CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Literary studies

This series provides a high-quality selection of early printings of literary works, textual editions, anthologies and literary criticism which are of lasting scholarly interest. Ranging from Old English to Shakespeare to early twentieth-century work from around the world, these books offer a valuable resource for scholars in reception history, textual editing, and literary studies.

King Henry the Eighth

John Dover Wilson's New Shakespeare, published between 1921 and 1966, became the classic Cambridge edition of Shakespeare's plays and poems until the 1980s. The series, long since out-of-print, is now reissued. Each work is available both individually and as part of a set, and each contains a lengthy and lively introduction, main text, and substantial notes and glossary printed at the back. The edition, which began with The Tempest and ended with The Sonnets, put into practice the techniques and theories that had evolved under the 'New Bibliography'. Remarkably by today's standards, although it took the best part of half a century to produce, the New Shakespeare involved only a small band of editors besides Dover Wilson himself. As the volumes took shape, many of Dover Wilson's textual methods acquired general acceptance and became an established part of later editorial practice, for example in the Arden and New Cambridge Shakespeares. The reissue of this series in the Cambridge Library Collection complements the other historic editions also now made available.

King Henry the Eighth

The Cambridge Dover Wilson Shakespeare

VOLUME 14

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE
EDITED BY JOHN DOVER WILSON

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge New York Melbourne Madrid Cape Town Singapore São Paolo Delhi

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108005869

This edition first published 1962
This digitally printed version 2009

ISBN 978-1-108-00586-9

THE WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE

EDITED FOR THE SYNDICS OF THE
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY
JOHN DOVER WILSON

KING HENRY THE EIGHTH

EDITED BY
J. C. MAXWELL

KING HENRY THE EIGHTH

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1969

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by
Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521094818

First published 1962
First paperback edition 1969
Re-issued in this digitally printed version 2009

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-521-07538-1 hardback
ISBN 978-0-521-09481-8 paperback

CONTENTS

PREFATORY NOTE

I am once again indebted to Mr. J. C. Maxwell for relieving me of a burden, my relief being all the greater that *Henry VIII* happens to be the last play in the First Folio to be dealt with in this edition and a play I find less interesting than any other in the Folio. Indeed, its chief interest to me is the question of authorship. I cannot enough admire the way this is handled in the following Introduction; for its cogency, its neatness (not a word too much or too few), and—I would dare to add—its finality; while I find the section on the play equally satisfying.

J. D. W.

INTRODUCTION

I. Date and Authorship

It is now agreed by all scholars that *Henry VIII* is of later date than any other play in the Folio: *The Two Noble Kinsmen* may well be later.[1] The performance on 29 June 1613,[2] in the course of which the Globe Theatre was burned down, need not have been the very first,[3] but Sir Henry Wotton's description of the play as new is scarcely consistent with its having been more than a few months on the stage. On the other hand, as Foakes points out,[4] Thomas Lorkin's letter written the day after the fire, referring without explanation to 'the play of Hen: 8', suggests that it was not completely unknown to his correspondent—though too much stress cannot be placed upon a single definite article in a hastily written letter.

It has long been conjectured that the play had a certain measure of topicality in 1613. Its culmination in the baptism of Elizabeth would have made it a suitable play for the occasion of the marriage of James's daughter, Princess Elizabeth, to Prince Frederick, the

[1] In the most recent study, Paul Bertram dates *The Two Noble Kinsmen* early November 1613 (*Shakespeare Quarterly*, XII (1961), 30).

[2] For contemporary descriptions, see E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare* (1930), II, 343–4 (Wotton's letter only) and *Elizabethan Stage* (1923), II, 419–23. The New Arden edition by R. A. Foakes (1957) has fresh texts of the letters of Thomas Lorkin and John Chamberlain.

[3] I see little force in Aldis Wright's argument (Clarendon edition (1891), p. xxi) that such an accident was not likely to happen except at a first performance.

[4] New Arden edition (1957), p. xxviii.

Elector Palatine, on 14 February 1613. Malone, who believed the play to be of Elizabethan origin,[1] none the less suggested that the marriage might have been the occasion for its revival, James Spedding thought the completion of the play may have been hastened on for this event,[2] and a number of later scholars have held similar views. The most recent supporter has been R. A. Foakes in his New Arden edition of 1957.[3] He points out that the identity of name between the Princess and the great Queen was exploited in pamphlets and sermons of the time,[4] as were the biblical echoes which are prominent in the final scene.[5] I think that he slightly underestimates the damage done to this theory by the fact that, though the records of court performances before the Princess and the Elector include five plays by Shakespeare, *Henry VIII* is not among them;[6] and not much can be built on the possibility that it was the play to have been acted on 16 February which 'lapsed contrarie, for greater pleasures [in the form of a masque] were preparing'.[7] I think that the theory must remain, on present evidence, what it has always been—attractive, intrinsically plausible, but unproved and probably unprovable.

The play as we know it, then, pretty certainly belongs to 1613, and earlier speculations, to be discussed below (pp. xiii–xiv), that it was originally written in substantially its present form in honour of Queen Elizabeth before her death, have not survived the systematic study of the development of Shakespeare's verse. But the question whether it is related to any earlier play on the same

[1] See below, p. xiv.
[2] See below, p. xxv.
[3] Pp. xxviii–xxxiii.
[4] Pp. xxx–xxxi.
[5] Pp. xxxi–ii.
[6] E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare* (1930), II, 343.
[7] Cited by Foakes, p. xxxiii.

subject must be raised. The only known play to be cited by a responsible scholar is the anonymous *Buckingham* recorded by Henslowe in 1593.[1] E. K. Chambers suggested this, but with diminishing confidence as time went on. In his 'Red Letter' edition of *Henry VIII* (1908), at a time when he was reluctant to attribute to Shakespeare any share in the Folio text, he suggested that *Buckingham* might have been an early Shakespearian version, and that knowledge of its existence might have been a reason for the inclusion of the present version in the Folio, even if it were completely non-Shakespearian.[2] In 1923, he still referred to *Buckingham* as 'a title which might fit either *Richard III* or that early version of *Henry VIII*, the existence of which, on internal grounds, I suspect',[3] though he had by this time reverted to the more orthodox view of *Henry VIII* as a Shakespeare–Fletcher collaboration.[4] In 1930, all he was prepared to say by way of introduction to the mention of *Buckingham* was: 'The reversion to the epic chronicle at the very end of Shakespeare's career is odd. I have sometimes thought that an earlier play may have been adapted';[5] and he now regarded *Richard III* as a more likely identification for *Buckingham* than any version of *Henry VIII*, though in the section on *Richard III* even this identification is cautiously described as 'not...inconceivable'.[6] I very much doubt whether *Buckingham* had any connexion with any Shakespeare play at all.

[1] *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. W. W. Greg (1904–8), II, 158; ed. R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert (1961), p. 20.
[2] Pp. 11–13; reprinted in *Shakespeare, a Survey* (1925), pp. 320–2.
[3] *Elizabethan Stage*, II, 95.
[4] *Ibid.* II, 217.
[5] *William Shakespeare*, I, 497.
[6] *Ibid.* I, 303.

If there is general agreement about the date of *Henry VIII*, this is very far from true about the authorship. The first writer who is on record as detecting stylistic peculiarities in the play is Richard Roderick, in a set of 'Remarks' first published in the sixth edition of Thomas Edwards's *Canons of Criticism* (1758). Roderick did not challenge Shakespeare's authorship, and he did not notice any disparity between different scenes: indeed he explicitly asserted 'that the measure throughout this whole Play has something in it peculiar',[1] and his first examples are drawn from the clearly Shakespearian opening scene. He singled out the frequency of unstressed endings, and invited the reader to 'read aloud an hundred lines in any other Play, and an hundred in This; and, if he perceives not the tone and cadence of his own voice to be involuntarily altered in the latter case from what it was in the former; I would never advise him to give much credit to the information of his ears'.[2] He also noted 'that the emphasis, arising from the sense of the verse, very often clashes with the cadence that would naturally result from the metre'.[3] The examples of this which he cites from Act 5, scene 5, are not very happily chosen, and include reversals of normal stress that could easily be paralleled elsewhere in Shakespeare, but he does hit upon an eminently Fletcherian passage from this scene.

It is hard to say whether Roderick deserves much credit as a pioneer. If he picks upon one Fletcherian passage, he also treats as characteristic of the special metre of this play, because of their feminine endings, lines that are perfectly unremarkable (1. 1. 3, 4, 8, 10). Perhaps the most that can be said for him is that his ear was, at least spasmodically, better than his powers of analysis.

[1] P. 263. [2] P. 264. [3] P. 265.

Johnson certainly seems to have had no misgivings about the play, and lavishes some of his highest praise on Act 4, scene 2: 'This scene is above any other part of *Shakespeare's* tragedies, and perhaps above any scene of any other poet, tender and pathetic, without gods, or furies, or poisons, or precipices, without the help of romantic circumstances, without improbable sallies of poetical lamentation, and without any throes of tumultuous misery'. But as early as Theobald the view had been current that the play was first produced in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, so that the references to King James must have been added later. Theobald and Johnson assumed that Shakespeare himself added these lines (5. 5. 39–55), which are bracketed in Johnson's edition; but the way was open to suggestions of another hand.

In his 'Attempt to ascertain the Order in which the Plays attributed to Shakspeare were written', first published in the first volume of Steevens's edition of 1778, Malone, accepting the Elizabethan dating for the original version, raised the question of its integrity. He quoted Johnson's suggestion that the prologue might be by Ben Jonson, and added that Farmer 'thinks he sees something of Jonson's hand, here and there, in the dialogue also'.[1] Later, he took up Roderick's remarks on metrical peculiarities, and quoted Steevens as thinking that these peculiarities might come from Ben Jonson (to whom, it may be added, they have not the

[1] P. 315. It may be worth while to insert a warning against the statement of R. W. Babcock, *The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry* (1931), p. 17, that Thomas Davies 'threw out *Henry VIII* in 1784'. This arises from a careless reading of Davies's statement (*Dramatic Miscellanies* (1784), I, 339) that Malone and Steevens 'suspect, with reason' that the Prologue was 'not entirely the work of Shakespeare'.

slightest affinity). He himself left it an open question whether the 'peculiarities' really existed.[1]

Both he and Steevens had second thoughts on the matter. In 1790, Malone, commenting on Johnson's note on 5. 5. 39 ff., wrote, 'I suspect these lines were added in 1613, after Shakspeare had quitted the stage, by that hand which tampered with the other parts of the play so much, as to have rendered the versification of it of a different colour from all the other plays of Shakspeare'.[2]

He was apparently now more confident that there were peculiarities, but less confident that they could be attributed to Jonson, than he had been twelve years earlier. Steevens had also shifted his position, for in commenting on the above remarks he wrote that he found Roderick's examples 'undecisive'; that Shakespeare might himself have 'intentionally deviated from his usual practice of versification'; and finally, and more damagingly to the theory he had previously espoused, 'if the reviver of this play (or tamperer with it, as he is styled by Mr Malone,) had so much influence over its numbers as to have entirely changed their texture, he must be supposed to have new woven the substance of the whole piece; a fact almost incredible'.[3] He did however, continue to attribute 'the lines under immediate consideration' (5. 5. 39–55) to Jonson. These rather vague speculations were as far as theories of non-Shakespearian material in *Henry VIII* had got by the time of the 1821 Variorum edition.

For the next thirty years, it was the question of date that chiefly concerned scholars. All this was changed when in 1850 James Spedding posed the question, 'Who

[1] P. 317.
[2] Quoted in Steevens's 1793 ed., XI, 202.
[3] *Ibid.*

wrote Shakspere's *Henry VIII*?'[1] Spedding's analysis gave to Shakespeare only Act 1, scenes 1–2, Act 2, scenes 3–4, Act 3, scene 2, lines 1–203 and Act 5, scene 1 (the last, in his view, 'altered'). Samuel Hickson at once made known the exact agreement of his division of the play, independently arrived at, with that of Spedding,[2] and Spedding then revealed that the suggestion of Fletcher's hand had first been made to him by Tennyson.[3]

Spedding's theory was naturally a shock to some traditional evaluations. Indeed, if Halliwell-Phillipps is to be believed, 'students who belong to an older school are literally petrified by the announcement that Wolsey's farewell to all his greatness, as well as a large part of the scene in which it occurs, are henceforth to be considered the composition of some other author'.[4] But in the second half of the nineteenth century Fletcher's share in the play came to be generally accepted. The new theory that was then advanced was that the 'Shakespearian' parts were not in fact by Shakespeare. The claims of Massinger were argued by Robert Boyle in the *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society* (1885), I, 10, and were still being urged by H. Dugdale Sykes, *Sidelights on Shakespeare*, in 1919, though W. E. Farnham had shown how completely divergent *Henry VIII* was from Massinger's plays in its use of colloquial contractions.[5] Even such a scholar

[1] *Gentleman's Magazine*, August 1850. My quotations are from the reprint in *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, I, 1 (1874), Appendix, pp. 1*–20*.

[2] *Notes and Queries*, II (24 August 1850); he added stylistic confirmation of Fletcher's hand in III (18 January 1851).

[3] *Gentleman's Magazine* (October 1850), p. 381.

[4] *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare* (ed. 2, 1882), p. 304.

[5] *P.M.L.A.* XXXI (1916), esp. p. 351.

as Aldis Wright, in the Clarendon edition of 1891, regarded Boyle as having made out a good case against Shakespeare, if not an adequate one for Massinger (p. xxiv). During the present century there has been a notable revival of belief in Shakespeare's undivided authorship, though further evidence for Fletcher has been adduced, especially by A. H. Thorndike[1] and A. C. Partridge.[2]

After this historical survey, it is now time to turn to the merits of the argument. It would be fatuous to make spurious claims to a balanced impartiality, and I had better say straight away that I think the case for joint authorship is as fully established as such a case ever can be on purely internal evidence. It may be that minute analysis will yield new arguments—and equally, that it may reveal things about the play which tell against joint authorship[3]—but it seems unlikely that those who have not been convinced by the arguments already available will be convinced by any new ones. (What I hope may become clearer in the course of time is the method of collaboration, which I believe to be almost entirely a matter of conjecture up to now.)[4]

I think that a good deal of harm has been done to the case for joint authorship by the loose use of the blanket term 'disintegration' and so I shall first set out the main differences, as I see them, between *Henry VIII* and all the other plays of disputed authorship in the Folio.[5]

[1] *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare* (1901).

[2] *The Problem of 'Henry VIII' Reopened* (1949).

[3] Some of these are noted by R. A. Foakes, New Arden edition (1957), esp. p. xxii.

[4] See below, pp. xxv–xxvii.

[5] One red herring deserves no more than a footnote. The fact that untenable claims were later made for Massinger's authorship of the non-Fletcherian parts of *Henry VIII* has no bearing on Spedding's arguments for Fletcher's share.

It is natural to think of the controversy about *Henry VIII* in connexion with the controversy about Shakespeare's earliest history plays. It is, of course, by no means universally accepted, even today, that the *Henry VI* plays are Shakespeare's unaided work. But, conceding for the sake of argument that they are, is there any close parallelism with *Henry VIII*? Believers in Shakespeare's exclusive authorship of *Henry VI* have justifiably made play with the failure of disintegrators to agree among themselves, and with their rash and unsystematic use of parallel passages as evidence of authorship. But there is nothing like this about *Henry VIII*. Spedding named Fletcher's as the second hand, and specified the scenes for which he believed him to be responsible. Hickson had arrived at exactly the same division,[1] and subsequent separatists have mostly accepted it unchanged as far as those scenes are concerned, though, as we have seen, there has been some (but diminishing) disagreement about the 'non-Fletcherian' parts. Fletcher, moreover, unlike the early dramatists invoked in connexion with the *Henry VI* plays, is a writer with a great mass of undisputed and well-preserved work to his credit for purposes of comparison, and with very marked stylistic idiosyncrasies, which make his work elsewhere stand out from that of his known collaborators.[2] It would be too manifestly having it both ways to cite their disagreement as an

[1] Peter Alexander writes that much is made of Hickson's reaching the same results as Spedding, but that once the test proposed was accepted it was merely a matter of counting syllables (*Essays and Studies of the English Association*, XVI (1930), p. 103 n. 3). This is to ignore Spedding's claim that it was the total impression that weighed most with him.

[2] See the series of articles by Cyrus Hoy in *Studies in Bibliography*, starting with vol. VIII (1956).

argument against disintegrators of the *Henry VI* plays, and then to attribute their agreement (as far as Fletcher is concerned) about *Henry VIII* to slavish following of Spedding.[1] Moreover, though opinions may differ as to the absolute value of the 'Fletcherian' scenes, there is at least no question of invoking a less illustrious name to relieve Shakespeare of the responsibility for manifestly inferior or careless work. On the contrary, all the great set-pieces of the play, except the trial of Katharine, are attributed to Fletcher: I have already (p. xiii) quoted Johnson's eulogy of the final Katharine scene.

It may, however, be thought so unlikely that the Folio editors would have included any substantial body of non-Shakespearian work that the case for Fletcher is very strongly handicapped from the start. Let us consider this for a little. The clearest statement of it is to be found in Peter Alexander's 'Conjectural History, or Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*' (*Essays and Studies of the English Association* (1930), XVI, 85–120). Alexander there argues that the acceptance of Fletcher as author of more than half the play is not compatible with belief in the honesty of Heminge and Condell.[2] The rejoinder to this, it seems to me, is simple. What does Alexander think that Heminge and Condell would have done if Spedding's analysis of the play were correct? Omitted it altogether? But it must have been well known, it contained a substantial body of Shakespearian work, and it rounds off one of the three sections of the Folio.[3] But, it might be argued, they would have said that it *was* a

[1] There is more than a hint of this in Foakes's remark, New Arden edition (1957), p. xxii: 'when once a lead had been given, as it was by Spedding, his successors found it comparatively easy to see the same peculiarities'.

[2] Pp. 118–19.

[3] This last characteristic distinguishes it from *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.

collaborative work. Here, I think, the only tenable position is a completely agnostic one. If Shakespeare was responsible for some collaborative works, there is no way of telling *a priori* what, if anything, Heminge and Condell were likely to say about them. It is true that they did not collect every scrap in which a case can be made out for Shakespeare's hand—they left out *Pericles* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, as well as *Sir Thomas More* (in which his share was a relatively small one) and *Edward III*. They also deserve full credit for ignoring the apocryphal plays later published in the Third Folio, one of which, *The First Part of Sir John Oldcastle*, had been attributed to Shakespeare in his lifetime, while three others, *The Puritan*, *Thomas Lord Cromwell* and *Locrine* had appeared with 'W.S.' on the title-page. By the standards of their time, then, they were markedly responsible in their attributions. But I cannot believe that any unprepossessed person, if told that Fletcher wrote more than half of *Henry VIII*, and then asked to read Heminge and Condell's 'To the great variety of readers', would think that a charge of deception could fairly be brought against them for failure to mention this fact. Shakespeare was not a writer much given to collaboration, so the question would not inevitably arise. And if it did not arise, I can see no reason why it should have been thrust into an address assuring the reader that he was being offered a complete Shakespeare with a good text. No doubt ideally conscientious and scholarly editors would have mentioned it, but then ideally conscientious and scholarly editors would have produced an edition very different from the First Folio. If Heminge and Condell had no greater editorial sins on their conscience than failure to mention Fletcher's share in *Henry VIII*, I do not think there are many of us who would hold that very seriously against them. If this is the only *a priori* argument against Fletcher's

participation,[1] I think we can with no initial prejudice consider Spedding's argument in detail.

Since those who reject the claims for Fletcher sometimes[2] write as if the case rested primarily on the sort of statistical evidence that is now regarded with more caution than it used to be, it is worth pointing out at the start that Spedding laid most stress on 'the general effect produced on the mind, the ear, and the feelings by a free and broad perusal',[3] and his comments on the different impression made by the first two scenes of Act I and the last two is still as good a statement of the case as we have. In the first scene he sees 'the full stamp of Shakspere, in his latest manner: the same close-packed expression; the same life, and reality, and freshness; the same rapid and abrupt turnings of thought, so quick that language can hardly follow fast enough, the same impatient activity of intellect and fancy, which having once disclosed an idea cannot wait to work it orderly out; the same daring confidence in the resources of language, which plunges headlong into a sentence without knowing how it is to come forth; the same careless metre which disdains to produce its harmonious effects by the ordinary devices, yet is evidently subject to a master of harmony; the same entire freedom from book language and commonplace; all the qualities, in short, which

[1] I can see nothing of moment in Alexander's later arguments, as far as they can be judged from the summary of his unpublished 1948 paper given by A. C. Partridge, *The Problem of 'Henry VIII' Reopened* (1949), pp. 9–10.

[2] Not always; R. A. Foakes, New Arden edition (1957), p. xviii, recognizes that 'Spedding's main argument was from his feeling that two very different styles representing two writers could explain what he saw as an incoherence of design'.

[3] *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, I, I (1874), Appendix, p. 7*.

distinguish the magical hand which has never yet been successfully imitated'.[1] In scene 3, on the other hand, 'I felt as if I had passed suddenly out of the language of nature into the language of the stage, or of some conventional modes of conversation. The structure of the verse was quite different and full of mannerism. The expression became suddenly diffuse and languid. The wit wanted mirth and character.'[2] So in the second Act he contrasted 'the languid and measured cadences of [Buckingham's] farewell speech' with his 'eager, impetuous, and fiery language...in the first Act'.[3] It was the force of these impressions that led him to seek confirmation from the sort of evidence that lends itself to quantitative assessment.

This evidence, in fact, proves to be quite remarkably consistent with that derived from Spedding's sense of style. Spedding himself did not pursue this type of investigation very far, but he found the Shakespearian scenes to have about the same proportion of 'redundant syllables' (feminine endings) as Shakespeare's last plays, and the Fletcherian scenes appreciably, and consistently, more. On the negative side, it is worth stressing that Spedding made no use of the much decried, and certainly hazardous, method of citing parallel passages as evidence for authorship.

Metrical analysis is all right as far as it goes, and, as will be noted later, more recent refinements of it have given some further support to Spedding's view; but it is open to sceptics to object that wide variations in the frequency of feminine endings may, and do, occur in works of single authorship, and are liable to be tied up with deliberate artistic effects. A much more satisfactory

[1] *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, I, 1 (1874), Appendix, p. 7*.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 7*–8*. [3] *Ibid.* p. 8*.

type of evidence is that afforded by trivial habits of syntax and accidence which a writer is not likely to be aware of, or to vary deliberately (or even unconsciously) in different parts of work of about the same period. It is in this field that twentieth-century investigation has confirmed Spedding's findings in several mutually independent ways; I find it quite impossible to regard the convergence of these results as fortuitous.

In 1901 A. H. Thorndike, in *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare*, investigated the relative frequency of the pronominal forms *them* and *'em* in late plays by Shakespeare, in plays by Fletcher of about the same date as *Henry VIII*, and in *Henry VIII* itself. The figures[1] are striking. The *them/'em* ratio in Shakespeare is 64:3 in *Cymbeline*, 37:8 in *The Winter's Tale* and 38:13 in *The Tempest*. In Fletcher, it is 4:60 in *Woman's Prize*, 6:83 in *Bonduca* and 1:15 in the last two of *Four Plays in One*. In the Shakespearian part of *Henry VIII* it is 23:5 and in the Fletcherian 7:59. Results are comparable for *has/hath*, the first being Shakespeare's preference and the second Fletcher's.[2] Cumulatively, these and some other less striking examples[3] seem to me to establish the case for Fletcher beyond any reasonable doubt; especially in conjunction with the greater frequency of such contractions as *'t* and *th'* in Shakespeare.[4]

I observed earlier that metrical evidence was in itself less satisfactory than the type of linguistic evidence just examined, but it is, fortunately, not necessary to remain content with the unanalysed category of 'feminine endings'. One particular type of line that is very fre-

[1] Reproduced on p. 21, n. 1, of A. C. Partridge, *The Problem of 'Henry VIII' Reopened*; tabulation on p. 22.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 20. [3] *Ibid.* pp. 20–3.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 24–5; see also Postscript, p. xxxvii.

quent in Fletcher and that attracts the attention from time to time in *Henry VIII* is that in which the feminine ending consists of a monosyllable, often of rather a heavy kind, as in 1. 4. 57, 'Go, give 'em welcome; you can speak the French tongue'. The purely qualitative aspect of this—amounting to a clash of metre with speech stress—does not lend itself to exact analysis, though it is one of the things that contribute most to the Fletcherian feeling; but the ratio of final monosyllables to the total of feminine endings can be worked out. Ants Oras[1] has done this, and the figures, to the nearest whole number, are 14 per cent for the Shakespearian scenes and 29 per cent for the Fletcherian ones. The figures for other late plays of Shakespeare are: *Cymbeline*, 18 per cent, *Winter's Tale*, 20 per cent, *Tempest*, 23 per cent; and for plays by Fletcher of about the same date: *Valentinian*, 32 per cent, *Bonduca*, 30 per cent and *Monsieur Thomas*, 42 per cent. Absolutely, the figures are a little surprising; the upward curve in Shakespeare's other plays is reversed, and the figure for the whole play, 24 per cent, is perhaps closer to what one would have predicted for a Shakespeare play of 1613. On the other hand, as Oras points out, *The Tempest* is the one play in which this device is specially associated with one character, and seems to have a particular dramatic purpose. Without Caliban, the figure for *The Tempest* would sink to 21 per cent, and 'the slightly retarding effect of the monosyllables on the rhythm agree well with the halting sub-humanity of the fish monster's mind'.[2] At any rate, here we have again a completely new test applied to a division of the play originally

[1] '"Extra Monosyllables" in *Henry VIII* and the Problem of Authorship' (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, LII (1953), 198–213).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 202.

arrived at on other lines, and giving a wide divergence, in the right direction, between the figures for the putative authors. (The figures for *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, by the way, are 'Shakespeare', 19 per cent; 'Fletcher', 36 per cent.) Oras's analysis is also valuable on the qualitative side: I would call attention especially to his Fletcher quotations for relatively heavy final monosyllables such as past participles (cf. *Henry VIII*, 4. 2. 83, 'Spirits of peace, where are ye? are ye all gone?'), '(once) more' (1. 4. 62), '(loved) most' (2. 1. 122), '(find) none' (5. 3. 136).[1] There may be those to whom such citations are perilously close to the discredited type of 'parallel passage' argument: it is evidently a question of how idiosyncratically Fletcherian we judge such lines to be; that they are at any rate frequent in Fletcher is a matter of fact and not of opinion.

For those already convinced, the argument has probably become tedious some time ago, and I shall add only one further observation. Though the original impetus for Spedding's theory, and the consideration that has maintained it in favour, is the overwhelming impression of stylistic affinity with Fletcher's work conveyed by the scenes in *Henry VIII* attributed to him, yet such quantitative tests as can be applied are highly specific. By contrast, the respects in which these scenes are claimed to be unlike Fletcher are extremely vague, and are presented with no evidence that the characteristics lacking in *Henry VIII* either are or might be expected

[1] Oras, though the most thorough, is not of course the only scholar to collect Fletcherisms of this sort. The frequency of final 'one(s)' and 'else' was noted by S. Hickson (*Notes & Queries*, III (1851), 33–4), and C. K. Pooler in the Arden edition (1915) collected (pp. xxiv–xxv) many examples of the pattern, 'a supper and a great one' (1. 3. 52).

to be anything like uniformly present in Fletcher's work. Thus Baldwin Maxwell notes the infrequency of verbal repetition and the relative frequency of sententiae and parentheses in *Henry VIII* as unFletcherian,[1] and almost all critics have recognized that Fletcher seems to have toned down some of his mannerisms in this play. This is not at all surprising if he was, as Chambers suggests, 'working under the influence of Shakespeare',[2] and, indeed, the notion that collaboration with Shakespeare might be expected to have no effect on him would be a curious kind of tribute to either dramatist.

I have just used the word 'collaboration', and that leads up to a much more conjectural part of the discussion. Those who accept dual authorship of *Henry VIII* are not at all in agreement about the way in which the play came into existence in its present form. Dissatisfaction with its structure has had something to do with the theory of dual authorship from the start, and this has extended to unwillingness to believe that Shakespeare could even share responsibility for the play in its present form. Spedding, noting that 'it is by Shakspere that all the principal matters and characters are *introduced*', conjectured 'that he had conceived the idea of a great historical drama on the subject of Henry VIII, which would have included the divorce of Katharine, the fall of Wolsey, the rise of Cranmer, the coronation of Anne Bullen, and the final separation of the English from the Romish Church, which being the one great historical event of the reign, would naturally be chosen as the focus of poetic interest'; but that, after he had reached perhaps the third Act, corresponding to the beginning of the existing Act 5, a new play was wanted,

[1] *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger* (1939), pp. 59–62.
[2] *William Shakespeare* (1930), I, 497.

in a hurry, for the marriage of Princess Elizabeth, and Shakespeare then handed the half-finished work to his company for rapid completion by Fletcher 'who finding the original design not very suitable to the occasion and utterly beyond his capacity, expanded the three acts into five, by interspersing scenes of show and magnificence, and passages of description, and long poetical conversations, in which his strength lay...and so turned out a splendid "historical masque, or shew-play", which was no doubt very popular then, as it has been ever since'.[1]

It is a pity that Spedding ever launched this 'bold conjecture', as it has cast some unwarranted doubt on what is sound in his analysis.[2] It is one thing to point to discrepancies in the handling of individual characters (Buckingham, Katharine and Wolsey) between the two parts of the play, and quite another to see in those parts undoubtedly by Shakespeare the promise of a radically different kind of play, and 'the final separation of the English from the Romish Church' would have been a kind of subject quite different from anything Shakespeare had ever treated in any of his other works. This objection does not apply so strongly to the view of Miss M. H. Nicolson that Shakespeare's conclusion was to have balanced the picture of Wolsey by tracing the rise and fall of Cranmer and the fate of Anne;[3] but again, such a conjecture would only be admissible if the

[1] *Transactions of the New Shakspere Society*, I, 1 (1874), Appendix, pp. 16*–17*.

[2] This emerges clearly from Delius's attack in *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespere-Gesellschaft*, XIV (1879), in which a very pertinent attack on the 'bold conjecture' precedes any consideration of his stylistic arguments, and the later analysis of the play treats arguments against that conjecture as if they were arguments against any form of collaboration.

[3] *P.M.L.A.* XXXVII (1922), 484–502, esp. 498–500.

existing play were shown to be quite inconceivable as a version acceptable to Shakespeare. Still less plausible is the view of H. Conrad, in a posthumous article which is still valuable for some of its detailed parallels between the Shakespearian scenes and other places in Shakespeare, that Shakespeare took over a play originally by Fletcher in order to make it theatrically effective (bühnenwirksam) by a number of additions[1]—this at a time when most of the Beaumont and Fletcher collaborations were already before the public, and such independent works as *Bonduca*, *Monsieur Thomas* and *Valentinian* had appeared or were soon to appear!

That Shakespeare was living mainly in retirement at this time, that there was no such close everyday collaboration as we may suppose between Beaumont and Fletcher—this is very probable, and may account for some lack of cohesion in the play as a whole. But I think it would take very strong evidence to overthrow the presumption that, if by two hands, *Henry VIII* is a work of collaboration in the ordinary sense of the term.

The sources are closely followed by both dramatists, in a way not otherwise characteristic of Fletcher, as Baldwin Maxwell has pointed out.[2] Foakes goes so far as to write, in support of Shakespeare's unaided authorship, 'Passages many pages away from those of immediate relevance to the text are used, and throughout there is a constant re-shaping of the material and compression of chronology. In addition, widely scattered extracts from the sources are brought together into one scene in the play. Such an extensive and detailed study of source-material as is shown here is not easily fitted into a theory of collaborative writing: it would have to

[1] *Englische Studien*, LII (1918), 210.
[2] *Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger* (1939), pp. 58–9.

be assumed that each author read independently not merely the sections in the histories relevant to the scenes he wrote, but all the material on the reign of Henry'.[1] This is an overstatement, even on Foakes's own assessment of the sources, as far as the Fletcher scenes are concerned. There is, indeed, the borrowing of 5. 3. 10–15 from a passage in Hall, either directly or through Foxe, which is remote from any other passage used from either chronicler, and it would be interesting to know how this came to the dramatist's attention. But I am not convinced that Speed's *History of Great Britain* was used at all;[2] and the one clear instance of transference of a plot-element—the blunder of Ruthall attributed to Wolsey (3. 2. 120 ff.)—is in a Shakespearian passage. Granted that Shakespeare was the first planner of the play, that it was of its very nature to be a history play sticking fairly faithfully to the facts, and that there was some discussion between the two authors, I do not see that Fletcher displays any very surprising degree of intimacy with the sources as a whole, apart from the specific passages he uses.[3]

II. Sources

The last part of the discussion has brought us to the question of sources in its own right. The only important narrative sources are Holinshed's *Chronicles* (2nd edition, 1587), for the main body of the play, and Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (first published in 1563)[4]

[1] New Arden edition (1957), p. xxiii.

[2] See below, p. xxix.

[3] For the absence from the Fletcher scenes of the transforming effect of dramatic imagination that the best of the Shakespeare scenes display, see R. A. Law, *Studies in Philology*, LVI (1959), 481–7.

[4] It assumed virtually its final form in 1570.

for the Cranmer part of Act 5. The most interesting indirect contributor to the tradition is George Cavendish in his *Life of Wolsey*,[1] which was drawn upon by various Elizabethan chroniclers including Holinshed—first by John Stow in his *Chronicles*[2] *of England* (1580). The handling of these principal sources will be discussed presently, and is analysed for individual scenes in introductory notes in the commentary; here I only raise the question of possible ancillary sources. Some use of Samuel Rowley's *When You See Me You Know Me* (1605) is probable, but of little importance.[3] Some scholars have also seen evidence for the occasional use of other chronicles. The extent to which Shakespeare at any time supplemented Holinshed by the older chronicle of Hall remains a matter of controversy.[4] The most suggestive unique agreement[5] with Hall in *Henry VIII* is 'silenced' at 1. 1. 97 ('commaunded to kepe his house in silence'). But the other parallels cited by Foakes (on 2. 4. 87, 135; 3. 2. 56–60) are very slender,[6] and I am inclined to think even the first one may be a coincidence. Foakes also cites Speed's *History of Great Britain* (1611) for 3. 2. 222–7 and 358–64, but the points of resemblance seem to me to be commonplaces.

[1] Now for the first time available in a reliable edition by R. S. Sylvester (*Early English Text Society*, 1959 for 1957).

[2] In later editions, *Annals*.

[3] See notes on Prol. 13–17; 1. 1. 197; 1. 2. 186; 2. 2. 1–8; 5. 1. 174; 5. 2. 22; 5. 3. 30, 81, 99.

[4] For a recent sceptical view in relation to *Richard II*, see Peter Ure's New Arden edition (1956), pp. xlix–l.

[5] Noted by W. G. Boswell-Stone, *Shakspere's Holinshed* (1896), p. 427.

[6] The references to Wolsey as a 'butcher's cur' (1. 1. 120: Hall 'Bochers dogge') may well come from oral tradition. On 5. 3. 10–15, see note *ad loc.*