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CHAPTER I

A SUMMARY OF CRITICAL OPINIONS CONCERNING THE
AUTHORSHIP OF THE HENRY VI PLAYS

The authorship of the first part of the Henry VI trilo-
yogy has received much less study in general than has the
authorship of the second and third parts of the group.
Since there is no record of 1 Henry VI having been printed
before its appearance in the Folio text of 1623, there is
a comparatively small amount of data available for investi-
gation of the authorship of the play. This deficiency of
data probably explains the lack of interest in the problem
on the part of scholars. The theories of critics relative
to the play's authorship may be grouped under four heads:
(1) that 1 Henry VI was originally written by Shakespeare
alone; (2) that 1 Henry VI was originally written by Shake-
speare in collaboration with one or more other writers;
(3) that Shakespeare alone or in collaboration with others
revised an inferior production by some unknown dramatist or
dramatists; (4) that Shakespeare had no hand in the compo-
sition of 1 Henry VI.

Charles Knight is one of the few critics who believe
Shakespeare the sole author of 1 Henry VI. He maintains that
the three parts of Henry VI and Richard III show a general
agreement in style, spirit, and plan, with a gradual increase
of power in the writer.\textsuperscript{1} Knight’s view is upheld by Henry M. Hudson who sees in the \textit{Henry VI} plays and \textit{Richard III} an unbroken harmony and integrity not only of design and action, but of composition and characterization, which pervades the four plays, and knits them together in the unity of individual authorship.\textsuperscript{2}

Neither can John M. Murry discover any “real ground, external or internal, for denying that Shakespeare was substantially the writer of all three parts of \textit{Henry VI}.”\textsuperscript{3}

The view that \textit{1 Henry VI} is one of Shakespeare’s youthful works is taken by Hermann Ulrici. It might be inferred, declares Ulrici, that because Shakespeare followed the English view in regard to the treatment of Joan that the First Part of \textit{Henry VI} is one of his youthful works, written at a time when he did not as yet possess a clear idea of what an historical drama should be.\textsuperscript{4}

Peter Alexander shares Ulrici’s belief that \textit{1 Henry VI} is Shakespeare’s work in unaiderd form.

H. R. D. Anders is in agreement with those scholars who think that \textit{1 Henry VI} was originally written by Shakespeare in collaboration with others. Anders, however, does not attempt to identify the various hands he sees in the play. According to F. S. Boas, “there can be no reasonable doubt that Shakespeare had a share in three parts of \textit{Henry VI}.

\textsuperscript{1}A. H. Tolman, \textit{Questions on Shakespeare}, Part II, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{2}Israel Gollancz, editor, \textit{Henry VI}, Part I (the Aldus Shakespeare), p. xxiv.

\textsuperscript{3}John M. Murry, \textit{Shakespeare}, p. 50.

\textsuperscript{4}Hermann Ulrici, \textit{Shakespeare’s Dramatic Art}, II, 264.
VI, but Part I is, almost without doubt, chiefly by other hands.⁵ 1 Henry VI is also assigned to several authors by F. G. Fleay, these authors being Peele, Lodge or Nash, Marlowe, and Shakespeare. Like Fleay, F. J. Furnivall believes that "there must be at least four hands in 1 Henry VI."⁶ Only the Temple Garden scene of the red and white roses is attributed to Shakespeare by Furnivall. The play is accepted by Tudor Jenks as being partly Shakespeare's work, for he, like Furnivall, distinguishes Shakespeare's style in the Temple Garden scene as well as the scene between Young Plantagenet and Mortimer and the scene in which the brave Talbot and his son fight to the death.⁷

J. M. Robertson is perhaps the only scholar who believes Chapman to have been associated with Shakespeare in the writing of 1 Henry VI, but he thinks "the whole composition of Part I is very much less Shakespearean than that of the other two."⁸ The authorship of this play is investigated by Caroline F. E. Spurgeon from the standpoint of the style of metaphor contained in the play. She says:

The fact that the metaphor is continuous, that it starts in 1 Henry VI and is developed in the two later parts, seems to me one of many proofs that the same mind and imagination had functioned through all five plays, and that the writer of Richard III and Richard II

⁵F. S. Boss, Shakespeare and His Predecessors, p. 141.
⁶Tolman, op. cit., p. 6.
⁷Tudor Jenks, In the Days of Shakespeare, p. 71.
⁸George Saintsbury, Shakespeare, p. 54.
had, therefore, at least a very great share in the
authorship of the three *Henry VI* plays.\(^9\)

Alfred W. Pollard is inclined *\(^10\) to believe that *Henry VI*
was originally written by Shakespeare in collaboration with
Peele.\(^10\) Harley Grenville-Barker, whose opinion is in
harmony with that of G. B. Harrison, thinks "Shakespeare
wrote with Marlowe and perhaps others" this play.\(^11\)

Raymond Alden is almost positive that *Henry VI* is a
revision by Shakespeare of an earlier drama, "although we
do not have the earlier drama with which to compare it as
in the cases of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*."\(^12\) Agreeing with Alden
is G. P. Baker, who states that "Shakespeare was probably
making over old material in the *Henry VI* plays."\(^13\) The be-
lief that *Henry VI* is a revision of an old play is likewise
held by G. H. Crump, who thinks it clear that the play is a
"fairly careful and systematic revision of an old play,
carried out, about the year 1590, by Shakespeare, together
with some other dramatist or dramatists," with Shakespeare

\(^9\)Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, *Shakespeare's Imagery*, p. 224.
\(^10\)Peter Alexander, *Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard
III*, p. 25.
\(^11\)Harley Grenville-Barker and G. B. Harrison, *A Com-
ppanion to Shakespeare's Studies*, p. 244.
\(^13\)G. P. Baker, *The Development of Shakespeare as a
Dramatist*, p. 148.
contributing only in a minor degree to the play.\textsuperscript{14} The assertion is made by Edward Dowden that \textit{1 Henry VI} is "almost certainly an old play, by one or more authors, which had received touches from the hand of Shakespeare."\textsuperscript{15} Dowden's opinion is in complete accordance with that set forth by William Rolfe. G. G. Gervinus credits Shakespeare with having had only a small share in \textit{1 Henry VI}, his "additions about the rising York and his political plans being made in order to unite the play with the two others."\textsuperscript{16} Isabel McReynolds Grey claims that \textit{1 Henry VI} is not wholly Shakespeare's. "A study of the lines of the play would seem," she says, "to indicate that the work of some inferior dramatist had been revised by Shakespeare."\textsuperscript{17} As does Furnivall, Isabel Grey attributes the Temple Garden scene to Shakespeare, but believes that "the later scenes dealing with Joan of Arc are plainly the work of an inferior mind."\textsuperscript{18} The opinion of Israel Gollancz coincides with Isabel Grey's belief. J. O. Halliwell-Phillips is convinced that \textit{1 Henry VI} could not have been written by Shakespeare, though he may possibly

\textsuperscript{14}G. H. Grump, \textit{A Guide to the Study of Shakespeare's Plays}, p. 181.

\textsuperscript{15}To\textsuperscript{man}, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 6.


\textsuperscript{17}Isabel McReynolds Grey, \textit{Short Scenes from Shakespeare}, p. 185.

\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Ibid.}
have added a few touches to it."19 Criticism has proved beyond a doubt to Sidney Lee "that in the three parts of Henry VI Shakespeare with varying energy revised and expanded other men's work."20 Lee finds only a small trace of Shakespeare's pen in the First Part and assigns it "at the most generous computation no more than three hundred out of the twenty-six hundred lines" included in the play.21 The only lines which Lee confidently assigns to Shakespeare are Talbot's speeches on the battlefield and the scene in the Temple Garden, the former scene also being assigned to Shakespeare by Jenks and the latter being credited to Shakespeare by Furnivall, Gaw, Jenks, Gollancz, and Isabel Grey. From both internal and external evidence it appears to E. G. Lawrence that "1 Henry VI is the production of more than one mind, Shakespeare in this play merely elaborating and embellishing the works of others."22 As for the external evidence, Lawrence says that there is conclusive proof to show "that plays dealing with the subjects contained in 1 Henry VI existed long before the commencement of Shakespeare's career as a dramatist," and as for internal evidence there is unmistakable

20Sidney Lee, A Life of William Shakespeare, p. 117.
21Ibid.
22E. G. Lawrence, Sidelights on Shakespeare, p. 159.
proof to show that much of this old matter is in the play that is now ascribed to him. Further internal evidence is offered by Lawrence in the fact that "in all his known works Shakespeare was fair in his estimation of the French, but in \textit{1 Henry VI} they are depicted as mean and cowardly." The possibility that Shakespeare "touched the substance of \textit{1 Henry VI} and modified its form here and there, sufficiently to bring it into keeping, for stage purposes, with Parts II and III" is suggested by R. G. White. White ventures to express this opinion:

The greater part of \textit{1 Henry VI} was originally written by Greene, whose style of thought and versification may be detected throughout the play beneath the thin embellishment with which it was disguised by Shakespeare; that traces of Marlowe's furious pen may be discerned in the second and third scenes of Act II; and I should be inclined to attribute the couplets of the fifth, sixth and seventh scenes of Act IV to Peele, were it not that Peele could hardly have written so many distichs without falling once into a peculiarity of rhyme which constantly occurs in his works. But perhaps Shakespeare amended the passage in this respect as well as in others.

B. E. Warner offers several reasons for believing that, if Shakespeare is not the author of \textit{1 Henry VI}, he is at least the editor or adapter of the play. These reasons are:

(1) the significance of the last chorus of \textit{Henry V}, in which the events of this Part One are indicated after the same fashion as the Chorus is employed throughout

\begin{flushright}
\textit{23Ibid.} \hspace{1cm} \textit{24Ibid.} \\
\textit{26R. G. White, The New Grant White Shakespeare, VIII, lxx-1xxi.}
\end{flushright}
that play; (2) the introduction of the deed King Henry at its beginning, and the historical and dramatic connection thus established with the preceding play; (3) the anti-French spirit of this Part, in harmony with Shakespeare's method and custom throughout the play; (4) the fact that these three Parts were alike attributed to Shakespeare by the editors of the First Folio, who were in better position to judge of the matter, not only than the critics of our own day, but of the critics of their own day. 27

The assumption that 1 Henry VI is mostly the work of others is made by E. Malone, who concludes that "the Folio editors retained the play merely as an introduction to the two later parts, Shakespeare having added a few lines to link them together." 28 An intensive study of this play has been made by A. Gaw, who believes the following to be a reasonable interpretation of what happened to the play during the course of its composition:

2 and 3 Henry VI passed from the hands of Pembroke's into those of Strange's Men, and the new owners of course wished to use them as a sequel to their popular heresy the vi. Someone then engaged to write a new link ending for heresy the vi. After Shakespeare had joined the company, probably about June 1, 1594, as its dramatist, he increased the unity of the trilogy. About 1599 Shakespeare again turned his attention to 1 Henry VI, by which revision he laid a more substantial dramatic foundation for the War of the Roses. 29

Gaw names as the four authors of heresy the vi, which he supposes to be the original play, Marlowe, Peele, and possibly

27B. E. Werner, English History in Shakespeare's Plays, p. 170.

28Alexander, op. cit., p. 31.

29A. Gaw, The Origin and Development of 1 Henry VI, p. 165.
Greene and Nash. Morgann speaks of the play as being "repaired and furbished up by Shakespeare with here and there a little sentiment and diction."\textsuperscript{30}

Belonging to that group of critics who think Shakespeare had nothing to do with the writing of \textit{1 Henry VI} is Hallam, who says, "In default of a more probable claimant, I have sometimes been inclined to assign the First Part of \textit{Henry VI} to Greene."\textsuperscript{31} Drake, who likewise believes Shakespeare did not write \textit{1 Henry VI}, proposes that the play "should be excluded from future editions of the Poet, as offering no trace of any finishing strokes from the master-bard."\textsuperscript{32} Coleridge opposes the belief that \textit{1 Henry VI} was written by Shakespeare. He comments:

\begin{quote}
Read aloud any two or three passages in blank verse even from Shakspere's earlist dram's, as Love's Labour's Lost, or Romeo and Juliet; and then read in the same way Bedford's speech in \textit{1 Henry VI}, Act I, Scene 1, with especial attention to the metre, and if you do not feel the impossibility of the letter having been written by Shakspere all I dare suggest is, that you may have ears,—for so has another animel,—but en ear you cannot have, me judice.\textsuperscript{33}
\end{quote}

There are comparatively few supporters of the theory that \textit{1 Henry VI} was originally written by Shakespeare alone. Murry and Alexander support this theory because there is no

\textsuperscript{30}Gollancz, \textit{op. cit.}, p. xxx.  \textsuperscript{31}\textit{Ibid.}, p. xxiv.

\textsuperscript{32}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{33}Samuel T. Coleridge, \textit{Lectures and Notes on Shakspere and Other English Poets}, p. 272.
real ground, external or internal, for denying Shakespeare's authorship of the play. Knight and Hudson base their belief in Shakespeare's authorship of the play on the fact that the three *Henry VI* plays and *Richard III* must have been written by only one author. Ulrici also assigns *1 Henry VI* to Shakespeare, though he believes it to have been one of Shakespeare's youthful works. The theory that *1 Henry VI* was originally written by Shakespeare in collaboration with others has more supporters than does the first theory mentioned. Most of the scholars who uphold the theory that the play was originally written by Shakespeare in collaboration with others agree that Shakespeare had very little part in the composition of *1 Henry VI*. Though some of the critics do not attempt to identify the various authors who they think wrote the play, other critics divide *1 Henry VI* between certain authors, sometimes naming as many as four collaborators. Among those suggested as the collaborators with Shakespeare are Peele, Lodge, Nash, Marlowe, and Chapman, with Marlowe and Peele being the most frequently suggested collaborators. The most popular theory concerning the authorship of *1 Henry VI* is that in which the play is thought to be a revision of an old play. The scholars cannot reach an agreement concerning the authorship of the old play, nor can they agree as to whether the revision was made by Shakespeare alone or by Shakespeare in collaboration with others. It is
generally agreed, however, that Shakespeare was the author of the Temple Garden scene and of Talbot's speeches at Chestillon. Marlowe, Greene, Peele, and Nash are suggested by the various critics as being the composers of the original play. A majority of the revisionists are of the opinion that the old play was revised in order to unite it with the two others, 2 and 3 Henry VI. Ggew, who has made a thorough study of the problem, supposes herey the vj to have been the original play. The belief that Shakespeare had nothing to do with the writing of 1 Henry VI is held by Hellem, Drake, and Coleridge, none of whom can distinguish any sign of Shakespeare in the play. Because he cannot find a more probable claimant, Hallam assigns the play to Greene.

Since a very close relationship exists between the three parts of Henry VI, a study of the authorship of 2 and 3 Henry VI is necessary for a complete understanding of the authorship of 1 Henry VI. The general trend of critical opinion concerning the authorship of 2 and 3 Henry VI may be classified into two main divisions: (1) that Shakespeare or Shakespeare and his collaborators revised the plays from earlier versions; (2) that the Henry VI plays are not revisions, The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy being bad quartos. Scholars favoring the belief that 2 and 3 Henry VI are revisions of earlier plays are more numerous than those who maintain the other point of view, but persuasive argument is offered on both sides of the question,
Malone is a staunch supporter of the revisionist theory, arguing that Shakespeare's early attempts as a dramatist were begun by revising, in collaboration with several others, the plays The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy, attributed by him to "Marlowe, Greene and Peele," into 2 and 3 Henry VI. 34 White agrees with Malone that 2 and 3 Henry VI were revised from The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy, but he differs from Malone in that he believes that Shakespeare, Marlowe, Peele, and probably Greene wrote these earlier plays, after which Shakespeare "took out and incorporated in the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI," all that is in them of his. 35 W. A. Wright does not agree with Malone that The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy "contain nothing of Shakespeare's since there are so many internal proofs of his having had a considerable share in their composition"; nor does he agree with C. Knight "that they are entirely Shakespeare's work." 36 Both Wright and H. N. McGreeken are convinced that 2 and 3 Henry VI are revisions, The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy forming the groundwork for these plays. G. F. Tucker Brooke, in 1912, advanced the theory "that there is a lost text from which The First Part of the Contention and The True

34 Alexander, op. cit., p. 2.
Tregedy, the Whole Contention and the Folio all come separately or independently." In accord with critics who uphold the belief that there is a lost play is Sidney Lee. His theory is propounded thus:

That Greene, with Peele's co-operation, produced the original draft of the three parts of Henry VI, which Shakespeare twice helped to recast, can alone account for Greene's indignant denunciation of Shakespeare as 'an upstart crow, beautified with the feathers' of himself and his fellow-dramatist. Signs are not wanting that it was Marlowe whom Shakespeare joined in the first revision which brought to birth The Contention and The True Tragedie. It is probable that Marlowe began together with Shakespeare the last revision, but that his task was interrupted by his premature death.38

W. G. Boswell-Stone is interested more in the question of sources than in authorship, but he agrees with Raymond Alden that 2 and 3 Henry VI are recasts of The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy. F. G. Fleay assigns 3 Henry VI substantially to Marlowe, and divides 2 Henry VI between Greene, Peele, Kyd, Marlowe, and Lodge. Shakespeare he only brings in about 1600, as 'revising 2 Henry VI considerably and 3 Henry VI slightly.'39 George Brandes contends that Marlowe must have collaborated with Shakespeare in revising the other plays, unless we suppose that his original text was carelessly printed in the earlier quartos and that it here reappears in the Shakespearean Henry VI, corrected and completed in accordance with his manuscript.40


38Lee, op. cit., p. 121.


40George Brandes, William Shakespeare, p. 22.
In a study contributed to the Transactions of the New Shakespeare Society, Jane Lee assigns the old plays to Marlowe, Greene, and perhaps Peele, as do Melone and Boas. Boas adds, however, that Shakespeare might possibly have assisted in writing the old plays. Boas, Baker, and Jane Lee give credit to Shakespeare and Marlowe as revisers of the old plays. In Jane Lee's article,

the Marlowean passages in the Quartos are definitely attributed to Marlowe, the Greenish to Greene, and others to Peele, while the Marlowen lines which occur for the first time in 2 and 3 Henry VI are accounted for by assuming that Marlowe and Shakespeare jointly revised the older plays; so that in some cases we have Shakespeare revising the work of Marlowe and Greene, at others Shakespeare and Marlowe revising the works of Greene.41

Of the theories which assume a mixed authorship for the plays, that of Jane Lee seems the most plausible to William Rolfe. Regarding the authorship of the older plays, Brandes believes some passages cannot be by any one else then Shakespeare, but he detects in them passages unworthy of Shakespeare, and more like the handiwork of Greene, while others strongly suggest Marlowe.42 Several possibilities in connection with the authorship of these two plays are suggested by Israel Gollancz, who states that

the comparatively few important additions which appear in the Folio version, and only there, may be (i) Shakespeare's contributions to the older plays before 1594; or (ii) the work of the original author or authors, omitted from the acting version; or (iii) new matter

41 Gollancz, op. cit., pp. xii-xiii.
42 Brandes, op. cit., p. 22.
added by Shakespeare any time between 1594 and 1600.\textsuperscript{43} Stating that 2 and 3 Henry VI are the "result of a fairly careful and systematic revision" of two old plays, Crump thinks it probable that "Marlowe was chiefly responsible for the revision," though Shakespeare's hand is traceable in many parts.\textsuperscript{44} Helliwell-Phillips agrees with Crump in thinking that 2 and 3 Henry VI are alterations of two old plays. Servinus, another revisionist, believes 2 and 3 Henry VI are worked up by Shakespeare from an existing original. This belief is also shared by Isabel Gray. Hudson's opinion is that 2 and 3 Henry VI are merely enlargements of The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy, and that "Shakespeare was the author of the plays in their original form."\textsuperscript{45} After a careful study of texts, Jenks is led to believe "that Shakespeare worked with the older plays before him, altering, amending, and omitting."\textsuperscript{46} He also believes the older plays to be revisions of cruder originals. The possibility of Chapman's having had a hand in working up the Henry VI plays is recognized by J. M. Robertson, who is satisfied that only here and there did Shakespeare's hand enter into the revision work, on the bases laid by Marlowe, Greene, and Feake.\textsuperscript{47} To Barrett Wendell 2 and 3 Henry VI

\textsuperscript{43}Collancez, \textit{op. cit.}, p. xiv. \textsuperscript{44}Crump, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 161. 
\textsuperscript{45}Collacez, \textit{op. cit.}, p. viii. 
\textsuperscript{46}Jenks, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 103. 
\textsuperscript{47}J. M. Robertson, \textit{Shakespeare and Chapman}, p. 239.
are obviously versions of The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy and are "collaborative beyond doubt, though just where and how we can never be sure." 48 Caroline Spurgeon, Saintsbury, and Logan P. Smith do not venture to name the various authors who have contributed passages to 2 and 3 Henry VI, but they are all convinced that Shakespeare had at least some share in their authorship.

Among the critics who think that 2 and 3 Henry VI are not revised plays is Anders, who is "disposed to believe that Shakespeare was the author of 2 and 3 Henry VI, and that The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy are imperfect reports of the former plays." 49 Delius also supposes that The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy "are imperfect and pirated copies of Shakespeare's plays." 50 Peter Alexander agrees with Pollard in regarding The Contention and The True Tragedy "as bad quartos, debased forms of plays written before 1592 and substantially the same as 2 and 3 Henry VI, not themselves the texts out of which 2 and 3 Henry VI were subsequently developed," though Pollard is not positive, as is Alexander, that 2 and 3 Henry VI are entirely Shakespeare's. 51 Alexander assigns 2 and 3 Henry VI to Shakespeare alone in the following passage:

48 Barrott Wendell, William Shakespeare, p. 74.
50 Ibid., p. 148.
51 Alexander, op. cit., p. 22.
The theory that 2 and 3 Henry VI are by Greene, or Peele, or Marlowe, or anyone by Shakespeare, has no textual foundation; the parallels with Edward II are more simply accounted for by another explanation than that advanced by Professor Tucker Brooke. We need have no hesitation therefore in attributing 2 and 3 Henry VI to Shakespeare himself.52

As regards 3 Henry VI, Murry writes, "I believe the quarto does not represent the original of 3 Henry VI, but a shortened version, put together from a play more like, if not identical with, the Folio play."53 Murry "can discover no real ground, external or internal, for denying that Shakespeare was substantially the writer" of 2 and 3 Henry VI.54 Sir Edmund Chambers states that "there is certainly no such disparity of style in 2 and 3 Henry VI as need compel us to abandon the authority of the First Folio."55 "Discussions of authorship," asserts Sir Edmund Chambers, "have been much complicated by the revision theory."56 In opposition to those who attempt to divide the Henry VI plays among several authors, Sir Edmund Chambers contends that we do not "have adequate criteria for distinguishing with any assurance from the style of Shakespeare’s contemporaries that of a young writer still under their influence."57 Grenville-Berker and Harrison both conclude that The First Part of the Contention and The True Tragedy are pirated versions of plays "which are more

---

52Ibid., p. 154.  
53Murry, op. cit., p. 52.  
54Ibid., p. 50.  
55Chambers, op. cit., p. 224.  
56Ibid., p. 285.  
57Ibid., p. 287.
correctly represented in the text of the Folio."\textsuperscript{58} Shakespeare, Marlowe, and perhaps others are named as the writers of \textit{Henry VI} by Granville-Barker and Harrison. A. H. Tolman expresses the belief that "The Contention and 2 \textit{Henry VI} are two versions of the same play, rather than two plays," the same being true of 3 \textit{Henry VI} and \textit{The True Tragedy}.\textsuperscript{59}

The most recent critics to investigate this problem are Lucille King and C. A. Greer. Lucille King upholds the theory that 2 and 3 \textit{Henry VI} are revisions of an early play, not \textit{The Contention} and \textit{The True Tragedy}, but probably of "a lost play, itself based principally on Hall, and revised from Holinshed."\textsuperscript{60} Lucille King investigated the question of priority of the Folio and Quarto texts from the standpoint of sources and found that "2 and 3 \textit{Henry VI} reveal fifty-two resemblances to the histories which \textit{The First Part of the Contention} and \textit{The True Tragedy} do not even approximate."\textsuperscript{61} Thus, she claims that

the Folio could not have been based entirely on the Quarto, but neither could the Quarto have been based entirely upon the Folio, as nine cases of closer resemblance between the Quarto and the history show.\textsuperscript{62}

The possibility that the Quarto may have been based on the Folio with some revisions from Holinshed is admitted by Lucille King, but she believes it much more probable that

\textsuperscript{58} Tolman, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{59} Lucille King, "Text Sources of the Folio and Quarto \textit{Henry VI}," \textit{Publications of the Modern Language Association}, \textbf{LI} (1936), 718.

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., p. 702.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., p. 715.

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., p. 715.
both the Folio and Quarto texts were based upon the lost play. Greer's view of the problem is in harmony with the stand taken by Lucille King, for he contends that The Contention and The True Tragedy "come from a text, now lost, much shorter than 2 and 3 Henry VI, and that the Folio plays are later revisions of the lost original." Argument in opposition to the belief that The Contention and The True Tragedy were reported by actors who had played in 2 and 3 Henry VI is proffered by Greer, who asks these questions in argument:

(1) Why did the actor-reporters omit from the Quartos much Folio material that distinctly adds to characterization and dramatic effect? (2) Why did the actor-reporters add several items in the Quartos that are not to be found in the Folio, items that apparently add nothing to characterization or dramatic effect? (3) Why did the actor-reporters make several non-essential additions or changes in the Quartos that indicate a close touch with the chronicle sources? that signify work independent of a mere reporting of another play?  

Thus we see that there is a large variety of opinions relative to the authorship of the Henry VI trilogy. The point of view taken by the majority of critics is that all three of the Henry VI plays are revisions of older plays. Modern opinion, however, is inclining to Alexander's view, which is that the Henry VI plays are not revised versions of older plays. Among modern critics who support Alexander's theory are Murry, Ulrici, Andere, Pollard, Chambers, Granville-Barker, and Harrison. Further agreeing with Alexander in the

---

63Greer, op. cit., p. 704.  64Ibid., p. 664.
belief that the *Henry VI* plays were written by Shakespeare alone are Murry, Andere, and Ulrici.

A thorough understanding of 2 and 3 *Henry VI* is necessary in order to reach any conclusion regarding the authorship of 1 *Henry VI*, for the three plays are linked together historically. The problem of the authorship of 1 *Henry VI* is also connected with that of the two later plays in light of the fact that the three *Henry VI* plays were included in the Folio of 1623 by Shakespeare's friends, Heminge and Condell, as Shakespeare's work. Similarities in style of writing and in the sources used in all the *Henry VI* plays have been a basis for the opinions of some critics concerning the authorship of the trilogy.

Through an investigation of the problem of the authorship of 1 *Henry VI*, I shall endeavor to present some new evidence concerning the play's authorship. As an aid in my understanding of the problem, I have studied the arguments given by various scholars in behalf of their theories on the authorship of 1 *Henry VI*, but in the main I shall examine the problem from the standpoint of the relationship between authorship and sources.
CHAPTER II

THE TREATMENT OF SOURCES IN 1 HENRY VI

The sources of all the Henry VI plays appear to be essentially the same for each. It is generally acknowledged that Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland and Hall's Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancaster and York are the usual sources of the historical matter in these plays. Other chroniclers are of such minor importance as sources that critics seldom mention them. Most scholars are of the opinion that the dramatist used both Holinshed's Chronicles and Hall's Chronicle, but a few attempt to prove that one of these sources was used to the exclusion of the other.

Paul Kaufman names Holinshed as the general source of 1 Henry VI, as does H. W. Mabie, who asserts that "the playwright defies historic chronology in the First Part with a callous freedom exceeding anything in Shakespeare's fully accredited history work."¹ In complete accord with Mabie is F. G. Fleay. John Masefield also expresses the belief that the source of 1 Henry VI is Holinshed's Chronicles. "It is noteworthy," remarks Israel Gollancz, "that Holinshed's Chronicles is the primary source of 1 Henry VI."² Since most

¹H. W. Mabie, William Shakespeare, p. 118.
²Gollancz, op. cit., p. xviii.
of the quotations from Holinshed which are similar to passages in *1 Henry VI* are paraphrases of Hall, W. G. Boswell-Stone finds it hard to determine which of these authorities was used. He states:

It is clear that the dramatist of *1 Henry VI* availed himself of accounts of Jeanne D'Arc, given by Holinshed, which are not in Halle. Fabyan may have yielded some details, and a few lines were copied from an epitaph published by Crompton and Brooke.3

Hollinshed's *Chronicle* is the only source of *1 Henry VI*, according to B. E. Warner. R. G. White makes the following comment:

The sources of the greater bulk of *1 Henry VI* are to be found in Holinshed's *Chronicles* and Hall's *Chronicle*. Holinshed's *Chronicles* is largely a paraphrase of Hall's in the portion used for this play, except that the characterization of Joan is based upon Holinshed alone. Also such minute references as those to Coeur-de-Lion and Pendragon are Holinshed's and not Hall's. Three references seem to be traced to Fabyan.4

According to Boswell-Stone, "the reviser who turned *The Contention* into *2 Henry VI* was indebted to Holinshed, Stow, Fabyan, Halle, and probably Hardying."5 Though Masefield names Holinshed as the source for *1 Henry VI*, he gives Hall's *Chronicle* as the source of the plot for *2 Henry VI*, and both Hall and Holinshed as the sources of *3 Henry VI*. Boswell-Stone makes the following statement:

*3 Henry VI* is, as a rule, based on Halle, or on his paraphrase Holinshed; but the dramatist appears to have profited also by Stow and parts of Holinshed's computation which were not drawn from Halle.6

---


5Boswell-Stone, *op. cit.*, p. xi. 6Ibid., p. xii.
The secondary source of 2 and 3 Henry VI is, in the opinion of Gollancz, Holinshed. White agrees with most of the critics that the "chief sources of 2 and 3 Henry VI are, as usual, the chronicles of Holinshed and Hall."7 Mebie shares the opinion expressed by White concerning the sources of 2 and 3 Henry VI. Though Flecky states that Holinshed is the source of 1 Henry VI, he believes the last two parts of the trilogy to have been founded on Hall, and not Holinshed.

Some critics name the same sources for all three of the plays. For instance, Gollancz says that "the materials for 1, 2, and 3 Henry VI were mainly derived from Holinshed's Chronicles and Hall's Chronicle."8 This opinion is shared by H. C. Bertleit and Lucille King. Lucille King has recently made a study in which she attempts to discover whether the 1577 or 1587 edition of Holinshed was used by the author of Henry VI. She writes:

Though both editions of Holinshed are usually parallel and therefore leave only incidentally clues as to which edition was used, we must conclude from the many instances in which Hall and the 1587 Holinshed are unquestionably the source that the dramatist was mainly using these two originals.9 Tolmen and Anders agree that Shakespeare essentially followed Holinshed's Chronicles in the writing of Henry VI. Anders adds, however, that Shakespeare "also made use of Edward

8Gollancz, op. cit., p. xvii.
Hall's Chronicle, probably as embodied in Richard Grafton's Chronicle, and perhaps also of John Stow's Annales and Fabian's Chronicle. Gervinus maintains that Shakespeare, in the writing of Henry VI, "has essentially followed only one single authority, namely, Holinshed's Chronicles." H. N. MacCracken agrees with Gervinus that "Holinshed's Chronicles is the ultimate source for Henry VI." The belief that Shakespeare used Holinshed to the exclusion of the other chroniclers is held by Malone. Argument in opposition to Malone's theory is offered by Alexander, who states:

Malone's idea is found to rest on one piece of positive evidence; there are a few mistakes in Shakespeare's historical matter that can be traced to Holinshed. To suppose that this is proof that he never consulted other chronicles is not only to go further than the evidence will stretch, but to take for granted what has yet to be proved, that the phrases from Hall, Grafton, Fabian, and others, which are found in his works, are the insertions of other hands.

Neither does H. N. Hudson believe Holinshed to be the only source of Henry VI. Hudson remarks:

Touching the chronicles used, it is to be observed that Holinshed's were first published in 1577, when Shakespeare was in his fourteenth year, and Hall's about thirty years earlier; and it is quite probable that the Poet became familiar with the elder chronicler in his boyhood, before the other got into circulation. Remains but to add on this point, that Shakespeare's unquestioned

---

10Anders, op. cit., p. 117.
11Gervinus, op. cit., p. 252.
13Alexander, op. cit., p. 183.
dreaded furnish numerous instances of acquaintance with Hall.\textsuperscript{14}

While W. G. Zeewolde thinks that Holinshed is one source of the \textit{Henry VI} plays, he is convinced that Hall's \textit{Chronicle} has never been fully evaluated as a source. Sir Edmund Chambers believes the historical matter of \textit{Henry VI} to be mainly from Holinshed, but he admits the possibility that "Holl, Fabyen, Greyton, and Stowe may also have been consulted."\textsuperscript{15} For most of the facts of \textit{Henry VI}, G. L. Kittredge says, "the author or authors went to Holinshed or Halle," though, of course, the author was acquainted with Grafton's \textit{Chronicle}.\textsuperscript{16} Barrett Wendell also names Holinshed and Hall as sources, but he adds Stowe to the list, while Grafton is added by Kittredge.

A survey of the critical opinions concerning the sources of \textit{Henry VI} reveals that five chroniclers have been suggested as possible sources of the plays. Though the critics generally agree that Holinshed and Hall are the principal sources, it is possible that Stowe, Fabyen, and Grafton furnished some details.

It will be my purpose (1) to point out any similarities I find between \textit{1 Henry VI} and passages in the chronicles of Holinshed, Hall, Stowe, Fabyen, and Grafton; (2) to show how

\textsuperscript{14}Gollancz, \textit{op. cit.}, p. xxv.
\textsuperscript{15}Chambers, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 289.
\textsuperscript{16}G. L. Kittredge, \textit{The Complete Works of Shakespeare}, p. 666.
the author used the historical materiel in his play; (3) to
determine, as far as is possible, which chronicle or chroni-
coles the author used. All citations from Holinshed's
Chronicles will be from the 1587 edition.

The opening scene of 1 Henry VI has for its setting
Westminster Abbey, where the funeral of King Henry V is
taking place. This event occurred, according to Fabyan, on
November 7, 1422.17 During the funeral, a messenger enters
with the sad news that Guinne, Champagne, Rheims, Orleans,
Paris, Guyasc, and Poictiers are all lost. In presenting
this news, the author has combined events which took place
many years apart, for the chroniclers record the loss of
these cities at taking place several years later than 1422.
A second messenger enters with the message that "the Dauphin
Charles is crowned king in Rheims,"18 a ceremony which did
not occur until 1429.19 A third messenger tells of a fight
between Talbot and the French, a battle which was fought in
1429.20 Thus we see that the author who borrowed material
from these chronicles was careless in assembling the facts,
often combining events which occurred years apart. Most of

17 Robert Fabyan, The New Chronicles of England and
France, II, 592.

181 Henry VI, I. i. 92.

19 Raphael Holinshed, Chronicles of England, Scotland,
and Ireland, III, 137.

20 Ibid., p. 165.
the events depicted in this first scene are set forth in Holinshed and Hall, though very few passages are adopted verbatim because of the fact that the author usually expands an idea gathered from the chronicles and through this expansion lends dramatic effect to his play. Thus we see that the first fifty-six lines treat of King Henry V’s funeral and the grief caused by his death, an event summed up by Holinshed in these words: “after that death had bereft the world of that noble prince king Henrie the fift.”²¹ In both Holinshed and Hall appear the characters of Gloucester as Protector of England, the Duke of Bedford as Regent of France, Henry Beaufort and the Duke of Exeter as special governors of the young prince, all of which characters appear in ¹ Henry VI in the same roles, with the exception of Henry Beaufort, the Bishop of Winchester. Winchester speaks of himself as a “Jack out of office”²² with no duties to perform. The loss of English cities to France is explained by the first messenger as being due to “no treachery; but want of men and money,” and the existence of factions in England.²³ The basis for these lines is given in Holinshed and Hall, who tell of the “disdeine amongst the cheefe peeres of the realme of England, the negligence of the kings counsell,”²⁴ and the failure

²¹Ibid., p. 136. ²²¹ Henry VI, I. i. 175.
²³¹ Henry VI, I. i. 69.
²⁴Holinshed, op. cit., p. 185; Edward Hall, Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancestre and York, p. 212.
to pay men of war. The news of English losses fires Bedford with the determination to overrun France, a detail which is brought out by both Hall and Holinshed and used to good advantage by the dramatist. The play represents the Bastard of Orleans, the Duke of Anjou, and the Duke of Alencon as flying to the Dauphin’s side, while none of these persons are mentioned in the chronicles as committing this act. The author probably gathered this idea from Holinshed and Hall, who include in their chronicles passages which speak of a “great menie of the nobilitie which did now revolt to the Dolphin, with all indeuour to drive the English nation out of the French territories.”25 From the entrance of the third messenger to the close of the first scene, the author follows Holinshed and Hall rather closely. In his description of the Battle of Patsey, the third messenger adopts several phrases directly from Holinshed and Hall. The play tells how Telbot,

Retiring from the siege of Orleans,
Having full scarce six thousand in his troop,
By three and twenty thousand of the French
Was round encompassed and set upon.26

Holinshed and Hall write of this event thus:

The Englishmen departed in good order of Bettell from Orlese. By the deilie repair of such as assembled together to strengthen the French part, they were in all to the number betweene twenty and three and twentie thousand men. All which being once loined in one armie, shortlie after fought with the lord Telbot (who had with him not past six [five according to Hall] thousand men)


26 Henry VI, I. i. 111–114.
neere unto a village in Besusse called Pataie. 27

The drama continues the story of the battle:

No leisure had he to enrank his men;
He wanted pikes to set before his archers;
Instead whereof sharp stokes pluck'd out of hedges
They pitched in the ground confusedly,
To keep the horsemen off from breaking in. 28

The preceding lines coincide with the accounts given by Holinshed and Hall:

At which bettell the charge was given by the French so
upon a sudden, that the Englishmen had not leisure to
put themselves in arretie, after they had put vp their
stakes before their archers, so that there was no rem-
edie but to fight at adventure. 29

The drama further follows Holinshed and Hall in these lines:

More than three hours the fight continued;
Where valient Talbot above human thought
Enacted wonders with his sword and lance;
Hundreds he sent to hell, and none durst stand him;
Here, there, and everywhere, enraged he flew:
The French exclam'd, the devil was in his arms;
All the whole army stood agaze on him:
His soldiers spying his undaunted spirit
A Talbot! a Talbot! cried out amain,
And rushed into the battle.
Here had the conquest fully been seal'd up,
If Sir John Festolfe had not play'd the coward:
He, being in the vaward, placed behind
With purpose to relieve and follow them,
Cowardly fled, not having struck one stroke.
Hence grew the general wreck and massacre;
Enclosed were they with their enemies:
A base Walloon, to win the Dauphin's grace
Thrust Talbot with a spear into the back. 30

27 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 165; Hall, op. cit., pp. 149-150.
28 1 Henry VI, I. i. 115-119.
29 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 165; Hall, op. cit., p. 150.
30 1 Henry VI, I. i. 120-138.
It is evident that the preceding lines had as their sources the following passages from Holinshed and Hall:

This bettell continued by the space of three long hours; for the Englishmen, though they were overpressed with multitude of their enemies, yet they never fled save one foot, till their capteine the lord Talbot was sore wounded at the backe, and so taken. From this bettell departed without anie stroke striken sir John Fastolfe. 31

Other words spoken by the third messenger which closely resemble lines found in Holinshed and Hall are:

O no, he [Talbot] lives; but is took prisoner,
And Lord Scales with him and Lord Hungerford;
Most of the rest slaughter'd or took likewise. 32

Holinshed and Hall give the following account:

Then their hearts began to faint, and they fled, in which flight were slaine above twelue hundred, and fortie taken, of whom the lord Talbot, the lord Scales, the lord Hungerford, and sir Thomas Rampston were cheefe.

The name of Thomas Rampston is omitted in the drame, but in all other respects the foregoing passages are similar. Upon hearing of the English losses, Bedford decides to go to Europe, taking ten thousand soldiers with him, a fact which is brought out in the play and in both Holinshed and Hall. In the following few lines, the dramatist shows his acquaintance with the chroniclers, Holinshed and Hall:

Remember, lords, your oaths to Henry sworn,
Either to quell the Dauphin utterly,
Or bring him in obedience to your yoke. 34

31 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 165; Hall, op. cit., p. 150.
32 Henry VI, I. i. 145-147.
33 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 165; Hall, op. cit., p. 150.
34 Henry VI, I. i. 162-165.
When Bedford, Gloucester, Salisbury, and Warwick visited the dying King Henry V, he commanded them

with fire and sword to persecute the Dolphin, till they had either brought him to reason and obeisance, or else to drive and expell him out of the realme of France. The noble men present promised to observe his precepts, and to performe his desires.35

The last two lines of the opening scene of the play show Winchester's intention to steal the king from Eltham "and sit at chiefest stern of public weal."36 This idea was probably taken from the articles of accusation between Gloucester and Winchester in which Gloucester claims that Winchester

purposed and disposed him to set hand on the kings person, and to have remoued him from Eltham to Windsor to the intent to put him in governance as him list.37

In the first scene of the first act, Holinshed and Hall seem to be the only sources for material, and the passages in these chronicles which are the sources for this scene are so much alike that it is impossible to say thus far whether the dramatist was using Holinshed or using Hall, or whether he was using both Holinshed and Hall. Most of the events depicted in this scene have an historical background, but the author is very careless in the handling of historic time, sometimes crowding events together for the purpose of making his play more compact. The author follows the two chronicles rather closely in the portreyal of the characters of Bedford,

35Holinshed, op. cit., pp. 132-133; Hall, op. cit., p. 112.

36i Henry VI, I. i. 177.

37Holinshed, op. cit., pp. 176-177; Hall, op. cit., p. 131.
Henry V, Telbot, Gloucester, and Winchester, particularly in the case of the latter two.

The second scene of the first act has its setting in France before Orleans. There is no historical record of the presence of Charles and Alencon at the siege of Orleans, but the dramatist writes of the unsuccessful attempt of Charles, Alencon, and Reignier to succor Orleans. The following passage from Holinshed and Hall may have been the source of the lines dealing with this attempt:

After the siege had continued full three weeks, the bastard of Orleans issued out of the gate of the bridge, and fought with the Englishmen; but they received him with so fierce and terrible strokes, that he was with all his company compelled to retire and flee back into the citie.\footnote{Holinshed, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 161; Hall, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 145.}

Though the chronicles show the Bastard of Orleans as the leader of the drive against the English, the dramatist does not show his presence in the play until after that event. When the Bastard of Orleans enters in the drama, he brings to Charles a holy maid by the name of Joan La Pucelle, who, in Hall's \textit{Chronicle}, is brought to Charles by Sir Robert Bandrecourt, and, in Holinshed's \textit{Chronicles}, is introduced to Charles by Peter Bedricourt. In the treatment of Pucelle, the dramatist clearly follows Holinshed instead of Hall. In describing Pucelle, the Bastard of Orleans says:

\begin{quote}
A holy maid hither with me I bring,
Which by a vision sent to her from heaven
Ordained is to raise this tedious siege,
And drive the English forth the bounds of France.
\end{quote}
The spirit of deep prophecy she hath, 
Exceeding the nine sibyls of old Rome. 39

The corresponding passages in Holinshed read that Joan was

a person (as French booke maketh) raised vp by power
divine, onelie for succour to the French estate then
deepe in distresse. She set out vnto him [Charles] the
singer feates (forsooth) given her to understend by
revelation divine, how she would raise the siege at Or-
leance, set him in state of the crowne of France, and
drive the English out of the countrie. 40

Hall's Chronicle does not give the full description of Joan
that is found in Holinshed's Chronicles. Hall merely writes:

She [Joan] declared that she was sent fro God, both to
side the miserable citee of Orleunce, and also to remit
hym, to the possession of his realme. 41

The drama tells of the first meeting of Charles and Joan at
which time Charles has Reignier to stand in his place to try
Joan's skill. Joan recognizes the deceit practiced upon her
and calls the Dauphin aside for a private talk, a talk which
lasts so long that the lords become worried. The Dramatist
has followed Holinshed closely, as can be seen from the fol-
lowing excerpt:

Vnto the Dolphin into his gallerie when first she
was brought, and he shadowing himselfe behind, setting
other geie lords before him to trie hir cunning from all
the companie, with a selutation that indeed merz all the
matter, she pickt him out alone, who thereupon had hir
to the end of the gallerie, where she held him an hous
in secret and private talke, that of his privie chamber
was thought verie long, and therefore would have broken
it off; but he made them a sign to let hir saie on. 42

39 Henry VI, I. ii. 51-56.
40 Holinshed, op. cit., pp. 163-164.
41 Hall, op. cit., p. 148.
42 Holinshed, op. cit., pp. 163-164.
Hall describes Joan's meeting with Charles so briefly that we may be sure the author used only Holinshed as a source for this event. Hall writes of the meeting thus:

> What should I rehearse, how they saie, she knewe and called hym her kyng, whom she never saw before.  

Both Hall and Holinshed relate how Joan chose her sword from old iron in St. Katherine's churchyard at Toureine, but only Holinshed furnishes the dramatist with the information that the sword was decked with five flower-de-luces on each side. Both Holinshed's Chronicles and the drama tell of the appointing of an army by Charles, with Joan the leader, in order to raise the siege at Orleans. The dramatist evidently invents the story of Joan's defeating Charles in a fight, for neither Hall nor Holinshed portray such an occurrence. One line in this second scene of the first act may have been taken from Hall. This line is:

> They the English want their porridge and their fat bull-beeves.

The passage in Hall from which the line may have been taken reads:

> I kepe an Englishman one moneth from his warme bed, fat befe and steale drynke, ye then shall se his courage abated.

A discrepancy concerning the order of events is present in this scene. Salisbury is present at the battle which occurs in the scene; yet he was killed several months before Joan's meeting with Charles, an event which is also depicted in this scene.

---

45 Hall, op. cit., p. 148.  
441 Henry VI, I. ii. 9.  
45 Hall, op. cit., p. 66.
In the second scene of the first act, we again see that the dramatist used both Holinshed and Hall as sources, to the exclusion of other chroniclers. However, the portrayal of Joan is taken from Holinshed, not Hall; so we know that the dramatist consulted Holinshed at least once when Hall was not used. Yet one line was discovered which was apparently taken from Hall, not Holinshed. Thus far, then, we have found that both Holinshed and Hall must have been sources of the play.

The action in the third scene of Act I occurs before the Tower in London. The scene is based upon the quarrels between Gloucester and the Bishop of Winchester. Both Holinshed and Hall contain several paragraphs pertaining to this dissension, from which passages the dramatist gathered his information. The action consists of the efforts of Gloucester to enter the Tower against the wishes of Winchester, who has commanded his men not to permit Gloucester’s entrance. The dramatist probably used the following passage from Holinshed and Hall as a source for this scene:

In this parlement the duke of Gloucester laid certeine art-icles to the bishop of Winchester his charge, the which with the answers hereafter doo insue: as followeth.

First, whereas he being protector, and defendour of this land, desired the Tower to be opened to him therein: Richard Woodville esquier (having at that time the charge of the keeping of the Tower) refused his desire and kept the same Tower against him vndulie and against reason, by the commandment of my said lord of Winchester. 46

In both Holinshed and Hall, Gloucester accuses the Bishop of Winchester of having contrived to kill the young prince. The play contains a similar accusation made by Gloucester:

---

46 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 147; Hall, op. cit., p. 130.
Stand back, thou manifest Conspirator,
Thou that contrived'st to murther our dear Lord. 47

The stage directions for part of the third scene tell of Win-
chester's men wearing tawny coats. Hudson gives the following
information on the matter:

Such was the usual livery of servants in the Poet's time,
and long before. Stowe informs us that on a certain oc-
casion the bishop of London "was attended on by a goodly
company of gentlemen in tawny coats." 48

Because Gloucester is refused entrance to the Tower, his men
engage in a skirmish against Winchester and his men. The play
has the skirmish interrupted by the Mayor of London and his
officers. The mayor then has a proclamation read to the men
in which he commands them to abstain from carrying weapons.
Fabyan was probably the source used for the roles played by
the mayor and his men. This passage occurs in Fabyan's Chron-
icle:

And lykely it was to have ensued great Effuoyon of blode
shortly thereupon, he hed ben the discredysyon of the Mayre
and his Brether, that exhorted the peole, by all Polytike
menye, to kepe the kynges pees. 49

For the third scene of Act I the dramatist gathered his
ideas from the chronicles, but he changed and expanded these
ideas into a more interesting form. By so doing, he has given
us a more dramatic account of the stormy brawl between Gloucester
and Winchester and of the mayor's interference in the struggle.
No lines are quoted directly from the chronicles. In this

47 Henry VI, I. iii. 33-34. 48 Collance, op. cit., p. 27.
49 Fabyan, op. cit., p. 596.
scene, some details are furnished the dramatist by Hall, Holinshed, Fabyan, and possibly Stow. Since tawny coats were the usual dress of servants at that time, it is likely that the dramatist described the dress of the servants without having consulted the line quoted from Stow's *Chronicle*.

The fourth scene of Act I takes place at Orleans. In this scene, too, the dramatist transposes the order of events. The affair in the Tower at Orleans which ended in the death of Salisbury took place in 1428, and is depicted in this scene. Telbot is also introduced in the same scene, and he tells of his capture by the French and of his being ransomed for Lord Poton de Sентrelles. According to the chronicles, Telbot was not captured until 1429, a year later than the affair at the Tower, and Lord Sентrelles was not captured by the English until 1431. The dramatist has followed the chronicles, however, in saying that Telbot was ransomed for Lord Sентrelles. The chronicles of Holinshed and Hall are closely followed for the details of Salisbury's and Gargrave's deaths.

The scene opens with a master Gunner speaking to his boy thus:

The English, in the suburbs close intrench'd,
Wont through a secret grate of iron bars
In yonder tower to overpeir the city,
And thence discover how with most advantage
They may vex us with shot or with assault.
To intercept this inconvenience,
A piece of ordnance 'gainst it I have placed.50

Several similarities may be seen between the preceding lines and the following passage from Holinshed and Hall:

In the tower that was taken at the bridge end (as before you have heard) there was an high chamber, having a grate full of barres of iron, by which a man might looke all the length of the bridge into the citie; at which grate manie of the cheefe capteins stood manie times, viewing the citie; and demaying in what place it was best to give assault. They within the citie well perceived this tooting hole, and laid a peace of ordinance directlie against the window.  

Next in the scene is the entrance of the Lords Salisbury and Talbot, Sir William Glensdale, Sir Thomas Gargrave, and others on the turrets. The presence of all these at the tower is given by Holinshed and Hall, with the exception of Talbot. The chronicles read:

The earle of Salisburie, sir Thomas Gargarve, and William Glaisdale, with diverse other went into the said tower.  

In the play, the boy fires the gun, causing Salisbury and Gargrave to fall. Talbot then addresses Salisbury, saying:

One of thy eyes and thy cheek's side struck off;  

Talbot also discovers that Gargrave is dying. The following passage in Holinshed and Hall gives a similar account:

The sonne of the maister-gunner, perceiving men looking out at the window, tooke his match (as his father had taught him) who was gone downe to dinner, and fired the gun; the shot whereof brake, and shivered the iron barres of the grate, so that one of the same bars stroke the earle so violentlie on the head, that it stroke awaie one of his sies, and the side of his cheeke. Sir Thomas Gargerve was likewise striken, and died within two daies.  

The author adds considerably to the dramatic element through Talbot's speeches to the dying Salisbury. Talbot's speeches

---

51 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 161; Hall, op. cit., p. 145.
52 Ibid.
53 Henry VI, I. iv. 75.
are, of course, inventions of the dramatist. When Talbot
tells of his treatment as a prisoner of the French, he says:

Here, said they, is the terror of the French;
The scarecrow that affrights our children so. 55

A similar passage occurs in Hall's Chronicle:

This men was to the French people, a very scourge and a
daily terror, insomuch that as his person was fearfull,
and terrible to the adversaries present; so his name
and fame was spitefull and dreadfull to the common people
absent, insomuch that women in France, to feare their
yong children, would crye the Talbot cometh, the Talbot
commeth. 56

The letter part of the scene consists of a messenger's report
that

the French have gather'd head;
The Dauphin, with one Joan la Pucelle join'd,
A holy prophetess new risen up,
Is come with a great power to raise the siege. 57

The source for the preceding lines is a passage found in both
Holinshead and Hall:

But in b]Joan la Pucelle's] prime time she armed at
all points, roede from Poictiers to Blois, and there
found men of warre, wittels, and munition, ready to be
conuied to Orleance. 58

In addressing Salisbury, Talbot calls him Plantagenet, a name
which is historically incorrect.

Like the first three scenes, the fourth scene shuffles
the order of historic events here and there. The dramatist
also errs in referring to Salisbury as a Plantagenet. The

56 Henry VI, I. iv. 100-104.
sources used for the fourth scene are Hall and Holinshed, with Hall alone being used in one instance.

The fifth scene of Act I likewise has its setting at Orleans. The entire scene deals with Joan's capture of Orleans, and is composed principally of stage directions which tell of the results of the various skirmishes. The dramatist evidently had read the accounts of the siege of Orleans given in Holinshed and Hall, but the sources were followed loosely. The play is made more enjoyable by the addition of a fictitious fight between Joan and Talbot. None of the lines occurring in the fourth scene are quoted verbatim from the chronicles.

The sixth scene also takes place at Orleans, and portrays the raising of French colors in Orleans. Then Reignier exclaims:

Why ring not out the bells aloud throughout the town? Deuphin command the citizens make bonfires And feast and banquet in the open streets, To celebrate the joy that God hath given us.

Hall's Chronicle tells of the celebration at the raising of the siege in a similar manner:

What triumph wer made in the cites of Orleans, what wood was spente in fiers, what wyne was dronke in houses, what songes wer song in the strete, what melody was made in Tausernes, what roundes were daunced, in large and brode places, what lightes were set vp in the churches, what anthemes were song in Chapelles, and what joye was shewed in every place, it were a long woork and yet no necessary cause.

The remainder of the scene consists of the praise given Joan by Charles and Alencon. Charles declares that

591 Henry VI, I. vi. 11-14. 60 Hall, op. cit., p. 149.
Joan le Pucelle shall be France's saint.  

A similar passage is found in Hall's Chronicle:

But in the mean season such credite was given to her, that she was honoured as a saint.

Thus we see that little of this last scene of the first act has a historic source. Two passages were cited from which the author of 1 Henry VI may have gathered materiel for this scene, both passages being found in Hall alone.

The opening scene of the second act, like the five previous scenes, is set at Orleans and relates Talbot's recapture of Orleans, a story which is altogether fictitious. The events which occur in the scene are similar to those described in Holinshed and Hall at the recapture of Le Mans. The drama speaks of the French at Orleans as follows:

This happy night the Frenchmen are secure, Having all day caroused and banqueted.

The corresponding phrase in Holinshed shows that the French varie negligently used themselves, without taking heed to their watch.

Holinshed's phraseology is different, but it is not possible to tell which of the chroniclers was consulted. The passage in Hall's Chronicle tells how the Frenchmen began to were wenton and felle to riote.

While the Frenchmen are off their guard, the English, headed

---

61 Henry VI, I. vi. 29.  62 Hall, op. cit., p. 143.
63 Henry VI, II. i. 11-12.
64 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 160.  65 Hall, op. cit., p. 143.
by Talbot, make a surprise attack. The drama gives the following account of the assault in the stage directions succeeding Act I, scene 1, line 39:

Cry: 'St. George,' 'A Talbot.' The French leap over the walls in their shirts. Enter, several ways, the Bastard of Orleans, Alencon, and Reignier, half ready, and half unready.

The similarity between the preceding lines and a passage in Holinshed and Hall is very close. The chronicles relate the event as follows:

The lords then, to make haste in the matter, (because the day approached) with all speed possible came to the posterne gate; and, alighting from their horses, about six of the clock in the morning, they issued out of the castell, crying, "saint George; Talbot!"

The Frenchmen, being thus suddainlie taken were sore amazed; in so much that some of them, being not out of their beds, got vp in their shirts, and left over the walls. Other ran naked out of the gates to save their lives, leaving all their apparell, horses, armour, and riches behind them: none was hurt but such as resisted.66

After the English victory in this attack, the play shows Charles's growing distrust of Joan. This part of the scene is a creation of the dramatist. The writer of 1 Henry VI learns from the chronicles of Holinshed and Hall that the name of Talbot is dreadful to the French; so he adds at the close of the first scene of Act II the entrance of an English soldier among the French. This soldier cries the name of Talbot, which causes the French to fly in fear, leaving their clothes behind for the soldier to take.

The study of sources used in the first scene of Act II shows, therefore, that the dramatist takes the liberty of

66Holinshed, op. cit., p. 150; Hall, op. cit., p. 143.
portraying Talbot's unhistorical recapture of Orleans in much the same way as Hall and Holinshed picture the battle of La Mans. The chronicles of Hall and Holinshed are again followed in this scene to the exclusion of the others.

The second scene of Act II occurs within the town of Orleans. This scene, as a whole, has no historical source. The scene begins with Talbot, Bedford, and Burgundy's discussing the attack which took place in the previous scene and the burial of Salisbury. Though Salisbury's death was in 1428, the historic time of this scene is 1429, a year after Salisbury was killed. The dramatist skips over the time in the intervening scenes between Salisbury's death and his burial as though only a day had passed. Talbot plans to erect a tomb on which shall be engraved

   The treacherous manner of his mournful death
   And what a terror he had been to France.67

Salisbury's character is described in a like manner in Holinshed and Hall:

   This earle was the man at that time, by whose wit, strength, and policie, the English name was much feareful and terrible to the French nation.68

A messenger enters in the latter part of the scene and requests Talbot's appearance before the Countess of Auvergne. This part of the scene was devised by the dramatist, for none of the chronicles relate such an episode. It is noticeable that in

67 Henry VI. II. ii. 16-17.
68 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 160; Hall, op. cit., p. 144.
the last few scenes, the dramatist seems to be varying more and more from the chronicle sources, most of the material in the second scene being entirely original. Only the description of Salisbury as a terror to the French has been taken from the chronicles of Holinshed and Hall.

The third scene of the second act changes the setting to Auvergne at the Countess's castle. This scene, too, is largely a result of the author's own mind. In the play, the Countess is surprised at the weak appearance of Talbot, who she has heard is "a Hercules, a second Hector, and a man much feared abroad, whose name is used by mothers to still their babes. The chronicles of Holinshed and Hall give a description of Talbot which is not in accord with the Countess's opinion of him. Hall's description of Talbot as "thys English Hector end mercial flower," appears in the play as "a second Hector." Hall describes Talbot much more fully than does Holinshed.

In the third scene of the second act, the author of the play departs from the chronicles almost entirely. Even Talbot's description by the Countess opposes the description given in the chronicles. However, the lines in which the Countess relates everything she has heard about Talbot correspond with a passage found in Hall's Chronicle.

The fourth scene of the second act, which is commonly known as the Temple Garden scene, has for its setting the

69 Hall, op. cit., p. 227. 70 Henry VI, II. iii. 20.
Temple Garden in London. No direct source for this scene, with which begins the faction between the dukes of York and Lancaster, is evident in the chronicles. The dramatist probably gathered the idea for the scene from the following paragraph found in Holinshed and Hall:

The duke of York perceiving his [Somerset's] evil will, openly dissembled that which he inwardly minded, either of them working things to the others displeasure, till through malice and division between them, at length by mortell were they both consumed, with almost all their whole lives and offspring.  

In this fourth scene, the dramatist shows his acquaintance with Hall and Holinshed in three passages. The first passage shows the writer's knowledge that Richard, Earl of Cambridge, was executed for treason during the reign of Henry V; other lines show the writer's knowledge that, according to Hall and Holinshed, a parliament was called for the truce of Winchester and Gloucester; another passage indicates that the chronicles of Hall and Holinshed were used as a basis for the quarrel between Somerset and Plantagenet. The remainder of the scene is unhistorical, consisting of the choosing of red and white roses among the lords to signify the sides taken by each.

The last scene of Act II has its setting at the tower in London. It tells of the visit of Richard Plantagenet with his uncle, Edmund Mortimer. This visit, during which Mortimer dies, is not included in the chronicles, but the dramatist learned of Mortimer's imprisonment from a passage in Holinshed and Hall, which says:

---

71 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 185; Hall, op. cit., p. 179.
During the same season Edmund Mortimer, the last earle of March of that name, (which long time had beene re- 
strained from his libertie, and finallie waxed lene,) 
deceased without issue; whose inheritance descended to 
the lord Richard Plantagenet, sonne and heire to Richard 
earles of Cambridg, beheaded (as before yee have heerd) 
at the towne of Southampton. 72

During the course of the scene, Mortimer tells Plantagenet 
the family pedigree, a pedigree which agrees with Holinshesd 
and Hall in detail. After Mortimer's death, Plantagenet re- 
marks:

And therefore haste I to the parliament, 
Either to be restored to my blood, 
Or make my ill the advantage of my good. 73

This remark may have been embodied from a passage in Hall's 
Chronicle:

Whiche Richard, within xxx yeres, as heire to this erle 
Edmond, in open parliament claimed the crowne and scepter 
of this reelme, as hereafter shall more manfestely appere. 74

The first scene of the third act relies heavily on the 
chronicles for materials, though events are brought together 
which are seperated by considerable intervals in Holinshed and 
Hall. The scene, which is laid in London at the Parliament- 
house opens with Winchester and Gloucester engaged in a quarrel. 
Winchester addresses Gloucester thus:

Comest thou with deep premeditated lines; 
With written pamphlets studiously devised? 75

The pamphlets referred to are the articles of accusation by

72 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 144; Hall, op. cit., p. 128.  
731 Henry VI, II, v. 127-129. 74 Hall, op. cit., p. 128.  
751 Henry VI, III. i. 1-2.
Gloucester against Winchester, which are contained in the chronicles of Holinshed and Hall. During the argument, Gloucester accuses Winchester of having laid a trap to take his life both at London-bridge and at the Tower. The passage from which this accusation is taken appears in Holinshed and Hall:

My said lord of Winchester, vntrulie, end against the kings peace, to the intent to trouble my said lord of Gloucester going to the king, purposing his death, in case that he had gone that waie, set men of armes and archers at the end of London bridge next Suthworks; and, in forebarring of the kings high waie, let draw the chaine of the stoups there, and set vp pipes and hurdles in manner and forms of bulworks; and set men in chambers, cellers, and windowes, with bowes and arrowes and other weapons, to the intent to bring finall destruction to my said lord of Gloucester’s person.  

Gloucester’s charge that Winchester does not exempt the king from his envious malice also has a basis in the articles of accusation contained in Holinshed and Hall. During the querrel, the bishop’s men and Gloucester’s men begin a fight, during which the cries of "Down with the tawny-costs!" and "Stones! stones!" are heard. The mayor enters with the message that the men have filled their pockets with pebble stones and are throwing them at each other. This event was developed from a passage written by Febyan:

This Parlyment was oltepyd of the Comon people the Parlyment of Bettes: the cause was, for Proclamaicyons were made that men shulde leve theyr Sverdes and other wepeynes in theyr Innys, the People toke great battes and steayas in theyr neckes, and so folowed theyr lordes and maisters

---

76 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 147; Hall, op. cit., p. 131.
77 Henry VI, III. i. 73-75.
nto the Parliament. And when that wepyn was Inhybted theym, then they toke stonye and plummettes of lede, and trussyd them secretlye in theyr aleuys and bosomys. 78

The mayor adds to his message:

Our windows are broke down in every street, 79
And we for feer compell'd to shut our shops. 79

The preceding lines are similar to accounts given in Holinshed and Hall during the conflict between Gloucester and Winchester:

So that the citizens of London were faine to keepe daule and nightlie watches, and to shut vp their shops, for feare of that which was doubted to have insued of their assembying of people about them. 80

The play continues with Gloucester's commanding his men to leave this "peevish broil," 81 but such a command is not given in the chronicles. The play then treats of the reconciliation between Gloucester and Winchester after a plea for peace is made by the king. According to the chronicles, the quarrel was settled by a decree issued by a committee appointed in the Parliament. In the play, Winchester yields to Gloucester, saying:

Love for thy love and hand for hand I give. 82

Holinshed and Hall record a similar reconciliation:

And when this was doone, it was decreed by the same arbitrators, that euerie each of my lord of Glocester, and Winchester, should take either other by the hand, in the presence of the king and all the parlement, in signe and token of good loue and accord. 83

78 Fabyan, op. cit., p. 596. 79 Henry VI, III. i. 84-85.
80 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 146; Hall, op. cit., p. 130.
81 Henry VI, III. i. 92. 82 Henry VI, III. i. 135.
83 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 154; Hall, op. cit., p. 137.
The Parliament at which this quarrel was settled met at the city of Leicester in 1462, and not at London. At that time, the king was only five years old; yet the dramatist puts eloquent words in his mouth when he pleads with Gloucester and Winchester. The scene then shifts to the restoration of Richard Plantagenet, an event which did not occur, according to Holinshed and Hall, until the following Whitsundaie. 84 Both Holinshed and Hall contain the information that Richard Plantagenet was created duke of York; therefore the dramatist was following these chronicles in dramatizing the event. Next in the scene, Gloucester persuades Henry to cross the seas and be crowned in France. Henry was not crowned in France until 1431, which is five years later than the historic time of the meeting of Parliament at Leicester. At the close of the scene, Exeter speaks some lines which closely resemble a passage in Holinshed and Hall. Exeter's words are:

And now I fear that fatal prophecy
Which in the time of Henry named the fifth
Was in the mouth of every sucking babe;
That Henry born at Monmouth should win all
And Henry born at Windsor lose all. 85

Holinshed and Hall record Henry V's prophecy thus:

He said unto the lord Fitz Hugh, his trustie chamberleine,
these words: *My lord, I Henrie, borne at Monmouth, shall small time reigne, and much get; and Henrie, borne at Windsor, shall long reigne, and ell loose; but, as God will, so be it.* 86

---

84 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 155; Hall, op. cit., p. 132.
85 Henry VI, III. i. 195-199.
86 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 129; Hall, op. cit., p. 108.
For the sources of the first scene of Act III, the dramatist has consulted three chronicles, those of Holinshed, Hall, and Febyan. Much of the action for the scene is developed from the chronicles, but the dramatist has changed the order of events and has added to the material taken from the chronicles.

The second scene of the third act is set in France. The capture of Rouen is mere fiction of the author’s; however, a story from Holinshed and Hall may have furnished a hint for some of the action. In the play, the disguised Joan gains entry into Rouen in the company of four soldiers with sacks upon their backs. The strategy used by Joan to enter Rouen was probably developed from a passage in Holinshed and Hall:

Sir Francis the Arragonois, hearing of that chance, appareled six strong fellowes, like men of the countrie, with sacks and baskets, as cariers of corne and vittels; and sent them to the castell of Cornill, in the which diverse Englishmen were kept as prisoners; and he, with an ambush of Englishmen, leie in a vallie nigh to the forteresse.

The six counterfeit husbandmen entered the castell unsuspected, and straight came to the chamber of the capteine, and laieng hands on him, gave knowledge to them that leie in ambush to come to their aid. The which suddenlie made forth, and entered the castell, slue and tocke all the Frenchmen, and set the Englishmen at liberty; which things doone, they set fire in the castell and departed to Rone with their bootie and prisoners. 87

The dramatist may also have obtained some ideas for the scene from Febyan’s account, which reads:

Sir Francis the Arrogoncis sette a bussheement mere vnto y sayd Castell, and in the Dawnynge of the morninge arrayed lili of his Cowdyours in husbendemennes array, and sent

87 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 198; Hall, op. cit., p. 197.
theym with Sakkes fylled with dyuers Frutes to offer to sell to the Occupyers of the Castell. The whiche, when they were comyn to the Gate, and by the langage taken for Frenshmen, alone without Suspicion were taken in. 88

Both Fabyan and the play give the number of soldiers accom-
panying Joan as four, while the accounts in Hell and Holinshed
give the number as six. After Joan gains entrance to Rouen,
she thrusts out a burning torch to signal Charles that the
gates are open. A similer type of signal is described in
Holinshed and Hell. When the French perceived a fire on an
hill to signify the approach of soldiers "a burning cresset
was shewed out of the steeple." 89 After Joan's entry into
Rouen, Talbot appears on the scene and calls Joan a witch and
a damned sorceress, phrases which are used in Holinshed's
Chronicles to describe the French maid. Talbot becomes angered
and vows to recover Rouen again or die

As sure as in this lete betreyed town
Great Cour-de-lion's heart was buried. 90

The dramatist, in speaking of the Great Cour-de-lion, is
speaking of Richard I, who, according to Holinshed, was buried
in Rouen. In the dreme, Talbot reminds Burgundy that he was
"prick'd on by public wrongs sustain'd in France." 91 The
chronicles of Holinshed and Hell relate the cause of Burgundy's
alliance with England. His father, relate the chronicles, was

88 Fabyan, op. cit., p. 615.
89 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 159; Hall, op. cit., p. 142.
901 Henry VI, III. ii. 82-83. 911 Henry VI, III. ii. 78.
killed by one of the Dauphin's servants while he was kneeling before the Dauphin. This act had the effect of throwing his son into close alliance with England and is the public wrong to which Talbot refers in the play. This scene shows Bedford, who is sick, sitting in a chair before the walls of Rouen. He cannot be persuaded to leave, for he has read

That stout Pendragon in his litter sick
Came to the field and vanquished his foes;
Methinks I should revive the soldiers' hearts,
Because I ever found them as myself.\(^{92}\)

A similar account occurs in Holinshed's Chronicles, though it names Pendragon's brother, instead of Pendragon, as being carried forth to witness the battle. In the latter part of the scene, Bedford dies after seeing the French overthrown and is carried off in his chair. The author has created out of his own mind the dramatic death of Bedford, for Holinshed and Hall record Bedford's death in his bed at Rouen as a quiet affair.

In the second scene of Act III, the dramatist again has departed widely from the chronicles. Historical data is changed at the author's will and the order of events is not correct. It is impossible to determine the date of the scene, for Rouen was never captured as portrayed in the play. The time naturally was before Joan's death in 1431; yet in the latter part of the scene Talbot plans to go to Paris to see the king crowned, an event which happened, according to the

\(^{92}\) Henry VI, III. ii. 95-98.
chronicles, several months after the death of Joan. Another inconsistency in this scene is the fact that Bedford did not die until 1435. The only chronicles which seem to have been used as sources for this scene are Holinshed, Hall, and Fabyan.

The third scene of Act III has for its setting the plains near Rouen. Joan tells Charles of her plan to regain Burgundy as an ally to the French, to which plan Charles answers:

Aye, marry, sweeting, if we could do that France were no place for Henry's warriors; Nor should that nation boast it so with us, But be extirped from our provinces.\(^{93}\)

These lines were probably derived from a speech by Charles to Burgundy which Hall records as follows:

By your helpe and aide, we shall expell, cleane pull vp by the rootes, and put out, all the Englyshe nacion, out of our realmes, territories and dominions.\(^{94}\)

Burgundy's return to the French side occurred in 1435, but the drama makes Joan the agent by which the reconciliation is made. Since Joan died in 1431, we see that the dramatist has again changed the natural sequence of events. The appeal by which Joan won Burgundy over to the French side is not in accord with the facts given in Holinshed and Hall. Joan argues thus with Burgundy:

Was not the Duke of Orleans thy foe? And was he not in Engleland prisoner? But when they heard he was thine enemy, They set him free without his ransom paid, In spite of Burgundy end all his friends.\(^{95}\)

\(^{93}\) Henry VI, III. iii. 21-24. \(^{94}\) Hall, op. cit., p. 177. \(^{95}\) Henry VI, III. iii. 69-73.
Holinshead and Hall give 1440 as the date of the release of the Duke of Orleans, which date was five years after Burgundy had forsaken the English cause. To show the further variance of the drama from Holinshead and Hall, a passage is quoted from the chronicles:

The cause why he [Duke of Orleans] was detained so long in captivity, was to pleasure thereby the duke of Burgognie: for, so long as the duke of Burgognie continued faithfull to the king of England, it was not thought necessary to suffer the duke of Orleans to be ransomed, least upon his deliverance he would not cease to seek means to be revenged upon the duke of Burgognie, for the old grudge and displeasure betwixt their two families.96

The third scene of the third act contains one passage which is an adaptation from Hall alone. The dramatist varies from history in making Joan the person to renew Burgundy's alliance with France, and further diverges from history in the statements made concerning the imprisonment of the Duke of Orleans.

The palace in Paris is the setting for the last scene in the third act. The scene depicts the ceremony in which Talbot is made the Earl of Shrewsbury, an event which took place in 1442 in London, instead of Paris as the play relates. The ceremony in the play is developed from a passage in Holinshead and Hall, which says:

About this season, John, the valiant lord Talbot, for his approved prowess and wisdom, as well in England as in France, both in peace and warre so well tried, was created earle of Shrewsburie.97

96 Holinshead, op. cit., p. 196; Hall, op. cit., p. 192.
In this scene, Henry invites Talbot to take his place in the coronation, but Henry’s coronation occurred in 1431, which is eleven years before Talbot gained the title of Earl of Shrewsbury. In the latter part of the scene, Vernon and Basset are shown arguing over the dukes of York and Lancaster. There is no historical basis for this part of the scene.

The opening scene of the fourth act is also set in Paris, and opens with the coronation ceremony of Henry in Paris. Following the information gathered from Holinshed and Hall, the play has Winchester to perform the coronation ceremony. The chronicles describe the ceremony thus:

On the seaventeenth daie of December, he was crowned king of France in our ladie church of Paris, by the cardinall of Winchester; the bishop of Paris not being contented that the cardinall should do such an high ceremonie in his church and jurisdiction.98

The king is attended, in the play, by Gloucester, the Bishop of Winchester, York, Suffolk, Somerset, Warwick, Talbot, Exeter, the Governor of Paris, and others. The king’s attendants which are named in the chronicles of Holinshed and Hall are similar to those listed in the play. The chronicles read:

There were in his companie of his owne nation, his vnclie the cardinall of Winchester, the cardinall and archbishop of Yorke, the dukes of Bedford, Yorke, and Norffolke, the earles of Warwike, Salisbury, Oxenford, Huntington, Ormond, Mortaigne, and Suffolke.99

The dramatist errs in listing Gloucester as one of the king’s company, for Gloucester, according to the histories, was in

England when Henry was crowned at Paris. He was appointed Lieutenant of England during the king's absence. At this point in the scene, Sir John Fastolfe enters with a letter from the Duke of Burgundy. Talbot, seeing Fastolfe, says:

I vow'd, base knight, when I did meet thee next, To tear the garter from thy creven's leg.100

Talbot then proceeds to pluck the garter off. Though this incident did not occur at the coronation ceremony, the chronicles of Holinshed and Hall contain the following account of a similar episode:

But for doubt of misdealing at this brunt, the duke of Bedford tooke from him Fastolfe the image of saint George, and his garter; though afterward by means of freends, and apparent causes of good excuse, the same were to him againe delivered against the mind of the lord Talbot.101

Thus, in the play, Talbot is pictured as tearing the garter off, while the chronicles credit Bedford with the act. The play continues with Talbot's account of the Battle of Patay, an event which has previously been shown to have had Holinshed and Hall as sources. After Talbot's narration of the story, the king banishes Fastolfe on pain of death. The chronicles do not give evidence that such an incident happened. In the drama, Burgundy's letter is sent to Henry by Fastolfe, but this detail is at variance with Holinshed and Hall, who record that

100 Henry VI. IV. i. 14-15.
101 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 165; Hall, op. cit., p. 150.
the duke of Burgognie, to set a veile before the king of Englands eyes, sent Thomas Dore his cheefe herald to king Henrie with letters.102

The dime gives Burgundy's inscription on his letter as being "To the King,"103 while Holinshed and Hall record the following inscription:

To the high and mightie prince, Henrie, by the grace of God, king of Engleand, his welbeloued cousine.104

The contents of the letter greatly resemble a passage related in Holinshed and Hall. The letter in the play reads thus:

I have, upon especial cause, Moved with compassion of my country's wreck, Together with the pitiful complaints Of such as your oppression feeds upon, Forsaken your pernicious fection, And join'd with Charles, the rightful King of France.105

Holinshed and Hall relate how Burgundy sent Henry a letter excusing the matter by way of information, that he was constrained to enter in this league with K. Charles, by the dailie outories, complaints, and lamentations of his people, alledgeing against him that he was the onlie cause of the long continuance of the wars, to the utter impoverishing of his owne people, and the whole nation of France.106

After the letter has been read, Henry commands Talbot to march straight unto Burgundy and
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Let him perceive how ill we brook his treason
And what offence it is to flout his friends. 107

In Holinshed and Hall, Thoison Dore is sent back to Burgundy
with a similar message, which reads thus:

What a new reconciled enemie was in respect of an old
tried freend, Burgundy might shortlie find. 108

The remainder of the scene consists of a quarrel between York
and Somerset. The king charges them to forget their quarrels,
and proceeds to make York regent of France and to appoint Som-
erset as York's assistant. A passage from Holinshed and Hall
forms a foundation for Henry's appointments. The passage is
as follows:

Richard duke of Yorke, regent of France, accompanied with
Edmund duke of Summerset, set forward into the duchie of
Anjou. 109

Holinshed and Hall, the only sources used in this scene, have
been followed rather closely, although the dramatist does not
adhere rigidly to the facts at any time.

The second, third, and fourth scenes of Act IV tell of
expeditions planned by York and Somerset. These expeditions
have no historical foundation, but are purely fictional.

The fifth scene of Act IV has its setting near Bordeaux
at an English camp. In this scene, Talbot sees that the Eng-
lish will lose the battle; so he begs his son, John, to fly
to escape. John, who is likewise devoted to his father, will

107 Henry VI, IV. i. 74-75.
108 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 184; Hall, op. cit., p. 177.
109 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 196; Hall, op. cit., p. 194.
not escape, but he pleads with his father to leave the field.

Hall gives a fuller account of this event than does Holinshed, but both chronicles contain the following passage:

It was said, that after he perceived there was no remedy, but present loose of the battell, he counselled his sonne, the lord Lisle, to save himselfe by flight, aith the same could not redound to enie great reprooch in him, this being the first iournie in which he had been present. Manie words he used to persuade him to have saved his life; but nature so wrought in the son, that neither desire of life, nor feare of death, could either cause him to shrinkke, or comuel himselfe out of the danger, and so there menfullie ended his life with his said fether.110

The chronicles give Telbot's son's name as Lisle, but it is changed to John in the drama. A few of the lines in this scene are taken directly from the fuller account given in Hall. These lines, in which Telbot pleads with his son to leave, are:

Fly, to revenge my death, if I be slain.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Thou never hadst renowne, nor euer loste it.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

And lese my followers here to fight and die; My age was never tainted with such shame.111

The passage in Hall from which the preceding lines are taken reads:

But because this is thy first iournie and enterprise, neither the flyeng shall redonde to thy shame, nor thy death to thy glory; for as herdy a man wisely flieth as a tamerarious person folishealy abidesth, therefore y flyynge of me shalbe y dishonor not only of me end my progenie, but also e discomfiture of all my company; thy depurture shal seue thy lyfe, and make the abe another tyme, if I be slayn, to revenge my death, and do honor to thy Prince end profyt to his Realme.112

1111 Henry VI., IV. v. 19, 40, 45-46.
112Hall, op. cit., p. 229.
The sixth scene of Act IV continues the dialogue between Talbot and his son. Several lines of this scene are also based on the excerpt which has been quoted from Hall. Lines of the play which are based upon a passage found in Hall are:

Fly, to revenge my death when I am dead.

My death's revenge, thy youth, and England's fame:
All these and more we hazard by thy stay;
All these are saved if thou wilt fly away.\(^{113}\)

The sixth scene closes with Talbot and John fighting side by side.

The seventh scene of the same act takes place after the battle is over. Both Talbot and John are killed in the battle, and a dramatic touch is added to the play by having John die in Talbot's arms. The account of their deaths is taken from Holinshed and Hall, which contain the following passage: "And so there manfullie Lisle ended his life with his said father."\(^{114}\) The Besterd of Orleans, on seeing the dead bodies of Talbot and son, desires to hew their bodies to pieces, but Charles replies:

Oh, no forbear; for that which we have fled
During the life, let us not wrong it dead.\(^{115}\)

The reply made by Charles is similar to a passage in Hall and Holinshed. In answer to persons who wish to destroy the tomb of Bedford, Lewis XI replies:

\(^{113}\) Henry VI, IV. vi. 30, 39-41.

\(^{114}\) Holinshed, op. cit., p. 236; Hall, op. cit., p. 229.

\(^{115}\) Henry VI, IV. vii. 49-50.
What honour shall it be to vs, or to you, to breake
this monument, and to pull out of the ground the dead
bones of him, whome in his life neither my fether nor
your progenitours, with all their power, puissance,
and friends were once able to make flee one foot back-
ward.\textsuperscript{116}

Sir William Lucy enumerates in the play the various honors
bestowed upon Talbot. Lucy's speech agrees almost word for
word with an epitaph on Talbot which appears in Richard
Crompton's \textit{Mansion of Magnanimitie}, published in 1599. This
evidence indicates the possibility that the original play,
which, according to Alexander, existed several years before
1599, was revised after the publication of Crompton's book.

Sir William speaks of Talbot thus:

\begin{quote}
But where's the great Alcides of the field,
Valiant Lord Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury,
Created, for his rare success in arms,
Great Earl of Washford, Waterford, and Valence;
Lord Talbot of Goodrig and Urchinfield,
Lord Strange of Blackmere, Lord Verdon of Alton,
Lord Cromwell of Wingfield, Lord Furnivel of Sheffield,
The thrice-victorious Lord of Falconbridge;
Knight of the noble order of Saint George,
Worthy Saint Micheiel and the Golden Fleece;
Great marshal to Henry the Sixth
Of all his wars within the realm of France?\textsuperscript{117}
\end{quote}

The epitaph from which the preceding lines are taken reads
thus:

\begin{quote}
Here lieth the right noble knight, Iohn Talbott Earle
of Shrewsbury, Washford, Waterford, and Valence, Lord
Talbot of Goodrig, and Urchinfield, Lord Strange of
the blacke Meere, Lord Verdon of Alton, Lord Cromwell
of Wingfield, Lord Louetoft of Worsop, Lord Furniual
of Sheffield, Lord Faulconbrige, knight of the most
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{116} Holinshed, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 184; Hall, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 178.

\textsuperscript{117} \textit{Henry VI}, IV. vii. 60-71.
noble order of S. George, S. Michael, and the Golden fleece, Great Marshell to king Henry the sixt of his realme of France; who died in the battell of Burdeux in the yeere of our Lord 1453. 118

The battle described in the last three scenes of Act IV did not take place until 1453, eight years after the king's marriage. The dramatist transposes the order of events in these scenes, for Henry's marriage in the play does not occur until the last scene of the fifth act.

It is thus apparent in the last three scenes of Act IV that the dramatist has essentially followed Hall as his source. The dramatist also avails himself of an epitaph found in Crompton's Mension of Magnanimity.

The first scene of Act V opens with the news that letters have arrived from the pope, the emperor, and the Earl of Armagnac, which letters entreat Henry to make peace with France. Holinshed and Hall relate how, at the Council of Basle, the emperor and other Christian kings desired mediation between England and France, but the chronicles do not include any account of a letter having been written to Henry. The letter humbly sues Henry

To have a godly peace concluded of
Between the realms of England and of France. 119

In Holinshed and Hall, a similar passage occurs in the speech made by the cardinal of Saint Cross at Arras. The cardinal begs the people to lay aside all remoror,

118 Boswell-Stone, op. cit., p. 233.
119 Henry VI, V. i. 5-6.
so that, in concluding a godlie peace [*concorde,* says Hall], they might receiue profit and quietnesse heere in this world.\(^{120}\)

Since both the drama and Holinshed contain parallel phrases, "a godly peace," the dramatist must have been using Holinshed as a source in this instance. Gloucester relates to the king the desire of the Earl of Armagnac, who is close kin to Charles, to bind the knot of amity between France and England by the marriage of his daughter to Henry. The Earl of Armagnac proffers his daughter

In marriage, with a large and sumptuous dowry.\(^{121}\)

Holinshed and Hall differ from the play in regard to the details of the Earl's offer. The corresponding passage in the chronicles reads:

In this yeare died in Guien the Countesse of Comings, to whom the French king and also the earle of Arminack pretended to be heire, in so much that the earle entred into all the lands of the said ladie. And because he knew the French king would not take the matter well, to have a Rouland for an Oliver he sent solemn ambassadors to the king of England, offering him his daughter in marriage, with promise to be bound (beside great summes of monie, which he would give with hir) to deliver into the king of Englands hands all such castels and townes, as he or his ancestors detaine from him within enie part of the duchie of Aquitaine, either by conquest of his progenitors, or by gift and deliuerie of enie French king; and further to aid the same king with monie for the rescue of other cities, within the same duchie, from the French king; or from enie other person that against king Henrie vniustlie kept, and wrongfullie withheld them.\(^{122}\)

\(^{120}\)Holinshed, op. cit., p. 163; Hall, op. cit., p. 175.

\(^{121}\)Henry VI, v. 1. 20.

\(^{122}\)Holinshed, op. cit., p. 205; Hall, op. cit., pp. 202-203.
Although the king bemoans the fact that he is young, he says in reply to the Earl's offer:

Yet call the ambassadors; and, as you please,
So let them have their answers every one;
I shall be well content with any choice
Tends to God's glory and my country's weal.\(^{123}\)

The representation in these lines was doubtless built upon the account given in Holinshed and Hall:

This offer seemed so profitable and also honorable to king Henrie and the realme, that the ambassadors were well heard, honourable received, and with rewards sent home into their countrie.\(^{124}\)

According to history, this proffer of marriage was made in 1442, and not in 1435 at the meeting at Arres as the play would have us believe. The scene next shifts to the entrance of Winchester in cardinal's habit. Although Exeter died in 1426, a year before Winchester was made a cardinal, the dramatist disregards the fact and has Exeter exclaim:

\begin{quote}
What! is my lord of Winchester instal'd
And call'd unto a cardinal's degree?
Then I perceive that will be verified
Henry the Fifth did sometime prophesy,
'If once he come to be a cardinal,
He'll make his cap co-equal with the crown.'\(^{125}\)
\end{quote}

The prophecy of which Exeter speaks is given by Hall:

\begin{quote}
Whyche degree, Kyng Henry the fifth, knowynge the haute courage, and the ambicious mynde of the man, pro-
hibited hym on hys allegiance once either to sue for
\end{quote}

\(^{123}\) Henry VI. V. i. 24-27.

\(^{124}\) Holinshed, op. cit., p. 205; Hall, op. cit., p. 203.

\(^{125}\) Henry VI. V. i. 29-34.
or to take; meenynge that Cardinalles Hettes shoulde
not bee egell with Frinces.\[126\]

Winchester is a cardinal in the third scene of Act I, but
in the first scene of Act IV, he is referred to as the Bishop
of Winchester. Thus we have another example of the careless
manner in which details are handled in the play. In the
latter part of the scene, Winchester pays the legate a sum
of money which he promised should be paid the Pope for making
him a cardinal. The chronicles do not contain any record of
such an occurrence, nor do they contain any evidence of the
king's sending the Earl's daughter a jewel, as is represented
in the play.

In the foregoing scene Hall and Holinshed have again
been the only sources utilized by the dramatist. The drama
follows Holinshed more closely in one instance, but a little
further in the scene Hall alone is the source of some lines.
Facts are dealt with even more loosely than usual in this
scene.

The second scene of Act V commences with a speech by
Charles, in which he tells his lords that the Parisians are
revolting from the English. In the first scene of the play,
the dramatist has a messenger enter with news that Paris is
already lost to the French, but this detail seems to have been
forgotten by the writer of the second scene of Act V. This
scene was probably developed from the account of the loss of

\[126\] Hall, op. cit., p. 159.
Paris contained in Holinshed and Hall:

Thus was the citie of Paris brought into possession of the French king, through the vntrue demeavour of the citizens, who, contrarie to their oths, and promised allegiance, like false and inconstant people, so resolted from the English.127

While Charles is planning to march to Paris, a scout enters with the message that the English party, formerly divided, has joined forces. This message is an addition made by the dramatist and has no historical warrant.

The action of the third scene of the last act occurs in Anjou. Here Joan calls upon the spirits to help her, but the fiends which appear can do nothing for her. This summoning of the fiends is altogether fictitious. The scene shifts to a fight between Joan and York, in which Joan is taken prisoner by the latter. York is regent of France in this scene, but he actually held no such post until 1436. Bedford, according to history, was regent of France at the time of Joan's capture, but the dramatist portrays his death in the third act of the play. The account of Joan's capture, as found in Holinshed's Chronicles differs from the account given in 1 Henry VI. The chronicle relates:

So happened it on a daie in an outswellie that Ione made by a Picard of the lord of Lutzenburghs band, in the fiercest of hir fight she was taken, and by him by and by to his lord presented, who sold hir over againe to the English.128

128Holinshed, op. cit., p. 170.
The remainder of the scene concerns Suffolk's wooing of Margaret for Henry. This part of the scene is based only upon the fact that Holinshed and Hall tell of Suffolk's arranging the marriage between Margaret and Henry. Holinshed and Hall tell of Suffolk's plan in this manner:

In treating of this truce, the earle of Suffolke, adventuring somewhat upon his commission, without the assent of his associates, imagined that the next waie to come to a perfect peace was to contrive a marriage betweene the French kings kinsewmen, the ladie Margaret, daughter to Reiner duke of Aniou, and his souereigne lord king Henrie.129

By adding to and changing the information given in the above passage, the dramatist has created a fictitious, but an interesting occurrence. In the scene, the author presents the eloquent wooing of Margaret by Suffolk and the meeting of Suffolk and Reignier to discuss the king's suit. The dramatist heightens the interest in the scene by portraying the fact that Suffolk himself is in love with Margaret, a fact which has no historical basis.

The fourth scene of the fifth act deals with the brutal treatment rendered Joan by the English. Joan, who has been condemned by the English to burn, is brought in before York at her worst, and is shown as denying her father. Holinshed, whom the writer follows as a source for this scene, does not give evidence of such a denial. When Joan discovers that she cannot turn the unrelenting hearts of the Englishmen, she

129Holinshed, op. cit., p. 206; Hall, op. cit., p. 203.
cries:
I am with child, ye bloody homicides:
Murder not then the fruit within my womb.
Although ye hate me to a violent death.\textsuperscript{130}

The corresponding passage in Holinshed reads:

But herein Ione fullie efore possest of the seend, not able to hold her in anie twardnesse of grace, falling straight waie into hir former abominations, (and yet seeking to estch out life as long as she might,) spake not (though the shift were shamefull) to confesse hir self a strumpet, and (unmarried as she was) to be with child.\textsuperscript{131}

In the play, Joan names Alencon as the father of the child, and then names Reignier. These details are invented by the dramatist. Joan's appeal has no effect upon the lords, who commend her to be led away to execution. This version furnished by the dramatist differs somewhat from the version by Holinshed, who relates the story thus:

For triall, the lord regents lenitie gaue hir nine moneths steis, at the end whereof she (found herein as false as wicked in the rest, an eight daies after, uppon a further definitie sentence declared against hir to be relese and a renouncer of hir oth and repentance) was thereupon deliuered over to secular power, and so executed by consumption of fire in the old market place et Rome.\textsuperscript{132}

After the departure of Joan, the dramatist relates the conditions under which a friendly peace is made between England and France. The terms of peace are similar to those proposed at Arras in 1435, four years later than the execution of

\textsuperscript{130} Henry VI, V. iv. 62-64.
\textsuperscript{131} Holinshed, op. cit., p. 171.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid.
Joan. Winchester sets forth the terms to Charles thus:

Charles, and the rest, it is enacted thus:
That, in regard King Henry gives consent,
Of mere compassion and of lenity,
To ease your country of distressful war,
And suffer you to breathe in fruitful peace,
You shall become true liegemen to his crown:
And, Charles, upon condition thou wilt swear
To pay him tribute, and submit thyself,
Thou shalt be placed as viceroy under him.
And still enjoy the regal dignity. 133

Though no peace was concluded at Arras, the terms of peace as
given in Holinshed and Hall, are similar to those in the play:

The Englishmen would that king Charles should have
nothing but what it pleased the king of England, and
that not as dutie, but as a benefit by him of his
meere liberalitie giuen and distributed. 134

The peace which was concluded in the play was in reality a
truce lasting for eighteen months. The chronicles show Suff-
folk as the agent of this truce, which was made at Tours in
1444, through plens for the marriage of Margeret and Henry.

Holinshed is the principal source of the fourth scene of
the fifth act, for Holinshed carries a much fuller version of
Joan la Pucelle than does Hall or any other chronicler. The
two events portrayed in this scene took place several years
apart; thus we are again furnished with an example of the
treatment of historic time in the drama.

The last scene of the pley centers around the discussion
of Margeret by Henry, Gloucester, Suffolk, and Exeter. Henry

134 Holinshed, op. cit., pp. 182–183; Hall, op. cit.,
p. 175.
consents to make Margaret England's queen, but Gloucester raises this objection:

You know, my lord, your highness is betroth'd
Unto another lady of esteem;
How shall we then dispense with that contract,
And not deface your honor with reproach? 135

The passage from which these lines are taken appears in Holinshed and Hall in the following form:

But although this marriage pleased the king and divers of his counsell, yet Humphrey duke of Glocester protector of the realme was much against it; alledging that it should be both contrarie to the lawes of God, and dishonorabe to the prince, if he should breake that promisse and contract of mariage, made by ambassadours sufficientlie thereto instructed, with the daughter of the earle of Armineske, vpon conditions both to him and his realme as much profitable as honourable. 136

In the play, Gloucester argues that Margaret's father is nothing more than an earl. Suffolk answers Gloucester by saying that Reignier is a king,

the king of Naples and Jerusalem. 137

The authority for this statement is found in Holinshed and Hall:

This Reiner duke of Anjou named himselfe king of Sicill, Naples, and Jerusalem; hauing onlie the name and stile of those realmes, without enie penie, profit, or foot of possession. 138

The above passage also shows the basis for Gloucester's conclusion that

135 1 Henry VI, V. v. 26-29.
136 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 207; Hall, op. cit., p. 204.
137 1 Henry VI, V. v. 40.
138 Holinshed, op. cit., p. 206; Hall, op. cit., p. 204.
Her father is no better than an earl. Although in glorious titles he excel.\footnote{139}

Gloucester's disapproval of the match holds no weight with the king, for Suffolk is sent after Margeret. Holinshed and Hall are also the source for this turn of events, for the chronicles record:

But the dukes words could not be heard, for the earles docings were onelie liked and allowed.\footnote{140}

The following description of Margeret made in a speech by Suffolk seems to echo from a passage contained in Hall.

Suffolk's words are:

Whom should we match with Henry, being a king
But Margeret, that is daughter to a king?
Her peerless feature, joined with her birth
Approves her fit for none but for a king.\footnote{141}

In Hall's account, Suffolk tells Henry that she\footnote{142}[	extit{Margeret}] was of such an excellent beautie, and of so high a parentage, that almost no king or Emperor was worthy to be her make.

Suffolk further praises Margeret in the play, by telling of her velient courage and undaunted spirit

More than in woman commonly is seen.\footnote{143}

Hall, who describes Margeret more at length than does Holinshed, was consulted for the above lines. The corresponding passage in Hall reads:

\footnote{139}{Henry VI, V. v. 37-38.}
\footnote{140}{Holinshed, op. cit., p. 207; Hall, op. cit., p. 204.}
\footnote{141}{Henry VI, V. v. 66-69.}
\footnote{142}{Hall, op. cit., p. 204.}
\footnote{143}{Henry VI, V. v. 70-71.}
The Quene his [Henry's] wyfe was a woman of a great witte, and yet of no greater wytte then of haute stomacke; desirous of glory and covetous of honor; and of reason, pollicye, counseil, and other giftes and talents belongyng to a man, full and flowyng.\textsuperscript{144}

Holinshed and Hall are the only sources which seem to have been used for the writing of the last scene. Hall was used more extensively than Holinshed in this particular scene, as the dramatist consulted Hall for the characteristics assigned to Margarett.

A study of the sources used for the writing of \textit{1 Henry VI} reveals that only two chroniclers, Holinshed and Hall, were used extensively. Though some critics claim that only one of these chronicles was employed as a source-book, this comparison of the play with the chronicles shows that both Holinshed and Hall were used. Holinshed furnishes details concerning Joan la Pucelle which are not to be found in Hall, and Hall alone is consulted by the dramatist for his portrayal of Talbot, Talbot's son, and Margaret of Anjou. Most of the passages in Holinshed and Hall are parallel, so that in most cases it is impossible to determine which source was used. Yet, because of some passages which are not parallel, we can be certain that both Holinshed and Hall were sources of the play. Richard Crompton's \textit{Mansion of Magnanimitye} was used only as a source for eleven lines in \textit{1 Henry VI}. Fabyen's \textit{The New Chronicles of England and France} was used as

\textsuperscript{144}Hall, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 208.
a source in three separate instances. Crompton and Fabian furnish only minor details, but it is evident that the dramatist used them to a small degree in the writing of the play. It is unlikely that Stow's Chronicle was used as a source, for the only phrase in Stow which is parallel to a phrase in the play is "tawny costs." Since tawny costs were the habitual dress of servants in Shakespeare's days, it may be assumed that the dramatist used the phrase of his own accord. Richard Grafton's Chronicle furnishes no evidence of having been used as a source. We may conclude, therefore, that Holinshed, Hall, Fabian, and Crompton furnish the historical matter used in 1 Henry VI, with Fabian and Crompton playing only a minor role as sources. The dramatist, in a very few instances, follows the historical material rather closely, but, as a general rule, the sources are interpreted freely. Some scenes of the play disregard historical data completely, and the material for such scenes is invented by the dramatist. Notable in the play is the large degree in which the chronological order of events is changed. This failure to depict accurately the events in their chronological order causes numerous inconsistencies in the play. Occasionally the dramatist avails himself of material from the chronicles, but changes the material in regard to name, date, or characters. Several of the characters portrayed in 1 Henry VI are of an unhistorical nature. The sources of 1 Henry VI
are treated by the author in such a variety of ways that it is difficult to imagine that one person could write with such disparity of style.
CHAPTER III

THE PROBLEM OF THE AUTHORSHIP OF 1 HENRY VI

CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE SOURCES

An attempt to determine the authorship of 1 Henry VI will necessarily require a grouping of the scenes of the play which have characteristics in common. Similarities in the style of writing and the treatment of sources in the various scenes will be the basis for my conclusions regarding the play's authorship.

In relation to the histories used as sources for the play, 1 Henry VI may be divided into the five following groups: (1) scenes in which Holinshed's Chronicles is known to have been used instead of Hall's Chronicle; (2) scenes in which Hall's Chronicle is known to have been used to the exclusion of Holinshed's Chronicles; (3) scenes in which it is impossible to tell whether Holinshed or Hall is used; (4) scenes in which it is clear that both Holinshed and Hall are used; and (5) scenes in which chronicles other than those of Holinshed and Hall are also used.

The scenes in which there are lines undoubtedly taken from Holinshed instead of Hall are the second scene of the first act and the fourth scene of the fifth act. Both of these scenes develop the story of Joan's first meeting with
Charles end of her trial and execution as given in Holinshed alone.

Hall is used as an authority for some lines found in the third and fifth scenes of the second act, the third scene of the third act, and the fifth and sixth scenes of the fourth act. The third scene of the second act describes Talbot's bravery much in the same manner as does Hall, who gives a fuller account of Talbot and his feats than is given in Holinshed's Chronicles. The story of young Talbot's devotion to his father, as related in the fifth and sixth scenes of the fourth act, closely resembles a similar account found in Hall's Chronicle. Both Holinshed and Hall contain an account of Mortimer's imprisonment, which the dramatist uses in the fifth scene of the second act, but Hall adds a few lines concerning the future course of Richard Plantagenet, Mortimer's heir, which lines the writer of 1 Henry VI apparently had in mind when he has Mortimer say to Plantagenet these words: "Thou art my heir; the rest I wish thee gather." Though the dramatist, in the third scene of the third act, makes Joen the author of an appeal to Burgundy to forsake England, the address parallels a passage found in Hall's Chronicle, in which Charles is speaking to Burgundy.

Since most of the passages from Holinshed which illustrate 1 Henry VI are paraphrases of Hall, it is impossible in many scenes to determine which authority was used. The

1 Henry VI, II. v. 96.
scenes which show no greater resemblance to one chronicle
then to the other are the first, fourth, fifth, and sixth
scenes of the first act; the first, second, and fourth scenes
of the second act; the fourth scene of the third act; the
first scene of the fourth act; and the second, third, and
fifth scenes of the fifth act.

There is only one scene in 1 Henry VI in which it is
clear that both Holinshed's Chronicles and Hall's Chronicle
are used as sources. The first scene of the fifth act con-
tains lines which indicate that both Holinshed and Hall are
sources. The phrase, "a godly peace," which occurs in the
fifth line of the scene also occurs in Holinshed's Chronicles,
while Hall's Chronicle reads "a godlie concorde." Hall's
Chronicle is used to the exclusion of Holinshed's Chronicles
for the prophecy that Winchester will make his esp co-equal
with the crown.

In four scenes of the play, chronicles in addition to
Holinshed and Hall are employed. In the third scene of the
first act, Fabyen is the source for the information that the
mayor of London prevented bloodshed between the followers of
Gloucester and Winchester. Fabyen is again used as a source
in the first scene of the third act, in which the followers
of Gloucester and Winchester arm themselves with stones. In
the second scene of the third act, the dramatist follows Fab-
yen's account of a surprise attack upon a castle by four
soldiers dressed as husbandmen. Sir William Lucy's enumeration
of Talbot's offices, occurring in the seventh scene of
the fourth act, agrees almost word for word with an epi-
taph on Talbot found in Richard Crompton's Mansion of Megen-
nanimitie. It is apparent, therefore, that the only sources
of 1 Henry VI besides Holinshed and Hall are Fabyan's Chron-
icle and Crompton's Mansion of Megenanimitie.

Though none of the scenes in 1 Henry VI follow the
chronicles exactly, some follow the histories more loosely
than do others, and a few scenes have no historical bases.
The scenes in which important incidents are developed that
are not included in the chronicles and the scenes in which
the date, characters, or name of an incident is changed are
among those scenes which follow the chronicles loosely.
Among those scenes which are entirely fictional are the third
scene of the second act, in which Talbot meets the Countess
of Auvergne; the fourth scene of the second act, in which the
two factions choose between the white and red roses; and the
second, third, and fourth scenes of the fourth act, in which
some of Talbot's expeditions are dramatized. Other scenes
which follow the chronicles loosely are the fifth scene of
the first act, which portrays a skirmish between the followers
of Talbot and Joan, and which is composed mainly of stage di-
rections of a fictional character; the sixth scene of the
first act, in which the dramatist elaborates on the cele-
bration of the French because of their victory over the Eng-
lish; the second scene of the second act, in which Talbot
honors the dead Salisbury, whose death occurred, according to the chronicles, long before the siege of Orleans; and the first scene of the fifth act, in which the reasons for the Earl of Armagnac's proffer of his daughter in marriage to Henry differ from the reasons set forth in Holinshed and Hall.

Only six scenes in 1 Henry VI follow the chronicles comparatively closely, these scenes being the first scene of the first act, in which details concerning the death of Henry V, the loss of English possessions to France, the causes of English losses, the crowning of the Dauphin as king, the battle at Patay, the lords' vows to Henry V, and the lords' offices are taken from the chronicles; the third scene of the first act, in which the dramatization of the dissension between Winchester and Gloucester follows Holinshed and Hall; the first scene of the third act, in which the portrayal of the strife and reconciliation of Winchester and Gloucester further follows the chronicles; the fifth and sixth scenes of the fourth act, which take the story of Talbot and his son's devotion from an account given in Hall; and the second scene of the fifth act, in which the account of the revolt of Paris from the English parallels the historical account.

The play includes some scenes in which important incidents are developed that are not in the chronicles. Such, especially, are the third scene of the second act, in which the Countess of Auvergne arranges a meeting with Talbot; the
fourth scene of the second act, in which the two factions of York and Lancaster choose either the white or red rose as a badge; the fifth scene of the second act, in which Richard Plantagenet visits Mortimer at the Tower of London; the fourth scene of the third act and the first scene of the fourth act, in which Basset and Vernon engage in quarrels; the seventh scene of the fourth act, in which young Talbot dies in his father's arms; the third scene of the fifth act, in which Joan calls the fiends to her aid and Suffolk woos Margaret for Henry; the fourth scene of the fifth act, in which Joan denies her father; and the fifth scene of the fifth act, in which Suffolk woos Margaret for Henry. Noteworthy is the fact that all of the important characters of an unhistorical nature (Basset, Vernon, Sir William Lucy, the Countess of Auvergne, and the shepherd) appear in the scenes in which important incidents are developed that are not contained in the chronicles.

Several incidents in the play, which are similar otherwise to the accounts given in the chronicles, differ from the historical account in that the date of the event is changed, the name of the event is changed, or the names of characters participating in the incident are changed. Such is the case in the following scenes: the second scene of the first act, wherein the presence of Cherles and Reignier at the siege of Orleans is given; the fourth scene of the first act, wherein the presence of Salisbury at the siege of Orleans
is given; the first scene of the second act, wherein the circumstances of Talbot's recapture of Orleans are similar to the recapture of Le Mans as given in the chronicles of Holinshed and Hall; the second scene of the third act, wherein Joan's capture of Rouen is similar to a story found in Holinshed, Hall, and Fabyan, which occurred in 1441, ten years after Joan's death, and which tells of a castle being surprised by soldiers dressed as husbandmen, carrying sacks and speaking French; the third scene of the third act, wherein Joan is the agent of Burgundy's reconciliation with France, instead of Charles, as given in the chronicles; the first scene of the fourth act, wherein Talbot, instead of Bedford (as given in the chronicles), tears the garter from Fastolfe's leg, and wherein Fastolfe, instead of Thoison Dore, delivers Burgundy's letter to the king; the seventh scene of the fourth act, wherein Charles's refusal to destroy the bodies of Talbot and his son is similar to Lewis XI's refusal to destroy Bedford's body as given in the chronicles; and the fourth scene of the fifth act, wherein peace is made between Charles and Henry, the terms of which are similar to those offered at the conference of Arras, according to the chronicles. In these scenes, the dramatist has treated the sources of his information more liberally than the other scenes are treated, changing details and transposing events at his will.

Characters of an unhistorical nature appear in several scenes of 1 Henry VI. Frequently appearing in the play are
such unhistorical characters as messengers, warders, a lawyer, jailors, servants, officers, a porter, a mayor, serving-men, a sergeant, sentinels, soldiers, a captain, a general, a legate, ambassadors, and fiends. None of these characters play an important part in the drama, but their roles are necessary for the unity of the play. Since these minor characters are of necessity added by the dramatist and since they appear in a majority of the scenes in the play, their presence in a scene is of little significance in attempting to determine the authorship of the scene. Several characters who play a rather important part in the play are unhistorical, these being the Countess of Auvergne, Vernon, Besset, Sir William Lucy, and the shepherd, who is Joan's father. The Countess of Auvergne, who arranges a meeting with Talbot, appears only in one scene, the third scene of the second act, though she is spoken of in the preceding scene. Vernon, of the York faction, appears in several scenes, these being the fourth scene of the second act, the fourth scene of the third act, and the first scene of the fourth act. Besset, of the Lancaster faction, appears in all the scenes in which Vernon appears, with the exception of the fourth scene of the second act. The unhistorical Sir William Lucy is included in three scenes, the third, fourth, and seventh scenes of the fourth act. While the chronicles merely mention the fact that Joan is a shepherd's daughter, the writer in the fourth scene of the fifth act dramatizes a meeting between Joan and her father.
while she is on trial for her life. It is interesting to note that the scenes in which the more important unhistorical characters appear are among the best scenes of the play.

In general, great liberty is taken with the order of events depicted in 1 Henry VI. The chronological order is changed so frequently throughout the play that we can hardly regard this point as a factor in ascertaining the play's authorship. Yet in some scenes, the manner in which incidents are shuffled back and forth is outstanding. For example, there are some scenes in which several incidents occurring years apart, according to history, are set forth in the same scene. Illustrative of this are the first scene of the first act, in which the historic time extends from 1422 to 1451; the fourth scene of the second act, in which the historic time extends from 1428 to 1433; the second and third scenes of the third act, in which the historic time of each extends from 1431 to 1435; and the fourth scene of the third act, in which the historic time extends from 1431 to 1442. The manner in which historic time is treated in the entire play is generally the same. Thus little importance can be attached to any conclusions drawn from such a mode of investigation in relation to the authorship of the play.

It seems improbable that some scenes of 1 Henry VI, in which there are discrepancies, could have been written by the same person. For instance, the writer of the first scene of the first act announces the loss of Paris to the French;
but the writer of the first scene of the fourth act is apparently unaware of the fact brought out in the opening scene of the play, for he tells of Henry's coronation at Paris. Perhaps the writer of the first scene of the fourth act was also the author of the second scene of the fifth act, in which Charles hears of the revolt of Paris from the English. In the third scene of the first act, Winchester appears in the role of a cardinal, but in the first scene of the fifth act, Exeter is surprised when Winchester enters, dressed in the robes of a cardinal. It appears unlikely that a single author would have been so inconsistent.

There are some scenes which show evidences of single authorship. The dramatist who wrote the third scene of the second act, in which the unhistorical Countess of Auvergne appears, must also have written the preceding scene, in which a message from the Countess to Telbot is delivered. The various scenes of the play in which there are quarrels between the factions of York and Lancaster show evidences of having been written by the same author, for their style of development is the same and the unhistorical characters of Vernon and Bassett appear in the scenes. Those scenes pertaining to the quarrels between the York and Lancaster factions are the fourth scene of the second act, the fourth scene of the third act, and the first scene of the fourth act. The fifth, sixth, and seventh scenes of the fourth act were in all probability written by the same author, for there is a continuity of
action pervading all three scenes, and only one source, Hall's Chronicle, is used.

The best scenes in the play are those about Talbot and his son, Suffolk's wooing of Margeret, the quarrels between York and Somerset, the meeting between Talbot and the Countess of Auvergne, and the visit of Plantagenet to Mortimer. All of these scenes are mostly of the author's invention and show more dramatic skill than do some of the other scenes.

The following tables are included for the purpose of showing more clearly the manner in which the scenes follow the chronicles and for the purpose of making more evident the similarities and differences between the various scenes of the play. Through the grouping of scenes in the tables, we can more readily ascertain the scenes which we believe to have been written by Shakespeare. Table 1 shows the scenes which have historical sources and also shows the chronicle or chronicles which are used as sources in those scenes. In general, it is impossible to tell whether Holinshed's Chronicles or Hall's Chronicle is the source, but in two instances Holinshed is consulted by the dramatist instead of Hall. Hall, however, is clearly the source in five instances. In one scene of the play, there are evidences that both Holinshed and Hall furnish material. Only in four scenes of the drama are chronicles other than those of Holinshed and Hall used.
# TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holinshed’s Chronicles Used</th>
<th>Hall’s Chronicle Used</th>
<th>Impossible to Tell whether Hall or Holinshed Is Used</th>
<th>Both Holinshed and Hall Used</th>
<th>Chronicles Other than Those of Holinshed and Hall Also Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act I, scene 2</td>
<td>Act II, scene 3</td>
<td>Act I, scene 1</td>
<td>Act V, scene 1</td>
<td>Act I, scene 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
<td>Act II, scene 5</td>
<td>Act I, scene 4</td>
<td>Act III, scene 1</td>
<td>Act III, scene 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III, scene 3</td>
<td>Act II, scene 5</td>
<td>Act I, scene 5</td>
<td>Act III, scene 1</td>
<td>Act III, scene 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 5</td>
<td>Act II, scene 6</td>
<td>Act II, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 6</td>
<td>Act II, scene 1</td>
<td>Act II, scene 4</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 2</td>
<td>Act III, scene 4</td>
<td>Act III, scene 4</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 3</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 4</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 illustrates the manner in which the chronicle material is used in the various scenes of *1 Henry VI*. A few scenes follow the chronicles closely, but the majority of the scenes follow the sources loosely. In many of the scenes important incidents are developed that are not contained in the chronicles. In other scenes, the dramatist changes material in regard to name, date, or characters, introduces characters of an unhistorical nature, and often changes the order of
events. The manner in which the historical material is treated aids in the selection of the scenes written by one dramatist and those written by another.

**Table 2**

**Ways in Which Chronicle Material Is Used in the Various Scenes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronicles Followed Loosely</th>
<th>Chronicles Followed Closely</th>
<th>Important Incidents Developed That Are Not in Chronicles</th>
<th>Material Changed in Regard to Name, Date, or Characters</th>
<th>Characters of Unhistorical Nature Introduced</th>
<th>Order of Events Changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act I, scene 2</td>
<td>Act I, scene 1</td>
<td>Act II, scene 3</td>
<td>Act I, scene 2</td>
<td>Act II, scene 3</td>
<td>Act I, scene 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act I, scene 4</td>
<td>Act I, scene 3</td>
<td>Act II, scene 4</td>
<td>Act I, scene 4</td>
<td>Act II, scene 4</td>
<td>Act I, scene 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act I, scene 5</td>
<td>Act III, scene 1</td>
<td>Act II, scene 5</td>
<td>Act II, scene 1</td>
<td>Act III, scene 4</td>
<td>Act II, scene 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act I, scene 6</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act III, scene 4</td>
<td>Act III, scene 2</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act II, scene 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 6</td>
<td>Act III, scene 4</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 3</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 4</td>
<td>Act II, scene 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 2</td>
<td>Act V, scene 2</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 4</td>
<td>Act II, scene 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 3</td>
<td>Act V, scene 3</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 7</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 4</td>
<td>Act II, scene 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 4</td>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
<td>Act V, scene 5</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 7</td>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
<td>Act III, scene 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 5</td>
<td>Act V, scene 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
<td>Act III, scene 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III, scene 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
<td>Act III, scene 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III, scene 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III, scene 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronicles Followed Loosely</th>
<th>Chronicles Followed Closely</th>
<th>Important Incidents Developed That Are Not in Chronicles</th>
<th>Material Changed in Regard to Name, Date, or Characters</th>
<th>Characters of Unhistorical Nature Introduced</th>
<th>Order of Events Changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table gives a list of the scenes in the play in which there are discrepancies. The inconsistencies apparent in these scenes convince us that the drama must not have been written by one author.

TABLE 3

SCENES OF 1 HENRY VI IN WHICH THERE ARE DISCREPANCIES

Act I, scene 1
Act I, scene 3
Act IV, scene 1
Act V, scene 1
Act V, scene 2

Some scenes of 1 Henry VI are much superior to other scenes in the play. This knowledge is another factor which leads
us to believe that the play is not of single authorship.

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Scene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An investigation of *1 Henry VI* leads us to believe that the play could not have been written by a single author. The use made of sources is the most important factor upon which I base my belief that the play is of double authorship. Some similarities among the better scenes of the play are noticeable. In most of these scenes it is impossible to determine whether Holinshed or Hall is the source, but when one chronicle is used to the exclusion of the other, Hall is employed in all but one instance. Febyen’s *Chronicle* is not used at all in the best scenes of *1 Henry VI*, but Crompton’s *Mansion of Magnanimity* is referred to only once in the play. This reference occurs in one of the better scenes, which point might indicate that the inferior dramatist was not acquainted with Crompton or, at least, did not refer to his writing.

Notable is the fact that all the better scenes of the play follow the chronicles loosely, with the exception of the fifth and sixth scenes of the fourth act. However, in these
two scenes, the dramatist is following Hell's Chronicle closely for the story of young Talbot and his father, a story which, as found in Hell, does not require much dressing-up for dramatic interest. The fact that all the better scenes, except two which evidently were of sufficient dramatic interest to warrant the dramatist's approval, followed the chronicles loosely is another basis for the assumption that the better scenes are by a superior dramatist than are the remaining scenes. In all the better scenes, which we here assign to Shakespeare, important incidents are developed that are not recorded in the chronicles, except in the case of the two scenes concerning Talbot and his young son. The fact that the unhistorical characters of the Countess of Auvergne, Vernon, and Basset appear only in the best scenes of the play is another favorable sign that one dramatist was the author of these scenes. The fact that some scenes of the play are far superior to other scenes is another reason for the conclusion that the play has more than one author. It is not plausible that the dramatist who wrote the better scenes of the play could have descended to the haphazard style in which other scenes are written.

The scenes which I believe to have been written by Shakespeare set forth the growth of fection between York and Somerset and their respective followers, Talbot's meeting with the Countess of Auvergne, Richard Plantagenet's interview with Mortimer, the story of young Talbot's devotion to his father,
and the wooing of Margaret by Suffolk in behalf of the king. All of these scenes, with the exception of the three scenes concerning Talbot and his son, show a continuity of thought and purpose on the author's part, and they commence a story which is further developed in the succeeding plays of 2 and 3 Henry VI. It is evident that the scenes portraying the evils of civil and domestic strife of which I believe Shakespeare to have been the author link 1 Henry VI with 2 and 3 Henry VI. Since the scenes in 2 and 3 Henry VI concerning the strife between the Houses of York and Lancaster are often assigned to Shakespeare, we are led to believe that the same author must have written the corresponding scenes in 1 Henry VI.

The discrepancies which are apparent in 1 Henry VI furnish additional evidence that the play is of dual authorship. The first scene of the first act relates the loss of Paris to French forces, but in the first scene of the fourth act the writer seems unaware of such a loss, for he tells of Henry's coronation at Paris. Since the characters of Vernon and Basset appear in the latter scene and since we assign all the scenes in which Vernon and Basset appear to Shakespeare, the first scene of the fourth act is evidently by Shakespeare and the opening scene of the play by the inferior dramatist. Neither is the writer of the second scene of the fifth act aware of the loss of Paris as brought out in the opening scene of the play; so we naturally conclude that the second scene of
Act V must also have been by Shakespeare. Since this scene refers to the division of the English army and the Frenchmen's fear of Talbot, facts brought out in the other scenes assigned to Shakespeare, it is apparent that the scene shows indications of Shakespeare's authorship. Some discrepancies are to be found in the third scene of the first act and the first scene of the fifth act. In the former scene, Winchester is represented as being a cardinal, but in the latter scene, Exeter, who is Winchester's brother, shows surprise at seeing Winchester dressed as a cardinal. The first scene of the fifth act shows signs of being by Shakespeare, for in the scene the author brings out plans for the marriage of the king to the daughter of the Earl of Armagnac. Since I believe that the scenes concerning the plans of marriage between Henry and Margaret to have been by Shakespeare, it is natural to conclude that the same author wrote all three of the scenes pertaining to Henry's choosing of a wife. Since the third scene of the first act is inconsistent with the first scene of the fifth act and shows no indications of Shakespeare's authorship, I conclude that it was written by the inferior dramatist. The following table shows the scenes which give indication of Shakespeare's authorship. Shakespeare's hand is not evident in any of the scenes of the first act of Henry VI, and only one scene, the fourth, of Act II shows signs of his authorship. Only twelve of the twenty-seven scenes of the play are here assigned to Shakespeare.
### TABLE 5

**SCENES WHICH SHOW SIGNS OF SHAKESPEARE'S AUTHORSHIP**

- Act II, scene 3
- Act II, scene 4
- Act II, scene 5
- Act III, scene 4
- Act IV, scene 1
- Act IV, scene 5
- Act IV, scene 6
- Act IV, scene 7
- Act V, scene 1
- Act V, scene 2
- Act V, scene 3
- Act V, scene 5

The following table shows the sources followed in the scenes assigned to Shakespeare and those assigned to the inferior dramatist.

### TABLE 6

**SOURCES FOLLOWED IN THE SCENES ASSIGNED TO SHAKESPEARE AND THOSE ASSIGNED TO ANOTHER DRAMATIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenes Assigned to Shakespeare</th>
<th>Holinshed or Hall the Source</th>
<th>Holinshed the Source</th>
<th>Hall the Source</th>
<th>Crompton the Source</th>
<th>Fabyan the Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 4</td>
<td>Act V, scene 1</td>
<td>Act II, scene 3</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III, scene 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenes Assigned to Shakespeare</td>
<td>Holinshed or Hall the Source</td>
<td>Holinshed the Source</td>
<td>Hall the Source</td>
<td>Crompton the Source</td>
<td>Fabyan the Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act I, scene 1</td>
<td>Act I, scene 2</td>
<td>Act III, scene 3</td>
<td>Act I, scene 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act I, scene 4</td>
<td>Act V, scene 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Act III, scene 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act I, scene 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act III, scene 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preceding table shows more clearly the fact that, in the scenes I have assigned to Shakespeare, the dramatist did not use Fabyan as a source. The table also points out that the inferior dramatist did not use Crompton as a source. In the scenes I have assigned to a dramatist other than Shakespeare, the chronicle sources are followed more closely. The unknown dramatist also consults Holinshed as a source more than he does Hall, while Shakespeare refers to Hall more often.

Many attempts have been made by scholars to solve the problem of the authorship of 1 Henry VI. Some scholars
merely assign certain scenes to Shakespeare without attempting to name the other dramatists who, according to their belief, had a hand in the play. An agreement has not been reached by critics as to the correct division of scenes according to authorship, for no scholar has given such conclusive proof in behalf of his argument that other scholars are willing to reject their own theories regarding the problem. The following table summarizes the opinion of Sir Edmund Chambers concerning the authorship of the play.

**TABLE 7**

OPINION OF SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP OF *1 HENRY VI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section (a) by One Dramatist</th>
<th>Section (b) by One Dramatist</th>
<th>Section (c) by Author of Section (b)</th>
<th>Section (d) by Third Dramatist</th>
<th>Section (e) by Shakespeare</th>
<th>Section (f) by Shakespeare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act I, scenes 1, 3</td>
<td>Act I, scenes 2, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>Act IV, scenes 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 1-32</td>
<td>Act V, scenes 5, 11, 45-end; 5</td>
<td>Act II, scene 4</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 5</td>
<td>Act II, scenes 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III, scenes 1, 4</td>
<td>Act III, scenes 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scenes 1, 4</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 7, 11, 33-end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scenes 1, 4, 11. 94-end</td>
<td>Act V, scenes 2, 3, 11, 1-44; 4, 11, 1-93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the opinion of G. G. Gervinus concerning the authorship of 1 Henry VI. Gervinus does not attempt to identify the dramatists who collaborated with Shakespeare in writing the play.

**TABLE 8**

OPINION OF G. G. GERVINUS CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP OF 1 HENRY VI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenes by Shakespeare</th>
<th>Scenes by Other Dramatists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 3</td>
<td>Act I, scenes 1, 2, 3, 4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 4</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 5</td>
<td>Act II, scenes 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III, scene 4</td>
<td>Act III, scenes 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act IV, scenes 2, 3, 4, 5,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 3</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 5</td>
<td>Act V, scenes 1, 2, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 9 shows the manner in which F. G. Fleay divides the play. He believes that three writers, Marlowe, Peele, and Shakespeare, had a part in the writing of 1 Henry VI.

**TABLE 9**

OPINION OF F. G. FLEAY CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP OF 1 HENRY VI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenes by Marlowe</th>
<th>Scenes by Peele</th>
<th>Scenes by Shakespeare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act I, scenes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>Act I, scene 3</td>
<td>Act II, scenes 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scenes 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Act III, scene 4</td>
<td>Act IV, scenes 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III, scenes 2, 3</td>
<td>Act IV, scene 1</td>
<td>Act V, scene 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scenes 3a, 4a, 5</td>
<td>Act V, scenes 1, 3b, 4b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like Gervinus, Sidney Lee does not attempt to name the dramatists who collaborated with Shakespeare in the writing of *1 Henry VI*. Table 10 shows how the scenes of the play are divided by Lee.

**TABLE 10**

OPINION OF SIDNEY LEE CONCERNING THE AUTHORSHIP OF *1 HENRY VI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenes by Shakespeare</th>
<th>Scenes by Other Dramatists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 4</td>
<td>Act I, scenes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II, scene 5</td>
<td>Act II, scenes 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 4</td>
<td>Act III, scenes 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 5</td>
<td>Act IV, scenes 1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 6</td>
<td>Act V, scenes 1, 2, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV, scene 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V, scene 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Allison Gaw, one of the outstanding critics concerning the problem of the authorship of *1 Henry VI*, believes that harey the *vj* was the original of *1 Henry VI* and thinks that the original play was written by Marlowe, Peele, and probably Greene and Nashe. Gaw is of the opinion that Shakespeare revised some of the play and added some new material to the play in a few scenes. Table 11 gives the scene division of the play, the dramatists who Gaw believes were the authors of harey the *vj*, and the extent to which Gaw believes Shakespeare participated in the writing of the play. According to Gaw, Shakespeare participated more in the writing of the fourth act of the play than in any other act.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene Division</th>
<th>Author in herey the vi</th>
<th>Shakespeare's Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 1</td>
<td>Marlowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 2</td>
<td>B (probably Greene)</td>
<td>Slight additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 3</td>
<td>Marlowe and B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scenes 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scenes 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Entirely new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 5</td>
<td>Marlowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 1</td>
<td>Marlowe</td>
<td>Lines 1-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 2</td>
<td>C (probably Nashe)</td>
<td>Lines 50-56?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 4</td>
<td>Marlowe and B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 1</td>
<td>Marlowe and B</td>
<td>Largely rewritten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 2</td>
<td>Peele</td>
<td>Largely rewritten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 3</td>
<td>Peele</td>
<td>Interpolations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 4</td>
<td>Peele</td>
<td>Rewritten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scenes 5, 6</td>
<td>Peele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 7, 11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-50</td>
<td>Peele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 7, 11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-96</td>
<td>Peele</td>
<td>Largely an interpolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 1</td>
<td>Marlowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 2</td>
<td>Peele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 3, 11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-44</td>
<td>Peele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 3, 11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-195</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entirely new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 4</td>
<td>Peele</td>
<td>Lines 56-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Added, not by Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gaw, op. cit., p. 159.*
Chambers asserts that the scenes which he has grouped under section (a) look forward to 2 and 3 Henry VI and resemble the style of the latter plays more nearly than anything else in the play. Section (a) includes the scene with Mortimer in the Tower, a scene which I have assigned to Shakespeare because of its superior style and because it shows York's intention to assert his claim to the throne. According to Chambers, however, the fifth scene of the second act is merely the best of the (a) scenes, which he assigns to one dramatist. Three other scenes are included in section (a) which I believe to have been by Shakespeare. These are the fourth scene of the third act, in which Talbot is made an earl and Basset and Vernon quarrel; the first scene of the fourth act, in which York and Somerset quarrel; and the first scene of the fifth act, which sets forth the betrothal of the king to the daughter of the Earl of Arran. Because I believe that all the scenes which refer to York and his dispute with Lancaster are by Shakespeare, I have grouped the fourth scene of the third act and the first scene of the fourth act under Shakespeare's authorship. My reason for believing Shakespeare wrote the first scene of the fifth act is that it is likely that Shakespeare wrote all the scenes of the play pertaining to the king's marriage. Moreover, the fifth scene of Act I is inconsistent with the scenes which I have assigned to the inferior dramatist. The scenes which come under section (b) are, according to Chambers, of a very
inferior style. While Chambers assigns section (b) to a second dramatist, I have seen Shakespeare's authorship in four of the scenes in (b). The four scenes which I believe are Shakespeare's are the third scene of the second act, in which Talbot foils the Countess of Auvergne; the seventh scene of the fourth act, in which Talbot and his son die; the second scene of the fifth act, in which the Parisian revolt to the French; and the third scene of the fifth act, in which Suffolk woos Margaret. Though I assign the Talbot death-scenes, which come under section (c), to Shakespeare, Chambers thinks it more likely that they are by the author of (b). Chambers thinks section (d), containing the Suffolk and Margaret scenes, is by a third hand, but I believe the scenes portraying Suffolk's wooing of Margaret to be by Shakespeare. I agree with Chambers that the Temple Garden scene is Shakespeare's, but I see no logical reason for Chambers' belief that Act IV, scene 2, an unrhymed Talbot scene, is by Shakespeare. Chambers would have us believe that Shakespeare played a very small part in the writing of 1 Henry VI because the style of most of the scenes is inferior to Shakespeare's usual style. We must remember, however, that 1 Henry VI was one of Shakespeare's early plays and that it was written at a time when Shakespeare had not developed into his full dramatic power.

The seven scenes which Gervinus designates as Shakespeare's are the same ones which I believe to have been
written by Shakespeare. However, I have attributed five
more scenes to Shakespeare than has Gervinus. While Gervi-
num believes the remaining scenes to be by more than one
dramatist, he does not attempt to identify the various
dramatists or to divide the remaining scenes among them.

F. G. Fleay divides the play among Marlowe, Peele,
and Shakespeare. Only seven of the nine scenes which Fleay
believes to have been written by Shakespeare are in agree-
ment with the scenes which I have grouped under Shakespeare's
scenes. Fleay adds the second and third scenes of the fourth
act to Shakespeare's hand, while I have assigned these scenes,
concerning Talbot's expeditions in Bordeaux, to the inferior
dramatist. Four of the scenes which I think were written by
Shakespeare are assigned to Peele by Fleay. Fleay believes
Marlowe to have been the author of three scenes which I have
attributed to Shakespeare.

Like Chambers, Sidney Lee believes that only a few
scenes of 1 Henry VI bear the impress of Shakespeare's style.
All but one of the seven scenes which Lee believes to have
been written by Shakespeare agree with the scenes I have
assigned to Shakespeare. Yet I have seen Shakespeare's
style in six scenes which are not mentioned by Lee. Like
Gervinus, Fleay, and Gw, Lee believes the fourth scene of
the fifth act to have been written by Shakespeare, though I
can find no indications of Shakespeare's style in the scene.
Allison Gaw asserts that the original play of 1 Henry VI was here the vi. Gaw assigns here the vi to four authors, Marlowe, Peele, and probably Nashe and Greene, and then indicates the scenes of the old play which Shakespeare wrote, rewrote, or interpolated. Gaw thinks that Shakespeare made slight additions to the second scene of the first act, a scene in which Chambers, Gervinus, Fleay, and Lee are not aware of Shakespeare's style. Like other critics, Gaw believes the Temple Garden scene to be entirely Shakespeare's. Though Gaw mentions several lines in the first and second scenes of the third act as being Shakespeare's, I have not included these scenes as Shakespeare's. Gaw is of the opinion that the first, second, third, fourth, and seventh scenes of the fourth act were rewritten or interpolated by Shakespeare. In my opinion only the first and seventh scenes of the fourth act exhibit any signs of Shakespeare. My opinion is in accordance with Gaw's in regard to Shakespeare's authorship of the Mergeret-Suffolk scene. Unlike most critics, Gaw believes several lines of Act V, scene 4, in which Joan is condemned to the stake, to be by Shakespeare. Gaw says that the last scene of the play was added to here the vi, but not by Shakespeare. I agree with Gervinus in claiming Act V, scene 5, as Shakespeare's.

The only scene which all critics agree is Shakespeare's is the Temple Garden scene. Otherwise, the critics are at
complete variance, some asserting that the Telbot death-scenes and others are by Shakespeare, others emphatically denying that the scenes are by Shakespeare. As a whole, the scenes which are most often attributed to Shakespeare are the scene in which Telbot meets the Countess of Auvergne, the Temple Garden scene, the Mortimer death-scene, the scenes which develop the dissension between York and Somerset and their followers, the Telbot death-scenes, and the scene in which Suffolk woos Margaret. No two of the critics whose opinions I have studied have reached a mutual agreement as to the scenes which Shakespeare wrote. Not only do the critics vary in their opinions of Shakespeare's scenes, but they also differ in regard to the identity of the other dramatists and the scenes which they wrote.

In this study of the authorship of 1 Henry VI, I have seen evidences of the double authorship of the play, but I have discovered no reason for asserting that the play had more than two authors. I have distinguished between the scenes of Shakespeare and those of the inferior dramatist by studying the style of scenes, similarities between scenes as regards treatment of sources, and the discrepancies contained in some scenes. I have named twelve scenes which I believe to have been written by Shakespeare. These twelve scenes pertain to the meeting of Telbot and the Countess of Auvergne, the quarrels of York and Somerset, the quarrels of Vernon and Basset in behalf of York and Somerset, the Mortimer
death-scene, the Telbot death-scenes, Henry's betrothal to the daughter of the Earl of Armagnac, the revolt of Paris to the French, and Suffolk's attempts to arrange a marriage between Margeret and Henry. These scenes, more than any others in the play, are of the author's invention. In these scenes, he uses material gathered from the chronicles, but he transforms the material into a more interesting and dramatic form. The chronicle material, which Shakespeare follows very loosely, is often changed in regard to dates, names, or characters. Important incidents which are not recorded in the chronicles are added for interest by the dramatist. Thus it is apparent that there is a close relationship between the sources used and the authorship of the play. Shakespeare does not follow the chronicles so faithfully as does his collaborator. Neither does Shakespeare use Fabian as a source as does the other writer. Nor does the inferior dramatist refer to Crompton as does Shakespeare. Since it is improbable that the writer of a play would in one scene follow the chronicles rigidly and in the next scene follow the historical material very loosely, I am convinced that the play has two authors, Shakespeare and an unknown dramatist. Furthermore, since the scenes in which the author consults Fabian follow the chronicles closely and are of inferior style to other scenes in the play, I naturally conclude that these scenes were not written by Shakespeare.
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