

I

The Raigne of King Edward the third

*Edward III** first appeared as an entry in the Stationers' Register on 1 December 1595. The First Quarto was published in the following year: *The Raigne of King Edward the third: As it hath bin sundrie times plaied about the Citie of London. London. Printed for Cuthbert Burby. 1596*.¹ A second quarto, also printed for Burby, appeared in 1599. There is a good deal of difference of opinion about when the play was most probably written. According to Farmer, on the title page of his facsimile edition of the first quarto, the play was written about 1589. However, Muir¹⁶ thinks it likely it was written after 1593, because of its allusion to *Lucrece* in lines 1019–22:

Arise true English Ladie, whom our Ile
May better boast of then ever Romaine might,
Of her whose ransackt treasurie hath taskt,
The vaine indevor of so many pens:

No other critic has made much of this. Both Ribner²¹ and Scharr²² think the play was written 1592–3; Østerberg¹⁹ before 1592; Jackson¹² about 1590; Wentersdorf²⁷ 1589–90; and Lapides¹⁴ any time between 1588 and 1592.

For purposes of comparison we may note that there is general agreement that all three parts of *King Henry VI* were written before the end of 1591. Chambers, Harrison and the Arden editors place *Richard III* and *Titus Andronicus* closely following in 1592–3. If it were Shakespeare's, then, *Edward III* would be among his earliest creations. By the end of 1595 *The Taming of the Shrew*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Richard II* had all been staged. The first and second parts of *Tamburlaine* had been produced a number of years earlier, in 1587 and 1588. So if *Edward III* were Marlowe's, it would be a work of his maturity.

Capell published *Edward III* in 1760 as 'a Play thought to be writ by Shakespeare'. It has been reprinted a number of times, the first quarto of 1596 being taken as authoritative. Since 1760 the question of Shakespearean authorship has been batted to and fro by editors and critics. Some have maintained that the whole of the play is by Shakespeare, and some that none of it is. Others to whom parts or the whole have been attributed include Drayton, Greene, Lodge and Peele. No general agreement has yet been reached. The balance of opinion has tended to favour

*For this book the Tudor Facsimile Text, edited by John S. Farmer, published in 1910, has been relied on; with reference, for a modern scholarly edition, to that edited by R. L. Armstrong in *Six Early Plays Related to the Shakespeare Canon*, ed. E. A. Everitt, Copenhagen, 1965.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-12348-8 - The Problem of the Reign of King Edward III: A Statistical Approach

Eliot Slater

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE PROBLEM OF THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD III

divided authorship, the Countess scenes in particular being allotted to Shakespeare.

In the present century the history of criticism begins with Tucker Brooke's edition of the play in his book *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*, 1908⁴. Brooke included in the *Apocrypha* edited texts of fourteen plays or parts of plays, but as candidates for acceptance into the canon he dismissed them all. The selection made for the First Folio cannot be faulted. We have the genuine articles – and the apocrypha, mostly poor stuff. Though some have merits, even great merits, they are not Shakespearean merits. In short, they can never pass Shakespearean standards and must be judged by apocryphal standards. *Edward III* fails along with the others.

The play is 'broken-backed', falling into two irreconcilable halves. The first two acts are a love intrigue. The beginning of Act III brings a complete change of plot and a considerable diminution of dramatic force. The last acts, 'though full of fine dramatic poetry', are not Shakespeare (p. xxi). And looking again at the Countess scenes, 'so much more Shakespearean at first sight', one sees they are in reality by the same author as the rest of the drama. The two references to the Countess story in III.iii and III.v show that the author of Act III must have had the contents of I and II before his mind (*ibid.*). Brooke finds other reasons for favouring singleness of authorship. Wherever in the last three acts the necessity of portraying actual events disappears, there is a return to the style of the earlier unhistoric scenes. Such parts actually 'give more pleasure to the true student and lover of the play than the brilliant intrigue scenes of the first acts which have . . . a rather cloying sweetness' (p. xxii). These scenes will hardly bear reading frequently:

Tried by the test of what they say, not how they say it, these passages sound hollow and insincere; the sophistry of nearly all the arguments becomes more objectionable . . . as one comes to feel . . . how much the characters guide their actions by the dictates of complex academic reasoning and how little by the inner voice of nature (pp. xxi–xxiii).

Brooke, in fact, finds the military scenes of the last three acts more to his taste than 'the quibbling mawkishness' of Warwick and the Countess. He singles out for high praise iv.viii.6–8 (in his edition; Farmer, ll. 2275–7) and v.27–30 (2376–80):

We recognize the writer's love of noble situations and his sympathy with high-minded characters, but the continual inferiority of his hand to his heart is equally obvious. The inability to grasp strongly the realities of life produces in the historical scenes a woodenness and restraint, which mark these portions of the play as distinctly un-Shakespearean, despite several bursts of magnificent poetry (p. xxii).

Tucker Brooke's verdict is, then, that all of the play is by one author, and that author not Shakespeare. He says he would like to see 'this fine though very imperfect play recognized as the crown and conclusion of the work of George Peele', a thesis which he then argues to maintain.

Brooke believed that the sources of the play were, for the Countess scenes, Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, and for most of the rest Holinshed's *Chronicles*, with an unknown source for the Villiers–Salisbury episode in Act IV. However, in 1911 R. M. Smith²⁴ showed with chapter and verse that the whole of Act I, scene i, and the

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-12348-8 - The Problem of the Reign of King Edward III: A Statistical Approach

Eliot Slater

Excerpt

[More information](#)

THE RAIGNE OF KING EDWARD III

whole of the main part of the play from III.i to the end of Act v, had been taken from Froissart; and finally that the Countess episode was described in detail by Froissart, taken over by Bandello and from him by Painter, and so finally back to *Edward III*:

Many critics, who insist that the Countess episode interrupts the main play, urge the fact as proof that the episode was thrust into an earlier version by Shakespeare. But this episode holds in the French chronicle the same position which the dramatic version of it holds in the play. It is evident, therefore, that the dramatist merely followed the order of events that Froissart had established, and selected only certain details from Painter for the Countess scenes (p. 101).

On the possibly Shakespearean authorship of the play Smith says that the contention that Shakespeare wrote the entire play can be dismissed at once. None of the critics offer reasons other than aesthetic to support the theory:

The whole drama is by no means up to Shakespeare's level. There is an absence of comedy, and a general want of characterization. Furthermore, the drama was never considered Shakespeare's until the eighteenth century, nor is there external evidence in favor of his authorship. Finally, the whole play was written at one time by one dramatist who took nearly all of his material from Froissart's Chronicles; and Shakespeare probably never consulted Froissart for chronicle history plays (p. 103).

On the Marlovian possibility Smith continues:

It is equally difficult to believe that Marlowe wrote the play. Aside from the Marlowesque blank verse and bombast which were employed in all drama after the appearance of Tamburlaine in 1587, *Edward III* bears none of that dramatist's well known characteristics. There is no protagonist, no attempt at such plot construction as is found in *Edward II*; nothing but the presentation of an interesting chronicle narrative taken wholly from one source. Furthermore, the portrayal of such a woman character as the Countess was totally foreign to Marlowe's genius. These facts, with others, make it probable that the whole drama was written by one playwright three or four years earlier than Mr. Fleay's date 1594, perhaps 1590, before Marlowe had put his final stamp upon Chronicle History Plays (p. 104).

Who that one playwright might have been, Professor Smith does not venture to conjecture.

Smith laid a firm foundation for our present understanding of the sources of *Edward III*, in plot and sub-plots, which has not subsequently been undermined; but, against his hopes, it seems to have had no effect at all on the debate about the authorship. This has remained as conjectural as ever. By far the most critical evidence has come from the work of Alfred Hart.⁹ This is statistical in nature and will be considered later. At this point we may notice the opinions advanced by Golding, Crundell and Østerberg. Of these only the last is worth serious attention.

Golding⁸ reports that from his perusal of the play he soon became 'convinced' then its author was 'undoubtedly' Robert Wilson (p. 313); and he noted and lists 30 parallels with *A Larum for London* totalling 125 lines of verse. Of these Nos. 5 to 11 are with *Edward III*, I.ii to II.ii. Golding has been alone in his attribution, and no other critic has reported being impressed by his parallel. Parallelisms, it would seem, are more or less convincing as evidence of community of authorship by their

THE PROBLEM OF THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD III

appeal to a subjective judgment. Moreover, the quality of that judgment is dependent on the discriminatory powers of the controversialist and the intimacy of his knowledge of a whole epoch of creative writing. The extent to which his arguments may also be found acceptable by others may be affected by current critical fashions and academic stereotypes. This sort of evidence is certainly not such with which the unlearned should venture to concern himself.

The arguments of Crundell⁵ are somewhat more widely based than those of Golding. He claims that there is a general likeness of *Edward III* (in both parts) to the work of Michael Drayton, and that it is more reasonable to regard it as an early work of Drayton's than to ascribe the play to Shakespeare or Greene. The 'likeness' is to be found in incidents, rhetoric, style, borrowings, and the comparison of certain passages.

Østerberg¹⁹ considers only the Countess scenes, i.ii and Act II, and expresses no opinion about the rest of the play. These scenes are of the highest poetic and dramatic merit, and Shakespearean in *character*. The balance of the evidence is decidedly in favour of Shakespearean *authorship*.

Østerberg bases his appreciation on the following qualities of the 'Countess' scenes:

1. their technical mastery;
2. dependence for dramatic tension on character rather than action;
3. the human earnestness as well as artistic excellence;
4. sound though limited psychology;
5. the union of linguistic and rhythmic power, poetic imagination and thought;
6. the ethical standard maintained throughout.

He then proceeds to examine parallels between passages in *Edward III* and others in *Venus*, *Lucrece*, *Romeo*, *Love's Labour's Lost* and the Sonnets. These are numerous and extensive, and some of them are striking. Østerberg also makes comparisons of sentiment, phraseology and rhythm, and tricks of word repetition.

He finds communalities of vocabulary between *Edward III* and Shakespeare's poems, observable in common usages, but also 'striking coincidences in the use of rarer and even "remarkable" ones' (p. 65). He lists: *scornful* (i.e. scorned), *wistly*, *reverent*, *cloak* (vb), *stain*, *let* (i.e. hindrance), *forbidding*, *untuned*, *insulting*, *lament* (n), *languishment*, *misdeed*, *mote*, *oratory*, *cabinet*. He also records combinations. 'Fly it a pitch above the soar of praise' of *Edward III* shows the combination soar—above—pitch found also in *Romeo*, *Julius Caesar* and *Richard II*. *Love's Labour's Lost* furnishes a number of uncommon words held in common with *Edward III*: *mote*, *muster*, *via*, *unseen wind*, *solicitor*, *immure*, *barbarism*, *cadence*, *foragement*, *faceless*. Communalities are also found with a number of the Sonnets, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *John*, *Merchant of Venice*, *Taming of the Shrew*, 2 *Henry IV*, *Henry V* (*gimmal*, *ordure*, *fluent*), *Hamlet*, *Measure for Measure*, *Lear* (*dislodge*, *grained ash*), *Coriolanus* (*twist*, n), *Antony* (*snaffle*, *tissue*, *treasurer*), *Timon* (*solder*, *witber*, trans. vb).

Østerberg examines parallelisms pointed out by others, e.g. by Robertson in

THE RAIGNE OF KING EDWARD III

Greene, but believes them to be mainly delusive. He has counted, and names, a number of words found in *Edward III* but not elsewhere in Shakespeare, and he argues against giving them importance. On this point Muir's discussion (see pp. 5–7 below) is greatly to be preferred. Østerberg enters on some other matters, such as versification, which need not concern us. He concludes by advancing his theory of authorship. This is that there was an early play, written by several authors in conjunction, probably Marlowe, Kyd and Greene. About the time of the re-opening of the theatres in 1594 the play was acquired by the company to which Shakespeare belonged, and 'as usual' (p. 90) Shakespeare was employed in dressing up the play. He then inserted his own vivid and spirited piece of poetry.

We are indebted to Kenneth Muir for the most recent full and scholarly review of the authorship problem. His first essay,¹⁶ 'A reconsideration of *Edward III*', appeared in *Shakespeare Survey* in 1953. In a revised form¹⁷ it was re-published as Chapter 2, 'Shakespeare's hand in *Edward III*', in his book, *Shakespeare as Collaborator*, 1960. The third chapter, '*Edward III*', examines the play's merits and demerits. Muir notes that some of the imagery in the Countess scenes recalls that of the Sonnets, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Love's Labour's Lost*. He concludes that if one were to follow Tucker Brooke in attributing the play, or parts of it, to Peele, one could account for the great unevenness in the quality of the poetry by supposing that Shakespeare revised a play by Peele, re-writing the Countess scenes and making extensive alterations in Act IV. But the evidence for Peele's hand in *Edward III* is slight, he thinks.

In his 1953 essay¹⁶ Muir discusses the vocabulary tests published by Hart,⁹ which we will examine later. Muir is particularly impressed by the frequency of compound and participial words, conspicuously high both in *Edward III* and in the works of Shakespeare, where they are two or three times as frequent as in Marlowe, Greene and Peele. Muir seems to consider this test alone as sufficient to dismiss these three as candidates for the authorship.

Muir then offers his own counts for one of Hart's tests, not applied by the latter to *Edward III*. This is the occurrence of words not used before in Shakespeare's plays. Muir divides *Edward III* into two parts, hypothetically Shakespearean and non-Shakespearean. The former, part A, is selected to include Act I scene ii, lines 90 and following, the whole of Act II and Act IV scene iv. Part B, the non-Shakespearean part, is the rest of the play. This excludes a substantial piece, including a soliloquy by the Countess, but starts with her re-entry at line 276 and goes down to the end of Act II with line 1037. Of Act IV it includes lines 1914 to 2079 inclusive. The entire play runs to 2600 lines, and by Muir's division part A has 928 lines and part B 1672. He tabulates the numbers of new words in parts A and B in six different counts: (a) when only Shakespeare's plays are taken into account, and (b) when the poems are also comprehended; and by date: if *Edward III* was written in 1597 (before 1 *Henry IV*), if in 1596 (before *King John*), or in 1594 (before *Richard II*). In all six presentations the number of new words in part A outnumbers the new words in part B; and in terms of lines per new word, almost exactly twice as many lines on average

THE PROBLEM OF THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD III

are required for a new word in part B as in part A. We may note that the difference between the two parts is statistically significant in all six presentations. We need instance only one of them. As we are considering Shakespeare as a writer, or a total personality, rather than as mere playwright, it seems well to take Muir's count, which includes both poems and plays; and as *Edward III* was published in 1595, Muir's counts for 1594 seem to be the most appropriate. In this count he found a total of 145 new words, 78 in part A, 67 in part B. The number to be expected, on the supposition of a single writer for both parts, would be proportionate to the number of lines available, 928:1672, i.e. not 78:67 but 51.75:93.25. The difference between observation and expectation is 26.25, and χ^2 , the sum of $(O - E)^2/E$, where O is the observed and E the expected number, is $13.315 + 7.389 = 20.704$. This is far larger than any number which could plausibly be attained even by an exceedingly remote chance. We can say, then, that on this criterion, there is a large and real difference between the two parts of the play – from whatever cause.

Muir then proceeds to a study of the imagery. He says there are about twice as many images in proportion to the number of lines in A as in B, one image per 3.8 lines as compared with one per 7 lines. An observation of this kind is not susceptible to statistical tests without a rigid if arbitrary definition of what constitutes an 'image'. The same limitation applies to Muir's observations on iterative imagery and image-clusters. Muir then has a short passage on parallels, finding them in *As You Like It*, *Hamlet*, *Richard III*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Twelfth Night*, *Winter's Tale*, *Much Ado*, *2 Henry IV*, *Macbeth*, *Antony*, *3 Henry VI*, *Henry V*, *Measure for Measure*.

Muir concludes by admitting that his arguments may not be conclusive. If Shakespeare was not the author of *Edward III*, he was at least intimately acquainted with it and deeply influenced by it. A theory which would cover all the facts is that Shakespeare, as perhaps in *Pericles*, was hastily revising a play by another dramatist, certain scenes being entirely re-written, and the remainder being left with comparatively few alterations.

In the revised edition of this essay, which he published in 1960 as Chapter 2 of his book *Shakespeare as Collaborator*, Muir changed his views and their presentation very little. He lists as inconclusive the following statistical observations reported by Alfred Hart:

(a) the average number of words used in some of Shakespeare's Histories is not very different from the number used in *Edward III*, not very different from the number used in some of Marlowe's plays;

(b) the vocabulary common to *Edward III* and some of Shakespeare's Histories is not very different in proportion to the vocabulary common to *Edward III* and some of Marlowe's plays (this objection is not well founded, as we shall see);

(c) nor is there any significant difference in the use of certain prefixes and suffixes in *Edward III* in comparison with some of Shakespeare's Histories and some of Marlowe's plays.

We shall come later to a detailed discussion of Hart's work.

THE RAIGNE OF KING EDWARD III

Muir then takes note of Mary Bell's thesis³ on *Edward III*, in which she included a concordance. He is impressed by the compounds: *light borne, under garnished, summer leaping, sole reigning, bed blotting, honey gathering, poison sucking*, in part A; and in part B *ever bibbing, Bayard-like, high-swollen, iron-barted, sweet-flowering, stiff-grown, imble jointed, swift-starting, and just-dooming* 'to mention only a few'. Yet while all the '-like' compounds appear in Part B, all the six 'thrice-' formations are in part A. Mary Bell reported a close resemblance between the vocabularies of the three *Henry VI* plays and *Edward III*; many words used once only in *Henry VI* are to be found also in *Edward III*. 'This evidence', says Muir, 'is ambiguous, since some critics still believe that *Henry VI* is not wholly Shakespearean.' Surely what the critics still believe is subjective and non-evidential. If it can be said that Mary Bell has disclosed communalities and resemblances between the vocabularies of 1 *Henry VI* and *Edward III*, this is objective factual evidence connecting two plays, whoever their Authors may have been. Muir then develops his commentary on the imagery of *Edward III* with greater depth and variety than in his essay of 1953.

In concluding his chapter Muir inclines to the theory of double authorship, with the Countess scenes and iv.iv allotted to Shakespeare. The strongest support for this judgment is the presence of close parallels with *Henry V* and *Measure for Measure*. He then, as in the 1953 essay, suggests a Shakespearean revision of another dramatist's work. This theory has the weakness that no named playwright, certainly not Greene or Marlowe or Peele, can be suggested for the job.

Over the years from the fifties to the seventies of the present century there seems to have been a variable tendency to shift from the theory of multiple authorship to that of single authorship. In a University of Texas dissertation of 1956, W. B. Dobson⁶ engaged in an elaborate discussion of the sources of each scene, the Author's habits of composition, the possibilities of single or multiple authorship, and the probable date of composition. He thinks there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the Countess scenes are interpolations by a second author. In comparison with other scenes, these passages have a firmer plot structure and are superior in originality. They introduce the character of Lodowick, who does not reappear in later scenes. They portray the Countess and the King in a manner inconsistent with characterisation in the rest of the play. They make more frequent and noticeably different use of imagery. They are somewhat less rigid in metre, and have a higher percentage of rhyming lines, and in general a more lyrical and rhetorical style. The Countess scenes may echo the style of Shakespeare's lyrical plays and narrative poems – but are not necessarily written by Shakespeare.

A few years later, in 1960, in a dissertation presented to the University of Cincinnati, K. P. Wentersdorf²⁶ takes an almost diametrically opposite point of view. Similar arguments are also advanced in his article of 1965.²⁷ He shows how Shakespeare's imagery differs from that of his contemporaries. The homogeneity of *Edward III* militates against any theory of multiple authorship. Main groups of imagery are drawn from the same areas of experience as those Shakespeare drew on. The Author of *Edward III* used the same kind of images in the same proportions

THE PROBLEM OF THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD III

from the same mental standpoint as Shakespeare. The possibility that the parallels of *Edward III* and the canon result from borrowing is untenable, as many relate to later work:

The view that Shakespeare is the borrower is not forbidden by chronology; to accept it, however, one must assume that Shakespeare was well acquainted with *Edward III* at a very early stage in his career, since there are many parallels in the narrative poems, and that he either possessed or developed the same artistic tastes as the unknown Author in the matter of image-subjects. Furthermore that the play impressed itself on his mind so powerfully that he reproduced multiple echoes from it throughout the rest of his long career.

A hypothesis requiring all these assumptions has little to recommend it in the face of the natural interpretation of the clusters, namely that these thoughts and images developed in the mind of one man – William Shakespeare.

In his study of the imagery of *Edward III* (1965), Wentersdorf²⁷ quoted other authors. He noted that Tillyard (1944)²⁵ regarded the play as ‘evidently written’ not by a professional dramatist, but by a university-trained courtier who had been greatly influenced by Shakespeare’s idiom. Irving Ribner (1957),²⁰ Wentersdorf thought, read not only the love element but a great deal more of the play as Shakespearean in origin; and Frank O’Connor (1961)¹⁸ considered the whole play of single authorship, manifesting clear evidence of Shakespeare’s draftsmanship throughout. Wentersdorf dates the play at any time between 1588 and 1595, but most likely near the earlier of these two dates. The play breathes the nationalistic feeling that was strong in the years before the Armada. Wentersdorf sees many resemblances between *Edward III* and the first part of *Henry VI*. ‘Quite apart from the similarity of tone, *Edward III* has many points of resemblance in diction, imagery and the treatment of subject matter in the play about Talbot’ (p. 231). The latter was written not later than 1591–2, possibly a year or two earlier, as it has plausibly been asserted that it preceded *Henry VI* Parts 2 and 3. ‘It seems . . . most likely that *Edward III* was written, as the topical allusions to the Armada and to the *Nonpareil* indicate, about 1589–90’ (ibid).

Wentersdorf considers that arguments against Shakespearean authorship have been based on its stylistic inferiority, especially when compared with *Henry V*. If it was written in 1594–5, the argument that Shakespeare could not have been the author is stronger than if the play was written in 1589–90. The account of the sea-battle is modelled on reports of the English triumph over the Spanish in 1588. The account in Froissart of the Battle of Sluys, 1340, described ships grappled together and hand to hand fighting. The account in *Edward III* has the anachronistic use of artillery. The highly imaginative description of the artillery effects is evidently one of the dramatist’s additions.

The contributions of Claes Schaar (1962)²² was to analyse the parallelisms between *Edward III*, Act II, and Shakespearean Sonnets, especially 7, 94, 127. Like other critics Schaar was greatly struck by identities of ‘scarlet ornaments’ and ‘lilies that fester smell far worse than weeds’. As long ago as 1911, Arthur Platt²⁰ pointed out that the reference to lilies that fester is appropriate in the Sonnet, but in *Edward*

THE RAIGNE OF KING EDWARD III

III is irrelevant. 'Scarlet ornaments' passes in the Sonnet, but applied to the cheeks of King Edward is quite ridiculous. The Sonnets were antecedent to the play, and must have been available to the author before the publication date of 1596. Platt writes 'after repeated readings of the play . . . I feel more and more convinced that the whole of it is due to one hand alone', (p. 513) – and that not Shakespeare's.

Schaar thinks the whole of Lodowick's description of the behaviour of King Edward bears comparison with a series of passages in canonical works (*TGV*, *Sbr*, *R2*, *1H4*). The notorious identities discussed by Platt above have their full force only in the Sonnets, and where they occur in the plays they do not ring naturally. Likewise parallel phrases in *Edward III* and *Measure for Measure* are better expressed and are more appropriate in the Shakespearean play than in the apocryphal one. The better versions are likely to be the later ones. Schaar writes

I have come to visualise the [Author] as having at his elbow a manuscript copy of Shakespeare's sonnets, or of some of them, dipping occasionally into the slender volume to appropriate an image or a phrase. [The present writer finds this imagined way of composing quite unthinkable.] If so he had access only while composing the last part of 1.ii, and the first part of Act II. Sonnets 7, 33, 94, 127 and 143 were available to the [Author]. The iterative imagery in these parts of *Edwrd III* suggest Shakespeare's authentic work.

Schaar concludes that if Shakespeare had a finger in the main part of *Edward III*, he had at least a hand in the Countess scenes.

Koskenniemi (1964)¹³ differs from the majority of critics in objecting to the tendency to divide the play into two parts, one about twice the magnitude of the smaller. He quotes both Tillyard (1944)²⁵ and Ribner (1957)²¹ in support of the view that the Countess scenes play an integral part in the education of the King. Tillyard saw a main theme in the education of those that have power: in the education of the King to self-mastery, and in that of the Black Prince to enter battle in hand to hand fighting, together with his education, through the wise words of Audley, to face death with equanimity. Queen Philippa teaches the King to show mercy to hostages; and she herself is given a moral lesson in what should be a royal attitude to the exceptional bravery of a subject (Sir John Copeland). Respect for marriage and respect for an oath are inculcated in more than one episode. Numerous images are supplied to support the emotional background of these teachings: school, learning, teaching, law, justice, crime and punishment. This presentation, which is taken up again by William Armstrong (1966),² makes the play something of a sermon.

Koskenniemi examines the case for other possible candidates for the authorship, including Peele, proposed by Tucker Brooke.⁴ He thinks there is no similarity in imagery. He also examines the candidacy of Thomas Kyd (proposed by G. Lambrechts), but here objects that a common imagery, with striking parallels, has little evidential value, since it all comes from a stock of imagery common to and used by many dramatists of the time. Koskenniemi concludes that Shakespeare wrote at least some parts of *Edward III* and revised the whole. King Edward III is mentioned fifteen times in Shakespeare's history plays: and the King and the Black Prince are held up as models of military and political virtue.

THE PROBLEM OF THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD III

McD. P. Jackson has contributed two notes. The second (1971)¹² is of minor interest to us here: he argues that the Author's foul papers served as copy for the Quarto. In an earlier work (1965),¹¹ he states categorically: 'It is now virtually certain that Shakespeare had at least a share in the writing of *Edward III*', and that 'there are excellent reasons for believing he wrote it all'. To support this emphatic judgment he calls upon Muir and Wentersdorf to stand at his side. Jackson gives an early dating to *Edward III*, confirming Wentersdorf: about 1590.

The debate about this play has ranged far and wide; but the conclusions of any one critic are usually taken seriously only by members of his own party. Schoenbaum (1966)²³ takes the play as a text for a sermon on the need for caution in appraising internal evidence. His dismissive résumé of the work of Alfred Hart (very generally ignored by others) amounts to little more than allowing him to show that the Author of *Edward III* had in common with Shakespeare 'a remarkably rich vocabulary' (p 126). Schoenbaum also gives some attention to image-clusters, mentioning that some acceptedly Shakespearean clusters appear in the works of other writers. 'No matter how promising a new test may seem, it behooves the investigator to proceed with extreme caution' (p. 189).

F. R. Lapes (1966)¹⁴ prepared a new critical edition of *The Raigne of Edward III* as a Rutgers Dissertation. He collected and collated his text from all available copies of the Quarto. He tries to show that in image-parallels, associational clusters and vocabulary tests, Shakespeare is the only Elizabethan who could have written the play. It was written no earlier than 1588 and no later than 1592. His thesis includes a theatrical history of the play, a study of the sources, Froissart and Painter, and a critical study of the plotting, of the character drawing, and of the poetry. Finally he examines the efforts of the printer(s), working from Author's foul papers, and marks and discusses the variant readings. This thesis would seem to be a useful source-book for textual criticism (which, however, is not the main focus of my study).

F. D. Horn (1969)¹⁰ also produced a critical edition of the play as a dissertation for the University of Delaware. He undertook a careful image study and discovered no fewer than twelve clusters. He concludes that the play could only have been the work of Shakespeare:

Charges of faulty structure and poor characterisation are found unconvincing after close study. There is a sense of unity throughout the play, strengthened by a strong central theme. Even though this dominant theme tends to cast all Englishmen in roles as strong, prudent and generous warriors, and all Frenchmen as boastful, imprudent and ultimately craven individuals, the [Author] has created an entire play, not only of persons, but also of personalities, especially important figures such as King Edward, the Countess of Salisbury, Prince Edward, Warwick and Artois... [*Edward III*] dramatizes the dangers of frivolous deeds and the rewards of noble behavior, and demonstrates that the appropriate response to potential tyranny is wise and understanding counsel.

As the latest addition to the critical literature we have Georgio Melchiori's book (1976),¹⁵ *Shakespeare's Dramatic Meditations*. Dealt with in depth are four of the Sonnets of most equivocal mood and many-sided interpretation, Sonnets 94, 121,