

KING HENRY VI.—PART II.

---

NOTES AND INTRODUCTION

BY

F. A. MARSHALL.

## DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

KING HENRY THE SIXTH.	MATTHEW GOUGH.
HUMPHREY, Duke of Gloucester, his uncle.	WALTER WHITMORE.
CARDINAL BEAUFORT, Bishop of Winchester, great- uncle to the King.	A Sea Captain, Master, and Master's Mate.
RICHARD PLANTAGENET, Duke of York.	Two Gentlemen, prisoners with Suffolk.
EDWARD and RICHARD, his sons.	ALEXANDER IDEN, a Kentish gentleman.
DUKE OF SOMERSET.	JOHN HUME and JOHN SOUTHWELL, two priests.
DUKE OF SUFFOLK.	ROGER BOLINGBROKE, a conjuror.
DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.	THOMAS HORNER, an Armourer. PETER, his man.
LORD CLIFFORD.	CLERK OF CHATHAM. MAYOR OF ST. ALBANS.
YOUNG CLIFFORD, his son.	SAUNDER SIMPCOX, an impostor.
EARL OF SALISBURY.	JACK CADE, a rebel.
EARL OF WARWICK.	GEORGE BEVIS, JOHN HOLLAND, DICK the Butcher, SMITH the Weaver, MICHAEL, &c., his followers.
LORD SCALES.	Two Murderers.
LORD SAY.	
SIR HUMPHREY STAFFORD, and WILLIAM STAFFORD, his brother.	MARGARET, Queen to King Henry.
SIR JOHN STANLEY.	ELEANOR, Duchess of Gloucester.
VAUX.	MARGERY JOURDAIN, a Witch, wife to Simpcox.

Lords, Ladies, and Attendants, Petitioners, Aldermen, a Herald, a Beadle, Sheriff, and Officers,  
 Citizens, Prentices, Falconers, Guards, Soldiers, Messengers, &c. A Spirit.

SCENE—In various parts of England.

## TIME OF ACTION.

The time of this play, according to Daniel, occupies fourteen days, as represented on the stage.  
 "with intervals, suggesting a period in all of say, at the outside, a couple of years."

Day 1: Act I. Scene 1.—Interval (?) eighteen months.	Day 8: Act IV. Scene 1.
Day 2: Act I. Scenes 2-4.	Day 9: Act IV. Scenes 2, 3.
Day 3: Act II. Scenes 1, 2.—Interval a month at least.	Day 10: Act IV. Scenes 4-7.
Day 4: Act II. Scene 3.—Interval at least two days.	Day 11: Act IV. Scene 8.
Day 5: Act II. Scene 4.—Interval about twenty-seven days.	Day 12: Act IV. Scene 9.—Interval three or four days.
Day 6: Act III. Scene 1.—Interval a few days.	Day 13: Act IV. Scene 10.
Day 7: Act III. Scenes 2, 3.—Interval three days or more.	Day 14: Act V. Scenes 1-3.

## HISTORIC PERIOD.

22nd April, 1445, to 23rd May, 1455.

## KING HENRY VI.—PART II.

### INTRODUCTION—PARTS II. III.

#### LITERARY HISTORY.

The connection between the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI. is so close that we have thought it best, as far as the Introduction is concerned, not to treat them separately. With regard to the sources whence they are derived, the literary history of these plays is very clear. We have more than one edition of the two old plays from which the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI., as they were first published in the Folio of 1623, were adapted by Shakespeare. As to the authorship of these two plays, whether they were the work of one, or more than one author, a controversy has been going on ever since the days of Malone; and will go on most probably till the end of time. The theory that they are merely imperfect copies of the two latter Parts of Henry VI., as we have them in the Folio 1623, is quite untenable. It seems beyond dispute that the Second Part of Henry VI. is an adaptation of a play first printed in quarto (Q. 1)<sup>1</sup> in 1594, and called "The | First part of the Con- | tention betwixt the two famous houses of Yorke | and Lancaster, with the death of the good | Duke Humphrey: | And the banishment and death of the Duke of | Suffolke, and the Tragical end of the proud Cardinall | of Winchester, with the notable Rebellion | of Iucke Cade: | And the Duke of Yorkes first claime vnto the | Crowne. | LONDON | Printed by Thomas Creed, for Thomas Millington, | and are to be sold at his shop vnder Saint Peters | Church in Cornwall. | 1594. | ." The Cambridge edd. in their preface (p. vii) to I. Henry VI., say: "The only copy known of this edition is in the Bodleian

<sup>1</sup> Stokes describes it as "A 12mo edition" (p. 6); but it is always described as a small quarto. It was entered on the Register of Stationers' Hall on March 12th, 1593-94.

Library (Malone, Add. 870), and is probably the same which was once in Malone's possession, and which he collated with the second Quarto printed in 1600."

In his preface to the reprint of *The Contention and The True Tragedy*, edited by him for the Shakespeare Society, and again reprinted by Hazlitt in his *Shakespeare Library* (pt. 2, vols. i. ii.), Mr. Halliwell-Phillips doubts that the Bodleian copy is the same as the one in Malone's possession. The Cambridge edd. give their reasons at length, reasons which are perfectly satisfactory, for believing that Mr. Halliwell-Phillips was mistaken. At any rate no trace of the existence of any other edition of this play has been found.

The second edition (Q. 2) of the First Part of *The Contention* appeared in quarto, in 1600, with the following title: "The | First part of the Con- | tention betwixt the two famous hou- | ses of Yorke and Lancaster, with the | death of the good Duke | Humphrey: | And the banishment and death of the Duke of | Suffolke, and the tragicall end of the proud Cardinall | of Winchester, with the notable Rebellion of | Iucke Cade: | And the Duke of Yorkes first claime to the | Crowne. | LONDON | Printed by Valentine Simmes for Thomas Millington, and | are to be sold at his shop vnder S. Peters church | in Cornewall. | 1600. | ." The Cambridge edd. say (p. ix) "Copies with this title are in the library of the Duke of Devonshire, and in the Bodleian (Malone, 867). An imperfect copy, wanting the last seven leaves, is in the Capell collection. Another impression bearing the same date, 'Printed by W. W. for Thomas Millington,' is said to exist, but we have been unable to find it." The only evidence of the existence of this edition is a MS. title, prefixed to a copy of Q. 2 in the Bodleian (Malone 36), which Mr.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00144-1 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 2

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## KING HENRY VI.—PART II.

Halliwell-Phillipps seems to have mistaken for a separate edition. We are indebted to the careful collation by the Cambridge Editors of this copy with that in the Capell collection for the establishment of the fact that it is not a separate edition.

In 1619 a third edition (Q. 3) without date, printed by Isaac Jaggard, and comprising also "The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York," appeared with the following title: "The | Whole Contention | betweene the two Famous | Houses, LANCASTER and | YORKE. | With the Tragicall ends of the good Duke | Humfrey, Richard Duke of Yorke, | and King Henrie the | sixt. | Diuided into two Parts; And newly corrected and | enlarged. Written by William Shake- | speare, Gent. | Printed at LONDON, for T. P. | "

In 1595 The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York (quoted as Q. 1), upon which III. Henry VI. is indisputably based, was published in small 8vo, with the following title: "The | true Tragedie of Richard | Duke of Yorke, and the death of | good King Henrie the Sixt, | with the whole contention betweene | the two Houses Lancaster | and Yorke, as it was sundrie times | acted by the Right Honoura- | ble the Earle of Pem- | brooke his seruants. | Printed at London by P. S. for Thomas Milling- | ton, and are to be sold at his shoppe vnder | Saint Peters Church in | Cornwall, 1595."

In 1600 the second edition (Q. 2) was published with the following title: "The | True Tragedie of | Richard Duke of | Yorke, and the death of good | King Henrie the Sixt: | With the whole contention betweene the two | Houses, Lancaster and Yorke; as it was | sundry times acted by the Right | Honourable the Earle | of Pembroke his | seruants. | Printed at London by W. W. for Thomas Millington, | and are to be sold at his shoppe vnder Saint | Peters Church in Corne- wall. | 1600. | " The Cambridge edd. (p. x) say, "Copies of this edition are in the Duke of Devonshire's Library, the Bodleian (Malone, 36), and the British Museum."

The third edition (Q. 3) of The True Tragedy, forming the second part of The Whole Contention, instead of title-page bears the heading, "The Second Part. | Containing the Tragedie

of | Richard Duke of Yorke, and the | good King Henrie the | Sixt. | "

The other sources, from which the dramatist, or dramatists, took their material, were Hall's Chronicle, whether from the original or from Holinshed, and the Mirror for Magistrates. There are very few, if any, original incidents or details introduced either by the authors of the two older plays or by Shakespeare.

The most important points of those in dispute are these two: First, had Shakespeare anything to do with The Contention and The True Tragedy, as they have come down to us in their published form? Secondly, did anyone assist Shakespeare in the adaptation of these plays as they appear in the First Folio under the title of the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI.? As to the first question, it greatly depends upon whether The Contention and True Tragedy have really come down to us in their original form, or whether they had been touched up by Shakespeare's or any other hand, before they were printed. As to this point we have no direct evidence of any kind, and very little indirect. As to the second question, we have nothing to rely upon but internal evidence; and what there is of that points most strongly to Marlowe, if to anyone, as Shakespeare's coadjutor. There are undoubtedly some of the *added* passages in these plays which strongly resemble Marlowe's style,<sup>1</sup> and which lead us to believe that either he assisted Shakespeare in the adaptation of the old plays, or, if not, that Shakespeare, consciously or unconsciously, imitated the style of the older dramatist.

The theory held by Johnson and Steevens, and adopted by Knight, Ulrich, Delius, &c., that Shakespeare wrote The Contention and The True Tragedy as well as the revised editions printed in F. 1, may be dismissed as untenable; and so may the singular contention of Mr. Fleay (see Macmillan's Magazine, Nov. 1875) that the whole of the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI. are by Peele and Marlowe; and that Shakespeare revised these plays, though he did not write them, about 1601 (see Stokes, p. 10). The most generally received

<sup>1</sup> For one instance, see II. Henry VI. note 195.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00144-1 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 2

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION.

opinion is, that Greene, and Marlowe, and, perhaps, Peele, wrote the two older plays, and that Shakespeare altered them into the form in which they have come down to us in F. 1.

By far the best account of the whole of the history of these plays, and of the controversy concerning their authorship, will be found in a most admirable paper by Miss Jane Lee (*New Shak. Soc. Transactions*, 1875-6, part 2, pp. 217-219). Miss Lee comes to the conclusion that *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy* were by Marlowe and Greene, and that possibly Peele had some share in them; that they are *not* imperfect representations of the *Second* and *Third Parts of Henry VI.*; that Shakespeare had nothing to do with the older plays, and that he was probably helped by Marlowe in altering them into the *Second* and *Third Parts of Henry VI.* She gives several resemblances of verbal expression and of thought, in both *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy*, to the acknowledged works of Marlowe and of Greene; and several allusions from both dramatists, especially from Marlowe's *Edward II.*, which are either repeated or imitated in *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy*.

As to the external evidence which tells against Shakespeare having had anything to do with the two older plays, it may be noted that Miss Lee insists very strongly on what Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps pointed out in his Introduction to the republication of *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy* (see Hazlitt, pp. 388, 389), namely, that Millington did not put Shakespeare's name to either of these plays, not even in the edition published as late as 1600; that after the year 1598, none of the undisputed plays of Shakespeare, except the early edition of *Romeo and Juliet*, and the first edition of *Hamlet* (Q. 1, 1603), were published without his name on the title-page; that it was not till 1619, or three years after Shakespeare's death, that the *Two Parts* were published together by Pavier, to whom the copyright had been transferred, with Shakespeare's name on the title-page. This gentleman appears to have done a great business in spurious Shakespearean plays, but not during the poet's lifetime. After his death he published Sir John Oldcastle, *The*

*Yorkshire Tragedy*, and *The Puritan*; stating that they were written by William Shakespeare, though we know that he had nothing on earth to do with any of them. The omission by Meres, writing in 1598, of any mention either of any of the *Three Parts of Henry VI.* or of *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy* among the list of Shakespeare's plays, although he gives *Titus Andronicus*, is a strong negative argument against the theory that Shakespeare was part author of the older plays.

Of contemporary allusions to the *Second* and *Third Parts of Henry VI.*, the most important is the well-known passage from Greene's *Groats-worth of Wit bought with a Million of Repentance*: "for there is an vpstart Crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his *Tygers heart wrapt in a Players hide*, supposes he is as well able to bumbast out a blanke verse as the best of you: and being an absolute *Johannes fac totum*, is in his owne conceit the onely Shake-scene in a cuntry" (*Shakspeare Allusion Books*, Series iv. No. 1, p. 30).

This passage seems to prove, first, that Greene had a share in the two earlier plays; secondly, that Shakespeare was the person who afterwards adapted them, and perhaps more or less adopted them as his own, in the shape of the *Second* and *Third Parts of Henry VI.*

In the Epilogue to *Henry V.* (lines 9-14) there is a manifest allusion to all *Three Parts of Henry VI.*:

Henry the Sixth, in infant bands crown'd King

Of France and England, did this king succeed;  
Whose state so many had the maunging,

That they lost France and made his England bleed:  
Which oft our stage hath shown; and, for their sake,  
In your fair minds, let this acceptance take.

This passage seems to prove beyond all doubt, that Shakespeare considered all *Three Parts of Henry VI.* as at least partly his own. Line 11 seems to refer especially to I. *Henry VI.*; line 12 to II. *Henry VI.*; while line 13 seems to imply that more than one play was alluded to. Still it is, perhaps, but fair to admit that the reference may be only to the *First Part of Henry VI.*; and that "*their sake*" might be nothing but a careless use of

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00144-1 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 2

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## KING HENRY VI.—PART II.

the plural possessive, or might refer to the characters in the play.

The question as to whether Shakespeare had any hand in *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy*, as they have come down to us, is one very difficult to determine. On the one hand, there are many passages in the two older plays—one may almost say whole scenes—which, as far as we can judge from internal evidence, after making every allowance for the crudity of Shakespeare's style when first writing for the stage, we cannot bring ourselves to believe were written by him. On the other hand, there are speeches and scenes of such merit, many of which we find to have undergone little or no alteration in the revised versions, that we feel tempted to claim them for Shakespeare. But what is more important than the mere language of the plays, the characterization, in two important instances—those of Queen Margaret and Richard, Duke of Gloucester—is nearly as complete in the older plays as it is in the revised versions. If we hold that *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy* were the works of two or more joint authors, not including Shakespeare, it would be unjust to attribute to these joint authors the demerits of the two older plays, and not to credit them with the merits such as they are. It must, in fairness, be granted that whoever wrote the soliloquy of Gloucester in *The True Tragedy*, to him belongs the credit of the original conception of the Richard who is the hero of *Richard III.* True it is that Shakespeare, in the latter play, may have very much elaborated the character, but all the main features of the intellectual and unscrupulous egotist, who makes love to Lady Anne over the coffin of her late husband, are to be found in the Gloucester who speaks these remarkable lines (*III. Henry VI. v. 6. 81–83*):

And this word "love," which greybeards call divine,  
Be resident in men like one another,  
And not in me: I am myself alone

(identically the same as in *The True Tragedy*, p. 102); while the fascinating hypocrisy, if one may use such an expression, of the murderer of the young princes is epitomized in that line (*III. Henry VI. iii. 2. 182*):

Why, I can smile, and murder whiles I smile,

6

nearly word for word the same as in *The True Tragedy* (p. 64):

Tut I can smile, and murder when I smile.

Also with regard to Queen Margaret; however much her speeches may be improved in the revised editions, and however easily we may trace the touches of Shakespeare's poetic fancy in many scenes in which she figures—in that, for instance, between her and Suffolk in the *Second Part*—still we must admit that the resolute and purposeful woman, who struggles so boldly against every difficulty almost with success, even against the greatest difficulty of all, the paralyzing influence of her too gentle and too conscientious husband, exists in the Margaret of *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy*; and that the development of her character in *Richard III.* is but a development and not a creation. No one can read carefully *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy* without perceiving that there are passages where all sense, and rhythm, and metre seem wanting; passages the language of which is of the baldest description. On the other hand, there are also passages evidently written by one who was a master of blank verse, as far as its capacities were then developed; by one who had no little sense of dramatic effect as well as poetic fancy and vigour. It is also clear, when we compare the revised versions as printed in the Folio with the older plays, that the former are something more than a mere correction of transcribers' or printers' errors, an amplification of scenes or of individual speeches: they are, evidently, the result of a careful revision and partial rewriting by one who was at once a poet and a practical dramatist. It is therefore a perfectly fair and reasonable theory to suppose that the two plays were, originally, the work of other authors than Shakespeare; while to him belongs the merit of the additions and the improvements found in the revised edition. But it is scarcely fair or reasonable to say that every passage in the older plays, which is of sufficient merit to have been Shakespeare's, and which we cannot assign to any one of his contemporaries, was therefore written by him; but that for faults in those plays he is in no way responsible. What is

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00144-1 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 2

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION.

more just and reasonable, and probably nearer the truth, is that Shakespeare *did* assist the authors of the older plays; but that he was at the time an unknown man, and quite unpractised in his art. He therefore did not carry so much influence with him as did his older and more experienced collaborators, who might fairly expect to receive the far larger share, if not the whole, of the credit attached to the work. But, as Shakespeare advanced in the estimation not only of those connected with the theatres but also of the public, the rumour would get about that he was, at least, part author of *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy*; and perhaps rather more than his due share of the merit of these plays would have been assigned to him. This could not but have irritated Greene and his other coadjutors; and the well-known passage in Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit*, already quoted, was the result. Afterwards, when Shakespeare had established his position in the theatre, he would very naturally take up again *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy*; and, having conceived the idea of writing a play on the subject of Richard III., would revise them with as much care as his inclination or his other occupations allowed.

## STAGE HISTORY.

There does not appear to be any record of the performance either of *The Contention* or *The True Tragedy*, in their unadapted shapes. We only know from the title-page of the first edition of *The True Tragedy* that it had been acted by the Earl of Pembroke's servants sundry times before 1595. On none of the title-pages of *The Contention* is any mention made of its having been performed. It will be observed that both Q. 1 and Q. 2 of *The True Tragedy* have on them "*The True Tragedy*," &c., "with the whole contention between the Houses of Lancaster and York," although they only contain the Second Part properly speaking; the third edition of 1619 is also called *The Whole Contention*, and does include both parts. We may therefore infer that the First Part, usually called *The Contention*, was acted as well as *The True Tragedy*, which forms its sequel. It is not very probable that the play

mentioned by Henslowe (see Introduction to I. Henry VI.) contained any portion of *The Contention* or of *The True Tragedy*; and there is no mention of the performance of either the Second or Third Parts of Henry VI. As to the two plays, after they had been altered by Shakespeare and their titles changed, there is no mention of them in Henslowe, Downes, or Pepys. The only contemporary reference—and that not an over complimentary one—to the performance of these two plays is to be found in the Prologue to Ben Jonson's *Every Man In His Humour*:

Though need make many poets, and some such  
As art and nature have not better'd much;  
Yet ours for want hath not so lov'd the stage,  
As he dare serve the ill customs of the age,  
Or purchase your delight at such a rate,  
As, for it, he himself must justly hate:  
To make a child now swaddled, to proceed  
Man, and then shoot up, in one beard and weed,  
Past threescore years; or, *with three rusty swords,*  
*And help of some few foot and half-foot words,*  
*Fight o'er York and Lancaster's long jars,*  
And in the tyring-house bring wounds to scars.

—Works, vol. i. p. 4.

This Prologue will have to be again alluded to with reference to the plays of Henry V. and *Winter's Tale*. Gifford says that it was probably written in 1596, but does not appear to have been given to the press till 1616; and he maintains that the references are not to Shakespeare's plays, but to others; and that the reference to *York and Lancaster's long jars* is to the old chronicle plays, that is to say, I suppose, to *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy*, and not to Shakespeare's adaptations of those plays. It is quite possible that Gifford may be right. At the same time, if Jonson did refer to Shakespeare's plays, there is nothing very malicious in such a reference. It is quite possible that the two poets might still be very good friends, and yet thoroughly appreciate the very distinct qualities of each other. In fact, as Shakespeare himself, in his own Prologue to Henry V. (spoken by the Chorus), ridicules the scantiness of the devices by which battles were represented on the stage, he would, probably, have not regarded it as anything malignant in the older poet, who represented what we might call the ultra

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00144-1 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 2

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## KING HENRY VI.—PART II.

classical school, if he did venture to chaff his young rival for availing himself of those mechanical devices which, in spite of that inadequacy of which he himself as a dramatist was too sensible, yet pleased the people. Thus much it is as well to say on this subject of the alleged ill feeling between Jonson and Shakespeare, at the first opportunity which occurs; and the subject may now be dismissed with the remark, that a great deal more has been made of this supposed enmity, both by Malone, who first formalized the indictment against Jonson, and by Gifford, who defended his favourite and congenial author with an earnestness almost fanatical.

The first record of any performance of the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI. to be found in Genest, is of the version produced by Crowne at Dorset Garden, 1681, which was called "Henry VI. Part II. or The Misery of Civil War," and was a continuation of the play already noticed in the Introduction to I. Henry VI. Although this play was acted during the period included in Downes's historic review of the stage, it is not mentioned by him; probably because it was acted only two or three times. In this play, Betterton played the part of the Earl of Warwick; Mrs. Lee that of Queen Margaret, and Mrs. Betterton that of Lady Grey. Genest gives the following account: "In this play a good deal is taken verbatim, or with slight alteration, from Shakspeare, but much less is borrowed than in the former part. Crowne in the Prologue says—

The Divine Shakspeare did not lay one stone.

Which is as impudent a lie as ever was broached—Stevens observes, that surely Shakspeare's works could have been but little read at a period when Crowne could venture such an assertion.

"Act 1st.—Jack Cade opens the play with the scenes in Shakspeare's 2d. part not very materially altered—Young Clifford kills him instead of Iden—but not on the stage—the Duke of York claims the Crown—he is supported by Warwick, and opposed by Clifford.

"Act 2d. begins with the battle of St. Albans—not materially altered—Edward Plantagenet says—

I fought with more dispatch,  
'Cause had the battle lasted, 'twould have spoil'd  
An Assignation that I have to night.

"Warwick sees Lady Grey weeping over her husband's dead body, and falls in love with her—Edward enters pulling in Lady Eleanor Butler—he makes violent love to her, but is obliged to leave her just as she is about to capitulate—the King and the Duke of York make the same agreement about the Crown, as they do in the 1st scene of Shakspeare's 3d. part.

"Act the 3d. begins with the scene at Sandal Castle badly altered—Lady Eleanor Butler enters, to Edward, in a riding dress—Edward protests he will not lose a second opportunity—then follow two scenes by Crowne—in one of them—"The scene is drawn, and there appears Houses and Towns burning, Men and Women hang'd upon Trees, and Children on the tops of Pikes."

"Act 4th.—Clifford begins with saying to King Henry

Damn your unlucky planets—

And a little after

Oh! damn all this—come let us to the battle.

After he has received his mortal wound—Edward, Warwick &c. jeer him, (as in Shakspeare) and conclude he must be dead as he does not swear—Crowne makes him recover for a moment just to say—"Damnation on you all"—Lady Grey is discovered—Warwick renews his love, and is again rejected—She is married to King Edward, and as soon as the ceremony is over, Lady Eleanor Butler enters, and reproaches the King for deserting her—Warwick takes Edward prisoner.

"Act 5th.—King Henry is restored—Edward makes his escape—then comes the battle at Barnet—Lady Eleanor Butler enters in boy's clothes, and is killed by King Edward, who did not know who she was—he next kills Warwick—Queen Margaret and her Son are brought in prisoners, as in Shakspeare—the scene changes to the Tower—the ghost of Richard the 2d and a good Spirit appear to Henry the 6th—Richard Plantagenet kills him—and King Edward concludes the play"



Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00144-1 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 2

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION.

(Genest, vol. i. pp. 305, 306). The Second Part is said to have been published in 1680, a year before the First Part; but it is not likely that it was written before. The latter play is full of bits of claptrap, conceived in that spirit of ultra loyalty which distinguished Crowne, and which the eminent virtues of the Merry Monarch were so calculated to excite. The next production of these plays, or of any version of them, was at Drury Lane Theatre, 1723; when a version by Theophilus Cibber was introduced on July 5th, the title of which was, "An Historical Tragedy of the Civil Wars between the Houses of York and Lancaster in the reign of King Henry 6th—altered from Shakspeare—containing the marriages of King Edward the 4th and Young Prince Edward with Lady Grey and Lady Anne—the distresses of Queen Margaret—the deposing of King Henry 6th—the battles fought at St. Albans, Wakefield, Mortimer's Cross, and Tewksbury—the deaths of Lord Clifford of Cumberland and his Son, the Duke of York, his son young Rutland, the great Earl of Warwick, and young Prince Edward and many other true historical passages (B.M.)" (Genest, vol. iii. p. 110). Theophilus Cibber was a young man, who does not appear to have ventured on the humorous freaks of originality in which Crowne indulged. The principal additions seem to consist of love scenes between Prince Edward and Lady Anne, the second daughter of Warwick, and a few tedious speeches by the adapter himself. He availed himself to a considerable extent of Crowne's version. Genest says, "T. Cibber's alteration is a very bad one; he has, however, retained considerably more of the original than Crown had done" (vol. iii. p. 112). The name of Savage appears in the cast as the representative of the Duke of York; and it appears that this was Richard Savage, the poet, who was the friend of Theophilus Cibber, and, possibly, may have assisted him in concocting this version of Shakespeare's plays. According to Johnson, Savage was a very bad actor; but, as the Duke of York is killed in act ii., it is quite possible he may have been intrusted with that character. Young Cibber himself played Edward Prince of Wales; and

young Wilks played young Clifford. This version was only represented once.

It appears to have been a long time before any attempt was made to revive these two plays in any shape whatever. In 1818 Edmund Kean appeared at Drury Lane Theatre as Richard Duke of York, in a play with that title. This version was by Mr. Merivale, the grandfather of Mr. Herman Merivale, the dramatist, and seems to have attained greater success on the stage than any previous adaptation of Shakespeare's Henry VI. The first act is chiefly taken from I. Henry VI. The rest of the play is mainly taken from II. Henry VI., with two or three scenes from III. Henry VI. in the last act, which ends with the death of the Duke of York. Of course it was necessary to amplify the principal character to make it worth the while of the great tragedian to undertake it; and this has been done, very tastefully and ingeniously, by the insertion of some well-chosen passages from other Elizabethan dramatists, principally from Chapman; no other play of Shakespeare's being put under contribution. In the preface to the published edition of this play Mr. Merivale, in very temperate language, joins issue with some of his critics whose conflicting opinions were certainly difficult to reconcile; one of these ingenious gentlemen, finding fault with the compiler for modernizing Shakespeare, selected as "his favourite passage in the original" the short scene between York and Rutland, introduced with great propriety, from a dramatic point of view, before the murder of Rutland; that being one of the very few passages written by Mr. Merivale himself! It would appear from this that the knowledge of Shakespeare, possessed by the critics of that day, was neither as wide nor as deep as it is now. Barry Cornwall, in his *Life of Edmund Kean*<sup>1</sup> says (vol. ii. p. 178): "Kean produced some striking effects in the part of Richard, and always spoke of it in terms of high eulogium." The cast of "Richard Duke of York" included, among other well-known names, Wallack as Young Clifford; T. P. Cooke as Buckingham; Munden as Jack Cade; and Mrs. Glover as Margaret

<sup>1</sup> The work was published by Moxon in 1835.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00144-1 - The Henry Irving Shakespeare, Volume 2

William Shakespeare

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## KING HENRY VI.—PART II.

of Anjou. I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. Herman Merivale for the loan of his copy of this play, which contains numerous MS. alterations and additions in the handwriting of his grandfather; the title-page is dated 1817, and the preface refers to various features in the representation of the play and to the criticisms thereon. Mr. Herman Merivale informs me, in a letter, that the play was first represented in 1816, so that the date 1818 given in the *Life of Kean* above referred to, must, if correct, refer to a revival of the play, not to its first production. The only other occasion on which any version of Henry VI. has been represented, as far as I can discover, was at the Surrey Theatre in 1863, when, under the management of Mr. Anderson, a version of I. Henry VI. was presented, called *The Wars of the Roses*, and was played some thirty or forty nights. Mr. Anderson himself doubled the part of the Duke of York and Jack Cade. In the letter, in which he kindly gives me this information, he adds that "unfortunately the MS. with all books and papers were destroyed when the theatre was burnt down in the year 1864."

Whether any manager will think it worth his while to revive any one of the above-mentioned versions of these plays, or to give a representation of any one of the Three Parts of Henry VI. as Shakespeare revised them, is very doubtful. The number of characters introduced, the violent changes of scene, the confused mass of incidents, and the necessary division of interest among the characters, all tend to make the effective representation of these plays on the stage very difficult.

## CRITICAL REMARKS.

In speaking of these two plays it is evident, from what has been said above as to their authorship, that one cannot treat them, any more than I. Henry VI., as being Shakespeare's own work. I cannot pretend to follow those who venture to portion out the lines of these plays between their different authors. For the purposes of criticism it is quite sufficient to accept the additional passages in F. I as being virtually the work of Shakespeare, whether Marlowe assisted him or not in the re-

vision. For what he chose to leave of the old plays in the revised editions of them he is responsible, as far as his taste as a poet and his judgment as a dramatist are concerned. Most critics do not hesitate to prefer these two plays, II. Henry VI. and III. Henry VI., to I. Henry VI.; and there is no doubt that they contain many more passages of merit both from a poetical and dramatic point of view; but the nature of their subject prevents them being as sympathetic as I. Henry VI. Indeed, had the same amount of talent and of pains been bestowed upon the latter, it would have more than held its own with the Parts founded upon *The Contention* and *The True Tragedy*. But we may take it that not only was the original play, from which Shakespeare worked in the case of I. Henry VI., of inferior merit to those from which he adapted the two other Parts, but also that he bestowed less care upon the First Part than on the Second and Third; and, probably, that he had not, at the time he prepared the former for the stage, made much progress in his art. Otherwise, the play, which tells the story of Talbot's glorious victories and heroic death, of Joan of Arc's noble enthusiasm for her country, and of her cruel end, would have taken a much firmer hold upon our sympathies than these two somewhat monotonous records of grasping ambition, mean treachery, and bloodthirsty cruelty. For, after all, when we come, fresh from a careful reading of them, to look back upon these two plays, with what characters, crowded as they are with many and various individualities, can we sympathize? Scarcely with the ambitious and disingenuous York; or with Warwick, brave though he be, yet never setting his heart upon anything else but his own selfish ends, changing his allegiance with as little scruple as he changes his armour, whenever it suits his purpose; hardly with the uncles, wrangling over their royal nephew; or with Edward IV., young, brave, and handsome as he is, but sensual, and only less cruel because more indolent than his scheming, vulpine brother Richard. We can care little for Clarence, who has just enough audacity to be a traitor, without the courage to be loyal; nor do our hearts go out even to Margaret, loyal