii.143-4
Wood: heere me king Richard

King: playne Thomas I'le not heare ye.

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough
Everitt	Egan

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Rossiter	Keller
	Halliwell
	Parfitt and Shepherd

Comment: These lines do not add up to an iambic pentameter, the syllable count being twelve. To make his thesis work, Jackson once again 'takes' certain things to be so, i.e., assumes them without evidence or even justification. In this case it's that the disyllabic *Richard* creates 'an epic caesura,' an extra syllable before the mid-line pause.

   This again begs the question, but Jackson simply rolls on, 'taking' *plain Thomas* to be an iambic foot. What he means perhaps is a 'trochaic substitution,' i.e., a trochee replacing an iamb in a decasyllabic line.[86] Jackson follows this with the incorrect assertion that the line 'has a monosyllabic feminine ending' meaning that the final *ye* is unstressed.

   I couldn't disagree more. First, the line is not open, while both *hear* and *ye* need to be equally stressed when spoken. The line's heaviest emphasis is upon *not*, which is unstressed only if we 'take' the verse to be iambic. Note too that the line possesses only three-and-a-half feet.

10. Corbin and Sedge, II.ii.220
Greene: […] I will support his arm.
King Richard: Gramercy, Greene.

Actual MS, II.ii.220
Greeň: […] I will support his Arme
King: gramarcy green

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough
Everitt	Egan
Parfitt and Shepherd	Halliwell
Rossiter	Keller

11. Corbin and Sedge, II.iii.73-4
Duchess of Gloucester: Madame, ye hear I'm sent for.
Queen Anne: Then begone.

185

Actual MS, II.iii.73-4
Duc: *Glo*:   maddame ye heare I'me sent for
Queen Anne: then begone.

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough *no entry*
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	
Keller	
Parfitt and Shepherd	
Rossiter	

12. Corbin and Sedge, III.i.14

All: Why, there's nothing writ!
Tresilian: There's the trick on't.

Actual MS, III.i.14
all: why thers nothing writt
Tresilian: thers the tricke ant.

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Everitt	Armstrong
Parfitt and Shepherd	Bullough
	Egan
	Halliwell
	Keller
	Rossiter

Comment: There are only four-and-a-half feet in this supposedly split line. In reality they're just two short lines of prose. It's not even a couplet, something the author could easily have created by giving 'on it' instead of 'ant' ('on't'). Jackson offers no explanation or defense of his reading.

13. Corbin and Sedge, III.i.24

Scroop: Excellent Tresilian!

Bushy: Noble lord chief justice!

Actual MS, III.i.24

[*all*] *Scroo*: excellent Trissillian
Bush: noble lord chiefe Iustice.

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough
Everitt	Egan
Parfitt and Shepherd	Halliwell
Rossiter	Keller

Comment: This is prose, not verse. See my discussion above.

14. Corbin and Sedge, III.i.63-6

Queen: They are your noble kinsmen—to revoke
                 The sentence were—

King Richard: An act of folly, Nan.
        King's [*sic*] words are laws. If we infringe our word
        We break our law.

Actual MS, III.i.63-6

queen: they are your noble kinsmen. To revoke the sentence, weare
King: an act of folly nan. Kings words are lawes
If we in frindge o^r word we breake o^r law

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Egan	Armstrong
	Bullough
	Everitt
	Halliwell
	Keller
	Parfitt and Shepherd
	Rossiter

Comment: I acknowledge in my variorum notes and 'A Short History of the Text' my acceptance of this edit by Corbin and Sedge. But it is not in the manuscript and no other editors agree.

15. Corbin and Sedge, III.ii.98-9
York: Let's still confer by letters.
Woodstock: Content, content

Actual MS, III.ii.98-9
york: letts still conferr by letters.
Woodstock: content content

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	
Keller	
Parfitt and Shepherd	
Rossiter	

Comment: Despite Corbin and Sedge's layout, this is clearly not a split-line iambic pentameter—*letters*' second syllable gets in the way. No problem: Jackson simply labels the conclusion of the first line an 'epic caesura' (note the circularity of the argument) and 'disregards' the final syllable of *letters*, thus achieving his desired result.[87]

16. Corbin and Sedge, IV.i.4-6
Servant: I will, my lord.   *Exit* Servant.
Tresilian: So seven thousand pounds
From Bedford, Buckingham and Oxford shires

Actual Manuscript, IV.i.4-6
ser: I will my lord. *Exit seruant.*
Triss: so (7000) pounds from bedford, buckingham and oxford sheires

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
	Armstrong
	Bullough *no entry*
	Egan
	Everitt
	Halliwell
	Keller
	Parfitt and Shepherd
	Rossiter

Comment: Corbin and Sedge are the only editors to split Tresilian's line.

17. Corbin and Sedge, IV.ii.179-185

Woodstock: I'll put in bail and answer to the law.
             Speak, is King Richard here?
All: No, no, my lord.
    Away with him.

Woodstock: Villains. touch me not.
    I am descended of the royal blood,
    King Richard's uncle,
    His grandsire's son, his princely father's brother.
    Becomes it princes to be led like slaves?

Actual MS, IV.ii.179-185

W: Ile putt in bayle, & answer to the law, speake is king Richard heere

all: no no my lord away wth hime

W: villaynes touch me not, I am dissended of the royall blood
      king Richards vncle, his grandsiers sonne. his princly fathers brother;
    becomes it princes to be led like slaues.

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	Keller
Parfitt and Shepherd	
Rossiter	

Comment: As noted above, Corbin and Sedge's radical relineation allows Jackson to quietly count this passage twice, once for 'No, no, my lord. / Away with him,' and once for 'Away with him./ Villains, touch me not.'

That's quite a technical triumph for a hack like Rowley, the same half-line functioning simultaneously as the conclusion of one pentameter and the beginning of the next. It's so improbable, Jackson takes care to separate his claims (they are entered as distinct examples on different pages).

18. Corbin and Sedge, V.i.136-7

Lapoole: Your grace mistakes, my lord.

Woodstock: What art thou? Speak

Actual MS, V.i.136-7
La: yoʳ grace mistakes my lord
W: what art thoᵘ speake

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough *no entry*
Everitt	Egan
Parfitt and Shepherd	Halliwell
Rossiter	Keller

19. Corbin and Sedge, V.iii.4-5
Lancaster: So traitorously betrayed.
York: Alack, good man,

Actual MS, V.iii.4-5
Lanck: So trayterously betrayd.
yorke: Alacke good man,

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	
Keller	
Parfitt and Shepherd	
Rossiter	

Comment: Jackson once again 'takes' it, without evidence, that 'The word "trait-orously" is effectively trisyllabic: "trait'rously".' [88] Maybe so, but my view here and elsewhere is that had the author intended 'trait'rously,' he would have written it.

20. Corbin and Sedge, V.iv.8-9
Greene: I'd seal't on all your hearts.
Cheney: This shall suffice

Actual MS, V.iv.8-9
Gr: […] Id sealt on all yoʳ hartes
Ch: this shall suffice

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough *no entry*
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	
Keller	
Parfitt and Shepherd	
Rossiter	

21. Corbin and Sedge, V.iv.23

Cheney: Stand firm, my lord. Here's rescue.
Cheney: Courage, then,
               We'll bear his body hence in spite of them.   *They fight*

Actual MS, V.iv.23

Ch: Stand firme my lord heeres rescue
Aron: courage then wele beare his body hence in spight of them   *They fight*

Other Editors	
Split	**No Split**
Armstrong	Bullough *no entry*
Egan	Halliwell
Everitt	Keller
Parfitt and Shepherd	
Rossiter	

General Summary: Jackson stacks his deck by employing a text overburdened with C-type pauses. No other edition comes close to Corbin and Sedge in this regard. But that's an insufficient reason for using their edition, especially as Jackson fails to acknowledge it. Scholarly integrity requires using the MS. alone, since it is available and authoritative. It's obvious too that the analyst should not adjust the author's language and/or layout to suit his thesis; Jackson however does not hesitate to alter everything important, adding and subtracting rhythmic values in a thinly disguised effort to make things fit. Hiding behind the disputed editorial decisions of others, especially without acknowledging it, is also not acceptable.

Rhymes and Reasons

Jackson's final section suffers from the same executive deficiencies as the rest of his paper. His purpose is to demonstrate identities of rhyming style and preference between *When You See Me* and *1 Richard II*, and thus identities of authorship.

  In order to accomplish this, however, he is forced again to establish arbitrary,

191

limiting and subjective criteria. Where his syllabic counts required slurs and verbal amputations, his alleged rhymes rest on impossibly distorted pronunciations ('assonantal near-rhymes, and, above all, nasal near-rhymes,' as he puts it [89]) that would turn any real-life performance into an adenoidal farce. Jackson insists upon it nonetheless; indeed, his case cannot survive otherwise.

Jackson's initial gambit advances what he calls 'jingling rhymes,' a dismissive term he invents for the complex process of rhyming three-syllable words ending in *-y* or *-ies*. But as Greene makes clear in his *Groatsworth of Wit*, facility in triple-rhyming was a prized skill. [90] Rowley does it, the author of *1 Richard II* does it (though only about one-third as frequently, 23 times to 74), and Shakespeare does it, e.g., 'Things base and vile, holding no quantity / Love can transpose to form and dignity' (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, I.i.232-33). Jackson's own figures show that the practice is scattered randomly throughout Shakespeare's works, suggesting no developmental pattern but the poetic exigencies of the moment.[91] He eventually concedes that Anon's usage in *1 Richard II*, 'cannot be deemed beyond Shakespeare's scope,'[92] so this part of his case need detain us no longer.

A later but similar aspect notes that the words 'boe' (boo) and 'ye' occur in *1 Richard II*, *Wily Beguiled* (which Jackson claims was also written or partly written by Rowley [93]) and *When You See Me You Know Me*. But 'boo' is a common enough expletive, while its context and usage in our play is completely different from Jackson's other examples. *Wily Beguiled* has 'cry bo ho' (to sob, not to make a scary noise) and *When You See Me*, 'cry boh.' In *1 Richard II* the Holofernesian schoolmaster, who is given to saws and idioms ('let's look there be no pitchers with ears, nor needles with eyes about us') says about the political authorities, referring to some satirical verses he has composed, 'they shall not [say] boo to a goose for it,' (III.iii.142-3), meaning that they won't be able to see through his subtle insults and take offense. This seems a usage of a completely different kind and, like the expression 'nor needles without eyes,' strikingly original.

The 'unshakespearean' use of 'ye' in *1 Richard II* is accounted for on stylistic grounds, evoking the Lord Protector's older and more traditional world against the minions' destructive modernism.

Speech-Pause Rhymes

Jackson's longest and most substantial argument involves so-called 'speech-pause rhymes,' a term borrowed from Frederick Ness who identified ten other rhyme-varieties in Shakespeare, including 'speech-end,' 'exit-and-cue,' 'scene-end' and 'act-end,' etc. [94]

Since none of Ness's other categories disqualify Shakespeare's authorship of *1 Richard II*, Jackson concentrates exclusively on 'speech pauses,' confusingly defined as

Rhymes occurring within speeches but preceded and followed by at least one full line of blank verse by the same speaker, except that when the closing couplet of a speech is followed by a single blank verse line Ness categorizes it as a 'speech-end' rhyme.[95]

After this, it's not clear whether Jackson collates 'speech-pause' or 'speech-end' rhymes or both. The complexity of this definition also suggests that Rowley was a more highly skilled dramatic poet than *When You See Me* displays. Either way, Jackson's point is that there are considerably more speech-pause/end rhymes in *1 Richard II* than elsewhere in Shakespeare. On the other hand, Anon's practice, as Jackson characterizes it, resembles Rowley's. He thus concludes that Shakespeare didn't write *1 Richard II* and Sam Rowley did.

But making good on these claims requires, first, excluding *Pericles*, *Prince of Tyre* and *Timon of Athens*, nominally on the grounds of collaboration,[96] but really because they're not helpful to the argument. Jackson again manipulates his data. *1 Henry VI*, also described as a collaborative work, is helpfully retained, as are *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Henry VIII*,[97] both in fact likelier than *Pericles* or *Timon* to have been co-authored.

A second prerequisite is defining 'rhyme' so broadly that anything can be said to rhyme with anything (or not), depending on the needs of the case. Instead of observing what actually distinguishes *1 Richard II*'s verse—a plethora of inventive and extended rhyme-sequences quite different from *When You See Me You Know Me*—Jackson seizes on the supposed occurrence of 'nasal assonantal near-rhymes.' Since these are hard to detect or recognize, his criteria for 'deciding to accept' whether a 'nasal assonantal near-rhyme' was 'intended' by the playwright include whether the rhyme 'has an obvious gnomic function,' and 'ends in a strong pause…in Corbin and Sedge's edition, but sometimes by a comma.'[98]

An gnomic statement ending in a strong pause but 'sometimes' a weak pause and only in one edition? These vague, over-broad and completely subjective criteria invalidate most of Jackson's results since they confessedly depend, as with his C-pauses, on 'conjectural emendations,' i.e., editorial guesswork. Relying on Corbin and Sedge rather than Frijlinck or the MS., the proper scholarly practice, Jackson assembles a list of supposed 'nasal' rhymes whose arbitrariness is not mitigated by his repeated acknowledgments that 'No doubt some of my instances of speech-pause rhyme in *Woodstock* would be discarded by another investigator,' etc.[99] In a similar vein he revealingly remarks that

There may be slight doubts about a few of the following [nasal assonantal near-rhymes], when the vowel sounds are not identical, but nearly all appear in positions where rhyme is almost certain to have been intended.[100]

Aside from the fact that Jackson seems never to have heard of the Intentional

Fallacy, his acknowledged method is completely unacceptable. First he locates a pair of lines 'preceded and followed by at least one full line of blank verse by the same speaker,' then searches for and surprise! discovers an 'assonantal nasal half-rhyme' just where he needs it and (he assures us) 'almost certainly' as the playwright 'intended.' Like *Alice in Wonderland*, it's sentence first, verdict afterward. Words that in reality don't even remotely rhyme are coerced into a kind of Platonic relationship, theoretically matched in ways that neither could nor would be sustained in any actual theater.

   Thus 'queen' finds itself nasally and assonantly rhymed with 'realm' and later 'crown,' but not with 'Green' which (given its position) has to be rhymed with 'room.' I can't imagine any actor nasaling his way through that one. 'Undone' is compelled to rhyme with 'harm,' 'come' with 'wrongs' and 'again,' which is later rhymed with 'him,' which is later rhymed with 'king,' and so on.[101]

   In other words, it's totally capricious and non-objective—exactly what stylometrics was supposed to save us from. Straightforward rhymes like *hands-lands* (IV.ii.139-40) are excluded from the count because they don't 'fit' the thesis. Other omitted pairs include *bold-gold* (I.i.210-11); *praise-prize* (I.i.84-5); *redress-stress* (I.iii.95-6); *prize-enemies* (I.iii.185-6); *ire-fire* (I.iii.203-4); *indeed-bleed* (IV.ii.215-16); *attend-end* (IV.iii.146-7); *crown-drown* (IV.iii.148-9); *go-woe* (IV.iii.177-8); *spilt-guilt* (V.i.39-40); *nigh-fly* (V.i.77-8); *good-blood* (V.i.124-5); *sport-for't* (V.i.135-6); *him-him* (V.i.184-5); and *me-see* (V.i.199-200).

   The problem is that Jackson's controlling search-criteria are restricted to 'rhymes occurring within speeches but preceded and followed by at least one full line of blank verse by the same speaker, except when the closing couplet of a speech is followed by a single blank verse line.' But since this doesn't happen too often in *1 Richard II*, appropriate examples have to be created by definition and editorial meddling.

   Jackson's pursuit of the 'right' kind of rhyme is carried through with such desperation that *1 Richard II*'s actual practice is overlooked, e.g., at IV.iii.106-7, where Jackson insists upon the 'assonantal nasal rhyme' of *him* and *again*, though the actual rhyme is between *again* and *uncertain*:

> Her speech is gone. Only at sight of him
> She heav'd her hands and clos'd her eyes again,
> And whether alive or dead is yet uncertain.

Note too the absence of any 'gnomic intent' in this and the examples following. Jackson's categories *hic et ubique* come and go on an 'as needed' basis. At I.i.34-6—

> In mournful France: the warlike battles won
> At Crécy Field, Poitiers, Artoise and Maine

> Made all France groan under his conquering arm

—Jackson insists upon the 'assonantal nasal rhyme' of *Maine* and *arm*, overlooking the far closer *Maine* and *won*. And again, at IV.i.15-18—

> I'll please the King and keep me in his grace,
> For princes' favors purchase land apace.
> These Blanks that I have scatter'd in the realm
> Shall double his revenues to the crown.

—Jackson recognizes *realm* and *crown*, but ignores *grace* and *apace*. This is theory blinded by itself. In the same selective spirit, Jackson notes the rhyme *all/fall* in the first two lines of the following, yet completely overlooks—but is that possible?—the assonance structuring the third line and the string of heroic couplets comprising all the rest:

> *King Richard*: Down with this house of Sheen! Go, ruin all,
> Pull down her buildings, let her turrets fall!
> Forever lay it waste and desolate,
> That English king may never here keep court,
> But to all ages leave a sad report,
> When men shall see these ruin'd walls of Sheen
> And sighing say, here died King Richard's queen.
> For which we'll have it wasted lime and stone
> To keep a monument of Richard's moan. (*1 Richard II*, IV.ii.153-61)

Here's a last example, spoken by the Ghost of Edward III over the sleeping Woodstock. Note the unmistakably Shakespearean resonance in this speech, whose content allows us to trace subtle lines of authorial and narrative development between *1* and *2 Richard II*, *Edward III* and *Henry V*.[102] This remarkable set of intertextual references all but clinches the proposition that Shakespeare was Anon:

> Richard of Bordeaux, my accursed grandchild,
> Cut off your titles to the kingly state
> And now your lives and all would ruinate:
> Murders his grandsire's sons his father's brothers!
> Becomes a landlord to my kingly titles,
> Rents out my crown's revenues, racks my subjects
> That spent their bloods with me in conquering France,
> Beheld me ride in state through London streets,
> And at my stirrup lowly footing by
> Four captive kings to grace my victory.
> Yet that nor this his riotous youth can stay,

> Till death hath ta'en his uncles all away.
> Thou fifth of Edward's sons, get up and fly!
> Haste thee to England, close and speedily!
> Thy brothers York and Gaunt are up in arms;
> Go join with them, prevent thy further harms
> The murderers are at hand awake, my son!.
> This hour foretells thy sad destruction.   (*1 Richard II*, V.i.85-102)

Jackson's culpable misreadings, deliberate or otherwise, have serious analytical consequences, since they ultimately form the basis of his attribution of the play to Rowley. Each is an instance of what might be called 'negative data manipulation,' that is, the suppression of counter-evidence.

My broader point is that there's nothing comparable in *When You See Me* to the sustained poetic exuberance we encounter in *1 Richard II*, IV.ii.153-61, V.i.85-102, and elsewhere. It completely undercuts Jackson's attempt to show that Anon and Rowley share verse styles (never mind poetic ability).

It is perfectly true that in some respects *1 Richard II* is anomalous, but that is what we would expect from a Shakespearean work so strikingly experimental. It might indeed be the first drama written specifically for the provincial tour, a possibility explaining many of its innovative features. *King John*, another controversial play, is so asynchronous that an entire school of commentators, led by E.A.J. Honigmann, dates it to 1588-9. It was nevertheless written in 1594.[103] In the case of *1 Richard II*, one thinks particularly of the live horse ridden onto the stage in III.ii, virtually without precedent or successor in the English theater,[104] and the astonishingly innovative ghosts of V.ii.[105]

Even more remarkable, and unmistakably Shakespeare in its inventive humor, the on-stage horse almost literally runs off with his scene when he is given a sort of silent dialogue with Woodstock. The moment has been justly compared by Tillyard to Launce and his dog Crab in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*.[106] This masterful episode alone, not to mention the masque, the waspish portrait of the Spruce Courtier, the mingled tragedy and humor of the Dunstable episode and the astonishing virtuosity of the play's language, indicate a writer working far beyond Rowley's limited range, though easily within Shakespeare's.

When it comes to the verse, the poet is equally prepared to chance his arm in a spectacularly un-Rowleyan but Shakespearean way, creating a kind 'prosiform' where rhyme and rhythm are woven in and out of the verbal texture. Note the process in the following comparative examples, the first from *1 Richard II*, the second from *Love's Labor's Lost* (1595). It's striking too how in both cases the rhyming passages (e.g., 'Those parts are thine as amply, Bagot, as the crown is mine') italicize the moment's general irony. All Elizabethans, and especially the queen herself, knew how insecurely the crown sat on young King Richard's head.

King: Come stand by me and mark those shires assign'd ye. Bagot, thy lot betwixt the Thames and sea thus lies: Kent, Surrey, Sussex, Hampshire, Berkshire, Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, Somersetshire, Devonshire, Cornwall. Those parts are thine as amply, Bagot, as the crown is mine. (*1 Richard II*, IV.i.195-202)

Holofernes: ...O thou monster Ignorance, how deformed dost thou look!
Nathaniel: Sir, he hath never fed of the dainties that are bred in a book; he hath not eat paper, as it were; he hath not drunk ink: his intellect is not replenished; he is only an animal, only sensible in the duller parts;
And such barren plants are set before us, that we thankful should be—
Which we of taste and feeling are-for those parts that do fructify in us more than he,
For as it would ill become me to be vain, indiscreet, or a fool,
So were there a patch set on learning, to see him in a school. (*Love's Labor's Lost*, IV.ii.23-31)

In his edition of the play Rossiter describes this technique as Anon's 'betwixt and between style of sub-verse or iambic prose,'[107] quite forgetting that Shakespeare uses it too.

The implications are considerable, since the occurrence in Anon and Shakespeare (but not in Rowley) of the distinctive 'betwixt and between style' helps confirm our hypothesis that Shakespeare and Anon are the same author. It also perhaps indicates an early verse-experiment by Shakespeare. Audiences would sense periodically that rhyme and verse were being used, allowing the playwright considerable variety and choice of manner.

The *-eth* Suffix

Jackson's final card is the relative absence in *1 Richard II* of words ending in *-eth*, a recognized early-middle-English marker. Citing data compiled by Estelle Taylor, Michael Dobson and Stanley Wells, he shows that Shakespeare's first twenty plays (1591-99) employ 239 *-eth* suffixes, whereas the latter sixteen (1600-13) contain only twenty-nine.[108] Since the Elizabethan *-eth* is rare in *1 Richard II* but the Jacobean *-es/s*, ('fares,' runs,' etc.) plentiful, he concludes that the play must be of the seventeenth century.

But of course there are Jacobean usages in the text—I've acknowledged the fact repeatedly, in my book and in this essay, as have Partridge, Rossiter, Keller, Frijlinck and every other serious scholar of the manuscript. Their presence, alongside the MS's many Elizabethanisms, helps us decipher the play's strange, eventful history. It was composed in the early 1590s but revised ca. 1605, when it was recopied by a scribe who introduced abbreviations, especially ampersands and other elisions (e.g., 'cuts throat' for 'cut his throat'), Jacobean proclitics, enclitics, and contractions such as *mat^{ie.}* for 'majesty.' As Eric Sams has shown, like many of his contemporaries 'Shakespeare regularly revised or rewrote his own work.'[109]

My discussion of *2 Henry VI*, illustrating the ways he creatively edited *The Contention* in the light of *1 Richard II*, demonstrates his capacity to reconsider and rephrase in great detail.[110]

If this is what happened to *1 Richard II* it would not be unusual. We saw in our discussion of Partridge and his 'stratification' data the way stage directions linking II.i and II.ii were displaced from the start of II.iii, and how at V.iv and V.v a big section was deleted, obviously from some earlier version. Only the author could 'authorize' edits of this magnitude, just as only he could have attempted to rework and then delete Richard's 'pelting farm' speech.

We also noted evidence of direct authorial intervention of a Shakespearean kind at IV.iii.93, where the stage direction '*Enter Baggott*' replaces '*Enter Dutchess & a Gentleman*' Tresilian's greeting is accordingly edited from 'heere comes the dutches' to 'heere comes Sr Edward Baggott'. What follows has to be a new or redrafted scene.

Despite these facts, Jackson considers it 'implausible' that the original was seriously edited. Again it's so because he wishes it: 'only a very thorough revision would account for this evidence,' he claims.[111] But a very thorough revision is precisely what the MS does indicate as the copyist struggles to reconcile versions and the writer periodically intervenes.

What especially worries Jackson is the notion that updating the *-eth* forms of an earlier text to the *-es/s* endings found in the actual MS would require 'a complete reworking of the verse,' far too extensive a job.[112] Verbs such as 'speaketh' and 'walketh' have two syllables while their -es/s forms possess only one. The original rhythms would be irretrievably lost.

Not necessarily so, however. *Hamlet* went through several drafts, as is well known, and in their transitions we may often catch Shakespeare at work. In I.iii. 77 Q2 and *Folio* he transforms an *-eth* sentence into an *-es/s* without the slightest trouble:

   And borrowing dulleth edge of husbandry (*Hamlet* Q2)

   And borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry (*Hamlet* Folio)

The turns out to be a simple anagram of *eth*. It's easily inserted, maintains the beat, and almost effortlessly updates antique language. Obviously, it's even simpler to replace *hath* with *has* and *doth* with *does*, a point made by Partridge.

Summary

Jackson presents an apparently forceful case for Rowley until one inspects his specifics. Then things begin to fall apart. Inaccuracies aside, he frequently substitutes his own opinion for the evidence, and abuses the privilege of definition

by expanding criteria to the point where anything and/or nothing may be said to comply.

Above all, he fails to take into account the phalanx of non-stylometrical data assembled in *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One* and elsewhere, almost all of it contradicting his hypotheses. Even Elliott and Valenza grant that known historical factors, such as an author's dates, must outweigh the apparent evidence of linguistic numbers—'For us, and, we believe, for most people, the one strong piece of exclusionary evidence would prevail over the scores of otherwise persuasive pieces of inclusionary evidence.'[113] Jackson needs to factor in these data, despite his antipathy to historically informed analysis.[114]

The final word goes to Samuel Schoenbaum, perhaps the most objective of all attribution scholars, who calls for authorial identifications based on a convergence of all the evidence, internal and external. In a successful authorship case, he says

> The ultimate effect is a cumulative one in which all the internal evidence—stylistic, bibliographical and linguistic—converges inexorably upon a single possible author-identification, an identification compatible with the known external information.[115]

This is precisely what Jackson fails to do—demonstrate the compatibility of his data 'with the known external information.' On the other hand, this is precisely what *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One* does succeed in doing, I hope it will be agreed: unites and reconciles all the known figures, words and facts, (including most of Jackson's) in a 'single author-identification.' The evidence derives from every possible category: linguistic, historical, bibliographic, social, literary, thematic, philosophic, artistic, and even stylometric.

Until Jackson (or someone else) demonstrates a disqualifying flaw in these data and/or their analysis, the attribution of *1 Richard II* to Shakespeare has to stand. Jackson's case for Rowley, built on slurs, nasal rhymes and amputations, may be disregarded.

Notes

1 MacD. P. Jackson: 'Shakespeare's *Richard II* and the Anonymous *Thomas of Woodstock*,' in John Pitcher, *et. al* (eds): *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, Volume 14 (Cranbury, CT: Associated University Presses and Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp. 2001) pp. 17-65. Originally published as *Richard II*, *Part One*, the anonymous MS was retitled *Thomas of Woodstock* in the 1920s by critics seeking to deemphasize its Shakespearean connections. Jackson insists on using the revision, often with a rider that Egan 'believes' the play should be 'retitled' *1 Richard II*. In *The Tragedy of Richard II*, *Part One*, Vol. I, pp 23-32, I provide a history of the title issue.

2 Michael Egan: 'Did Samuel Rowley Write *Thomas of Woodstock*?' *The Oxfordian*/10 2007, pp. 35-54.

3 MacD. P. Jackson: 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*: Evidence and its Interpretation' (*Research Opportunities in Medieval and Renaissance Drama* XLVI 2007) pp. 67-100; 'Riposte to Egan,' m.jackson@auckland.ac.nz.

4 Jackson, Email, 'Riposte to Egan' p. 8; 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 95.

5 See 'A Short History of the Text,' in Egan, *The Tragedy of Richard II*, *Part One*, Vol. III, pp. 130-210.

6 A.C. Partridge: *Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama; A Study of Colloquial Contractions, Elisions, Prosody and Punctuation* (University of Nebraska Press, 1964) pp. 34-42.

7 Partridge, op. cit., p. 41.

8 Copyists would typically transcribe a text without assigning speech-heads. These crucial assignments would then be added later, presumably by the playwright or in consultation with him.

9 If the revisions are indeed authorial, this could be one of the few examples definitely attributable to the author of the *Collected Works of Shakespeare*. But this itself raises many questions. The handwriting does not seem like the six known signatures of Shakespeare of Stratford, (though these may not be in his own hand anyway). Neither is it anything like the acknowledged handwriting of Edward de Vere, who was supposedly dead by 1605. As noted, however, the date for the authorial revisions themselves is circumstantial, and there are doubts too about the date of de Vere's death. Experts in calligraphy will have to examine the handwriting more fully: much in the authorship debate could hinge on it.

10 R[obert] A[llott]: *Englands Parnassus: or The choysest Flowers of our Moderne Poets, with their Poeticall comparisons. Descriptions of bewties, personages, castles, pallaces, mountaines, groues, seas, springs, riuers, &c. Whereunto are annexed other various discourses, both pleasaunt and profitable.* (London: N. L[ing] C. B[urke] & T. H.[ayes], 1600).

11 R. Holinshed: *Chronicle of England, Scotland and Ireland*, 6 vols. (London: J. Johnson, 1807-8 New York: AMS Press, 1965), Vol. II, p. 859.

12 Brian Vickers: *'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship and John Ford's* Funerall Elegye (Cambridge U.P., 2002) p. 87.

13 As elsewhere in the MS., long textual lines of this sort indicate a pause. See my 'Short History of the Text,' *op. cit*., Vol. III. Jackson, whose later argument depends in large part on pause analysis is completely unaware of it and thus fails to take this crucial feature into account.

14 '*Woodstock*: The Text,' in Rossiter, *ed. cit*., pp. 170-180, and Notes, passim; *Text and Variorum Notes*, passim; Frijlinck, *ed. cit*., pp. vi-xxii.

15 Partridge, p. 41.

16 *Ibid*. Partridge also dates the play 1592-3.

17 Jackson, 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 73.

18 David Crystal: *The Stories in English* (Allen Lane, 2004) p. 97.

19 Email,'Riposte to Egan,' p. 5

20 Egan, *op. cit*., Vol. I, pp. 129-30; MacD. P. Jackson: *Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare* (Institut Für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Universität Salzburg, 1979), p. 152.

21 The T index was devised by Jonathan Hope*: The Authorship of Shakespeare's Plays*: *A Socio-Linguistic Study* (Cambridge U.P., 1994), p. 55-63. For a positive assessment of Hope and his methodology, see Vickers, *Shakespeare, Co-Author*, pp. 124-6.

22 Vickers, *'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare*, Chapter 6: Rhetoric: the Shakespearean 'hendiadys,' pp. 163-188.

23 Kermode: *Shakespeare's Language,* p. 102, quoting George T. Wright, 'Hendiadys and Hamlet,' P.M.L.A., 96, pp. 168ff.

24 Egan, *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, Vol. I, pp. 99-102, 448-452

25 Egan, *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, Vol. I, pp. 100-2

26 Jackson, 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 72

27 Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, I, p. 175

28 'The Dramatist as Historian,' *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, Vol. I, pp. 176-193

29 'Sieben Jahre (1390-1397) regierte Richard jetzt als vorbildlicher konstitioneller monarch.' (Gustav Kirchner: '*Das historische und dichterische Bild Richards II' (Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* (1953) p. 148.

30 Inga-Stina Ewbank: 'These Pretty Devices: A Study of Masques in Plays,' in Anon. (ed.): *A Book of Masques in Honour of Allardyce Nicoll* (Cambridge U.P., 1967) pp. 438-9; Janet C. Stavropoulos: ' "A masque is treason's license": the Design of *Woodstock*,' *The Journal of the South Central Modern Language Association* (Summer, 1988) pp. 1-12, Edgar Schell*: Strangers and Pilgrims: From* The Castle of Perseverance *to* King Lear (The University of Chicago Press, 1983) pp. 98-9

31 Stavropoulos, op. cit., p. 11. Similar but unrelated claims have been made for the play's ghost scene., e.g., Charles Edward Whitmore: *The Supernatural in Tragedy* (New York: P.P. Appel, 1971) p. 227

32 Inga-Stina Ewbank: op. cit., pp. 438-9

33 Schell, pp. 98-9.

34 Marie Axton*: The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1997), p. 99.

35 Ward E.Y. Elliott and Robert J. Valenza: 'And Then There Were None: Winnowing the Shakespeare Claimants.' *Computers and the Humanities* 30 (1996) pp. 191–245.

36 See for example 'Auditing the Stylometricians: Elliott, Valenza and the Claremont Shakespeare Authorship Clinic,' by John M. Shahan and Richard F. Whalen, elsewhere in this issue.

37 Ward E.Y. Elliott and Robert J. Valenza: 'Glass Slippers and Seven-League Boots: C-Prompted Doubts about Ascribing *A Funeral Elegy* and *A Lover's Complaint* to Shakespeare,' Shakespeare Quarterly, Vol. 48, No. 2 (Summer, 1997) p. 185.

38 Egan, *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, Vol.I, pp. 99-102, 448-452, reprinted as 'Woodstock's Golden Metamorphosis' in Douglas A. Brooks (Ed): *The Shakespeare Apocrypha* (*Shakespeare Yearbook*, Vol. 16, Edwin Mellen Press 2007) pp. 75-115.

39 Shakespeare's 'academic side...so prominent in his early years.' (Tillyard, *op. cit*., p. 157.) '...Shakespeare worked like a historical scholar, and made his histories by collating authorities, cross-checking and (in a word) Research.' (Rossiter: 'Prognosis on a Shakespeare Problem,' cited by Ure, *ed. cit*., p. l.)

[40] The poems are quoted and these points elaborated in 'Text and Variorum Notes,' *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, Vol. II, pp. 517-18 and 634-37.

41 Egan, *op. cit*., Vol. I, pp 189-95. See also Matthew W. Black: 'Sources of Shakespeare *Richard II*' in Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies (Washington, 1948).

42 Egan, op. cit., 'Commentary', Vol. III, pp. 264-278.

43 Jackson, 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 94.

44 Ants Oras: *Pause Patterns in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1960).

45 Oras. p. 2.

46 Oras. p. 3.

47 Oras, p. 2

48 Jackson, 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 79.

49 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 82

50 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 85.

51 Oras, p. 2.

52 See e.g. Trevor McNeely: *Proteus Unmasked: Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric and the Art of Shakespeare* (Lehigh U.P. 2004); Robert Matz: *Defending Literature in Early Modern England: Renaissance Literary Theory in Social Context* (Cambridge U.P., 2000); Marshall Grossman: *The Story of All Things: Writing the Self in English Renaissance Narrative Poetry* (Duke U.P. 1998); William J. Grace*: Approaching Shakespeare* (Basic Books, 1964); Una Ellis-Fermor and Kenneth Muir: *Shakespeare the Dramatist: And Other Papers* (Methuen & Co., 1961) George Pierce Baker: *The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist* (Macmillan, 1907).

53 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 80

54 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 82

55 Oras, p. 3.

56 David Crystal: *'Think on my words' Exploring Shakespeare's Language* (Cambridge U.P. 2008), p. 68.

57 Crystal, op. cit., pp. 65-6.

58 Oras, p. 4.

59 Oras, pp. 2, 4.

[60] Jackson uses Peter Corbin & Douglas Sedge (eds.): *Thomas of Woodstock: or King Richard the Second, Part One* (Manchester U.P., 2002). See my discussion of this below.

61 A.E. Housman: 'Introductory Lecture,' 1892 in *Selected Prose*, ed. Carter, 1961.

62 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 82

63 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 82

64 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock,*' p. 83

65 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 83

66 Oras, p. 3, Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 85

67 Crystal, op. cit., pp. 65-6.

68 Oras, p. 3

69 Frijlinck, Introduction, p. x.

70 Crystal, op. cit., p. 67.

71 John Dover Wilson: 'Textual Introduction' *The Tempest*, ed. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson (Cambridge, 1921), pp. xxxvii-xxxviii). See also Michael J. Warren, 'Re-punctuation as Interpretation in Editions of Shakespeare,' in *Shakespeare and the Editorial Tradition*, ed. Stephen Orgel and Sean Keilen (New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1999) pp. 179-193.

72 A small but important point follows from this. Jackson makes a fuss about the absent apostrophe in byth, which he takes for evidence of 17th-century practice ('Date and Authorship,' p. 73). But as one can see, the copyist is uncertain about the difference between a comma and an apostrophe, and in the end makes the wrong choice. Thereafter he opts for the contemporary (1605) spelling, *bith*.

73 Egan, op. cit., Vol. III, pp 131-2

74 Crystal, op. cit., pp. 63-4.

75 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 82

76 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 85

77 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 85

78 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 82

79 Egan, *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, Vol. III, p. 205

80 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 82

81 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 83

82 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 82

83 Frijlinck incorrectly gives 'e faith,' although as I note elsewhere MS *i* and *e* are often hard to distinguish.

84 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 83

85 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 83

86 Trochaic substitution occurs when a slacked syllable followed by a stressed syllable (- /) is replaced by a two-syllable foot comprising a stressed syllable followed by a slacked syllable (/ -). Trochaic substitutions are typically employed for emphasis.

87 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 83

88 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 83

89 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,'   p. 89

90 The anonymous Gentleman says: 'The people make no estimation Of Morals teaching education. Was not this prettie for a plaine rime extempore? If ye will ye shall have More.' —D. Allen Carroll (ed.): *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* (Binghamton, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1994) pp. 84-85. See also Frank Davis's article on *Groatsworth* in this issue.

91 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 86

92 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 86

93 Rowley keeps popping up as everyone's favorite author of anonymous plays, including (at various times) *The Taming of a Shrew*, *Orlando Furioso* and *The Famous Victories of Henry V*., etc. In his edition of *King John*, Honigmann

discusses the phenomenon of what he calls 'Rowley plays' (E.A.J. Honigmann, (ed.): *King John* (London: Methuen & Co., 1954, 1973), pp. lv-lvi).

94 Frederick Ness: *The Use of Rhymes in Shakespeare's Plays* (Yale U.P., 1941); Jackson, pp. 86-7.

95 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 87

96 As Earl Showerrman shows elsewhere in this issue, scholars are uncertain whether *Timon* is unfinished or the product of collaboration.

97 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,'   p. 93

98 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' pp. 87-88

99 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' pp. 88

100 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 89

101 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,' p. 89-90. Jackson erroneously gives 1 Richard II, I.iii.3-4 for this usage, probably intending I.iii.83-4

102 This striking observation was first made by Corbin and Sedge in their edition of the play. For details, see my discussion of *Edward III* in *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, General Introduction.

103 See Michael Egan, 'Introduction to *King John*' in Joseph Rosenblum, (ed.): *A Student's Companion to Shakespeare*: *A Comprehensive Guide to the Plays and Poems* (Evergreen, 2005).

104 There are only two other occasions where live horses are called for. In *Alarum for London,* 261-2, a dead figure is 'carried upon a horseback covered with black', and in *Late Lancashire Witches*, 234, a skimmington ('a ludicrous procession...common in villages and country districts,' *OED*) passes over the stage. (Alan C. Dessen and Leslie Thomson: *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama 1580-1642* (Cambridge U.P. 1999), horse.) In Kyd's *Solyman and Perseda* Basilisco briefly rides a mule, while Corbin and Sedge conjecturally add the s.d. 'Enter Sir John Oldcastle on horseback' to their edition of *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth* (Peter Corbin and Douglas Sedge (eds.): *The Oldcastle Controversy*: Sir John Oldcastle, Part I *and* The Famous Victories of Henry V (Manchester U.P. 1991), noting that 'An entry on horseback into the yard was probably practical when the play was performed at the Bull Inn,' (p. 148 n.). As these comments and data confirm, stage horses were practical only in early dramas and/or when performances were held outdoors in tavern yards, market squares or perhaps open fields.

105 See Charles Edward Whitmore: *The Supernatural in Tragedy* (New York: P.P. Appel, 1971) p. 227 ff.; F.W. Moorman: 'The Pre-Shakespearean Ghosts,' and 'Shakespeare's Ghosts,' Modern *Language Review* 1 (1906), pp. 86-95, 192-201; and Marjorie Garber: *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers*: *Literature as Uncanny Causality* (New York: Methuen, 1987).

106 Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays*, p. 123.

107 Rossiter, *Woodstock*, p. 199

108 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,'   p. 92; Estelle W. Taylor: 'Shakespeare's Use of *eth* and *es* Endings of Verbs in the First Folio,' in Vivian Salmon and Edwina Burness, eds., *A Reader in the Language of Shakespearean Drama* (John

109 Benjamins, 1987) pp. 349-69; Michael Dobson and Stanley Wells, eds., *The Oxford Textual Companion to Shakespeare* (OUP 2007).
109 Eric Sams: *The Real Shakespeare: Retrieving the Early Years* 1564-1594 (Yale UP 1995) p. 169; Bernard Beckerman: *Shakespeare at the Globe 1599-1609* (New York: Macmillan 1962) pp. 17-19.
110 Egan, *The Tragedy of Richard II, Part One*, Vol. I, pp. 233-49.
111 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,'   p. 94.
112 Jackson, 'Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*,'   p. 94.
113 Ward E.Y. Elliott and Robert J. Valenza: 'Glass Slippers and Seven-League Boots: C-Prompted Doubts about Ascribing *A Funeral Elegy* and *A Lover's Complaint* to Shakespeare,' *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 48, No. 2 (Summer, 1997) p. 185.
114 Jackson goes out of his way to state that he is no New Historicist.
115 S. Schoenbaum*: Internal Evidence and Elizabethan Dramatic Authorship: An Essay in Literary History and Method* (Northwestern U.P., 1966), p. 195.

Bibliography

Axton, Marie: *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977)
Black Matthew W: 'Sources of Shakespeare *Richard II*' in *Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies* (Washington, 1948)
——(ed.): *The Mirror for Magistrates* (Cambridge U.P., 1938)
Carroll, Allen D. (ed.): *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit* (Binghamton, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1994
Chambers, E.K. : *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems*, 2 Vols. (Oxford U.P. 1930),
Corbin, Peter & Douglas Sedge (eds.): *Thomas of Woodstock: or King Richard the Second, Part One* (Manchester U.P., 2002)
Crystal, David: *'Think on my words' Exploring Shakespeare's Language* (Cambridge U.P. 2008).
Egan, Michael*: The Tragedy f Richard II, Part One: Edited Introduced and with Variorum Notes* (Edwin Mellen Press 2006)
——Introduction to *King John* in Joseph Rosenblum, (ed.): *A Student's Companion to Shakespeare*: *A Comprehensive Guide to the Plays and Poems* (Evergreen, 2005)
Elliott, Ward E.Y. and Robert J. Valenza: 'Glass Slippers and Seven-League Boots: C-Prompted Doubts about Ascribing *A Funeral Elegy* and *A Lover's Complaint* to Shakespeare,' *Shakespeare Quarterly,* Vol. 48, No. 2 (Summer, 1997)
Ewbank, Inga-Stina: 'These Pretty Devices: A Study of Masques in Plays,' in Anon. (ed.): *A Book of Masques in Honour of Allardyce Nicoll* (Cambridge U.P., 1967)
Frijlinck, Wilhelmina P.: *The First Part of the Reign of King Richard the Second or Thomas of Woodstock* (Oxford University Press, 1929).
Grafton, Richard: *Chronicles of England* Vol. I ([1590] London: J. Johnson, 1809)
Holinshed, Raphael: *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 6 vols. (London: J.
Honigmann, E.A.J. (ed.): *King John* (London: Methuen & Co., 1954, 1973)

Hope, Jonathan: *The Authorship of Shakespeare's Plays*: *A Socio-Linguistic Study* (Cambridge U.P., 1994)

Jackson, MacD. P.: 'Shakespeare's *Richard II* and the Anonymous *Thomas of Wood-stock*,' in John Pitcher, *et al.* (eds): *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, Vol. 14 (Cranbury, CT: Associated University Presses and Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp., 2001)

——*Studies in Attribution: Middleton and Shakespeare* (Institut Für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Universität Salzburg, 1979)

—— 'The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*: Evidence and its Interpretation' (*Research Opportunities in Medieval and Renaissance Drama* XLVI 2007) pp. 67-100

——Riposte to Egan,' m.jackson@auckland.ac.nz. Johnson, *et al*, 1807-8, New York: AMS Press, 1965)

 ——*Defining Shakespeare: Pericles as Test Case* (Oxford U.P. 2003)

Kermode, Frank: *Shakespeare's Language* (New York: Farrar, Strauss, Giroux, 2000)

Parfitt, George and Simon Shepherd (eds.): *Thomas of Woodstock* (Nottingham Drama Texts, Nottingham University Press, 1977)

Ness Frederick: *The Use of Rhymes in Shakespeare's Plays* (Yale U.P., 1941)

Partridge, A.C.: *Orthography in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama; A Study of Colloquial Contractions, Elisions, Prosody and Punctuation* (University of Nebraska Press, 1964)

Rossiter, A.P. (ed.): *Woodstock, a Moral History* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1946).

Sams, Eric *The Real Shakespeare*: *Retrieving the Early Years, 1564-1594* (Yale U.P. 1995

Schell, Edgar: *Strangers and Pilgrims: From The Castle of Perseverance to King Lear* (Chicago U.P. 1983)

Schoenbaum, S.: *Internal Evidence and Elizabethan Dramatic Authorship: An Essay in Literary History and Method* (Northwestern U.P., 1966)

——*Shakespeare: His Life, His Language, his Theater* (New York: Signet, 1990)

——'*Richard II* and the Realities of Power,' *Shakespeare Survey* 28 (1975) in Kirby

Stavropoulos, Janet C.: ' "A masque is treason's license": the Design of *Woodstock*,' *The Journal of the South Central Modern Language Association* (Summer, 1988)

Tillyard, E.M.W.: *Shakespeare's History Plays* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1944, 1961 edn.)

Vickers, Brian : *Shakespeare, Co-Author*: *A Historical Study of Five Collaborative Play*s (Oxford U.P., 2002)

——'*Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship and John Ford's* Funerall Elegye (Cambridge U.P., 2002)

——*Shakespeare, Co-Author*: *A Historical Study of Five Collaborative Play*s (Oxford U.P., 2002)

Charles Edward Whitmore: *The Supernatural in Tragedy* (New York: P.P. Appel, 1971)