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Abstract

This edition presents a fully modernised and annotated text of Samuel Rowley’s *When You See Me, You Know Me*, first performed by Prince Henry’s Men at the Fortune playhouse c. 1604. The earliest extant playtext to represent King Henry VIII as a character on the early modern stage, *When You See Me* dramatizes a number of key events in the Tudor king’s reign including, as per the play’s subtitle, ‘the birth and virtuous life of Edward, Prince of Wales’. The play was first printed in 1605, with subsequent editions appearing in 1613, 1621 and 1632. Despite its apparent success on the Fortune stage, however, the play has become increasingly marginalized since the mid-seventeenth century, receiving only cursory critical attention. In addition to making the text of Rowley’s play accessible to a modern readership, this edition aims to rehabilitate *When You See Me* as an important dramatization of the Henrician Reformation; it also seeks to draw attention to Rowley and his long and influential career in the early modern theatre.

The introduction to the edition is divided into two main parts, focusing respectively on the author and the play; the latter is subdivided to include separate critical, bibliographical and editorial introductions. The Critical Introduction provides information on the play’s composition and performance history, including aspects of its performance on the Fortune stage and its position within the extant company repertory; the Bibliographical Introduction considers the play’s entrance in the Stationers’ Register and the manuscript used as printers’ copy, as well as the physical manufacture of its first edition and the text’s treatment in later and modern editions; and the Editorial Introduction provides comment on the specific methodologies employed in the production of the edition, with particular reference to the Arden Early Modern Drama editorial guidelines upon which the text is based.

The appendices provide useful supplementary information, including Rowley’s likely source material; doubling charts; current locations of extant copies; bibliographical descriptions; press variants; and photographs of the copy-text.
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A note on the text

Quotations from When You See Me, You Know Me are keyed to this edition. Works from Shakespeare are cited from the most recent Arden editions.

Although old spellings are maintained in some citations, I have silently modernised the long ‘s’ and altered ‘vv’ to ‘w’; contractions are also expanded throughout with the conjectured letters italicised. The start of the year has been taken as 1 January.
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PART 1

INTRODUCTION TO
SAMUEL ROWLEY
Background to Samuel Rowley

Samuel Rowley was an important individual in the early modern theatre. An actor, playwright and sharer in the Admiral’s Men, he maintained a significant and authoritative position in the company for perhaps as many as thirty years. Yet his role has been sorely overlooked, both in relation to the company’s more better-known actors and dramatists, and in relation to others known to have occupied a tripartite role in the theatre – William Shakespeare, in particular. The biography provided in this section aims to redress this imbalance. Considering the various elements of Rowley’s career, it serves to position When You See Me, You Know Me in the context of Rowley’s wider canon and of his theatrical career as a whole. It also seeks to combine evidence from official documents and parish registers with Rowley’s known movements in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries to develop a fuller account of the playwright’s life than has hitherto been attempted. For practicality, elements of Rowley’s non- and extra-theatrical life are considered apart from his theatrical career – itself a complex and controversial puzzle, as detailed below. However, a general timeline, covering both strands of Rowley’s biography, is provided in Appendix 1.

The earliest known record of Samuel Rowley is the entrance of his marriage to Alice Coley in the parish register of St Michael, Crooked Lane in Candlewick Ward on 7 April 1594.1 F. P. Wilson, in the introduction to his edition of When You See Me, was reluctant to associate the entry with the dramatist, but the more recent discovery of Rowley’s will in the 1960s confirms the association, since in it Rowley

---

1 The entry was first noted by Mark Eccles in ‘Jonson’s Marriage’, RES, 12.47 (1936), 257–72 (p. 261); the parish register is now located at the LMA (P69/MIC3/A/001/MS11367). See also Bentley, JCS, II.555.
bequeathed ‘[a]ll the rest of my goodes debtes, and Chattelles not geuen, nor bequeathed … vnto my louing wife Alice Rowley’.  

As J. A. B. Somerset suggests, ‘[o]nly conjecture, supported by circumstantial evidence’, can give any clue as to Rowley’s birth or parentage. He does, however, draw attention to two register entries that may shed light on the latter: the marriage of one Robert Rowley to Mary Tye at Trinity Church, Ely in 1560; and the marriage of Mary Tye’s sister, Ellen, to Robert White, the current ‘informator choristarum’ at the Cathedral Church of Ely, in 1564. Somerset interprets these records to suggest a possible family connection between Samuel Rowley and Dr Christopher Tye, Robert White’s predecessor as organist and choirmaster at Ely and the man dramatized so effectively as Prince Edward’s music tutor in When You See Me. Significantly, Nigel Davison provides further evidence to back up this early conjecture, namely the will of Ellen White nee Tye, which confirms that Christopher was her father. This in turn suggests that Samuel Rowley may have been the grandson of Dr Christopher Tye. Not only would this indicate that Rowley was born into a family of higher social status than a number of his fellow actors and playwrights, but it would also explain the reasoning behind Rowley’s full and seemingly unprecedented depiction of Tye on the early modern London stage.

---

2 The will, dated 23 July and proved on 4 December 1624, was discovered by J. A. B. Somerset; it is now housed at the LMA (former GL MS 9172/34). The will was transcribed by Somerset in ‘New facts concerning Samuel Rowley’, RES, 17.67 (1966), 293–7, and more recently in E. A. J. Honigmann and Susan Brock (eds.), Playhouse Wills, 1558–1642: An edition of wills by Shakespeare and his contemporaries in the London theatre (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), pp. 138–40. All citations are taken from Honigmann and Brock’s transcription, with which my own reading accords.

3 Somerset, p. xx. John H. Astington provides a possible birth date of c. 1575 for Rowley, but there is no evidence to back this up. See Actors and Acting in Shakespeare’s Time (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 213.

4 Somerset, p. xx.

5 Somerset, p. xx.

Very little is known about Rowley’s early life. If, as suggested below, he first came to London to act and write for the Queen’s Men in the early to mid-1580s, it is likely that he lived for some years prior to this with his family in Cambridgeshire, perhaps near Trinity Church, Ely, where Mary and Robert Rowley married in the 1560s. One possible reference to Rowley’s education exists in Francis Meres’ *Palladis tamia*, in which it is noted that a ‘Maister Rowley’, one of ‘the best for Comedy’ in the present age, was once ‘a rare Scholler of learned Pembrooke Hall in Cambridge’.\(^7\) Since, as discussed in greater detail below, Rowley seems to have had a hand in a number of Queen’s Men’s plays before joining the Admiral’s in the 1590s, it is likely that he first gained a reputation for comedy with this company. The man in question is unlikely to be actor and playwright William Rowley, since William’s theatrical career seems to have commenced at a much later date.\(^8\)

Evidence from Samuel Rowley’s will (Fig. 1) also strengthens the likelihood that he was the brother of William Rowley, himself an actor with the King’s Men at the time of Samuel’s death: ‘Item I giue and bequeath vnto my Brother William Rowley All my Bookes’. Another brother, Thomas Rowley, received forty shillings. Quite possibly, this is the same Thomas Rowley whose name appears with Samuel’s in the stage plot for *1 Tamar Cam*, revived by the Admiral’s Men at the Fortune in 1602.\(^9\) Rowley also makes reference in his will to a daughter, Jane Adams; a son-in-law, Richard Adams who, along with Alice Rowley, acted as executor; a nephew,\(^7\) Francis Meres, *Palladis tamia: Wits treasury being the second part of Wits common wealth.* (London: printed by P[eter] Short for Cuthbert Burbie, 1598), *STC* 17834, p. 283.

\(^8\) William Rowley’s name does not appear in theatrical records until 1607; his first mention as an actor is in May 1609, when he appears as a member of the newly formed Duke of York’s Men. See David Gunby, ‘Rowley, William (1585?–1626)’, *ODNB*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, September 2013 <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24227> [accessed 10 April 2014].

\(^9\) A transcription and facsimile of the plot can be found in Greg’s *Dramatic Documents*, vol. 2, no. 7. See also *Henslowe’s Diary*, pp. 332–3.
Richard Rowley; and a grandson, Samuel Adams.\textsuperscript{10} Four entries in the parish register of St Mary Matfelon, Whitechapel may refer to members of Rowley’s family. A ‘daughter of Samuell Rowly’, Mary, was baptised at the church on 5 March 1602 (f. 46\textsuperscript{v}), but was subsequently buried on 24 July 1603 (f. 51\textsuperscript{v}); she may, as Somerset suggests, have died of the plague.\textsuperscript{11} On 24 May 1607, another ‘Marye daughter of Samuell Rowley’ was baptised at St Mary’s Church (f. 58\textsuperscript{v}), but just three months later, on 28 July, she too was buried (f. 60\textsuperscript{r}). If these entries refer to the same Samuel Rowley, as would appear to be the case, then they confirm that Samuel and Alice were resident in Whitechapel by 1601. Given that Rowley’s burial is also recorded in the registers of St Mary Matfelin (f. 150\textsuperscript{r}) and that a Samuel Rowley performed a number of civic duties in Whitechapel, it seems reasonable to assume that the couple remained in the parish for the duration of their married life.

\textbf{Figure 1}: Rowley’s original will, former GL MS 9172/34. Image reproduced by kind permission of the London Metropolitan Archives.

\textsuperscript{10} The record in the parish register of St Mary Matfelin, Whitechapel (London County Record Office: P93/MRY/1/1) of the marriage of ‘Rich: Adams et Jane Rowley’ on 20 May 1616 almost certainly refers to Rowley’s daughter (f. 77\textsuperscript{r}), though there does not appear to be any reference to her baptism.

\textsuperscript{11} Somerset, p. xxxiv.
Some of Rowley’s civic duties were bound up with his role as a member of Prince Henry’s Men or, as he is styled on the title-page of *When You See Me*, as a ‘servant to the Prince’. On 15 March 1604, for example, Rowley – along with a number of other players from the three royal acting companies – was granted four yards of red cloth for livery to wear as he marched as part of the king’s royal entrance into the City of London. Eight and a half years later, Rowley was again granted cloth for livery, this time in his capacity as a Groom of the Chamber for the young Prince Henry’s funeral in 1612.\(^\text{12}\) The majority of Rowley’s civic responsibilities, however, were more specific to Whitechapel. On 12 October 1610, for instance, a ‘Samuel Rowlie’ acted as surety with Edward Hide for two yeomen of Whitechapel, Hugh Evans and Robert Wakefield, who had been arrested ‘for committinge a verie foule Riott with some others’.\(^\text{13}\) Rowley and Hide, both named as gentlemen in the record, paid the Lieutenant of the Tower Sir William Waad forty pounds to bail them out. The name appears again in the records when Rowley acted as a member of the Middlesex jury panel, once in 1610 and again in 1611; by 1 September 1624, just six weeks before the playwright’s death, Rowley was named as foreman of the jury.\(^\text{14}\) Finally, when several men were bound over in 1618, the accompanying notes in the records read: ‘Samuell Rowley Constable of Whitechappell to prowe it’.\(^\text{15}\)

Although there is no concrete evidence to connect this Samuel Rowley to the playwright, both the location of the records and the frequency with which this name appears in parish and other official registers and documents of the time allows for a

---

\(^{12}\) Information from documents PRO LC 2/4/5 and PRO LC 2/4/6, both housed at TNA.


fairly positive identification.\textsuperscript{16} That such records halt in late 1624, at the time of the playwright’s death, further strengthens the possibility. Another Samuel Rowley, a merchant tailor, is known to have been alive during the first two decades of the seventeenth century; the entry of his burial in the parish registers of St Giles, Cripplegate was recorded by G. E. Bentley in 1929.\textsuperscript{17} This Samuel Rowley, however, is not known to have had any connections with Whitechapel. Moreover, the Samuel Rowley noted as foreman of the jury in the Whitechapel records performed this role in September 1624, nearly four years after the merchant tailor’s burial in November 1620. Of the two men, only the playwright could have taken on the responsibility at this time.

Another possible reference to Rowley can be found in the London lay subsidy rolls (1593–1600), many of which have been transcribed and digitized by Alan H. Nelson.\textsuperscript{18} The rolls are a useful means of isolating individuals ‘of sufficient wealth to be taxed’ – individuals, Nelson suggests, of ‘lower middle class and above’ and worth upwards of three pounds at the time of assessment. ‘Samuel Rowley’ appears in Middlesex Subsidy Roll 234, dated 1 October 1600, under the section headed ‘Whitechappell adhuc’ (\textit{Fig. 2}).\textsuperscript{19} Once again, both the location and date of the record accord with Rowley’s known movements.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17} G. E. Bentley, ‘Records of Players in the Parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate’, \textit{PMLA}, 44.3 (September, 1929), 789–826 (pp. 817–18).
\item \textsuperscript{18} See Alan H. Nelson, ‘Lay Subsidy Returns’ <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~ahnelson/SUBSIDY/subs.html> [accessed 3 February 2014].
\item \textsuperscript{19} Document PRO E179/142/234 (Osulston K3 79) at TNA. Nelson provides the following information: ‘3rd Subsidy granted 1597, assessment date 1 October 1600’. Alan H. Nelson, ‘Middlesex Subsidy Roll 234’ <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~ahnelson/SUBSIDY/M234.html> [accessed 3 February 2014].
\end{itemize}
Not only does this show that Rowley was sufficiently wealthy to occasion a mention in the rolls (a sum of three pounds is recorded alongside his name), it also confirms that he was resident in Whitechapel in the very early 1600s, and certainly before the entry of his daughter Mary’s baptism in March 1602 – the earliest known reference to Rowley’s parish of residency. Significantly, Rowley’s name is absent in the earlier Middlesex Roll 239, dated 1 October 1598. This may indicate a rise in wealth over the two-year period from 1598 to 1600, perhaps concurrent with Rowley’s acquisition of sharer status at the Rose (see below). It may also suggest that Samuel and Alice lived elsewhere prior to the 1600 assessment. It is tempting to think that the couple’s move to Whitechapel coincided with the company’s move to the Fortune in 1600, but in the absence of further evidence this must remain a matter for conjecture. As S. P. Cerasano notes,

---

'some of the players in the Admiral’s–Prince’s–Palsgrave’s Men who began their careers at the Rose Playhouse in Southwark … probably maintained property in both locales’.\textsuperscript{21} This might have been true of Rowley, though the list of leases, tenements and properties mentioned in Rowley’s will includes only residencies north of the Thames.\textsuperscript{22} Certainly, there are no extant records to suggest that Rowley ever held property on Bankside.

A further possible reference to Rowley can be found in a letter to Edward Alleyn dated 1 April 1620 from one of his lessees, Haris Jones, in which an agent, ‘m’ Rowly’, is named as Alleyn’s rent collector (Fig. 3). W. W. Greg, in his edition of the \textit{Henslowe Papers}, was unwilling to assign the role to Samuel, stating simply: ‘Whether Samuel Rowley, the Palsgrave’s man, or William, Prince Charles’ man, was intended does not appear: probably one or the other’.\textsuperscript{23} However, Samuel’s longstanding career alongside Alleyn, first at the Rose and then at the Fortune, would suggest him as the more likely candidate in this instance. Although it is difficult to determine precisely when he retired as an actor from the Palsgrave’s Men (see below), it is generally supposed that Rowley stepped down from this position some time in the late 1610s. It is possible, therefore, to view this responsibility as an indirect continuation of Rowley’s theatrical career, through which, although not actively involved at the Fortune, he was still able to maintain links with its personnel.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22} A further reference to Rowley’s property may be found in document PRO, C54/2515, 71 at TNA, which makes reference to ‘the copyhold tenements of Samuel Rowley’. The citation is taken from the modernised version of the deed in Glynne Wickham, Herbert Berry and William Ingram (eds.), \textit{English Professional Theatre, 1530–1660} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 491.
\textsuperscript{24} It is possible that Rowley continued to write for the company even after he ceased acting (see below).
A second, undated letter sent by Haris Jones’s husband some time prior to Philip Henslowe’s death in 1616 confirms the lease detailed in Haris’s letter as the
Leopard’s Head public house in Shoreditch.\textsuperscript{25} Based on the existence of these two letters, Rowley’s involvement at the Leopard’s Head, and the lease mentioned in Samuel’s will – a property in Plough Alley owned by a ‘John Hope, gentleman’ – Somerset suggests that Rowley became a publican between 1613 and 1618: ‘No evidence disallows the speculation that Rowley retired from the stage … to look after Mrs Harri Jones’s establishment, and later acquired the lease to a tavern of his own’.\textsuperscript{26} While this is certainly possible, there is not enough evidence to confirm Somerset’s supposition.

Rowley was buried in the parish of St Mary Matfelon, Whitechapel on 20 October 1624. By the time of his death, he had come to style himself ‘gentleman’ and his will stipulated that he was to be buried ‘in the parishe Church’. Somerset suggests that Rowley’s request was intended to serve as a statement of his wealth, though whether Rowley wished to be buried ‘\textit{in} the parish church’, as Somerset supposes, or simply within its grounds is unclear.\textsuperscript{27} Clearly, Rowley did not die poor: he held considerable property; gave generous bequests of five pounds to his nephew, Richard and forty shillings to his brother, Thomas; and left his numerous books and ‘\textit{Chattelles}’ to his brother, William and wife, Alice, respectively. Moreover, an additional bequest of forty shillings ‘\textit{vnto the most needie, A<ged> and impotent poore of the parishe of White chappell … to be laide owt in bread and giuen them in the daie of my buriall}’ indicates Rowley’s confidence that the goods, properties and monies already stipulated in the will would be more than sufficient to support his wife and family at the time of his death.\textsuperscript{28} Since neither the death of his

\textsuperscript{25} Document MSS 1, Article 111 at Dulwich College. A full transcription can be found in Greg (ed.), \textit{Henslowe Papers}, p. 94.
\textsuperscript{26} Somerset, p. xlv.
\textsuperscript{27} Somerset, ‘New facts’, p. 297.
\textsuperscript{28} A separate inventory of Rowley’s possessions, now in the Probate Act Book at the LMA (former GL MS 9168/17 f. 181’), was valued at £32 8s. Few of the entries included in Honigmann and
wife nor the baptism of his grandson, Samuel Adams, are recorded in the parish registers of St Mary Mattelon, it is likely that the family moved away from Whitechapel soon after Rowley’s death.

Rowley’s theatrical career

Rowley’s theatrical career was both long and successful. By the turn of the seventeenth century and certainly by 1604, at which time When You See Me was composed, Rowley’s position in the early modern theatre was one of great influence and authority. Not only was he a leading actor in the Admiral’s and later the Prince’s Men, he was also a company shareholder and playwright. While other names may appear more frequently in the company stage plots or as authorising figures or paid playwrights within the pages of Henslowe’s Diary, it is fair to say that Rowley’s tripartite role at the Rose and then at the Fortune marks him out as a key player in both the formation and the success of Prince Henry’s Men, the company under whose auspices When You See Me was first performed. Furthermore it is likely, as discussed below, that Rowley’s play was the one with which the newly named company publicly launched themselves after the King’s royal entrance into London in March 1604.

Given Rowley’s position, it is surprising his theatrical career has attracted so little critical attention. His writing style and playwriting career have certainly been considered, but typically only in negative terms and nearly always in relation to the styles and careers of his better-known contemporaries. The relationship between Rowley’s When You See Me and Shakespeare and Fletcher’s King Henry VIII is

Brock’s Playhouse Wills include such a valuation, making it difficult to contextualise the extent of Rowley’s wealth. Useful comparisons, however, may be drawn between Rowley and the playwright William Haughton (d. 1605), whose possessions valued £19 1s (pp. 75–6), and the boy actor John Clarke (d. 1624), whose possessions valued £8 6s 3d (pp. 132–4).
perhaps the most obvious example. That the majority of his playtexts for the company no longer survive has also contributed to Rowley’s continued marginalization. Moreover, while a number of plays from other companies have been attributed – either in whole or in part – to Rowley based on stylistic evidence (see below), such analyses rarely develop to consider the implications for Rowley’s career as a whole.

**Early career at the Rose and the acquisition of sharer status**

*Henslowe’s Diary* is a particularly useful tool in tracing Rowley’s movements during his first few years at the Rose, though his specific status within the company is often more difficult to pinpoint. Quite when Rowley joined the Admiral’s Men and in what capacity is also open to debate. The first definite mention of Rowley’s name is on 3 August 1597, when he acted as one of five witnesses to Henslowe’s loan to ‘John Helle the clowne’.29 However, another possible and much earlier mention can be found between entries dated 14 December 1594 and 14 January 1595, in what Carol Chillington Rutter describes as ‘the earliest record of the personnel of the Admiral’s Men’.30 Down the left-hand side of the main list, which includes the names of eight players, can be found the names ‘same’, ‘Charles’ and ‘alen’ – possibly, as Rutter suggests, Samuel Rowley, Charles Massey and Richard Alleyn, respectively.31 Since his name is set apart from the main list, it may perhaps be supposed that Rowley, although a principal player in the company, was only a

---

29 *Henslowe’s Diary*, p. 239.
hired man at this time. Presumably this is what Christine Eccles meant when she suggested that, by 1594, Rowley, Massey and Alleyn were among the men ‘[m]aking up the numbers’ at the Rose.\textsuperscript{32}

Certainly, Rowley was acting for the company by 3 June 1597, at which time he played Heraclius in \textit{Frederick and Basilea}.\textsuperscript{33} Yet, significantly, he was not included in the list of company members compiled on 11 October 1597.\textsuperscript{34} Neither was he included in the reduced company list of 14 October 1596, in which only four sharers were named: Edward Alleyn, Martin Slater, James Donstone and Edward Juby. As R. A. Foakes notes, this shorter list was compiled during the period in which ‘Jones and Downton had left to form what was to be Pembroke’s Men at the Swan Theatre’, and when Towne and Singer were missing for a time from company records; it was also written at a time when, as evidenced in the \textit{Diary}, Henslowe seems to have made a concerted effort ‘to attract new actors or sharers to join the company’.\textsuperscript{35} Possibly, Rowley was one of the men recruited during this period, though his absence from the company list of October 1597 would appear to suggest otherwise.

A later personnel list of 8 March 1598, in which members of the Lord Admiral’s Men acknowledged their indebtedness to Henslowe, contains Rowley’s autograph signature, suggesting that he held a more prominent position in the company at this time.\textsuperscript{36} Once again, as in the 1594–5 entry, Rowley’s name (along with Massey’s) appears to one side of the main list, leading Greg to speculate that the two names were added at a later date.\textsuperscript{37} Foakes suggests instead that the players’ names may have been set to one side because, although important members of the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{32} Christine Eccles, \textit{The Rose Theatre} (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), p. 42.
  \item \textsuperscript{33} The stage plot is held at the British Library; a transcription and facsimile are provided in Greg’s \textit{Dramatic Documents}, vol. 2. See also \textit{Henslowe’s Diary}, pp. 328–9.
  \item \textsuperscript{34} \textit{Henslowe’s Diary}, p. 84.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} \textit{Henslowe’s Diary}, p. xli. The company list can be found on p. 50.
  \item \textsuperscript{36} \textit{Henslowe’s Diary}, p. 87.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} See Greg (ed.), \textit{Henslowe’s Diary, Part II}, p. 101.
\end{itemize}
company at this time, Rowley and Massey were not yet sharers in the Lord Admiral’s Men – certainly the more plausible of the two interpretations. By 10 July 1600, at which time two separate personnel lists were drawn up, both names were incorporated amongst those of the company’s prominent shareholders.38

On 16 November 1598, Rowley, along with Massey, bound himself as Henslowe’s ‘covenente Servant’; until Shrovetide 1600, the two men were to perform at ‘no other howsse’ but the Rose.39 Quite possibly, this contract marked the beginning of Rowley’s sharer status. Such an argument certainly finds support in his increasing involvement in the company’s financial dealings from late 1598 onwards. In fact, Rowley’s first appointment in this capacity came just four weeks later, on 12 December 1598, when he was granted twenty-four shillings ‘to bye divers thinges for to macke cottes for gyantes in brvtte’. By February the following year, he was responsible for buying in new plays for the company; the first of these was recorded on 10 February 1598/9, when Henslowe gave Rowley and Downton five pounds and ten shillings ‘to bye A boocke called fryer fox & gyllen of branforde’.40 The establishment of the contract thus marked a significant change in both the level and manner of Rowley’s involvement in the Lord Admiral’s Men.41

As Greg and Foakes both note, however, even these increased responsibilities are not necessarily indicative of full sharer status. Greg, for example,

---


39 Henslowe’s Diary, pp. 241–2. Based on their joint contractual agreement and the appearance of both names – often alongside one another – in the extant company stage plots, Greg termed Rowley and Massey ‘the inseparable pair’. See Greg (ed.), Henslowe’s Diary, Part II, p. 101. However, such a pairing, prevalent in early mentions of the two men, does not endure: Rowley became far more involved in the company finances than Massey and seems to have had more influence in choosing and/or rejecting new plays to complement the company repertory.

40 Henslowe’s Diary, pp. 102 and 104, respectively.

41 Given the evident increase in Rowley’s responsibilities in late 1598, Rutter’s suggestion that Rowley had acquired sharer status by 1597 is difficult to substantiate. See Documents of the Rose Playhouse, p. 129
initially saw the agreement as a more temporary measure, suggesting that Rowley and Massey became sharers only after Shrovetide 1600. Foakes, too, tempered the significance of Rowley’s managerial role throughout this period to argue simply that he and Massey became sharers ‘by 1600, when their names are incorporated in the company lists’. Foakes also noted the particular form and wording employed by Henslowe in his contractual agreements with players between 1597 and 1598: while those in 1597 bound the players only to perform at Henslowe’s theatre, those in 1598 bound the players to Henslowe himself, as ‘hired’ or ‘covenant servants’. Thus while Jones, Shaa, Bird and Downton became full sharers at the time of their contractual agreements, it is possible that Richard Alleyn, Thomas Heywood, Rowley and Massey did not. Rather, the four players may have occupied a position between that of sharer and hired man, working, in Foakes’s words, as ‘master actors’ and thus enjoying some but not all of the privileges associated with sharer status.

The issue is further complicated by the use of the prefix ‘Mr’, typically assumed to denote sharer status, in the extant company stage plots. That the honorific is absent from Rowley’s name in the 1597 stage plot for Frederick and Basilea has previously – and probably correctly – been taken to indicate that he was not a sharer in the Lord Admiral’s Men at this time. Rowley is named ‘Mr Sam’ in the stage plots of The Battle of Alcazar (dated variously between 1598 and 1602) and 1 Tamar Cam (c. 1602), but since the date of the former is so uncertain, no further light can be shed on the matter on the basis of this evidence. Moreover, in

---

42 Greg (ed.), Henslowe’s Diary, Part II, p. 101. By the 1930s, however, Greg altered his argument to suggest that the three 1598 contracts marked ‘the inception of sharership’. See Greg, Dramatic Documents, vol. 1, p. 34.
43 See Henslowe’s Diary, p. xxxvii.
44 Henslowe’s Diary, p. xliii. The eight binding contracts fall on ff. 232–230v of the account book, where entries were made with the book reversed. See Henslowe’s Diary, pp. 239–42.
45 Henslowe’s Diary, p. 331.
46 The plot, held at the British Library, is transcribed in Greg’s Dramatic Documents, vol. 2 (no. 6). While Greg dates the plot to late 1598 (Dramatic Documents, vol. 1, pp. 38–9 and 146), Foakes
the fragmentary plot of 2 Fortune’s Tennis (typically dated 1602–3), only the clown John Singer is afforded the title. As Cerasano suggests, it is likely that ‘Mr’ was used variably by Henslowe at different times to denote either sharers or players of high capability. The descriptor ‘Mr Sam’ cannot, therefore, accurately be used as a means of gauging Rowley’s status within the company.

Despite the variant wording of Rowley and Massey’s contractual agreement with Henslowe, Rowley’s prominence in the Diary from December 1598 onwards is difficult to overlook. Neil Carson even goes so far as to single Rowley out as one of the three ‘leading sharers’ and policy-makers responsible for ‘the stricter supervision of literary expenditures’ following the company’s reorganisation in 1599; the others were Thomas Downton and Robert Shaa. Significantly, Carson identified three discrete periods of literary management in the company’s accounts: December 1598–June 1600, when all three men were active in the role, but Downton and Shaa – the two ‘senior men’ – were most prominent; December 1600–January 1602, when Downton’s name all but disappeared from the Diary and Rowley and Shaa made most of the authorisations; and April 1602–March 1603, when Downton once again became principal manager after Shaa’s departure from the company around Lent 1602. While Rowley was clearly most active in the second period, approving a total of thirteen new plays, he approved eight in the first period alone, and six of these within the first nine months. Aside from Shaa and Downton, no other company member – and certainly no non-sharer – had as much of an input as Rowley in the

favours the later date of 1600–1 (Henslowe’s Diary, pp. 329–30). Other late estimates include 1600 (Astington, Actors and Acting in Shakespeare’s Time, p. 127) and 1601–2 (Nungezer, Dictionary, p. 378).


acquisition of new company playtexts. Thus, although bound as Henslowe’s ‘covenente Servant’ until early 1600, it would appear that Rowley was afforded the position and authority of a sharer from the commencement of the contract in November 1598.

In addition to the numerous *Diary* entries, Rowley’s influence in the Lord Admiral’s Men can be seen in four short letters written to Henslowe between April and June 1601, in which he typically acted either to prompt Henslowe to buy a new play or to pay money owing to the dramatists for work already in the company’s possession (*Figs. 4–7*). The first of these letters (*Fig. 4*: MSS 1, Article 32 at Dulwich College), written c. 4 April 1601, is perhaps the most revealing, in that it shows the process behind the company’s decision to commission a new play. In it, Rowley notes that he has ‘harde fyue shetes of a playe of the Conqueste of the Indes’ and, doubting not ‘but It wyll be a verye good playe’, encourages Henslowe to pay the dramatists forty shillings ‘In earnest of It’. A note at the bottom of the letter in Henslowe’s hand, and a corresponding entry in the *Diary*, indicate Rowley’s success in this endeavour. Article 33 (*Fig. 5*) shows how, on another occasion, the company made the decision to return a script to its author: ‘M' hynchlo I praye ye let M' hathwaye haue his papers agayne of the playe of John a gante’. In another undated note (*Fig. 8*), Rowley prompted Henslowe to pay thirty shillings to John Day for the third part of *Tom Strowde*.50

---

50 Initially thought to have been an Ireland forgery, this note is now recognised as genuine. See Greg (ed.), *Henslowe Papers*, p. 127 and *Henslowe’s Diary*, p. 315. As Greg notes, the thirty-shilling sum does not match any surviving entry in the *Diary*.  

18
Figure 4: MSS 1, Article 32 at Dulwich College: letter from Rowley to Henslowe, c. 4 April 1601, to commission the play The Conquest of the Indies. Reproduced with kind permission of the Governors of Dulwich College.

Figure 5: MSS 1, Article 33 at Dulwich College: undated letter from Rowley to Henslowe about the play John of Gaunt. Reproduced with kind permission of the Governors of Dulwich College.
Figure 6: MSS 1, Article 34 at Dulwich College: undated letter from Rowley to Henslowe about John Day and William Haughton. Reproduced with kind permission of the Governors of Dulwich College.

Figure 7: MSS 1, Article 35 at Dulwich College: undated letter from Rowley to Henslowe about John Day, William Haughton and the plays Six Yeomen[?] of the West and The Conquest of the Indies. Reproduced with kind permission of the Governors of Dulwich College.

Figure 8: Rowley’s note to Henslowe regarding the third part of Tom Strowde appears at the top of this manuscript fragment, now a part of the manuscript collection at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, DC (MS. X.d.261). Photograph by Joanna Howe, courtesy of the Folger Shakespeare Library.
Thus, while some of the details of Rowley’s status in the Lord Admiral’s Men in the mid- to late 1590s remain unclear, his influence and authority were evidently at their highest at the turn of the seventeenth century, around the time of the company’s move north of the Thames. It was also at this time that Rowley started writing for the company, as detailed below.

Rowley as actor

The only tangible evidence of Rowley’s acting career exists in the company’s extant stage plots. Of the seven plots, two of which survive only as fragments, Rowley’s name appears in four: *Frederick and Basilea*, *The Battle of Alcazar*, *2 Fortune’s Tennis* (fragment), and *1 Tamar Cam*.\(^{51}\) From the plots alone it is difficult to ascertain the types of role that Rowley typically performed within the company, since these are known only by the characters’ names: Heraclius in *Frederick and Basilea*; Pisano, the Moor’s ambassador, and Death in *The Battle of Alcazar*; and Ascalon and Crymm in *1 Tamar Cam*.\(^{52}\) However, the plots do at least allow some insight into the size and importance of the various roles, based on the number of exits and entrances Rowley was required to make.

The casting tables in T. J. King’s influential *Casting Shakespeare’s Plays* are particularly useful in this respect, exemplifying Rowley’s movements in each play and

---

\(^{51}\) On the likely date and attribution of these plays, including a summary of Greg’s and Chambers’s arguments on the matter, see *Henslowe’s Diary*, pp. 327 and 329. Greg suggested that the names ‘b samme’ and ‘sam’ in the plot of *The Dead Man’s Fortune* may also refer to Rowley (*Dramatic Documents*, vol. 1, pp. 48–9). However, Rowley is not known to have been a member of the Admiral’s or Strange’s Men at this time, and if the ‘b’ of ‘b samme’ refers to a boy actor, and Rowley was already writing plays in the mid- to late 1580s (see below), there is little to substantiate Greg’s argument.

\(^{52}\) While Rowley presumably acted in *2 Fortune’s Tennis*, the severely mutilated fragment indicates only a more practical, backstage role: ‘A Table brought in / its Sam and Ch[ar][les]’. It is also possible, as Eleanor Lowe suggests, that the character ‘Monsieur Rowle(e)’ in Chapman’s *An Humorous Day’s Mirth* (first performed in 1597) was written with Rowley in mind. However, in the absence of further evidence, this can only remain speculative. See Eleanor Lowe, ‘A critical edition of George Chapman’s “The Comedy of Humours”, later printed as “An Humorous Day’s Mirth”’, unpublished doctoral thesis, Shakespeare Institute, University of Birmingham (2005), p. 166.
clarifying which roles he played in each scene.\textsuperscript{53} From these, it is possible to ascertain that the role of Heraclius in \textit{Frederick and Basilea} may have been the largest, since Rowley was required on stage for seven of a total eighteen scenes, in addition to the prologue and epilogue. That \textit{Frederick and Basilea} is the earliest of the four plots in which Rowley is named stands as testament to his influence in the Lord Admiral’s Men prior to his acquisition of sharer status. In \textit{The Battle of Alcazar}, performed between one and four years later, Rowley played only three seemingly minor roles, perhaps suggesting that while heavily involved in the financial and literary management of the company he focused his efforts accordingly. By the time of the Admiral’s revival of \textit{1 Tamar Cam}, when Downton was once more in control of the company’s expenditures, it seems Rowley had resumed a more prominent position on stage.\textsuperscript{54}

Regrettably, only one of these plays exists in fuller form: George Peele’s \textit{The Battle of Alcazar}, printed in quarto in 1594. Since the plot, as noted above, refers to a revival c. 1598–1602, it is difficult to know to what extent it reflects the version of the play preserved in the printed playtext. On comparing the two, King observed that the stage plot corresponds only to the first four acts of the quarto edition. Andrew Gurr further noted that the plot adds in some ‘gory dumbshows’, cuts one scene, and amends others so as to make the play performable by sixteen adults and ten boys.\textsuperscript{55} Since he performed only minor roles in this play, the existence of the printed playtext sheds little light on Rowley’s character types or likely acting style. From the evidence of the printed text, it seems he may have spoken as few as eleven lines in this play in his role as the Moor’s captain, Pisano; both the Moor’s ambassador and Death, only the first of which appears in the quarto playtext, were likely mute roles.

\textsuperscript{53} See T. J. King, \textit{Casting Shakespeare’s Plays: London Actors and their Roles, 1590–1642} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), tables 6, 7 and 8 (pp. 99, 102 and 103), respectively.

\textsuperscript{54} Appearing in six separate scenes, Ascalon seems, like Heraclius, to have been a principal role.

Rowley as playwright

As Cerasano notes, ‘Rowley's career as a playwright is fraught with questions’. 56 There are two main reasons for this: first, of the six plays Rowley is known to have written, either in whole or in part, only When You See Me survives; and second, while a number of other early modern playtexts have been attributed to Rowley on the basis of stylistic analyses, no external evidence can be found in support of these assertions. Moreover, the possible detection of Rowley’s hand in these other playtexts raises a number of questions regarding the playwright’s movements prior to his employment at the Rose. That the date and company attribution of these texts are in many cases uncertain further complicates the matter. Of the lost plays, the titles of which are found either in the pages of Henslowe’s Diary or in the records of Sir Henry Herbert’s office book, very little is known, though the titles themselves, as detailed below, do at least afford some insight into the types of play Rowley was writing at different times in his theatrical career.

Rowley is first mentioned as a playwright in Henslowe’s Diary in December 1601, at which time he and William Borne (alias Bird) were paid five pounds for a play called Judas, possibly the same play as that first seen in connection with the playwright William Haughton. 57 Nine months later, on 27 September 1602, Henslowe recorded a sum of seven pounds in full payment to Rowley ‘for his playe of Jhosua’. 58 Both plays, as Martin Wiggins points out, seem to have contributed to

---

56 Cerasano, ‘Rowley, Samuel (d. 1624)’ [accessed 16 March 2014].
57 The first payment to Rowley and Bird indicates that Judas was a new play: ‘pd vn to w Borne … the 20 of desember 1601 Jn earnest of a Booke called Judas w samewell Rowly & he is a writtinge’ (Henslowe’s Diary, p. 185). Four days later, the ‘fulle payment’ of five pounds was given over. On 27 May 1600, however, Haughton was paid ten shillings ‘in earneste of a Booke called Judas’; his autograph signature after the entry confirms the attribution (p. 135). Either the company commissioned two plays of the same name or, more likely, Haughton did not complete the play and writing passed over to Rowley and Bird. Since they were paid the full price of five pounds, it is possible that Haughton never began work on Judas.
58 Henslowe’s Diary, p. 205.
the influx of biblical plays commissioned for performance by the Lord Admiral’s Men around 1602, ‘when evidently they were briefly in fashion’. However, while Wiggins suggests that Judas stands out as one of just two New Testament plays recorded around the turn of the century, it is equally likely, as Michael O’Connell notes, that the apocryphal story of Judas Maccabeus formed the narrative focus of Rowley and Bird’s play. Thus Judas and Joshua and the biblical characters they portrayed might have stood together with other Old Testament plays, favoured by the Admiral’s Men, which foregrounded the value of bold, spiritual leadership and unyielding martial valour. The anonymous biblical play Samson, first recorded in Henslowe’s Diary on 29 July 1602, has also been attributed in part to Rowley, based on the somewhat ambiguous wording of its entry: ‘Lent vnto … Samwell Rowley & edwarde Jewbe to paye for the Boocke of Samson … vjli’. Since the attribution cannot be substantiated, however, and since Juby is not known to have written for the company at any other time, Samson has not been included in the timeline of Rowley’s life and work (Appendix 1); rather, I regard this entry as a record of Rowley and Juby’s payment to another unnamed dramatist. Nonetheless, Rowley was, as Louis B. Wright attests, ‘an important playwright in Henslowe’s series of

63 Murray Roston also attributed to Rowley and Juby a play called Absalom, on the evidence of the following brief Diary entry: ‘pd for poleyes & worckmansion for to hange absolome . . . xiiij d’ (p. 217). The attribution, however, is unsubstantiated: Rowley and Juby’s names are absent, thus undermining the case for their involvement, and as Foakes suggests (Henslowe’s Diary, p. 338), the entry itself might not even refer to the title of a play, but simply to a named character in another play. See Roston’s Biblical Drama in England: From the Middle Ages to the Present Day (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968), p. 118.
scriptural plays’, both in his capacity as playwright and in the authorisation of payments to other dramatists.\textsuperscript{64}

Significantly, O’Connell suggests that the so-called ‘Foxean’ plays of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries that took much of their subject matter from Foxe’s \textit{Acts and Monuments} were an extension of Henslowe’s biblical enterprise: ‘The overlapping list of playwrights and the coinciding dates may suggest not two projects, but two parts to a single project’.\textsuperscript{65} Plays such as \textit{When You See Me} were thus, in O’Connell’s eyes, designed to expand the company’s biblical material. While this may be true of earlier histories such as Munday, Drayton, Wilson and Hathaway’s two-part \textit{Sir John Oldcastle} (1599), however, the company’s later ‘Foxean’ plays were influenced largely by the company’s new patron, Prince Henry, and were in many ways tailored specifically to endorse elements of the young prince’s character. It is inaccurate, therefore, to view \textit{When You See Me} purely as an extension of Rowley’s earlier work: Rowley and Bird’s \textit{Judas} and Rowley’s \textit{Joshua} followed in the wake of other biblical drama; Rowley’s \textit{When You See Me} set a new precedent for the playwright in its reference and relevance to the company’s royal patron.

The Admiral’s apparent desire to extend the existing repertory following their move to the Fortune in the autumn of 1600 was perhaps the motivation behind Rowley’s decision to write new plays. As noted above, Rowley had played a leading role in the acquisition of scripts from mid-1600 and was undoubtedly aware of the company’s aesthetic philosophy at this time. \textit{Judas} and \textit{Joshua} presumably exemplified this philosophy, playing not only on the success of the biblical plays of the 1590s, but also on the particular strengths and

\textsuperscript{64} Wright, ‘The Scriptures and the Elizabethan Stage’, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{65} O’Connell, \textit{The Idolatrous Eye}, p. 113.
capabilities of Rowley’s fellow actors. While it is likely, as discussed below, that Rowley had a hand in several plays prior to his move to the Rose in the mid-1590s, Henslowe’s entry of Judas in the Diary effectively marked the beginning of Rowley’s tripartite career with the Lord Admiral’s Men: the moment at which he expanded his existing role as actor–sharer in the company and began offering his own dramatic compositions for performance.

Another important aspect of Rowley’s early playwriting career at the Fortune is his extension or revision of other dramatists’ work. Perhaps the most debated of the references to Rowley in Henslowe’s Diary concerns the ‘adicyones’ in Christopher Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus (c. 1588–1592), for which Rowley and Bird were paid four pounds on 22 November 1602.66 While the authenticity of the entry in the Diary is not disputed, what remains a matter for debate is the extent to which these ‘adicyones’ survive in the extant printed editions of the play. While there is clearly a close link between the A- and B-texts (printed in 1604 and 1616, respectively) in much of the play’s tragic action, the vastly augmented comic scenes of the latter have led a number of critics to the conclusion that these additional passages constitute the Rowley–Bird additions.67 Stylistic analyses, too, have confirmed the presence of post-1600 revisions in the B-text and, based on a comparison with the text of When You See Me, identified particular features characteristic of Rowley’s style (see below).68 Moreover, the very nature of this additional material, with its penchant for

66 Henslowe’s Diary, p. 206.
stage spectacle and its pervasive anti-papal spirit, not only provides links with the subject matter of *When You See Me*, as noted by Leslie M. Oliver, but also points to adaptation for performance on the Fortune stage.\(^{69}\) Greg’s account, in which the B-text is seen to predate the A-text and in which Rowley is named as Marlowe’s original collaborator, is no longer widely accepted.\(^{70}\)

Rowley’s comedic additions to the text of *Doctor Faustus* may thus represent the dramatist’s only surviving work for the company prior to the composition of *When You See Me* just two years later, and it may well be that the popularity of the additional B-text scenes on the Fortune stage led Rowley to attribute such a large proportion of the action and spoken lines of *When You See Me* to Will Summers, thus capitalising on the success of his earlier work. Significantly, the *Faustus* B-text is the only extant playtext for which there exists any external evidence to support the stylistic and circumstantial evidence by which Rowley’s authorship is typically inferred (see below). Moreover, since Bird’s share of the additions seem largely to have been confined to the final act of the play, with Rowley taking on the larger, more elaborate scenes in the third and fourth acts, it is possible to deduce the likely nature of Rowley and Bird’s collaborative practice.\(^{71}\)

This in turn may give some indication of the way in which the two men set to work on the lost play *Judas* in December the previous year.

Since company records largely cease after 1602/3, it is impossible to know whether Rowley wrote additional plays for the company throughout the course of Prince Henry’s patronage; certainly, no other extant playtext bears his name. In the

\(^{69}\) Leslie M. Oliver, ‘Rowley, Foxe, and the *Faustus* Additions’, *MLN*, 60.6 (June, 1945), 391–4. On adaptation for the new performance venue, see in particular Bevington and Rasmussen (eds.), *Doctor Faustus A- and B-Texts*, p. 45.


\(^{71}\) For each man’s likely share, see Sykes, *Sidelights*, p. 66 and Keefer, ‘The A and B Texts’, p. 228.
1620s, however, three of Rowley’s plays were recorded in the office book of Sir Henry Herbert: *Richard the Third, or the English Profit* (perhaps more correctly ‘Prophet’) ‘with the Reformation’, licensed on 27 July 1623; a ‘new Comedy’ called *Hard Shift for Husbands, or Bilbo’s the Best Blade*, licensed on 29 October 1623; and a second ‘new Comedy’, *A Match or No Match*, licensed on 6 April 1624.72 Joseph Quincy Adams, in his edition of Herbert’s office book, also tentatively assigned a fourth play to Rowley: *Hymen’s Holiday or Cupid’s Vagaries*, licensed on 15 August 1633.73 The text is described by Herbert as ‘an oould play of Rowleys’, and while the record does not specify which Rowley – Samuel or William – wrote the play, William is the more likely author in this instance.74 Admittedly, Herbert’s record for *A Match or No Match* also fails to specify which of the two Rowleys was responsible for the play, stating simply: ‘Written by Mr. Rowleye’. That the entry begins ‘For the Fortune’, however, points clearly to Samuel’s authorship.

It is uncertain whether these were new plays, written by Rowley to enhance the company repertory after the Fortune fire in December 1621, or older plays, reconstructed either by Rowley or by other members of the Palsgrave’s Men for performance after this date.75 MacDonald P. Jackson favours the former scenario,

---


73 *The Dramatic Records*, p. 53.

74 The play was first recorded on 24 February 1612 when the following entry was made in the Revels Accounts: ‘By the Duck [sic] of yorks Players. Shroue: munday: A Play Called Himens Haliday’. Since William Rowley was a sharer in the Duke of York’s Men, he is by far the more likely candidate for the play’s authorship. See W. R. Streitberger (ed.), *Collections Volume XIII: Jacobean and Caroline Revels Accounts, 1603–1642* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 48–9 and Bentley, *JCS*, V.1023.

noting that Rowley was ‘foremost among those who laboured to provide a new repertoire’; Bentley, on the other hand, suggests simply that these were memorial reconstructions of older plays, written before Rowley’s retirement.76 Certainly, Herbert’s use of the word ‘new’ would appear to indicate the former, though it may also suggest that the plays had been recently revived or expanded, perhaps in a manner similar to *Doctor Faustus*. On the basis of the plays’ titles, *Hard Shift for Husbands* and *A Match or No Match* appear to have been marriage comedies. Rowley’s play on Richard III, however, is more likely to have been a history play, perhaps, as Fleay suggests, a revival or reworking of Ben Jonson’s *Richard Crookback*, recorded in *Henslowe’s Diary* on 22 June 1602.77 The ‘reformation’ alluded to in Herbert’s entry may thus refer to the company’s recent rewrites of the play, rather than to any specific aspect of its content. Alternatively, the word may have been used by Herbert – as it was by George Buc on the manuscript of *The Second Maiden’s Tragedy* (1611) – with reference to the censored portions of the text.78

Another later play frequently attributed either in whole or in part to Rowley is *The Noble Soldier; Or, A Contract Broken, Justly Revenged*, first printed in 1634.79 Evidence in support of Rowley’s authorship, however, is slim, and rests wholly on the title-page attribution of the play to one ‘S. R.’. Aside from this dubious attribution, there is further reason to doubt Rowley’s authorship. In the Stationers’ Register, two separate entries name Thomas Dekker as the play’s author, and indeed much of the evidence, both internal and external, points to this

---

76 MacDonald P. Jackson, ‘Shakespeare’s *Richard II* and the Anonymous *Thomas of Woodstock*’, *MRDE*, 14 (2001), 17–65 (p. 49) and Bentley, *JCS*, V.1011.
79 The *STC* labels *The Noble Soldier* as a product of Rowley’s sole authorship (vol. 2, p. 290). See also Cerasano’s *ODNB* entry on Rowley, in which she claims that he ‘collaborated with Thomas Dekker (and perhaps John Day)’. 
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Not only have elements of Dekker’s style been detected in the text of *The Noble Soldier*, including, as Tirthankar Bose points out, a number of characteristic witticisms and allusions, much of the content of the play was reproduced in Dekker’s *The Welsh Ambassador* (c. 1623).\(^{81}\) The Latin motto included on the title-page of *The Noble Soldier* further strengthens the case, since similar mottos appear on the title-pages of texts confidently attributed to Dekker. To account for this, a number of early critics proposed that Rowley took charge of the play after Dekker’s death.\(^ {82}\) The more recent discovery of Rowley’s will, however, has shown that Dekker outlived Rowley by nearly eight years.

On the basis of external evidence no further material can be credited to Rowley. Stylistic analyses, however, have resulted in the attribution to Rowley of five additional early modern playtexts, some placing him with companies other than the Admiral’s Men in the 1580s and early 1590s and thus perhaps allowing some insight into Rowley’s pre-Rose theatrical career. Foremost amongst these is H. Dugdale Sykes’s influential *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama* in which, in addition to the extra B-text material in Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*, he makes a strong case for Rowley’s authorship of *The Famous Victories of Henry V* (first printed in 1598 though likely performed before mid-1587) and part-authorship of *The Taming of a Shrew* (printed in 1594). Other texts mentioned in Sykes’s analyses include the 1594 quarto edition of Robert Greene’s *Orlando Furioso*, for which Rowley is credited with the addition of comic material, and the anonymous

---

\(^{80}\) ‘The noble Spanish Souldier’ was entered to John Jackman on 16 May 1631 and to Nicholas Vavasour on 9 December 1633. See Arber, *Transcript*, vol. 4, pp. 253 and 310, respectively.


Wily Beguiled, printed in 1606 but probably written several years earlier, which Rowley is thought to have written in collaboration with another dramatist.  

In particular, Sykes noted the close connection between a number of Will Summers’s lines in Rowley’s When You See Me and the speeches of the plays’ respective clown characters. A persuasive parallel is drawn, for example, between Summers’s lines ‘an thou wert the devil himself, he’ll conjure thee, I warrant thee. I would not have such a conjuring for twenty crowns’ (1.4.188–90) and Dick’s lines in the Faustus B-text: ‘an my master come he’ll conjure you, ’faith’; ‘[a]n he follow us, I’ll so conjure him as he was never conjured in his life, I warrant him’ (2.3.14–15; 3.3.4–5). Sykes also points to the similarities between these passages and Dericke’s speech in The Famous Victories which ends with the words: ‘Ile tel thee Iohn, O Iohn, / I would not haue done it for twentie shillings’ (B4). Moreover, in a number of the plays’ verse passages Sykes noted both a tendency towards dactylic line-endings and a ‘compositional trick’ of placing polysyllabic adjectives ending in -al after the nouns that they qualify (‘pomp pontificial’, ‘blessing apostolical’, ‘treason capital’, etc.). While he may in some cases have overstated the relationship between certain passages or the individuality of specific words or phrases that he labels ‘Rowleyan’, a number of Sykes’s arguments and observations are upheld by later scholars. Constance B. Kuriyama in particular highlights the infrequency with which such expressions as ‘as it

---

83 Sykes suggests that the co-author of Wily Beguiled may have been the same dramatist with whom Rowley collaborated on the text of A Shrew. See Sidelights, p. 69.
84 Sykes, Sidelights, p. 61.
passeth’ appear in the drama of Rowley’s contemporaries and thus confirms them as ‘stylistic fingerprints’ in the case for Rowley’s authorship.\footnote{See Kuriyama, ‘Dr Greg and Doctor Faustus’, pp. 191–4.}

Sykes was well aware that his analyses would have important implications for the study of Rowley’s theatrical career and he stated outright the significance of the attribution of ‘this fresh work’ to Rowley: ‘It dates the commencement of his dramatic authorship back to a period certainly eight, possibly twelve or thirteen, years before we find any mention of him as a playwright’.\footnote{Sykes, Sidelights, p. 74.} Yet he says relatively little about the company attribution of these plays and what this in turn may reveal about Rowley’s movements during this period. If Rowley did indeed have a hand in the composition of The Famous Victories, as indicated by the abovementioned stylistic evidence, then this suggests that he may have begun both his acting and playwriting career with the Queen’s Men. The attribution to Rowley of this play, often regarded as ‘the earliest of extant English history plays among the professional companies’, also makes an important statement about the playwright’s potential influence in the theatre several years prior to his first official mention in the theatrical records.\footnote{Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth MacLean, The Queen’s Men and their Plays (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 89.} The play – and the characterisation and action of the play’s clown Dericke in particular – may give some indication of Rowley’s early work, thus affording opportunity for comparison with When You See Me, composed almost twenty years later. Moreover, Rowley’s possible affiliation with Richard Tarlton might have influenced elements of Will Summers’s character in When You See Me, and the portrayal of the fool’s extemporising rhyming games may perhaps reflect a desire on Rowley’s part to recreate certain of Tarlton’s antics.
While Greene’s *Orlando Furioso* likewise belonged to the Queen’s Men, as stated on the play’s printed title-page, the author is also said to have sold a copy of *Orlando* to the Admiral’s Men; indeed, in February 1591/2 Henslowe recorded a performance of the play by the combined Strange’s–Admiral’s Men at the Rose.\(^90\)

Since it is unclear (despite the title-page attribution) from which of the acting companies the printed playtext derives, it is difficult to place Rowley’s possible contribution to this text within the playwright’s wider canon. That the version of the play preserved in the quarto includes, as Greg notes, a number of scenes of ‘rough clownage and horseplay’ absent in the separate manuscript of Alleyn’s part for Orlando may indicate that Rowley was employed as a reviser of plays at the Rose several years prior to his work on the *Faustus* B-text.\(^91\) If this is indeed the case, as Sykes attests, then the comic additions in *Orlando Furioso* may constitute Rowley’s earliest work for performance by the Admiral’s Men.\(^92\) Equally, though, the clowning scenes attributed to Rowley may derive from an earlier performance by the Queen’s Men, perhaps written around the same time as *The Famous Victories*.

Rowley’s potential input in *The Taming of a Shrew* would also appear to place him with the Earl of Pembroke’s Men (named on the play’s printed title-page) some time prior to the text’s entrance in the Stationers’ Register in May 1594. Quite possibly, Rowley left the Queen’s Men in the early 1590s and spent some years writing and acting as a hired man in both Pembroke’s and the Admiral’s Men before turning more assuredly to Henslowe after the controversial *Isle of Dogs* incident and the subsequent return of a number of actors from Pembroke’s Men to the Rose in the

\(^{90}\) On Greene’s reselling of the play, see *The defence of conny catching* (London: printed by A. J[effes] for Thomas Gubbins, 1592), *STC* 5656, C3v–v; for the record of performance, see *Henslowe’s Diary*, p. 16.


summer of 1597. Alternatively, The Taming of a Shrew may originally have belonged to the Queen’s Men, as suggested by its association with Shakespeare’s The Taming of the Shrew, and it may be that Rowley wrote his share of the text while still a member of that company in the late 1580s.

Since both the date and company attribution of Wily Beguiled are unknown, the text sheds no further light on Rowley’s possible movements in the years prior to his composition of When You See Me. On the basis that the epilogue specifies performance in ‘a circled round’, Gurr argues that the Fortune could not have been the play’s intended venue and thus that Rowley could not have been the play’s author. This argument, however, rests on the assumption that the play was composed c. 1602. Had the composition of Wily Beguiled predated the Admiral’s move to the Fortune or even Rowley’s involvement with that company, then the reference to performance in a ‘circled round’ poses no real problem to Sykes’s argument and the case for Rowley’s part-authorship of the play remains valid.

The more recent analyses of Lake and Jackson add another possible play to Rowley’s canon: the anonymous Thomas of Woodstock, which survives today in manuscript form. The extent of Rowley’s input in this play, however, is a matter of contention: while Lake, who – on the basis of handwriting and linguistic evidence – dates the manuscript to 1604–10, argues that Rowley revised an earlier version of the play, Jackson argues instead that the play was written in the seventeenth century and
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93 See Henslowe’s Diary, p. xli.
94 Four of the nine extant Queen’s Men’s plays were subsequently turned into six Shakespearean plays, suggesting that Shakespeare may once have worked with the Queen’s Men. This in turn may explain the relationship between the two Shrew plays: possibly, a now lost version of the play survived which Shakespeare and Rowley (plus an unknown collaborator) reconstructed as The Shrew and A Shrew, respectively. McMillin and MacLean, The Queen’s Men and their Plays, p. xv.
95 Gurr, Shakespeare’s Opposites, p. 273.
thus that Rowley was its original author. In 2007, however, Michael Egan published a scathing rebuttal of Jackson’s claims, reaffirming an earlier date of composition for Woodstock (c. 1590–5) and arguing the case for Shakespeare’s authorship.\(^9^7\) While much of Egan’s argument is clearly governed by his notion of Shakespeare as the superior dramatist (‘When You See Me evinces nothing of the careful blueprinting, grand historical sweep, [or] biting political concerns … as revealed by the author of Woodstock’), he does point persuasively to a number of lines in the manuscript that reflect topical debates of the 1590s and thus pose ‘considerable difficulties for any Jacobean attribution’.\(^9^8\) It is problematic, therefore, to accept Rowley’s role as primary author. If, as Jackson suggests, the play were written by Rowley post-1604, Woodstock would first have been performed by Prince Henry’s Men at the Fortune and would presumably have shared certain characteristics with When You See Me regarding casting and staging. As it stands, Woodstock bears little resemblance to Rowley’s play and, as Janet Clare suggests, seems to have been written with ‘an altogether different agenda’.\(^9^9\) That the marks of Rowley’s authorship (as laid out in Lake and Jackson’s articles and revisited in the Bibliographical Introduction, below) are present in the manuscript suggests only that Rowley contributed to the play at some point in its textual history. Thus, while Rowley’s revision of the manuscript is included in Appendix 1, his authorship of the play is not.

One unfortunate consequence of Sykes’s research in particular was the tendency amongst scholars to attribute other anonymous or lost plays to Rowley, often with little or no recourse to stylistic or circumstantial evidence; indeed, Egan recently commented on the way in which Rowley kept ‘popping up’ throughout the

---

\(^9^8\) Egan, ‘Did Samuel Rowley write Thomas of Woodstock?’, pp. 35 and 42, respectively.
twentieth century as ‘everyone’s favourite author of anonymous plays’. Soon after the publication of Sykes’s work, for example, E. H. C. Oliphant considered Rowley’s contribution to the anonymous *Arden of Faversham* (c. 1592) and Greg put forward the suggestion that Rowley was likely the man responsible for the latter acts of Thomas Nashe’s ‘seditious’ *Isle of Dogs* (c. 1597). This in turn had the effect of diminishing Sykes’s observations. While F. P. Wilson is undoubtedly correct to point out that ‘[s]peculation on Rowley’s style seems the more hazardous if it be remembered that *When you See me* [sic] is the only certain example of his work that has survived’, informed stylistic analyses are nonetheless a useful means of establishing possibilities: without such analyses, Rowley’s theatrical career ostensibly begins and ends with the Admiral’s–Prince’s–Palsgrave’s Men; using stylistic evidence, it is possible not only to date the conceivable beginning of Rowley’s career back several years before his name appears in the pages of *Henslowe’s Diary*, but also to associate him with the Queen’s and possibly Pembroke’s Men prior to his engagement at the Rose. Such possibilities (highlighted as such) are incorporated in Appendix 1.

**Later theatrical career**

Company records diminish radically after 1602/3, making it difficult to ascertain Rowley’s later involvement in the Lord Admiral’s–Prince’s–Palsgrave’s Men, either in his role as sharer or in his capacity as playwright. Since Rowley is named in the official licences, household lists and patents of 1604, 1606, 1610 and 1612/13, respectively (see ‘Actors and casting’, below), and since he was present at Prince

---

100 Egan, ‘Did Samuel Rowley write *Thomas of Woodstock*?’, p. 50, n.3.
102 Wilson, p. ix.
Henry’s funeral, it is clear he was still a member of the company at the commencement of the Elector Palatine’s patronage. That three of his plays were licensed by Sir Henry Herbert in the early 1620s may, as discussed above, indicate that he was still active – at least as a playwright – just months before his death.

The paucity of evidence regarding the company’s personnel after January 1613, when members of the Palsgrave’s Men were granted a licence to perform at the Fortune and elsewhere, largely hinders any attempt to determine the year of Rowley’s retirement. Bentley suggests that he retired from the stage soon after the issuance of the licence in 1613 and that he left London for Germany – a suggestion for which there exists no evidence.103 Somerset, too, notes that Rowley likely retired eleven years before his death, and certainly ‘by 31 October 1618’, at which time his name was absent from ‘a complete list of players’.104 In fact, as Glynne Wickham, Herbert Berry and William Ingram point out, the document in question was not a full company list, but rather a record of the names of ten players to whom Edward Alleyn leased the Fortune playhouse after inheriting Henslowe’s share some time after the latter’s death in 1616.105 That Rowley’s name is not included is not in itself proof of retirement and may suggest only that Rowley chose to perform a lesser role in the business in his later years.

The more recent discovery of a Cambridgeshire legal document confirms that Rowley was still an active member of the Palsgrave’s Men on 25 March 1616, when the company, evidently on tour, were commanded to leave Cambridge University: ‘Dounton et Iubey were Charged themselves & all the rest of their companye presently to departe the universitye & playe noe moore at any tyme

103 Bentley, JCS, V.1011. In an earlier volume, Bentley offered the more practical suggestion that Rowley gave up acting in 1613 to become a contracted writer for the company (JCS, II.555).
104 See Somerset, ‘New facts’, p. 297 and Somerset, p. xxxvii, respectively.
105 The lease is transcribed in Greg’s edition of The Henslowe Papers, pp. 27–8 and modernised in Wickham, Berry and Ingram’s English Professional Theatre, pp. 544–5, document 425.
hereafter either in Cambridge or the Compasse of five myles’. The name ‘Sam Rowle’ is included here along with the names of eight other players. Quite what sparked the order is unknown, and the document provides no further information regarding either the company’s transgression or the occasion of their visit. It does, however, prove Rowley’s continued involvement in the Palsgrave’s Men throughout the mid-1610s, and thus extends his known theatrical career beyond that recorded in the official licensing documents at TNA.

Although the official end of Rowley’s theatrical career is unknown, it is possible to conclude that he spent at very least nineteen years with the Admiral’s–Prince’s–Palsgrave’s Men and, if the three plays licensed in the 1620s were indeed new at the time of their entrance in Henry Herbert’s account book, possibly as many as thirty. Moreover, for the majority of his career Rowley maintained an important, tripartite position within the company, which saw him not only acting and managing the company finances but also extending the repertory, both by commissioning plays by others and by writing them himself. Rowley’s *When You See Me* was composed at the height of this long and prosperous career and, importantly, right at the start of the period of the young Prince Henry’s patronage.

---


107 Other members, too, spent a great many years with the company; as Gurr observes, ‘[t]he durability of the major names is a remarkable record of company loyalty’ (*Shakespeare’s Opposites*, p. 34).
PART 2

INTRODUCTION TO THE PLAY
Critical Introduction
Rowley’s composition of When You See Me

In The English Chronicle Play, Felix Schelling put forward the suggestion that Rowley’s When You See Me may contain the text of the two lost Cardinal Wolsey plays ‘in a later revised form’. He took as evidence both Rowley’s perceived role in the initial stages of the plays’ production and a series of payments in Henslowe’s Diary for the procurement of extravagant costumes and stage properties for use in their performance. Certainly, a lot of money changed hands in the acquisition of materials for the two plays: the total output of just under forty pounds marked an investment larger than that recorded in the Diary for any other single or two-part play. In utilising much of the text of the earlier plays and thereby portraying many of the same characters and events on stage, Schelling argued, Rowley could make further use of Henslowe’s earlier purchases.

While Schelling’s hypothesis is at first appealing, there are a number of reasons to doubt his arguments. First, the composition of the Wolsey plays, as evidenced in an intricate series of payments between June and October 1601, was particularly complex, leading Schelling to misinterpret Rowley’s role in their production: ‘The Life of Cardinal Wolsey’, he claimed ‘was the production of Chettle and Samuel Rowley’. In fact, Rowley was only responsible for authorising payment to Chettle; no evidence exists in support of his own part-authorship of the
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111 On 5 June 1601, an initial payment of twenty shillings was made to Henry Chettle ‘for writtinge the Booke of carnalle wolseye lyfe’; a further twenty shillings was paid on 28 June ‘for the altrynge of the booke’ and forty shillings was given over for the finished play on 4 July (Henslowe’s Diary, pp. 171, 175 and 176, respectively). On 24 August, however, a payment of twenty shillings was made to Chettle for a second play ‘called j pt of carnall wolseye’, soon followed on 10 October by a payment of forty shillings to Chettle, Michael Drayton, Anthony Munday and Wentworth Smith for ‘A Booke called the Rissenge of carnowlle wolseye’ (p. 183). The latter play, The Rising, thus became part one of the two-part play. See The English Chronicle Play, p. 219 for Schelling’s misinterpretation of these records.
play. Moreover, the reuse of company costumes and stage properties is likely to have taken place regardless of whether or not Rowley built upon the text of the two Wolsey plays in his composition of *When You See Me*; as Cerasano notes, ‘apparel was used and reused as long as it was in reasonable condition’. Henslowe’s extravagant purchases cannot therefore be taken as evidence in support of textual revision.

Perhaps most fundamentally, the argument for revision is dependent upon the assumption that King Henry VIII was depicted on stage as a character in the lost Wolsey plays, a belief fuelled by the inclusion of a ‘hary ye viii gowne’ in the second of two inventories of theatrical apparel drawn up respectively in the late 1590s and early 1600s. The presence of the ‘hary ye viii gowne’, as well as the inclusion of a ‘cardinalls gowne’ and ‘will somers cote’, has led scholars to date the inventory to 1601–2, to coincide with the company’s first performances of the Wolsey plays. Significantly, though, Henslowe’s acquisition of the Wolsey playtexts marks only the lower date limit of the inventory: the list could conceivably have been written any time between the composition of the Wolsey plays and Rowley’s completion of *When You See Me*, at which time King Henry’s gown was required for performance. Thus while the ‘cardinalls gowne’ and ‘will somers cote’ were in all probability procured for the production of the Wolsey plays, the ‘hary ye viii gowne’ might not have been purchased until early 1604. This in turn suggests a later date of origin for Alleyn’s inventory than is typically supposed and it is possible, therefore, that the
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113 Both are reprinted in *Henslowe’s Diary* (pp. 317–25 and 291–4, respectively).
114 See Cerasano, ‘An Inventory of Theatrical Apparel’ [accessed 14 May 2014].
115 The ‘will somers cote’ included in Alleyn’s list is presumably that for which the company paid three pounds in May 1602 (*Henslowe’s Diary*, p. 201). A ‘Will. Sommers sewtte’ had also appeared in Henslowe’s 1598 inventory, confirming (along with the text of Nashe’s *Summer’s Last Will and Testament*, c. 1592), that the presence of Summers on stage did not necessitate the presence of King Henry.
list was drawn up not for the Lord Admiral’s Men but for Prince Henry’s Men, soon after the commencement of the young prince’s patronage.

This finds support in the fact that the company is unlikely to have represented King Henry VIII as a character on stage while his daughter, Queen Elizabeth, was still on the throne. Rather, the Wolsey plays presumably followed the model of other Elizabethan plays about the Reformation in which the King’s presence was felt only through the words and actions of others. In *Thomas, Lord Cromwell*, for example, references are made only to ‘the King’ or ‘my Soueraigne King’ and the King’s intentions are vocalised and put into action by other characters, thus shifting responsibility for Cromwell’s demise: ‘O God a little speede had saued his life, / Here is a kinde repriue come from the king, / To bring him straight vnto his maiestie’ (G3'). Similarly ‘the king’ of *Sir Thomas More*, receiving notice of the insurrection, sends Shrewsby, Surrey, Palmer and others to act in his name (scene 5, lines 27–34). Assuming such caution to have been the norm during Elizabeth’s reign, very little of the subject matter of Rowley’s *When You See Me* could have been performed before March 1603 and as such the play is unlikely to have derived from the company’s earlier material.

Moreover, as Somerset points out, although Wolsey is an important character in *When You See Me*, ‘much of the play does not concern him at all, and probably would not have been treated in two plays centred upon his rising and life’. Indeed, much of Rowley’s play covers aspects of King Henry’s reign that fall outside of Wolsey’s lifetime, including the accusation of Queen Katherine Parr and, perhaps
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most importantly, the birth and early life of the young Prince Edward – the subject of the play’s subtitle. Furthermore, Rowley’s anachronistic handling of source material (discussed at length below) allows him to implicate Wolsey even in historical events that occurred long after his death. Clearly, such aspects of the play could only have been borrowed from the lost Wolsey plays if these exhibited an equally anachronistic depiction of the Cardinal’s life.

There is little to suggest, therefore, that Rowley drew upon the text of the Wolsey plays in his composition of When You See Me; indeed, on the strength of available evidence it is possible to conclude that Rowley began work on a new play in 1603–4. Composed in the wake of Queen Elizabeth’s death, Rowley’s When You See Me was written with a very different purpose to the two lost Wolsey plays, whose aim, like that of Thomas, Lord Cromwell and Sir Thomas More, was presumably to bring to the fore the rising, the life and, in all probability, the fall of an important player in the Tudor court, with only cursory and indirect reference to the role of the monarch. Rowley’s play, in contrast, had the freedom to explore the Tudor monarchy much more thoroughly and directly and did so to great effect by placing King Henry VIII at the centre of the ongoing religious and socio-political debate.

Date of composition

Since, as noted above, Rowley is unlikely to have written a play about the reign of King Henry VIII while his daughter Elizabeth was still on the throne, the lower date limit of composition is set at 24 March 1603. The entrance of the play in the Stationers’ Register on 12 February 1605 (see Bibliographical Introduction, below) marks the upper date limit, though it is likely that Rowley composed the play earlier than 1605, not least so that the company could take advantage of the
play’s great topicality in the more immediate aftermath of Queen Elizabeth’s death. Quite possibly, as Gurr suggests, *When You See Me* was the very first play performed by Prince Henry’s Men upon the reopening of the Fortune playhouse on Monday 9 April 1604, after the eventual passing of a long outbreak of plague that had rendered the theatres inoperable for upwards of six months.\textsuperscript{118} If indeed this was the case, then the date of composition can be narrowed down to the period between March 1603 and March 1604.

Scott James Schofield argues for a later date of composition, based on the assumption that much of the rhetoric employed by Queen Katherine Parr and the Catholic bishops in *When You See Me* consciously reflected that of the speakers at the Hampton Court Conference, held on 14, 16 and 18 January 1604: ‘Katherine Parr’s commitment to defending a reformed theology, and the subsequent troubles she faces as a result of her conviction, echo the commitment and experiences of the puritan delegates’.\textsuperscript{119} He points specifically to the account of events presented by William Barlow in *The svmme and svbstance of the conference* (*STC* 1456.5), entered in the Stationers’ Register on 22 May 1604 and printed in August that year, suggesting in turn that Rowley based much of the structure and dialogue of act 5, scene 1 of his play on this material.\textsuperscript{120} Despite similarities in the content of *When You See Me* and Barlow’s *Svmme and svbstance*, however, Schofield’s argument falls down in the absence of any specific parallels in the *language* of the two texts. As discussed below, Rowley’s depiction of Queen Katherine in act 5, scenes 1 and 4 is in fact taken almost

\textsuperscript{118} Gurr, *Shakespeare’s Opposites*, p. 37.


\textsuperscript{120} Schofield, ‘Staging Tudor Royalty’, p. 84.
verbatim from Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* and is not therefore reliant on Barlow’s – or any other – account of the Hampton Court Conference in circulation in 1604.

That is not to say that the ongoing religious debates that characterised the first year of King James’s reign did not prompt Rowley to make the accusations levelled against Queen Katherine Parr one of the main focal points of his play. Indeed, debates regarding James’s supremacy and the extent of religious diversity in the Church probably governed Rowley’s selection of source material and aided him in his organisation of such – the question posed by Queen Katherine to Bonner and Gardiner concerning the bishops’ allegiance to the King (‘How are ye faithful subjects to the King / When first ye serve the Pope, then after him?’ (5.1.121–2)) in particular highlighted the issue of religious versus monarchical authority. After the drafting of the Millenary Petition in April 1603, many of the ministers’ grievances became common knowledge and Rowley was presumably well aware of the issues and debates that greeted King James in his first few months on the English throne. It is possible, therefore, that the composition of *When You See Me* was intended not to reflect on the Hampton Court Conference, but rather to coincide with or perhaps even to pre-empt it.

**Source material and the structure of *When You See Me***

As Wilson notes, ‘Rowley flouts chronology with a freedom unusual even in the chronicle plays of his age’.

Perhaps the most striking example of this can be evidenced in the character of Cardinal Wolsey, whose life Rowley prolonged for over sixteen years in order to have his corruption publicly exposed in front of the Holy Roman Emperor at the play’s conclusion. The extension of Wolsey’s life also

---

121 Wilson, p. x.
allowed Rowley to implicate him directly in such events as Anne Boleyn’s execution (1.3.32–3). On occasion, such tampering with chronology leads to confusion on Rowley’s part, for example when Wolsey welcomes ambassadors ‘from Francis the Most Christian King of France’ (1.1.2) before the death of King Louis, which is announced at 2.3.148. Yet on the whole, the play is carefully crafted to present a series of important events in the reign of the Tudor king which simultaneously shed new light on the character of King Henry, glorify the actions of Prince Edward and reveal the escalating power and dishonesty of the deceitful Cardinal Wolsey, whose timely fall marks also the beginning of an amicable alliance between the English monarchy and the Holy Roman Empire.

Rowley evidently made use of a great number and variety of contemporary sources in his composition of *When You See Me*, drawing upon a range of apocryphal material, such as folktales, ballads and poems, as well as upon many of the more in-depth historical chronicles of Edward Hall, Richard Grafton, John Stow, John Foxe and Raphael Holinshed. Of course, the very nature of these texts, with their continual reuse and rehashing of the work of previous authors, makes the task of identifying various passages as sources of influence on Rowley’s play all the more complex, but it is nonetheless possible to draw certain inferences, both with regard to the types of source material Rowley visited for particular scenes and to the way in which he arranged this material into a coherent and workable script, apposite for performance on the Fortune stage.

Before considering some of the more prominent sources for *When You See Me*, it is important to draw attention to the episodic structure of the play, not least
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122 While it is, of course, possible that the play was written in collaboration with another dramatist, Rowley’s sole authorship is assumed here on the basis that there is no discernible discrepancy in style between the various scenes of the play. As noted in the Bibliographical Introduction below, there is also reason to believe that the manuscript used as printers’ copy for Q1 was written throughout in Rowley’s hand.
since it seems to have governed the selection of source material on several notable occasions. The organisation of this material has also defined the nature of much critical attention and many have come to view the text’s structure as an inherent weakness in Rowley’s compositional practice. Joseph Candido, for example, comments negatively on the play’s ‘rambling and episodic’ nature and Somerset labels the text ‘disunified’. John H. Wasson even goes so far as to suggest that Rowley’s *When You See Me* is ‘a patchwork of innocuous scenes, or a play mutilated by cutting’, though this can hardly be the case given the play’s uncommon length (see below). Significantly, such critics overlook the overall effect and purpose of Rowley’s play. *When You See Me* is episodic by design, and while the text does play around with chronology, it does so deliberately in order to emphasise and accentuate certain events and individuals and their relationships to one another. It also, by means of introducing the narratives of folktales and ballads, offers a different view of King Henry: at once historical, in the sense that the events and characters depicted on stage were from a past era, but also accessible and familiar, thus bridging the gap between the represented past and the present performance.

Counter to Somerset’s suggestion that Rowley ‘may have read the chronicles hurriedly, culling what he wanted from them, and relying on his memory while actually writing his play’, it would seem that he both read and wrote with a clear purpose in mind, extracting from the various sources the information he needed and organising the material in such a way as to realise his intentions for the play. In consequence, the script presented for performance at the Fortune was not structured
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chronologically but rather thematically, moving in and out of the English court to branch into other aspects of royal life. As Wiggins observes:

The play’s overall point about the power of the crown […] is not made through a single developing action but through variegated repetition in a series of episodes whose apparent disconnectedness also emphasizes the range of different spheres in which royal authority must operate.\textsuperscript{126}

The narrative does not therefore adhere to accounts of King Henry VIII’s reign in either the historical chronicles or the apocryphal material, but rather mingles aspects of each in order to create a new history of the Tudor king with an emphasis not only on his public actions, but also on the more personal image of Henry as husband, father and common man.\textsuperscript{127}

Rowley accordingly utilised and arranged the source material in a very precise way, relying most heavily on the historical chronicles in acts 1, 3 and 5, which take as their focus the intrigue and proceedings of the English court, and turning either to apocryphal sources or using his own dramatic licence for acts 2 and 4, the two most developed comic episodes of the play: King Henry’s night-walk into the City of London and the scene of the young Prince Edward’s tuition. Rowley also interspersed his use of the historical chronicles with other material in certain of the court-based scenes, including, perhaps most notably, the portrayal of Jane Seymour’s death (1.2), as detailed below. Moreover, the introduction of the fool Will Summers at least once in each of these sections served to break up the more serious historical matter of the play and no doubt provided the audience with some much-needed comic relief.

\textsuperscript{126} Wiggins, \textit{Shakespeare and the Drama of his Time}, p. 86.

\textsuperscript{127} Clare suggests that in linking high state affairs with anecdote and jest-book literature Rowley revived ‘features of the Queen’s Men’s dramaturgy with its medley style’ (\textit{Shakespeare’s Stage Traffic}, p. 257). If Rowley had indeed been a member of the Queen’s Men before joining the Admiral’s Men, it is hardly surprising that elements of the Queen’s repertory found their way into the playwright’s later work.
As Wiggins suggests, *When You See Me* is ‘a well-made episodic play’, formed of a series of discrete incidents with ‘neatly layered transitions between them’.\(^\text{128}\) Even Somerset concedes that the structure of the play is not entirely unsystematic: ‘one could not, for example, juggle the sections of the play into reverse order and expect the same movement and effect’.\(^\text{129}\) Indeed, the effect of Rowley’s organisation of source material is powerfully climactic, building up to Wolsey’s dramatic fall and the triumph of Will Summers as he reveals to the King the whereabouts of the Cardinal’s hidden treasure. The episodic structure also helps to smooth the temporal transition between act 1, scene 2 of the play, in which Prince Edward is born, and act 4, in which he is represented as a young schoolboy some seven or eight years old. The compression and distortion of time elsewhere in *When You See Me* allows Rowley to make such temporal leaps without detriment to the wider narrative, thus providing a paradoxically uninterrupted sense of continuity to the action of the play as a whole despite the thirty-year timeframe that it spans.

**Notable sources**

In his discussion of source material, Somerset noted that while Rowley relied primarily upon Holinshed for the ‘narrative details and historical allusions’ of *When You See Me*, he drew both ‘the purpose and design of his work’ from Foxe.\(^\text{130}\) He thus suggested that the two sources were used in different ways: Holinshed’s chronicle for the bare historical facts of Henry’s reign (the names, dates and locations that give credence to Rowley’s dramatic representation); and Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* for the particular interpretation of these individuals.

\(^{129}\) Somerset, p. lxxiv.
\(^{130}\) Somerset, pp. iv and lix, respectively.
and events that Rowley presents throughout the play.\textsuperscript{131} Certainly, there are precise narrative details – the visit of the French ambassadors in act 1, scene 1, for example – that appear only in Holinshed, and must therefore derive from this source. Yet Somerset’s proposition is difficult to substantiate on a wider scale when one considers that most of the narrative details of Rowley’s play can be found in both works. Perhaps more significantly, Somerset’s assertion that Rowley took both the design and purpose of his play from Foxe’s \textit{Acts and Monuments} has the effect of reducing \textit{When You See Me} to a rather crude and unsophisticated portrayal of stock religious types, in turn overlooking the issues that arise from the specific circumstances of the play’s production, such as the position of the company’s royal patron in relation to Rowley’s protagonists, and other complexities associated with the play’s dual historicity.\textsuperscript{132} That is not to say that certain characters are \textit{not} drawn in the Foxean tradition (the character of Wolsey providing a case in point) but that the play offers a rather more nuanced representation of the source material than Somerset would seem to suggest.

Act 5, scenes 1–4 of Rowley’s play in particular owe a great deal to Foxe’s account of the accusation of heresy levelled against Queen Katherine Parr (see Appendix 2); the Queen’s words in 5.1, for example, are repeated almost verbatim. Yet despite Rowley’s precise use of this material in the dialogue of the play, the outcome presented in \textit{When You See Me} is viewed almost entirely as the result of Prince Edward’s intervention, pleading with his father to hear the Queen speak (5.4.8–9) and using his position as Prince of Wales to convince the King of

\textsuperscript{131} I cite from the most recent version of each work available at the time of the play’s composition: the 1587 edition of Holinshed (sixth volume) and the 1597 edition of Foxe (second volume).

\textsuperscript{132} See, for example, Judith Doolin Spikes’s observation that Rowley ‘charts his course between extremes’, acknowledging that the Lutheran reformists of Henry VIII’s time were as much a threat as the play’s Roman Catholics. ‘The Jacobean History Play and the Myth of the Elect Nation’, \textit{Renaissance Drama}, n.s. 8 (1977), 117–49 (p. 129).
Katherine’s innocence (5.4.49–50). Foxe conversely presents the King’s forgiveness as a sign of divine providence, proclaiming triumphantly: ‘But see what the Lorde God … did for his poore handmaiden’ (p. 1133). Here as elsewhere in the play Rowley moves away from Foxe’s providential account to focus on the actions and intentions of individuals. Thus, although much of the dialogue of the play is taken from Foxe’s account, the overall purpose of When You See Me is very different.

It is also important to note that a number of passages in the play find their origin neither in Foxe nor in Holinshed, but in other historical chronicles. A clear example can be found in act 5, scene 1, where Bonner and Gardiner speak with King Henry regarding the books and letters sent to the English court by Martin Luther. While Foxe and Holinshed touch only very briefly on this subject, Richard Grafton’s An abridgement of the chronicles of England (1562) provides a far more detailed account:

At this tyme Luther by the counsell of dyuers, wrote vnto king Hẽry the .viii. submitting himselfe, and beyng hartely sorye that he had written so sharply against the king. But […] the kyng in his aunswere blamed Luther much, and noted him of lightnes and inconstancy.133

Comparison with the following passage from Rowley’s When You See Me reveals a strong resemblance between the two accounts, even down to the level of individual word choice:

BONNER
   We hear that Luther out of Germany
   Hath writ a book unto your majesty,
   Wherein he much repents his former deeds,
   Craving your highness’ pardon, and withal
   Submits himself unto your grace’s pleasure.

KING
Bonner, ’tis true, and we have answered it,
Blaming at first his haughty insolence
And now his lightness and inconstancy,
That writ he knew not what so childishly.

(5.1.79–87)

Grafton’s account can also be seen to inform subsequent episodes in the play, particularly that in which King Henry reads aloud a portion of one of Luther’s letters (5.1.227–34). Here, Grafton’s words are repeated almost verbatim: ‘Luther then repented him of his submission, and wrote agayne that he was deceaued when he thought to fynde John Baptist in the courtes of princes, and among them that are clothed in purple’ (f. 126b).

Additionally, certain aspects of act 5, scene 5, including the Emperor Charles V’s arrival in England, can be seen to take their origin in Grafton’s account:

And shortly after the Emperour landed at Douer, and so came to London, where he was honourably receaued by the Mayor, Aldermen, and commons of the Citie, the king himselfe accompanying him. From thence he went to Windesor and sate in the stalle of the Garter (f. 125a).

Of course, it is possible that Rowley did not use Grafton’s Abridgement directly as source material for these episodes: a large portion of Grafton’s account is replicated in John Stow’s Summarie of Englyshe chronicles (1565) and it may well be, as Somerset supposes, that Rowley accessed this version instead.134 Either way, it is clear that he read beyond Foxe and Holinshed to supplement his own historical narrative.

It also seems, as Wilson points out, that Rowley may have used ‘a source or sources as yet unidentified’, since the name John de Mazo, which he attaches to the

134 John Stow, A summarie of Englyshe chronicles ([London]: In aedibus Thomae Marshi, [1565]), STC 23319, ff. 180a–b and ff. 117b–78a. See also Somerset, p. liii.
Bishop of Paris (1.2.49), appears in none of the abovementioned histories.\textsuperscript{135} Somerset additionally speculates that a hint from Cavendish’s \textit{Life of Wolsey}, which existed only in manuscript at the time of the play’s composition, may have formed the basis of the scene in which Brandon is threatened with death for marrying Lady Mary (3.2.173–99).\textsuperscript{136} However, since there is no suggestion of King Henry’s threat in Cavendish’s holograph, and no mention at all of the marriage in \textit{The negotiations of Thomas Woolsey} (the earliest edition of Cavendish’s work, printed in 1641), it is reasonable to speculate that the death threat uttered by King Henry in this scene was of Rowley’s own invention, perhaps intended to demonstrate the detrimental yet unavoidable intermingling of state and family politics.\textsuperscript{137}

As noted above, in addition to the historical chronicles Rowley drew upon a range of other source material in his composition of \textit{When You See Me}, particularly in those scenes set away from court. Perhaps the most obvious example occurs in act 2 of the play, in which King Henry embarks on his night-walk into London to examine the impact and efficiency of the City watch. The only possible mention of the King’s furtive activity in the chronicles is recorded in Holinshed – ‘On Midsummer night, the king came priuilie into Cheape, in one of the cotes of his gard’ (p. 806) – and repeated in Stow’s \textit{The chronicles of England} (1580), though in neither case is there any indication of either the purpose or the outcome of the expedition.\textsuperscript{138} Elements of this episode may derive from other contemporary playtexts: parallels with Shakespeare’s \textit{Henry V}, for instance, in which the King mingle anonymously with soldiers in the field on the eve of the Battle of Agincourt are difficult to miss, and

\textsuperscript{135} Wilson, p. x. \\
\textsuperscript{136} Somerset, p. liii. \\
\textsuperscript{137} The most detailed accounts of the marriage can be found in Holinshed, pp. 835–6; Hall, ff. lv\textsuperscript{2}–b; and Stow (1592), p. 830. Holinshed’s account, the fullest of the three, is included in Appendix 2. \\
Rowley almost certainly draws upon Shakespeare’s portrayal of Dogberry, Verges and the watch in *Much Ado About Nothing*.\(^{139}\) Greatest inspiration for this episode, however, seems to have been taken from the chapbook *The pleasant and delightful history of King Henry 8th. and a cobbler*.\(^{140}\) The first section of the chapbook, ‘How King *Henry* the 8th. used to visit the Watches in the City, and how he came acquainted with a merry and a Jovial Cobbler’, is of particular relevance: ‘It was the Custome of King *Henry* the Eigth, to Walk late in the Night into the City Disguised, to take notice how the Constastables [sic] and Watch performed their duty’.\(^{141}\) Notably, in *When You See Me* it is the villain Black Will rather than the cobbler Prickawl who becomes acquainted with the disguised King, leading in turn to a sequence of witty banter regarding the identity of the two men, an on-stage swordfight and the arrest of both offending parties.\(^{142}\)

The scene of Prince Edward’s tuition (4.1), the second of the two episodes set outside the King’s court, is also significant in its turn away from the chronicles. Unlike act 2, however, in which there is a clear narrative source for the action of the play, act 4 seems largely of Rowley’s own invention. In fact, the only reference to Edward’s schooling is that in Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, where it is observed that ‘in the midst of all his play and recreation, hee woulde alwaies obserue and keepe his houre appointed to his studie’ (p. 1179). The view of Edward offered in *When
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\(^{139}\) Other playtexts that might have served as inspiration for Rowley’s incorporation of the disguised ruler motif include Peele’s *Edward I*, Heywood’s *Edward IV* and Greene’s *George a Greene*, as well as the near contemporary *Measure for Measure* and *The Phoenix*. Together, these formed a part of what Kevin A. Quarmby has termed ‘a disguised ruler phenomenon’ that flourished around the turn of the century. *The Disguised Ruler in Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), p. 105.

\(^{140}\) The earliest extant edition of the folktale was printed in 1670 (Wing P2530); however, it is clear that the tale had been in print before this date, since, as the title-page attests, ‘The cobler’s song’ was added in this edition. It is likely that the tale – or versions of it – was well known orally, as well as in print.

\(^{141}\) Anon., *King Henry 8th. and a cobbler*, A3*–*.

\(^{142}\) On the effect of Rowley’s substitution of Black Will for the cobbler, see Rochelle Smith, ‘King-Commoner Encounters in the Popular Ballad, Elizabethan Drama, and Shakespeare’, *SEL*, 50.2 (Spring, 2010), 301–36 (p. 324).
You See Me thus runs counter to this description and the poor whipping-boy, Ned Browne, is seen to suffer for the Prince’s neglect (4.1.14). Very likely, as observed elsewhere in this introduction, this episode was composed with the young Prince Henry in mind, who, like Prince Edward in Rowley’s play, was frequently admonished for neglecting his studies.143

Significantly, much of the humour of this scene is provided by Will Summers, whose witty retorts and rejoinders are designed both to frustrate Edward’s tutors and to delight the playhouse audience. Elsewhere in the play, Summers is seen to challenge and belittle key players in the English court, and once again it seems Rowley looked well beyond the confines of the historical chronicles in his depiction of the King’s fool. One work on which Rowley’s characterisation may have been based is Robert Armin’s Fool Upon Fool (1600), in which Summers is one of six natural ‘sots’ whose stories are relayed to the reader by means of humorous anecdotes. Of this ‘merry foole’, ‘the Kings natural Iester’, Armin describes how:

[…] in all the Court,
Few men were more belou’d […]
When he was sad, the King and he would rime,
Thus Will exiled sadnes many a time.144

Armin’s description may thus inform act 1, scene 4 of When You See Me, in which Brandon implores Summers to help rid King Henry of his foul mood: ‘Now, Will, or never, make the King but smile, / And with thy mirthful toys allay his spleen’ (1.4.151–2). It may also inform those scenes of the play in which Summers and the King engage in rhyming contests, even though the rhymes themselves do not derive from this source.

144 Robert Armin, Foole Vpon Foole, or Six sorte of Sottes (London: printed [by E. Allde] for William Ferbrand, 1600), STC 772.3, E1v. All further references appear in parentheses in the main text.
In addition, Armin tells how Will was ‘a poore mans friend’ (E2'), eager to encourage the King to spend his wealth on those who truly need it. In Rowley’s play, Summers similarly stands up for the poor in putting their prayers above those of the Pope (3.2.80–2). Armin also has much to say on the antagonistic relationship between Summers and Wolsey (see, for example, the jest entitled ‘How Will Sommers … borrowed ten pounds of Cardinall Wolsey, to pay where the Cardinall owed it’, beginning on E4') and it may well be that Armin’s depiction of Summers in *Fool Upon Fool* inspired Rowley to use the character throughout *When You See Me* as a mouthpiece, voicing concerns over the Cardinal’s movements both at home and abroad. That Summers is also responsible in the play for effecting Wolsey’s ‘heavy fall’ further supports this interpretation.

Another episode in *When You See Me* which presumably finds its origin in folktales and ballads is Rowley’s depiction of Prince Edward’s birth, and the decision King Henry is asked to make regarding the life of Jane Seymour:

\[
\text{[...]} \text{Then, good my liege,} \\
\text{Resolve it quickly: if the Queen shall live,} \\
\text{The child must die; or if it life receives,} \\
\text{You must your hapless queen of life bereave.}
\]

(1.2.219–22)

Foxe is particularly brief on this subject, stating only that ‘[i]n the month of October, the same yeare following, was borne Prince Edward. Shortlie after whose birth, Queene Iane … died in childbed’ (pp. 992–3). Holinshed’s account of the incident, based on Hall and Foxe, does go one step further by speaking of King Henry’s sorrow: ‘the king hir husband tooke it most grieuouslie of all other, who remooung to Westminster, there kept himselfe close a great while after’ (p. 944), but once again there is no hint of any personal intervention on King Henry’s part in the scene of Edward’s birth. While it is clear that Rowley had read the version of events
presented in these chronicles, carefully integrating the Latin verses from Foxe and Holinshed into the action of the play (1.2.334–5), it is evident that he turned elsewhere for the more minute narrative details of this scene, most likely basing his dramatization upon versions of the tale in circulation – either orally or in print – at the time of the play’s composition.

The sequence of events presented in When You See Me may be based, for example, on the lost broadside ballad ‘The Lamentation of Queen Jane’, entered in the Stationers’ Register on 30 November 1560, only a month or so after the entrance of a similarly titled ‘ballett’ named ‘the lady Jane’. It is possible, too, that ‘The Lamentation’ represented an early form of ‘The Death of Queen Jane’, recorded as Ballad 170 in Francis J. Child’s English and Scottish Popular Ballads. Of the nine different versions recorded by Child, Rowley’s dramatization most closely resembles version A in which, in response to Queen Jane’s plea ‘O women, O women, as women ye be, / Rip open my two sides, and save my baby!’ (lines 3–4), King Henry gives the reply ‘O royal Queen Jane, that thing will not do; / If I lose your fair body, I’ll lose your baby too’ (lines 11–12). In none of the versions recorded by Child, however, does Henry actively seek to save the life of Queen Jane over that of his baby. Contrary to the various versions of this ballad, Rowley also places King Henry’s dilemma at the centre of the action as he agonises at length over the vital decision he has been asked to make.

There is also a strong resemblance between the text of this scene and a ballad entitled ‘The wofull death of Queene Iane’, printed in Richard Johnson’s collection A crowne garland in 1612. The fifth stanza is particularly relevant:
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145 Arber, Transcript, vol. 1, pp. 152 and 151, respectively.
146 Francis J. Child, The English and Scottish Popular Ballads, 5 vols. (New York: Folklore Press and Pageant Book Co., 1956). Ballad 170 is printed in its various forms in volumes 3 (pp. 372–6) and 5 (pp. 245–6).
Being thus perplex in greefe and care,
a Lady to him did repaire:
And said oh king shew vs thy will,
thy Queenes sweet life to saue or spill.
If she cannot deliuered be,
yet saue the flower if not the tree.
Oh mourne, mourne, mourne, faire Ladies,
Iane your Queene, the flower of England dies.

Later stanzas also bear resemblance to Rowley’s depiction, including, for example, the effect Prince Edward’s survival has upon his grief-stricken father: ‘This babe so borne much comfort brought, / and cheard his fathers drooping thought’ (C3v). While the title-page of A crowne garland claims that the contents of the book were ‘neuer before imprinted’, that is not to say that the individual ballads had never seen print. Moreover, the ballad was likely to have been in transmission orally several years prior to the printing of Johnson’s collection, and could easily have been known to Rowley at the time of his composition.

The dramatization in When You See Me of the King’s dilemma and his initial decision to preserve the life of Queen Jane over that of his unborn child can thus be viewed as a significant and deliberate deviation from the sources on Rowley’s part. The importance Rowley attaches to the King’s response is vital to his portrayal of Henry in his domestic role as husband and father, and the intention of this scene may well have been to counter more traditional views of the King as a harsh and prudent ruler, interested only in furthering the Tudor line. Certainly, this is the view of Kim H. Noling, who suggests that ‘the trajectory of the episode appears calculated to reveal Henry as innocent of any ruthless patriarchal compulsion for a male heir’.\footnote{Kim H. Noling, ‘Woman’s Wit and Woman’s Will in When You See Me, You Know Me’, SEL, 33 (1993), 327–42 (p. 330).} The playhouse audience thus encountered an altogether more human king than the chronicles typically allow, swayed continually
by the evil machinations of Cardinal Wolsey and his Catholic followers in matters of state policy, but resolute and steadfast in his love and loyalty to Queen Jane and devoted to Prince Edward in her memory.

Rowley’s use of sources in *When You See Me* is thus comprehensive and diverse, ranging from the near verbatim borrowing of the words of official letters and documents to the adaptation of apocryphal folktales and ballads. His own probable invention of the extended scene of Prince Edward’s schooling and his development of the character of Will Summers also contribute a great deal to the overall effect and humour of the play. The result is a play at once appealing and engaging, in which the trials and triumphs of King Henry VIII’s reign – both official and personal – were performed on the public stage for what appears to have been the very first time. The number and frequency of printed editions of *When You See Me* to materialise over the next two and a half decades can only be seen to bear witness to the play’s popularity on the early modern stage.

The play in performance

While, as Alan Dessen suggests, the stage directions in extant playtexts preserve only a small fraction of the staging techniques utilised in the early modern theatre, it is nonetheless possible to reconstruct certain elements of *When You See Me*’s first performances by combining information afforded in the play’s printed editions with evidence from other contemporary sources.\(^{149}\) The playtext alongside company personnel lists, for example, can reveal information about the likely cast of Rowley’s play, as well as the need and potential for doubling in particular scenes;

further information in this regard can be gleaned from the extant company stage plots. Knowledge about the size and structure of the Fortune playhouse in particular opens up a range of interpretive possibilities and Henslowe’s inventories of theatrical apparel are of use in considering the various stage properties and musical instruments that might have been used in the play’s earliest performances.  

Length of text and duration of performance

Standing at 3,095 lines in its earliest printed edition, Rowley’s *When You See Me* is not only one of the longest extant playtexts presented for performance by the Lord Admiral’s–Prince Henry’s Men at the Fortune, but one of the longest plays of the early modern period. As the work of Alfred Hart and more recently Lukas Erne has shown, only about ten per cent of extant playtexts from the period 1590–1616 exceeded 3,000 lines; moreover, fewer than a quarter of these were written by dramatists other than Shakespeare and Jonson. While this importantly marks *When You See Me* out as the fullest dramatic representation of the early Tudor dynasty, the question arises as to whether the play could have been performed in its entirety at the Fortune or whether, as is often supposed, plays that exceeded 2,500 lines were cut in preparation for performance.

150 My own approach in this respect runs counter to Dessen’s statement that any attempt to deal with the plays’ original staging must ‘build almost exclusively upon the evidence within the plays themselves’. See Dessen’s *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), p. 19.

151 The line count for *When You See Me* is taken from Wilson’s MSR edition. The only extant company playtext to rival Rowley’s in terms of length is Dekker and Middleton’s *The Roaring Girl*, which stands at just over 3,100 lines; the two parts of *The Honest Whore* each come in at just under 3,000. In each case I use the TLN system, which includes the texts’ stage directions in addition to their dialogue.


This belief stems from two interrelated and, as I will argue, unsubstantiated assumptions about the nature of early modern performance: that theatrical cutting was undertaken primarily as a means of reducing authorial playtexts to a performable length, and that the typical duration of a play was just over two hours. Theatrical cutting did of course take place, but the length of the play in question was not necessarily the determining factor. Greg’s work on the First Folio, for instance, reveals that cuts tended to make ‘no great impression on the length of the play’, appearing on many occasions to have been made ‘on what may be called local grounds, to remove offence or obscurity’ rather than to shorten performance time. Michael Hirrel points also to the manuscript prompt copy of *Thomas of Woodstock*, which contains as many as 2,910 lines even after a number of incidental cuts and revisions. Moreover, theatrical abridgements were likely to have been necessitated by more immediate concerns such as the number of men available for a particular performance rather than the number of lines given over to each actor. The 1623 title-page of John Webster’s *Duchess of Malfi*, which speaks of ‘diuere things Printed, that the length of the Play would not beare in the Presentment’, may not therefore indicate that the play was too long for performance, but rather that it contained too many roles. Since there is no indication of any systematic attempt on the part of theatrical personnel to reduce plays to a standard length, there is nothing to suggest that Rowley’s *When You See Me* could not have been performed in its entirety.

---

154 See, for example, Gurr’s ‘Maximal and Minimal Texts’, in which he uses the evidence of abridgement in extant playbooks to suggest that the full-length or ‘maximal’ playscripts handed over by the dramatist(s) were necessarily ‘trimmed and modified, in varying degrees of substantiality’ to allow for performance within a predetermined two-hour timeframe. Andrew Gurr, ‘Maximal and Minimal Texts: Shakespeare v. the Globe’, *SS* 52 (1999), 68–87 (pp. 70 and 68, respectively).


The supposed two-hour performance timeframe, usually noted with reference to the ‘two hours’ traffic’ declared in the Prologue to Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet* (line 12) or other such allusions, is also unsustainable. It is possible, for instance, to draw upon the evidence of a number of contemporary playtexts which specify a playing time greater than two hours. The scrivener (on behalf of the author) in Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair* appeals to audience members to sit quietly ‘for the space of two hours and an half and somewhat more’ (59–60), while the Epilogue in Dekker’s *If It Be Not Good* speaks of the play’s ‘three hours of mirth’ (line 5). Reference to time is also made in *The Tempest*, where Prospero says: ‘What is the time o’th’ day? … At least two glasses. The time ’twixt six and now / Must by us both be spent most preciously’ (1.2.239–41). The performance of a single play, it seems, could last anything between two and four hours, and with the addition of pre- and post-play entertainments, as well as the possibility of improvisation within the play itself, the overall theatrical experience could perhaps have lasted for as many as five hours. Furthermore, of those plays identified at the time as taking two hours to perform, the shortest (Robert Tailor’s *The Hog Hath Lost His Pearl*) and the longest (Jonson’s *The Alchemist*) stand respectively at 1,951 and 3,066 lines, thus demonstrating the mutability of the professed timeframe. That Rowley’s *When You See Me* exceeds 3,000 lines does not therefore pose a problem in this respect.

---


159 As Steven Urkowitz notes, the ‘two hours’ traffic’ of Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* is in fact repeated in the far longer second quarto, even though the title-page boasts that the play is ‘[n]ewly corrected, augmented, and amended’. Steven Urkowitz, ‘Did Shakespeare’s Company Cut Long Plays Down to Two Hours Playing Time?’, *Shakespeare Bulletin*, 30.3 (2012), 239–62 (p. 248).
Clearly, given the potential for improvisation in the theatre, the practice of using line counts to determine duration of performance is problematic; as Richard Preiss suggests, a ‘substantial part’ of each performance consisted ‘not of the play at all, but of the dilatory performance of its own reception’, as well, of course, as the various non-scripted elements of performance such as music, dumbshows and other related stage business.\textsuperscript{160} In addition to the 3,095 printed lines of \textit{When You See Me}, the play’s stage directions call for three separate musical performances and an on-stage fight between Black Will and the disguised King Henry. The episode in which Patch creeps up behind the King (1.4) is also likely to have interrupted the flow of the scripted dialogue, and a number of grand entrance directions (in the final scene in particular) indicate further areas for protraction and perhaps improvisation on the part of the players. Himself an actor, Rowley was no doubt aware of the amount of time given over to stage business and is unlikely to have incorporated such elements if performance restrictions did not allow for their inclusion.

Significantly, it seems that many of the traditionally incidental aspects of performance – musical interludes, singing, clowning, extemporal rhyming – are written into the play as part of the central narrative. Will Summers, for example, is not ancillary to the action of the play, but rather, as Alexander Leggatt suggests, ‘an essential part of the occasion’.\textsuperscript{161} This may perhaps be explained by the potential absence of the clown John Singer from the cast of \textit{When You See Me} (see ‘Actors and casting’): the witty rhyming contests between Summers and a number of the play’s other principal characters are purposely reminiscent of those performed by

\textsuperscript{160}Preiss, \textit{Clowning and Authorship}, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{161}Leggatt, \textit{Jacobean Public Theatre}, p. 105.
Singer in the years prior to the play’s first performances. Alternatively, the uncommon length of *When You See Me* and the fullness of its extra-theatrical entertainments may indicate the company’s desire to return to the stage with renewed vigour after the devastation of the plague, and to showcase their abilities as members of the newly named Prince Henry’s Men. Either way, the undertaking demonstrates a great level of confidence on Rowley’s part, both in the subject matter of his play and the reception it would accordingly receive, and in the acting space at the Fortune for which the play was purposefully written. Such confidence can also be evidenced in the large number of actors required to perform *When You See Me* and in the splendour of the play’s musical performances, as discussed in the sections that follow.

**Actors and casting**

Using *Henslowe’s Diary* and *Greg’s Dramatic Documents* alongside the evidence of contemporary patents and licences, it is possible to identify twelve adult company members who are likely to have acted in the first public performances of *When You See Me*: Thomas Downton, Anthony and Humphrey Jeffes, William Borne (alias Bird), Thomas Towne, Charles Massey, Edward Juby, William Parr, William Cartwright (the elder), William Kendall, John Shank and Rowley himself. Of course, not all the actors in the company necessarily acted in every play, making it impossible to state with certainty the precise number of men available for any given

---

162 Before joining the Admiral’s Men, Singer worked alongside Tarlton as a member of the Queen’s Men and had, as Preiss suggests, inherited ‘Tarlton’s mould’ (*Clowning and Authorship*, p. 73). He was also one of a number of comic actors to whom Heywood paid homage in *An apology for actors* (London: printed by Nicholas Okes, 1612), *STC* 13309, E2v.

163 Biographies for each of these men can be found in Astington, *Actors and Acting*, pp. 188–224; Nungezer, *Dictionary*; and Gurr, *Shakespeare’s Opposites*, pp. 274–88.
performance. Nonetheless, it is likely that, if not all, then at least a significant proportion of these actors would have taken part. Since, as Cerasano notes, Edward Alleyn seems to have ‘given up a central role in the company’ in February 1604, his name has not been included in the list of possible actors. It is important to note, however, that the part of King Henry VIII may have been written with Alleyn in mind (see below).

It is not possible to identify boy actors with the same degree of confidence. The names of at least fifteen boys are included collectively in the stage plots for *Frederick and Basilea*, *The Battle of Alcazar* and *I Tamar Cam*, in addition to the more non-specific references to ‘mr Townes boy’, ‘mr Allens boy’, ‘gils his boy’ and ‘Dengtens little boy’. How long the boys continued to perform for the company after their appearances in these plays is not known: some may have ceased performing – certainly in female or child roles – when their voices broke, while others may have continued on the stage for some time, allowing for the possibility that at least some of those who acted in *The Battle of Alcazar* and *I Tamar Cam* may also have acted in Rowley’s *When You See Me*. Quite possibly, Prince Henry’s Men also took on a number of new boys to coincide with the reopening of the Fortune in April 1604, and may have taken on boy actors as and when needed in performance, much in the way of hired men.

Of the adult actors mentioned above, the first seven (Downton, the two Jeffes, Bird, Towne, Massey and Juby) appear respectively in each of three official

---

166 The plots are all reprinted, with facsimiles and tables, in Greg’s *Dramatic Documents*, vol. 2. The distinction between boy and adult actors here follows that in *Henslowe’s Diary*, pp. 326–33.
167 Four of the boys who acted in *The Battle of Alcazar* (James, Dick Juby, Thomas Parsons and George Somerset) also acted in *I Tamar Cam* the following year, perhaps suggesting a more active, long-term involvement in the company.
documents listing the personnel of Prince Henry’s Men: a manuscript naming the
members of the three royal playing companies who were to march as part of King
James’s grand entrance into London (15 March 1604); a licence for Prince Henry’s
Men, allowing the company to ‘vse and exercise the arte and facultie of playing …
within theire nowe vsuall house called the ffortune’ and elsewhere (30 April
1606); and a list of company members granted livery for Prince Henry’s funeral
(8 November 1612). This, combined with the personnel lists included in
Henslowe’s Diary, confirms their active involvement in the Admiral’s–Prince’s
Men both before and after the company’s move to the Fortune in 1600 and well
into the seventeenth century.

The remaining four actors (Parr, Cartwright, Kendall and Shank) are more
difficult to place. William Parr does not appear in the 1604 personnel list or the
1606 licence, but his name can be found in the stage plot for 1 Tamar Cam,
performed at the Fortune in 1602, and in the Prince’s Household lists of 1610,
suggesting his continued participation in the company under the patronage of the
young prince. Similarly, William Cartwright’s name is absent from the earlier lists
and licences, but he too is mentioned in the stage plot for 1 Tamar Cam and again
in a royal patent dated 11 January 1613, licensing the Palsgrave’s Men to perform
at the Fortune and elsewhere. Whether the absence of these two men in the 1604
and 1606 documents indicates a hiatus in their involvement in the company
remains uncertain, though it is probable they continued to act as hired men as and
when needed. If this is the case, the considerable number of actors required to
perform Rowley’s play, as discussed below, would suggest that they may have

168 The documents, held at TNA, are transcribed in E. K. Chambers and W. W. Greg (eds.),
169 The Prince’s Household lists are transcribed in the appendix to Thomas Birch’s Life of Henry,
been called upon to participate in the performance. William Kendall, likewise, may have been paid to perform in *When You See Me*; a hired man in late 1597, he performed in the revival of *The Battle of Alcazar* around 1601 and is known to have been active in this capacity at least until 1614.  

Of all the actors mentioned above, John Shank’s involvement in the company at this time is the most contentious. Although absent from the 1604 personnel list and 1606 licence, Shank’s name appears in the Prince’s Household lists of 1610 and it is possible, as Gurr and Preiss suggest, that he joined the company c. 1603 (presumably as a hired man) to replace John Singer as company clown after the latter’s apparent departure from the stage earlier the same year. Singer’s name disappears from theatrical records after 13 January 1602/3, at which time Henslowe paid five pounds for the ‘playe called Syngers vallentarey’, often thought to have been Singer’s last public performance as a member of the then Lord Admiral’s Men. It is possible that he left the stage after this time to become an ordinary Groom of the Chamber in the Queen’s household, a position, as Herbert Berry points out, ‘he is found occupying at the time of Elizabeth’s funeral’. Whether or not Singer died in 1603, his absence from the 1604 personnel list is telling, given his prominence in previous lists, and it is likely that the Admiral’s–Prince’s Men would have been keen to find a replacement for their comic actor as soon as possible. Thus although there is nothing to confirm the precise moment at

---

172 See, for example, Chambers, *ES*, II.177: ‘I take “vallentary” to mean “valediction”’. The entry in question can be found on p. 208 of *Henslowe’s Diary*.  
174 Preiss points to similar instances of companies working to replace comic actors immediately after their departure from the stage. He cites, for instance, the ‘urgency’ with which the Lord Chamberlain’s Men replaced Kemp with Armin, and the subsequent replacement of Kemp with Thomas Greene upon Worcester’s Men’s becoming Queen Anne’s Men. See *Clowning and Authorship*, p. 185.
which Shank joined the company, both the absence of Singer and the consequent need for a new company clown can be taken as evidence in support of his involvement at this time. Possibly, then, Shank played Will Summers in the company’s first performances of *When You See Me*.175

It is also worth considering which of these actors might have played King Henry, who was required to speak (in this edition) a remarkable 1,003 lines: more than one third of the play’s total. Based on a comparison with the fifty-three playtexts examined in King’s *Casting Shakespeare’s Plays*, in terms of the number of lines assigned to a single character, Rowley’s King Henry is surpassed only by four other roles: Hamlet (1,338 lines in Q2; 1,240 lines in F); the King in *Richard III* (1,062 lines in Q1; 1,116 lines in F); the King in *Henry V* (1,056 lines in F); and Iago in *Othello* (1,032 lines in Q1; 1,098 lines in F). To this list, Scott McMillin added the roles of Barabas in Marlowe’s *Jew of Malta* (1,138 lines in Q1) and Hieronimo in the enlarged version of Thomas Kyd’s *Spanish Tragedy* (1,018 lines in Q4). Since McMillin’s line count for the role of King Henry VIII in *When You See Me* is based on Wilson’s edition, itself based on Q1, he noted a total of 1,018 lines: the same as Kyd’s Hieronimo. Given the larger paper and type size of my own edition, McMillin’s positioning of Rowley’s King Henry provides a fairer comparison with the playtexts listed above.

An even more accurate assessment of role size can be gained by looking at the actual number of words spoken by each of the abovementioned characters. Thus while Hamlet, who speaks an extraordinary 11,121 words in Q2, remains at the top of the list, the number of words spoken by Marlowe’s Barabas (8,740) actually

175 Gurr suggests that Rowley may have written the part of Summers for himself, but he provides no evidence to support this supposition, other than the fact that Rowley is known to have written comic plays for the Palsgrave’s Men. See *Shakespeare’s Opposites*, p. 190.
exceeds the number spoken by Shakespeare’s Iago (8,379). The part of King Henry in Rowley’s *When You See Me* contains 8,038 words, placing it below that of Iago, but only by a matter of a few hundred words.\textsuperscript{177} Significantly, this confirms that of all the extant dramatic texts listed in Harbage’s *Annals of English Drama* from 1580 to 1610 inclusive (the parameters of McMillin’s study), Rowley’s Henry VIII was either the fifth or the sixth largest role, depending on whether role size is determined by line or word count.\textsuperscript{178}

It is well known that playwrights often had specific actors in mind when they wrote particular parts, and this was especially true of Rowley, who not only knew the character types of the performers but who, as the company stage plots testify, had also acted alongside them on numerous occasions prior to the composition of *When You See Me*.\textsuperscript{179} As noted above, it is likely that the part of King Henry VIII was written for Edward Alleyn but that, given the actor’s apparent retirement from the stage in February 1604, the role fell to another member of the company to perform.\textsuperscript{180} Alleyn was, as Cerasano observes, ‘a man of exceptional physical stature, with a strong voice to match his size’, and it is clear from the manner and variety of roles he is known to have performed that playwrights exploited his abilities to the full.\textsuperscript{181} Significantly, as McMillin notes, no extant playtext written for the Admiral’s Men between 1597 and 1600, during Alleyn’s

\textsuperscript{177} Word counts here were established using full-text digital transcriptions available via EEBO or, in the case of Q2 *Hamlet*, the Shakespeare Quartos Archive <http://www.quartos.org/> [accessed 12 February 2014]. For *When You See Me* I used this edition.

\textsuperscript{178} McMillin, *The Elizabethan Theatre*, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{179} Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern note that playwrights created lines ‘that explicitly matched an actor’s size, vocal range, and mannerisms’. *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 41.

\textsuperscript{180} Cerasano alternatively suggests that the role of Cardinal Wolsey might have been written for Alleyn, given Alleyn’s likely performance in the two lost Wolsey plays. Private correspondence, 10 September 2014. I am grateful to Professor Cerasano for taking the time to respond to my queries.

temporary break from the stage, contains a role larger than 600 lines.\textsuperscript{182} Thus it seems the role of King Henry, at upwards of 1,000 lines, was tailored specifically both to highlight the importance of the play’s royal protagonist and to showcase Alleyn’s theatrical skill.\textsuperscript{183}

The success of the company did not depend upon Alleyn’s ability, however. In \textit{Actors and Acting}, John H. Astington notes that Thomas Downton, who had joined the Admiral’s Men in 1597 as a hired man, quickly rose in the company ‘to take on parts formerly played by the temporarily absent Alleyn’ and it is possible, therefore, that Downton came to assume the role of lead actor after Alleyn’s more permanent departure from the stage.\textsuperscript{184} Support for this may be found in subsequent personnel lists for the company: in the 1606 licence and indeed in all later references to the Prince’s–Palsgrave’s Men, Downton’s name appears at the head of the list, and while, as Greg points out, the actors’ respective positions cannot necessarily be taken to indicate their relative seniority within the company, it is nonetheless significant that Downton’s name retains its prominent position.\textsuperscript{185} In Alleyn’s absence, then, it is possible that Downton came to take on the role of King Henry VIII.

As it stands in Q1, Rowley’s \textit{When You See Me} contains a total of forty-one speaking parts and at least an additional fifty-three mute parts. My own editorial emendation at 3.2.142, which assigns the line ‘My royal lord —’ to the messenger rather than to Rooksby, puts the total number of speaking parts at forty-two. Adopting King’s definition of a ‘principal role’ – twenty-five or more lines

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{182} McMillin, \textit{The Elizabethan Theatre}, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{183} McMillin believed not only that the role of King Henry VIII was written for Alleyn but that Alleyn actually performed it. He thus describes \textit{When You See Me} as a ‘star vehicle’, thrusting Alleyn back into his leading position at the Fortune. See \textit{The Elizabethan Theatre}, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{184} Astington, \textit{Actors and Acting}, p. 196.
\textsuperscript{185} Greg (ed.), \textit{Henslowe’s Diary, Part II}, p. 102.
\end{flushright}
for adults and ten or more for boys – and adhering to the practices observed in the extant company stage plots, whereby men only play adult roles and boys typically play female roles or children, the speaking parts of Rowley’s play can be divided into sixteen principal and sixteen minor adult roles, and five principal and five minor boys’ roles. Of the play’s total 2,874 lines in this edition, 2,746 (95.5 per cent) are spoken by the play’s principal characters: a finding largely consistent with King’s averages.186

Of course, although he does consider plays outside of the repertory of the Lord Chamberlain’s–King’s Men, King’s focus, as his title attests, is on the plays written by Shakespeare and others predominantly for performance at the Globe. More useful in the case of Rowley’s *When You See Me* is McMillin’s study of minimum casting requirements in the plays written specifically for performance by Prince Henry’s Men at the Fortune.187 Using the earliest printed texts of *When You See Me*, *1 and 2 Honest Whore*, *The Whore of Babylon* and *The Roaring Girl*, McMillin noted that ‘they all reduce to virtually the same minimum cast for speaking roles and to virtually the same division between roles for boy actors and roles for adults’.188 On average, he observed, the plays required a minimum cast of seventeen to cover all speaking parts, twelve adult actors and five boys, and he devised a casting chart to show one possible way in which all speaking roles in Rowley’s *When You See Me* could be covered by these seventeen performers.189 Notably, McMillin’s chart includes thirty-nine speaking parts – three fewer than in this edition. The discrepancy

186 For the purpose of calculating character line-counts, portions of shared verse lines have been treated as complete lines; similarly, in the case of lines spoken by more than one character, such as 1.4.262, one line is attributed to each of the speakers.

187 McMillin’s purpose here was to highlight similarities in the casting requirements of the Fortune plays and the revised *Sir Thomas More* so as to support his suggestion that the latter was revised specifically for performance by Prince Henry’s Men. See McMillin, *The Elizabethan Theatre*, p. 85. Two plays not considered in the study are Middleton’s *No Wit/Help Like a Woman*s and R.A.’s *The Valiant Welshman*.


is easily accounted for: McMillin retains the line ‘My royal lord —’ as part of Rooksby’s speech (see above), conflates the parts of ‘Servant’ and ‘1 Servant’ (4.1 and 5.2), and overlooks the guardsman’s lines in act 5, scene 4. Although the discrepancy is small, it nonetheless has a bearing on the distribution of speaking parts between actors and it has thus been necessary to create a new minimum casting chart for When You See Me that takes into account these additional roles (Appendix 3a). Actors here are numbered 1–12 (adults) and 13–17 (boys) and listed in each case according to the total number of spoken lines, from the highest down to the lowest.

In both McMillin’s table and my own, the actor playing King Henry VIII performs just the one role, in accordance with what seems to have been the company’s standard practice. However, while McMillin assigns only a single role to the actors playing Wolsey, Will Summers, Compton, Brandon and Seymour, all except Compton double in the revised chart. Not only does this straighten out some peculiarities, such as McMillin’s decision to assign Seymour as a single role despite the fact that the character speaks only seventeen lines, it also opens up some interesting doubling possibilities, such as the pairing of Will Summers and Black Will – the only two characters in the play with whom the King can freely converse on matters outside the realm of state politics. Moreover, the shortest change-over between roles in the revised chart is a space of twenty-four lines, between Dudley, Seymour and Campeius in act 1, scene 4 and their respective doubled roles, 2 Watch, Dormouse and the Constable at the start of act 2; the shortest change-over in McMillin’s chart is only fourteen lines.

Since twelve adult actors are required to cover all speaking parts in Rowley’s play, it is tempting to assume that the abovementioned actors took on the majority of

---

190 In the company’s extant stage plots, for instance, Alleyn only ever appears on stage in the lead role. See King, Casting Shakespeare’s Plays, p. 20.
these roles. The problem with minimum casting charts, however, is that they only take into consideration the dialogue of each play: they do not incorporate the numerous mute roles identified in the text’s stage directions. Thus while twelve adults and five boys are sufficient to cover the speaking parts of *When You See Me*, this number is insufficient to realise the play in its entirety. In order to work out how many actors were required to perform Rowley’s play in full, I have adopted a method similar to that used by McMillin and Sally-Beth MacLean in their work on the constitution and repertory of the Queen’s Men, which focuses on a play’s largest grouping of characters – both speaking and mute – to determine ‘the number of actors the play cannot do without’.¹⁹¹ As McMillin and MacLean point out, this does not indicate the actual size of the company, but rather ‘the economic ground-level of the company – a limit below which the company cannot perform the play as it stands’.¹⁹² In the case of *When You See Me*, this involves turning to act 5, scene 5. The action here requires the presence of five boys to play the roles of Prince Edward, Queen Katherine, Lady Mary and the mute ‘ladies attending’, and the presence of at least eighteen men to play the five speaking roles of the Emperor, Wolsey, Brandon, King Henry and Will Summers, as well as the numerous mute roles of attendants, guardsmen, lords, gentlemen, and so on, many of whom exit the stage at line 42 and subsequently re-enter as part of the King’s grand procession moments later. By way of doubling, it was possible for these five boys and eighteen men to cover all forty-two speaking parts and fifty-three mute parts.¹⁹³

A second doubling chart has therefore been constructed for *When You See Me* which demonstrates how all roles in the play, both speaking and non-speaking,

¹⁹¹ McMillin and MacLean, *The Queen’s Men and their Plays*, p. 99.
¹⁹² McMillin and MacLean, *The Queen’s Men and their Plays*, p. 99.
¹⁹³ This is consistent with McMillin and MacLean’s observation that the number of players on stage in these ‘largest groupings’ can fill all the roles in the play. *The Queen’s Men and their Plays*, p. 103.
might feasibly have been covered by these twenty-three performers (Appendix 3b). The chart also includes the number of lines spoken in each role and thus gives an indication not only of the size of each individual part but of each actor’s overall contribution to the play. I have included the trumpeters’ parts in the doubling chart as there is evidence to suggest that the actors themselves performed these roles: the stage plot for *I Tamar Cam*, for example, includes an entrance note in scene 11 for ‘a Trompett: W. Parr’, suggesting in turn that William Parr might have performed one of the two trumpeters’ roles in *When You See Me*. I have not, however, included the various singers’ and instrumentalists’ parts required for act 4 since, although the company evidently possessed the means to take on these roles themselves (see below), the possibility remains that extra musicians were hired for the performance.

Since there are five principal boys’ roles in the play (Prince Edward, Queen Katherine, Lady Mary, Queen Jane and young Browne), and since five boys are required on stage in act 5, scene 5, one principal part has been assigned to each actor and the five minor and nine mute roles divided between them. The sixteen principal adult roles have been divided between eleven men: four (the actors playing the King, Will Summers, Wolsey and Compton) perform only a single role; the others either double in lesser roles or assume mute supernumerary roles elsewhere in the play. The seven adult actors not already occupied take on the remaining forty minor and mute roles, each speaking a total of between twelve and thirty-one lines. One of these men takes on eight roles – an unusual though not unprecedented scenario, as evidenced in the stage plot for *I Tamar Cam*.

In the majority of plays included in his study, King noted that it was usual for an actor ‘who doubles in lesser principal roles’ to have an interval of at least
one scene offstage per individual costume change. While I have tried throughout to adhere to this general rule, it has been necessary to make one exception: the actors playing Bonner and Bonnivet in act 1, scene 3 have each been assigned a non-speaking role as a trumpeter in the following scene before entering respectively as the Constable and the Cobbler in act 2, scene 1. This is perfectly feasible, however, given that, after their departure at the end of act 1, scene 3, neither actor is required on stage for a space of at least 275 lines. Providing the trumpeters’ costumes were relatively straightforward, or could be quickly adapted into the Constable and Cobbler’s outfits by means of an additional robe, beard or hand-held stage property, the thirty-four lines between the actors’ exit in act 1, scene 4 and entrance in act 2, scene 1 would have provided time enough to effect the change. Indeed, as McMillin observes, the extant repertories of both the Queen’s and Admiral’s–Prince’s Men afford ‘numerous examples of costume changes covered by fewer than twenty-five lines of dialogue’ and actors, it seems, could change from one role into another in a remarkably short space of time.

Since only twelve possible actors were identified above, it is likely that the remaining six men required to perform Rowley’s When You See Me would have been hired specifically for the performance. It is also possible that backstage tiring-house men or other theatre personnel may have been called upon to provide additional bodies for the final scene if the eighteen men already on stage at this point were deemed insufficient in number. It should also be noted here that whereas the extant company stage plots typically assign three men to each indiscriminate group of ‘lords’, ‘attendants’, ‘gentlemen’, and so on, I have

---

194 King, Casting Shakespeare’s Plays, p. 13.
195 McMillin, The Elizabethan Theatre, p. 78.
only assigned two, in accordance with the practices of William Ringler, David Bradley and McMillin and MacLean; as the latter note, ‘two seems to be the most economical way of representing a plural call for extras’. The only exceptions to this rule occur in act 2, scene 3, where ‘prisoners’ at 34 SD1 has been taken to indicate two speaking parts plus another mute role (see commentary); in act 5, scene 4, where the action requires at least two guardsmen in addition to the speaking role 1 Guard; and in act 5, scene 5, where three ‘gentlemen’ have been appointed on the basis that these men exit and then subsequently double as the lords in the Prince’s procession. Since the non-specific label ‘lords’ is used variously throughout the play to indicate Brandon, Dudley, Seymour and Grey, and since Brandon is already on stage in this scene, I have taken ‘lords’ here to mean that Dudley, Seymour and Grey make a final silent appearance, and have thus assigned the mute lords’ roles to the three actors who had previously played them. If Rowley had intended three men in each of the indeterminate roles in this scene, however, an additional five actors (four men and one boy) would have been required on stage, making a total possible cast of twenty-two men and six boys – a total, though large, fully in keeping with that in the stage plot for 1 Tamar Cam, in which twenty-seven or twenty-eight different performers are named.

---


197 See Henslowe’s Diary, pp. 332–3 for a breakdown of the cast of 1 Tamar Cam. The name ‘Jeames’ (James) appears twice in the plot and it is uncertain whether there were two boy actors of the same name or whether the same boy made two distinct appearances. Foakes lists the names separately.
Use of stage space

The existence of the Fortune contract, drawn up between Edward Alleyn and Peter Street in January 1599/1600, allows some insight into the ways in which various elements of *When You See Me* might have been performed on the public stage. The Fortune theatre was square, unlike the Rose and Globe, and measured eighty feet square on the outside and fifty-five feet square on the inside, with three storeys of galleries. According to the contract, the stage itself was to be forty-three feet long, extending to ‘the middle of the yarde’; this in turn allowed for a playing space of approximately forty-three feet by twenty-seven feet and six inches.\(^{198}\) Although the method of construction was largely to follow that of the Globe, ‘with suchelike steares, conveyances, & divisions withoute & within’, the main physical difference between the two playhouses – excluding the overall shape of the buildings – was in their internal appearance, particularly with reference to the decoration of the *frons scena* and the shape and position of the theatres’ stage posts.\(^{199}\) As the contract stipulated:

\[
\text{all the princypall and maine postes of the saide Frame and Stadge forwarde shalbe square and wroughte palasterwise, with carved proporcion called Satiers to be placed & sett on the top of every of the same postes.}^{200}
\]

This large, rectilinear playing area, then, and the square, inset posts that held in place the cover over the stage, could be utilised and exploited in performance to a far greater extent than those at the Rose.


\(^{199}\) Fortune contract, f. 1r. For a detailed examination of the theatre’s construction and the timescale of Street’s work, see John Orrell, ‘Building the Fortune’, *SQ*, 44.2 (1993), 127–44.

\(^{200}\) Fortune contract, f. 1r.
Actors’ use of stage posts at the Rose was undoubtedly imaginative, as evidenced for example in Haughton’s *Englishmen For My Money*, where the posts act as geographical markers, or in Greene’s *Orlando Furioso*, in which verses are hung ‘on the trees’, but the physical position of the posts at the edge of the stage remained a limiting factor in performance.\(^{201}\) As Gurr observes, ‘the archaeological evidence [puts] them too near the edge of the stage to allow any player to hide behind them’.\(^{202}\) The Rose’s posts could not, therefore, be used for concealment, as they were in Rowley’s play: ‘I’ll stand behind the post here, and thou shalt go softly stealing behind him’ (1.4.178–9). The stage layout at the Fortune thus allowed actors to hide themselves from other characters while remaining visible to the vast majority of audience members. This, combined with the larger performance space, amplified the opportunity both for comedy and for dramatic irony in the new Admiral’s–Prince’s Men’s plays and Rowley, who had performed at the Fortune on numerous occasions, evidently made shrewd use of the stage in his composition of *When You See Me*.

The play seems, for example, to have incorporated what McMillin terms a ‘divided-stage technique’ whereby, in the scenes set in the King’s royal residence, the stage was divided into two specific acting areas: ‘a broad expanse’ that stood for the royal presence chamber and an adjacent focal area that represented ‘the furnished private room of the King’\(^{203}\). Certainly this offers one explanation for the stage direction at 1.4.25, where King Henry is directed to enter ‘within’. Moreover, the staggered entrances in this scene, which allow Brandon, Dudley, Grey, Seymour


\(^{202}\) Gurr, *Shakespeare’s Opposites*, p. 133.

and Compton to remark upon Wolsey’s actions as he enters with Summers and Patch, suggest the use of a further stage space within the presence chamber, perhaps indicating an even more complex division than that described by McMillin. Dividing the stage in this way towards the beginning of the play may also, as McMillin suggests, have affected the audience’s interpretation of later scenes. When in act 2, scene 3 the actor playing the King is instructed to enter ‘in prison’, for example, it is possible that he would have entered into the same physical playing space that had previously served as the King’s private room at court. Thus, when he notifies the Constable that he has ‘made the Counter this night the royal court of England’s King’ (2.3.14–15), Henry can be seen to comment upon the performance space as much as upon the action of the play. The scenes concerning Katherine Parr might also have made effective use of the public and private performance areas: the former for her open debate with Bonner and Gardiner, and the latter for her private conference with the Prince and Sir William Compton in the aftermath of the bishops’ accusations.

The larger performance space at the Fortune presumably also afforded greater opportunity for spectacle and special effects than the smaller, more restrictive stage space at the Rose. Both the stage plot for the company’s revival of Peele’s Battle of Alcazar and the additions in the Faustus B-text bear witness to the various ways in which existing plays were altered for performance on the Fortune stage. Written specifically for performance at the Fortune, Rowley’s When You See Me, like Dekker’s Whore of Babylon, made the most of this large space by filling it with action, music and spectacle. The complex stage business of act 5, scene 5 of When You See Me in particular, in which at least twenty-three actors move across the stage in spectacular, staggered procession, confirms the playwright’s confidence
in and exploitation of the company’s new acting space. Leggatt’s description of this scene as a ‘stage-filling climax’ in which ‘waves of spectacle sweep over the stage’ clearly demonstrates the intended dramatic effect of the procession in performance.\textsuperscript{204} The complex musical interludes that form a fundamental part of Prince Edward’s tuition, as detailed below, further contribute to the overall spectacle of the play.

\textbf{Music}

It is often supposed that songs and musical interludes were incidental aspects of performance in the early modern theatre, existing in a number of cases independently of the scripted playtext and having little overall effect on the main action of the play. Tiffany Stern, for example, suggests that the omission of such elements in performance ‘would not alter the narrative of the play or put out actors performing from parts’.\textsuperscript{205} In Rowley’s \textit{When You See Me}, however, this is manifestly not the case: the instrumental and vocal performances in act 4 of the play constitute an integral part of the play’s action. Moreover, the musical performances in this scene are accompanied by what Nan Cooke Carpenter describes as ‘one of the most remarkable examples of musical dialogue’ in the drama of the period.\textsuperscript{206} Doctor Tye devotes twenty-two lines of uninterrupted verse to the praise of music and its divine capabilities (4.1.237–59) and Prince Edward draws upon Tye’s expertise to highlight and thus refute objections to the use of music in church services (4.1.234–6). Upon hearing the instruments play, Edward also makes reference to the Pythagorean principles of \textit{musica mundi} and \textit{musica

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{204} Leggatt, \textit{Jacobean Public Theatre}, p. 64.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
humana, which related the harmony of effective musical practice to the wider harmony of human existence in the created world. The instrumental and vocal performances that intersperse and accompany the dialogue, as detailed below, thus serve to highlight aspects of the characters’ speech while simultaneously providing the playhouse audience with a rare insight into the religious, philosophical and musical instruction of the young prince.

It is clear, as Carpenter suggests, that ‘the musical parts’ of When You See Me are ‘most integral to the general tone, structure, and plot’ of the play as a whole. The intricacy of the musical performances called for in this scene is also significant, in that they seem to reflect the commencement of an increasing level of boldness in the players’ theatrical endeavours. In her thesis on the functions of music in the extant repertory of the Admiral’s Men, Elizabeth Ketterer observed that the company’s Fortune plays are more ‘musically complex’ than their Rose counterparts, and that Rowley’s When You See Me and the masque performance in Dekker’s Whore of Babylon ‘ask more of the company musically than their usual fare’. In particular she speaks of Prince Edward’s musical tuition in When You See Me as ‘one of the most complex musical performances evidenced by the repertory’. While the stage directions supplied for these performances remain vague, further information can be gleaned from the dialogue, as well as from our knowledge of the instruments in the possession of Prince Henry’s Men at this time.

---

210 Ketterer, “‘Govern’d by stops…’”, pp. 279 and 283, respectively.
As the stage directions indicate, three separate musical performances are conducted in this scene. The first direction calls for ‘loud music’, usually indicative, as John H. Long suggests, of a broken consort of woodwind instruments comprising any combination of flutes, recorders, sackbuts and shawms.\(^{212}\) This is corroborated in the dialogue of the play when Tye instructs the musicians to ‘[g]ive breath to [their] loud-tuned instruments’ (4.1.264). When the music finishes, Edward continues his speech by linking the stages of musical composition and performance to the various stages of human existence. The second musical performance is ‘soft’ and, as evidenced in the Prince’s reference to ‘these many strings’, is likely to have been played by a broken consort of viols, lutes, citterns and bandores.\(^{213}\) The softness of the strings allows Edward to speak over the music, and thus permits him to pass comment on the wider implications of discord and dissonance within an otherwise harmonious social group:

Yet ’mongst these many strings be one untuned,
Or jarreth low or higher than his course,
Not keeping steady mean amongst the rest,
Corrupts them all: so doth bad men the best.

(4.1.275–8)

The consort is silenced by Tye’s command: ‘Enough. – / Let voices now delight his princely ear’ (lines 279–80), after which follows ‘a song’. No more of the ‘song’ is known, and the dialogue affords no extra clues. The voices are likely to have split into parts, however, in view of Edward’s previous speech and Tye’s attested ‘skill in music’s harmony’ (line 286), and it is just possible that appropriate verses from the historical Tye’s *Actes of the Apostles* (1553) – presented to the young


Prince Edward in the play for patronage, but dedicated to him as King in actuality – may have supplied the words and music for this particular performance.\textsuperscript{214}

Having identified the likely nature of these three musical performances, it remains to consider whether such performances were within the scope of the actors’ musical abilities, or whether Rowley’s play would have entailed the engagement of professional musicians from outside the company. Long suggests that, from 1590 onwards, ‘public players seem to have restricted their talents to acting, and, though they still frequently sang songs, they turned to the professional musicians for their instrumental music’.\textsuperscript{215} While this might have been true in certain circumstances, the hiring of large numbers of professional musicians would have increased production costs and Rowley, a sharer in Prince Henry’s Men, was unlikely to have overlooked this. Furthermore, it is evident that the whole musical episode depicted in this scene was carefully choreographed, particularly at lines 273–8 where Edward’s words complement the musical performance and vice versa, suggesting that quite some time must have been given over to its rehearsal. Presumably, then, it would have been more prudent to tailor the musical action of the play to the abilities of Rowley’s fellow players than to rely on external professionals. This is supported by Ketterer’s observation that the practice of ‘reaching outside for musical support was the exception, rather than the rule’ for the Admiral’s–Prince’s Men.\textsuperscript{216}

There are, in addition, a number of references in \textit{Henslowe’s Diary} to the procurement of musical instruments. Some of these, such as a loan of thirty shillings to Thomas Downton on 13 July 1599 ‘to bye enstrumentes for the company’, remain

\begin{footnotes}
\item[{214}] The music is printed for voices in four-part harmony and the singers, as suggested on the title-page to the work \textit{(STC 2985)}, may have been accompanied by a lute.
\item[{216}] Ketterer, “‘Govern’d by stops...’”, p. 50.
\end{footnotes}
vague, while others are more specific.\textsuperscript{217} On 10 November 1598, for example, a loan of forty shillings was recorded to pay for ‘a sackebute of marke antoney’ and on 22 December that year a further forty shillings bought the company ‘a basse viall & other enstrementes’. On 7 February 1599 Robert Shaw purchased two trumpets for the sum of twenty-two shillings.\textsuperscript{218} Moreover, the inventory of theatrical apparel drawn up by Henslowe in March 1598 includes a list of instruments already in the company’s possession: ‘iij trumpettes and a drum, and a trebel viall, a basse viall, a bandore, a sytteren’ and, further down the list, ‘j chyme of belles’ and ‘j sack-bute’.\textsuperscript{219} The company thus owned a considerable number and range of instruments, more than capable of producing the ‘loud’ and ‘soft’ music designated in the stage directions of Rowley’s play.

It is known, too, that certain members of Prince Henry’s Men had a background in musicianship. Edward Alleyn in particular, although perhaps no longer active in the company at the time of When You See Me’s first public performances, is likely to have passed on a certain level of musical knowledge to his fellow actors, particularly with regard to the style and quality of music performed at court.\textsuperscript{220} The actor Thomas Towne was also noted for his musical abilities and court connections, and William Parr, as noted above, was named as a trumpeter in the stage plot for 1 Tamar Cam. Moreover, Thomas Downton was named as a ‘musysyon’ in the record of his son Christopher’s baptism in 1592, suggesting that he, too, enjoyed a background in music before assuming a permanent role within the company.\textsuperscript{221}

\textsuperscript{217} Henslowe’s Diary, p. 122.
\textsuperscript{218} Henslowe’s Diary, pp. 101, 102 and 130, respectively.
\textsuperscript{219} Henslowe’s Diary, pp. 318–19.
\textsuperscript{220} See Ketterer, “Govern’d by stops...”, pp. 50–1.
\textsuperscript{221} Ketterer, “Govern’d by stops...”, p. 50. The baptism record of Christopher Downton is cited in Chambers, ES, II.313.
in the lead-up to the company’s move to the Fortune, fully supports the notion that the actors took on the musicians’ roles in Rowley’s *When You See Me*.

This in turn would have had a significant impact upon the allocation and doubling of actors’ parts. The possible doubling chart included in Appendix 3b indicates that ten different adult actors were required for performance in act 4, thus leaving eight actors available to play or sing. Furthermore, only three out of the five boy actors had a role to play in this scene, thereby permitting a total of ten players (eight adults and two boys) to perform the musical entertainments. That said, during the specific part of the scene that deals with Edward’s musical tuition, only Tye, Cranmer and Prince Edward are required on stage, thus freeing up more actors for performance. Assuming each consort consisted of three or four players, and that the song was sung in three- or four-part harmony, there are a number of ways in which this could have been staged. Quite possibly, the eight adult players without any further role in this scene performed the ‘loud’ and ‘soft’ music, while a combination of boy and adult actors, with their corresponding and complementary vocal ranges, performed the ‘song’. It is also likely that the musicians came on to the stage at Tye’s behest, despite Long’s observation that musicians tended to remain hidden offstage or set apart in a designated music room on the stage balcony.\(^{222}\) Since the dialogue clearly suggests that the musicians and singers perform in full view of Prince Edward, it seems only fitting that they should appear and perform in full view of the playhouse audience also. Such a performance would have greatly boosted the dramatic impact of this scene and given the spectators an uncommon glimpse into the life and education of an esteemed royal prince.

Far from incidental interludes, then, these performances form an integral part of Rowley’s depiction of Prince Edward and his royal upbringing in *When You See Me*. In simulating the music of the Tudor court, Rowley not only exploited the musical knowledge and abilities of Prince Henry’s Men but also treated the audience to a rare musical experience. This, as noted elsewhere, demonstrates a great level of confidence in the acting company as a whole, and perhaps suggests that the first few years at the Fortune theatre, quickly followed by the commencement of the young Prince Henry’s patronage, marked a particularly prosperous period in the company’s history, reflected, at least in part, in the scale and grandeur of their bold new plays.

*When You See Me* as part of the company repertory

In her unpublished essay ‘Plays, Politics and Patronage’, Lucy Munro made a strong case for studying the ‘Fortune plays’ as a distinct group: a collection of plays upon which the specific ideological positions of the company’s respective patrons, Prince Henry and the Elector Palatine, have ‘left a discernible mark’. 223 Both patrons, as Munro points out, were associated with a militant brand of pan-European Protestantism and thus seem to have been ‘perfect candidates for a[n] ideologically-inflected repertory’. 224 To view those plays written specifically for performance by Prince Henry’s Men as distinct from those performed under the patronage of the Elector Palatine further reveals the ways in which certain of the company’s dramatists played upon the public image and persona of the young prince. It also becomes clear that the most overtly political plays in this respect were written in response to noteworthy religious and/or socio-political events – defining moments in


224 Munro, ‘Plays, Politics and Patronage’, p. 2.
Prince Henry’s life that influenced not only how the prince was perceived as heir to the throne, but also the responsibility with which he was subsequently imbued.

In addition to Rowley’s *When You See Me*, six playtexts survive from the repertory of Prince Henry’s Men: Dekker and Middleton’s *1 Honest Whore* (1604), Dekker’s *2 Honest Whore* (c. 1605), Dekker’s *The Whore of Babylon* (c. 1606), Dekker and Middleton’s *The Roaring Girl* (c. 1611), Middleton’s *No Wit/Help Like a Woman’s* (almost certainly the same play as that performed at court as *The Almanac* in December 1611), and R. A.’s *The Valiant Welshman* (c. 1611).225 Although Dekker’s *If It Be Not Good* (c. 1611) was originally written for the Prince’s Men, it is not included in this list on the basis that the play was actually performed by Queen Anne’s Men at the Red Bull.226 Significantly, the seven plays listed above can be further divided into two groups: those with a specific political agenda concerning the company’s royal patron (*When You See Me*, *The Whore of Babylon* and *The Valiant Welshman*) and those, although perhaps written in response to current concerns or events, with no direct reference or relevance to Prince Henry (*the two parts of The Honest Whore, The Roaring Girl and No Wit/Help Like a Woman’s*).

Those in the second of the two groups, all written by Middleton and/or Dekker, fall broadly into the category of city comedy. While Dekker’s *2 Honest Whore* was clearly intended as a sequel to *1 Honest Whore*, John Jowett has also drawn attention to the similarities between *The Roaring Girl* and Middleton’s *No Wit/Help*, suggesting that the latter can be viewed as ‘something approaching a

---

225 The dates given here are those of the plays’ likely first performances. For information on the association of Middleton’s *No Wit/Help* and *The Almanac*, see Mark Eccles, ‘Middleton’s Comedy *The Almanac*, or *No Wit, No Help Like a Woman’s*’, *N&Q*, n.s. 34.3 (September, 1987), 296–7 and John Jowett, ‘Middleton’s *No Wit at the Fortune*’, *Renaissance Drama*, n.s. 22 (1991), 191–208.

226 The Prince’s Men seemingly rejected this play, as evidenced in Dekker’s dedication to Queen Anne’s Men.
companion-piece’ to the earlier play. Both Dekker and Middleton had written for the company before they became Prince Henry’s Men and it seems these plays were written largely with the actors’ specific skills and the tastes of the playhouse audience in mind, rather than the particular ideological position of the company’s young patron.

Rowley’s *When You See Me*, Dekker’s *The Whore of Babylon* and R. A.’s *The Valiant Welshman*, however, bore relevance to Prince Henry in several ways. Rowley’s play, as noted elsewhere, was particularly important in that it marked the accession of King James and the subsequent commencement of Prince Henry’s patronage. Through the character of Prince Edward, Rowley made shrewd reference to the company’s patron and the religious and moral vigour with which he was expected to conduct himself as the new heir to the English throne. It is also relevant that the first of these ‘ideologically-inflected’ plays derived not from Dekker, Middleton, or any of the other well-established playwrights whose names appear regularly throughout the pages of *Henslowe’s Diary*, but from Rowley: a resident-dramatist and, as styled on the title-page of *When You See Me*, a ‘servant to the prince’. Clearly Rowley made the most of this opportunity to highlight the company’s new profile as Prince Henry’s Men and the action of *When You See Me*, as discussed in the following section, regularly plays out prevailing hopes and aspirations for the young Protestant prince.

Dekker’s *The Whore of Babylon* was performed roughly two years after Rowley’s *When You See Me*, in the aftermath of the treasonous Gunpowder Plot of November 1605. The play stands apart from Dekker’s other extant plays for the company in its reference to contemporary religio-political events, and it can perhaps

---

227 Jowett, ‘Middleton’s *No Wit*’, p. 198.
more usefully be read in conjunction with political pamphlets such as *The Double PP* (1606), in which Dekker pitted the threat of the Pope against the humility and sanctity of the single ‘P’: ‘Protestantism’. Taking as its subject the protection and preservation of the true Protestant faith, *The Whore of Babylon*’s allegorical account of the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (Titania) covered a number of assassination attempts by members of the Roman Catholic Church, each under the direction of their symbolic leader, the ‘Purple whore of Roome’ (Lectori, line 9); the elaborate ‘sea fight’ at the play’s conclusion portrayed the monarch’s defeat of the Spanish Armada. *The Whore of Babylon*’s anti-Spanish stance may, as Susan Krantz suggests, have been prompted in part by Prince Henry’s recent refusal to marry the Spanish Infanta. The play can also be seen to undermine the pacifism that typified King James’s foreign policy by presenting Titania as a warlike queen whose brave and chivalrous leadership influenced England’s victory over the Armada: ‘Me thinkes it best becomes / A Prince to march thus, betweene guns and drummes’ (5.6.10–11). Thus, while the allusion to King James is made apparent in Dekker’s reference to a ‘second Phoenix’ (3.1.235), it is to Prince Henry and his fervent militarism that the playwright seems to have looked to ‘shake all Babilon’ (3.1.244) – a sentiment zealously reiterated in R. A.’s *The Valiant Welshman* four to five years later.

On the basis of the initials ‘R. A.’, printed on the title-page of the text’s first edition (1615), *The Valiant Welshman* has been speculatively attributed to Robert Armin; however, its author, as Tristan Marshall suggests, is more likely to have been Robert Alleyne (or Allyne), whose *Funerall Elegies* and *Teares of Joy* were published

228 Thomas Dekker, *The Double PP* (London: Imprinted by T[thomas] C[reede] and are to be sold by John Hodgets, 1606), STC 6498.
under the same initials in 1613. Like Dekker’s *Whore of Babylon, The Valiant Welshman* emphasised the value of active leadership in the pursuit of military victory, but qualified martial heroism by promoting also a need for sagacity and selflessness. The play, it seems, was written in response to Henry’s investiture as Prince of Wales on 4 June 1610, an event that raised the profile of the company’s patron still further. As Marisa R. Cull explains, the investiture marked the ‘re-invigoration of a title that had remained dormant during a long period of dynastic uncertainty’: the title had not in fact been formally bestowed upon an heir to the English throne since Arthur Tudor’s investiture in 1489. The playwright’s frequent reference to the protagonist Caradoc as ‘Prince of Wales’ was thus a sure nod towards Prince Henry and the potential under his leadership for a strong and unified Britain.

Clearly, as Cull suggests, Prince Henry’s Men were ‘participatory in the image-building of their patron’, but it would be inaccurate to suggest that all of their plays embraced this potential. Whether *When You See Me, The Whore of Babylon* and *The Valiant Welshman* were unusual in this respect, or whether these were just three of a number of ideologically-charged plays that became staples of the repertory under Prince Henry’s patronage is difficult to say. That the three surviving plays can all be seen to respond to a particular political event might suggest that the company only emphasised their status as Prince Henry’s Men at times when the prince’s position was particularly prominent. Either way, the fact that all three of these plays

---


231 Marisa R. Cull, ‘Contextualizing 1610: *Cymbeline, The Valiant Welshman*, and the Prince of Wales’, in *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly*, ed. Willy Maley and Philip Schwyzser (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 127–42 (p. 127, n.2). Henry Tudor was named Prince of Wales after his brother’s death in 1502; although Prince Edward acquired the title by right of birth, he was never formally invested.

were published, despite the apparent failure of Dekker’s *Whore of Babylon* on the Fortune stage, indicates an interest in their subject matter beyond the specific moment of performance and thus highlights their enduring value not only as playtexts, but as historical and socio-political documents.\(^{233}\)

**Performance at court**

In late 1604 and early 1605, a number of plays were performed at court in front of Prince Henry. The first relevant entry in the accounts of the Revels records a payment of £17 13s 4d to Edward Juby ‘for himselfe and the rest of his Companie for presentinge twoe plaies [sic] one before the Queenes Matie … and the other before the Prince the 24th of November’; the second records payment

\[
\text{for presentinge sixe Interludes or plaies before the Prince at the Courte these several nightes viz on the 14th and 19th December 1604 the 15th and 22nd January and the 5th and 19th of February nexte followinge after the rate of vjli. xiijs. iiiijd. for every plaie.}\(^{234}\)
\]

Any one of these eight plays or interludes, perhaps excluding that performed before Queen Anne, could have been Rowley’s *When You See Me*. Although Rowley’s play is not mentioned by name in the accounts, there are a number of reasons to suggest that it would have been selected for performance at court. Perhaps most significant is the fact that the play was produced under the patronage of the young Prince Henry and was, if not the first, then one of the earliest plays to be performed by the company in their capacity as Prince Henry’s Men.

Moreover, as Mark Rankin observes:

\(^{233}\) On Dekker’s complaint regarding the actors’ performance, see *The Whore of Babylon*, Lectori, lines 20–43. The disagreement over this play might in part have prompted Dekker to take his *If It Be Not Good* elsewhere.  
\(^{234}\) Cited in Peter Cunningham (ed.), *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court* (London: printed for the Shakespeare Society, 1842), pp. xxxvii and xxxiv, respectively.
When You See Me was a new play, so it would likely have been offered, especially since the company’s repertoire may have consisted of as few as nine plays during this period. The number of extant Fortune plays is indeed slight in comparison with the number and frequency of new plays performed at the Rose. Cerasano suggests that between 1603 and 1608 as few as eleven new plays can be identified, though as she points out, ‘whether this signals a falling off in purchases or a paucity of evidence is open to question’. Nonetheless, if the Fortune initially started life as ‘something of a revival house’, as McMillin suggests, and as indicated in Henslowe’s Diary, then it is likely that When You See Me was one of the newest and – based on its subject matter – arguably one of the most relevant plays to be considered by the company for performance at court.

The subject matter of the play is particularly significant in its focus on ‘the birth and vertuous life of Edward Prince of Wales’, as noted on the title-page of the play’s first printed edition. At the time of the earliest performances of When You See Me, Prince Henry would have been just ten years old – only slightly older than Prince Edward in his first appearance on stage as a young boy in act 4 of Rowley’s play. As Mark H. Lawhorn suggests, however, the correspondence between Edward and Henry is emphasised not by any direct reference to the princes’ respective ages, but ‘by situations that depict the intellectual and spiritual evolution desired in a royal male heir’. So it is, then, that Prince Edward, like Prince Henry, is responsible for welcoming foreign ambassadors to England ahead of his father (5.5.17–18), and just

---

237 McMillin, The Elizabethan Theatre, p. 82.
as Edward plays the role of domestic peacemaker in the play between the King and Katherine Parr, so Prince Henry was apparently required to act as mediator in his parents’ frequent disputes. Henry was thus, in the words of J. W. Williamson, an ‘astonishing embodiment of adult purpose’, and many of his qualities are exemplified in Rowley’s depiction of Prince Edward.

In addition to their princely duties and virtues, another parallel can be drawn between the two young princes in their respective disinclination to study – ‘a frequent source of dissention’, Roy Strong suggests, ‘between [Prince Henry] and his father’. While in reality Henry was frequently admonished for his negligence, however, Prince Edward in the play escapes punishment by fooling the King into thinking he is hard at work: ‘God-a-mercy, Ned. Ay, at your book so hard? ’Tis well, ’tis well’ (4.1.88). Will Summers’s unfailing ability to undermine Cranmer’s teachings with a few well-placed, witty remarks further adds to the appeal of this episode. Thus, although undoubtedly entertaining for the audience at the Fortune, the scene of Prince Edward’s tuition in particular seems tailored to reflect the interests and concerns of the company’s young patron.

Teresa Grant’s argument that When You See Me was ‘a play written primarily for Prince Henry’, however, is limited, in that it overlooks both the importance and appeal of the play to the playhouse audience and its wider significance to consumers of the play’s printed editions. While particular aspects may have appealed to Prince

241 Strong, Henry, Prince of Wales, pp. 14–15. Strong cites a letter written by the Venetian Ambassador in 1607: ‘He studies, not with much delight, and chiefly under his father’s spur, not of his own desire’ (from Calendar of State Papers, Venetian 1603–7).
Henry, thereby increasing opportunity for performance at court. *When You See Me* was, it seems, designed largely to further the prince’s cause by drawing attention to the role and reputation of the heir apparent on the public stage. As Schofield suggests, ‘in the many dedications and panegyrics for Prince Henry printed in 1603/4, we encounter the foundations of the rhetoric of hope so common in later celebrations of the Prince’, and it would appear that Rowley’s play formed an important part of these foundations.\(^{243}\) Thus King Henry’s plea to Jane Seymour, ‘Be but the mother to a Prince of Wales, / Add a ninth Henry to the English crown, / And thou mak’st full my hopes’ (1.2.119–21), can be seen as a forward glance towards Prince Henry, depicting him as King Henry VIII’s own figurative offspring and expressing the expectations and hopes that had been placed in him from the moment of James’s accession to the English throne. This sense of anticipation is again picked up in act 3, scene 2: ‘I tell thee, Cranmer, he is all our hopes, / That what our age shall leave unfinished / In his fair reign shall be accomplishèd’ (30–2). Here, the King’s words can be seen to reflect the hope amongst militant Protestants that Prince Henry would lead the country to realise the full and, in the words of Patrick Collinson, ‘natural potential of the English Reformation’.\(^{244}\) Rowley’s *When You See Me* thus fed into Prince Henry’s public image much in the way of contemporary portraits and panegyrics, and appealed not only to the young prince, but to all who eagerly anticipated his reign.

Considering the series of court performances recorded in the accounts of the Revels, and taking into account the relevance of Rowley’s play to the company’s royal patron, it is reasonable to assume that Prince Henry witnessed a performance


of *When You See Me* some time in the three-month period from November 1604 to January 1605. Certainly the grandeur of the play’s royal processions, the complexity of its musical entertainments and the unceasing rhetoric of praise for the heir apparent would all have played well at court. The success of Rowley’s play at the Fortune, however, does not seem to have relied upon Prince Henry’s endorsement and, despite Greg Walker’s claim that the play was ‘very much a product of its historical moment’, *When You See Me* appears to have enjoyed enduring popularity on the Fortune stage even after Prince Henry’s death.\(^\text{245}\) The following section, which considers the potential revival of *When You See Me* alongside the publication of the play’s second, third and fourth editions, bears witness to this enduring appeal.

**Revival on the early modern stage**

Given the evident popularity and continuing topicality of the play, it seems likely that *When You See Me* would have been revived at least once on the Fortune stage. After its initial publication in 1605, the play, as discussed in the Bibliographical Introduction below, went through three subsequent editions, printed in 1613, 1621 and 1632, respectively. Any one of these could have been prompted by a revival in performance.

It is important to note how apposite much of the subject matter of *When You See Me* is to the wider political events of the years in which these editions were printed. The 1613 edition followed very closely after the death of Prince Henry in November 1612, and the third and fourth editions were both printed during years in which the actions of the Stuarts left many in doubt over the political and religious loyalties of the English monarchy. In March 1621, only a few years after the outset

of the Thirty Years’ War and in the immediate aftermath of the death of King Philip III of Spain, James was engaging in negotiations with Catholic Spain in an attempt to marry Prince Charles with the Spanish Infanta – an action which succeeded only in accelerating the mounting schism between king and parliament.\textsuperscript{246} After the death of his father, and under the king’s personal rule, Charles’s own actions during the Thirty Years’ War were equally misguided: English foreign policy was largely ineffectual and religious and political factions continued to develop at an alarming rate. Gerald M. Pinciss notes additionally that the fourth edition of \textit{When You See Me} ‘came off the presses at the time that Laud was consolidating his power to enforce conformity in religious practices’ and it is likely, therefore, that the extensive religious dialogue of Rowley’s play found renewed resonance at this time.\textsuperscript{247} The year 1632 also marked the death of the Elector Palatine, the company’s patron in their most recent incarnation as the Palsgrave’s Men.

It is possible, then, that the second, third and fourth editions of \textit{When You See Me} were produced in response to growing public fears and anxieties regarding these wider political events. Somerset even goes so far as to suggest that Butter published each edition as a form of political tract, whereby, instead of giving support to the Stuarts as rightful successors to the English throne (a sentiment established in the play by associating Prince Henry with the Tudor Prince Edward), the text now afforded ‘a disparaging comparison between the Stuarts and Henry VIII’.\textsuperscript{248} Whether Butter viewed \textit{When You See Me} as a political tract is uncertain, although his increasing interest in the publication of controversial news-books and other topical material goes some way towards supporting Somerset’s claim. Indeed, as

\textsuperscript{248} Somerset, p. ci.
Sabrina A. Baron observes, ‘it was Butter’s role as a pioneering publisher of news in the 1620s that brought him greatest success and fame’. Either way, he evidently considered publication at these times a worthwhile and profitable undertaking. In the years 1613 and 1632, Butter also published new editions of Thomas Heywood’s *If You Know Not Me*, in which the gentle humility of the young Princess Elizabeth is offset by the cruelty of Queen Mary and the monarch’s Catholic supporters. The plays, with their focus on religious faction and the use and abuse of monarchical power, were seemingly printed when their subject matter was at its most relevant, and it is likely that the impetus for revival on stage would have been guided by much the same principles.

The year 1613 also saw the publication of the second edition of W. S.’s *Thomas, Lord Cromwell* and the first public performances of Shakespeare and Fletcher’s *King Henry VIII*, suggesting a sudden increase in interest in material on the Tudor dynasty. The death of the young Prince Henry in 1612 and thus the loss of an apparently fit and healthy Protestant male heir may well have been the cause of this, as issues of the royal succession once again came to the fore. A revived performance of *When You See Me* in particular at this time would have served as a fitting tribute to the life of the company’s late patron. It is also possible that Rowley’s play was revived as part of the marriage celebrations of Frederick V, the Elector Palatine and Elizabeth Stuart, King James’s eldest daughter, on 14 February 1613, often thought to have been the occasion for the performance of Shakespeare and Fletcher’s *King Henry VIII*. That the former Prince Henry’s Men were licensed by royal letters patent to act under the patronage of the Elector Palatine on 249


4 January 1613 further strengthens the case that the company may have performed
*When You See Me* around the time of his marriage, though whether this would have
taken place at court or on the public stage is uncertain.

Evidence for a 1613 revival at the Fortune, however, may be found in the
prologue to *King Henry VIII*, which sets Shakespeare and Fletcher’s play in
opposition to a ‘merry bawdy play’ in performance at a playhouse other than the
Globe. Since *When You See Me* is the only other extant playtext to deal with the
subject of King Henry’s reign, and given that it had first been staged in 1604, almost
ten years before the performance of *King Henry VIII*, it is reasonable to assume that
the prologue here refers to a revived version of Rowley’s play, only recently out of
production.\textsuperscript{251} If indeed this is the case, and the play was staged in celebration of the
marriage of the company’s new patron, it can be assumed that *When You See Me* was
revived at the Fortune by the Palsgrave’s Men some time between February and June
1613, at which time Shakespeare and Fletcher’s *King Henry VIII* had been performed
‘not passing 2 or 3 times before’.\textsuperscript{252} This in turn may have prompted Butter’s
publication of the second edition of Rowley’s play.

Whether the third and fourth editions of *When You See Me* were also
published in response to a revival is unknown. After the devastation of the Fortune
fire in December 1621, it is possible that the company no longer possessed the
means to stage such a complex and demanding play; certainly, if the ‘hary ye viii
gowne’ perished in the fire, the Palsgrave’s Men might not have considered it worth
their while to purchase or fashion another. Thus, while a 1613 performance of
Rowley’s play can be largely substantiated by external evidence, it is perhaps more

\textsuperscript{251} The relationship between the two plays was the subject of my paper ‘A “merry bawdy play”: Samuel
Rowley’s *When You See Me, You Know Me* and Shakespeare/Fletcher’s *King Henry VIII*, delivered at
BritGrad at the Shakespeare Institute in June 2013.

\textsuperscript{252} Eyewitness account of the burning of the Globe, Somerset Record Office (DD/SF 3066); cited in full
likely that the 1621 edition and in particular the 1632 edition of *When You See Me* were prompted by the topicality of the play’s subject matter, rather than by any subsequent revival at the Fortune.

Another possible performance

On Friday 11 May 1632, a Warrington alehouse-keeper, Gregory Harison, made a series of depositions in the presence of a local Justice of the Peace, accusing a group of young men of acting out a play in the loft space over his alehouse the previous Sunday. He admitted them to the loft, he claimed, ‘not thinkeinge that they would haue stayed any Longer then ffor the drinking of a Cann: or tow of alle’. After a couple of hours, however, the young men were arrested and subsequently tried for acting a play on the Sabbath. The play in question was called ‘Henery the Eaight’.

Whether this was Rowley’s *When You See Me*, Shakespeare and Fletcher’s *King Henry VIII*, or another as yet unidentified play on King Henry is uncertain. However, it is tempting, as Wiggins suggests, to suppose that it was Rowley’s play: the Shakespeare and Fletcher play, never printed in quarto, would only have been available in either the First or Second Shakespeare Folios (printed in 1623 and 1632, respectively) – both weighty and expensive books from which to attempt a subsequent performance. Moreover, the fact that Harison suspected no furtive activity on the part of the young men suggests that they were not carrying a large folio volume upon entering the alehouse. As Wiggins points out, the alehouse-keeper’s ignorance also gives some indication of the type of performance the actors

---

are likely to have carried out: ‘This cannot have been a full-scale performance, but a convivial play-reading with, no doubt, exceptionally heavy doubling up of parts’. Indeed, only nine men were held responsible for the performance.

That *When You See Me* seems to have been chosen for performance at this time is indicative of its enduring appeal not only in London, but also in the provinces. Interest in Rowley’s play may have been sparked by an earlier performance by the Prince’s or Palgrave’s Men on tour in Lancashire. Alternatively, copies of the printed editions might have circulated widely, or one of the actors could have obtained a copy of *When You See Me* while in London. However ‘Henery the Eaight’ came to be performed, the record of its performance and the subsequent consequences for its players indicates both a sustained interest in the history of the Tudor dynasty and, significantly for Rowley’s play, the lengths such men were prepared to go in order to experience it.

After this date, the play is not known to have been performed until the early twentieth century, at which time, as detailed below, its religious subject matter came to find new and heightened resonance.

**A twentieth-century performance**

On Sunday 10 July 1927, *When You See Me* was performed at the Holborn Empire in London under the auspices of William Poel’s Elizabethan Stage Circle. The intention of the association was to perform the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries much in the manner that they were staged in the early modern London theatres. Plays were thus presented on a thrust platform stage that extended

---

258 A more detailed account of this performance is provided in my article ‘William Poel’s 1927 Production of Samuel Rowley’s *When You See Me, You Know Me*’, *Theatre Notebook*, 68.1 (March, 2014), 19–38.
beyond the proscenium arch and out into the space usually occupied by the stalls. Rowley’s *When You See Me* marked the first of the Elizabethan Stage Circle’s platform-stage productions.

Contemporary reviews reveal a number of stage-tactics employed in the production, while information on casting, music and the cost of the platform-stage set-up can be found in the collection of production materials at Blythe House, London. Greatest insight into the production, however, can be gained from Poel’s promptbook: a copy of Elze’s 1874 edition of *When You See Me*, onto which he marked a remarkable number of cuts, alterations and insertions. In addition to a number of local edits, Poel juxtaposed scenes from the beginning of the play with scenes from the end and vice versa, thus creating a play far removed from Rowley’s original as it stands in the early modern printed editions. He also cut a considerable number of Will Summers’s lines, almost to the point of removing him from the play altogether.

In a circular entitled ‘A Protestant Play’ (14 June 1927), Poel disclosed the reason for his decision to revive *When You See Me* at this time: ‘I am reviving the Tudor drama’, he declared, ‘mainly as my contribution towards the present religious discussion’. The ‘religious discussion’ in question was the Prayer Book controversy of 1927–8, which saw an attempt to revise the 1662 liturgy and thus widen the latitude of acceptable religious practices within the Anglican Church. Rowley’s *When You See Me*, with its overt dramatization of religious debate, was certainly a fitting choice for revival.

---

261 Enthoven Theatre Collection, S.1218-1983.
262 The overall intention, as John Maiden attests, was to ‘set in stone the limits of Anglican ritual’. *National Religion and the Prayer Book Controversy, 1927–1928* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009), p. 11.
When viewed in conjunction with the controversy, Poel’s cuts and edits appear less arbitrary, if no less radical. The intention, it seems, was to prioritise the play’s religious debates and diminish its subplots so as to reduce Rowley’s play to a single narrative thread. It is notable, therefore, that the only lines belonging to Summers that Poel retained in the play are those in which the fool dismisses the role of authority in the protection and preservation of the ‘true’ religion (see, for example, 1.4.310–12 in this edition). Moreover, Poel made comparatively slight alterations to the text in those scenes that draw attention to the opposition between the Lutheran Queen Katherine Parr and the Catholic bishops Bonner and Gardiner. In heightening both the speed and the injustice of Henry’s treatment of Katherine (achieved, as revealed in the promptbook, by running parts of three separate scenes concurrently in different acting spaces), Poel emphasised one of the central issues of the contemporary controversy: namely, the extent to which an individual should be forced to alter his or her own religious beliefs in order to conform to those sanctioned by the state.

Poel’s treatment of the text of When You See Me was not uncharacteristic; even in some of his Shakespearean productions he was criticised for cutting and/or altering the narrative structure of his copy.263 While in a well-known play Poel’s directorial cuts and transpositions were easily recognised, however, in a play such as Rowley’s, completely unknown to the audience at the Holborn Empire, his numerous large-scale edits went unnoticed. Reviewers thus passed negative comment on ‘Rowley’s play’, when in fact what they were viewing and judging was Poel’s own radical adaptation.

In seeking to create a single, unified narrative on the benefits and dangers of individual religious freedom, Poel instead seems to have created a disjointed and incoherent account based only loosely on Rowley’s early history, but upon which Rowley and his playwriting abilities have subsequently been judged. The production was clearly a success in terms of its experimental staging techniques, but it did little to rehabilitate *When You See Me* and seems only to have contributed to the play’s marginalization.
Bibliographical Introduction
Entrance in the Stationers’ Register and the title of Rowley’s play

On 12 February 1605, the following entry was made in the Register of the Stationers’ Company:

12º ffebruarij [1605]
Nathanaell yf he gett good alowance for the enterlude of King HENRY the 8th
Butter before he begun to print it. And then procure the wardens handes to yt for the entrance of yt: He is to haue the same for his copy . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . [no sum stated]  

While there is no concrete evidence to connect this entry to Rowley’s *When You See Me*, both its association with the publisher Nathaniel Butter, for whom the first edition of Rowley’s play was printed, and its temporal proximity to the printing of this first edition increase the likelihood that ‘the enterlude of King Henry the 8th’ and *When You See Me* are one and the same play. Certainly, there is no other extant text to which this entry could belong.

Significantly, the statement made in the Stationers’ Register does not in itself constitute the actual entrance of ‘the enterlude’, for Butter was still required to ‘procure the wardens handes to yt for the entrance of yt’. Rather, this statement acted as a placeholder for a later entry: a provisional note to indicate Butter’s intention to publish the play and presumably also to protect his right to do so.

Provisional entries can be found elsewhere in the Stationers’ Register. The entrance of Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida*, for example, on 7 February 1603 would have become effective only if the publisher James Roberts had ‘gotten sufficient

---

264 Arber, *Transcript*, vol. 3, p. 283. On 21 May 1639 the rights of *When You See Me* transferred to Miles Flesher, though no edition is known to have been printed under his name. Arber, *Transcript*, vol. 4, p. 466.

265 Peter Blayney usefully clarifies the meaning of the terms authority (or allowance), licence and entrance: respectively, ‘the approval of a text by a representative of either the church or the state’; ‘the Company’s permission to print’; and the official entrance of that permission into the Stationers’ Register. It is important to note, however, that the word ‘entrance’ in the above citation does not refer to the text’s entrance in the Register, but to its official licensing by the Company; as Blayney points out, ‘[b]y the turn of the century entrance and license had become interchangeable’. See Blayney’s ‘The Publication of Playbooks’, in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 383–422 (citations from pp. 396, 400 and 492).
authority for yt’. No edition subsequently emerged in this instance, and the play was re-entered in 1609 under the names of Richard Bonian and Henry Walley. Peter Blayney suggests that Roberts may have had ‘something of a habit of entering plays provisionally, selling them, and leaving the buyers to obtain the necessary authority’. Butter, however, does not appear to have shared Roberts’s reputation for entering titles in this provisional manner, and this in turn suggests some other motivation or reason for the appearance of this isolated placeholder entry.

It is also significant that, although the above example represents only a provisional entry and Roberts was still required to seek further ‘aucthority’ before printing could begin, a sum of sixpence was nonetheless recorded, suggesting that the wardens had agreed to license the text for publication. Conversely, no sum was recorded for Butter’s entry of ‘the enterlude of King Henry the 8th’. In the years 1600–1610, only three other provisional entrances in the Register were recorded without an accompanying sum of money, all in the year 1605. Of these, the one closest to the ‘enterlude’ in terms of status – for neither represents the actual entrance of the text – is that of 17 June, where it states:

```
yf he [John Trundell] get sufficient Aucthoritie. for. The copy of A letter sent from a gent[leman] of the report of the Late bloody fight at sea betwene the Spaniarides and the Hollanders before Dover. And shewe his aucthority to the wardens Then yt is to be entred for his copy.
```

The entry goes on to stress that ‘yf any other bringe the Aucthority, yet it is to be the said John Trundelles copy’, and it seems therefore that Trundell made this move in order to help ensure his future right to publish the text. Butter, too, seems to

---

268 See Arber, Transcript, vol. 3, pp. 289, 293 and 301, respectively.
269 As Blayney notes, ‘it was problems of infringement, rather than of censorship, that the Company’s license was intended to regulate’. ‘The Publication of Playbooks’, p. 399.
have used the placeholder entry as a means of laying claim to his ownership of ‘the enterlude’ prior to the official authorisation and licensing of the text, thus preventing others from entering it as their own in the interim. Such an action would have been all the more prudent if the text in question were particularly popular on the early modern stage, as Rowley’s *When You See Me* – judging by the play’s topicality and the frequency of subsequent editions – seems to have been.\(^{270}\)

The fact that ‘the enterlude’ is not mentioned again in the Stationers’ Register should not necessarily be taken to indicate that Butter failed to ‘procure the wardens hands to yt’ for, as John Jowett has stressed,

> If a play was published without entry … it was not necessarily a surreptitious publication. A book apparently could be and occasionally was issued with a license on the manuscript itself without entry in the Register, which would save the stationer from paying the separate fee that was required for entry.\(^{271}\)

Blayney, too, seeks to clarify this common misunderstanding by emphasising the fact that ‘entrance was voluntary’, and further, that ‘its absence is never sufficient reason for suspecting anything furtive, dishonest, or illegal’.\(^{272}\) It is probable, then, that Butter did indeed obtain the Company’s permission for the publication of this play, but that this permission was recorded only in the form of the wardens’ signatures on the manuscript from which the first edition of the text was to be printed.\(^{273}\) It seems less likely, given his efforts to ensure ‘the enterlude’ was mentioned in the Register in the first place, that Butter would subsequently have

\(^{270}\) My thanks go to Professor Blayney for his help and advice on this matter. Blayney referred to Butter’s entry of ‘the enterlude’ as ‘a genuine “staying entry”’ (private correspondence, 23 August 2011) with ‘a few parallels including one outside of the Registers’. Authority, or ‘good allowance’, was presumably required in this instance due to the play’s topicality.


\(^{273}\) As Blayney makes clear, it was the wardens’ signatures that constituted the stationer’s licence, not the text’s subsequent registration. ‘The Publication of Playbooks’, p. 400.
let his claim to publish the text lapse.\textsuperscript{274} Having already laid claim to the text in the Stationers’ Register, and having presumably already paid fourpence to the clerk for the privilege of the placeholder entry, it perhaps seemed an unnecessary expense to have the text re-registered once the relevant authority was obtained. Rather, it seems, Butter paid only the requisite sixpence for the wardens’ approval and then proceeded to pass the manuscript on to the text’s printers.\textsuperscript{275}

There is also the issue of how ‘the enterlude’ came to be printed as \textit{When You See Me, You Know Me}. Significant in this respect is the similarity between the title of Rowley’s play and that of Heywood’s two-part \textit{If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody}, entered in the Stationers’ Register under this title to Butter on 5 July 1605.\textsuperscript{276} Both plays stand out for their boldness in depicting the Tudor monarchy on stage very early in James I’s reign, and it is possible that Butter sought to market Rowley’s play and \textit{If You Know Not Me, Part 1} as a pair (the second part of Heywood’s play was printed the following year). This in turn would suggest that Butter was responsible for the title given to Rowley’s play and that he altered it from \textit{The Interlude of King Henry VIII} to \textit{When You See Me, You Know Me} subsequent to its placeholder entry in the Stationers’ Register. It would also indicate that the title of Rowley’s play derives from the title of Heywood’s and not the other way round, as the earlier entrance of ‘the enterlude’ in the Stationers’ Register might otherwise suggest. Such a sequence of events finds corroboration in

\textsuperscript{274} The ‘enterlude of King Henry the 8th’ was one of Butter’s very earliest publications, and only his second play publication. Given Butter’s inexperience in early 1605, it is even more unlikely that he would have acted surreptitiously; indeed, he seems to have gone to great lengths to ensure that everything was undertaken lawfully and correctly.

\textsuperscript{275} On the various costs associated with the acquisition, authority, licensing, registration and printing of playtexts, see Blayney, ‘The Publication of Playbooks’, p. 409.

\textsuperscript{276} Arber, Transcript, vol. 3, p. 295. Heywood referred to \textit{If You Know Not Me} only as ‘The Play of Queene Elizabeth’, suggesting that Butter may also have been responsible for its title. See Heywood’s \textit{Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma’s} (London: printed for R. H[earne], 1637), \textit{STC} 13358, p. 249.
Blayney’s observation that ‘the wording of the title would often, perhaps usually, be decided by the publisher’.277

Butter may have taken the titles of Rowley’s and Heywood’s plays from a turn of phrase common in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the use of which drew attention to the plays’ well-known and much celebrated protagonists. A similar expression can be found, for example, in Robert Wilson’s Three Lords and Ladies of London (1590; STC 25783), in which the character Simplicity has a picture of the famous clown Tarlton for sale, declaring: ‘if thou knewest not him, thou knewest nobody’ (C1v). Morris Palmer Tilley also draws attention to the anonymous play Mucedorus (1598; STC 18230), in which the Clown remarks to Segasto: ‘Why then you know no bodie, and you knowe not mee’ (B1v), as well as the interchange between John Hobs and King Edward in Heywood’s 1 Edward IV (1599; STC 13341): ‘Dost thou not know mee? – No. – Then thou knowest no bodie’ (C4v).278 Additionally, Butter may have drawn upon Rowley’s reworking of the familiar folktale ‘The King and the Cobbler’, in which personal identity and the recognition of such are brought humorously to the fore.

A number of other possible explanations have been offered for the provenance of the title When You See Me, You Know Me. Somerset, for example, speaks of the metaphorical ‘unmasking’ of King Henry as the play progresses, by which deceit and pretence are revealed to him through the actions of others. The constant message of the play, he suggests, is that ‘once the king has “seen” the facts of any situation, he is able to judge correctly, and defend the right’.279 Grant, on the other hand, speaks of the ‘tricksiness’ of the title and suggests that it refers, not to the specific contents of

279 Somerset, p. ixix.
Rowley’s play, but rather to the thinly veiled parody of contemporary royalty in the characters of King Henry and Prince Edward: ‘the historical characters in the play are ciphers for current political figures and the title warns an audience that looking and seeing are not the same thing’.\textsuperscript{280} Significantly, though, each of these suggestions works under the assumption that Rowley was the source of the play’s title rather than Butter. Certainly, Grant’s theory relies on the notion that Rowley’s play was performed as \textit{When You See Me, You Know Me}, since she speaks of the way in which the title was intended to guide the audience in their understanding of the play.\textsuperscript{281} That Rowley would have drawn attention so explicitly in the title to any comment passed upon the Stuart dynasty, however, is doubtful, and presumably the audience would have identified parallels with or without such prompting on Rowley’s part. Moreover, the play’s alternative title, \textit{The Interlude of King Henry VIII}, is far more in keeping with the titles of other Admiral’s–Prince’s Men plays performed around this time, many of which simply comprised the name of their main protagonist and perhaps an indication of the play’s scope: \textit{The Downfall} and \textit{The Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon, Sir John Oldcastle, The Rising} and \textit{The Life of Cardinal Wolsey}, and so on. The title \textit{When You See Me} is in contrast far more enigmatic and given the significance of Rowley’s play in 1604, it is unlikely the company would have passed up an opportunity to advertise its topical subject matter.

It would seem, then, that Rowley’s play may not originally have been performed under the title by which it has since come to be recognised: entered in the Stationers’ Register and in all likelihood performed as \textit{The Interlude of King Henry VIII}, \textit{When You See Me} received its more familiar title only when Butter passed the licensed manuscript on to the text’s printers in 1605.

\textsuperscript{280} Grant, ‘History in the Making’, p. 130.

\textsuperscript{281} Grant, ‘History in the Making’, p. 130.
The manuscript used as printers’ copy for Q1

As Paul Werstine remarks, there are ‘an array of possibilities for printer’s copy: authorial MS, MS by a theatrical scribe, or MS by a non-theatrical scribe, whether literary or not’.\textsuperscript{282} There are also, as Blayney points out, a number of ways in which such manuscripts might have found their way into the hands of the London printers.\textsuperscript{283} Naturally, this raises questions regarding both the type of manuscript that is likely to have served as copy for the printers of Q1 \textit{When You See Me} and the method by which it came to be in Butter’s possession. Did the manuscript derive from Rowley’s own drafts of the play, from a scribal copy, or from a different source entirely? Did Rowley and/or Prince Henry’s Men freely hand over the manuscript for publication, or did Butter obtain it by some other means? The answers to these questions are important as they affect not only our notion of the text’s authority, but also our understanding of the company’s relationship with print more generally.

Butter’s hasty provisional entrance of the manuscript in the Stationers’ Register, and the subsequent speed with which the play seems to have been printed, has attracted a great deal of critical attention, especially amongst the text’s previous editors. Wilson in particular argues that Butter must have come by the manuscript surreptitiously, since the players ‘were not likely to countenance the publication of a play so recently added to their repertory’.\textsuperscript{284} Such an argument, however, embraces the now largely outdated belief that actors were instinctively hostile towards the publication of their playtexts. On the contrary, as Blayney demonstrates, there is no evidence to suggest that players ever feared that the consumers and readers of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{283} See Blayney, ‘The Publication of Playbooks’, pp. 392–3.
\item \textsuperscript{284} Wilson, p. viii.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
playtexts ‘would consequently lose interest in seeing [the plays] performed’.\textsuperscript{285} Rather, the two modes of transmission – performance and print – could operate side by side, the success of one in many cases feeding off the success of the other. There is nothing to suggest, therefore, that Butter’s actions were indicative of anything other than a desire to capitalise upon the popularity of Rowley’s play. Furthermore, the length and lucidity of the text as printed in Q1 negates any possibility that the manuscript was produced by means of stenography or memorial reconstruction – a charge frequently levelled against playtexts thought to have been obtained without a company’s full consent.\textsuperscript{286}

Since \textit{When You See Me} is the only definite surviving example of Rowley’s work, its transmission into print cannot be viewed alongside that of the dramatist’s other playtexts. It can, however, be viewed alongside the other Admiral’s–Prince’s plays performed at the Fortune around the same time. This in turn allows for comparison regarding the interval between the plays’ first performances and their subsequent appearance in print, and gives some idea of the typical practices of the company as a whole. As Gurr notes, ‘[o]nce Prince Henry’s Men were back on stage at the Fortune after the long plague closure the few plays they sold to the press seem to have been got there very quickly’.\textsuperscript{287} Indeed, both Dekker and Middleton’s \textit{1 Honest Whore} (1604) and \textit{The Roaring Girl} (1611) were composed, performed and printed within the space of a single year, and Dekker’s \textit{Whore of Babylon}, performed c. 1606, was printed in 1607.\textsuperscript{288} All of these playtexts reached the printing house much faster than the typical two-year interim noted by Stern, and so it

\textsuperscript{286} On forms of transmission typically associated with such texts, see Laurie E. Maguire, \textit{Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The ‘Bad’ Quartos and Their Contexts} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
\textsuperscript{287} Gurr, \textit{Shakespeare’s Opposites}, p. 110.
\textsuperscript{288} The dates of composition and performance for these plays are taken from Gurr’s Appendix 1 in \textit{Shakespeare’s Opposites}, pp. 269–70.
would be wrong to view Rowley’s play as unique in its rapid progression into print. Rather, *When You See Me* stands as witness to the company’s close and sustained engagement with print over the course of Prince Henry’s patronage. Far from implying that the Prince’s Men were hostile to the notion of publication, this gives the impression of a company not only tolerant of print but at ease with it, and perhaps even seeking to use it to their advantage.

Wilson’s arguments also downplay the importance of Rowley’s tripartite role within the company. He speaks, for example, of ‘the players’ as if their attitudes were largely at odds with the playwright’s, thus overlooking the fact that Rowley was himself a leading actor and shareholder in Prince Henry’s Men. It is likely, therefore, that Rowley had far more control over the fate of his plays, both in terms of the manner and frequency of their performances and the decision about whether or not to put them into print, than other, non-resident playwrights writing for the company at this time. Moreover, as a prominent member of the company, Rowley presumably had access not only to his own manuscript of *When You See Me* but to the promptbook and any other versions of the playtext owned by Prince Henry’s Men.

To pass one of these manuscript versions on to Butter would not have come at any great cost to the company. Rowley’s status as sharer also indicates that he is likely to have played an important part in any decision-making processes that were liable to

---

290 A number of plays performed at the Rose under the patronage of the Earl of Nottingham were also printed well within the two-year timeframe, many (including *The Shoemaker’s Holiday* and *1 Sir John Oldcastle*) within the space of a single year.
291 Dekker, for example, voiced concern in the prefatory material to *The Whore of Babylon* over the ways in which Prince Henry’s Men were likely to have marred the play in his absence; he subsequently justified his decision to put the text into print by claiming that the players, despite his initial care and attention in its composition, failed to do the play justice in performance (Lectori, lines 20–43).
292 In *Making Shakespeare*, Stern argued that ‘[n]either actor nor instructor generally had access to the full play, for the prompter kept it locked away’ (p. 79). Although this might have been true of other company actors, Rowley occupied an important position within Prince Henry’s Men and may have enjoyed certain privileges as a result.
affect the company’s reputation and/or financial success. No doubt keen to take advantage of the topicality of the play’s subject matter while the death of Queen Elizabeth was still firmly in the minds of its spectators, it is likely that Rowley – if not the company as a whole – approved of the text’s publication at this time, hopeful, perhaps, that the popularity of the play in one medium might fuel its success in another and that this, in turn, might reignite its success upon the Fortune stage.

Having established that Rowley and Prince Henry’s Men were likely in support of Butter’s actions in early 1605, it remains to determine the nature of the manuscript that served as printers’ copy for Q1. Both Wilson and Somerset, working under the assumption that the text in question came into Butter’s hands against the company’s express wishes, categorise the manuscript as a rough, authorial draft, full of contradictions and ambiguities. Wilson, for instance, writes: ‘[Butter’s] manuscript can hardly have come to him from the theatre, for entrances and exits are most imperfectly marked, and the quarto bears every sign of having been printed from Rowley’s “foul papers”’. Somセット likewise remarks: ‘there is evidence to suggest that his play was in a hastily written and unrevised version when it came to Nathaniel Butter’s hands’, and he points in particular to the presentation of speech prefixes and stage directions, characterising them as ‘chaotic in the extreme’. Somerset also describes the quarto’s directions as ‘literary’ rather than ‘theatrical’ in nature, and argues that Rowley left them ‘to be finalised and any confusions in his hurried manuscript to be resolved in the preparation of the prompt-copy, or in actual

293 Wilson, p. viii.
294 Somerset, p. vii. Inconsistent and ambiguous speech prefixes and stage directions in particular are seen to indicate the use of authorial ‘foul papers’ as printers’ copy. See, for example, Jowett’s discussion of Q2 Romeo and Juliet (1599), in which the role of Lady Capulet is described severally as ‘Capulets Wife’, ‘his wife’, ‘Mother’, ‘Lady’, and ‘Lady of the house’. Shakespeare and Text, p. 99.
performance'. While Wilson and Somerset’s descriptions of the textual features of Q1 are mostly sound (if overstated at times), the conclusion they draw regarding the provenance of the underlying manuscript requires revision both in light of new research on the topic of textual categorisation and with an awareness of Rowley’s particular position within the company from which that manuscript derived.

Significantly, a number of recent studies have emphasised the shortcomings of grouping manuscripts into rigid and preconceived textual categories. Werstine in particular highlights the problematic nature of Greg’s distinction between ‘foul papers’ and ‘promptbooks’, noting that the two categories fail to find support in empirical evidence. He describes, for example, the many ways in which bookkeepers could create manuscripts with ‘foul paper’ characteristics, such as by making well-informed cuts in the dialogue but subsequently failing to register these cuts in stage directions. Moreover, Werstine’s study – an examination of nineteen playhouse manuscripts and three annotated quartos – demonstrates that some of the texts produced by bookkeepers for use in the theatre were actually more chaotic and inconsistent than many of the extant autograph manuscripts traditionally classified as ‘foul papers’. As Gabriel Egan suggests, such categorisation might in the past have provided editors with a straightforward rule for determining ‘which kind of manuscript was used as copy for a particular early print edition’, but in reality it marks a significant oversimplification of the processes and practices of textual transmission. For an actor–playwright such as Rowley, the supposed distinction between the theatrical and the authorial is blurred still further. Rowley’s early

---

295 Somerset, p. viii.
manuscript could, for instance, have been used in the theatre: knowing both the size and capabilities of the company, as well as the practicalities of performance on the Fortune stage, it is unlikely Rowley’s drafts needed much revision and this perhaps negated the need for a scribal transcription at the early stages of the play’s preparation. Indeed, if the playwright’s own manuscript served much in the way of a scribal ‘fair copy’ or promptbook then the subsequent classification of the text as either authorial or theatrical is not only unhelpful but inherently misleading.

Clearly, in the absence of textual categories, it becomes far more difficult to identify the nature of printers’ copy. As Egan observes, ‘where there are no manifest impossibilities in a script … authorial papers cannot easily be distinguished from papers used to run a performance’, and so additional evidence is required to confirm identification. Rowley does not seem to have made any comment regarding the transmission of his work, and so far as publication is concerned there is, as noted above, no evidence to indicate any animosity on the part of the players of Prince Henry’s Men. Since the company is just as likely to have handed over a later authorial or scribal transcription of Rowley’s *When You See Me* as it is the author’s early drafts of the play, all evidence concerning the nature of printers’ copy in this instance must necessarily rely upon the internal features of the text’s first printed edition.

That Q1 *When You See Me* was a product of shared printing (see following section) is beneficial in this respect, for whenever unusual spelling patterns or other accidental features are traceable throughout the text and not just in a particular forme or gathering, it is likely that these forms resemble those of the compositors’ copy. Coupled with this is the evidence we have of Rowley’s handwriting and spelling

---

preferences, as demonstrated in five brief letters to Henslowe regarding the procurement of and/or payment for new company playtexts (see Figs. 4–8, above). The first of these is transcribed here in full in order to highlight some of the letters’ more striking orthographic features:

Mr Hinchloe I haue harde fyue shetes of a playe of the Conqueste of the Indes & I dow not doute but It wyll be a verye good playe therefore I praye ye delyuer them fortye shyllynges In earneste of yt & take the papers Into yor one hands & on easter eue thaye promyse to make an ende of all the Reste.

The somewhat irregular and archaic spelling preferences on display in these letters have led Jackson to the conclusion that ‘Rowley’s orthography was almost as eccentric as that of Henslowe himself’. Certainly, a preference for archaic spellings can be traced across multiple gatherings of Q1 *When You See Me*, perhaps indicating the presence of Rowley’s hand in the underlying manuscript.

Stronger evidence of Rowley’s hand, however, is afforded in a peculiar feature of the playwright’s handwriting: the use of an upper case ‘I’ for words such as ‘it’, ‘in’ and ‘is’ in the middle of lines or sentences. The above letter to Henslowe alone contains three examples. Significantly, this tendency – initially noted by Jackson in his discussion of the extant *Woodstock* manuscript – is evident throughout the printed text of Q1 *When You See Me*. Some of the examples are perhaps a little ambiguous, such as that at 3.2.102, occurring on F2v of the first quarto edition: ‘O syr, you’re welcome, Is your name Kookesbie? [sic]’. Possibly in this instance the comma after ‘welcome’ was set in error in place of a full stop and the upper case ‘I’ was intended. Other examples are more clear-cut, such as Patch’s ‘I care not for comming Ins sight againe’ (3.1.19–20; E4r), the King’s ‘How Is your...

---

301 Jackson, ‘The Date and Authorship of *Thomas of Woodstock*’, p. 73. Jackson did not note the reoccurrence of this tendency in the text of *When You See Me*. See ‘Rowley as playwright’, above, for information on Jackson’s attribution of *Woodstock* to Rowley.
counsels…?’ (5.1.241; H4’), and the double occurrence of upper case ‘It’ in Will Summers’s impassioned defence at 3.2.57–9 (F2’ in Q1): ‘Give me it againe, It shall nere be seene more I assure ye: and I had knowne tad come for that purpose, It should nere have bin brought for Will I warrant yee’. Examples in other sections of the printed text include Will Summers’s ‘I, In any case’ at 1.2.191 (B2’), King Henry’s ‘O thou art deceaved Ned, It is too certaine’ at 5.4.20 (I3’), and Queen Katherine Parr’s ‘O my good Lord, If it have traytors blood’ at 5.4.64 (I4’). The peculiarity occurs in both verse and prose passages, in the speech of a number of different characters and across four separate gatherings set by at least three different compositors. Together with the existence of a number of archaic forms in the printed text of When You See Me, this significantly strengthens the case that the manuscript in question was penned by the author’s own hand.

Whether the manuscript used as printers’ copy represented an early draft of the play or derived from a later transcription in the playwright’s hand remains uncertain, but the fact that the manuscript seems to have stemmed directly from Rowley lends authority to the text presented in Q1. Not only is the text workable and largely performable as it stands, it also bears witness to Rowley’s insightful knowledge of the size and capabilities of Prince Henry’s Men at the time of the play’s earliest performances. That Rowley may have scripted this manuscript after the initial performance took place, perhaps specifically for the purposes of publication, highlights the sheer interconnectedness of playwriting and performance in this instance, and further blurs the distinction between the authorial and the theatrical that previous editors have so fervently sought to enforce.
The first edition (Q1)

The first edition of When You See Me was printed in 1605. From the large mask ornament on the title-page and initial on the half-title, it can be inferred that the playtext was printed by Humphrey Lownes the elder although, as discussed below, it is unlikely that the whole text came from Lownes’s press. The quarto contains forty-two leaves and is made up of twenty-one formes, printed on ten and a half sheets of paper, signed A–L. The half-sheet L that concludes the play was likely printed by means of the work and turn method of half-sheet imposition (see below), whereby all four of the sheet’s type-pages were locked into a single forme on the press-bed and used to print both sides of the paper. Two copies of this edition exist, with variants evident in four different formes: the outer forme of gathering B, the inner forme of gathering C, and both formes of gathering I (see Appendices 4–6).

Writing in 1955, John Crow described the first quarto of Rowley’s When You See Me as ‘a hideously printed play’. Somerset went one step further, arguing that Crow’s assertion was, ‘if anything, not strong enough’, adding: ‘When You See Me was badly served by Butter and the printer or printers who produced it for him’. While it is plain to see those aspects of the text upon which these judgements have been based – confusing speech prefixes, loose locking of the type, and poorly justified lines to name just a few – it should be noted that these imperfections do not appear regularly throughout the text; rather, they occur only in particular gatherings or sections and were introduced only at particular stages of the text’s production. Moreover, it should be noted that the layout of the text is at times sensitive to and thus aware of the needs of an early modern readership, suggesting at

303 Somerset, p. x.
least some forethought on the part of individual compositors. To argue that the text is ‘hideously printed’ in its entirety is therefore a misleading exaggeration, not least because it obscures significant information about the physical handling of the manuscript at the time of the playbook’s manufacture.

Besides his enthusiastic entrance of When You See Me in the Stationers’ Register, Butter seems to have further speeded up the process of production by splitting the manuscript prior to typesetting and dividing it between several printers to work on simultaneously – a practice widely known as shared printing. Accordingly, Q1 can be divided into five sections: gatherings A–C; gatherings D–F; gathering G; gatherings H–I; and gatherings K–L. In addition to displaying differing sets of running titles (see Appendices 5 and 7), which may simply point to a different compositor at work at the same press or a temporary hiatus in production, each of the five sections, as detailed below, exhibits a number of impositional and typographical features that corroborate the division and thus strengthen the case for shared printing.

The relative division of labour between printers allows further insight into the circumstances of the strategy’s employment. While, as Adrian Weiss explains, even sharing sections indicate the adoption of a pre-planned, time-saving strategy, unequal or asymmetrical sections tend instead to indicate interruption in the process of seriatim printing. In the case of Q1 When You See Me, the text seems

---

304 Additionally, some of the features that led Crow and Somerset to describe the text as poorly printed, such as a lack of indentation before speech prefixes, may be indicative of compositorial practice rather than of shoddy workmanship, perhaps explaining why such features are more prevalent in some formes and/or gatherings than in others.

305 Indeed, the printer of Q1 is identified in STC as ‘Lownes and others’ (vol. 2, p. 290). On the common and frequent use of this method of production, see in particular Peter Blayney, ‘The prevalence of shared printing in the early seventeenth century’, PBSA, 67 (1973), 437–42.

to have been divided into broadly equal sections of three sheets each, plus an additional smaller section of one and a half sheets, made up of gathering K and the half-sheet L. The only real anomaly is gathering G, which seems to have been set in isolation, and which presumably points to some form of disruption during the printing of the central gatherings. It is likely, therefore, that sections three and four of the text – gathering G, and gatherings H and I, respectively – were initially intended to form a single work unit, roughly equal in size to those that had preceded it.\textsuperscript{307} Some interruption or difficulty ensuing, the last two-thirds of this section were evidently passed on to another printer to complete.

That it was primarily the publisher’s rather than the printers’ decision to split the manuscript of \textit{When You See Me} is also supported by the fact that paper from the same stock is used both in early and in later sharing sections. Watermarks visible in section one of the text, for instance, can be found again in later sheets of the playbook, alternating throughout between versions of a three- and a four-fingered hand.\textsuperscript{308} This suggests that Butter may have been responsible for providing the paper on which the play was to be printed. Had Butter supplied the paper but the sharing strategy been initiated by Lownes, it is possible that the paper would have remained in Lownes’s possession and that only the manuscript copy would have been passed on to the sharing partner(s).

While significant features of each of the sections are discussed in turn below, by far the largest discussion is reserved for section one, which sheds light on a number of printing-house methods employed in the text’s production and goes some

\textsuperscript{307} Out of a total 3,095 lines, 906 are printed in section one; 886 in section two; 909 (assuming gatherings G, H and I were intended to form a single work unit) in section three; and 394 in the final section. Line counts are based on the TLN system employed in Wilson’s edition.

\textsuperscript{308} Patterns of watermark recurrence vary in the two extant copies of the edition. No watermarks are visible at all in sheets C, E and L of the Bodleian copy or in sheets A, C, I and L of the copy at Boston Public Library.
way towards explaining the negative criticisms of Crow and Somerset in their respective comments upon the text. In particular, this opening section provides an intriguing case-study in its use of variant measures that not only draws attention to an important aspect of compositorial practice, but also demonstrates the need for editors to remain alert to all elements of typographical arrangement.

Figure 9: First edition of Rowley’s *When You See Me*, Bodleian copy, title-page. Photograph by Joanna Howe, courtesy of the Bodleian Library.
Section one: sheets A–C

In sheets A–C alone are roman numerals used for signatures, with one example evident per gathering: ‘Aij’, ‘Biii’ and ‘Cij’. The number of lines per page in this section vary from forty to forty-four, and measurements from the top of the running heads down to the bottom of the signatures and catchwords vary from 154 to 167 mm, depending on how many lines of text are printed per page.

Notably, this opening section is printed in small pica type instead of pica, as per the remainder of the edition. Rather than a matter of preference on the part of Lownes’s compositor(s), however, small pica seems to have been used in this instance as a matter of necessity in order to fit the requisite amount of text into the available space. Significantly, it appears that Butter – or whoever physically divided the manuscript – did not take into consideration the space required for the title-page and half-title at the beginning of the printed text: indeed, the number of text lines set in these opening three gatherings was twenty higher than in the following three-gathering section (see footnote 307, above). In order successfully to offset the space taken up by the title-page, its blank verso, and the half-title – roughly two and a half out of eight type-pages – this section should have included no more than seventy per cent of the total number of text lines printed in section two. The considerable number of lines allocated to Lownes’s compositors may thus explain some of the more erratic impositional and compositorial features on display in this section.

309 Several other works originating from Lownes’s press exhibit the same feature, including William Covell’s *A modest and reasonable examination* (STC 5882) and Thomas Becon’s *The sicke mans salue* (STC 1768), both printed within a year of Q1 *When You See Me*.

310 This is corroborated by W. Craig Ferguson’s observation that Lownes ‘preferred larger’ typefaces. See *Pica Roman Type in Elizabethan England* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1989), p. 28. The small pica used in this section has a twenty-line measurement of roughly 71 mm, as opposed to the 81–3 mm of pica.

311 In order to set gatherings A–C in pica type, this 906-line section should only have contained about 635 lines. If this had been the case, the half-sheet L that concludes the text would have been replaced with a whole sheet, thus creating a playbook comprising eleven full sheets of paper, collating A–L."
Throughout these three gatherings, only speech prefixes immediately preceded by a stage direction tend to be indented; others are presented as the main body of the text, with a flush left-hand margin. Combined with the compositors’ use of a small pica typeface, this makes the opening pages of the playbook appear rather dense. In addition, there is a noticeable attempt in the first two and a half gatherings to save space, with the introduction of numerous contractions and the frequent omission of spacing type after commas and, on occasion, between words. The final words of long verse lines are also often turned up or down to the end of preceding or succeeding lines to avoid taking up additional room on the type-page (although, as discussed below, this may have something to do with the use of variant measures). As noted in the Editorial Introduction, stage directions, particularly entrance and exit points, are often lacking, and Somerset has speculated whether this deficiency may have been a deliberate space-saving strategy on the part of the compositor(s). While this is feasible for the first few gatherings, however, Somerset’s hypothesis fails to explain why stage directions are equally deficient in later gatherings of the text where space was not such a pressing issue. Since exit directions are lacking more than entrance directions, and since these could be positioned at the ends of verse lines with no bearing upon the number of text lines printed per page, it can be assumed that these were absent in the compositors’ copy.

Variant measures are also frequently employed in gatherings A–C. While evident in later gatherings of Q1 and in later editions of the text, the compositors’ use of a variant measure is most apparent in this opening section and little if any attempt

---

312 The only exceptions are A2r, A3v, A4v and B2r, where speech prefixes are habitually indented, perhaps signalling the work of a different compositor.
313 On B4v, C1r and occasionally on C2v, the compositor broke the flush left-hand margin by creating hanging prose lines. There are only a few examples of this, though, and since the majority of lines in these gatherings are set in verse, the practice does little to increase the accessibility of the text.
314 Somerset, p. x.
has been made to disguise its employment.\textsuperscript{315} Two distinct measures were used: a shorter measure of 79 mm and a longer measure of 96 mm. Bearing in mind D. M. McKenzie’s observation that compositors did not set their sticks to mm-lengths but rather to em-measurements, it is perhaps more accurate in this instance to say that type was justified respectively to line-lengths of 24- and 29-ems.\textsuperscript{316} The shorter 24-em measure was typically used for verse and the longer 29-em measure for prose.\textsuperscript{317} This in turn accounts for the numerous turn-downs and turn-ups at the ends of longer verse lines, and for the frequent introduction of contractions and ampersands.

There are, however, a number of anomalous instances where the shorter measure was used for prose passages. The first occurs on A4\textsuperscript{v}, with the use of both 24- and 29-em measures resulting in a rather strange arrangement whereby prose is justified at two distinct points across the page (see Fig. 10). Tracing the use of the shorter measure back to A4\textsuperscript{v}, it seems that the compositor, setting verse for the first three-quarters of the page, failed to notice when the text switched back to prose at Will Summers’s entrance (after 1.2.56 in this edition). Thus he continued to make use of the shorter measure until he, or someone else, noticed the error and the longer measure was re-introduced two-thirds the way down the following page (at 1.2.87). Not only does this highlight oversight in the compositor’s work, especially considering the space-saving strategies at work elsewhere in this gathering, it also reveals that the opening section of Q1 was set seriatim rather than by formes, since the use of the two measures – and the switching back and forth between them – progresses sequentially through the text.

\textsuperscript{315} The use of variant measures was certainly not unique in Rowley’s \textit{When You See Me}, though its use was usually better disguised.
\textsuperscript{316} D. M. McKenzie, “‘Indenting the Stick’ in the First Quarto of \textit{King Lear} (1608)’, \textit{PBSA}, 67 (1973), 125–30 (p. 126).
\textsuperscript{317} This corresponds with Fredson Bowers’s findings about the use of variant measures. See ‘Bibliographical Evidence from the Printer’s Measure’, \textit{SB}, 2 (1949–50), 153–68 (p. 154 in particular).
B1 also sees the use of two different measures. The longer measure is used for the opening eight lines and the final prose line of the type-page, while the shorter measure is used at its centre. Although better disguised than in the previous example, the compositor’s use of the 24-em measure (hinted at by the use of a turn-down and contractions in the verse lines) becomes evident at Summers’s prose passage.
(1.2.136–7 in this edition), justified to a point several millimetres short of the full width of the type-page. Text in the isolated last line of the page, set to the 29-em measure, is then continued over onto B1\(^v\), once again suggesting that the text was set in seriatim order. It seems also, from this instance, that the precise location of page-breaks was not predetermined, and that the final line of B1\(^v\), set together with the remainder of the prose speech, was only placed in its current position once the surrounding text was complete.\(^{318}\) A similar method seems to have been employed at the bottom of C2\(^v\), where the last line of text, set in the longer measure, stands in isolation while the rest of the type-page is justified to the shorter 24-em measure; the speech concludes in the longer measure at the top of the following page.\(^{319}\)

Significantly, the shorter measure seems to have been employed more and more throughout gathering C as the compositor(s) became increasingly aware that there was not enough text left to neatly fill the sheet. This results in a rather untidy attempt in the final two pages to space out the remaining lines by the irregular insertion of large or multiple pieces of spacing type between words and punctuation marks. The effect is particularly evident on C4\(^v\), where the words ‘rare’, ‘not’ and the second part of the hyphenated ‘com-ming’ unnecessarily take up a whole new line of text to themselves.\(^{320}\) Moreover, both the recto and verso of leaf C4 contain only forty lines of text, while the average number of lines per page for this section is forty-two. The additional white space surrounding these two pages becomes all the

\(^{318}\) This accords with W. Speed Hill’s observation that, ‘[f]aced with irregular copy or a major miscalculation, the compositor had but two choices: he could expand (or crowd) the type on a single page […] or he could, in imposition, shift lines from one page to another.’ See ‘Casting Off Copy and the Compositors of Hooker’s Book V’, SB, 33 (1980), 144–61 (pp. 154–5). Lownes’s compositors seem to have made use of both of these techniques.

\(^{319}\) The only difference in this case is that it cannot prove seriatim setting, since C3\(^r\) would have followed C2\(^r\) even if the section were set by formes.

\(^{320}\) While, as noted above, speech prefixes in this section are rarely indented, it is significant that the speech prefix ‘kyng’ is heavily indented in order to push the word ‘not’ down onto the following line in this way.
more noticeable when viewed in conjunction with the cramped and overcrowded leaves of the section’s previous gatherings.

While it appears that two distinct composing sticks were used in the setting of this opening section, it is important to point out that Lownes’s compositors are more likely to have made use of an indented stick for sections set in the shorter 24-em measure. In other words, rather than make use of a shorter composing stick, the longer stick, measuring 29-ems, was used throughout the composition process, but was indented for verse passages with large quads or ‘quotations’. The benefits of using an indented stick over two separate sticks or a single adjustable stick were considerable. As McKenzie points out, ‘it is a nuisance to change measures to this extent within the same book, let alone the same sheet, forme, or page’. Moreover, the repeated substitution of one stick for another, or indeed the continual lengthening and shortening of an adjustable stick, would inevitably have complicated matters when it came to imposition:

Simply removing the shorter lines from the stick and resetting the measure as the longer ones occur is to be avoided at all costs, for the inevitable inequalities make side-locking of the page difficult and the risk of loose type dropping from slightly short lines is intolerable. Nor is there any joy to be had in handling the longer lines in a galley or on the stone when they are not an integral part of a properly justified type area.

The main advantage of this practice, then, was that it required no interference with the furniture during imposition. While the visible type was constrained, the type-pages themselves remained justified to the full width of the longer measure, and thus longer lines were neatly accommodated as part of the larger imposed structure. The use of an indented stick would also have saved valuable spacing quads, no doubt

---

321 The process is described in detail by McKenzie in “Indenting the Stick”. A brief description is also provided in Weiss, ‘Casting, Compositors, Foul Cases and Skeletons’, p. 213.
used by Lownes’s compositor(s) to justify shorter verse lines within the 24-em measure once the indenting quotations were set in place.324

As Blayney points out, these quotations seem to have come in a standard size, measuring approximately 13 x 17 mm.325 That the 24-em measure is precisely 5-ems or 17 mm shorter than the 29-em measure points to the conclusion that the verse passages of section one – and a number of its prose passages – were set in a 29-em stick indented with a quotation lying on its long side. The quotations in turn would have occupied a space in the composing stick approximately 13 mm deep, thus allowing Lownes’s compositor(s) to set roughly three consecutive type-lines before either a second quotation was added to the stick or the type-lines were transferred to the page-galley. Assuming the text was set in seriatim order, as suggested above, the position of page-breaks would have been of little concern in the opening two gatherings; if a blank area happened not to coincide with a whole number of quotation quads when the page was imposed, the empty fraction could be filled with smaller spacing type from the text fount.326 Thus single lines could be shifted from one page to another as necessary. Only when the compositors reached the final portion of their copy might the position of page-breaks become a real cause for concern, as seems to have been the case in the latter half of sheet C.

While there is no direct evidence of indentation in this section, such as offset or unintentional inking from the raised edge of a quotation quad, its use is detectable

324 McKenzie suggests that a lack of 12-point pica quads may have led Okes to indent his stick in this way. See “‘Indenting the Stick’”, pp. 126–7.
325 Private correspondence, 23 August 2011.
326 It is also possible, as McKenzie points out, that quotation quads were cast to match a particular em-measurement (“‘Indenting the Stick’”, p. 128). He cites the following passage in Moxon: ‘when the Compositor Indents any Number of Lines, he may have Quadrats so exactly Cast that he shall not need to Justifie them either with Spaces or other helps’. Mechanick Exercises on the Whole Art of Printing, ed. Herbert Davis and Harry Carter (New York: Dover Publications, 1958), p. 349.
in other ways.\textsuperscript{327} As McKenzie suggests, the use of an indented stick ‘creates in effect a long, vertical and virtually independent column of type up the right-hand side of the page, aligned but not always interlocked with the type area set within the reduced line length’.\textsuperscript{328} Thus, if the type-pages were not locked tightly in position, or if the quads were not all equal in size, longer lines could appear misaligned, set either slightly above or below lines justified to the shorter measure.\textsuperscript{329} At least two examples of such misalignment are evident in this section of Q1.\textsuperscript{330} The first occurs on B4\textsuperscript{r} at Wolsey’s line ‘My Lords of Fraunce you haue had small cheere with vs’ (1.3.1 in this edition), where the words ‘with vs’ are positioned visibly lower than the rest of the line. Another example, though a little different in its application, can be found on A2\textsuperscript{r} in the opening stage direction. Here, the first two words of the first line (‘Enter the’) and first word of the second line (‘royaltie’) are positioned 2 mm below the rest of the type-line (see Fig. 11). Significantly, these lower portions of the line take up a space of precisely 13 mm, suggesting that a quotation quad – this time lying on its short side – may have been used at the opposite end of the composing stick to fill up some of the white space between the half-title and initial ‘G’. On this type-page, then, indenting quotations were likely used at both sides of the justified type area: at its right, as imposed, at the top of the page, and at its left further down.\textsuperscript{331}

\textsuperscript{327} Such evidence may exist in Q2 Romeo and Juliet, printed by Thomas Creede (1599), on G1\textsuperscript{v} and H4\textsuperscript{v}, respectively. See McKenzie, “Indenting the Stick”, p. 129, n.6.

\textsuperscript{328} McKenzie, “Indenting the Stick”, p. 128.

\textsuperscript{329} McKenzie finds numerous examples of such misalignment in Okes’s King Lear (1608). “Indenting the Stick”, p. 129.

\textsuperscript{330} Misalignment may also be observable in other type-pages of Q1 When You See Me, particularly at the bottom of B1\textsuperscript{r} and C2\textsuperscript{v}, with their long, isolated last lines of prose. However, these examples are not as prominent, and might simply be indicative of poor justification or loose locking of the type.

\textsuperscript{331} The compositor’s use of an indented stick for the lengthy verse passage on this type-page can be evidenced by the turn-down ‘grace,’, roughly two-thirds the way down the page.
Combined with the use of a small pica typeface, an inaccessible flush left-hand margin, and numerous other condensing – and, in the case of leaf C4, expanding – techniques, the visible use of variant measures makes the text of this opening section appear rather rushed and poorly produced, no doubt fuelling Crow’s assertion that the text of Q1 \textit{When You See Me} was ‘hideously printed’. However, Crow’s evaluation is only really true of this one section: the other sections of the text are printed in a larger pica typeface; speech prefixes are regularly indented; and while condensing and expanding methods are still applied, including the use of variant measures in gatherings D–F, such features rarely encroach upon the overall appearance or accessibility of the text.
Section two: sheets D–F

Section two differs most obviously from section one in its use of a more conventional pica roman typeface. The number of lines per page varies from thirty-six (D1v) to thirty-nine (E2r) and the distance from the top of the running heads down to the bottom of the signatures and catchwords is 165 mm; the only exceptions are D3r, E4v and F2v, which measure 160 mm. In this section alone can be seen the anomalous running title ‘When you see me, you shall know me’, used once in each of the three gatherings (see Appendix 5).

Variant measures of 91 mm (23-ems) and 75 mm (19-ems) respectively are evident in this section of the text. Unlike in section one, however, the two measures are employed both consistently and systematically: prose passages are habitually set to the longer measure and verse passages to the shorter measure, regardless of the length of the verse lines in question. On occasion, this makes the use of variant measures rather obvious, such as on E2r, where the word ‘so.’, slightly too long to fit into the 19-em measure, is raised up to the end of the previous verse line. The most noticeable examples can be found on F4v, where the words ‘there’?, ‘mind’, ‘away.’ and ‘straite’ are all either turned up or down to the preceding or succeeding text lines. These turn-ups/downs are made all the more evident by the use of the full 23-em measure at the very bottom of the page, which seems in this case to have been employed out of necessity in order to squeeze in the final words of Cranmer’s speech before the next printer took over the text at the start of gathering G. The compositor subsequently tried to disguise this strategic manoeuvre by altering

---

332 The difference between the two measures here is 16 mm, suggesting that, as in section one, the compositor made use of a hollow quotation lying on its long side.
333 There are only two exceptions: on D1r and D1v, respectively. In both cases, the compositor seems to have been unsure whether to set as verse or as prose: the longer measure is employed, as if for prose, but the final words of the line are turned down, as if for verse; in each case the subsequent text lines are set two line spaces below, thus leaving a gap between text lines.
the final lines of the speech (4.1.16–18 in this edition) to prose. The lineation shifts suddenly back to verse at the top of G1′.

Gatherings D–F are also characterised by the frequent use of an italic upper case ‘I’ in place of its roman counterpart. While evident in other sections of the text, with seven examples in section one and two in section three, its use is far more prominent here: of a total 137 occurrences in Q1, 128 can be found in these three gatherings, spread evenly between the inner and outer formes. Moreover, fifteen italic upper case ‘T’ s, four italic upper case ‘F’ s, three italic upper case ‘H’ s and two italic upper case ‘P’ s are used in place of roman capitals, suggesting that the printer responsible for section two was running short of at least five different sorts at the time of the text’s production. There are, however, alternative explanations for the frequent substitution of italic upper case letters in these three sheets. It is possible, for instance, that at some point prior to the production of Q1 When You See Me the printer in question intentionally supplemented the contents of particular sort boxes by adding italic pieces of type, which would explain why the italic ‘I’ appears so regularly and consistently from one type-page to the next. Another possible explanation is that someone accidentally put italic type into the type-case, such as an inexperienced compositor responsible for cleaning and distributing the wrought-off formes. In neither scenario is italic type used out of necessity because of a depleted fount; on the contrary, the sort boxes in question may have been full when the compositor came to set his portion of Rowley’s play. Thus these appearances may actually reflect what Weiss calls ‘substitutions in the absence of sort-pressure’ rather than a deliberate strategy to counteract type shortage.334

If type shortage was an issue and the compositor did in fact substitute these letterforms intentionally, the equal distribution of italic capitals may suggest that the text of section two was set by formes. Thus type from one forme could be washed and distributed before work on the perfecting forme began. If, however, type was substituted because of a prior distribution error, or because the compositor was using type from a supplemented sort box, the regular distribution of italic upper case ‘I’ could have come about regardless of the number of formes set and imposed at any one time.335 That more than one set of four headlines was produced for use in this section is significant, as it suggests that more than four type-pages may have been made ready for the press simultaneously (see Appendix 7): if only one forme was set and imposed, the compositor is unlikely to have wasted time and effort creating additional sets of headlines. It is probable, therefore, that the frequent substitution of italic type in this section reflects not a depletion of sorts but rather a muddling of sorts in the type-case.

This does not in turn suggest that the text of section two was not set by formes, but simply that more than one forme was likely to have been set before type was distributed back into the compositor’s type-case. Indeed, some of the spacing issues evident in these three gatherings are fully indicative of the practice of setting by formes, as the compositor seems on several occasions to have spaced out or condensed the text of his copy in order to get back to text already set in type. The compositor’s attempt to save space is perhaps most obvious on E2f where Black Will’s short line ‘My bloods vp still’ is printed adjacent to the final words of the previous speech rather than on a new line. The decision to take the last word of the

335 Only a detailed type analysis could reveal whether or not individual pieces of type recur in consecutive formes. Given that Q1 When You See Me was unlikely to have been the only text in production at this time, however, it is doubtful – even if set by formes – whether type would have recurred in both formes of a single sheet.
following speech, ‘hands’, up to the end of the same text line further reveals a need to save space. It is also worth noting that there are thirty-nine lines of text on this page rather than the average thirty-eight; the final text line is positioned level with the catchword and signature. Very likely, the crowding evident on this type-page is indicative of faulty casting off.\textsuperscript{336} If the outer formes of each sheet were set before the inner formes, the following type-page (E2') would already have been locked up in the chase, allowing no room for manoeuvre on the part of the compositor.\textsuperscript{337} He could conceivably have gone back to the previous page (E1') to try and rectify the problem (the Porter’s exit direction, for instance, set on a line of its own, could easily have been moved up to the end of the previous line). However, this would have involved the disruption of type already imposed, and the compositor presumably found it less of an inconvenience simply to squash in the final lines of E2'.\textsuperscript{338}

Other spacing issues are apparent on D1' and D2'. While text on D1' is visibly spaced out, with two empty type-lines after the initial stage direction and line spaces either side of the right-aligned ‘Exit’ at the bottom of the page, text on D2' is condensed, with numerous turn-ups and turn-downs at the ends of lines. Moreover, while D1' contains only thirty-six lines of type, D2' contains thirty-eight. The discrepancy between the two pages is perhaps more unusual in that both D1' and D2' form part of the inner forme of the sheet. Possibly, the text of this forme was set out of sequential order, or perhaps, as with the above example, copy was poorly cast off from the start and the compositor, loath to disturb type already

\textsuperscript{336} Jowett, for instance, notes that whenever copy was cast off incorrectly ‘it is common to find inconsistent spacing round stage directions, stretching or squeezing of text to waste or save a type-line, or pages with one more or less line of type than was regular’. \textit{Shakespeare and Text}, p. 54.

\textsuperscript{337} While in his study on pressmen’s practice Kenneth Povey noted a tendency to print the inner formes of sheets before the corresponding outer formes, he found that preference for the inner forme was ‘much less evident in the first half of the seventeenth century than in the second’. See ‘Working to Rule, 1600–1800: A Study of Pressmen’s Practice’, \textit{The Library}, 5th ser., 20.1 (March, 1965), 13–54 (p. 15).

\textsuperscript{338} This accords with Speed Hill’s observation that compositors tended to alter the spacing in and around text lines rather than the text lines themselves. See ‘Casting Off Copy’, pp. 154–5.
set, simply continued crowding the text until he reached the end of his quota for that particular type-page.

**Sections three and four: sheet G and sheets H–I**

As noted above, it is likely that the printer of sheet G intended also to print sheets H and I as part of a single, three-gathering work unit. For some reason, however, he seems to have stopped work after the first sheet and handed the remainder of his copy over to another printer to complete.\(^{339}\) While it is possible that the break between gatherings G and H indicates only a temporary disruption in the production process and that sheets H and I were in fact set at a later date in the same printing house as sheet G, there are a number of differences between the two sections that suggest otherwise including, as Wilson points out, ‘differences in type which cannot be attributed to a mere change of compositor’.\(^{340}\) Although similarities do exist between the two sections, such as the compositors’ use of a 22-em (87–89 mm) measure and a shared average of thirty-eight type-lines per printed page, it should be noted that such features, taken in isolation, can prove nothing about either when or where these sheets were set.\(^{341}\) Likewise, the fact that sheets G and H are both fully signed cannot be taken to suggest that they were set by the same compositor, since playtexts originating from at least three different printing houses in 1605 demonstrate the same practice.\(^{342}\)

---

\(^{339}\) It is not uncommon to find texts in which a single sheet was produced by a different printer. See, for example, Chiaki Hanabusa, ‘The Printer of Sheet G in Robert Greene’s *Orlando Furioso* Q1 (1594)’, *The Library*, 6th ser., 19 (1997), 145–50.

\(^{340}\) Wilson, p. v.

\(^{341}\) The measure used in sheet I (89 mm) is slightly longer than that used in sheets G and H (87 mm), seemingly connecting G and H more closely than H and I. However, it is important to bear in mind Bowers’s observation that ‘sticks were likely to vary among themselves by as much as two millimetres’. ‘Bibliographical Evidence from the Printer’s Measure’, p. 154.

\(^{342}\) As Weiss notes, from 1603–6, both George Eld and Thomas Purfoot [I]’s compositors consistently signed all four leaves in printed play quartos. Adrian Weiss, ‘Bibliographical Methods for Identifying Unknown Printers in Elizabethan/Jacobean Books’, *SB*, 44 (1991), 183–228 (p. 190). Simon Stafford is
The two sections are differentiated in a number of ways. Text in section three, for example, is characterised by the frequent use of a distinctive upper case roman ‘P’, evident in this sheet alone, to head the speech prefixes ‘Pr.’ and ‘Prince’. As in section two, this may indicate a deficiency or muddling of sorts at the time of the text’s production. Further evidence of type shortage or supplementation may be detectable in the frequent use of an italic upper case ‘T’, again, as in section two, evident in both the inner and outer forme of the gathering. Type used in sheet G is also noteworthy for a number of reasons. While all other sections of the text exhibit only an expanded lower case ‘k’, the fount used for sheet G includes both a condensed and an expanded letterform. Similarly, sheet G displays two different forms of upper case roman ‘M’, the first akin to W. Craig Ferguson’s ‘M1’ (‘no upper-right serif, splayed’) and the second akin to Ferguson’s ‘M2’ (‘normal serifs, upright’). Only in sections two and three of the text are the two ‘M’ forms seen together. In general, the roman capitals on display in sheet G are far heavier in appearance than those in sheets H and I; the italic upper case ‘W’ and the long italic ‘f’ used in the running heads throughout gathering G are also different to those in H and I. In gathering G alone the name ‘Cranmer’ is consistently spelt ‘Cranmar’, and only in this gathering (on G4r and G4v) can be seen the occasional use of an initial ‘j’. While spelling variants such as these are not in themselves evidence of a different printing house, they do at least point to the work of a different compositor and, combined with other features of the text in this section, lend further weight to the argument that sections three and four were printed as discrete textual units.

also known to have engaged in this practice. See, for example, The history of the tryall of cheualry (1605), STC 13527.
343 Section three contains thirteen of the twenty-eight examples of italic upper case ‘T’; the others, as mentioned above, can be found in section two.
344 The differences between the various sorts are described by Ferguson in Pica Roman Type, pp. 4–5.
The divergent running-title text of sections three and four is also noteworthy. The running titles in sheets H and I follow the conventional pattern established earlier on in the playbook, ‘When you see me, you know me.’, while those in sheet G are split across openings. Thus while the opening spanning sections two and three (F4v–G1r) reads ‘When you see me, you know me. | you know me.’, that spanning sections three and four (G4v–H1r) reads ‘When you see me, | When you see me, you know me’. Possibly, the compositor of sheet G expected others to adopt a similar practice; alternatively, he may simply have been following a particular personal or printing-house convention with little concern for the text’s overall consistency. Either way, such incongruity sets sheet G apart from sheets H and I and suggests locational as well as temporal disruption in its production. The failure of the final catchword in gathering G to catch may also be indicative of this disruption, though in this instance the fault clearly lies with the compositor of H1r, who omitted the requisite speech prefix ‘Prince’ at the start of the page.

As demonstrated in the headline analysis in Appendix 7, one set of four headlines was used to print both the inner and outer formes of sheet G. Similarly, one set of four headlines was used to print the whole of sheet H, and another the whole of sheet I. In terms of their patterns of reuse, sheets G and I are actually more closely connected than sheets H and I, since in both cases the four headlines appear in the same relative positions in the forme; in sheet H, two of the headlines switch positions and appear in the opposite quadrants. One difference between sheets G and I, however, is that G may have been printed using a single skeleton forme. This cannot have been the case with sheet I, as the spacing either side of the running-title text alters from one forme to the other. In this instance, headlines were picked out the wrought-off forme and placed one by one around
new letterpress. Thus although the method of imposition appears the same for both sheets, the processes may have been dissimilar. That the anomaly here is sheet H, not sheet G, further highlights the dangers of viewing such features of the text in isolation.

Both sections three and four are carefully set and printed, with largely consistent spacing and justification throughout. There are some minor spacing issues in gathering G, such as at the bottom of G1v, where the compositor seems to have spaced out the text and deliberately set only thirty-seven lines instead of the more usual thirty-eight, but the required alterations are minimal. This sheet does contain a number of turn-ups at the ends of long lines, which may be indicative of faulty casting off. However, in each case the lineation of the line is ambiguous and it is uncertain whether the compositor intended to set these lines as verse or prose. If variant measures were employed in sheet G, their use is undetectable.

Sheets H and I are even better thought out and contain no visible padding or space-saving techniques. The compositor seems even to have been aware of Rowley’s often idiosyncratic lineation and rarely misinterpreted the distinction between verse and prose (see Editorial Introduction, below). The presentation of the letters Prince Edward receives from his sisters is also carefully thought out, simulating the likely appearance of the letters themselves: the text, set entirely in italic type, is indented from the left-hand margin and, in the case of Elizabeth’s letter, contains a right-aligned roman signature at the end (I1r). Possibly, the layout reflected that of the manuscript serving as printers’ copy. It is also possible that the compositor himself, thinking both about the content of the play and the potential readership of the text, resolved to present the letters in this way. As Linda McJannet suggests, a printed

---

345 I am grateful to Professors Gabriel Egan and David Vander Meulen for discussing the likely significance of headline recurrence in these sections of Rowley’s play.
playtext could imitate in its layout ‘the form of documents read aloud’ so as to aid the reader in his or her approach to the text, and it was perhaps the attractiveness of this mimetic layout that led a seventeenth-century reader to copy Elizabeth’s letter word for word alongside the relevant passage in the Worcester College copy of the play’s second edition (Fig. 12). 346

There is a great deal of evidence, therefore, to substantiate the work of two different printers in sections three and four: compositorial tendencies in sheet G differ from those in sheets H and I; the layout of running titles in gathering G is incongruous with that in earlier and later gatherings of the text; the methods of imposition, based on the recurrence of headlines, differ in each of the three sheets; and most significantly, the type used in the two sections is not alike. Many

346 Linda McLanet, The Voice of Elizabethan Stage Directions: The Evolution of a Theatrical Code (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1999), p. 71. McLanet points to this passage as a key example. Q2 reproduces the layout of Q1 in all aspects other than its indentation of the letters from the left-hand margin.
individual letterforms are unique to sheet G and even without conducting a detailed
type analysis it is possible to isolate distinctive features of the founts used in each
section. Such differences are unlikely to have come about simply as a result of
disruption within a single printing house.

Section five: sheets K–L

The final section of Q1 is made up of gathering K and the half-sheet L. Each page
in this section, excepting that at the very end of the play, contains thirty-eight lines
of text, and each type-page, from the top of the running title down to the bottom of
the signatures and/or catchwords, measures a uniform 165 mm. On each page it
seems a single measure of 81 mm (20-em) was used to set the text.

Section five is characterised by consistent use of the medial ‘v’, seen only
very occasionally in earlier gatherings. In gatherings K and L can also be seen use
(although not exclusive use) of a smaller italic upper case ‘K’ for the speech
prefix ‘King’ and the name ‘Kate’. Throughout these two gatherings the names
‘Brandon’ and ‘Sommers’ – as they appear elsewhere in the playtext – are set
continually as ‘Branden’ and ‘Summers’, and all speech prefixes are presented in a
consistent manner whereby only abbreviated names are stopped with a full point or
colon.347 The indentation of speech prefixes and the amount of space between
these and the spoken text is also far more uniform than in previous sections of Q1,
perhaps suggesting the work of a more experienced compositor, or a compositor
following a stricter printing-house style. The comparative orderliness of this
section may also be due to the fact that the compositor did not have to worry about
how much space the text would occupy, having no set point at which to conclude

347 As noted below, this provides important information about the compositor responsible for this
section of the text and may aid in identifying its printer.
gathering L other, of course, than the end of the text itself. That the verso of the final leaf (L2) is blank further highlights the compositor’s freedom in this respect.

Although difficult to substantiate, it is likely that the work and turn method of half-sheet imposition was used in this section. As Kenneth Povey notes, when determining the employment of this method, ‘[t]he physical evidence is often inconclusive, and it is necessary to consider circumstantial evidence in order to reach a decision based on probabilities’.348 There are a number of issues hindering its detection in this case, the most fundamental of which being the scarcity of extant witnesses: only two copies of the first edition survive, and of these, one is severely cropped at the head.349 From the Bodleian copy, it is clear that no material was duplicated between the headlines of inner and outer L (such a configuration would have verified that the half-sheet L had been worked together with another half-sheet). Since only one headline from sheet K was transferred for reuse onto the half-sheet L, it cannot be determined whether the four type-pages of the half-sheet were constructed as part of a single forme or shared between two separate formes. The absence of watermarks in both copies is also unhelpful, for had the work and turn method been employed, half the copies would have had a visible watermark and half would not. Moreover, the pages in both copies have been beaten too flat to allow for accurate determination of first-forme impressions.350 It is impossible, therefore, to conclude with certainty that the work and turn method was employed for the half-sheet L. However, given the economical nature

349 For the ways in which headline configurations can help to identify methods of imposition, see Fredson Bowers, ‘Running-Title Evidence for Determining Half-Sheet Imposition’, SB, 1 (1948–9), 199–202.
350 Had one copy been printed inner forme first and the other outer forme first, this would have confirmed the employment of the work and turn method. See Povey’s ‘The Optical Identification of First Formes’, SB, 13 (1960), 189–90.
of the method and given that Rowley’s text begins with a full sheet rather than a half-sheet of prelims, its use would appear the more likely.

Although it was not uncommon to end a playtext with a half-sheet (as a glance through Greg’s Bibliography reveals), what stands out in the case of Q1 When You See Me is the disjunction between the relaxed and straightforward setting of the play’s final section and the cramped and relatively inaccessible layout of its opening. This highlights the potentially problematic nature of the sharing strategy and further emphasises Butter’s initial miscalculation.

The printers of Q1 When You See Me

As noted above, the printer of section one can be identified as Humphrey Lownes the elder, active in London from 1587–1630. In his study on playbook production, Blayney described Lownes as one of ‘the few printers in London with fairly high standards of craftsmanship’ and it is significant, therefore, that text in the opening three gatherings of Q1 should be so erratically and inconsistently presented. Given the large amount of text Lownes was required to fit into these three sheets it is perhaps unsurprising that his compositor(s) encountered difficulties; certainly, this accounts for the use of a small pica typeface. Yet many of the text’s other features, including the frequently loose locking of the type and the unusually visible use of variant measures, suggest error and/or oversight, and cannot simply be explained with reference to the relative size of Lownes’s allotted portion.

While Lownes, who did not start work as a printer until 1604 (when he married the widow of Peter Short), was relatively inexperienced at the time of Q1’s

---

351 The mask ornament that appears on the title-page of Q1 When You See me can be found in numerous other texts printed by Lownes in 1605. In each case, the printer’s name is given in the imprint.
production, the same cannot be said of his compositors, many of whom presumably continued in their positions after Short’s death. It is also worth noting that, although Rowley’s When You See Me was feasibly the first playtext Lownes printed, he was not new to the practice of shared printing and had in fact been responsible for a portion of at least two shared texts prior to the production of Rowley’s play: Gervase Babington’s Comfortable notes (STC 1088) and Dekker’s The Magnificent Entertainment (STC 6510). Since neither of these texts displays any of the inelegancies or oversights inherent in Q1, despite both having been set from manuscript copy, it can be assumed that the handling of text in Rowley’s When You See Me was atypical of Lownes’s – and thus of his compositors’ – workmanship.

One explanation for this might be that the majority of this section was set by an apprentice in Lownes’s printing house. If the apprentice’s movements were supervised by a more experienced worker, it is likely that the overseer would have looked primarily to catch textual errors or omissions rather than issues of spacing, and indeed many of the shortcomings of these three gatherings relate not to the accuracy of the text’s content but to its layout on the printed page. Quite possibly, it was the overseer who shifted lines of type from one type-page to another (see ‘Section one’, above) in an attempt to even out the compositor’s work. The same man may also have been responsible for the decision to use an indented stick consistently throughout the final pages of gathering C.

Three apprentices were likely to have been active in Lownes’s shop around the time of Q1’s production: Richard Badger, John Spurrier and Humphrey Lownes

---

354 Heywood’s two-part Edward IV (STC 13343), also printed in 1605, may have preceded Q1 When You See Me, but this was set from printed rather than manuscript copy.
355 The situation here was perhaps similar to that encountered during the production of the Shakespeare First Folio, whereby ‘Compositor B’ was forced to oversee and in many cases correct the work of the apprentice ‘Compositor E’. See Charlton K. Himman, ‘The Prentice Hand in the Tragedies of the Shakespeare First Folio: Compositor E’, SB, 9 (1957), 3–20 and Blayney, The First Folio, pp. 11–15.
the younger. Badger, the eldest of the three, was bound to Short on 12 April 1602 and freed by Lownes on 7 May 1610.\footnote{D. F. McKenzie, \textit{Stationers' Company Apprentices, Volume 1: 1605–1640} (Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1961), as printed in \textit{SB}, 13 (1960), 109–41 (p. 127, no. 353).} Spurryer was bound to Lownes on 25 June 1605 and freed on 1 August 1614.\footnote{McKenzie, \textit{Stationers' Company Apprentices, Volume 1}, p. 127, no. 361.} Since we cannot know the exact month in which the text of Rowley’s \textit{When You See Me} left the press, it is difficult to ascertain whether Spurryer would have been present at the time of its production. However, even if Q1 were printed in the latter months of 1605, it is perhaps unlikely that Spurryer would have engaged in compositorial work at such an early stage in his apprenticeship. Finally, Lownes’s son, a journeyman printer, was freed by patrimony on 7 July 1612.\footnote{McKenzie, \textit{Stationers' Company Apprentices, Volume 1}, p. 127, no. 360.} This suggests that he was fourteen in 1605 and it is just possible that he was in training in his father’s shop at this time. Like Spurryer, though, it is uncertain whether he would have been given such a responsibility at this stage in his career. On the available evidence, Richard Badger was the most likely of the three apprentices to have been typesetting in 1605 and it is possible that some of his earliest compositorial work for Lownes exists in the opening gatherings of Rowley’s \textit{When You See Me}. 

Four other printers were involved in the production of Q1 – three from the start and one, as explained above, who was called upon to complete gatherings H–I. Lownes is known to have worked alongside at least six different printers around the time that \textit{When You See Me} was first printed: Edward Allde, Thomas Creede, George Eld, Thomas Purfoot the elder, Valentine Simmes and Simon Stafford. In Dekker’s \textit{Magnificent Entertainment}, for example, he worked with Allde, Creede and Stafford, as well as a fourth as yet unidentified printer.\footnote{R. Malcolm Smuts, ‘\textit{The Whole Royal and Magnificent Entertainment}’, in \textit{Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture: A Companion to The Collected Works}, Gen. Eds. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), pp. 498–506 (p. 500).} That each of these
six printers is known to have worked on playtexts in the years surrounding the
publication of *When You See Me* further strengthens the case for their involvement
in its production; Eld in particular printed a considerable number of first-edition
playtexts in 1605.\(^{360}\) Moreover, Stafford, Purfoot and Creede all printed playtexts
for Butter in 1605. While there were presumably several other such partnerships
that have yet to come to light, looking to established sharing patterns is
nonetheless, as Weiss observes, a useful and often productive means of narrowing
down the range of possibilities in the long and complex search for an unknown
sharing printer.\(^{361}\)

Although there is not space here to conduct a full type analysis, it has
nevertheless been possible to highlight certain features of the text in order to
provide clues for the future identification of its printers. Many of these clues
concern the appearance of type in each section and for the descriptions of some of
the letterforms I have referred to Ferguson’s *Pica Roman Type*. I have, however
(given the negative reviews Ferguson’s study received in the two to three years
following its publication), supplemented these descriptions wherever possible with
what Weiss calls the ‘gross features’ of the font, such as mixed capitals or foul
case cluster, as well as with the more noteworthy characteristics of each printer’s
share.\(^{362}\) Section five of the text, in which certain features point determinedly to
the work of one of Valentine Simmes’s compositors, is discussed separately and in
greater detail below.

---

\(^{360}\) A search on DEEP for first editions of single playbooks reveals that Eld was responsible for a third
of those printed in 1605 [accessed 10 November 2014].

\(^{361}\) Weiss, ‘Bibliographical Methods’, p. 228, n.25.

\(^{362}\) Weiss, ‘Bibliographical Methods’, p. 185. For reviews of Ferguson’s study, see Adrian Weiss,
‘W. Craig Ferguson, *Pica Roman Type in Elizabethan England* (Book Review)’, *PBSA*, 83 (1989),
539–46 and John A. Lane, ‘Identifying Typefaces: Review of W. Craig Ferguson’s *Pica Roman
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section (sheets)</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Description/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Section 2 (D–F)** | Letterforms | * High ‘i’ dot  
* Mix of ‘M1’ (no upper-right serif, splayed) and ‘M2’ (normal serifs, upright)  
* Large bowl ‘p’  
* Large lower counter ‘g’  
* Expanded ‘k’ |
| | Composition | * Measures: 91 mm and 75 mm |
| | Other features | * Frequent use of italic upper case ‘I’ and, to a lesser extent, ‘T’, ‘F’, ‘H’ and ‘P’ may suggest mixture of sorts in particular sort boxes |
| **Section 3 (G)** | Letterforms | * Mixed ‘i’’s (some dots centre, some high)  
* Mix of ‘M1’ and ‘M2’  
* Small bowl ‘p’  
* Mixed ‘k’’s (both condensed and expanded)  
* Heavy capitals and distinctive upper case ‘P’ |
| | Foul case | * Foul case ‘e’ in word ‘Lorde’ on first speech line of G2’ |
| | Composition | * Measure: 87 mm  
* Use of initial ‘j’ |
| | Imposition | * Split running titles  
* Possible use of a single skeleton forme to print the whole sheet |
| **Section 4 (H–I)** | Letterforms | * Central ‘i’ dot  
* ‘M1’ only  
* Expanded ‘k’ |
| | Composition | * Measure: 87–9 mm |

Of these three sections, the third (sheet G) is the most distinctive, particularly in its mix of different letterforms. Simon Stafford is a possible printer for this section, since he is known to have used a pica roman fount that was ‘very much a jumble’.³⁶³ Stafford also split running titles in playtexts, as evidenced in *The Trial of Chivalry*

³⁶³ Ferguson, *Pica Roman Type*, p. 31.
(STC 13527) and King Leir (STC 15343), both printed in 1605. George Eld is another possible candidate. As Weiss notes, Eld owned a mixture of Hautlin and Lyon (c) in 1605 and often used both founts in the same book.\textsuperscript{364} While he did not habitually split playtext running titles (the only extant example from 1605 is Daniel’s Philotas, printed alongside his Certain Small Poems; STC 6239), Eld did tend to sign all four sheets in quarto playbooks; Stafford engaged in this practice only in The Trial of Chivalry.\textsuperscript{365} Clearly, the foul case ‘e’ on G2 is the strongest evidence for printer identification in section three and its reappearance in the canon of either Stafford or Eld would significantly strengthen the case for their involvement. Section two is also distinctive in its combination of ‘M’ forms and its inclusion of the high ‘i’ dot, features which, once again, may point to either Stafford or Eld as possible printers. Section four is the least distinctive and on the present evidence no attempt can be made to identify its printer. Nonetheless, it is hoped that the information provided here will act as a starting point for further investigation into the text’s sharing printers.

Stronger evidence can be found in support of Valentine Simmes as the printer responsible for the fifth and final section of Q1. This bears witness not only to some of the sharing patterns evident in the years immediately preceding the printing of Rowley’s play, but also to the detailed analyses of Simmes’s compositors carried out respectively by Ferguson and Alan E. Craven. Specifically, Ferguson identified a number of features associated with one of Simmes’s compositors, ‘Compositor A’, that can be traced throughout Q1’s sheet K and the half-sheet L. By far the most distinctive feature of this compositor’s work, observable throughout Q1’s section five, was the tendency to stop only abbreviated speech prefixes, either with a full point or, later, with a colon. From 1599–1601, Ferguson found only four

\textsuperscript{365} Weiss, ‘Bibliographical Methods’, p. 190.
isolated examples of this practice in the work of printers other than Simmes. Orthogonal features of Compositor A’s work around this time, including the use of an upper case ‘e’ for exit directions and the presentation of character and place names in italic type, are similarly evident in section five.

In addition to the more specific features of Compositor A’s work, there is evidence to connect this section of Q1 with Simmes more generally. The 81 mm measure used in section five, for example, was one of the most common employed by Simmes in quarto format. Moreover, the printers’ flowers that adorn the blank space on L2 are the same as those identified by Ferguson as Simmes’s ‘flower 1’: ‘This was Simmes’s most popular flower, and was used for borders, rules, and title-page ornaments in almost half his books.’ The flowers were used many times by Simmes in 1605, including in Drayton’s Poems (STC 7216), Henry Smith’s Two Sermons (STC 22766) and Heywood’s How a Man may Choose a Good Wife from a Bad (STC 5595). Section five also bears witness to Ferguson’s observation that Simmes’s signatures (and Compositor A’s signatures in particular) follow a regular format – a roman capital letter and Arabic numeral, unstopped, with ‘a narrow quad between letter and number’ – though, given that numerals were not included on the first leaves of each gathering and that the final leaves were left unsigned, such conformity is discernible only on leaves K2 and K3.

---

369 Ferguson, Valentine Simmes, pp. 49 and 53.
370 While not unique to Simmes, the flower was used more frequently by Simmes than by his contemporaries.
The evidence for Compositor A’s involvement in the text, and thus for identifying Simmes as the printer of section five, is compelling; as Craven attests, ‘evidence from the speech-prefixes alone is virtually conclusive’. 372 Certain features of the type also point strongly in this direction. Throughout sheet K and the half-sheet L, the vast majority of ‘i’ dots are positioned significantly to the left of the central stem; the remaining few are positioned directly above it. This accords with Ferguson’s description of Simmes’s Lyon (b): ‘Its “i” dot was very much to the left … Some centre-dot “i” appeared in 1604’. 373 The exclusive use of Ferguson’s ‘M1’ in this section, as well as the large counter of each lower case ‘g’, further strengthens the case for Simmes’s involvement.

If indeed section five was the work of Simmes’s compositor, it is important to highlight Craven’s observation that Compositor A was especially ‘prone to alter copy-readings’, with one substantive alteration occurring on average in his work once every seventeen lines. 374 Craven also noted that the compositor’s modifications often falsified the text ‘in an especially damaging way since the corrupted lines almost always make sense and seldom reveal that they have suffered corruption’. 375 With no copy for comparison, it is impossible to ascertain the extent of the compositor’s interference in the text of Rowley’s When You See Me – certainly, there are no palpable errors or omissions in this section of the play. It should nevertheless be borne in mind that the text of section five (beginning at 5.4.130 in this edition) may be slightly further removed from Rowley’s manuscript than text presented elsewhere in Q1.

373 Ferguson, Pica Roman Type, p. 31.
374 Craven, ‘Simmes’s Compositor A’, p. 49. He takes as evidence Compositor A’s work on Q2 Richard II, for which the compositor’s copy, Q1, exists for comparison (see p. 54).
Subsequent early modern editions of *When You See Me*

Only the first edition of Rowley’s *When You See Me* is substantive: the three subsequent editions, printed in 1613, 1621 and 1632, respectively, are derivative in nature and each was evidently printed from its immediate predecessor. Although Q1 is clearly the most authoritative of the four early modern editions, there is a clear attempt on the part of the compositors of later editions to correct and improve upon the text of their copy. A number of readings from Qs 2–4 are therefore adopted in the present edition, as recorded in the textual notes and as summarised below.

The second edition (Q2)

Q2 was printed by Thomas Purfoot the younger for Nathaniel Butter in 1613. The edition contains forty-four leaves and thus comprises twenty-two forms printed on eleven full sheets of paper, signed A–L. Seven copies of Q2 are known to exist although, as noted in Appendix 4, the seventh copy cannot currently be located. This edition exists in three different states, with single stop-press variants evident in the outer forms of gatherings H and K (see Appendix 6). Given the nature of Q1’s variants (all either palpable errors or accidents at press), it is impossible to know whether Q2 was set from a copy of Q1 with corrected or uncorrected sheets B, C and I.

The compositor of Q2 was confronted with a more difficult task than usual for a play set from printed copy. Typically in this situation, as evidenced in Qs 3 and 4, compositors would reproduce the layout of an earlier printed edition so as to save time that would otherwise be spent casting off copy from scratch. Since the first three gatherings of Q1 were printed in a small pica typeface, however, the layout of Q1
could not be replicated in Q2 and the compositor had to cast off the text of *When You See Me* for a second time. The switch from a longer 104 mm to a shorter 95 mm measure at the start of gathering E may indicate either a change of compositor or a break in the printing of the text between gatherings D and E; alternatively, the use of a longer measure at the start of this edition may have been calculated to compensate for the densely packed type-pages of Q1’s section one. The alterations made in this edition also suggest that the copy may have been marked for correction in certain gatherings prior to typesetting, though there is nothing to suggest Rowley’s involvement in this process.

In terms of its treatment of the text, Q2 begins to standardise particular features, such as the use of italic type for proper nouns. It also displays distinctive compositorial practices, such as the tendency to end words with ‘ie’ rather than ‘y’, and the substitution of ‘j’ for ‘i’ in both initial and medial positions. Significantly, this edition corrects a number of errors and makes several important substantive alterations to the text of the first edition. It corrects the erroneous speech prefixes in gathering C of its copy, for instance, where three times Q1’s compositor had set the prefix ‘Patch’ as ‘Page’, or abbreviated equivalents (1.4.186, 192 and 194 in this edition), and restores the speech prefix ‘Prince’, missing in Q1 at the top of H1’. It also seeks on many occasions to clarify the layout of its copy, for example by setting the name ‘Campeus’ in full and thus resolving the ambiguity of Q1’s ‘Campe.’ (C3v), where the name appears as a speech prefix rather than as a continuation of Wolsey’s speech.

The edition does, however, retain several of Q1’s errors and introduce a number of its own. More serious, substantive errors occur in later sheets of Q2, such as on K2v, where the line ‘Is landed in our faire Dominion’ (5.4.141 in this edition)
is omitted altogether, presumably due to eye-skip on the part of the compositor. Another example can be found on Q2’s G2’ (4.1.12), where the speech prefix ‘Brow.’ is assigned in place of ‘Cran.’, so that Browne is seen to call for his own punishment at the hands of the Master of the Children. Both are addressed in Q3.

Figure 13: Third edition of Rowley’s *When You See Me*, Bodleian copy (Douce), title-page. This striking image of Henry VIII (bused, it seems, on the famous portrait by Hans Holbein the Younger) was printed also on the title-page of Q2. Photograph by Joanna Howe, courtesy of the Bodleian Library.
The third edition (Q3)

Q3 (Fig. 13) was printed by Thomas Purfoot [II] for Nathaniel Butter in 1621; like Q2, it comprises eleven full sheets of paper, signed A–L. The lineation and page-breaks of this edition follow those of Q2 throughout, with very few exceptions. Across the ten extant copies of this edition there exist numerous states, with variants evident in four different formes: outer B, outer E, inner G and outer L (see Appendix 6). The compositors clearly based their edition on a copy of Q2 with an uncorrected sheet K, for the word ‘hand’, missing in the uncorrected state of outer K, is absent in Q3.

The compositors of this edition regularly worked to clarify the text, for example by inserting apostrophes whenever letters were missing from a word. There is also a marked attempt to regularise speech prefixes and character names and to distinguish proper nouns more consistently in the main body of the text. Importantly, a number of Q2’s errors are addressed, including the omission (mentioned above) of the line ‘Is landed in our faire Dominion’. This error in particular is carefully handled in Q3 by the insertion of the words ‘Is come’ before ‘To see’: ‘Our Nephew, and the hope of Christendome / Is come to see his Vncle and the English Court’. Although this affects the metre of the verse, it rectifies the damage done in Q2 to the sense of King Henry’s lines and it is clear that either the compositors themselves, or someone marking up the copy from which the compositors were to work, gave careful thought to the content of the text as well as to its layout. This is further demonstrated in a number of small-scale substantive revisions, evident in particular across the first two gatherings of Q3. Only some of these revisions constitute actual corrections; the others, such as the alteration of ‘stands’ to ‘which stands’ and ‘laffing’ to ‘now laffing’ (both 1.4.200 in this edition),
simply provide alternative readings. That the words were altered at all, however, highlights not only a desire to correct the text of Rowley’s play, but also an intention to improve upon it.

The fourth edition (Q4)

The final early modern edition, printed in 1632 by Bernard Alsop and Thomas Fawcett for Nathaniel Butter, comprises the same number of pages, formes and sheets as Qs 2 and 3, and its lineation and page-breaks are largely consistent with those of its copy (the only discrepancies occur in gathering A). Thirteen copies of Q4 survive, and these exist in numerous states, with variants evident in the outer formes of gatherings B and H, the inner formes of gatherings E and F, and both formes of gathering K. However, as clarified in Appendix 6, only those variants in gatherings B, H and F constitute conscious stop-press corrections; the others simply reflect accidents at press, such as slipping catchwords (inner E and outer K) or minute variants in spacing between individual pieces of type (inner K). Q4 was clearly set from a copy of Q3 with corrected sheets E and L, for the substantive revisions introduced in these sheets are reproduced in the text of the later edition.

Q4 aims throughout for greater consistency of capitalisation and italicisation than its copy. From the evidence of spellings, typographical preferences, such as use of ligatures, and treatment of copy (i.e. how closely the compositor followed the text in front of him), it is possible to ascertain that at least two, maybe three, different compositors worked on this edition, typically alternating between formes. In addition to a number of substantive alterations – ‘happie’ to ‘prosperous’ (1.2.130), ‘for’ to ‘by’ (1.2.150), etc. – the compositors made a number of important changes to the lineation of the play, some of which are adopted in the present edition (see, for
example, the presentation of Will Summers’s Skeltonic lines at 1.2.205–10). Significantly, the changes here seem to have been planned carefully and in advance of typesetting, for the layout further up the page is altered in order to accommodate the extra lines. Q4 also frequently clarifies the layout of its copy, for example on B3v (1.2.257–8), where the combined stage direction and speech prefix ‘Enter Compton’ is separated out. Such alterations seem largely to have been made in order to improve the accessibility of the text for its readers.

It should be pointed out, though, that a number of substantive variants in this edition, particularly in later gatherings, introduce incorrect readings into the text. One such example is the assignment of a number of Prince Edward’s lines to Cranmer (4.1.189–93 in this edition). Evidently the person responsible for marking up the copy thought that Edward’s address to Cranmer as ‘Tutor’ at line 194 marked the beginning of the Prince’s speech rather than a continuation of it and altered the text accordingly. Given Edward and Cranmer’s respective positions, though, it is unlikely that Cranmer spoke line 189 – ‘God giue ye truth that you may giue it me’ – and the earlier reading is therefore retained in this instance.

The types of changes introduced in these three editions offer important information about the process of transmission in the play’s early textual history and demonstrate a continued interest in the text of Rowley’s *When You See Me* three decades after its initial composition. Each edition was clearly created with the intention of improving upon the text of its copy and indeed a number of substantive alterations made in the later editions mark important changes, smoothing over inconsistencies and clarifying the layout of the text. Other alterations, however, are ill-advised and can only be seen to introduce further ambiguities. That the changes made in each edition are non-authorial is evident, given the often failed attempt of
compositors to compensate for or correct errors introduced into the text of their copy. No recourse seems to have been made to Rowley’s manuscript in later editions, nor to the text of earlier printed editions, and each successive edition is thus one step further removed from the playwright’s intended text. This not only reaffirms the authority of Q1, but also draws attention to certain of the decisions behind the play’s nineteenth- and twentieth-century editions.

Later editions of When You See Me

Karl Elze (1874)

Elze’s was the first edition of When You See Me to appear in over two hundred years and its publication thus marked an important stage in the transmission of Rowley’s play. Regrettably, the introduction revolves largely around the play’s likely relationship to Shakespeare and Fletcher’s King Henry VIII and little is said either about the importance of When You See Me or about Elze’s own editorial principles and methodologies. Elze was clearly aware that the play existed in four early modern editions – indeed, he supplied title-page transcriptions for each – yet he based his own version of the text on Qs 2 and 4, using a transcription of Q2 as his copy-text and introducing what he described as ‘a number of welcome corrections’ from Q4 whenever the earlier text was considered deficient.376 In bypassing Q1, Elze overlooked a number of important early readings, and in excluding Q3 from his collations he wrongly attributed a number of textual corrections to Q4, thus providing both an imperfect and incomplete account of the play’s textual history. Before the discovery of Rowley’s will in the 1960s, it was typically supposed that the playwright

376 Elze, p. xvii.
lived into the 1630s and it could perhaps be argued that Elze placed such emphasis on Q4 because it represented, to the best of his knowledge, the latest text in which Rowley could feasibly have played a part.\textsuperscript{377} This does not, however, explain his decision to use Q2 rather than Q1 as copy-text, despite the clear line of transmission from one edition to the next, and it is far more likely in this instance that Elze focused on Qs 2 and 4 simply as a matter of convenience: copies of both were available for examination at the British Museum.

Elze provides a clear-text edition of \textit{When You See Me} in which the copy-text’s spellings and punctuation are silently modernised; lineation is also frequently altered in accordance with the editor’s preferences. Despite Elze’s caveat that the edition proposes remedies that ‘conservative critics will think rather bold’, many of his alterations are in fact judicious and sensitive to Rowley’s idiosyncrasies.\textsuperscript{378} The problem is not so much the extent of Elze’s emendations, but rather his failure to document them. Some records of emendations and substantive variants are included at the back of the edition under the general heading ‘Notes’, but these are inconsistent and frequently combined with literary and historical commentary, making them difficult to navigate. Moreover, Elze makes a number of errors in his collations and often suggests that he is the source of an emendation, when in reality his own reading follows that of Q4 (the rendering of Summers’s lines as verse at 1.2.205–10 provides one such example).

Clearly Elze’s edition was important in making the text of Rowley’s play accessible to a far greater readership.\textsuperscript{379} The text it presents is for the most part sound and, as noted above, Poel’s use of the edition for his 1927 production of \textit{When You

\textsuperscript{377} Elze believed Rowley died ‘between 1632 and 1634’ (p. iii).
\textsuperscript{378} Elze, p. xvii.
\textsuperscript{379} Published by Williams & Norgate, Elze’s edition was available for sale in both London and Dessau, Germany.
See Me indicates a renewed, if temporary, interest in the play’s content as a direct result of Elze’s work. The reliability of the textual apparatus, however, is another matter: collations are incomplete, inaccurate and, importantly, overlook the only substantive witness to the text of Rowley’s play (Q1). Elze’s edition is very much a product of its time and it is perhaps unfair to judge it by twenty-first-century standards. Nonetheless, its shortcomings demonstrate the dangers of Elze’s selective approach and highlight the need for a new critical edition of the play.

J. S. Farmer (1913)
Prepared as part of the Tudor Facsimile Texts series, Farmer’s facsimile reprint edition of When You See Me reproduces the British Library’s copy of Q2. Again, convenience and ease of access seem to have been the reasoning behind the editor’s decision to reproduce this particular copy, though there is no indication of this in the edition itself. In accordance with the series’ practice, there is no introduction to the text or to its author; Farmer simply provides a short note at the start of the text: ‘All that is known of the author is narrated by Sir Sidney Lee in the “Dictionary of National Biography”’. The edition was reprinted by AMS Press in 1970.

F. P. Wilson (1952)
Wilson’s type facsimile edition was prepared for the Malone Society Reprints series and thus follows the conventions laid out by the series editors. It provides a useful introduction to the text of When You See Me and offers an insight into the production of Q1, covering such aspects as watermarks, headlines and printers’ measures. It also considers the date of composition, Rowley’s use of source material and the

---

380 Farmer, p. iii.
manuscript used as printers’ copy, though as noted elsewhere, Wilson’s discussion of the latter revolves around the assumption that Butter came by the manuscript surreptitiously.

The text of this edition, as Wilson states, was ‘set up from photostats of the Barton copy of the quarto of 1605’, located at Boston Public Library.\textsuperscript{381} This copy was collated with that at the Bodleian and the four variants were recorded. Wilson’s edition does indicate another variant on C3, where the facsimile reads ‘footeball’ instead of ‘footebal’. However, both copies of the edition read ‘footebal’ and the fact that Wilson does not include this variant in his list suggests that this was a typographical error introduced during the production of the type facsimile rather than an error of collation. Readings from Qs 2–4 and Elze’s modernised edition are recorded ‘only when they present an acceptable or possible acceptable correction to the text of 1605’.\textsuperscript{382} A number of ‘doubtful’ and ‘irregular’ readings from the first edition supplement the list of variant readings and a useful character list with brief explanatory notes is appended at the start of the text.

While Wilson’s type facsimile indicates the change from small pica to pica at gathering D and aims to demonstrate distinctive features of Q1, such as the compositors’ frequent use of a variant measure in sections one and two, it does not draw attention to issues associated with the spacing of various lines; as Wilson explains, ‘wherever possible’, the printers have been given ‘the benefit of the doubt’.\textsuperscript{383} Similarly, the reproduction ignores such features as the prolific substitution of italic for roman letters in section two and, in accordance with the Society’s practice, single wrong-fount letters, such as the foul case ‘e’ on G2, are replaced in

\textsuperscript{381} Wilson, p. xii.\textsuperscript{382} Wilson, p. xiii.\textsuperscript{383} Wilson, p. xiii.
this edition without notice. This in turn obscures useful information about the production of Q1 and highlights the importance of returning to the original copies.

J. A. B. Somerset (1964)

Somerset’s edition, produced as part of his MA thesis for the University of Birmingham, provides a modernised and annotated text of *When You See Me* based on a photostat of the Bodleian copy of Q1. Somerset collated his copy-text in full against the Boston copy of the same edition and against the Bodleian’s copy of Q2; the V&A copy of Q3 and the Huntington copy of Q4 were collated for substantive variants only. Elze’s 1874 edition was also collated for substantive variants, but its readings were noted only in those places where Somerset adopted them. While Somerset’s emendations regarding the wording of the copy-text are recorded at the foot of each page, his alteration of the play’s lineation is documented only in an appendix. Variant readings in the later quartos are likewise consigned to the appendices. Commentary on the text is printed at the end of the edition but, unlike Elze’s, is easily navigable.

Despite presenting a modernised edition, Somerset occasionally retains old spellings from the copy-text without comment. He also overlooks a small number of variants from Qs 2–4. Throughout the edition, words are elided or expanded to fit a regular metrical pattern, and Somerset aids the reader by using grave accents to indicate a sounded ‘-ed’ (a practice adopted in the present edition). Punctuation is typically light, but emendations are recorded wherever modernisation is seen to involve ‘the resolution of ambiguities inherent in the punctuation of Q1’.

---

384 Somerset, p. vi.
at times heavily influenced by Elze, Somerset’s alterations to the text are consistently well-judged and several of his emendations are adopted in this edition.

Somerset never intended to publish his thesis and his edition of *When You See Me* exists only in a single copy at the Shakespeare Institute Library in Stratford-upon-Avon; it is not widely available and thus its impact is limited. Nonetheless, the research conducted by Somerset into *When You See Me* and its author offered a significant and valuable contribution to knowledge. The discovery of Rowley’s will in particular revealed that Rowley had died eight years prior to the production of Q4 – information unavailable to the text’s previous editors.

---

385 Private correspondence, 9 November 2010.
Editorial Introduction
General editorial principles

This edition presents a fully modernised and annotated text of Rowley’s *When You See Me*, which takes the 1605 edition of the play as its copy-text. Not only does Q1 provide the most authoritative version of *When You See Me*, but there is also evidence, as discussed above, to suggest that the manuscript used as printers’ copy for Q1 was written in Rowley’s own hand. Q1 is therefore both the earliest extant witness to the text of Rowley’s play and the one most likely to reflect the author’s intentions. Since Rowley was a leading actor and sharer in Prince Henry’s Men at the time of his composition of *When You See Me*, the notion of constructing either the play as written or the play as performed is rather unhelpful in this instance; as with the labelling of printers’ copy, the intention to reconstruct either one or other type of text creates a binary distinction between the authorial and the theatrical that is unlikely to have existed in the case of Rowley and Prince Henry’s Men. Q1 may in fact represent the play both as written and as performed, and it is thus the text of *When You See Me* as presented by Rowley for performance at the Fortune that this edition seeks to present.

The underlying text of the edition derives from *EEBO*’s full-text transcription of the Bodleian copy of Q1, which was checked several times against the original; all variants between this and the Boston copy were then recorded. A full historical collation of Qs 1–4 was conducted and a list of variants, both substantive and accidental, drawn up. Using transparency reproductions of each of the four early modern editions I was then able to collate multiple copies in order to identify press variants. Finally, Elze and Somerset’s editions were collated for substantive variants. Only once this information was synthesised and substantive emendations made did I begin to modernise the text of Rowley’s play.
This edition of *When You See Me* has been prepared in accordance with the Arden Early Modern Drama (AEMD) editorial guidelines, modelled on those of the Arden Shakespeare Third Series.\(^{386}\) Not only are the AEMD guidelines comprehensive, covering numerous possibilities and situations, they are also designed to deal specifically with non-Shakespearean drama. While The Revels series is similarly known for its editions of non-Shakespearean playtexts, the publisher’s ‘Notes for the use of editors’ take much from the Arden guidelines, sometimes citing them verbatim.\(^{387}\) Moreover, the ‘Notes’ in question are far less detailed than their Arden counterparts, particularly on such matters as the elision and expansion of copy-text forms and the distinction between verse and prose. The AEMD editorial guidelines are therefore used for the layout and appearance of the edited text in this edition, as well as for the presentation and content of the textual notes and commentary.

The edition deviates from the AEMD guidelines in just three ways. First, the text is laid out as if in a published volume and does not therefore adhere to the guidelines’ specific formatting instructions, such as the three-space indentation of edited text from the left-hand margin, or the use of a fifty-four-character column width for prose passages. Second, I have adopted the Revels and Complete Oxford Shakespeare practice – applied also in Somerset’s edition – of using the grave accent to indicate sounded ‘-ed’ in verse lines. During an organised play-reading of *When You See Me*, which dramatized an earlier version of the edited text, it was found that readers, while comfortably eliding polysyllabic words to fit the metre of the verse,

---

\(^{386}\) Arden Early Modern Drama, ‘Editorial Guidelines’ (unpublished, October 2008). I am grateful to Professor John Jowett for sharing these with me.

\(^{387}\) The Revels Plays, ‘Notes for the use of editors’ (unpublished, 2008). Thanks go to Matthew Frost for passing these on.
frequently stumbled over ‘-ed’ endings.\textsuperscript{388} The intended pronunciation of sounded ‘-ed’ is therefore indicated in the text rather than in the commentary.\textsuperscript{389} Finally, as an extension of the previous point, other sounded syllables typically unsounded in modern speech are indicated in the edited text, such as disyllabic ‘-ience’ or ‘-ion’, frequently used at line-endings or as part of rhyming couplets. Only in those cases where pronunciation is ambiguous is further comment provided. For the benefit of readers, photographs of the copy-text are provided in Appendix 8.

**Modernisation**

The practice of textual modernisation and the value of such an undertaking has been the subject of much scholarly debate, particularly throughout the mid- to late twentieth century when the New Bibliographers were engaged in the process of setting out principles for the construction of reliable, old-spelling critical editions.\textsuperscript{390}

The main argument against modernisation tends to centre on what Arthur Brown describes as a ‘lack of principles’ and the apparent unwillingness of editors to formulate ‘consistent ones’.\textsuperscript{391} Fredson Bowers, too, voiced concerns over the practices of nineteenth-century modernising editors who emended and adapted the texts of their authors without recourse to the original editions and with little or no comment on the extent or significance of their intervention in the text.\textsuperscript{392} Since the

\textsuperscript{388} This took place at the Shakespeare Institute in October 2013. Thanks go to Dr Wiggins for arranging the reading, and to the numerous participants who commented on the edited text.

\textsuperscript{389} In cases where this also marks an expansion of the copy-text reading, however, I follow the guidelines in providing a textual note (see, for instance, ‘hinderèd’ at 3.1.3).


development of scholarly editorial guidelines, however, and with them the publication of influential texts that deal specifically with the issues involved in modernising early modern playtexts (see ‘Spellings’), the principles of modernisation and the rigorousness and consistency with which they are carried out need no longer be such cause for concern. That is not to say that modernisation is straightforward – on the contrary, it is often a very complex and sensitive task, and each text naturally presents its own specific set of problems and challenges – but rather that it should be recognised as both a valuable and scholarly undertaking that extends rather than undermines the work of old-spelling editors.393

Other arguments typically levelled against modernisation concern the language of the original playtexts, and the sense that something is lost in the introduction of modern orthography. Greg, for instance, maintained that ‘the language of an Elizabethan author is better represented by his own spelling than by ours’, and A. C. Partridge made the case that old spellings offer an insight into the intended pronunciation of particular words.394 As John Russell Brown points out, however, ‘“Old-Spelling” was neither old nor odd nor distinctive’ to contemporary authors and readers, and ‘the so-called “Elizabethan flavour” of an old-spelling text’ is a modern phenomenon.395 Moreover, Helge Kökeritz and Stanley Wells have separately argued that Elizabethan and Jacobean spellings do not necessarily reflect contemporary pronunciation and should not be retained on

393 See Stanley Wells’s Re-editing Shakespeare for the Modern Reader (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), in which he suggests that the preparation of a modern-spelling edition ‘is likely to result in a fuller exploration of the text, and so in a more thorough work of scholarship, than the preparation of an old-spelling edition’ (p. 16).
this basis. That compositors introduced so many changes of their own, sometimes simply to enable better justification, further highlights the problem of retaining copy-text spellings on the basis that these might be meaning-bearing.

Unlike Edmund Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*, in which the author deliberately preserved a number of archaic spellings and forms, and for which modernisation would be at direct odds with the author’s intentions, Rowley’s *When You See Me* was written in contemporary Jacobean English. That is not to say that different types of speech are not represented in the play (Will Summers, Black Will, the watchmen and the prisoners, for example, speak in a more colloquial manner than the text’s other characters), but that such elements are not conveyed by means of spelling; rather, they are indicated by the use of particular expressions and character-specific idiosyncrasies – all of which are retained in the present edition (see ‘Spellings’). Modernisation does not obscure these important features; if anything, it draws attention to them.

The aim of this edition, like all editions in the AEMD series, has been to make the text of the play as accessible and intelligible as possible. The sections that follow offer further insight into some of the more specific challenges encountered in the preparation and modernisation of Rowley’s *When You See Me*.

**Spellings**

Copy-text spellings have been modernised throughout in accordance with the AEMD editorial guidelines, with reference to the *OED*, and with recourse to the following three texts, which not only explicate the practice of modernisation, but also propose

---

ways in which to deal with some of its complexities: Wells’s ‘Modernizing Shakespeare’s Spelling’, Wells’s *Re-editing Shakespeare for the Modern Reader*, and David Bevington’s ‘Modern spelling: the hard choices’.

An argument frequently levelled against modern-spelling critical editions, and one I have been careful to take into account in my own edition, is the seemingly arbitrary way in which some editors decide which words to modernise and which to preserve in old spelling. In many cases the result is a strange hybrid, producing, in Bowers’s words, ‘a fake Elizabethan English’ in which language is only partially modernised.\(^{397}\) G. Blakemore Evans’s Riverside Shakespeare, for example, retains a ‘selection of Elizabethan spelling forms’ on the basis that these may provide clues to contemporary pronunciation.\(^{398}\) As Wells notes, such a policy – evident to some extent in Somerset’s edition of *When You See Me* – serves only to add ‘phonetic confusion to orthographical inconsistency’ and neither aids nor informs the reader in his or her approach to the text.\(^{399}\)

Wells’s ‘Modernizing Shakespeare’s Spelling’ is particularly useful in highlighting the inconsistency of the *OED* in distinguishing between variant spellings and variant forms: ‘Many editors follow the rule of thumb that the existence of a separate entry in *OED* for a variant warrants considering that spelling as a distinct form; but in fact *OED* makes no clear distinction’.\(^{400}\) The practice of retaining certain copy-text spellings on the basis that they are afforded an individual entry in the *OED* is thus flawed and may in part account for the proliferation of archaic spellings in scholarly critical editions. Wells instead makes the case for


\(^{399}\) Wells, ‘Modernizing Shakespeare’s Spelling’, p. 8.

\(^{400}\) Wells, ‘Modernizing Shakespeare’s Spelling’, p. 7.
revision of copy-text forms whenever these are deemed ‘semantically indifferent’ to the modern-spelling equivalents.\textsuperscript{401} There are, of course, exceptions to this general rule, such as when old-spelling forms are used to emphasise rhymes or clarify wordplay (Wells gives the example of \textit{A Midsummer Night’s Dream}: ‘This lanthorn doth the hornèd moon present’ (5.1.231)). Nonetheless, Wells’s guidance provides a much stronger and more consistent foundation upon which to base a modernised edition than the policies of selective retention advocated by editors of the Riverside Shakespeare.

In this edition, then, copy-text forms thought to be semantically indifferent to modern-spelling forms are not retained, even if the alteration results in a change in pronunciation. The archaic forms ‘vild’ (3.2.149) and ‘vildest’ (5.1.144 and 5.4.122), for instance, are presented as ‘vile’ and ‘vilest’ respectively and the change is in each case recorded in the textual notes. On occasion, the modernisation of copy-text forms can be seen to alter syllabification as well as pronunciation. In the case of prose passages, this is of little significance and the change is recorded only in the textual notes; the alteration of ‘throughly’ to ‘thoroughly’ at 5.1.78, for example, adds an extra syllable but does not affect an established rhythm or metre. When such changes fall in verse lines, however, the effect is more substantial. An example can be found in act 1, scene 1, where the alteration of the copy-text’s ‘Shrieue’ to ‘sheriff’ disrupts the rhythm of the line (125). In this instance a note is added in the commentary to indicate the likely elision.

Wells’s second category, ‘semantically significant variants’, is more complex, and variants typically fall into one of two groups: words which were used indiscriminately in Elizabethan and Jacobean English for variant senses that are still

\textsuperscript{401} Wells, ‘Modernizing Shakespeare’s Spelling’, p. 10.
current, such as ‘courtesy’ (used for both ‘courtesy’ and ‘curtsy’); and instances where, in Wells’s words, ‘modern spelling distinguishes senses which were orthographically indistinct’, such as ‘wrack’ (used for senses now shared between ‘wrack’ and ‘wreck’). In the case of When You See Me, Rowley’s text contains very few words of double meaning in early modern usage. The word ‘travail’, for instance, which could mean either ‘travail’ or ‘travel’ (or in some cases both, in a deliberate play on words) appears only once in the text, and its intended meaning is apparent from the sense of the line in question: ‘Poor souls no more but travail for their pain’ (1.2.40). The copy-text form is thus retained and little is lost in the act of modernisation. Similarly, the copy-text’s ‘metall’ at 2.3.123 is easily identified as ‘mettle’ in modern usage: ‘I perceive there’s some mettle in thee’, and the alteration is recorded in the textual notes. The possible pun on ‘metal’ in this instance is discussed in the commentary.

Since the speech of Will Summers and Black Will is characterised in the play by use of the distinctive form ‘an’ or ‘and’ to mean ‘if’, the traditional copy-text form is retained in this edition. Given, as Wells suggests, that ‘an’ ‘alerts the reader to the difference in meaning’ in a way that ‘and’ does not, all instances of ‘and’ in the copy-text are altered to ‘an’ whenever this is the intended meaning. Clipped words, such as ‘‘a’ for non-emphatic ‘he’, are also characteristic of Summers’s speech and are therefore retained, as at 3.2.51–2: ‘An any had said so but thou, Harry, I’d have told him ’a lied’. The spelling ‘eth(e)’, used in the copy-text predominantly in the speech of the watchmen and prisoners, is replaced in this edition by the more common form ‘i’th’. However, since the copy-text spelling in this instance may indicate a particular

403 See Wells, ‘Modernizing Shakespeare’s Spelling’, p. 16. All such changes are recorded in the textual notes.
dialect or mode of speech, the modernisation is in each case recorded in the textual
notes and a note added in the commentary to this effect.

Modernisation in this edition extends also to proper names. As Jürgen
Schäfer suggests, to leave character and place names in their Elizabethan or
Jacobean forms demonstrates an ‘incomplete application of modern editorial
principles’. 404 Proper names are therefore regularised throughout in accordance with
modern standard usage. Original copy-text spellings are recorded in the textual notes
and a note is added in the commentary whenever modernisation is liable also to
affect pronunciation, metre or rhyme. (See also ‘Speech prefixes and character
names’, below.)

Punctuation

As R. B. McKerrow suggests, ‘the subject of punctuation is one which bristles with
difficulties’. 405 While spellings are typically either seen as ‘old’ or ‘modern’, with
some notable exceptions, punctuation can have many subtle variations and is thus
particularly subject to individual preference and interpretation. Moreover, unlike
spelling, punctuation is seen by many to be more than just an accidental or ‘surface
feature’ of the text. Indeed, it was the significance of certain punctuation variants
that led Bowers to develop Greg’s ‘Rationale of Copy-Text’ to include the sub-
category ‘semi-substantives’. 406

John Dover Wilson in particular speaks of punctuation as being of ‘the
highest dramatic importance’:

---

404 Jürgen Schäfer, ‘The Orthography of Proper Names in Modern-spelling Editions of Shakespeare’,
SB, 23 (1970), 1–19 (pp. 1–2).
405 R. B. McKerrow, Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method (Oxford:
406 See Bowers, ‘Greg’s “Rationale of Copy-Text” Revisited’, p. 125 in particular. The expression
‘surface features’ is taken from Greg’s ‘The Rationale of Copy-Text’, p. 21.
The stops, brackets, and capital letters in the Folio and Quartos are in fact stage-directions, in shorthand. They tell the actor when to pause and for how long, they guide his intonation, they indicate the emphatic word, often enough they denote ‘stage-business’.407

Percy Simpson put forward a similar theory, based on the premise that different marks of punctuation correspond with different pause-lengths in performance.408 Certainly, there is evidence to support this supposition. George Puttenham’s *The arte of English poesie*, for example, clearly set down the distinction between the comma, the colon and the ‘periodus’ and their respective pause values in spoken language, while Heywood’s *Apology for actors* referred to commas, colons and points as an actor’s respective ‘parentheses’, ‘breathing spaces’ and ‘distinctions’.409

It follows, then, that the punctuation of an early printed playtext may contain clues as to its intended method and style of performance that the act of re-punctuation (inadvertently) obliterates in favour of a more grammatical text.410

Such a theory, however, is reliant on the assumption that the marks of punctuation found in early playtexts are those of the author, or those relating to a specific performance of the play in question. Significantly, it overlooks the important and often considerable role played by compositors in the plays’ transmission from manuscript to print. As Joseph Moxon’s *Mechanick Exercises* demonstrates, compositors were encouraged to ‘discern and amend’ the spelling and pointing of their copy, particularly in the case of poor punctuation.411 That it is

410 See in particular Michael J. Warren’s ‘Repunctuation as Interpretation in Editions of Shakespeare’, *ELR*, 7 (1977), 155–69, in which he argues that alteration of copy-text punctuation creates ‘a radical change in the nature of the text’ (p. 156).
possible to discern individual compositorial preferences in this respect further undermines the retention of copy-text punctuation on the assumption that it represents the authors’ intended pointing. McKenzie’s call for ‘a more cautious reappraisal’ of playtexts’ residual punctuation is thus of particular relevance to the text of Q1 *When You See Me*, which – set in five different printing houses – embodies the habits and preferences of at least five different men, some of whom presumably strayed further than others from the punctuation of their copy.\(^{412}\) The use of punctuation in Q1 cannot therefore be relied upon to indicate Rowley’s intentions for the play in performance.

Total retention of copy-text punctuation is also at odds with the production of a modernised critical edition in which, as the AEMD guidelines affirm, ‘[t]he provision of consistent and intelligible punctuation for the modern reader is paramount’.\(^{413}\) That is not to say that the punctuation of the copy-text is of no authority or significance; on the contrary, it should form the basis of any modern interpretation. The purpose of this edition is not therefore to re-punctuate the text of *When You See Me* from scratch, but rather to re-punctuate in a way that clarifies the sense and effect of the copy-text’s original pointing. Punctuation is thus more consistent than that in the copy-text and it avoids overuse of the exclamation mark, as favoured in Elze’s nineteenth-century edition. The punctuation of this edition also seeks to avoid obscuring the rhythm of the text – a concern elucidated by both N. F. Blake and Anthony Graham-White.\(^{414}\)

Although individual punctuation changes are not recorded, care has been taken to identify and record all substantive changes to copy-text punctuation and,

\(^{412}\) D. F. McKenzie, ‘Shakespearean Punctuation – A New Beginning’, *RES*, 10 (1959), 361–70 (p. 370). See also the information on Simmes’s Compositor A, above (p. 151).

\(^{413}\) AEMD guidelines, p. 14, 2i.

where relevant, to discuss these emendations and their effects in the commentary. Substantive punctuation variants in later editions of *When You See Me* not adopted in this edition are also recorded in the textual notes. In terms of editorial punctuation, this edition uses the en-dash (‘–’) throughout to signify a change of address within a single speech, with an added stage direction for clarification where necessary. It also uses the em-dash (‘—’) at the end of a line to signify either that the speaker has been interrupted, as at 3.2.142, or that he or she has broken off mid-sentence, as, for example, at 5.2.32, where Prince Edward reads only a part of his sister Mary’s letter. Finally, interpolations marked by parentheses in the copy-text are marked by commas in this edition.415

**Global modification of the copy-text**

A number of silent modifications have been made to the copy-text throughout. These include the expansion of ‘&’ to ‘and’, the rectification of turned letters, the use of roman rather than italic type for proper names, and the normalisation of spacing. In addition, and in accordance with the practice of modernisation, the copy-text’s ligatures are not reproduced, the long ‘s’ is standardised throughout, digraphs which represent diphthongs in words of classical origin are normalised, and tildes representing contractions are expanded. All other modifications that go beyond the modernisation of spelling and punctuation are recorded in the textual notes. These include, for example, the expansion of abbreviations such as ‘L.’, ‘M.’ and ‘La.’ to ‘Lord’, ‘Master’ and ‘Lady’, respectively.

415 While Partridge suggests that parentheses were sometimes used ‘to indicate a drop or change in the voice’, the examples in Q1 seem largely to have been used for syntactical purposes, introducing such interpolations as ‘my gentle sister’ (1.2.211) or ‘quoth she’ (1.2.275), the single possible exception (occurring at 1.2.230) is noted in the commentary. See Partridge, *Orthography in Shakespeare*, p. 135.
Additional modifications involve the expansion of elided forms in the copy-text. The AEMD guidelines suggest that polysyllabic adjectives and participles should be given in their fullest form, irrespective of metre in verse passages and regardless of their appearance in the copy-text; the rule extends in this edition to all present participles of three or more syllables.\(^\text{416}\) The copy-text’s ‘remembring’ at 1.1.26, for example, is presented as ‘remembering’ in this edition, even though the word in context is clearly meant to be elided: ‘We thank his highness for remembering us’. Similarly, the copy-text’s ‘Bordring’ at 5.5.70 becomes ‘Bordering’, despite its intended disyllabic pronunciation. In all such cases, the expansion is recorded as a modernisation and a note in the commentary informs the reader of the desired pronunciation. This edition also modernises historical contractions: ‘th’art’ becomes ‘thou’rt’, ‘h’as’ becomes ‘he’š’, ‘y’are’ becomes ‘you’re’, and so on. The only exception to this general rule occurs at 5.5.211, where the verb ‘are’ is emphatic: ‘y’are too hard for all’.

Other global changes include the alteration of verb forms to correspond with modern grammatical practice (see, for example, the alteration of ‘traitors creeps’ to ‘traitors creep’ at 5.4.4) and the translation of theatre Latin into English, such as the modification of ‘\textit{Manit, Wil, and Patch. / Exit omnes}.’ to ‘\textit{Exeunt all but Will Summers and Patch}.’ (3.1.74); the more anglicised directions ‘\textit{Exit}’, ‘\textit{Exeunt}’ and ‘\textit{Exeunt omnes}’ are retained in this edition. In those places where the copy-text reads ‘\textit{Exit}’ for multiple departures, ‘\textit{Exeunt}’ has been substituted and the change recorded as a modernisation in the textual notes. Since the word ‘\textit{Exit}’ alone is used in this edition to indicate the departure of the last-named speaking character, copy-text readings are modified whenever a character

\(^{416}\) AEMD guidelines, p. 22, 7h.
name is supplied unnecessarily; once again, the change is recorded as a modernisation. Some changes to stage directions, however, remain silent, and these include their layout on the printed page (how many lines they take up and where line breaks occur) and the way in which characters are named: in entrance directions, the names of all speaking characters appear in small capitals and the names of all non-speaking characters appear in lower case with an initial capital. Only when substantively emended, supplemented or moved are these directions recorded in the textual notes.

Speech prefixes and character names

It is widely thought, even amongst editors of old-spelling texts, that the labelling of speech prefixes and by extension the appearance of character names in stage directions should remain consistent throughout an edition. It is also common practice to abandon abbreviated speech prefixes – in all their various manifestations – in favour of complete forms, not least to avoid the confusion that ensues from the abbreviation of two names that begin with the same letters. In act 1, scene 1 of When You See Me, for example, both Bonner and Bonnivet appear as ‘Bon.’ in Q1’s speech prefixes, and in act 5, scene 4 there is confusion between Gardiner and the guard, both of whom are designated ‘Gard’ in the copy-text. Wells in particular argues against the retention of abbreviated forms, viewing the practice as ‘an indefensible barbarism in anything other than a diplomatic edition’.

As McKerrow suggests, a sensible approach in any type of edition, either old- or modern-spelling, is to treat speech prefixes ‘as labels and to make the

---

417 See, for example, Fredson Bowers, ‘Regularization and Normalization in Modern Critical Texts’, SB, 42 (1989), 79–102.
418 Wells, Re-editing Shakespeare, p. 65.
labels uniform’. It is this sense of uniformity that lies behind the decision to expand and regularise speech prefixes throughout the text of When You See Me. In each case, I have assigned the shortest names that can be used without ambiguity or confusion. Thus while King Henry is simply designated ‘King’, as he is in the copy-text, his two queens Jane and Katherine, each designated ‘Queene’ in Q1, are named in full so as to clarify which of the two characters is intended. Similarly, Will Summers’s name is printed in full throughout in order to avoid confusion with the villain Black Will.

The character name for Cardinal Wolsey presents more of a challenge. While in the stage directions of the copy-text ‘the Cardinal’ appears far more frequently than ‘Wolsey’, the copy-text’s speech prefixes refer consistently to ‘Wol.’ or ‘Wools.’; only once is the prefix ‘Car.’ assigned instead (3.2.165). Thus, with preference split in the copy-text, it is necessary to select the most appropriate form for the edition and to use it consistently throughout. In this instance, the name ‘Wolsey’ is preferred over ‘Cardinal’ for several reasons. First, of all the characters active in King Henry’s court, only members of the royal family are named according to their status; others are typically referred to only by surname. Second, the copy-text’s speech prefixes are more abundant than its stage directions, thus swaying overall usage in Q1 towards this particular form. Finally, and most importantly, this action calls for minimum intervention in the copy-text: all speech prefixes are retained and simply expanded as necessary (the single alteration of ‘Car.’ is recorded in the textual notes) and stage directions require only simple supplementation (‘Enter Cardinal [WOLSEY]’).

---

419 McKerrow, Prolegomena, p. 57.
420 The few exceptions to this general rule, including the Countess of Salisbury and the Marquess of Dorset, are designated such only because their names are not provided in the text of the play.
To correspond with the accepted modern spelling, Gardiner’s name, a combination of ‘Gardner’ and ‘Gardiner’ in the copy-text, is spelt consistently with an ‘i’ in this edition. This in turn has implications for the way in which the name is spoken. In a number of verse lines ‘Gardiner’ is clearly intended to be spoken with two rather than three syllables: ‘Gardiner ’tis true, so was the rumour spread’ (1.3.32); on other occasions, the metre demands trisyllabic pronunciation: ‘Now, Gardiner, what think’st thou of these times?’ (1.3.21). The variant readings in the copy-text, ‘Gardner’ and ‘Gardiner’, do not conform to any set metrical pattern and it can perhaps be inferred that actors were expected to elide and expand the name as necessary in performance.\(^{421}\) A commentary note in this edition indicates when disyllabic pronunciation is intended. Since the modified spelling of Gardiner’s name occurs throughout the edition, the copy-text spellings have not been recorded as modernisations in the textual notes. Rather, a commentary note in the List of Roles at the beginning of the play draws attention to the global change.

In a similar manner, the names ‘Campeus’, ‘Gray’, ‘Bonevet’ and ‘Rookesby’ (as they appear consistently in the stage directions and dialogue of the copy-text) are altered in this edition to ‘Campeius’, ‘Grey’, ‘Bonnivet’ and ‘Rooksby’, respectively, so as to conform to accepted modern spellings. ‘Prichall’ is also altered to ‘Prickawl’ to highlight Rowley’s pun on the character’s profession as cobbler.\(^{422}\) Unlike Gardner–Gardiner, though, these modifications have no impact on syllabification (the ‘e’ in ‘Rookesby’ is unsounded in verse passages) and thus

---

\(^{421}\) The different spellings in Q1 can largely be attributed to the text’s compositors.

\(^{422}\) The same alteration is made by Wiggins in his *Catalogue*, vol. 5, entry 1441, p. 146. In Q1, the names Prickawl and Capcase are assigned respectively to the Cobbler and 1 Watch, the first in the opening stage direction of 2.1 and the latter only in the dialogue of that scene. In both cases, I follow AEMD policy in retaining the role form of identification most frequently used in speech prefixes and stage directions (p. 20, 7b).
no effect on the metre of the text. Once again, a brief commentary note on each in the List of Roles draws attention to the change.

Stage directions

In *Re-editing Shakespeare*, Wells states that ‘the editor of a critical edition has a responsibility to amplify the directions of his original texts’. The nature and extent of such amplification, however, is open to debate. While only two categories of stage direction, exits and entrances, are truly necessary (as Wells notes, ‘[c]haracters must be got on to the stage, and off it’), the more involved action of a play may sometimes call for further clarification. The level of editorial intervention necessary to elucidate stage business is thus determined both by the quantity and comprehensiveness of stage directions in the early modern editions of the play and the perceived complexity or ambiguity of the play’s action. In the case of Rowley’s *When You See Me*, much of the action is guided and clarified by the spoken text, rendering amplification redundant on a number of occasions. However, it has sometimes been necessary to supplement Q1’s existing directions, either to highlight characters’ likely movements on stage or, more commonly, to clarify who is speaking to whom when a number of characters appear on stage at the same time. In accordance with the AEMD guidelines, the copy-text’s directions have been preserved as far as possible and all substantive alterations are recorded in the textual notes; emendations are also printed within square brackets so as to draw attention to the editorial process.

Perhaps most fundamentally, the text of Q1 is lacking in entrance and exit directions and these have therefore been supplied in the most logical positions in relation to the action and dialogue of the play. The wording of a number of entrance

---

423 Wells, *Re-editing Shakespeare*, p. 63.  
directions in particular has been supplemented in order to clarify who enters when and, where possible, how many people enter at a given moment. The main textual alteration thus involves the naming of speaking parts where these remain vague in the copy-text, such as in act 1, scene 2, where ‘Enter [BRANDON and GREY with BONNIVET and PARIS]’ replaces Q1’s indiscriminate ‘Enter Lords and Ambassadors’ (143 SD2). It has also been necessary to alter the position of several of the text’s original entrance and exit directions to correspond with the action on stage. Exit directions, for example, have frequently been moved down a line so that the character’s departure does not precede a line of speech intended for them to hear. Whenever stage directions have been moved but not substantively altered, they are treated as emendations rather than editorial insertions and do not appear in the text in square brackets. Their movement, though, is duly recorded in the textual notes, where the original positions of the stage directions are made explicit.

Directions are also frequently added in order to clarify the intended auditors of lines when these are not immediately apparent, particularly in cases where successive lines within a single speech are directed to a number of different characters (see, for example, 4.1.114–22). Asides are similarly explicated in this edition. There were, as Manfred Pfister suggests, three different types of aside that dramatists could employ: the ‘conventionalised monological aside’, in which a character speaks aloud to himself/herself; the ‘dialogical aside’, spoken to another character or characters, but not to all characters on stage; and the ‘ad spectatores aside’, usually reserved for comedic effect, in which the actor directly addressed the audience.425 In this edition, the word ‘aside’ alone is used to indicate Pfister’s ‘conventionalised monological aside’, though it is possible that

some of these lines may have been spoken to the audience (see 2.1.116 as a likely example); in the case of ‘dialogical asides’, the names of specific characters are added to indicate the speakers’ intended auditors. On occasion, as at 1.4.12–16 and 5.1.61–3, it has been more prudent to condense the stage direction by writing ‘aside to the other lords’, rather than listing each of the lords’ names in turn. To avoid ambiguity, however, the directions are clarified in the commentary. Significantly, the different types of aside in When You See Me are not always as clear-cut as Pfister suggests. In the last of the examples given above, for instance, where Dudley, Seymour and Grey each speak ‘aside to the other lords’ (5.1.61–3), the conspiratorial nature of their dialogue is undermined when the King notices their private conversation and questions: ‘Ha! What’s that ye talk there?’. It is unclear whether the King is supposed to have overheard the lords’ conversation, or whether he is only meant to have seen them talking together, but either way this episode can be seen to challenge the conventional notion of the ‘dialogical aside’.

Occasionally, directions are introduced in this edition to clarify a character’s action on stage, such as at 1.4.192 where Patch ‘Creeps up behind the King’, or at 5.1.222 where the King ‘Reads the letter’. Directions are also added when stage properties are involved, for example when money changes hands, or when papers are carried, read or torn in two (see in particular 5.4.177–8). However, prescriptive directions such as these are included only when actions can be inferred with reasonable certainty; in cases where movements on stage are unclear, or where there exist a variety of performance options, a note is instead provided in the commentary. Thus, while editors such as John D. Cox call for the complete elimination of editorial directions, perhaps in turn neglecting the responsibility
with which Wells tasks any editor (see above), this edition seeks to achieve some sense of balance.\footnote{\textit{Lineation}}

**Lineation**

In addition to lacking a number of important stage directions, the first edition of \textit{When You See Me} also confuses verse and prose passages in the play, often blurring the distinction between the two. Somerset suggests that ‘[m]ost of the anomalous lineation in the first quarto is the result of the compositors having changed prose into verse’ and while this is frequently the case, more often it is rather the ambiguous arrangement of text in Q1 that raises doubts over Rowley’s intended lineation.\footnote{Somerset, Appendix II, p. 316.} The diverse habits of the text’s compositors can go some way towards explaining these ambiguities. The frequent and in many cases inconsistent use in gatherings A–C of an indented stick (see Bibliographical Introduction) repeatedly complicates the identification of verse and prose in the copy-text, since both are often justified to the same measure; the arbitrary use of upper case letters in this section at the beginning of type-lines further obscures the distinction. Moreover, while the compositor of section one made regular use of the turn-up and turn-under for long verse lines, the compositor of gatherings K–L tended instead to split such lines over two separate type-lines; the compositors of the central gatherings employed a combination of these variant methods. Q1 thus reflects a range of different approaches to the interpretation of Rowley’s lineation and the text presumably varies section by section in its faithfulness to copy.\footnote{On the nature, extent and source of mislineation in printed playtexts, see Paul Werstine, ‘Line Division in Shakespeare’s Dramatic Verse: An Editorial Problem’, \textit{AEB}, 8 (1984), 73–125.} It has therefore been necessary to re-examine the lineation of the copy-text throughout.

Since verse passages in *When You See Me* rarely adhere to a strict metrical code, the distinction between verse and prose is far from straightforward. Rowley’s text embodies a variety of metrical forms and its verse passages, although typically written in iambic pentameter, regularly move away from this conventional rhythm and structure. Rowley’s tendency to shift between iambic and trochaic rhythms also breaks up the natural flow of the verse and can be seen to suggest prose as the more suitable medium on a number of occasions. Such metrical irregularity, however, should not be taken as evidence of corrupted verse; neither does it suggest that the line or lines in question should be printed as prose. Rather, metre needs to be examined in conjunction with a number of other factors, both bibliographical and literary.

Lineation in *When You See Me* is in many cases determined by who is speaking or, more specifically, by who is speaking to whom at any given moment. Typically, as in other contemporary playtexts, the higher status characters speak in verse while the lower status characters converse in prose; however, there are a number of important exceptions to this general rule. Perhaps the most obvious example is Will Summers’s frequent shift into Skeltonic verse whenever he engages in battles of extemporal rhyming with the other characters. In each case, despite Q1’s habitual setting of these passages as prose, the fool’s challenger adopts the same Skeltonic metre. In addition, the King almost always speaks in prose when conversing with Summers or when speaking to his queens on an intimate or personal level (see, for example, King Henry’s heartfelt apology to Queen Katherine at 5.4.108–18), and he intentionally adapts his speech when in disguise so as to further conceal his true identity; only when the King is left alone to contemplate the night’s events does his speech revert to verse (2.3.14–34). Whenever Henry acts as King and
ruler, then, he speaks in verse, but when he acts as husband, father or associate, prose is the more common medium. Lineation is not therefore simply a matter of status in When You See Me; it is determined also by the relationships between different characters and by the subject matter and mood of the scene or episode in question.

It is also common in When You See Me to find passages that combine verse and prose within a single speech. Although this practice does not seem to have been widely adopted in other plays of the period, the tendency has been noted in a number of Middleton’s works. Jackson, for example, draws attention to the practice in his textual introduction to The Revenger’s Tragedy:

Middleton’s abrupt transitions from verse to prose and back again, even within a single speech, his tendency at times to nudge either medium towards the other, and his liking for hypermetrical exclamations and short phrases that interrupt the basic iambic pentameter appear to have perplexed the compositors on several occasions and can make it hard to determine the most appropriate setting-out.429

Similarly, the compositors of Q1 When You See Me appear to have been somewhat confused by Rowley’s verse–prose transitions, setting these speeches predominantly as verse, sometimes as prose, and only occasionally (as, for example, at 2.3.100–7) as the author seems to have intended: as an amalgamation of the two.

This combination of verse and prose is used in a number of different ways throughout the text, and is typically determined by the abovementioned factors – character relationships, subject matter and tone – as well as by the action on stage. Once again, it is often King Henry who speaks these hybrid lines. A useful example, in which the King switches twice between the two mediums, can be found at 5.1.227–34, where the action and dialogue of the play is centred on Luther’s letter.

While the opening five lines – the King’s initial response to the letter – are spoken in verse, the following three lines switch to prose as the King invites Gardiner to share in its contents: ‘Gardiner, look here, he was deceived, he says …’. The final line of the speech then returns to verse as the King’s anger is roused a second time by Luther’s audacity. A second example, at 5.4.178–83, also centres on a stage property, though in this instance it is the King’s action on stage (the dramatic ripping of the paper in two) that prompts the change in lineation rather than the dramatized reading of its contents.

Rowley also frequently adapts the length of verse lines in *When You See Me*, incorporating, in addition to a large number of hexameter lines, all five categories of short verse line identified by Abigail Rokison: final, internal, initial, single and shared. Short verse lines are most commonly used for greetings (‘How now, Bonner?’), parting lines (‘I take my leave.’), pleas (‘I beseech your grace.’) and words of general agreement or acquiescence (‘Yes, my liege.’, ‘We will, my lord.’). Frequently, such lines are used to begin or end a passage of otherwise regular verse, such as at 3.2.29: ‘We thank thee. / I tell thee, Cranmer, he is all our hopes …’. In some cases, as in the example cited above, short verse lines were identified as such by the text’s compositors and set accordingly. Elsewhere, though, both in the case of initial and internal short lines, the distinction is not made in Q1 and short verse lines are commonly found tacked on to the beginning or end of surrounding lines. On occasion, Somerset identified the mislineation and emended the text of his edition, as, for example, at 5.4.165, where the King angrily questions Bonner and Gardiner ‘Call you her traitor?’ before
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concluding his impassioned speech in iambic pentameter. On other occasions, this edition is the source of the emendation.

In certain cases, the decision has been made not to separate out a longer verse line into a short line and a pentameter. King Henry’s characteristic exclamation ‘Ha!’, for example, frequently extends the metre of the text beyond the pentameter of surrounding verse lines but, since ‘Ha!’ does not in itself constitute an individual text line, the exclamation is treated as a hypermetrical interjection and left to stand as per its position in the copy-text (see, for example, 1.4.102). The same is true of the word ‘Ay’ at the beginning of Gardiner’s line at 5.1.147. Thus whenever the additional syllables in a long verse line in Q1 are an inherent part of the line in question, or a characteristic outburst as opposed to meaningful dialogue, the lineation of the copy-text is retained; only when the hypermetrical words are meaning-bearing in isolation, mark a change of address or subject matter (as at 1.4.114 and 4.1.279), or are clearly differentiated in some way from the remainder of the line is an emendation made in this edition.

In the case of split verse lines, in which regular verse lines are divided between two or more different characters, this edition follows the modern practice of indenting the second part-line and placing it on the same line as the second speech prefix. I have, however, been careful throughout to maintain an awareness of alternative methods of lineation and to divide a line only when the copy-text itself seems to lend itself to this arrangement. Thus, whenever Q1 presents a series of short lines with no obvious metrical pairings (as at 5.5.43–5, where the second of the three lines could feasibly be paired with either the first or the third), the verse has not been divided and each line is left to stand on its own; as Taylor notes, it is preferable in the case of such ‘amphibious part-lines’ to ‘submit to the fluidity of the medium’ by
setting each short line as a single unit. This in turn prevents the edited text from imposing on the copy-text a fixed metrical structure that may not have been intended by Rowley. As George T. Wright suggests, playwrights ‘may have meant us to hear the ambiguity, to hear one line mounted, as it were, on another’. To pair one line off with another would therefore be to diminish intentional ambiguity in the text. It would also be to deny the possibility that these lines were intended as prose.

This edition emends the lineation of Q1 on numerous occasions, in many cases following the decisions of the text’s previous editors. Whenever the copy-text reading differs from my own, the change – as well as the source of the emendation – is recorded in the textual notes. Particularly complex or ambiguous examples are also discussed in the commentary, where the reasoning behind the emendation (or, in some cases, retention) of copy-text lineation is made explicit.

**Act and scene division**

Q1 *When You See Me* does not contain act or scene divisions and no such breaks were introduced in later seventeenth-century editions of the play. As Taylor and W. T. Jewkes point out, adult playing companies do not seem to have begun performing in acts in outdoor playhouses until at least 1607, when the transition to five-act performance began to take place. To introduce act divisions in plays composed prior to 1607 would thus, in many cases, be to enforce a particular structure upon the
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play that is unlikely to have been intended on the early modern stage. In the case of Rowley’s *When You See Me*, however, the play, with its manifestly episodic structure, lends itself to internal division. Moreover, the various episodes of the play, typically differentiated in terms of their location, timeframe, subject matter and source material, can be seen to fall into five discrete sections (see ‘Source material and the structure of *When You See Me*’, above). The act breaks introduced in this edition do not therefore create unwelcome disunity, but serve only to highlight elements of the play’s original composition.\(^{434}\)

The scene divisions of this edition correspond throughout with those in Wilson’s MSR edition and represent natural breaks in the action where all characters make their exit from the stage. Often such breaks are self-evident, marked in the copy-text by the inclusion of the word ‘*Exeunt*’ (or sometimes just ‘*Exit*’); elsewhere, due to the deficiency of exit and entrance directions, the mass exit is inferred and confirmed implicitly in the text by means of a perceptible change in mood, location or subject matter. One such example can be found at the end of act 4, scene 1 where, after Prince Edward takes his leave ‘to be a little idle’, Cranmer and Doctor Tye remain on stage to discuss their hopes for the Prince’s future. No exit direction prompts their departure in Qs 1–4; however, given that Bonner and Gardiner then enter to discuss ‘[h]eretical and damnèd heresies’, it can be inferred that Cranmer and Tye leave the stage prior to the bishops’ entrance. The scene (and act) break is further corroborated by the change in subject matter, as the action turns once more to focus on the intrigue and corruption of the King’s court.

While Gurr and Mariko Ichikawa suggest that ‘[a] break between Shakespearean scenes generally begins with the exit of all characters’ and that ‘[a]
new scene opens with the entrance of other characters’ (my emphasis), it is often the
case in Rowley’s When You See Me that a scene break can be identified when a
character already on stage is named in a separate entrance direction. Either the
character was intended to depart the stage earlier on in the scene so that he or she
could subsequently re-enter (as with Bonner at 1.1.78), thus suggesting the
continuation of a single scene, or – more commonly – the final ‘Exeunt’ is lacking in
Q1 and the second entrance marks the beginning of a new scene. A useful example
is provided at the end of act 1, scene 1. Neither Wolsey nor Bonner are directed to
leave the stage (although Wolsey’s ‘haste after me’ at line 126 does indicate their
imminent departure), yet Wolsey is then seen entering as part of King Henry’s grand
procession. Bonner is not a part of this procession, and since he does not appear at
all in the next scene, it can only be assumed that he is meant to leave the stage along
with Wolsey after the latter’s rhyming couplet (lines 126–7).

The only real ambiguity in the identification of scene breaks occurs partway
through act 5, scene 5, where a further division suggests itself at the elaborate stage
direction after line 42 (SD2). This direction sees the entrance of a stately procession
as the King, Queen Katherine, Wolsey and numerous others journey to meet the
Holy Roman Emperor. While such an elaborate direction typically signifies the
start of a new scene, however, the action in this instance requires that a number of
characters remain on stage throughout. Just before the entrance of the royal train,
Prince Edward says: ‘Go, all of you attend his royal person, / Whilst we observe the
Emperor’s majesty’ (lines 41–2). At least some of the characters on stage at this
point must leave in order to obey the Prince’s command, and since Wolsey, a
herald and the guard then enter with King Henry as part of the procession, it can be
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inferred that it is to them Edward directs his order; the Lord Mayor and lords presumably remain on stage with the Prince and Emperor as the train enters. This is corroborated by the fact that only ten lines later Prince Edward entreats the Emperor to meet the King: if this had been a scene break proper, and the Prince and Emperor had left the stage prior to the royal procession, there would have been no viable point at which they could have re-entered without interrupting the action of the play. The scene has not therefore been divided and the editorial direction ‘Trumpets sound as the train moves towards the Prince and Emperor.’ is added after line 51 to clarify this decision.

**Commentary and textual notes**

The commentary draws attention to biblical, classical and literary allusions in the text and highlights puns, proverbs and the relationship between the text and Rowley’s likely source material. It also provides simple glosses of the play’s more complex words and phrases and discusses staging possibilities when these are not given in the text as editorial directions. In addition, the commentary draws attention to substantive emendation of the copy-text whenever further clarification is thought necessary and offers explanation of difficult or ambivalent modernisations including, where relevant, a guide to the likely pronunciation and/or elision of modernised words in verse passages.

Although, as noted in the AEMD guidelines, the amplitude of annotation is ‘one of the principal attractions of the series’, it is nonetheless important that the annotations do not dominate the edited text upon which they provide comment; as Philip Edwards suggests, ‘[t]he vices of over-annotation are as bad as the vices of
under-annotation’ and the solution must be one of balance. Bowers’s distinction between the ‘required’, the ‘useful’ and the ‘superfluous’ (drawn initially in his discussion on editorial stage directions) has therefore been of use in determining what should and, importantly, should not be included. The commentary in this edition thus aims to clarify, explain and justify all that is necessary to the reader, as well as that which he or she may find useful when approaching the text for the first time; it does not aim to gloss every speech and, in line with AEMD policy, avoids glossorial notes whenever the information in question is available in a standard concise dictionary. Moreover, in cases where an unusual or archaic word is repeated several times throughout the text, a gloss is provided only on its first appearance, with reference to later occurrences where appropriate.

The textual notes draw attention to the following four features: substantive emendations of the copy-text, including punctuation marks and other typically ‘accidental’ aspects when these affect meaning; substantive variants in other editions of the text; complex or significant modernisations; and all differences in lineation, including the position of stage directions. Significant modernisations, such as those that affect scansion and/or pronunciation, are recorded as follows, with the copy-text reading in italicised parentheses: ‘346 Calais] (Cales)’; this form of textual note is also used to record the expansion of copy-text forms, such as ‘M.’ for ‘Master’. When a word appears more than once in a line, a superscript arabic numeral is prefixed to indicate to which appearance of the word the textual note refers. Stage directions are not numbered separately and therefore take the number of
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the line in or after which they occur; if a stage direction occupies more than one line in the edited text, an internal line number is supplied for clarification.

In accordance with the AEMD guidelines, readings from the copy-text and other seventeenth-century editions of the text retain the i/j and u/v conventions of the originals, but do not retain the long ‘s’, ligatures, or ‘vv’ for ‘w’. The sigla for the four early modern editions of *When You See Me* appear in the textual notes as *Q1*, *Q2*, *Q3* and *Q4* and the letters *a* and *b* are added where necessary to signify respectively the uncorrected and corrected states of the relevant forme in each edition. Modern critical editions of the play are referred to simply by editor surname: *Elze* and *Somerset.*
PART 3

EDITED TEXT
Abbreviations used in the commentary and textual notes

As noted in the Editorial Introduction, the sigla Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, Elze and Somerset refer to the four early modern editions of When You See Me and the more recent critical editions of Karl Elze and J. A. B. Somerset; ‘Wilson’ refers to the introduction to F. P. Wilson’s Malone Society Reprints edition of the play. Full details of each edition can be found on p. xi. A reference to this edn indicates a reading adopted or proposed for the first time in this edition.

All biblical quotations are from the Geneva Bible (1599); OED and ODNB references are from OED² and ODNB online. References to ‘Wiggins’ are to Martin Wiggins’s Catalogue, which appears in the List of Abbreviations on p. xiii. Citations from Holinshed and Foxe are from the most recent version of each work available at the time of Rowley’s composition: the 1587 edition (sixth volume) and 1597 edition (second volume), respectively. Works by Shakespeare are cited from the most recent Arden editions.

The titles of plays by dramatists other than Shakespeare are given here in full, along with STC/Wing numbers and brief details of the editions cited; full details can be found in the Bibliography. Other primary texts mentioned but not cited in the commentary are listed only in the Bibliography.

General abbreviations

* precedes a commentary note which involves a reading substantively altered from the copy-text

( ) italic parentheses are used in textual notes to highlight noteworthy copy-text readings and to record modernisations

after used in textual notes to indicate that a stage direction is positioned either after a particular word in a line of text or on a line of its own: in the first instance, the relevant word is given; in the second, the line number of the preceding text-line

conj. a conjectured reading, proposed but not adopted by the named scholar

LR List of Roles

MS(S) manuscript(s)

MSR Malone Society Reprints edition

n. commentary note

opp. used in textual notes to indicate that a stage direction is positioned to the right of (i.e. opposite) a line of text

SD(D) stage direction(s)

SP(P) speech prefix(es)

subst. substantially

TLN Through Line Number, used when citing from MSR editions

t.n. textual note

trans. translated by
Short titles for works by (and partly by) Shakespeare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>All’s Well That Ends Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>The Comedy of Errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cym</td>
<td>Cymbeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1H4</td>
<td>King Henry IV, Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2H4</td>
<td>King Henry IV, Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>King Henry V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1H6</td>
<td>King Henry VI, Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2H6</td>
<td>King Henry VI, Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3H6</td>
<td>King Henry VI, Part 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>King Henry VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJ</td>
<td>King John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KL</td>
<td>King Lear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLL</td>
<td>Love’s Labour’s Lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Much Ado About Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Measure for Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MND</td>
<td>A Midsummer Night’s Dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV</td>
<td>The Merchant of Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>The Merry Wives of Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oth</td>
<td>Othello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>King Richard II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>King Richard III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ</td>
<td>Romeo and Juliet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STM</td>
<td>Sir Thomas More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Troilus and Cressida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tem</td>
<td>The Tempest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGV</td>
<td>The Two Gentlemen of Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Timon of Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Twelfth Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNK</td>
<td>The Two Noble Kinsmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>The Taming of the Shrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT</td>
<td>The Winter’s Tale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short titles for other plays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Full Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Shoemaker</td>
<td>Rowley, William, A Shoemaker, A Gentleman, STC 21422 (1638 Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Shrew</td>
<td>Anon., The Taming of a Shrew, STC 23667, MSR edn (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Fools</td>
<td>Chapman, George, All Fools, STC 4963 (1605 Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All’s Lost</td>
<td>Rowley, William, All’s Lost by Lust, STC 21425 (1633 Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author(s and Notes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden of Faversham</td>
<td>Anon., <em>Arden of Faversham</em>, STC 733, MSR edn (1939–40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind Beggar</td>
<td>Chapman, George, <em>The Blind Beggar of Alexandria</em>, STC 4965, MSR edn (1928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar &amp; Pompey</td>
<td>Anon., <em>The Tragedy of Caesar and Pompey; or, Caesar’s Revenge</em>, STC 4340, MSR edn (1911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobbler’s Prophecy</td>
<td>Wilson, Robert, <em>The Cobbler’s Prophecy</em>, STC 25781 (1594 Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromwell</td>
<td>S., W., Thomas, <em>Lord Cromwell</em>, STC 21532 (1602 Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupid’s Whirligig</td>
<td>Sharpham, Edward, <em>Cupid’s Whirligig</em>, STC 22380 (1607 Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchess of Suffolk</td>
<td>Drue, Thomas, <em>The Duchess of Suffolk</em>, STC 7242 (1631 Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening’s Love</td>
<td>Dryden, John, <em>An evening’s love, or, The mock-astrologer</em>, Wing D2275 (1675 Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 If You Know Not Me</td>
<td>Heywood, Thomas, <em>If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part 1</em>, STC 13328, MSR edn (1934)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 If You Know Not Me</td>
<td>Heywood, Thomas, <em>If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Part 2</em>, STC 13336, MSR edn (1934–5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Leir</td>
<td>Anon., <em>The History of King Leir</em>, STC 15343, MSR edn (1907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knack to Know</td>
<td>Anon., <em>A Knack to Know A Knave</em>, STC 15027, MSR edn (1963)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Late Lancashire Witches: Heywood, Thomas and Richard Brome, *The Late Lancashire Witches*, STC 13373 (1634 Q)

Locrine: S., W., *The Lamentable Tragedy of Locrine*, STC 21528 (1595 Q)

Look About You: Anon., *Look About You*, STC 16799, MSR edn (1913)


Richard the Third: Anon., *Richard the Third*, STC 21009 (1594 Q)


Silver Age: Heywood, Thomas, *The Silver Age*, STC 13365 (1613 Q)


The Night-Walker: Fletcher, John, *The Night-Walker; or, The Little Thief*, STC 11072 (1640 Q)

Three Ladies: Wilson, Robert, *The Three Ladies of London*, STC 25784 (1584 Q)


Valiant Welshman: A., R., *The Valiant Welshman*, STC 16 (1615 Q)
**Whore of Babylon**  

**Wily Beguiled**  
Anon., *Wily Beguiled*, STC 25818 (1606 Q)

**Witch of Edmonton**  

**Other primary sources**

- **A Pleasant History**  
  Anon., *A pleasant history of the life and death of Will Summers*, Wing P2551 (1676)

- **Aquinas, Commentary**  

- **Aristotle, Parts of Animals**  

- **Barrough**  
  Barrough, Philip, *The method of physick containing the causes, signs, and cures of inward diseases in mans body from the head to the foote*, STC 1510 (1596)

- **Calvin, Institution of Christian Religion**  
  Calvin, Jean, *The institution of Christian religion, wrytten in Latine by maister Ihon Caluin, and transtlated into Englysh according to the authors last edition*, STC 4415 (1561)

- **Common Whore**  
  Taylor, John, *A common whore with all these graces grac’d*, STC 23742 (1622)

- **Compter’s Commonwealth**  
  Fennor, William, *The compters common-wealth, or A voiage made to an infernall iland*, STC 10781 (1617)

- **De Officiis**  
  Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *De Officiis*, trans. Miller (1913)

- **Duties of Constables**  
  Lambarde, William, *The duties of constables, borsholders, tythingmen, and such other lowe ministers of the peace*, STC 15146 (1582)

- **Fool Upon Fool**  
  Armin, Robert, *Foole Vpon Foole, or Six sortes of Sottes*, STC 772.3 (1600)

- **Fuller**  
  Fuller, Thomas, *The church-history of Britain*, Wing F2416 (1655)

- **Good News & Bad News**  
  Rowlands, Samuel, *Good Newes and Bad Newes*, STC 21382 (1622)

- **Grafton (1562)**  

- **Grafton (1569)**  
  Grafton, Richard, *A chronicle at large and meere history of the affayres of Englande and kinges of the same*, STC 12147 (1569)

- **Hall**  
  Hall, Edward, *The vnion of the two noble and illustre families of Lancastre [and] Yorke*, STC 12722 (1548)
Hardyng, John, finished by Richard Grafton, *The chronicle of Ihon Hardyng from the firste begynnyng of Englande, vnto the reigne of kyng Edward the fourth wher he made an end of his chronicle*, STC 12767 (1543)

Heywood, Epigrams
Heywood, John, *An hundred epigrammes*, STC 13294.5 (1550)

King and Cobbler
Anon., *The pleasant and delightful history of King Henry 8th. and a cobbler*, Wing P2530 (1670?)

Metamorphoses

Puttenham
Puttenham, George, *The arte of English poesie. Contrieued into three bookes: the first of poets and poesie, the second of proportion, the third of ornament*, STC 20519.5 (1589)

Singing Simpkin
Kemp, Will[?], *Singing Simpkin*, printed in Richard Cox, *Acteon & Diana*, Wing C6711 (1656)

Stow
Stow, John, *A summarie of Englyshe chronicles*, STC 23319 (1565)

Tarlton’s News
Tarlton, Richard, *Tarltons newes out of purgatorie*, STC 23685 (1590)

Varthema, Itinerario
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WHEN YOU SEE ME, YOU KNOW ME;

OR,

THE FAMOUS CHRONICLE HISTORY
OF KING HENRY THE EIGHTH,
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EDWARD, PRINCE OF WALES
List of Roles

THE ENGLISH COURT

KING Henry VIII of England
QUEEN JANE Seymour the King’s wife and daughter to Lord Seymour
QUEEN KATHERINE Parr the King’s wife, after the death of Queen Jane
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Stephen GARDINER the King’s secretary, later Bishop of Winchester
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Edward BROWNE the Prince’s schoolfellow and whipping-boy, later Sir Edward Browne
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ROOKSBY a groom of the wardrobe
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Cardinal CAMPEIUS of the Holy Roman Empire
EMPEROR Charles V
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No list of roles is provided in Q1-4. Elze, Wilson and Somerset each provide a list, but differ in their presentation of such. While Elze and Somerset list male roles first, Wilson lists characters by order of appearance. The list of roles provided in this edn seeks to clarify particular groups of characters and their relationships to one another.

1 King Henry VIII (1491-1547) acceded to the throne in 1509. The most momentous occasions of King Henry’s reign include his divorce from Katherine of Aragon, his break with the Roman Catholic Church and the subsequent foundation of the Church of England in 1534. While Rowley’s account takes much from the historical chronicles, his portrayal of the King also borrows from the popular ‘bluff King Harry’ tradition.

2 Queen Jane Jane Seymour (c.1508-1537) was the King’s third wife; her second wife, Anne Boleyn, is mentioned only very briefly at 1.3.29-33 and his first wife, Katherine of Aragon, not at all. Queen Jane married the King in 1536 and gave birth to his only son, Edward, in October 1537; she died just days later.

3 Queen Katherine Katherine Parr (1512-1548) was King Henry’s sixth wife; she outlived him by nearly two years. Her marriage to King Henry (first mentioned at 2.3.168-70) took place in 1543; his fourth wife, Anne of Cleves, gets a brief mention at 2.3.171, but Catherine Howard, like Katherine of Aragon, is completely overlooked. Katherine Parr was accused of treason and heresy in 1546.

4 Prince Edward (1537-1553) became King of England when he was just nine years old; he died six years later. As noted in the Critical Introduction, numerous parallels can be drawn in the play between the Protestant Prince Edward and the company’s young patron, Prince Henry. The naming of the Prince on the title-page of Q1 indicates the importance of Edward’s role.

5 Wolsey Cardinal Thomas Wolsey (c.1473-1530), Archbishop of York, became Lord Chancellor in 1515. His papal aspirations are well documented and may have been treated in the Admiral’s two lost Wolsey plays (see pp.41-4). The character appears also in Cromwell, as well as in H8, where he is drawn in a more ambivalent light. As noted elsewhere, Rowley extends Wolsey’s life into the 1540s so as to position him as chief antagonist throughout the play.

6 Bonner Edmund Bonner (c.1500-1569), Bishop of London from 1539, became known during the reign of Mary I as ‘Bloody Bonner’ for his role in the persecution of heretics. As in the later Duchess of Suffolk, Rowley positions Bonner alongside Gardiner throughout When You See Me; in reality, it was Gardiner and Lord Chancellor Wriothesley that were responsible for Queen Katherine’s near-demise.

7 Gardiner Stephen Gardiner (c.1483-1555), secretary to King Henry, was made Bishop of Winchester in 1531. Like Bonner, his role in the Marian persecutions made him one of the most hated sixteenth-century Catholics and he frequently appears in playtexts as an antagonist and villain (see Cromwell, 1 If You Know Not Me and H8). The name is spelt consistently as ‘Gardiner’ in this edn (see p.180); whenever metre requires elision, a note is added in the commentary to this effect.

8 Compton On King Henry’s accession to the throne, Compton (c.1482-1528) became Groom of the Stool; he was knighted in 1513 and died of sweating sickness before the King’s break from the Roman Catholic Church. Like Wolsey, his life is extended in the play by nearly twenty years; in 5.4, Compton takes on the role historically played by the physician Thomas Wendy.

9 Brandon Charles Brandon, 1st Duke of Suffolk (c.1484-1545) was an important and respected member of the King’s household; he became Henry VIII’s brother-in-law upon his marriage to Lady Mary in 1515 (see 3.2.174-216 and Appendix 2). He appears also in H8.

10 Dudley Most likely John Dudley, 1st Duke of Northumberland (1504-1553), who took part in Wolsey’s diplomatic voyages in the 1520s; he was knighted by Brandon in 1523 and became a Knight of the Body in 1524. Dudley was an influential member of the government of King Edward VI and advocated Lady Jane Grey’s succession to the throne after Edward’s death.

11 Seymour Sir John Seymour (1474-1536), a prominent courtier in the reigns of both Henry VII and Henry VIII; counter to Rowley’s narrative, he died ten months before his daughter, Queen Jane. Either Rowley extends the life of Seymour much in the way of Wolsey and Compton, or he conflates the historical person of John Seymour with one (or perhaps both) of his sons, Thomas and Edward; the former married Katherine Parr after King Henry’s death; the latter became Lord Protector of England during the minority of King Edward VI.

12 Grey Presumably Thomas Grey, 2nd Marquess of Dorset (1477-1530), an influential courtier under both Henry VII and VIII; Grey travelled with Brandon in 1514 to escort Mary Tudor to France to marry King Louis XII. The name, spelt ‘Gray’ in Q1, is regularised in this edn.
**LADY MARY** Mary Tudor (1496-1533) was the third daughter of King Henry VII; Rowley’s naming of Lady Mary as the King’s ‘second sister’ (1.2.157) may take into account the fact that the King’s real second sister, Elizabeth, died in 1495, aged just three years old. Mary became the third wife of King Louis XII of France in 1514, marrying Brandon secretly upon King Louis’s death.

**COUNTESS** Presumably Margaret Pole (1473-1541), 8th Countess of Salisbury, lady-in-waiting to Katherine of Aragon and later governess to Princess Mary. She was in and out of favour with the King and is not known to have served as waiting woman to Queen Jane at the time of Edward’s birth.

**CRANMER** Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556) was a key player in the English Reformation. He is not known to have tutored Prince Edward (who received a formal education under Richard Cox and John Cheke), having been appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1532. Cranmer’s accusation and trial (see 5.2.70-95 and 5.4.131-5) forms an important part of *H8*; Cranmer appears also in *Duchess of Suffolk* alongside Latimer and Ridley (see 3.1.69-70 and ns), with whom he perished during the Marian persecutions.

**TYE** Dr Christopher Tye (c. 1505-1571/3) was organist and choirmaster of Ely Cathedral from the early 1540s; there is no record of him having tutored Prince Edward, though his connection with Richard Cox (see 16n.) strengthens the possibility. As noted in the introduction (p. 3), there may have been a family connection between Rowley and Tye.

**BROWNE** The name Edward Browne does not appear in the chronicles. It does, however, appear (as ‘Ned Browne’) in the plot of *I Tamor Cam* to refer to an adult supernumerary (*Honslowe’s Diary*, 333). Possibly, Rowley borrowed the name from this actor. Browne’s historical counterpart was Barnaby Fitzpatrick (c.1535-1581), with whom, as Jordan attests, Edward ‘spoke with an ease and informality suggesting a strong personal affection’ (44).

**MARQUESS** Presumably, as Somerset notes, Henry Grey (1517-1546), 1st Duke of Suffolk, who became 3rd Marquess of Dorset in 1530 after the death of his father, Thomas (see 12n.); he was the father of Lady Jane Grey. Twenty years the Prince’s senior, he is unlikely to have been Edward’s schoolfellow.

**WILL SUMMERS** Summers came into Henry VIII’s service c.1525 and remained in the royal household until the time of his death in 1559. The fool’s closeness to the King is evidenced in his appearance in at least three family portraits, as well as in the King’s personal psalter. In addition to the anecdotes recorded in *Fool Upon Fool* (see pp. 56-7), Summers appears as a character in *Summer’s Last Will*; the inclusion of a ‘Will. Sommers sewtte’ and ‘cote’ in the company inventories demonstrates the character’s repeated appearance on the early modern stage. The fool’s absence in *H8* (and thus the play’s divergence from Rowley’s) is treated in the play’s prologue.

**PATCH** A derogatory name given to a natural fool or dullard (*OED* n.² 1), deriving from the appearance of the fool’s motley; also the nickname of Wolsey’s fool, Master Sexton (see Heywood’s Epigram 44, B6). Cavendish’s biography of Wolsey indicates that he gave Patch, along with Hampton Court, to King Henry as a final attempt to make amends in 1529. The name appears, along with Summers’s, in the prologue to *Thorney Abbey* (c.1615), as well as in a collection of papers at St John’s College, Oxford (late 1610s), relating to a satire about the foundation of a college of fools (Wiggins, private correspondence).

**ROOKSBY** No such name exists in the chronicles; presumably the role was fabricated by Rowley so as to serve as a reminder of the King’s promise to the Counter prisoners (2.3.100-4). The name, regularised throughout (see p. 180), may derive from the verb ‘rook’, meaning ‘to cheat or swindle’ (*OED*, v.²).

**BONNIVET** Guillaume Gouffier, seigneur de Bonnivet (c. 1488-1525) was a French soldier and, from 1515, High Admiral of France; in 1519 he travelled to England with the Bishop of Paris (30n.) as ambassador from King Francis I. The name, often spelt ‘Bonevet’ in *Q1*, is regularised in *this edn*.

**PARIS** As Wilson notes (xix), the Bishop of Paris associated with Lord Bonnivet in 1519 was Étienne de Poncher (1446-1524), not John de Mazo. The name was presumably invention on Rowley’s part.

**CAMPEIUS** Lorenzo Campeius or Campeggio (1474-1539) was a cardinal and papal legate; he came to England as part of Pope Leo X’s peace policy in 1518, at which time Wolsey was granted temporary legatine powers (see 5.4.260n.). Campeius appears in *H8*, in which he acts as co-judge with Wolsey in the matter of the legitimacy of the King’s marriage, and in *Whore of Babylon*. The name, frequently spelt ‘Campeus’ in *Q1*, is regularised throughout *this edn*.

**EMPEROR** Charles V (1500-1558), Holy Roman Emperor from 1519, was nephew to Queen Katherine of Aragon; as evidenced in his lengthy style (see 5.5.59-62 and ns), he was a hugely influential figure on the Continent. The Emperor and King Henry fought over the
latter’s divorce, but joined as allies against France in the 1540s. The Emperor appears also in the Faustus B-text.

34 Two … WATCH The first watchman is named at 2.1.15 as ‘Capcase’, meaning a travelling-case or bag (OED); possibly the name refers to a hand-held stage property associated with the actor who played him. I retain Q1’s SPP, which provide the role form of the name throughout.

35 DORMOUSE Perhaps a nickname deriving from the proverb ‘As dull as (to sleep like) a Dormouse’ (Tilley, D568); see 2.1.55-8.

36 Prickawl … COBBLER The name Prickawl, altered from ‘Prichall’ in Q1, highlights the pun on the Cobbler’s profession; a prick awl is an instrument used by shoemakers to pierce holes in leather. Unlike Elze, who adopts ‘Prichall’ in SPP, I retain the role form of the name in this edn. The emphasis on the Cobbler’s trade is important, given the play’s likely connection with the King and Cobbler chapbook; Q1’s SPP are also given consistently as ‘Cob.’.

37 BLACK WILL A ‘Black Will’ appears also in Arden of Faversham as one of ‘two desperat ruffins’ (title-page) and in Richard the Third as one of a pair of ‘murtherous villaines’ (E4’); the name and character type may thus have been recognisable to members of the playhouse audience. This in turn increases the humour of the episode in which the King and Black Will fail to recognise one another (2.1.116-29).

38 PRISONERS At least three men are required in this role, two of whom have individual speaking parts (see 2.3.34 SD1n. and 2.3.84 SPn.); line 2.3.84 is presumably spoken by all prisoners present on stage. One of the prisoners may perhaps be identified with Hopkins, referenced at 3.2.106.

41 Lord Mayor At the time of the Emperor’s visit to England in 1523, the Lord Mayor of London was Thomas Baldry (c.1481-1524/5); this is not the same ‘Mayor’ referenced at 1.4.298 (see n.).
WHEN YOU SEE ME, YOU KNOW ME

[1.1]

Enter the Cardinal [WOLSEY] with [BONNIVET and PARIS,] the Ambassadors of France, in all state and royalty, [others bearing] the purse and mace before him.

WOLSEY

Gentlemen, give leave. – [Exeunt the purse- and mace-bearers.]

[to Paris and Bonnivet] You great ambassadors From Francis the Most Christian King of France, My Lord of Paris and Lord Bonnivet, Welcome to England. Since the king your master Entreats our furtherance to advance his peace, Giving us titles of high dignity, As next elect to Rome’s supremacy, Tell him we have so wrought with English Henry, Who, as his right hand, loves the Cardinal, That undelayed you shall have audience, And this day will the King in person sit To hear your message and to answer it.

BONNIVET

Your grace hath done us double courtesy, For so much doth the king our master long To have an answer of this embassage, As minutes are thought months till we return.

1.1 Location: either York House (Wolsey’s residence, later Whitehall Palace) or a private room in Westminster (the King’s main residence until 1530). As Somerset notes, Rowley in this scene conflates elements of three French embassies, which took place respectively in 1514, 1519 and 1524 (see Holinshed, 832, 847-8 and 894-5). Only in 1519 were the ambassadors named as Bonnivet and the Bishop of Paris; however, the purpose for which the ambassadors come in the play (see 40-1) matches that of the 1514 embassy. Henry’s intervention in the Emperor’s invasion of the Low Countries (see 51-3) was an outcome of the 1524 embassy.

0.3 purse an ornate cloth bag in which the Great Seal was carried; one of the official insignia of the Lord Chancellor mace a sceptre or staff of office, resembling the metal-headed weapon of war

2 Francis King Francis I, who acceded to the French throne after the death of King Louis XII in 1515. Rowley’s anachronistic handling of source material leads to some confusion in the chronology of events, as Louis is still alive at line 47.

Most Christian King the style of the King of France since 1469, when the title was conferred upon King Louis XI by Pope Paul II (Brewer’s Dictionary, ‘Christian’)

8 wrought with persuaded, worked upon

9 as … hand Cf. Tilley, H73: ‘He is his right hand’. Wolsey here indicates his proximity to and thus power over the King. See also the note to Ephesians, 1.19-20: ‘To be set on God’s right hand, is to be partaker of the sovereignty which he hath over all creatures’.

15 embassage the message conveyed by an ambassador (OED n. 2)
PARIS
And that is the cause his highness moves your grace
To quick dispatch betwixt the King and him,
And for a quittance of your forwardness
And hopeful kindness to the crown of France,
Twelve reverend bishops are sent post to Rome,
Both from his highness and the Emperor,
To move Campeius and the cardinals
For your election to the papal throne,
That Wolsey’s head may wear the triple crown.

WOLSEY
We thank his highness for remembering us,
And so salute my lord the Emperor,
Both which, if Wolsey be made Pope of Rome,
Shall be made famous through all Christendom.

Enter BONNER.

How now, Bonner?

BONNER
Sir William Compton from his highness comes,
To do a message to your excellence.

WOLSEY
Delay him a while and tell him we are busy. –
Meantime, my lords, you shall withdraw yourselves;
Our private conference must not be known.
Let all your gentlemen in their best array
Attend you bravely to King Henry’s court,
Where we in person presently will meet you,
And doubt not we’ll prevail successfully.

BONNIVET
But hath your grace yet moved his highness’ sister
For kind acceptance of our sovereign’s love?

WOLSEY
I have, and by the King’s means finished it.
And yet it was a task, I tell ye lords,
That might have been imposed to Hercules,
To win a lady of her spirit and years

17 that is elided, i.e. that’s
moves urges, incites (OED v. 31a); cf. 23 and 40
21 reverend rev’rend
22 Emperor ‘The Emperor’ here and at lines 27 and 109 refers to Maximilian I; the Emperor referred to at 51, however, is Charles V, the ‘Emperor’ of the play (see LR 32n.).
25 triple crown the Pope’s crown, later referred to as the ‘papal diadem’
26 remembering rememb’ring (see t.n.)
To see her first love crowned with silver hairs
As old King Louis is, that bed-rid lies:
Unfit for love or worldly vanities.

BONNIVET
But 'tis his country’s peace the king respects.

WOLSEY
We think no less, and we have fully wrought it.
The Emperor’s forces that were levièd
To invade the frontiers of Low Burgundy
Are stayed in Brabant by the King’s command.
The Admiral Howard, that was lately sent
With three-score sail of ships and pinnaces
To batter down the towns in Normandy,
Is by our care for him called home again.
Then doubt not of a fair, successful end,
Since Wolsey is esteemed your sovereign’s friend.

PARIS
We thank your excellence and take our leaves.

WOLSEY
Haste ye to court; I’ll meet ye presently.

BONNIVET
Good morrow to your grace.

WOLSEY
Good morrow, lords.
Go, call Sir William Compton in.

[Exeunt Paris and Bonnivet.]

We must have narrow eyes and quick conceit
To look into these dangerou[s stratagems].
I will effect for France as they for me:
If Wolsey to the Pope’s high state attain
The league is kept, or else he’ll break’t again.

47 King … lies King Louis, who was fifty-two at
the time of his marriage to Lady Mary; she was
just eighteen. Grafton (1569) notes how people
’spake shamefully of this marriage, that a feble
old and pocky man should marry so fayre a
Lady’ (1010). Rowley’s spelling ‘Lewes’ (see
Q1 lines after 62 Somerset) suggests that the name may have been
pronounced ‘Lewis’.

50 wrought accomplished
51-3 As Somerset notes, the reference is to the
collapse of the agreement of 1525, by which
the Emperor was to invade the Burgundian
provinces through the Low Countries.

51 the Emperor’s i.e. Charles V’s (see 22n.)
levied enrolled, enlisted (OED v. 4)

52 To invade elided, as t’invade

53 stayed ceased, prevented from further action
(OED stay v.2 1a)

54 *Admiral Howard Wilson (xix) is no doubt
correct to identify Q1’s ‘Admiral Hayward’
as either Sir Edward Howard (1476/7-1513)
or his brother Lord Thomas Howard (1511-
1537), Earl of Surrey and later Duke of Nor-
folk, both of whom served under Henry VIII
as Lord Admiral.

55 pinnaces small vessels used as attendant vess-
els to a larger ship

56 William disyllabic

58 We … eyes ‘we must keep our wits about us’
quick conceit shrewdness, understanding

59 dangerous dang’rous

60 league a military or political compact made
between parties for their mutual protection
(OED n.2 1a)
Enter BONNER and COMPTON.

[to Compton] Now, good Sir William.

COMPTON

The King, my lord, entreats your reverend grace,
There may be had some private conference
Betwixt his highness and your excellence
Before he hear the French ambassadors,
And wills you hasten your repair to him.

WOLSEY

We will attend his highness presently. –
Bonner, see all our train be set in readiness,
That in our state and pomp pontifical,
We may pass on to grace King Henry’s court.

[Exit Bonner.]

COMPTON

I have a message from the Queen, my lord,
Who much commends and humbly thanks your grace
For your exceeding love and zealous prayers,
By your directions through all England sent,
To invocate for her sound, prosperous help,
By heaven’s fair hand in child-bed passiöns.

WOLSEY

We thank her highness that accepts our love.
In all cathedral churches through the land
Are masses, dirges and processions sung,
With prayers to heaven to bless her majesty
And send her joy and quick delivery.
And so, Sir William, do my duty to her;
Queen Jane was ever kind and courteous,
And always of her subjects honourèd.

COMPTON

I take my leave, my lord.

WOLSEY

Adieu, good knight, we’ll follow presently. –
Now Wolsey, work thy wits like gads of steel

1.1.69–95

70 reverend rev’rend
74 repair journey
77 pontifical of or relating to the Pope
79 the Queen i.e. Queen Jane
83 invocate pray
84 heaven’s hea’en’s
child-bed passions the throes of labour
87 masses forms of liturgy used in celebration of the Eucharist
     dirges The more well-known meaning of the word, i.e. the songs sung at burial, is inappropriate here (cf. 1.2.70); presumably the word was intended to signify evensong (OED dirge n. 1). processions litanies or prayers sung in a religious proc,ession (OED procession n. 4b). Q2’s compositor likely mistook the long ‘s’ for an ‘f’ (see t.n.). heaven hea’en
89 quick delivery from her suffering, but also, more literally, from her pregnancy
94 gads sharp spikes of metal
And make them pliable to all impressions,
That King and Queen and all may honour thee.
So toiled not Caesar in the state of Rome
As Wolsey labours in the affairs of kings;
As Hannibal with oil did melt the Alps
To make a passage into Italy,
So must we bear our high-pitched eminence
To dig for glory in the hearts of men,
Till we have got the papal diadem.
And to this end have I composed this plot,
And made a league between the French and us,
And matched their aged king in holy marriage
With Lady Mary, royal Henry’s sister,
That he in peace complotting with the Emperor
May plead for us within the courts of Rome.
Wherefore was Alexander’s fame so great,
But that he conquered and deposèd kings?
And where doth Wolsey fail to follow him,
That thus commandeth kings and emperors?
Great England’s lord have I so won with words
That under colour of advising him
I overrule both council, court and king.
Let him command, but we will execute,
Making our glory to outshine his fame
Till we have purchased an eternal name. –

Enter BONNER.

Now, Bonner, are those proclamations sent,
As we directed to the sh’riffs of London,
Of certain new-devisèd articles
For ordering those brothels called the stews?

96 As Somerset suggests, the ‘them’ in this line likely refers to members of the King’s court, while ‘impressions’ (= influences) marks an implicit reference to the use of sealing wax; Wolsey moulds those around him in accord-
ance with his ambitions. Cf. Tilley, W138: ‘To work upon one (anything) like wax’ and
3H6: ‘Have wrought the easy-melting King like wax’ (2.1.171).
100 Hannibal … Italy The story of Hannibal
(247-183/1 BC) is recorded in both Appian and
Livy (English translations of which were printed
in 1578 and 1600, respectively), although, as
Elze notes, it was acid or ‘vinegar’ rather than oil
that was used to dissolve the Alps; Anthony
Cope’s Historie (1544) is another possible source.
102 high-pitched lofty, noble

104 papal diadem the Pope’s crown (cf. ‘triple
crown’ at 25)
109 Emperor See 22n.
111 Wherefore for what
Alexander’s Alexander III of Macedon (356-
323 BC), i.e. Alexander the Great
116 under colour of under pretext or pretence of
120 purchased obtained, gained possession of
(OED purchase v. 4a)
121-4 In 1546 King Henry issued a proclamation to
convert the stews (see 124n.) into respectable
houses (Holinshed, 972); Wolsey, who died in
1530, had no input in its implementation. See
Common Whore: ‘The Stewes in England bore
a beastly sway, / Till the eight Henry banish’d
them away’ (B3’).
124 the stews brothel houses on Bankside

98 Rome] (Roome) 107 matched] Q3; match Q1 117 council] (Counsell) 122 sh’riffs] (Shiriffes); shrives Elze
BONNER
They are ready, my lord, and the sheriff attends for them.

WOLSEY
Dispatch him quickly and haste after me;
We must attend the King’s high majesty. [Exeunt.]

[1.2]

*Sound trumpets. Enter KING Harry the Eighth, QUEEN JANE big with child, the Cardinal [WOLSEY], Charles BRANDON Duke of Suffolk, DUDLEY, GREY, COMPTON, the LADY MARY, [and] the COUNTESS of Salisbury attending on the Queen.*

KING
Charles Brandon, Dudley and my good Lord Grey,
Prepare yourselves and be in readiness
To entertain these French ambassadors.
Meet them before our royal palace gate,
And so conduct them to our majesty; We mean this day to give them audience.

DUDLEY, GREY
We will, my lord.

BRANDON
Let one attend without,
And bring us word when they are coming on. [Exit Compton.]

KING
How now, Queen Jane? Mother of God, my love,
Thou wilt never be able to sit half this time.
– Ladies, I fear she’il wake ye ere’t be long;
Methinks she bears her burden very heavily.
– And yet, good sister, and my honoured lords,
If this fair hour exceed not her expect
And pass the calendar of her accounts,
She will hear this embassage. – Jane, wilt thou not?

125 Since lineation in Q1 is ambiguous, it is difficult to know whether this is verse or prose. I follow Elze and Somerset in setting as verse: if spoken as a combination of anapaestic and iambic feet (with ‘sheriff’ elided to ‘sh’riff’), the line maintains the pentameter of surrounding verse lines.

1.2 Location: presumably Hampton Court Palace, where Prince Edward was born. Although the action is continuous (Henry is preparing to meet Bonnivet and Paris), the historical action moves forward to 1537.

0.1 Harry often used in place of ‘Henry’, particularly by Will Summers

big with child Perhaps effected by a bundle of rags inside the actor’s costume; cf. Blind Beggar (TLN 1459) and Witch of Edmonton (1.1.0 SD).

3 French ambassadors i.e. Bonnivet and Paris
8 SD Somerset reads ‘Exit Compton and Gray’, but only one character needs to leave the stage to carry out the King’s request; since Compton enters alone at 51, he is the most likely candidate.

9 Mother of God one of King Henry’s characteristic expressions in the play
10 Thou wilt never elided, as thou’lt ne’er
11 *ere’t before it
12 heavily sluggishly, laboriously; perhaps also with reference to her size
14-15 exceed … accounts exceed computations on the length of her pregnancy
16 She will elided, as she’ll

embassage message, communication
QUEEN JANE

Yes, my dear lord, I cannot leave your sight,
So long as life retains this mansion,
In whose sweet looks bright sovereignty’s enthroned,
That makes all nations love and honour thee;
Within thy frame sits awful majesty,
Wreathed in the curled furrows of thy front,
Admired and feared even of thine enemies;
To be with thee is my felicity.

Not to behold the state of all the world
Could win thy queen, thy sick, unwieldy queen,
To leave her chamber in this mother’s state,
But sight of thee, unequalled potentate.

KING

God-a-mercy, Jane, reach me thy princely hand.

[They hold hands.] Thou art now a right woman, goodly chief of thy sex;

Methinks thou art a queen superlative.

Mother o’ God, this is a woman’s glory,
Like good September vines laden with fruit.

How ill did they define the name of woman,

Adding so foul a preposition to call it woe to man? ‘Tis woe from man,

If woe it be, and then who does not know

That women still from men receive their woe.

Yet they love men for it, but what’s their gain?

Poor souls no more but travail for their pain.

18 mansion the human body (OED n. 1d)
18-19 Somerset notes that the ‘change of thought here is abrupt’ and plausibly suggests that a line may have been omitted between 18 and 19.
20 *makes altered from Q1’s ‘make’, since the verb refers to the King’s sovereignty altered from Q1’s ‘make’, since the verb refers to the King’s sovereignty
21 frame body, person
22 curled furrows wrinkles
23 even e’en
24 felicity happiness, prosperity (OED n. 2, 3a)
26 win convince, persuade
27 this mother’s state pregnancy
28 potentate monarch, ruler
29 God-a-mercy ‘God have mercy’
30 With much elision this line can fit a pentameter metre or, if a predominantly iambic rhythm is maintained, it can be spoken as a hexameter; alternatively, it may be read as something app-
Come, love, thou art sad. – [to Dudley] Call Will Summers in
To make her merry; where’s the fool today?

DUDLEY
He was met, my liege, they say at London,
Early this morning with Doctor Skelton.

KING
He’s never from him. Go, let a groom be sent
And fetch him home. – [to Wolsey] My good Lord Cardinal,
Who are the chief of these ambassadors?

WOLSEY
Lord Bonnivet, the French High Admiral,
And John de Mazo, reverend Bishop of Paris.

KING
Let their welcome be thy care, good Wolsey.

WOLSEY
It shall, my liege.

KING
Spare for no cost. –

Enter COMPTON.

Compton, what news?

COMPTON
Ambassadors, my liege.

KING
Enough. – Go give them entertainment, lords. –
Charles Brandon, hear’st thou? Give them courtesy
Enough, and state enough. Go, conduct them.

BRANDON
I go, my lord. [Exeunt Brandon and Grey.]

Enter WILL SUMMERS, booted and spurred, blowing a horn.

KING
How now, William? What? Post, post! Where have you been riding?

WILL SUMMERS
Out of my way, old Harry, I am all on the spur, I can tell ye.
I have tidings worth telling.

KING
Why, where hast thou been?

41-2 *Lineation here follows that of Q4 (see t.n.); the line scans best if ‘thou art’ is elided to ‘thou’rt’ and the change of address marks a pause equal to a single unstressed beat.

42 *where’s altered from Q1’s ‘where is’ to prevent stress falling on ‘is’

44 Doctor Skelton John Skelton (c. 1463-1529), poet laureate and tutor to Henry during the reign of his father, King Henry VII.

45 him Like Somerset, I retain the copy-text’s ‘him’ over Q2’s ‘thence’; thus the King comments on Summers’s proximity to Skelton. The latter’s distrust of Wolsey was well known (see ‘Why come ye not to courte?’) and it may be that Rowley connected the two in their dislike of the Cardinal; that Summers frequently speaks in Skeltonic verse further suggests links between the two characters.

49 reverend rev’rend

John de Mazo See LR 30n.

56 SD1 Somerset provides the vague exit direction ‘Exeunt lords’, but it is clear that only Brandon and Grey leave the stage; both Dudley and Compton speak later in the scene.

57 post ‘hurry up’

58 I … spur Cf. Dent, S789: ‘He is (To be) all on the spur’.

1.2.41–60
WILL SUMMERS    Marry, I rose early and rode post to London to know what
news was here at court.

KING      Was that your nearest way, William?

WILL SUMMERS    Oh ay, the very footpath, but yet I rode the horse-way to hear
it. I warrant there is ne’er a conduit-head keeper in London but knows
what is done in all the courts in Christendom.

WOLSEY    And what is the best news there, William?

WILL SUMMERS    Good news for you, my Lord Cardinal, for one of the old
woman water-bearers told me for certain, that last Friday all the bells in
Rome rang backward; there was a thousand dirges sung, six hundred Ave
Maries said, every man washed his face in holy water, the people
crossing and blessing themselves to send them a new Pope, for the old is
gone to purgatory.

WOLSEY    Ha, ha, ha!

WILL SUMMERS    Nay, my lord, you’d laugh if ’twere so indeed, for
everybody thinks, if the Pope were dead, you gape for a benefice; but this
news, my lord, is called too good to be true.

KING    But this news came apace, Will, that came from Rome to London since
Friday last.

WILL SUMMERS    For ’twas at Billingsgate by Saturday morning. ’Twas a
full moon, and it came up in a spring tide.

KING    Then you hear of the ambassadors that are come?

---

61 *As Somerset suggests, Q1’s ‘rise’ and ‘ride’
may stand here for the obsolete past tenses ‘ris’
and ‘rid’ (as at 64; see t.n.); the modern forms
‘rose’ and ’rode’ clarify the sense of the passage.

post quickly, without delay

61-2 This episode seems to have been used as
source material for an Epigram, upon a jest of
Will Sommers’ in Rowlands’ Good News and
Bad News; the lines ‘And therefore for a while,
ade White-hall, / Harry, Ile bring thee newes
home, lyes and all’ (A3’) correspond with
Rowley’s line 176.

63 nearest most direct

64 horse-way bridle path

65 it i.e. the gossip, the ‘tidings worth telling’ (59)
conduit-head keeper the official responsible for
watching over the public conduit or
fountain; one who sees all the comings and
goings of the City. Summers similarly receives
information from the City’s water-bearers (69),
barbers (84) and bakers (96). Q1’s ‘Cundhead’
(possibly an elision of Q3’s ‘Cundid-head’) may
give some indication of pronunciation.

6 water-bearers people responsible for trans-
porting water from the conduit-head, usually of
ill repute; see Summer’s Last Will: These
Water-bearers will empty the conduit and a
man coffers at once’ (TLN 1704-5)

69-70 all … backward A peal of bells is typically
run out of order as a sign of distress or
mourning; cf. Late Lancashire Witches: ‘They
ring backwards, I me thinks’ (E3').

70 dirges songs of mourning (cf. 1.1.87)

70-1 Ave Maryes Hail Marys; salutations to the
Virgin said or sung in the Roman Catholic
Church (see Luke 1.28)

73 purgatory a place of spiritual cleansing in
the Roman Catholic Church; figuratively, a
place of temporary suffering or madness (OED
n. 2)

76 gape … benefice yearn for recompense or
reward; proverbial (Tilley, B308)

76-7 this … true Cf. Tilley, N156; ‘This news is
too good to be true’.

80 For Somerset’s conjectured reading ‘Foh’ works
well in context here; alternatively, he suggests
‘For’ may be a shortening of ‘Fore God’.

Billingsgate a small ward in the south-east of
the City of London, lying on the north bank of
the Thames; the principal of the old water-
gates. Boats (and with them, news) came
upriver with the tide.

81 spring tide a tide occurring on the days short-
ly after the new and full moon, when the
high-water level reaches its maximum (OED
n. 2a)
WILL SUMMERS Ay, ay, and that was the cause of my riding: to know what they came for. I was told it all at a barber's.

KING Ha, ha! – What a fool’s this, Jane? – And what do they say they come for, Will?

WILL SUMMERS Marry, they say they come to crave thy aid against the Great Turk that vows to overrun all France within this fortnight. He’s in a terrible rage, belike, and they say the reason is, his old god Mu’mmad, that was buried i’th’ top on’s church at Mecca, his tomb fell down and killed a sow and seven pigs, whereupon they think all swine’s flesh is new sanctified, and now it is thought the Jews will fall to eating of pork extremely after it.

KING This is strange indeed; but is this all?

WILL SUMMERS No, there is other news that was told me among the women at a bakehouse, and that is this: they say the great bell in Glastonbury Tower has tolled twice, and that King Arthur and his knights of the Round Table that were buried in armour are alive again, crying ‘Saint George for England’, and mean shortly to conquer Rome. Marry, this is thought to be but a moral.

KING The ambassadors are coming, and hear, William, see that you be silent when you see them here.

85 *they come* This edn follows Somerset in emending ‘he comes’, since ‘they’ refers to the ambassadors’ at 82 (see also 87).

87-8 Great ... fortnight The ‘Great Turk’ refers to the Ottoman Sultan. This may, as Somerset suggests, be a reference to the embassy of 1519 ‘from the Pope for aid against the invaders of Rhodes’ (Holmshed, 845; cf. I.4.304-9).

89 belike in all likelihood Mu’mmad i.e. Muhammad (c. 570-632), the Arab prophet through whom the Qur’an was revealed. Q1’s ‘Mamet’, an elided form of the name Mahomet (an archaic version of Muhammad), indicates Summers’s pronunciation.

90 Mecca the holy city in Saudi Arabia, home of Muhammad; not, however, where Muhammad was buried: ‘some who say that the body of Muhammad is suspended in the air at Mecca must be reproved … I have seen his sepulchre in this city, Medina’ (Varthema, *Itinerario in Travelers in Disguise*, 69; cited in Somerset).

his ... down The tomb was said to have been suspended midway between heaven and earth (Tilley, M13); see also Mahomet, which includes the direction ‘with a Tombe hanging over the doore’ (*The Properties*, line 3).

92 sanctified ‘given the sanction of a religious body’ (Somerset)

93 extremely in or to an extreme degree

95 bakehouse a public bakery, probably pronounced ‘backhouse’ (see t.n.); alternatively, as per Somerset, Rowley may have intended ‘backhouse’ (= back-shop, lying behind a street’s main shops); cf. Cobbler’s Prophecy: ‘And some that dwelt in streetes were large and faire, / Kept backe shops to vttter their baddest ware’ (TLN 181-2).

Glastonbury Tower I follow Somerset in emending Q1’s ‘Tor’ (perhaps ‘To’r’ in the underlying MS), since this seems to be a reference to St Michael’s Tower on Glastonbury Tor; readings in Qq2-4 and Else represent increasing states of corruption, seemingly instigated by the erroneous full point in Q1 (see t.n.).

96-9 they ... Rome a popular version of the legend whereby Arthur and his knights conquered Rome. Glastonbury is said to be the burial place of Arthur and Guinevere.

98-9 *Saint ... England* the ‘common cry of the English soldiers in attacking an enemy’ (Collier, *Collection*, IX.49; cited in Somerset).

100 moral No parallel use is recorded in *OED*; the meaning here seems to be ‘myth’, ‘legend’.

83 Ay; ay] (L 1) 85 they come] Somerset; he comes Q1 89 Mu’mmad] (Mamet) 96 bakehouse] (back house) Somerset Glastonbury Tower] Somerset; glassenberie. Tor Q1; Glassenberie. For Q2; Glassenberie: For Q3; Glassenbery: For Q4; Glastonbury Else 97 tolled] (told) 98-9 ‘Saint George for England’] Somerset; Saint Gorge for England Q1 98 George] (Gorge)
WILL SUMMERS I’ll be wise and say little, I warrant thee, and therefore till I see ‘em come, I’ll go talk with the Queen. – How dost thou, Jane, sirrah? –
Harry, she looks very big upon me, but I care not an she bring thee a young prince. Will Summers mayhaps be his fool when you two are both dead and rotten.

KING Go to, William. – How now, Jane, what groaning?
God’s me, thou hast an angry soldier’s frown.

WILL SUMMERS I think so, Harry, thou hast pressed her often; I am sure this two years she has served under thy standard.

QUEEN JANE
Good faith, my lord, I must entreat your grace That with your favour, I may leave the presence; I cannot stay to hear this embassage.

KING
God’s holy mother! – Ladies, lead her to her chamber, Go bid the midwives and the nurses wait;
Make wholesome fires and take her from the air. –
Now, Jane, God bring me but a chopping boy, Be but the mother to a Prince of Wales, Add a ninth Henry to the English crown,

103 I’ll … little The sentiment of numerous proverbs; cf. Tilley, M606: ‘Wise men silent, fools talk’; P145: ‘He is wise that can hold his peace’; and F531: ‘Fools are wise as long as silent’. See also Proverbs, 17.28: ‘Even a fool (when he holdeth his peace) is counted wise’.

104 Jane … Harry Q2 alters the punctuation of these lines so that ‘sirrah’ is addressed to Henry rather than to Jane (see t.n.). It was not unknown, however, for women to be addressed as sirrah; cf. 1 Honest Whore (2.1.198).

105 upon me upon my word an if; altered from ‘and’ whenever this is the reading supplied in Q1 (as per t.n.)

106 but … fool Punctuation in Somerset alters the sense of these lines (see t.n.); both readings are acceptable, though this edn places more emphasis on the importance of gender.

107 dead and rotten Proverbial (Dent, D126.1).

108 groaning the action/sound of groaning, but also more closely related with labour and childbirth (see ‘groaning-chair’ in OED)

109 God’s me contraction of ‘God save me’ an … brown Cf. Faithful Friends: ‘whose fearfull Soule, a Souldiers browne would fright’ (TLN 826).

110 pressed a bawdy pun (see Partridge, 215; Williams, 244-5). Cf. A Shoemaker: ‘That very day my Brother was prest forth … You prest her at night, did you?’ (H1).

111 served … standard continuing the pun, whereby standard (as military ensign) = penis (Partridge, 248; Williams, 289). Cf. LLL: ‘Advance your standards and upon them, lords!’ (4.3.341).

112 embassage message, communication (see 16)

113 This line does not fit comfortably into any metrical pattern and, given its nature, may be spoken more as an impassioned outburst than to a strict rhythm.

114 Cf. Oth: ‘O, bear him out o’th’ air’ (5.1.104). Possibly this was contemporary medical advice: Somerset cites Barrough: ‘it profiteth to use hot infusions and evaporations, and to have the aire of the house inclining to heate’ (III. 265).

wholesome conducive to well-being

117 Prince of Wales Thus linking Prince Edward with the company’s patron, Prince Henry; see also ‘ninth Henry’ at 120 and pp. 90-2 on links with Valiant Welshman.

120 Add A more emphatic reading than Q2’s ‘And’, in that it stresses the importance of Jane’s role in furthering the Tudor line.

104 ‘em] them Qq2-4, Elze Jane, sirrah? – Harry] (Jane, sirra, Harrie); lane? sirra Harrie Qq2-4, Elze 105 not] not; Somerset an] (and) 106 prince] prince, Somerset 109] prose in Elze and Somerset thou hast] Elze; th’hast Q1 116 wair] (weight) 119 the] a Qq2-4, Elze 120 Add] (Ad); And Qq2-4, Elze
And thou mak'st full my hopes. Fair queen, adieu,
And may heaven's helping hand our joys renew.

**COMPTON**
God make your majesty a happy mother.

**DUDLEY**
And help you in your weakest passions.
With zealous prayer we all will invoke
The powers divine for your delivery.

**QUEEN JANE**
We thank you all, and in fair interchange
We'll pray for you.

Emily [to the King]
Now on my humble knees,
I take my leave of your high majesty.

**KING**
Do not think so, fair queen, go to thy bed,
Let not my love be so discomforted.

**WILL SUMMERS**
No, no, I warrant thee, Jane, make haste and dispatch this
that thou mayst have another against next Christmas.

**KING**
Ladies, attend her. Countess of Salisbury, sister Mary, who first brings
word that Harry hath a son shall be rewarded well.

**WILL SUMMERS**
Ay, I'll be his surety. But do you hear, wenches? She that
brings the first tidings, howsoever it fall out, let her be sure to say the
child's like the father, or else she shall have nothing.

*Exeunt Queen Jane, Lady Mary and Countess.*
KING

Welcome, Lord Bonivet; – welcome, Bishop. – What from our brother brings this embassage?

BONNIVET

Most fair commends, great and renownèd Henry. We in the person of our lord and king Here of your highness do entreat a league, And to re-edify the former peace Held betwixt the realms of England and of France, Of late disordered for some petty wrongs; And pray your majesty to stay your powers Already levied in Low Burgundy, Which to maintain, our oaths shall be engaged, And to confirm it with more surety, He craves your fair consent unto his love, And give the Lady Mary for his queen, The second sister to your royal self; So may an heir springing from both your bloods Make both realms happy by a lasting league.

KING

We kindly do receive your master’s love, And yet our grant stands strong unto his suit, If that no following censure feeble it, For we herein must take our council’s aid; But howsoever our answer shall be swift. Meantime we grant you fair access to woo, And win her, if you can, to be his queen; Ourself will second you. Right welcome, both. – Lord Cardinal, these lords shall be your guests, But let our treasure waste to welcome them; Banquet them how they will, what cheer, what sport: Let them see Harry keeps a kingly court.

WOLSEY

I shall, my sovereign.

143 Bishop i.e. Paris
144 brother i.e. King Louis XII; a familiar expression used by kings and princes to refer to one another (see OED n. 6)
145 embassage the body of persons sent as a deputation to or from a sovereign (OED n. 4, earliest recorded use in 1626)
146 commends greetings (OED commend n. 3)
147 league See 1.1.68n.
148 re-edify restore, re-establish
149 Held betwixt anapaestic, i.e. the first stressed syllable is –twixt
150 Somerset notes that the peace was broken in 1518/9 due to Wolsey’s grudge against France; see Holinshed, 839.
151-2 stay … Burgundy Cf. 1.1.51-3.
153 engaged offered as guarantee; Somerset alternatively reads ‘in gage’, where ‘gage’ = pledge, security
154 surety certainty, conviction
157 second sister See LR 13n.
159 yet for the time being (Abbott, no.76)
161 our … suit i.e. we support his intention
162 feeble enfeeble, weaken (OED v. 2)
164 howsoever howsoe’er
165 access permission, freedom
166 woo likely pronounced ‘woe’ (see Kökeritz, 85); perhaps, as Somerset suggests, recalling 34-40
167 second support
169 let … waste ‘spare no expense’
KING
Withdraw a while, ourselves will follow ye. –

Exeunt [all but the King and Will Summers].

Now, Will, are you not deceived in this embassage?
You heard they came for aid against the Turk.

WILL SUMMERS Well then, now I see there is loud lies told in London. But all’s one, for their coming’s to as much purpose as the other.

KING And why, I pray?
WILL SUMMERS Why, dost thou think thy sister such a fool to marry such an old dies Veneris? He get her with prince? Ay, when either I or the Cardinal prove Pope, and that will never be, I hope.

KING How knowest thou him to be old? Thou never sawest him.
WILL SUMMERS No, nor he me, but I saw his picture with ne’er a tooth in’t head on’t, and all his beard as well favoured as a white frost. But it is no matter, if he have her: he will die shortly and then she may help to bury him.

Enter [two] LADIES [in haste].

1 LADY Run, run, good madam! Call the ladies in; call for more women’s help. The Queen is sick!
2 LADY For God’s love, go back again and warm more clothes. O let the wine be well burned, I charge ye. [Exeunt Ladies.]

WILL SUMMERS Ay, in any case, or I cannot drink it. – Dost thou hear, Harry, what a coil they keep? I warrant these women will drink thee up more wine with their gossiping than was spent in all the conduits at thy coronation.

Enter LADY MARY and the COUNTESS of Salisbury.

KING ’Tis no matter, Will. – How now, ladies?

175 Referring back to their conversation at 87-8.
176 loud flagrant, barefaced
177 all’s one it matters not. Cf. Dent, Exclusive, A123.11: ‘All comes to one’.
180 dies Veneris Latin, translated as day of Venus (Friday). Since Venus is the Roman goddess of love, this is no doubt a sarcastic reference to King Louis’s age and probable infertility.
180-1 Ay ... hope Although ‘Pope’ and ‘hope’ rhyme here, the lines are unlike the Skeltonic verse spoken elsewhere in the play (e.g. 205-10); thus, while the rhyme was perhaps intended to bring home Summers’s point, I retain Q1’s lineation on this occasion.
181 prove become
184 i’th’ Q2’s spelling ‘ethe’ may indicate Summers’s pronunciation; cf. the watchmen’s language in 2.1 (see t.ns).

*on’t I follow Q4 in emending Q1’s ‘out’ (probably ‘ont’ with upturned ‘n’); however, Somerset retains ‘out’ on the basis that it may mean protruding or visible.
as well ... frost Possibly a vague reference to the proverb ‘as white as snow’ (Tilley, F768).
187-90 *I follow Elze in setting these lines as prose; both the haste and urgency with which the ladies enter suggests faster speech than is achievable with blank verse.
190 burned heated over fire. Somerset cites Barrough: ‘If sore trauell in child-birth be caused of adstriction, and binding … you must helpe it … by powring in largely sweet wine and hote’ (III.265).
192 coil noisy disturbance, turmoil (OED n. 2 1); cf. Tilley, C505: ‘To keep a (foul) coil’. See also Alchemist, 5.4.14-15 and Mahomet, 4.5.1.
LADY MARY I beseech your grace, command the fool forth of the presence.

KING Away, William, you must be gone; here’s women’s matters in hand.

WILL SUMMERS Let them speak low, then. I’ll not out of the room, sure.

COUNTESS Come, come, let’s thrust him out; he’ll not stir else.

WILL SUMMERS Thrust me? Nay, an ye go to thrusting, I’ll thrust some of you down, I warrant ye.

KING Nay, go, good William.

WILL SUMMERS I’ll out of their company, Harry. They will scratch worse than cats if they catch me; therefore I’ll hence and leave them.

[to Lady Mary] Do you hear, madam Mary, You had need to be wary,

Your news is worth a white-cake;

You must play at tennis

With old Saint Denis,

And your maidenhead must lie at the stake.

EXIT.

KING Ha, ha! The fool tells you true, my gentle sister.

But to our business: how fares my queen? How fares my Jane? Has she a son for me To raise again our kingdom’s sovereignty?

LADY MARY That yet rests doubtful, O my princely lord.

Your poor distressed queen lies weak and sick,

And be it son or daughter, dear she buys it,

Even with her dearest life, for one must die;

All women’s help is past. Then, good my liege,

Resolve it quickly: if the Queen shall live,

The child must die; or if it life receives,

You must your hapless queen of life bereave.

KING You pierce me with your news. Run, send for help,

Spend the revènues of my crown for aid To save the life of my belovèd queen.
How haps she is so ill attended on
That we are put to this extremity,
To save the mother or the child to die?

COUNTESS
I beseech your grace, resolve immediately.

KING
Immediately, say’st thou. O, ’tis no quick resolve
Can give good verdict in so sad a choice.
To lose my queen, that is my sum of bliss,
More virtuous than a thousand kingdoms be;
And should I lose my son, if son it be,
That all my subjects so desire to see,
I lose the hope of this great monarchy.
What shall I do?

LADY MARY
Remember the Queen, my lord.

KING
I not forget her, sister. O, poor soul!
But I forget thy pain and misery.
Go, let the child die, let the mother live;
Heaven’s powerful hand may more children give.
Away, and comfort her with our reply,
Harry will have his queen, though thousands die.

Exeunt Lady Mary [and Countess].

I know no issue of her princely womb:
Why then should I prefer’t be fore her life,
Whose death ends all my hopeful joys on earth?
God’s will be done, for sure it is His will,
For secret reasons to Himself best known.
Perhaps He did mould forth a son for me
And seeing, that sees all, in His creation
To be some impotent and coward spirit,
Unlike the figure of his royal father,
Has thus decreed, lest he should blur our fame,
As whilom did the sixth king of my name
Lose all his father, the fifth Henry, won;
I’ll thank the heavens for taking such a son. –  
Who’s within there?

Enter COMPTON.

COMPTON
My lord?

KING
Go, Compton, bid Lord Seymour come to me,  
The honoured father of my woeful queen. –  
[Exit Compton.]

[Enter LADY MARY and Ladies.]

How now, what news?

LADY MARY
We did deliver what your highness willed,  
Which was no sooner by her grace received  
But with the sad report she seemed as dead,  
Which caused us stay. After recovery,  
She sent us back t’entreat your majesty,  
As ever you did take delight in her,  
As you prefer the quiet of her soul  
That now is ready to forsake this life,  
As you desire to have the life of one  
She doth entreat your grace that she may die,  
Lest both doth perish in this agony;  
Then to my lord, quoth she, thus gently say,  
The child is fair, the mother earth and clay.

KING
Sad messenger of woe. – O my poor queen!  
Canst thou so soon consent to leave this life,  
So precious to our soul, so dear to all,  
To yield the hopeful issue of thy loins,  
To raise our second comfort? Well, be it so;  
Ill, be it so. – Stay, I revoke my word,  
But that you say helps not, for she must die.
Yet if ye can save both, I’ll give my crown,
Nay, all I have, and enter bonds for more,
Which with my conquering sword with fury bent
I’ll purchase in the farthest continent.
Use all your chiefest skill, make haste, away,
Whilst we for your success devoutly pray.  
[Exeunt Lady Mary and Ladies.]

Enter [COMPTON with] Lord SEYMOUR.

SEYMOUR
All joy and happiness betide my sovereign.

KING
Joy be it, good Lord Seymour, noble father?
Or joy or grief, thou hast a part in it.
Thou com’st to greet us in a doubtful hour:
Thy daughter and my queen lies now in pain,
And if I lose, Seymour, thou canst not gain.

SEYMOUR
Yet comfort, good my liege, this woman’s woe,
Why ’tis as certain to her as her death,
Both given her in her first creatiön.
It is a sour to sweet, given them at first,
By their first mother. Then put sorrow hence;
Your grace ere long shall see a gallant prince.

KING
Be thou a prophet, Seymour, in thy words,
Thy love some comfort to our hopes affords. –

Enter [COUNTESS holding a baby, and another Lady].

How now?
COUNTESS
My gracious lord, here I present to you
A goodly son; see here your flesh, your bone.
Look here, royal lord, I warrant ’tis your own.

SEYMOUR
See here, my liege, by the rood, a gallant prince.

KING
Ha! Little cake-bread; ’fore God, a chopping boy!
Even now I wept with sorrow, now with joy.
[to the Countess] Take that [handing her money] for thy good news. How fares my queen?

Enter LADY MARY and one Lady.

COUNTESS
O my good lord, the woeful —

KING
Tell no more of woe. Speak, doth she live?
What, weep ye all? Nay, then my heart misgives.
[to Lady Mary] Resolve me, sister, is the news worth hearing?

LADY MARY
Nor worth the telling, royal sovereign.

KING
Now by my crown, thou dimm’st my royalty,
And with thy cloudy looks eclipse my joys.
Thy silent eye bewrays a ruthful sound,
Stopped in the organs of thy troubled spirit.
Say, is she dead?

LADY MARY
Without offence, she is.

KING
Without offence, say’st thou, heaven take my soul!
What can be more offensive to my life
Than sad remembrance of my fair queen’s death?
[to Seymour] Thou woeful man, that cam’st to comfort me,
How shall I ease thy heart’s calamity
That cannot help myself? How one sad minute
Hath raised a fount of sorrows in his eyes
And bled his aged cheeks! Yet, Seymour, see, [indicating the baby]
She hath left part of herself, a son, to me;
To thee a grandchild, unto the land a prince,
The perfect substance of his royal mother,
In whom her memory shall ever live.

Phoenix Jana obii nato Phoenice;
Dolendum secula phoenices nulla tulisse duas:
One phoenix, dying, gives another life;
Thus must we flatter our extremest grief. –
[to Compton] What day is this?

COMPTON Saint Edward’s even, my lord.

KING Prepare for christening; Edward shall be his name. [Exeunt.]

[1.3]

Enter the Cardinal [WOLSEY], Ambassadors [PARIS and BONNIVET],
[and] BONNER and GARDINER.

WOLSEY [to Paris and Bonnivet]
My lords of France, you have had small cheer with us,
But you must pardon us; the times are sad,
And sorts not now for mirth and banqueting.
Therefore, I pray, make your swift return,
Commend me to your king, and kindly tell him,
The English cardinal will remain his friend.
The Lady Mary shall be forthwith sent,
And overtake ye ere you reach to Dover,
And for the business that concerns the league,
Urge it no more, but leave it to my care.

BONNIVET
We thank your grace, my good Lord Cardinal,
And so with thankfulness we take our leaves.

WOLSEY
Happily speed, my honourable lords,
My heart, I swear, still keeps you company,
Farewell to both; pray your king remember
My suit betwixt him and the Emperor.
We shall be thankful if they think on us.

PARIS
We will be earnest in your cause, my lord,
So of your grace we once more take our leaves.

WOLSEY
Again, farewell. – Bonner, conduct them forth. –

[Exeunt Bonner, Paris and Bonnivet.]

Now, Gardiner, what think’st thou of these times?

GARDINER
Well, that the league’s confirmed, my gracious lord;
Ill, that I fear the death of good Queen Jane
Will cause new troubles in our state again.

WOLSEY
Why think’st thou so?

GARDINER
I fear false Luther’s doctrine’s spread so far,
Lest that his highness, now unmarried,
Should match amongst that sect of Lutherans.
You saw how soon his majesty was won
To scorn the Pope and Rome’s religion
When Queen Anne Boleyn wore the diadem.
WOLSEY

Gardiner, ’tis true, so was the rumour spread,
But Wolsey wrought such means she lost her head.
Tush, fear not thou; whilst Harry’s life doth stand,
He shall be king, but we will rule the land. –

[Re-enter BONNER.]

Bonner, come hither, you are our trusty friend.
See that the treasure we have gathered,
The copes, the vestments, and the chalices,
The smoke-pence, and the tributary fees
That English chimneys pay the Church of Rome,
Be barrelled close within the inner cellar.
We’ll send it over shortly to prepare
Our swift advancement to Saint Peter’s chair.
Be trusty, and be sure of honours speedily:
The King hath promised at the next election,
Bonner shall have the bishopric of London.

BONNER

I humbly thank your grace.

WOLSEY

And Gardiner shall be Lord of Winchester.
Had we our hopes, what shall you not be then,
When we have got the papal diadem?

Exeunt.

[1.4]

Enter BRANDON, DUDLEY, GREY, SEYMOUR, [and] COMPTON.

BRANDON

How now, Sir William Compton, where’s the King?
COMPTON

His grace is walking in the gallery,
As sad and passionate as e’er he was.

DUDLEY

[to Brandon] ’Twere good your grace went in to comfort him.

BRANDON

Not I, Lord Dudley, by my George, I swear,
Unless his highness first had sent for me,
I will not put my head in such a hazard:
I know his anger and his spleen too well.

GREY

’Tis strange; this humour hath his highness held
Ever since the death of good Queen Jane,
That none dares venture to confer with him.

Enter Cardinal [WOLSEY], [WILL] SUMMERS, and PATCH.

DUDLEY [aside to the other lords] Here comes the Cardinal.
BRANDON [aside to the other lords] Ay, and two fools after him; his lordship
is well attended still.
SEYMOUR [aside to the other lords]

Let’s win this prelate to salute the King;
It may perhaps work his disgrace with him.

WOLSEY How now, William? What, are you here too?

WILL SUMMERS Ay, my lord, all the fools follow you. I come to bid my
cousin Patch welcome to the court, and when I come to York House, he’ll
do as much for me. – Will ye not, Patch?

PATCH Yes, cousin. ([He] sing[s].) Hey, da, tere, dedell, dey, day.

WOLSEY What, are you singing, sirrah?

WILL SUMMERS I’ll make him cry as fast anon, I hold a penny.

DUDLEY [to Wosley]

Good morrow to your grace, my good Lord Cardinal.

WOLSEY

We thank your honour.
Enter KING within.

KING [Calls from within.] What, Compton! Carew!
BRANDON [to Wolsey and the other lords] Hark, the King calls.
KING [Calls from within.] Mother of God, how are we attended on! Who waits without?
BRANDON [to Compton]
  Go in, Sir William, and if you find his grace
  In any milder temper than he was last night,
  Let us have word, and we will visit him.
COMPTON
  I will, my lord.
Exit.

WOLSEY
  What is the occasion that the King’s so moved?
BRANDON
  His grace hath taken such an inward grief,
  With sad remembrance of the Queen that’s dead,
  That much his highness wrongs his state and person.
  Besides in Ireland do the Burkes rebel,
  And stout Percy, that disclosed the plot,
  Was by the Earl of Kildare late put to death;
  And Martin Luther out of Germany
  Has writ a book against his majesty
  For taking part with proud Pope Julius,
  Which being spread by him through Christendom
  Hath thus incensed his royal majesty.

25 SD1 within Possibly meaning from within the backstage tiring-house; alternatively, the King enters into the stage space representing his private antechamber (see p. 79), seen by the audience but unseen by other characters on stage.
26 Carew Perhaps a reference, as Somerset suggests, to Sir Peter Carew, a gentleman of the Privy Chamber from 1530, or, as Wilson suggests (xix), to Sir Nicholas Carew, Master of the Horse from 1522; the name is not mentioned again in the play and may indicate revision or haste on Rowley’s part.
milder lesser
34 the occasion elided, as th’occasion
37 state position
38 in … rebel No reference to this incident can be found in the chronicles. It is likely that Rowley had in mind the Burkes (or Bourkes), an Anglo-Norman Irish clan ‘famous for treachery around 1600-03’ (Somerset).
39 Perhaps spoken with a pause at the beginning of the line or after the caesura.
stout haughty, arrogant (OED adj. 1a)
Percy Again, not in the chronicles; the Percy family was one of the most powerful in northern England under the Tudors.
40 Earl of Kildare Gerard FitzGerald, 9th Earl of Kildare, sent to Ireland as Lord Deputy in 1524 late recently
41 Martin Luther See 1.3.26n.
a book This was Luther’s Contra Henricum Regem Angliae (1522), written in response to Henry’s Assertio Septem Sacramentorum (1521); see 274n.
taking part with siding with
43 proud arrogant, haughty
Pope Julius Julius II, Pope from 1503 until his death in 1513; he was succeeded by Leo X.
incensed angered, exasperated (OED incense v. 2 3b)
WOLSEY

Tush! I have news, my lord, to salve that sore,
And make the King more feared through Christendom
Than ever was his famous ancestors.
Nor can base Luther with his heresies,
Heretically blur King Henry’s fame
For honour that he did Pope Julius,
Who in high favour of his majesty
Hath sent Campeius with a bull from Rome,
To add unto his title this high style:
That he, and his fair posterity,
Proclaimed defenders of the faith shall be;
For which intent the holy cardinals come
As legates from the imperial court of Rome.

GREY

This news, my lord, may something ease his mind;
’Twere good your grace would go and visit him.

WOLSEY

I will, and doubt not but to please him well. [Exit.]

SEYMOUR So, I am glad he’s in; an the King be no better pleased than he was at our last parting, he’ll make him repent his sauciness.

BRANDON [to Will Summers] How now, old William? How chance you go not to the King and comfort him?

WILL SUMMERS No, by’r lady, my lord, I was with him too lately already; his fist is too heavy for a fool to stand under. I went to him last night after you had left him, seeing him chafe so at Charles here, to make him merry, and he gave me such a box on the ear that struck me clean through three

Tush! an expression of ridicule or contempt
to … sore i.e. to appease the King’s anger. Cf. Tilley, S84: ‘There is a salve for every sore’.
base despicable, ignoble (OED adj. 10b)
his heresies i.e. against the Roman Catholic Church. Since Rowley plays freely with chronology, it is difficult to pinpoint the King’s religious beliefs at any given moment. From 1534, Henry was a founder member of the Church of England; while Pope Julius II was alive, however, he was still a Roman Catholic.
pope Julius It was Pope Leo X, not Julius II, who sent Campeius to England in 1518.
bull a papal bull, an episcopal edict or mandate from the Pope. The purpose of Campeius’s visit was to make Wolsey a papal legate; Henry was not granted the title Defender of the Faith until 1521 (Holinshead, 872; Foxe, 901-2).
style the ceremonial designation of a sovereign, including his various titles
posternity descendants
defenders … faith a reference to the title ‘Defender of the Faith’ (see 292n.)
cardinals card’nals; Elze alters to ‘cardinal’s’, but the plural is correct since Campeius arrives with others (see 263 SD2)
legates deputies sent to represent the Pope imperial of senses relating to an empire or sovereign state; exalted, majestic (OED n. 1, 2a and 5a). Elided (th’imperial) and trisyllabic.
sauciness boldness, insolence
How chance how come (Abbott, no. 37)
by’r lady by our lady, i.e. the Virgin Mary
chafe shout, scold (OED v. 6a)
Charles Summers’s switch from the second to the third person is strange here; however, Elze’s suggestion that ‘Charles’ refers to Patch rather than Brandon is unfounded, not least as the episode concerning Patch has not yet taken place (see 168-97).
chambers, down four pairs of stairs; I fell o’er five barrels in the bottom of
the cellar, and if I had not well liquored myself there, I had never lived
after it.
BRANDON    Faith, Will, I’ll give thee a velvet coat, an thou canst but make
him merry.
WILL SUMMERS    Will ye, my lord? And I’ll venture another box on the ear, but
I’ll do it.

Enter COMPTON.

COMPTON
Clear the presence there, the King is coming.
God’s me, my lords, what meant the Cardinal
So unexpected thus to trouble him?
GREY
Is the King moved at it?

Enter the KING and WOLSEY.

COMPTON [to Grey]
Judge by his countenance; see, he comes.
BRANDON [to the lords]
I’ll not endure the storm.
DUDLEY [to the lords]    Nor I.
WILL SUMMERS [to Patch]    Run, fool; your master will be felled else.
KING [to Wolsey]
Did we not charge that none should trouble us?
Presumptuous priest, proud prelate as thou art,
How comes it you are grown so saucy, sir,
Thus to presume upon our patience,
And cross our royal thought, disturbed and vexed,
By all your negligence in our estate,
Of us and of our country’s happiness?
WOLSEY
My gracious lord —
KING    Fawning beast, stand back,
Or by my crown, I’ll foot thee to the earth! —    [Wolsey kneels in submission.]

71    four pairs i.e. four flights; the number four is
likely used here simply to denote an indefinite
number (see Elze, Notes, 227-9 and cf. forty at
2.1.2)
"in Q1 reads ‘into’, but it is more likely that
the barrels themselves were in the cellar, rather
than that Summers fell over them and then into
the cellar (see also 1.3.41)."
72    liquored oiled, greased, i.e. with wine
76    venture risk
78    the presence the presence chamber
81    moved angered
83    SD 1&2 lords See 12-16n.
84    your master i.e. Wolsey
felled knocked or struck down
89    cross thwart (OED v. 14a), in this sense also
disturb
90    Somerset convincingly argues that a line of
text may accidentally have been left out be-
tween this and 91.
92    Fawning cringing, flattering (OED adj. 2)
93    foot strike with the foot, kick (OED v. 5a)
Where’s Brandon, Surrey, Seymour, Grey?
Where is your counsel now? — [to the lords] Oh, now ye crouch
And stand like pictures at our presence door. —
Call in our guard, and bear them to the Tower.
Mother of God, I’ll have the traitors’ heads;
Go, hale them to the block. — [to Wolsey] Up, up, stand up,
I’ll make you know your duties to our state.
Am I a cipher? Is my sight grown stale?
Am I not Harry? Am I not England’s king? Ha!
WILL SUMMERS [to Patch] So la, now the watchword’s given. Nay, an he
once cry ‘ha!’, ne’er a man in the court dare for his head speak again. Lie
close, cousin Patch.
PATCH [to Wolsey] I’ll not come near him, cousin; he’s almost killed me with his
countenance.
KING [to Wolsey]
We have been too familiar, now I see,
And you may dally with our majesty. —
Where are my pages, there?
Enter PAGES.

1 PAGE My lord?
KING
Truss, sirrah! None to put my garter on? —
Give me some wine! —

Here, stuff a’th’ tother side. —

Proud Cardinal,
Who followed our affairs in Italy,

94 Surrey No character in the play bears this
name; possibly, as Elze suggests, ‘Dudley’
was intended here. Cf. ‘Carew’ at 26.
95 your counsel Elze’s conjectured reading ‘our
council’ is also plausible, though the emendation is unnecessary.
95 SD lords See 12-16n.
crouch cower; possibly pronounced ‘crooch’
(see t.n.)
96 like pictures completely still, like portraits
97-9 Call … block Seemingly spoken out loud as if to a waiting attendant outside the presence chamber.
97 the Tower i.e. the Tower of London
99 hale
block the piece of wood on which the condemned were beheaded
99 SD It is possible that this instruction was intended for the lords, who continue to cower at the door; however, it is more likely, given the continuation of the King’s speech at 108-10, that Henry here turns his attention back to Wolsey, who kneels in submission at the King’s threats (see 93 SD).
100 cipher a person who fills a place but is of no
importance, a nonentity (OED n. 2a)
my sight i.e. the sight of me, my image
stale diminished in attractiveness, youth or
vigour (OED adj. 1 4a)
103 la an exclamation used for emphasis
watchword’s signal’s, password’s, Henry’s
watchword is ‘ha!’
familiar inappropriately informal
daily to trifle with a person or thing, under the
guise of serious action (OED v. 3a)
112 Truss tie the points or laces with which the
hose were fastened to the doublet
garter Possibly the ceremonial garter, worn
below the left knee (see 5.4.245n.).
113 SD In order to enter again at 127, Compton
must at some point leave the stage; since his
later entrance is ‘with wine’, it is reasonable to
assume that it is Compton who responds to the
King’s demand.
113 Here … side Likely, as Somerset suggests, an
instruction to the page to stuff (= tuck in) the
excess stocking material inside the doublet.
114-15 *See pp. 187-8 on short verse lines.
That we that honoured so Pope Julius,
By dedicating books at thy request
Against that upstart sect of Lutherans,
Should by that heretic be banded thus?
But by my George, I swear, if Henry live,
I'll hunt base Luther through all Germany
And pull those seven electors on their knees,
If they but back him against our dignities.

Enter COMPTON with wine.

COMPTON
Here's wine, my lord.

KING
Drink and be damned! I cry thee mercy, Compton,
What the devil meant'st thou to come behind me so?
I did mistake, I'll make thee amends for it.
By holy Paul, I am so crossed and vexed,
I knew not what I did; and here at home,
Such careful statesmen do attend us,
And look so wisely to our commonweal,
That we have Ill May Days and riots made,
For lawless rebels do disturb our state:
Twelve times this term have we in person sat,
Both in the Star Chamber and Chancery courts,
To hear our subjects' suits determinèd.

118 upstart characteristic of upstarts, i.e. those who have newly or suddenly risen in position or importance
119 banded tossed from side to side (OED bandy v. 3). This seems to have been the intended meaning of Q1’s ‘banded’.
120 George See 5n.
122 seven electors i.e. of the Holy Roman Empire (see 5.5.57n.); ‘seven’ is pronounced ‘se’en’
124 Base menial, of low rank (as opposed to despicable; cf. 121)
125 Ireland trisyllabic
126 kerns light-armed Irish foot-soldiers
127 the English Pale part of the eastern coast of Ireland over which English jurisdiction was established
128 holy Paul Paul the Apostle, who taught the gospel of Christ to the first-century world
129 crossed Cf. ‘cross’ at 89 (and see n.).
130 commonweal common wellbeing (OED n. 1); perhaps ‘commonwealth’ (Somerset)
131 Ill May Days The riots that took place between 28 April and 1 May 1517, directed against the resident ‘aliens & strangers’ who ‘eat the bread from the fatherlesse children, and take the liuing from all the artificers’ (Holinshed, 841); see the opening scenes of STM.
132-41 As Elze notes, while the author of the riots, John Lincoln, was executed in Cheapside, King Henry sat in judgement in Westminster Hall to hear the petitions or ‘suits’ of over 400 men and women.
134 Star Chamber a room in Westminster Palace in which the King’s council sat to exercise jurisdiction; so called because of its decorated ceiling
135 Chancery chanc’ry; the court headed by the Lord Chancellor of England (i.e. Wolsey), the highest court in the realm
Yet ’tis your office, Wolsey, but all of you
May make a packhorse of King Henry now.
Well, what would ye say?

WOLSEY

Nothing that might displease your majesty;
I have a message from the Pope to you.

KING

Then keep it still, we will not hear it yet.
– Get all of you away, avoid our presence;
We cannot yet command our patience. –
[to 1 Page] Reach me a chair.

[Exeunt all but the King, Brandon,
Wolsey, lords &c.]

BRANDON [aside to Will Summers]

Now, Will, or never, make the King but smile,
And with thy mirthful toys allay his spleen
That we, his council, may confer with him,
And by my honour, I’ll reward thee well.
To him, good Will.

WILL SUMMERS [aside to Brandon]

Not too fast, I pray, lest Will Summers
ne’er be seen again. I know his qualities as well as the best on ye, for ever
when he’s angry and nobody dare speak to him, ye thrust me in by the head
and shoulders, and then we fall to buffets, but I know who has the worst
on’t. But go, my lord, stand aside and stir not till I call ye. Let my cousin
Patch and I alone; an he go to boxing, we’ll fall both upon him, that’s
certain. But an the worst come, be sure the Cardinal’s fool shall pay for’t.

BRANDON [aside to Will Summers]

Use your best skill, good William,
I’ll not be seen unless I see him smile.

[Exit.

WILL SUMMERS [to Patch]

Where art thou, cousin? – Alas, poor fool, he’s
crept under the table. – Up, cousin, fear nothing; the storm’s past, I warrant
thee.

PATCH

Is the King gone, cousin?

WILL SUMMERS

No, no, yonder he sits; we are all friends now. The lords
are gone to dinner, and thou and I must wait at the King’s table.

143  packhorse one employed in ‘mean, servile or
distasteful work, a drudge’ (OED n. 2); cf. R3:
‘I was a packhorse in his great affairs’ (1.3.121)

148  avoid depart

150  Presumably the King takes the chair and sits at
the edge or back of the stage, with his back to
the other characters; this in turn permits Patch
to creep up behind him (see 192). Lines 165-
91 are thus spoken out of earshot of the King.

151  Now … or never Proverbial (Tilley, N351);
cf. 2H6: ‘Now, York, or never’ (3.1.330).

152  toys jests, antics

158-9  thrust … shoulders Proverbial (see Tilley,
H274).

165  fall to resort to

166  crept … table Suggestive of Patch’s movements
on stage during the King’s impulsive outburst.
 PATCH Not I, by’r lady, I would not wait upon such a lord for all the livings in the land. I thought he would have killed my Lord Cardinal, he looked so terribly.

WILL SUMMERS Foh, he did but jest with him. But I’ll tell thee, cousin, the rarest trick to be revenged as’t passes, and I’ll give thee this fine silk point an thou’lt do it.

PATCH O, brave! O, brave! Give me it, cousin, and I’ll do whatsoe’er ‘tis.

WILL SUMMERS I’ll stand behind the post here, and thou shalt go softly stealing behind him as he sits reading yonder, and when thou comest close to him, cry ‘boo’, and we’ll scare him so, he shall not tell where to rest him.

PATCH But will he not be angry?

WILL SUMMERS No, no, for then I’ll show myself, and after he sees who ’tis, he’ll laugh and be as merry as a magpie, and thou’lt be a made man by it, for all the house shall see him hug thee in his arms, and dandle thee up and down with hand and foot an thou wert a football.

PATCH O, fine! Come, cousin, give me the point first, and I’ll roar so loud that I’ll make him believe that the devil’s come.

WILL SUMMERS So do, and fear nothing. – [aside] For an thou wert the devil himself, he’ll conjure thee, I warrant thee; I would not have such a conjuring for twenty crowns! But when he has made way, I’ll make him merry enough, I doubt it not. – So, so now, cousin, look to your coxcomb.

PATCH [Creeps up behind the King.] Boo!

KING Mother of God, what’s that?

PATCH Boo!

KING Out ass, take that [striking him], and tumble at my feet, For thus I’ll spurn thee up and down the house.

PATCH [to Will Summers] Help, cousin, help!

WILL SUMMERS No, cousin; now he’s conjuring, I dare not come near him.

172-3 I ... terribly Cf. H8: ‘He parted frowning from me, as if ruin / Leaped from his eyes’ (3.2.205-6).

174 Foh an explanation of reproach

175 rarest of uncommon excellence or merit

176 OED rare, adj. 1a

177 brave excellent, fine

178 I’ll ... post Presumably a reference to one of the Fortune’s stage posts (see p. 79).

179 stealing creeping

180 cry ‘boo’ As Elze notes, this seems to have been a popular trick amongst domestic fools; cf. Wily Beguiled: ‘I’ll rather put on my flashing red nose … and crie bo’ (D1”). ‘Boo’ is likely pronounced ‘bo’ (see t.n.).

183 merry ... magpie Proverbial (Tilley, P281).

184 dandle move up and down playfully in the hand (OED v. 1b)

185 an as if

186 O, fine Cf. ‘O, brave’ (177).

189 conjure influence or overpower, as if by casting a spell

189-90 I would ... crowns See p. 31 for links between this and passages in Faustus (B-text) and Famous Victories.

190 crowns coins valued at roughly 5s each

191 coxcomb the cap worn by a professional fool

196 spurn strike with the foot, kick (OED v. 2b). Cf. CE: ‘Am I so round with you, as you with me, / That like a football you do spurn me thus?’ (2.1.82-3) and see Summers’s words at 184-5.
KING

Who set this natural here to trouble me?
Who’s that stands laughing there? The fool? Ha, ha!
Where’s Compton?

[Enter COMPTON.]

Mother o’ God, I have found his drift; ’tis the craftiest old villain in Christendom! – [to Compton] Mark, good Sir William: because the fool durst not come near himself, seeing our anger, he sent this silly ass, that we might wreak our royal spleen on him, whilst he stands laughing to behold the jest. By th’ blessed lady, Compton, I’ll not leave the fool to gain a million, he contents me so. – Come hither, Will.

WILL SUMMERS I’ll know whether ye have done knocking, first; my cousin Patch looks pitifully. Ye had best be friends with us, I can tell you; we’ll scare ye out of your skin else.

KING Alas, poor Patch. Hold, sirrah; [handing him money] there’s an angel to buy you points.

WILL SUMMERS La, cousin, did not I say he’ll make much on ye?

PATCH Ay, cousin, but he’s made such a singing in my head I cannot see where I am.

WILL SUMMERS All the better, cousin; an your head fall a-singing, your feet may fall a-dancing, and so save charges to the piper.

KING Will Summers, prithee tell me, why didst thou send him first?

WILL SUMMERS Because I’ll have him have the first fruits of thy fury. I know how the matter stood with the next that disturbed thee, therefore I kept i’th rearward, that if the battle grew too hot, I might run presently.

KING But wherefore came ye?

WILL SUMMERS To make thee leave thy melancholy and turn merry man again. Thou hast made all the court in such a pitiful case as passes: the

199-207 Another speech in which King Henry switches from verse to prose, this time prompted by Compton’s entrance.

199 natural i.e. Patch; a derisory term for a person with a low learning ability (OED n.7a; see also ‘natural fool’, n.)

202 drift scheme, intention

205 wreak give vent or expression to (OED v.3a)

206 blessed lady the Virgin Mary

206 to … million Cf. Dent. Exclusive, M963.11: ‘Not for a million’ and cf. Cynthia’s Revels: ‘I will not depart withal, whosoever would give me a million’ (1.4.152).

208 knocking beating

210 scare … skin Cf. Tilley, S507: ‘He is ready to leap out of his skin’.

211 Hold hold still

angel abbreviated form of angel-noble, an old English gold coin worth approximately 7s 6d; so called because of its depiction of the archangel Michael

212 points See 175n, point.

213 La an exclamation of surprise or admiration on i.e. of

214 such … head Cf. All Fools: ‘Ile swear I had / A singing in my head a whole weeke after’ (11).

217 save … piper Possibly based on the proverb ‘To pay the piper’ (Tilley, P349), first recorded in 1638.

219 first fruits the first agricultural produce of the harvest; in context, the first blows of the King’s rage

221 rearward the part of an army stationed behind the main body

hot characterized by intense suffering, discomfort or danger (OED adj.9a) presently immediately

222 wherefore for what purpose

224 as passes See 175n., as’t passes.
lords have attended here this four days, and none dares speak to thee, but thou art ready to chop off their heads for’t; and now I, seeing what a fretting fury thou continuest in, and everyone said ’twould kill thee if thou keepest it, pulled e’en up my heart, and vowed to lose my head, but I’d make thee leave it.

KING Well, William, I am beholden to ye; ye shall have a new coat and cap for this.

WILL SUMMERS Nay, then I shall have two new coats and caps, for Charles Brandon promised me one before, to perform this enterprise.

KING He shall keep his word, William; go, call him in.

Call in the lords; tell them our spleen is calmed. – [Exit Will Summers.]

Mother o’ God, we must give way to wrath That chafes our royal blood with anger thus, And use some mirth, I see, to comfort us. –

[Re-enter WILL SUMMERS with WOLSEY, BRANDON, DUDLEY, GREY and SEYMOUR.]

Draw near us, lords. – Charles Brandon, list to me:

Will Summers here must have a coat of you,
But Patch has earned it dearest. Where’s the fool?

WILL SUMMERS He’s e’en creeping as near the door as he can; he’ll fain be gone, I see, an he could get out. – Wouldst thou not, cousin?

PATCH Yes, cousin Will, I’d fain be walking. I am afraid I am not as I should be.

WILL SUMMERS Come, I’ll help thee out then. – [Exit Patch.]

[to Wolsey] Dost thou hear, my Lord Cardinal? Your fool is in a pitiful taking; he smells terribly.

WOLSEY You are too crafty for him, William.

KING So is he, Wolsey, credit me.

WILL SUMMERS I think so, my lord; as long as Will lives, the Cardinal’s fool must give way to the King’s fool.

KING Well, sir, be quiet. – And, my reverend lords, I thank you for your patient suffering.
We were disturbèd in our thoughts, we swear;  
We now entreat you speak, and we will hear.

**WOLSEY**

Then may it please your sacred majesty, 
Campeius, legate to his Holiness, 
Attends with letters from the court of Rome.

**KING**

Let him draw near; we’ll give him audience. –  
Dudley and Grey, attend the Cardinal,  
And bring Campeius to our presence here.

**DUDLEY, GREY**

We go, my lord. [Exeunt Dudley and Grey with Wolsey.]

[Re-enter DUDLEY, GREY and WOLSEY  
with CAMPEIUS, other Legates and Attendants.]

**KING**

Brandon and Seymour, place yourselves by us  
To hear this message from his Holiness. –  
[to Campeius and the Legates] You reverend princes, pillars of the Church,  
Legates apóstolic, how fares the Pope?

**CAMPEIUS**

In health, great king, and from his sacred lips  
I bring a blessing apostolical  
To English Henry and his subjects all.  
And more to manifest his love to thee,  
The prop and pillar of the Church’s peace,  
And gratify thy love made plain to him  
In learnèd books ’gainst Luther’s heresy,  
He sends me thus to greet thy majesty  
With style and titles of high dignity. –  
Command the heralds and the trumpets forth.

**SEYMOUR**

Gentlemen, dispatch and call them in. [Exeunt Attendants.]

[Re-enter Attendants with Heralds and Trumpeters.]

**WILL SUMMERS**

Lord bless us, what’s here to do now?

**CAMPEIUS**

Receive this bull, sent from his Holiness,  
For confirmation of this dignity  
To thee, and to thy fair posterity.
WILL SUMMERS  'Tis well the King's a widower; an ye had put forth your bull with his horns forward, I'd have marred your message, I can tell ye.

KING  Peace, Will. – Heralds, attend him.

CAMPEIUS  Trumpets, prepare, whilst we aloud pronounce This sacred message from his Holiness, And in his reverend name, I here proclaim, Henry the Eighth, by the grace of God, King of England, France and Ireland, And to this title from the Pope we give Defender of the Faith, in peace to live.

WOLSEY  Sound, trumpets, and God save the King.  [Trumpets sound.]

KING  We thank his Holiness for this princely favour, Receiving it with thanks and reverence, In which, whilst we have life, his grace shall see Our sword defender of the faith shall be. – [to the lords] Go, one of you salute the Mayor of London; Bid him with heralds and with trumpets’ sound Proclaim our titles through his government. – Go, Grey, see it done. – Attend him, fellows.

GREY  I go, my lord. – Trumpets, follow me.  [Exeunt Grey, Trumpeters and Heralds.]

KING [to Campeius]  What more, lord legate, doth his Holiness will?

CAMPEIUS  That Henry, joining with the Christian Kings Of France and Spain, Denmárk and Portugal, Would send an army to assail the Turk

283 *ye altered from Q1’s ‘he’, since Summers is talking directly to Campeius

283-4 an ... forward Summers puns on the double meaning of ‘bull’, possibly with reference to the proverb ‘Take the bull by the horns’ (Dent, Exclusive, B715.11); probably also intended as an image of cuckoldry.

284 marred ruined, interrupted

286-93 Cf. Foxe: ‘the bull was againe published, the trumpets blew, the shawmes and sackbuts played in honor of the kings new stile’ (902).

288 reverend rev’rend

290 Ireland trisyllabic; while Henry was Lord of Ireland, he did not assume kingship until 1541 (see 5.5.54-5n.)

292 Defender ... Faith A title conferred by Pope Leo X in October 1521, in response to King Henry’s defence of papal supremacy (see 274n.); see Grafton (1562): ‘king Henry y’viiii wrote a boke against Luther, & therfore the Bishop of Rome, named him defendor of y’e faith’ (f. 124v).

295 reverence deep respect

298 SD lords i.e. those named in the entrance direction at 238

299 Mayor At the time of Campeius’s visit, the Lord Mayor of London was Thomas Exmewe; as Wiggins notes (5.147), this is not the same ‘Mayor of London’ who appears as a mute character in 5.5 (see LR 41n.).

300 his government the territory over which the Lord Mayor has jurisdiction: the City of London

301 fellows Presumably the heralds and trumpeters who exit with Grey at 302.

303 will intend

304-9 Rowley’s source here was probably Holinshed: ‘This yeaere came to Calis … Laurence Campeius … to require the king of aid against the Turk’ (844-5).

306 assail attack, assault
That now invades with war the isle of Rhodes,
Or send twelve thousand pounds to be disposed
As his Holiness thinks best for their relief.

WILL SUMMERS I thought so; I knew 'twould be a money matter, when all's done. Now thou'rt Defender of the Faith, the Pope will have thee defend everything, himself and all.

KING [to the lords and attendants] Take hence the fool.

WILL SUMMERS Ay, when? Can ye tell? Dost thou think any o' th' lords will take the fool? None here, I warrant, except the cardinals.

KING What a knavish fool's this? – [to Campeius and the Legates] Lords, you must bear with him. – Come hither, Will, what sayest thou to this new title given us by the Pope? Speak, is't not rare?

WILL SUMMERS I know not how rare it is, but I know how dear 'twill be, for I perceive 'twill cost thee twelve thousand pounds at least, besides the cardinals' cost in coming.

KING All that’s nothing; the title of Defender of the Faith is worth, yea, twice as much. Say, is it not?

WILL SUMMERS No, by my troth. Dost hear, old Harry? I am sure the true faith is able to defend itself without thee, and as for the Pope's faith, good faith! 'Tis not worth a farthing, and therefore give him not a penny.

KING Go to, sirrah. Meddle not you with the Pope's matters.

WILL SUMMERS Let him not meddle with thy matters then, for an he meddle with thee, I'll meddle with him, that's certain; and so farewell. I'll go and meet my little young master Prince Edward; they say he comes to court tonight. I'll to horseback. Prithee Harry, send one to hold my stirrup. Shall I tell the Prince what the Pope has done?

KING Ay, an thou wilt, Will. He shall be Defender of the Faith too, one day.
WILL SUMMERS  No, an he and I can defend ourselves, we care not, for we are sure the faith can.  

KING [to Campeius]  Lord legate, so we reverence Rome and you,  As nothing you demand shall be denied:  The Turk will we expel from Christendom,  Sending stout soldiers to his Holiness,  And money to relieve distressed Rhodes.  So, if you please, pass in to banqueting. –  Go, lords, attend them. – Brandon and Compton, stay,  We have some business to confer upon.

CAMPEIUS  We take our leave.

KING  Most hearty welcome to my reverend lords. –  

[Exeunt all but the King, Brandon and Compton.]

So, now to our business. – Brandon, say,  Hear ye no tidings from our sister Mary  Since her arrival in the realm of France?

BRANDON  Thus much we heard, my lord: at Calais met her  The youthful dauphin and the peers of France,  And bravely brought her to the king at Tours,  Where he both married her and crowned her queen.

KING  'Tis well. – But Brandon and Compton, list to me,  I must employ your aid and secrecy:  This night we mean in some disguised shape  To visit London and to walk the round,  Pass through their watches and observe the care  And special diligence to keep our peace.  They say night-walkers hourly pass the streets,  Committing theft and hated sacrilege,  And slightly pass unstayed or unpunished. –

336 reverence rev’rence; respect, honour  
338 Deviance from the source material on Rowley’s part, since Holinshed reports that Campeius had ‘no toward answer’ to his request for aid (845).  
339 stout valiant, brave (OED adj. 3a)  
340 distressed besieged  
344 *SP Q1 appears to assign this speech to Compton (see t.n.), but this was evidently just an error of typesetting.  
345 reverend rev’rend  
346 As at 301, the change of address signifies a pause equivalent to a single unstressed metrical beat.  
349 Calais elided; Q1’s spelling (see t.n.) may give some indication of the word’s pronunciation.  
According to Holinshed (832), Lady Mary was actually landed at Boulogne and married King Louis in Abbéville (not Tours, as at 351).  
350 dauphin the heir to the French throne, whose crest was a dolphin (hence Q1’s spelling; see t.n.)  
351 the king King Louis XII of France  
Tours See 349n.; Q1’s spelling ‘Towres’ may be indicative of pronunciation.  
355-8 Cf. King and Cobbler (Appendix 2).  
356 walk the round walk a circuit of the City, as the watchmen on their rounds (see OED round, n.1 23a)  
359 night-walkers nocturnal thieves or miscreants, as per the title of Fletcher’s The Night-Walker; or, The Little Thief  
360 sacrilege the desecration of sacred objects  
361 slightly easily  
unstayed unhindered, unimpeded
Go, Compton, go and get me some disguise,
This night we’ll see our city’s government. –
Brandon, do you attend at Baynard’s Castle;
Compton shall go disguised along with me.
Our swords and bucklers shall conduct us safe,
But if we catch a knock to quit our pain
We’ll put it up, and hie us home again.  

Exeunt.

[2.1]

Enter the constable and [two men of the] watch, Prickawl the cobbler,
being one bearing a lantern, [and dormouse].

constable
Come, neighbours, we have a strait command;
Our watches be severely looked into.
Much theft and murder was committed lately:
There are two strangers, merchants of the Steelyard,
Cruelly slain, found floating on the Thames,
And greatly are the stew-houses in suspect
As places fitting for no better use.
Therefore be careful and examine all;
Perhaps we may attach the murderer.

watch Nay, I assure ye, Master constable, those stew-houses are places
of much slaughter and redemption, and many cruel deeds of equity and
wickedness are committed there, for diverse good men lose both their
money and their computation by them, I abjure ye. – How say you, neighbour
prickawl?

Cobbler Neighbour Capcase, I know you’re a man of courage, and for the
merry cobbler of Lime Street, though I sit as low as Saint Faith’s, I can
look as high as Paul’s. I have in my days walked to the stews as well as my

364 baynard’s castle a palace belonging to the
King, situated on the Thames riverfront; it was
destroyed by the Great Fire of 1666
366 bucklers small round shields
367 catch a knock sustain an injury
quit our pain ‘repay us for our labours’ (somerset)
put it up somerset suggests ‘endure it, say no
more about it’; more likely, the king means
‘put [the wound] up’ with plasters or bandages
(see 2.3.119-20).
hie hasten, speed (OED v.1 2a)
2.1 location: city of London. Likely sources
include King and Cobbler (see Appendix 2),
as well as other disguised king plays, such as
H5, in which the soldiers experience ‘[a] little
touch of Harry in the night’ (4.0.47). Lines
concerning the watchmen may also derive from
MA (3.3) and King Leir (scene 27; Tln 2434).
1 strait strict, rigorous; severely regulated (OED
adj. 5a, 5b; 8b)
4-5 An event from 1534, related in Holinshed (937).
4 strangers foreigners
Steelyard the main trading base of the Hanse
merchants in London, situated on the north bank
of the Thames
6 the stews See 1.1.121-4 and n.
9 attach arrest, lay hold of
10-14 As Somerset notes, the speeches of the watch-
men are full of ‘Doggyberrisms’: long words,
mistakenly used. Cf. MA, 3.3 and see 11-13n.
11-13 redemption … equity … computation …
abjure somerset plausibly suggests that the
watchman has in mind the words ‘damnation’,
‘iniquity’, ‘reputation’ and ‘assure’.
16 Lime Street a residential street for London
merchants (somerset)
16-17 Saint faith’s … paul’s ‘As high as paul’s
(steeple)’ was proverbial (see dent, exclusive,
P118.11); the church of Saint Faith’s was
located in the crypt of Saint Paul’s Cathedral,
under the choir.
neighbours, but if the mad wenches fall to murdering once, and cast men into the Thames, I have done with them; there’s no dealing, if they carry fire in one hand and water i’th’ tother.

**CONSTABLE** Well, masters, we are now placed about the King’s business, and I know ye all sufficient in the knowledge of it, I need not to repeat your charge again.

Good neighbours, use your greatest care, I pray,
And if unruly persons trouble ye,
Call and I’ll come. So, sirs, goodnight.

**1 WATCH** God ye goodnight and twenty, sir. I warrant ye, ye need not reconcile to our charge, for some on us has discharged the place this forty year, I am sure. – Neighbours, what think you best to be done?

**COBBLER** Every man according to his calling, neighbour. If the enemy come, here lies my town of garrison. I set on him as I set on a patch to bid any man stand, in the purpose, for indeed, neighbours, every sensible watchman is to seek the best reformation to his own destruction.

**2 WATCH** But what think ye, neighbours, if every man take a nap now, i’th’ forehand o’th’ night, and go to bed afterward?

**COBBLER** That were not amiss neither, but an you’ll take but every man his pot first, you’ll sleep like the man i’th’ moon, i’faith.

18 mad wenches Cf. Dent, W274.1: ‘To be mad wenches’.
19-20 carry ... tother Proverbial (Tilley, F267); also punning on fire as a symbol of sexual desire (Partridge, 135; Williams, 125). The women lure men with their sexual advances (fire) and then drown them in the Thames (water).
21-6 Although set entirely as prose in Q1, the Constable’s speech appears to be a combination of prose and verse. While Somerset also acknowledged the shift, he made the transition into verse slightly earlier than in this edn (see t.n.).
23 charge duty, responsibility; see MA: ‘This is your charge: you shall comprehend all vagrom men. You are to bid any man stand, in the prince’s name’ (3.3.24-6).
27 God ye goodnight contraction of ‘God give you goodnight’ (as at 156); a form of farewell and twenty used here as an intensive; cf. MW: ‘Good even and twenty, good Master Page’ (2.1.177-8).
28 reconcile Possibly another ‘Dogberryism’; Somerset suggests ‘counsel’ is intended.
some on some of (Abbott, no.180) discharged the place i.e. performed this duty forty Likely used to denote an indefinite number of years; see Elze, Notes, 230-2.
30 calling trade, occupation
31 garrison defence, protection (OED n. 2)
31-4 if ... Sunday an extended simile describing the Cobbler’s plan of attack, based on everyday tasks carried out in his work; perhaps accompanied by appropriate actions and gestures
32 underlay to furnish a shoe with soling-pieces or heel-plates
33 yerk bind tightly with cords; cf. Shoemaker’s Holiday: ‘yarke and seame’ (2.3.82)
34 th’ Q1’s spelling may give some sense of pronunciation (see this and later t.ns).
36 sensible Qq3-4 and Elze read ‘senseless’, possibly to maintain parallels with MA: ‘You are thought here to be the most senseless and fit man for the constable of the watch’ (3.3.22-3); in this context, though, ‘senseless’ is the more appropriate reading.
37 reformation ... destruction Possibly both ‘Dogberryism’, as Somerset notes (see 10-14n.),
38-9 ‘t’th’ ... night i.e. before midnight
41 pot i.e. of alcohol
the ... moon a common legend (see 45n. and 46n.) that forms the subtitle of Lyly’s Endymion

21-3) this edn: Q1 lines business, / it, / again: i.: prose in Somerset until 22 (it), then lines again, / 21 placed] Elze: plac’st Q1 22 ye all] all ye are Qq3-4 26 SD] Elze: Exit Constable, [after 26 Q1 27 God ye goodnight] (Godyeoodnight), Godyeoodnight Somerset 28 some] some one Elze 34 by th’] (beth) 36-8 neighbours, ... neighbours] om. Elze (added in corrigenda) 36 sensible] sencees Qq3-4; senseless Elze 38 i’th’] (eth) 39 o’th’] (eth) 40 an] (and) 41 i’th’] (eth)
2 WATCH  Do ye think, neighbour, is there a man i' th' moon?
1 WATCH  I assure ye, in a clear day I have seen't at midnight.
2 WATCH  Of what occupation is he, trow?
CLOBBER  Some think's he's a shepherd, because on's dog; some says he's a baker going to heat his oven with a bavin at's back. But the plain truth is, I think he is a cobbler, for ye know what the song says:
   I see a man i' th' moon,
   Fie, man, fie,
   I see a man i' th' moon,
   Clouting Saint Peter's shoon,
   and so, by this reason, he should be a cobbler.
1 WATCH  By my feckins, he saith true. Alas, alas, goodman Dormouse hath even given up the ghost already; 'tis an honest, quiet soul, I warrant ye.
CLOBBER  It behoves us all to be so. – How do ye, neighbour Dormouse?
DORMOUSE  God speed ye, God speed ye; nay, an ye go a God's name, I have nothing to say to ye.
2 WATCH  La ye, his mind's on's business, though he be ne'er so sleepy.
CLOBBER  Come, let's all join with him and steal a nap. Every man, masters, to his several stall.
2 WATCH  Agreed. Goodnight, good neighbours.
CLOBBER  Nay, let's take no leave. I'll but wink a while and see you again.

Enter KING [in disguise], and COMPTON, with bills on his back.

KING
Come, Sir William,
We may now stand upon our guard, you see,
The watch has given us leave to arm ourselves;

44 trow do you suppose (OED v. 4c)
45 on's of his (see Abbott, no. 180)
dog included in typical representations of the man in the moon. According to folk legend, the man disregarded Sabbath regulations by collecting firewood on a Sunday; he and his dog were thus banished. See the representation of Moonshine in MND (5.1.231–49) and Stephano’s conversation with Caliban in Tem (2.2.135–8).
46 bavin a bundle of wood, such as is used in bakers’ ovens; here representing the firewood collected by the man in the moon (see prev. n.)
48-51 Taken from the ballad ‘Martin said to his Man’ (see Appendix 2). It is uncertain whether the Cobbler speaks or sings these words.
51 Clouting patching up with leather (OED clout, v. 1a)
Saint Peter’s See 1.3.43n.
shoon archaic form of ‘shoes’, retained here for its rhyme
53 By my feckins distortion of ‘by my faith’ or ‘by my fegs’ (OED fegs, n. 1)
goodman ranking one lower than a gentleman; more generally, a respectful form of address
given … ghost in this sense, nearly asleep
behoves befits, benefits
a God’s name in God’s name
La ye an exclamation used to introduce or accompany a conventional phrase or address
several stall individual post
wink to close one’s eyes. Cf. Campaspe: ‘though I wink I sleep not’ (5.4.4).
SD in disguise Holinshed notes that ‘the king came priuiliue into Cheape, in one of the cotes of his gard’ (806), perhaps indicating the form of the King’s disguise.
bills military weapons, typically a simple concave blade with a long wooden handle; used by constables of the watch until the eighteenth century (OED n. 12)
his back Elze reads ‘their backs’, suggesting that both the King and Compton carry weapons; King Henry’s words at 67, though, suggest otherwise.
given gi’en

2.1.42–65
They fear no danger, for they sleep secure.
Go, carry those bills we took to Baynard’s Castle
And bid Charles Brandon to disguise himself,
And meet me presently at Gracechurch Corner.
We will attempt to pass through all the watches,
And so I take’t ’twill be an easy task;
Therefore make haste.

COMPTON  I will, my liege.

KING  The watchword, if I chance t’o send to ye,
Is ‘the great stag of Baydon’, so my name shall be.

COMPTON  Enough, we’ll think on it.

Exit.

KING  So, now we’ll forward. Soft, yonder’s light,
Ay and a watch, and all asleep, by’r lady.
These are good, peaceable subjects; here’s none
Beckons to any, all may pass in peace. –
Ho, sirrah!

COBBLER  Stand! Who goes there?

KING  A good fellow. Stand’s a heinous word i’th’
KING’s highway; you have been at noddy, I see.

COBBLER  Ay, and the first card comes to my hand’s a knave.

KING  I am a coat-card indeed.

COBBLER  Then thou must needs be a knave, for thou art neither king nor
queen, I am sure. But whither goest thou?

KING  About a little business that I have in hand.

COBBLER  Then goodnight. Prithee trouble me no longer. [Returns to his stall.]
KING

Why, this is easy enough; here’s passage at pleasure.
What wretch so wicked would not give fair words
After the foulest fact of villainy,
That may escape unseen so easily?
Or what should let him, that is so resolved
To murder, rapine, theft or sacrilege,
To do it, and pass thus examinèd?
I see the City are the sleepy-heads.
Fond, heedless men, what boots it for a king
To toil himself in his high state affairs,
To summon parliaments and call together
The wisest heads of all his provinces,
Making statutes for his subjects’ peace,
That thus neglecting them, their woes increase?
Well, we’ll further on. –

Enter BLACK WILL.

[aside] Soft, here comes one;
I’ll stay and see how he escapes the watch.

BLACK WILL So, now I am got within the City, I am as safe as in a
sanctuary. It is a hard world when Black Will, for a venture of five pounds,
must commit such petty robberies at Mile End; but the plain truth is, the
stews from whence I had my quarterage is now grown too hot for me:
there’s some suspicion of a murder lately done upon two merchants of
the Steelyard, which indeed, as far as some five or six stabs comes to, I
confess I had a hand in. But mumbudget, all the dogs in the town must not
bark at it. I must withdraw a while till the heat be o’er, remove my
lodging and live upon dark nights and misty mornings. Now, let me then
see the strongest watch in London intercept my passage.
KING [aside]
   Such a fellow would I fain meet withal. –
BLACK WILL    'Sblood! Come before me, sir. What a devil art thou?
KING    A man at least.
BLACK WILL    And art thou valiant?
KING    I carry a sword and a buckler, ye see.
BLACK WILL    A sword and a buckler, and know not me? Not Black Will?
KING    No, trust me.
BLACK WILL    Slave, then thou art neither traveller nor purse-taker, for I tell thee, Black Will is known and feared through the Seventeen Provinces: there’s not a sword-and-buckler man in England nor Europe, but has had a taste of my manhood. I am toll-free in all cities, and the suburbs about them; this is my sconce, my castle, my citadel, and but King Harry, God bless his majesty, I fear not the proudest.
KING    Oh yes, some of his guard.
BLACK WILL    Let his guard eat’s beef and be thankful. Give me a man will cover himself with his buckler, and not budge an the devil come.
KING    Methinks thou wert better live at court, as I do. King Harry loves a man, I can tell ye.
BLACK WILL    Would thou and all the men he keeps were hanged, and ye love not him then. But I will not change my revenues for all his guards’ wages.
KING    Hast thou such store of living?
BLACK WILL    Art thou a good fellow? May I speak freely, and wilt not tell the King on’t?

118  'Sblood euphemistic shortening of ‘God’s blood’, used as an oath
120  valiant brave, courageous; showing boldness in a fight or on the battlefield
121-3 Although spoken as prose, the rhymes of these three lines were perhaps intentional.
122  know not me Playing both on the title of the play and Black Will’s own inability to see through the King’s disguise. Cf. Tilley, K174 and the title of Heywood’s play: ‘If you know not me, you know nobody’.
124  purse-taker pickpocket
125  the Seventeen Provinces the Imperial states of the Habsburg Netherlands, roughly corresponding to those of the Low Countries. The reference here indicates that Black Will is a returned soldier, now a vagabond.
126  a sword-and-buckler man Cf. Two Angry Women: ‘a man, a tall man and a good sword and buckler man’ (TLN 1342-3) and 1H4: ‘that same sword-and-buckler Prince of Wales’ (1.3.228).
127  manhood courage, valour; in this instance, swordsmanship
128  sconce a small fort, built to defend a ford or pass; a stronghold or fortified area within a city; excluding
131  Let … beef A reference to the guardsmen’s standard of living but also, it seems, to their dim-wittedness; see Dent, B215.1: ‘To be beef-witted’ and TN: ‘I am a great eater of beef, and I believe that does harm to my wit’ (1.3.83-4).
132  cover shield, protect
133  an the devil come Cf. TC, 1.2.202-3.
134  King … man Cf. Tilley, K92: ‘King Harry loved a man’.
135  revenues income, profit, i.e. from his dishonest trade
138  store abundant or plentiful supply
KING I have my weekly tribute. And to assure thee my liberty to return) at 16, 16, -

BLACK WILL An I tell him anything, let him hang me. But for thyself, I think if a fat purse come i’th’ way, thou wouldst not refuse it. Therefore leave the court and shark with me. I tell thee, I am chief commander of all the stews; there’s not a whore shifts a smock but by my privilege, nor opens her shop before I have my weekly tribute. And to assure thee my valour carries credit with it, do but walk with me through the streets of London, and let me see the proudest watch disturb us.

KING I shall be glad of your conduct, sir.

BLACK WILL Follow me, then, and I’ll tell thee more.

1 WATCH Stand, who goes there?

BLACK WILL A good fellow. – [to the King] Come close, regard them not.

2 WATCH How shall we know thee to be a good fellow?

BLACK WILL My name’s Black Will.

1 WATCH Oh, God give ye goodnight, good Master Black William.

2 WATCH Goodbye, sir, goodbye. – [to 1 Watch] I am glad we are so well rid on him.

BLACK WILL [to the King] La, sir, you see here’s egress enough. Now follow me, and you shall see we’ll have regress back again.

1 WATCH Who comes there?

COBBLER Come afore the Constable.

BLACK WILL What, have ye forgot me so soon? ’Tis I.


BLACK WILL [to the King] How likest thou now?

KING Faith, excellent. But prithee tell me, dost thou face the world with thy manhood that thus they fear thee, or art thou truly valiant?

BLACK WILL ’Sfoot! Dost thou doubt of my manhood? Nay, then defend yourself; I’ll give you a trial presently. Betake ye to your tools, sir; I’ll teach ye to stand upon inter’gatories.

141 Keep … counsel ‘keep your own secrets’ (Somerset); cf. Tilley, C694: ‘Keep counsel first thyself! Keep your own counsel’

141-2 the King … him Dramatic irony; playing on the success of the King’s disguise.

145 shark practise deception or fraud

145-7 I am … tribute Cf. Arden of Faversham: ‘The bawdie houses haue paid me tribute, / There durst not a whore shift vp, vnslesse she haue aggreed / with me first, for opning her shoppe windowes’ (TLN 2015-17). Somerset persuasively argues: ‘The parallel is close enough to suggest that Rowley may have borrowed the name, and some of the characteristics of Black Will’ from the earlier play.

146 smock a woman’s undergarment

147 tribute money’s worth

148 credit reputation

152-3 Cf. 81-2 and see 82n; reminiscent of the King and Sir John’s interchange in I Sir John Oldcastle (TLN 1364-72).

159 egress liberty to leave, i.e. to pass the watch; cf. ‘regress’ (= liberty to return) at 160

160 ’Sfoot a shorted form of the oath ‘Christ’s foot’

169 give … trial put you to the test

170 inter’gatories a syncopated form of ‘interrogatories’, i.e. questioning, interrogation under oath, Cf. MV: ‘Let us go in, / And charge us there upon inter’gatories’ (5.1.297-8). The clipped form is similarly used in a prose passage in AW (4.3.178).

KING I am for ye. There’s ne’er a man the King keeps shall refuse ye. But tell me: wilt thou keep the King’s act for fighting?

BLACK WILL As ye please, sir; yet because thou’rt his man, I’ll observe it, and neither thrust nor strike beneath the knee.

KING I am pleased. Have at you, sir. They fight.

I WATCH Help, neighbours! O take ye to your brown bills; call up the Constable.

Here’s a piece of chance-meddle ready to be committed. – [to the Cobbler] Set on, goodman Prickawl.

COBBLER I’ll firk them a’ both sides. – Lie close, neighbour Dormouse. – [to Black Will and the King] Keep the King’s peace, I charge ye. – Help, Master Constable!

Enter the Constable.

CONSTABLE Keep the peace, or strike them down.

BLACK WILL Zounds, I am hurt. Hold, I say!

2 WATCH Let them not pass, neighbours. Here’s [indicating his wound] bloodshed drawn upon one of the King’s officers.

CONSTABLE Take away their weapons. – [to Black Will and the King] And since you are so hot, I’ll set you where you shall be cool enough.

BLACK WILL Zounds, the moon’s a waning harlot; with the glimpse of her light I lost his point and mistook my ward. He’d ne’er broached my blood else.

CONSTABLE [to the King] Pray sir, what are you?

KING I am the King’s man, sir, and of his guard.

CONSTABLE More shame you should so much forget yourself, For, as I take’t, ’tis parcel of your oath As well to keep his peace as guard his person, And if a constable be not present by, You may as well as he his place supply; And seeing ye so neglect your oath and duty, –

goodman See 53n.

172 King’s … fighting No known act or proclamation exists with this title, hence the lower case ‘a’; as Somerset suggests, ‘the King’s act’ probably just means King Henry’s method of fighting (see 174n.).

174 neither … knee To aim beneath the knee was considered bad form in broadsword fighting due to the small size of the shield.

176 brown bills a kind of halberd used by footsoldiers and watchmen (OED). Different types of bill (see 62 SDn.) were painted different colours.

177 chance-meddle i.e. ‘chance-medley’, the name properly applied to the act of killing in self-defence (see Tomlins, Law Dictionary). I retain Q1’s spelling on the basis that the mispronunciation is typical of the watchmen’s speech.

178 Set on Either set upon them, i.e. break up the fight, or set about your task, i.e. call the Constable.

179 firk beat, trounce (OED v. 4a); cf. H5: ‘I’ll fer him, and firk him, and ferret him’ (4.4.28-9)

180 Zounds an abbreviation of the oath ‘by God’s wounds’

181 one … officers i.e. himself (see 200)

182 hot agitated, angry; playing upon the coolness (and relative calm) of the Counter prison (see 2.3). Cf. Fool Upon Fool: ‘nay saies the King, are yee so hot, clap him fast’ (F1’).

183 I’ll … enough Cf. Tilley, H391: ‘To cool one’s heels’.

184 harlot rogue, rascal; strumpet

185 point i.e. of the sword

186 mistook my ward struck the wrong defensive position (OED ward, n. 2 8a)

187 broached my blood drawn blood, by piercing the flesh (OED broach v. 1 4c)

188 Co. 118.
[to the men of the Watch] Go bear them to the Counter presently. —
There shall ye answer for these misdemeanours.

2 WATCH  He’s broke my head, sir, and furthermore it bleeds.

CONSTABLE  Away with them both. They shall pay thee well ere they come forth, I warrant thee.

BLACK WILL  I beseech ye, sir.

KING  Never entreat, man; we shall have bail, I doubt it not. — But, Master Constable, I hope you’ll do me this favour: to let one of your watchmen go of an errand for me, if I pay him?

CONSTABLE  With all my heart, sir; [indicating the Cobbler] here’s one shall go.

KING [to the Cobbler]  Hold thee, good fellow, [handing him money] here’s an angel for thee. Go thy way to Baynard’s Castle and ask for one Brandon, he serves the Duke of Suffolk; and tell him his bedfellow, or the great stag of Baydon, this night is clapped i’th’ Counter, and bid him come speak with me. — Come, Constable, let’s go. — [to the Cobbler] Sirrah, make haste.

[Exeunt all but the Cobbler.]

COBBLER  I warrant you, sir, an this be all, I’d have done it for half the money. Well, I must enquire for one Brandon, and tell him the great stag of Baydon is i’th’ Counter. By'r lady, I doubt they be both crafty knaves, and this is some watchword between them. By th’ mass, I doubt he ne’er came well by his money, he’s so liberal. Well, I’ll forward. [Exit.]

[2.2]

Enter BRANDON and COMPTON.

BRANDON  Sir William, are you sure it was at Gracechurch his majesty appointed we should meet him? We have been there and missed him. What think ye, sir?

COMPTON  Good faith, I know not.
His highness is too venturous bold, my lord;
I know he will forsake himself in this,
Opposing still against a world of odds.

198 the Counter the Wood Street Counter in Cheapside; a debtors’ prison which dealt also with small-scale public misdemeanours

201-2 They … thee See Duties of Constables: ‘if any such officer, or other person conning on his [the constable’s] part, doe take hurt, he shall have good remedie by action against him that did the hurt’ (15; cited in Somerset).

209 angel See 1.4.211n.
Baynard’s Castle See 1.4.364n.

210 he … Suffolk a ploy to disguise Brandon’s true identity, since Brandon was himself the Duke of Suffolk
bedfellow close friend, intimate

clothed imprisoned; cf. 2H6: ‘let them be clapped up close’ (1.4.50)

215 doubt suspect (see also 216)
they Brandon and the (disguised) King watchword See 73n.
By th’ mass a mild oath. See t.n. for probable pronunciation of ‘by th’’.

217 liberal free in giving, generous (OED adj. 1a)

2.2 Location: City of London, perhaps near Gracechurch Corner or Baynard’s Castle.

5 venturous vent’rous; willing to take risks, disposed to dangerous activity

6 forsake himself i.e. ‘to shed his dignity as a king’ (Somerset)

a … odds Cf. 1H6: ‘While he, renowned noble gentleman, / Yield up his life unto a world of odds’ (4.3.78).
[Enter COBBLER.]

BRANDON
Good faith, 'tis true. But soft, here comes one. --
How now, good fellow, whither goest thou?

COBBLER
It lies in my authority, sir, to ask you that question, for I am one of the King's watch, I can tell ye.

COMPTON
Then perhaps thou canst tell us some tidings. Didst thou not see a good, lusty, tall, big-set man pass through your watch tonight?

COBBLER
Yes, sir, there was such a man came to our watch tonight, but none that passed through, for he behaved himself so that he was laid hold on quickly, and now he is forthcoming in the Counter.

BRANDON
And whither art thou going?

COBBLER
Faith, sir, he's given me an angel to do an errand for him at Baynard's Castle, to one Brandon that serves the Duke of Suffolk. He says he is his bedfellow, and I must tell him the great stag of Baydon is i'th Counter.

BRANDON
If thine errand be to Brandon, I can save thee a labour, for I am the man thou lookest for; we have been seeking him almost all this night. Hold thee, [handing him money] there's an angel for thy news. I'll bail him, I warrant thee.

Exeunt [Brandon and Compton].

COBBLER
I thank you, sir, but he's not so soon bailed as you think, for there's two of the King's watch has their heads broke, and that must be answered for. But all's one to me; let them shuffle as they will. The angels have flown about tonight, and two gulls are light into my hands, and these I'll keep. Let him get out as he can.

Exit.

[2.3]

Enter the KING [in disguise, and the PORTER] in prison.

KING
Ho, porter! Who's without there?

PORTER
What's the matter now? Will ye not go to bed tonight?
KING [aside]

No, trust me, 'twill be morning presently,
And I have hope I shall be bailed ere then.
[to the Porter] I prithee, if thou canst, entreat some of the prisoners to keep
me company a pair of hours or so, and we'll spend them i'th' rouse of healths,
and all shall be my cost. Say, wilt thou pleasure me?

PORTER If that will pleasure ye, sir, ye shall not want for company. Here's
enough that can tend it; they have hunger and ease enough at all times.

KING There's a couple of gentlemen in the next room. I prithee let them
come in, [handing him money] and there's a Harry sovereign for thee.

PORTER I thank you, sir. I am as much beholden to you as to King Harry
for it.

Exit.

KING Ay, I assure thee thou art. Well, Master Constable, you have made the
Counter this night the royal court of England's King, and by my crown, I swear,
I would not for a thousand pounds 'twere otherwise.
The officers in cities, now I see,
Are like an orchard set with several trees,
Where one must cherish one, rebuke the other.
And in this wretched Counter I perceive
Money plays fast and loose, purchases favour,
And without that, naught but misery.
A poor gentleman hath made complaint to me:
'I am undone,' quoth he, 'and kept in prison,
For one of your fellows that serves the King,
Being bound for him, and he neglecting me,
Hath brought me to this woe and misery.'
Another citizen there is complains
Of one belonging to the Cardinal,
That in his master's name hath taken up
Commodities valued at a thousand pounds;

3-7 An example of Rowley's verse/prose hybridity
(see pp. 186-7); in this instance, to distinguish
King Henry's aside. See also 14-35, where the
transition marks the point at which King Henry
speaks as ruler rather than commoner.
6 i'th' … healths in drinking and toasting
7 pleasure satisfy
9 'enough plenty (i.e. of prisoners); see t.n. for
likely pronunciation
10 tend it see to it
11 Harry sovereign a gold coin first minted in
England during Henry VII's reign, originally
worth 22s 6d
14-15 Well … King See pp. 79-80 and McMillin
(106) on the possible (re-)use of stage space.
16 a thousand pounds Proverbial (Dent, T248.1).
19 i.e. not all can be favoured at any one time
rebuoke check, repress
21 money … loose i.e. changes hands quickly and
for dishonest purposes; see Tilley, P401: 'to
play fast and loose'. Cf. Every Man Out: 'they
play fast and loose with a poor gentleman's
fortunes to get their own' (1.2.96-7).
25 For because of
one … King Possibly, this is Rooksby (see
3.2.101-63), in which case the 'poor gentle-
man' at 23 may be Hopkins (3.2.106).
26 bound bonded, as surety for debt
30-1 taken up commodities a common abuse used
by moneylenders to escape the usury laws
(Somerset). A commodity was an article pur-
chased on credit from a moneylender.
The payment being deferred hath caused him break,
And so is quite undone. Thus kings and lords, I see,
Are oft abused by servants’ treachery.

Enter the [Keeper and Porter with Black Will and] Prisoners.

[aside] But whist a while, here come my fellow prisoners.

1 Prisoner Where’s this bully grig, this lad of life, that will scour the Counter with right Rhenish tonight? O sir, you are welcome.

KING I thank ye, sir. Nay, we’ll be as great as our word, I assure ye. – Here, porter, [handing him money] there’s money; fetch wine, I prithee. – Gentlemen, you cannot be merry in this melancholy place; but here’s a lad has his heart as light as his purse. – [to 1 Prisoner] Sirrah, thou art some mad slave, I think, a regular companion: one that uses to walk o’ nights, or so. Art thou not?

1 Prisoner Hark i’thine ear. Thou’rt a good fellow?

KING I am right born, I assure thee.

1 Prisoner King Harry loves a man, and thou a woman. Shall I teach thee some wit? And tell thee why I met thee here? I went and set my lime down? And tell thee why I met thee here? I went and set my lime

32 break to become bankrupt

33 undone ruined, destroyed

34 abused taken advantage of

34 SD1 PRISONERS It seems as least three men enter here: the two men designated 1 and 2 Prisoner in SPs and another mate character (or characters), to whom (along with 2 Prisoner) King Henry addresses 100-7.

35 Perhaps spoken as prose rather than verse as the King prepares to get back into character.

36 bully jolly, admirable (OED adj.1 1; earliest recorded use of this sense in 1689)

36 grig possibly a cricket or grasshopper (OED n.1 4), as in the phrase ‘as merry as a grig’, or possibly a dwarf (n.1 1), i.e. an ironic joke, given King Henry’s stature

37 scour refresh

38 right good, wholesome; Somerset suggests undiluted, in this context

38 Rhenish wine produced in the Rhine region

38 as great … word Cf. Dent, W773.1: ‘to be as good as one’s word’.

41 has … purse cares little about the consequences of his actions. Perhaps a corruption of the proverb ‘a heavy purse makes a light heart’ and ‘a light purse makes a heavy heart’ (Tilley, P655 and P659).

42 regular perfect (Somerset)

42 companion i.e. in trade, lifestyle

42 one … nights See 1.4.359n, night-walkers.

42 or so or the like

44 Hark i’thine ear listen closely; ‘i’thine’ possibly pronounced ‘ethen’ (see t.n.)

45 good fellow See 2.1.82n.

46 King … man See 2.1.133n.

47 wit piece of trickery

47-8 lime-twigs twigs smeared with birdlime for catching birds; used figuratively here to mean traps, snares. Cf. Sir Thomas Wyatt: ‘Catch Fools with Lime-twigs dipt with pardons’ (4.1.50).

49 Coombe Park about a mile away from Kingston-on-Thames in Surrey; the scene of numerous highway robberies (Sugden)

50 watch ambush

51 contrary name false or fabricated name; or possibly the name of another

52 lay … seek me As Somerset notes, this was common practice; see Compter’s Commonwealth: ‘if the hews and Cries come too hotly after them, [they] instantly [get] themselves arrested into one of the Compters, and lie there while the matter cools’ (58).

52 heat’s See ‘heat’ at 2.1.113.

53 lustily vigorously, energetically (OED adv. 2); in pleasurable pursuits

32-35 after 35 in Elze, Somerset. Keeper and Porter with Black Will and this edn. 35 come{] (comes) 39, 41 SD1 this edn 42 one] (won) that om. Qq2-4 o’] (a) 44 i’thine] (ethen) thou’rt] (that) fellow?] Somerset; fellow. Q1 46-53 Elze: Q1 lines woman: / wit? / here? / think / pound, / Parke: / ladye, / persons: / me, / counter, / me, / libertine, / lustily, / Bullie? / 47 met] meet Qq3-4, Elze 49 there was] there Q3a, ther’s Qq3b-4 50 one] (won) me my Somerset 51 i’th’[ (eth); in the Elze ne’er] (here) 52 o’er] (ore) 53 likest] (liketh)
KING An excellent policy.
I PRISONER But mum, no words; use it for yourself, or so.
BLACK WILL When ‘tis at highest, ’twill fall again. Come; hands, hands.
[They shake hands.]
BLACK WILL I’ll shake hands with thee because thou carriest a sword and buckler, yet thou’rt not right cavalier: thou knowest not how to use them; thou’st a heavy arm.
KING Ay, a good, smart stroke.
BLACK WILL Thou cuttest my head indeed, but ’twas no play; thou layest open enough, I could have entered at my pleasure.
KING Nay, I have stout guard, I assure ye.
BLACK WILL Childish to a man of valour. When thou shouldst have borne thy buckler here, thou lettest it fall to thy knee; thou gavest me a wipe, but ’twas mere chance. But had we not been parted, I had taught ye a little school-play, I warrant ye.
BRANDON [Knocks and calls from within.] What ho, porter! Who keeps the gates there?
PORTER Who knocks so fast?

Enter BRANDON and COMPTON hastily.

COMPTON Stand by, sirrah.
PORTER Keep back, I say. Whither will ye press amongst the prisoners?
BRANDON Sirrah, to the court, and we must in.
PORTER Why, sir, the court’s not kept i’th Counter today.
BRANDON Yes, [pointing to the King] when the King is there. –

All happiness betide our sovereign.

55 mum, no words Cf. ‘mumbudget’ (2.1.112 and n.). See also Tilley, W767: ‘no word but mum’.
57 forget, i.e. ‘I forget’. On the common omission of ‘I’ after oaths, see Abbott, no. 400.
59 Clap hands shake hands to call a truce; cf. H5: ‘clap hands and a bargain’ (5.2.130-1)
60 My blood’s up to be in a state of anger
61 fall either subside or gush, as from a wound
63 cavalier a gentleman trained to arms (n.); or gallant, valiant (adj.)
65 smart neat, precise; causing pain
68 stout undaunted, vigorous (OED adj. 3a) guard posture of defence
70 here Perhaps accompanied by appropriate action.
72 school-play swordsmanship as learned in a fencing academy (Somerset)
73 SD within i.e. off stage, from within the back-stage tiring-house. Q3’s ‘without’ was presumably intended to mean ‘from outside of the prison cell’; the emendation does little to clarify the action.
75 Cf. R.J. ‘Who knocks so hard?’ (3.3.79).
77 press barge or push in
80-2 Cf. King and Cobbler: ‘When of a sudden several of the Nobles came into the Celler … presently he [the cobbler] knew him to be the King’ (B2).
BLACK WILL  Zounds! King Harry!
1 PRISONER  Lord, I beseech thee, no!
BLACK WILL, PRISONERS [They kneel.]  We all entreat your grace to pardon us.

KING
Stand up, good men. –  [Black Will and the Prisoners rise.]
Beshrew ye, Brandon, for discovering us,
We shall not spend our time so well this month.
But there’s no remedy now, the worst is this: –
The court, good fellows, must be removed the sooner;
Ye all are courtiers yet. –  [to 1 Prisoner] Nay, nay, come forward,
Even now you know we were more familiar.
You see, policies hold not always current;
I am found out, and so I think will you be.
Go, porter, let him be removed to Newgate;
This place, I see, is too secure for him.
We’ll send you further word for his bestowing.

1 PRISONER  I beseech your grace.

KING  There’s no grace in thee, nor none for thee.
–  Go, away with him.


BLACK WILL  [aside]  Zounds, I shall to Tyburn presently.

KING  Gentlemen, you that have been wronged by my servants and the Cardinal’s shall give me nearer notes of it, both what they are, and how much debt they owe ye.
Send your petitions to the court to me,
And doubt not but you shall have remedy.
[Hands them money.] There’s forty angels; drink to King Harry’s health, And think, withal, much wrong kings’ men may do,
The which their masters ne’er consent unto.

2 PRISONER  God bless your majesty with happy life,
That thus respects your woeful subjects’ grief.

82 Zounds] (Sonnets): ‘Swoons Elze; Swoons Somerset 84 SP] this edn; All 81 Q1 84, 85 SDD] this edn 85-8] this edn; prose in Q1 89-90] prose in Elze, Somerset 90 SD] this edn; opp. 90 | Elze subst. 92 hold| (holds) 98] Somerset; Q1 lines ‘thee’ / him / There’s] There is Elze Go om. Elze SD | opp. 98 Exeunt| (Exit) 1] this edn Prisoner Prisoners [Elze 99 SD] this edn Zounds] (Sonnets): ‘Swoons Elze; Swoons Somerset 100-2] Elze lines by / give / it / ye. / 100 Gentlemen] The gentlemen Elze you] om. Elze 105 SD] this edn 106 kings’] (Kings); king’s Elze 107 ne’er] (nere) 108 SP] Both Pris. | Somerset
84 *SP  Altered from Q1’s ‘All.’, which would indicate that Brandon, Compton and the King also speak these words. I interpret ‘All.’ to mean ‘all the prisoners’, though it is possible that the Porter and Keeper also join in.
85-8 *Q1 presents these lines as prose; however, the King, speaking once again as monarch, seems to assert his dominance by speaking in verse.
86 Beshrew curse, the devil take discovering discov’ring; revealing, exposing us Presumably the King uses ‘us’ to mean ‘our plot’, ‘our scheme’.
91 Even e’en
92 policies … current i.e. not even the best-laid plans hold sway
94 Newgate a prison for both debtors and felons, located at the corner of Newgate Street and Old Bailey, just inside the City of London
95 secure comfortable
96 bestowing imprisonment
98 grace in the first sense, virtue; in the second, favour
99 Tyburn a place of public execution
101 nearer notes more specific information
105 drink … health Cf. King and Cobbler: ‘With that he call’d for a large Glass of Wine, and drank to the Cobler the King’s good Health’ (B2’).
109 grief hardship, suffering; possibly intended to rhyme with ‘life’ (cf. 1.2.336-7).
KING

BLACK WILL By th’ Lord, your majesty’s the best sword-and-buckler man in Europe; ye lie as close to your wards, carry your point as fair, that no fencer comes near ye for gallant fence-play.

KING Nay, now ye flatter me.

BLACK WILL ’Fore God, ye broke my head most gallantly.

KING Ay, but ’twas by chance, ye know. But now your head’s broke, you look for a plaster, I am sure.

BLACK WILL An your grace will give me leave, I’ll put it up and go my ways presently.

KING Nay, soft, sir; the keeper will deny ye that privilege. Come hither, sirrah. Because ye shall know King Harry loves a man, and I perceive there’s some mettle in thee, [handing him money] there’s twenty angels for thee. Marry, it shall be to keep ye in prison still, till we have further use for ye. If ye can break through watches with egress and regress so valiantly, ye shall do’t amongst your country’s enemies.

BLACK WILL The wars, sweet king! ’Tis my delight, my desire, my chair of state; create me but a tattered corporal, and give me some pre-eminence over the vulgar hotshots. An I beat them not forward to as brave attempts, and march myself i’th’ vanguard, as e’er careered against a castle wall, break my head in two places more and consume me with the mouth of a double culverin. I’ll live and die with thee, sweet king.

KING ’Twill be your best course, sir. – Go, take him in. When we have need of men, we’ll send for him.

BLACK WILL God bless your majesty; I’ll go drink to your health.
KING
Be gone, sir. –
Exit [Black Will].
Keeper, I thank you for our lodging; nay, indeed I do. I know, had ye known us, it had been better. Pray tell the constable that brought us hither we thank him, and commend his faithful service. – [to Brandon and Compton]
Gentlemen, let’s hear from you. – And so, good morrow, keeper.
[Hands him money.] There’s for my fees; discharge the officers, And give them charge that none discover us Till we are past the City. In this disguise we came, We’ll keep us still and so depart again. Once more, good morrow; you may now report Your Counter was one night King Henry’s court.
Away, and leave us. –
Exeunt [Keeper and Prisoners].
Brandon, what further news?
BRANDON
The old King of France is dead, my liege, And left your sister Mary a young widow.
KING
God forbid, man! What, not so soon, I hope! She has not yet been married forty days. Is this news certain?
BRANDON
Most true, my lord.
KING
Alas, poor Mary, so soon a widow, Before thy wedding robes be half worn out; We must then prepare black funeral garments too. Well, we will have her home; the league is broke, And we’ll not trust her safety with the French. Charles Brandon, you shall go to France for her; See that your train be richly furnishèd, And if the daring French brave thee in attempts

136-47 *Again, it appears the King switches from prose to verse as he moves from a conversational tone of gratitude to one of leadership and authority. discover us reveal our identities. The … France i.e. King Louis XII. This dates the scene to soon after January 1515. forty days The marriage in fact lasted eighty-two days (Holinshed, 835). we … home According to Holinshed (836), the King let Lady Mary decide whether or not to return to England; Brandon (among others) was sent to conduct her home at her own request. Here, Rowley’s narrative follows more closely that of Stow: ‘king Henry sent agayne for his syster’ (174b). we will I follow Elze in expanding Q1’s ‘weele’ for better scansion of the verse. Since the word ‘weele’ was used also in the following line, it is likely the elision was a result of eyeskip on the part of the compositor. the … broke Although the league was initially set up on the occasion of Lady Mary’s marriage, King Louis’s death did not mark its end; a new league was set up with King Francis almost immediately (Holinshed, 836). This league was not broken until 1519, at which time Bonnivet and Paris travelled to London (as in 1.1). Compression of time on Rowley’s part complicates the historical narrative. furnished equipped; lavishly dressed brave challenge.
Of honour, barriers, tilt and tournament,
So to retain her, bear thee like thyself,
An Englishman, dreadless of the proudest,
And highly scorning lowly hardiness.

BRANDON
I shall, my sovereign, and in her honour
I’ll cast a challenge through all the court,
And dare the proudest peer in France for her.

KING
Commend me to the Lady Katherine Parr;
Give her this ring, tell her on Sunday next
She shall be queen, and crowned at Westminster,
And Anne of Cleves shall be sent home again. —
Come, sirs, we’ll leave the City and the Counter now;
The day begins to break, let’s hie to court,
And once a quarter we desire such sport.

Exeunt.

[3.1]

Enter the Cardinal [WOLSEY] reading a letter,
and BONNER [and GARDINER] in their bishops’ robes.

WOLSEY [to Bonner]
My reverend Lord of London,
Our trusty friend the King of France is dead,
And in his death our hopes are hinderèd.
The Emperor, too, mislikes his praises,
But we shall cross him for’t, I doubt it not,
And tread upon his pomp imperial
That thus hath wronged the English cardinal.
BONNER

Your grace’s letters, by Campeius sent,  
I doubt not but shall work your full content.

WOLSEY

Ay, that must be our safest way to work;  
Money will make us men, when men stand out.  
The bastard Frederick, to attain the place,  
Hath made an offer to the cardinals  
Of threescore thousand pounds, which we will pay  
Three times thrice double ere we lose the day.

Enter WILL SUMMERS and PATCH.

PATCH

Come, cousin William, I’ll bring ye to my Lord Cardinal presently.

WILL SUMMERS

I thank ye, cousin, and when you come to the court, I’ll bring you to the King again. Ye know, cousin, he gave ye an angel.

PATCH

Ay, but he gave me such a blow o’th’ ear for it, as I care not for coming in’s sight again while I live.

WOLSEY


WILL SUMMERS

I thank your grace. I heard say your lordship had made two new lords here, and so the two old fools are come to wait on them.

BONNER

We thank ye, William.

PATCH

Your lordship will be well guarded an we follow ye, the King’s fool and the Cardinal’s, and we are no small fools, I assure ye.

WILL SUMMERS

No, indeed. My cousin Patch here is something too square to be set on your shoe; marry, an you’ll wear him on your shoulder, the fool shall ride ye.

WOLSEY

A shrewd fool, Bonner. – Come hither, William, I have a quarrel to you since our last rhyming.

WILL SUMMERS

About your fair leman at Charlton, my lord? I remember.

BONNER

You speak plain, William.

WILL SUMMERS

Ye never knew fool a flatterer, I warrant ye.

8 letters Rowley’s source here may have been Foxe: ‘the Cardinall … sought all means to displease the Emperour wryting very sharply unto him many menacing letters’ (901).

9 content intention

10 Ay] (I) 14 pounds] (pound) 19 Ay] (I) 23 heard] (hard)

11 Money … men Cf. Tilley, M1076: ‘money makes the man’.

12 Frederick Fred’rick. There is no evidence of this name in the chronicles; as Somerset notes, ‘the name is very probably Rowley’s invention’.

13 presently immediately

23-4 two new lords i.e. Bonner and Gardiner, the newly created bishops

27 we … fools Cf. Dent, Exclusive, F506.11: ‘To be (think oneself) no small fool’. ‘Small’ here means inconsiderable, though Summers puns on the alternative meaning (= of little size) in the following line.

28 square stoutly and strongly built (OED adj. 4)

29 set … shoe Probably a pun on the name ‘Patch’ (see 2.1.31).

29-30 the … ye ‘your folly will master you’ (Somerset). Cf. Cupid’s Whirligig: ‘I thinke the Foole rides you’ (H1) and Tim: ‘There’s the fool hangs on your back already’ (2.2.55-6).

30 leman lover. Wolsey is thought to have had numerous mistresses; cf. H8: ‘I’ll startle you / Worse than the sacring-bell when the brown wench / Lay kissing in your arms, lord Cardinal’ (3.2.294-6).

33-4 plain to the point (OED adv.1 3)

34 Charlton an area of south-east London
WOLSEY    Well, Will, I’ll try your rhyming wits once more: what say you to this?
        The bells hang high,
            And loud they cry;
        What do they speak?
WILL SUMMERS    If you should die,
            There’s none would cry,
    Though your neck should break.
WOLSEY    You are something bitter, William. But come on, once more I am for ye:
        A rod in school,
            A whip for a fool,
    Is always in season.
WILL SUMMERS    A halter and a rope,
            For him that would be Pope,
    Against all right and reason.
WOLSEY    He’s too hard for me still; I’ll give him over. – Come, tell me, Will, what’s the news at court?
WILL SUMMERS    Marry, my lord, they say the King must be married this morning.
WOLSEY    Married, Will? To whom, I prithee?
WILL SUMMERS    Why, to my Lady Katherine Parr. I was once by when he was wooing on her, and then I doubted they would go together shortly.
WOLSEY    Holy Saint Peter, shield his majesty,
        She is the hope of Luther’s heresy;
    If she be queen, the Protestants will swell
        And Cranmer, tutor to the Prince of Wales,
    Will boldly speak ’gainst Rome’s religion. –
        [to Bonner and Gardiner] But bishops, we’ll to court immediately,
    And plot the downfall of these Lutherans.
    You two are tutors to the Princess Mary;
        Still ply her to the Pope’s obedience
    And make her hate the name of Protestant.
    I do suspect that Latimer and Ridley,

46-8  Proverbial; reprinted (along with 49-51) in A Pleasant History (C1). Rowley’s is the earliest recorded version of the proverb (see Tilley, W305).
46  rod cane
49  halter noose
52  hard quick, skilful
58  doubted suspected
59  Saint Peter See 1.3.43n.
61  swell increase in number and power
66  tutors ... Mary Unhistorical; presumably intended to highlight their extreme religious positions.
67  ply urge, counsel; ‘to convince of the correctness’ of a particular opinion or position (OED v. 5a)
69  Latimer Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester before the Reformation and later chaplain to King Edward VI; burned at the stake during Queen Mary’s reign.
        Ridley Nicholas Ridley, who became Bishop of London after Bonner. Like Latimer, Ridley was burned at the stake during the Marian persecutions.

Chief teachers of the fair Elizabeth,  
Are not sound Catholics, nor friends to Rome;  
If it be so, we’ll soon remove them all:  
’Tis better they should die, than thousands fall. 

Come, follow us.  

[Exeunt all but Will Summers and Patch.] 

WILL SUMMERS Your lord’s mad, till he be at the wedding; ’twas marvel the King stole it so secretly and ne’er told him on’t. But all’s one; if he be married, let him play with his queen tonight, and then tomorrow he’ll call for me. There’s no fool to th’ wilful still. What shall we do, cousin? 

PATCH I’ll go get the key of the wine-cellar, and thou and I’ll keep a passage there tonight. 

WILL SUMMERS We have but a little wit between us already cousin, and so we should have none at all. 

PATCH When our wits be gone, we’ll sleep i’th’ cellar, and lie without our wits for one night. 

WILL SUMMERS Content, and then i’th’ morning we’ll but whet them with another cup more, and they’ll shave like a razor all day after. Come close, good coz, let nobody go with us lest they be drunk before us, for fools are innocents, and must be accessory to no man’s overthrow.  

Exeunt. 

[3.2] 

Sound trumpets. 

Enter KING, QUEEN KATHERINE, Cardinal [WOLSEY], SEYMOUR, DUDLEY, [and] GREY. 

Enter COMPTON, crying ‘hautboys!’.

KING 

Welcome, Queen Katherine, seat thee by our side; Thy sight, fair queen, by us thus dignified. –
Earls, barons, knights and gentlemen,
Against ye all we’ll be chief challenger,
To fight at barriers, tilt and tournament,
In honour of the fair Queen Katherine.

QUEEN KATHERINE
We thank your highness and beseech your grace,
Forbear such hazard of your royal person;
Without such honours is your handmaid pleased
Obediently to yield all love and duty
That may beseem your sacred majesty.

KING
God-a-mercy, but where are our children,
Prince Edward, Mary and Elizabeth,
The royal issue of three famous queens?
How haps we have not seen them here today?

DUDLEY
They all, my liege, attend your majesty
And your fair queen, so within the presence here.

KING
'Tis well, Dudley. – Call Cranmer in,
He is chief tutor to our princely son
For precepts that concern divinity.

Enter CRANMER.

And here he comes. – Cranmer, you must ply the Prince;
Let his waste hours be spent in getting learning,
And let those linguists for choice languages
Be careful for him in their best endeavours.
Bid Doctor Tye ply him to music hard;
He’s apt to learn, therefore be diligent:
He may requite your love when we are gone.

CRANMER
Our care and duty shall be had, my lord.

KING
We thank ye.
I tell thee, Cranmer, he is all our hopes,
That what our age shall leave unfinishèd

to any character on stage and would not necessarily have required an exit on their part.

4 barriers … tournament See 2.3.161n.
8 Forbear dispense with (OED v. 4a)
9 hazard of danger to
10 handmaid female attendant or servant; an expression of Queen Katherine’s subservience
14 three famous queens Jane Seymour, Katherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn, respectively.
18 Somerset, focussing on the punctuation of Q1 (see t.n.), offers a different interpretation of the line, whereby Dudley is the one asked to fetch Cranmer; however, the task could have fallen to any character on stage and would not necessarily have required an exit on their part.
19 chief tutor unhistorical; see LR 16n.
20 precepts instruction, guidance
21 ply urge, compel (to study hard)
22 waste spare
24 careful full of care
26 apt fit, prepared
30-2 Cf. Hardyng, in which hope is expressed that Edward ‘maie finishe and mainteigne that whiche his noble father … hath moste graciously begonne’ (f. Cxlvi²).
In his fair reign shall be accomplisèd.
Go and attend him. –

[Exit Cranmer.]

Enter WILL SUMMERS [with petitions].

How now, Will Summers, what’s the news with you?

WILL SUMMERS I come to bid thee and thy new queen good morrow. –

Look to him, Kate, lest he cozen thee; provide civil oranges enough, or he’ll have a leman shortly.

QUEEN KATHERINE God-a-mercy, Will, thou’lt tell me then, wilt thou not?

WILL SUMMERS Ay, and watch him too, or let him ne’er trust me. – But dost hear, Harry, because I’d have thee have the poor’s prayers, I have brought thee some petitions. The friars and priests pray, too, but I think ’tis as children say grace, more for fashion than devotion; therefore the poor’s prayers ought to be soonest heard, because they beg for God’s sake. Therefore, I prithee, dispatch them.

KING Read them, Seymour.

SEYMOUR [Takes the petitions and reads.] The humble petition of the Lady Seaton for her distressed son, that in his own defence, unhappily hath slain a man.

KING The Lady Seaton, God’s holy mother,
Her son has had our pardon twice already
For two stout subjects that his hand hath slain.

WILL SUMMERS An any had said so but thou, Harry, I’d have told him ’a lied: he ne’er killed but one; thou killedst the tother, for an thou hadst hanged him for the first, the two last had been alive still.

KING The fool tells true: they wrong our majesty
That seek our pardon for such cruelty.
Away with it.

WILL SUMMERS Give me it again; it shall ne’er be seen more, I assure ye.
An I had known ’t had come for that purpose, it should ne’er have been brought for Will, I warrant ye.
This other comes from two poor prisoners i’th’ Counter.  

We know the inside, then; come, *taking the petitions* give them me. –  

Lord Cardinal, *handing him a petition* here’s one is dedicated to you. How! Read it. Who’s there? – Compton, enquire for Rooksby, a groom of the wardrobe, and bring him hither.

Cardinal, what find ye written there?  

Mine own discredit, and the undoing of an honest citizen by a false servant.

’Tis not your fool, my lord, I warrant ye.

I thought so; I knew ’twas one of your knaves, for your fools are harmless.

Well said, Will. Thou lovest thy master’s credit, I know.

Ay, Kate, as well as any courtier he keeps. I had rather he should have the poor’s prayers than the Pope’s.

Faith, I am of thy mind, Will. I think so too.

Take heed what ye say, Kate. What, a Lutheran?

’Tis heresy, fair queen, to think such thoughts.

And much uncharity to wrong the poor.

Well, and when the Pope is at best, he is but Saint Peter’s deputy, but the poor present Christ and therefore should be something better regarded.

Go to, fool.

Sirrah, you’ll be whipped for this.

Would the King would whip thee and all the Pope’s whelps out of England once, for between ye, ye have racked and pulled it so, we

---

60 two … Counter Possibly these are the same two men mentioned at 2.3.23-33.

61-4 Another example of Rowley’s verse–prose hybridity, prompted in this instance by the action concerning the petitions.

61 the inside i.e. the contents

62 dedicated addressed

How! an exclamation to attract attention. Q2’s ‘hold’ also works in context, but the emendation is unnecessary.

63 Who’s there? who is named?

67-8 the undoing … servant Likely the second of the two prisoners referred to by the King in 2.3 (see 2.3.28-33).  

70 *This edn follows Elze in altering Q1’s question mark to a full point; thus Wolsey answers Summers’s question rather than poses another. The exclamation mark in Somerset has the same effect.

71-2 I knew … harmless Perhaps a corruption of Tilley, F446: ‘better be a fool than a knave’.

73 credit honour, reputation

80-1 when … Christ Rowley contrasts the Roman Catholic and Protestant views regarding the position of the clergy; Summers propounds the Lutheran doctrine that any man may represent Christ’s priesthood.

81 present represent something somewhat

85 whelpa term applied depreciatingly to the offspring of a noxious creature

86 racked inflicted with suffering. Also with reference to the rack, an instrument of torture on which victims were stretched; the pun continues with ‘pulled’, itself perhaps a pun on ‘polled’ (= cheated, robbed; OED poll v. 5a).
shall be all poor shortly. You have had four hundred threescore pounds within this three year for smoke-pence; you have smoked it i’faith. – Dost hear, Harry? Next time they gather them, let them take the chimneys and leave the coin behind them: we have clay enough to make brick, though we want silver mines to make money.

KING
Well, William, your tongue is privileged.

WOLSEY [to the King]
But my good liege, I fear there’s shrewder heads, Although kept close, have set this fool a-work
Thus to extirp against his Holiness.

WILL SUMMERS Do not you think so, my lord, nor stomach nobody about it.
Ye know what the old proverb says, therefore be patient:
Great quarrellers small credit wins,
When fools set stools and wise men break their shins.
Therefore think not on it. – For I’ll sit down by thee, Kate, and say nothing, for here comes one to be examined.

Enter COMPTON and ROOKSBY.

KING O sir, you’re welcome. Is your name Rooksby?
ROOKSBY Your poor servant is so called, my lord.
KING Our servant we guess ye by the cloth ye wear, but for your poverty ‘tis doubtful, your credit is so good. Let’s see, what’s the man’s name?
[Looks at the petition.] Ha! Hopkins. Do you know the man?
ROOKSBY Hopkins? No, my lord.
KING Had you never no dealings with such a man?
ROOKSBY No, if it like your majesty.
KING No, if it like our majesty? Saucy varlet!
It likes not our majesty, thou shouldst say no;

87 four hundred threescore twenty-four thousand
88 smoke-pence See 1.3.39-40n.
smoked squandered, wasted (OED smoke v. 13), with an obvious pun on ‘smoke-pence’
91 want lack
silver … money Presumably a topical allusion to King James’s payments throughout 1604 to search for gold and silver (Somerset).
92 your … privileged Summers is ‘protected by the customary licence given the tongue of a fool’ (Hotson, 64).
93 shrewder more malevolent; Q1’s spelling (see t.n.) may give some indication of pronunciation
95 extirp speak abusively against (OED v. 4). A non-standard definition in OED, ‘perhaps arising from a misunderstanding of the phrase “the extirping of the Bishop of Rome”’.
his Holiness the Pope. It is unclear whether Clement VII or Paul III is intended; possibly ‘his Holiness’ is intended simply to refer to the figurehead of the Roman Catholic Church rather than to any specific individual.
96 stomach incite, anger (OED v. 4)
98-9 Only the second of these two lines is recorded in Tilley and Dent (F543), where When You See Me is named as the source of the proverb.
104 cloth livery
105 credit reputation, position
106 Hopkins Presumably a name fabricated by Rowley.
109 like please
110-14 Lineation in Q1 is uncertain here; this edn sets the King’s opening line as prose, but 111-14 as verse. This is in keeping with other examples in the play where speech shifts into verse at times when King Henry’s authority comes to the fore.
110 varlet menial, groom; knave, rogue (OED v. 1a, 2a)
It likes us not thou liest, for that we know.
You know him not, but he too well knows you,
And lies imprisoned, slave, for what’s thy due.

ROOKSBY    Sure some envious man hath misinformed.

KING
Durst thou deny it still, outfacing knave?
Mother o’ God, I’ll hang thee presently!
Sirrah, ye lie, and though ye wear the King’s cloth,
Yet we dare tell ye so before the King.
Slave, thou dost know him!
He here complains he is undone by thee,
And the King’s man hath caused his misery.
Yet you’ll outface it still, deny, forswear
And lie, sir? Ha!

WILL SUMMERS    Not a word more, if thou loves thy life, unless thou’lt confess all, and speak fair.

ROOKSBY    I do beseech your grace.

KING
Out, perjured knave! What, dost thou serve the King,
And durst thou thus abuse our majesty
And wrong my subjects by thy treachery?
Think’st thou, false thief, thou shalt be privileged,
Because thou art my man, to hurt my people?
Villain, those that guard me shall regard mine honour.
Put off that coat of proof, that strong security
Under which ye march, like a halberdier
Passing through purgatory, and none dare strike;
A sergeant’s mace must not presume to touch
Your sacred shoulders with the King’s own writ.
God’s dear lady, does the cloth ye wear
Such privilege and strong prevention bear?
Ha! Is’t, Rooksby?

Enter a MESSENGER in haste.

115 envious malicious, spiteful (OED adj. 2)
116 misinformed imparted misleading information
117 presently immediately
123-4 outface … deny … forswear … lie The words are all synonymous here.
125-6 Cf. 1.4.103-4: ‘now … again’.
128 perjured guilty of having committed perjury, i.e. the act of swearing the truth of a statement which one knows to be false
132 ‘thou art’ The metre here demands expansion of Q1’s ‘thart’.
133 Either ‘Villain’ is hypermetrical or this line, like 134, is a hexameter.
134 coat of proof the livery or ‘cloth’ (118) which acts also as Rooksby’s security
135 halberdier a soldier or civic guard armed with a halberd (a weapon combining the properties of spear and battle-axe)
136 purgatory the place of purification in Roman Catholic theology; more generally, prison: ‘a place of temporary suffering’ (OED n. 2). Rooksby, like a prison guard, is afforded a certain protection.
137-8 A … shoulders Arrest, as Somerset notes, was formally effected by touching the shoulder of the criminal with hand or mace; see the ‘shoulder-clapper’ reference in CE (4.2.37-8).
138 mace a heavy staff or club
138 writ i.e. the writ of privilege; the authority to deliver a privileged person from custody (OED n. 3c (b))
140 prevention protection from punishment

115 Sure] Surely Elze 116 Durst] (Durst) 117 o’] (a) 120 dost] (doest) 123-4] Somerset; single verse line in Q1
128] (doest) 129 durst] (darst) 132 thou art] Elze; that is Q1 133 mine] my Qq2-4, Elze 135 halberdier] (halbertere)
137 sergeant’s] (Seriants) 141 Is’t] (ist); is it Elze 3D Elze; after 142 Q1
MESSENGER My royal lord —

KING Take that [striking him], and know your time to tell your message. Sirrah, I am busy. [Exit messenger.]

WILL SUMMERS So, there’s one served. I think you would take two more with all your heart, so you were well rid on him.

ROOKSBY [to the King] Your pardon, good my liege.

KING Ha! Pardon thee? I tell thee, did it touch thy life in aught more than mine own displeasure, not the world should purchase it. Vile caitiff, hadst thou neglected this thy duty to our person’s danger, hadst thou thyself against me aught attempted, I might be sooner won to pardon thee Than for a subject’s hateful injury.

QUEEN KATHERINE Let me entreat your grace to pardon him.

KING Away, Kate, speak not for him; Out of my lenity I let him live. — Discharge him from my cloth and countenance To the Counter to redeem his creditor, Where he shall satisfy the utmost mite Of any debt, default or hindrance. I’ll keep no man to blur my credit so; My cloth shall not pay what my servants owe. Away with him. — Exeunt [Rooksby and Compton].

WOLSEY Yes, my good lord, your grace hath shown a pattern to draw forth mine by. I assure your highness, The punishment inflicted on your man Is meant for my servants that bear such minds; Their masters thus but serve them in their kinds.

142 *SP I follow Elze in assigning this line to the messenger rather than to Rooksby. The address seems a likely prompt for King Henry’s impulsive action and the wording at 143 suggests that the messenger had indeed begun to ‘tell [his] message’.

145 served struck; dealt with

148-53 The intended lineation of this passage is difficult to gauge. While this edn follows Q1 in setting the speech (minus the final couplet) as prose, it is possible that verse was intended, with the King’s ‘Ha! Pardon thee?’ forming a shared verse line with Rooksby’s plea at 147.

148 touch affect

149 purchase gain, acquire (i.e. the King’s pardon)

Vile The modern form of Q1’s archaic ‘vild’; cf. ‘vilest’ at 5.1.144.

caitiff wretch, villain

156 lenity mercifulness

157 countenance sight, presence; maintenance (OED n.4 11)

158 redeem deliver, in both a literal and moral sense

159 satisfy pay off

mite any insignificant amount (OED n.2 1b)

default absence or lack, in this case of money

hindrance injury, damage; probably pronounced ‘hinderance’ to fit the metre

160 blur Cf. 1.2.253 and see n.

162 cloth employment in King Henry’s name

165 SD *and Compton Q1’s ‘Exit’ only indicates that Rooksby should leave at this point, but it is perhaps more likely that he exits accompanied by another. Since Compton does not speak again in this scene, and since Compton was the one tasked with fetching Rooksby, he is the most likely candidate.

165-9 A rare occasion where Wolsey’s speech moves from prose to verse, much in the manner of King Henry’s.

165 shown a pattern set an example

166 mine i.e. Wolsey’s man, as named in the petition

169 serve … kinds ‘treat them as they treat others’
KING [to Will Summers] Where’s this fellow now that brings this news?  
WILL SUMMERS He is gone with a flea in his ear, but he’s left his message behind with my Lord Dudley, here.

KING [to Dudley] And what’s the news?

DUDLEY Duke Brandon, my liege —

KING Oh, he’s returned from France; And who comes with him?

DUDLEY His royal wife, my lord.

KING Ha! Royal wife? Who’s that?

DUDLEY Your highness’ sister, the late Queen of France.

KING Our sister queen, his wife? Who gave him her?

GREY ’Tis said they were married at Dover, my liege.

KING ’Twere better he had never seen the town. Dares any subject mix his blood with ours Without our leave?

Enter BRANDON and [LADY] MARY.

DUDLEY He comes himself, my liege, to answer it.

BRANDON Health to my sovereign.

KING And our brother king: Your message is before ye, sir. — Off with his head!

BRANDON I beseech your grace, give me leave.

KING Nay, you have taken leave. — Away with him. Bid the captain of our guard convey him to the Tower.

---

170 this fellow i.e. the messenger (see 141-4)  
171 He … ear Cf. Tilley, F354: ‘To send one (To go) away with a flea in his ear’.

173-6 *Although Q1 does not habitually indicate shared verse lines, the King’s words at 174-5 are split over two lines. Shared lines in this edn are allocated accordingly.

178 Who … her? King Henry was in fact aware of Brandon’s desire to marry Lady Mary and granted permission on condition that ‘the duke should bring her into England unmarried, and … marrie hir in England’ (Holinshed, 836).

179 they … Dover The couple were actually wed in secret in Paris.

184 sovereign suv’reign

186 leave permission and thus forgiveness. The King plays on the fact that Brandon has already ‘taken leave’.

188 Likely spoken as prose. While 187 is altered to verse in this edn, the metrical regularity breaks down in the second line of the King’s speech.
BRANDON
    Hear me, my lord.

KING
    Audacious Brandon, think'st thou excuse shall serve?

LADY MARY
    Right gracious lord —

KING
    Go to, your prayers will scarce save yourself. 
    Durst ye contract yourself without our knowledge? — 
    Hence with that hare-brain duke to the Tower, I say, 
    And bear our careless sister to the Fleet. — 
    [to Brandon] I know, sir, you broke a lance for her, 
    And bravely did unhorse the challengers; 
    Yet was there no such prize set on her head 
    That you, without our leave, should marry her.

QUEEN KATHERINE
    O my lord, let me entreat for them.

KING
    Tut, Kate, though I seem a while to threaten them, 
    I mean not to disgrace my sister so. — 
    Away with them. — What say ye, lords:
    Is he not worthy of death for his misdeed?

DUDLEY, GREY
    Unless your grace shall please to pardon him.

KING
    He deserves it then?

DUDLEY, GREY
    He does, my liege.

KING
    You are knaves and fools, and ye flatter me. 
    God’s holy mother, 
    I’ll not have him hurt for all your heads. —

190 excuse apology
192 prayers pleas
scarce scarcely (possibly the intended reading, 
given that the line is metrically short)
contract bind in marriage
hare-brain used as an adjective, i.e. hare-brained (= reckless, heedless)
careless thoughtless, negligent; perhaps also carefree
the Fleet a prison by the side of the River Fleet in London; 
typically a place of reception for prisoners committed by the Star Chamber
broke a lance ‘entered into competition’ (OED break v. 3). Cf. 1H6: ‘Break a lance / And run a-tilt at death’ (3.2.49-50).

197 unhorse throw from a horse in battle; in a more general sense, outwit
let ... them This highlights the extent of Rowley’s anachronistic narrative: Henry married Queen Katherine nearly thirty years after the marriage of Brandon and Lady Mary.
Tut an expression of impatience or dissatisfaction
disgrace put out of royal favour (OED v. 3)
202 lords lords: / heads: / prose in Somerset
207 knaves and fools Cf. Dent, F506.1: ‘to be both fool and knave’.

Dear Brandon, I embrace thee in mine arms. –
[to Lady Mary] Kind sister, I love you both so well,
I cannot dart another angry frown
To gain a kingdom. Here, take him, Mary,
I hold thee happier in this English choice
Than to be Queen of France. – [to Brandon] Charles, love her well.
And tell on, Brandon, what’s the news in France?

BRANDON

The league is broke betwixt the Emperor
And the young King of France; forces are mustering
On either part, my lord, for horse and foot.
Hot variance is expected speedily;
The Emperor is marching now to Landersey,
There to invade the towns of Burgundy.

KING

God and Saint George, we’ll meet his majesty,
And strike a league of Christian amity. –
[to Wolsey] Lord Cardinal, you shall to France with speed,
And in our name salute the Emperor;
We’ll give direction for your embassage.
The next fair wind shall make us France to greet,
Where Charles the Emperor and King shall meet. 

Exeunt omnes.

[4.1]
Enter CRANMER [and] Doctor TYE, [followed by] young BROWNE,
[who] meets them with the Prince’s cloak and hat.

CRANMER    How now, young Browne, what have you there?
BROWNE     The Prince’s cloak and hat, my lord.
CRANMER    Where is his grace?
BROWNE     At tennis, with the Marquess Dorset.

210 1 … arms Possibly a cue for action, though perhaps just a figure of speech.
213 To … kingdom Perhaps a corruption of the proverb ‘for a kingdom any law may be broken’ (Tilley, K90); cf. The Scornful Lady: ‘I would not kisse thee of a month to gaine / A Kingdome’ (5.2.110-11).
214 happier disyllabic
217-22 King Henry sided with the Emperor in war against France three times: in 1518 (when Maximilian I was Emperor) and in 1525 and 1543-4 (when Charles V was Emperor); as Somerset notes, Rowley conflates aspects of all three wars in this passage (see Holinshed, 839, 891 and 960).
218 the … France Francis I
219 either part both sides
220 Hot characterized by intense activity or danger (OED adj. 9a)
221 variance disyllabic; conflict, change
222 Landersey a French town, north-east of Paris
223 his majesty Emperor Charles V
224 strike set up
225-7 A reference to Wolsey’s journey to Calais in 1522 to make peace between King Francis and the Emperor (see Holinshed, 870).
228-9 This suggests, unhistorically, that King Henry, too, travelled to France to meet the Emperor. Presumably ‘King’ here does not mean Henry personally but rather his representative in the person of Wolsey.
4.1 Location: the King’s residence or the Prince’s lodging (referenced at 5.1.30). On the musical performances of this scene, see pp. 83-4.
CRANMER
You and the Marquess draw the Prince’s mind
to follow pleasure and neglect his book,
For which the King blames us. But credit me,
you shall be soundly paid immediately.

BROWNE
I pray ye, good my lord, I’ll go call the Prince away.

CRANMER
Nay, now ye shall not. – Who’s within there, ho?

[Enter SERVANT.]

SERVANT
My lord?

CRANMER
Go bear this youngster to the chapel, straight,
And bid the Master of the Children whip him well. –
[to Browne] The Prince will not learn, sir, and you shall smart for it.

BROWNE
O good my lord, I’ll make him ply his book tomorrow.

CRANMER
That shall not serve your turn. Away, I say. –

[Exeunt [Browne and Servant].

TYE
’Tis true, my lord, and now the Prince perceives it,
As loath to see him punished for his faults,
Plies it of purpose to redeem the boy.
But pray, my lord, let’s stand aside awhile
And note the greeting ’twixt the Prince and him.

[Enter BROWNE, crying, and WILL SUMMERS.]

CRANMER
[aside to Tye] See where the boy comes, and the King’s fool with him;
Let’s not be seen, but list their conference.

7 credit believe
8 soundly thoroughly, severely (OED adv. 3b)
paid punished, dealt with; Somerset highlights the pun with ‘credit’
12 straight straight away
13 Master … Children the man responsible for the musical tuition of the Children of the Chapel
14 Perhaps spoken as prose rather than as a hexameter line.
smart suffer in a general sense, but here ‘sting’ (from the whip’s lashes)
15 ply apply oneself to (OED v. 2 1a)
16 serve your turn make recompense
17 this policy i.e. of punishing Browne for the Prince’s neglect
21 the fearful boy Browne
22 breech buttocks
25 haunt follow, shadow
25 *Plies Q1’s reading ‘plays’ makes less sense in context; it is possible that the MS here read ‘ply(e)s’.
29 Let’s … seen Possibly making use of the Fortune’s stage posts to conceal themselves. Elze directs Tye and Cranmer to leave the stage here (see t.n.), but the indication is rather that they remain visible to the audience.
list eavesdrop
WILL SUMMERS  [to Browne] Nay, boy, an ye cry you’ll spoil your eyesight.  
         Come, come, truss up your hose,  
         You must hold fast your wind,  
         Both before and behind,  
         And blow your nose.  
BROWNE  For what, fool?  
WILL SUMMERS  Why, for the mote in thine eye, is there not one in’t?  
         Wherefore dost thou cry else?  
BROWNE  I prithee, Will, go call the Prince from the tennis court.  
WILL SUMMERS  Dost thou cry for that? Nay, then I smell a rat: the Prince  
         has played the truant today, and his tutors have drawn blood of thy buttocks  
         for’t. Why, boy, ‘tis honourable to be whipped for a prince.  
BROWNE  I would he would either leave the tennis court and ply his book,  
         or give me leave to be no courtier.  
WILL SUMMERS  Ay, for I’ll be sworn thy breech lies i’th’ hazard about it.  
         But look, little Ned; yonder he comes.  

Enter the PRINCE and the young MARQUESS with their rackets,  
[a SERVANT and] diverse attending.  

MARQUESS [to the Servant]  Some rubbers for the Prince.  
SERVANT  Here, my good lord.  
PRINCE  One take our rackets and reach me my cloak. –  
         By my faith, Marquess, you are too hard for me.  
MARQUESS  Your grace will say so, though ye overmatch me.  
PRINCE  Why, how now, Browne, what’s the matter?  
BROWNE  Your grace loiters, and will not ply your book, and your tutors  
         have whipped me for it.

30 [truss] tie up  
31 hold fast keep from getting away  
32 before and behind i.e. in front (by talking) and behind (by breaking wind). Cf. CE: ‘A man may break a word with you, sir, and words are but wind; / Ay, and break it in your face, so he break it not behind’ (3.1.75-6).  
36 mote speck of dust. Cf. KJ: ‘there were but a mote in yours, / A grain, a dust, a gnat, a wandering hair’ (4.1.91-2).  
39 I … rat Proverbial (Tilley, R31).  
44 hazard each of the winning segments of a tennis-court (OED n. 6); here, as Somerset suggests, ‘the pun plays upon the strokes which are driven at the hazard’. Cf. H5: ‘We will … play a set / Shall strike his father’s crown into the hazard’ (1.2.263-4).  
45 SD  The entrance here may be simultaneous with Summers’s line 45; possibly the Prince and Marquess enter at the words ‘But look’, followed by the servant and attendants at the end of Summers’s line. Alternatively, Summers responds to an offstage noise, such as the boys’ voices, allowing him to pre-empt the Prince’s entrance.  
45.2 diverse A permissive SD that could indicate any number of men. Since in this edn the speaking role of the servant is listed separately, I have (for the purposes of the doubling chart in Appendix 3b) assumed the presence of another two attendants; however, several other actors would have been available at this point in the scene should the company have required more men.  
48 rubbers OED suggests that ‘rubber’ in this context applies to a final decisive game (n.2 1b); however, this does not appear to be Rowley’s intended meaning. Rather, ‘rubbers’ appears to suggest ‘towels’ or some other form of stage property that the servant hands to the Prince at 47. See OED n.1 2b.  
49 hard skilled, talented. Cf. 3.1.52.  
50 overmatch o’ermatch; surpass, outshine
PRINCE Alas, poor Ned, I am sorry for it; I'll take the more pains, and
entreat my tutors for thee. Yet in truth, the lectures they read me last night
out of Virgil and Ovid I am perfect in; only I confess I am something behind
in my Greek authors.

WILL SUMMERS
And for that speech,
They have declined it
Upon his breech.

PRINCE [to Browne] And for my logic, thou shalt witness thyself I am perfect,
for now will I prove, that though thou wert whipped for me, yet this whipping
was good for thee.

MARQUESS I'll hardly believe you, my lord, though Ramus himself should
prove it. Well, proba.

PRINCE Mark my problem:
Bona virga facit bonum pu erum;
Bonum est, te esse bonum puerum:
Ergo, bona virga res bona est.

And that’s this, Ned: a good rod makes a good boy; ’tis good that thou
shouldst be a good boy: ergo, therefore, a good rod is good.

WILL SUMMERS Nay, by’r lady, the better the rod is, it’s the worse for him,
that’s certain. – [to Browne] But dost hear me, boy? Since he can prove a
rod to be so good, let him take’t himself next time.

PRINCE [to Browne] In truth, I pity thee, and inwardly I feel the stripes thou
beardest, and for thy sake, Ned, I’ll ply my book the faster. In the meantime,
 thou shalt not say, but the Prince of Wales will honourably reward thy service.

Come, Browne, kneel down. [Browne kneels.]

WILL SUMMERS What, wilt thou knight him, Ned?

PRINCE I will. My father has knighted many a one that never shed drop of
blood for him, but he has often for me.
WILL SUMMERS  O, brave! He looks like the mirror of knighthood already.

Enter COMPTON.

COMPTON    Clear the presence, gentlemen. The King is coming.

PRINCE    The King? – [to the Servant] God’s me, reach me my book; call my tutors in. – Come, Browne, I’ll confirm thy knighthood afore the King.  

MARQUESS    Here be your tutors, my lord, and yonder the King comes.

Enter the KING [and Attendants].

PRINCE    Health to your majesty.

KING    God-a-mercy, Ned. Ay, at your book so hard? ’Tis well, ’tis well. – Now, Bishop Cranmer and good Doctor Tye, I was going to the gallery, and thought to have had your scholar with me; but seeing you’re so busy, I’ll not trouble him. – Come on, Will, come; go you along with me. What make you among the scholars here?

WILL SUMMERS    I come to learn my qui quae quod  
To keep me from the rod.  
Marry, here’s one was whipped in pudding time, for he has gotten a knighthood about it. Look, old Harry, does he not look more furious than he was wont?

KING    Who, Will, young Browne? God’s Mary mother, his father is a gallant knight as any these south parts of England holds.

WILL SUMMERS    He cannot compare with his son, though; if he were right Donsal Delphoebus, or the very Knight of the Sun himself, yet this knight shall unhorse him.

KING    When was he made a knight, Will?
WILL SUMMERS Marry, i’th last action; I can assure you, there was hot service, and some on ’em came so near him, they had like to smelt on’t. But when all was done, the poor gentleman was pitifully wounded in the back parts, as may appear by the scar, if his knightship would but untruss there.

KING But who knighted him, William?

WILL SUMMERS That did Ned here; and he has earned it too, for I am sure this two year he has been lashed for his learning.

KING Ha! How? Come hither, Ned. Is this true?

PRINCE It is, my lord, and I hope your highness will confirm my deed.

KING Confirm it? God’s holy mother, what shrewd boys are these! Cranmer and Tye, do ye observe the Prince? – Now by my crown, young Ned, thou hast honoured me; I like thy kingly spirit that loves to see Thy friends advanced to types of dignity. – Young knight, come hither; what the Prince hath done We here confirm: be still, Sir Edward Browne. – But hear ye, Ned, now you have made him knight, You must give him some living, or else ’tis nothing.

WILL SUMMERS Ay, by my troth, he is now but a knight under forma papris, for a knight without living is no better than an ordinary gallant.

KING Well, what will ye give him, Ned?

PRINCE When I have heard of something that may do him good, I will entreat your majesty for him, and in the meantime from mine own allowance I’ll maintain him.

KING ’Tis well said; but for your sake, son Edward, we’ll provide for him. – Cranmer, see presently a patent drawn, wherein we will confirm to him from our Exchequer a thousand marks a year.

BROWNE I thank your majesty, and as I am true knight, I’ll fight and die for ye.

WILL SUMMERS Now if your tutors come to whip ye, you may choose whether you’ll untruss by th’order of arms.

104 action battle (OED n. 7); it was common for soldiers to be knighted for heroism
105 hot characterized by intensity of feeling or by pain and discomfort (OED adj. 8a, 9). Cf. CE: ‘When I am cold, he heats me with beating’ (4.4.30-1).
106-7 back parts backside, buttocks
107 knightship a form of address, predating the first recorded use in OED (1694)
108 he i.e. Browne
110 shrewd cunning (OED adj. 13a)
111 thou hast elided, as thou’st
112 dignity honourable office or rank
113 living income
114 forma papris ‘Forma pauperis’ is a Latin term meaning ‘in the character or manner of a pauper’; a legal formula whereby a person without means could place himself under the protection of a patron. I retain Q1’s reading on the basis that it is more likely to represent Summers’s colloquial or inaccurate rendering of the expression. Somerset additionally notes a pun on papris in its suggestion of Browne as a mere ‘paper-knight’.
128 maintain sustain, support
131 Exchequer an office of state concerned with the administration of royal revenues
135 by … arms by the law of arms, in combat
KING [to the Prince]  Well, Ned, see ye ply your learning, and let’s have no more knights made in this action. – Look to him, Browne; if he loiter, his tutors will have you up for’t.

BROWNE I hope, my lord, they dare not whip me now.

KING By’r lady, sir, that’s doubtful.

WILL SUMMERS If they do, he shall make thee a lord, and then they dare not.

KING Well, Cranmer, we’ll leave ye. When your pupil has done his task ye set him now, let him come and visit us. – On, gentlemen, into the gallery.

PRINCE Heaven keep your majesty. – [Exeunt the King, Compton and Attendants.]


TYE Good morrow to your grace.

PRINCE Good morrow, tutors, at noon? ’Tis good even, is it not?

CRANMER We saw not your grace today.

PRINCE O ye quip me cunningly for my truantship, that I was not at my book today; but I have thought of that ye read last night, I assure ye.

WILL SUMMERS If they do, he shall make thee a lord, and then they dare not.

CRANMER I hope your excellence can answer me in that axiom of philosophy I propounded to ye.

PRINCE I promise ye, tutor, ’tis a problem to me, for the difference of your authors’ opinions makes me differ in mine own. Some say omne animal est, aut homo, aut bestia, that every living creature is or man or beast.

WILL SUMMERS Then a woman’s a beast, for she’s no man.

PRINCE Peace, William, you’ll be expulsed else. – And again, some authors affirm that every beast is four-footed.

WILL SUMMERS Then a fool’s no beast, for he has but two.

PRINCE Yet again, Will.

WILL SUMMERS Mum, Ned, no words; I’ll be as still as a small bagpipe.

CRANMER Omne animal est, aut homo, aut bestia, and thus ’tis proved, my lord:

Omne animal est rationale, vel irrational; Homo est rationalis, bestia irrationalis:
Ergo, omne animal homo est, vel bestia.

138 have you up call you to account 141 he Prince Edward 144 Heaven hea’en
146 Good morrow … even Cf. Tilley, M987: ‘the first minute after noon is night’. The earliest record of the proverb dates from 1633.
148 quip make sarcastic remarks 152 axiom principle, maxim
155-6 omne … bestia Latin, translated by the Prince later in the same line.
156 or either (see also 168) 157 a woman’s … man Cf. Phoenix: ‘Their wenches, I mean, sir; for your worship knows those that are under men are beasts’ (4.10-11).
158 expelled expelled
162 Mum … words Cf. Tilley, W767: ‘no word but mum’; see also 1 Prisoner’s words at 2.3.55.
as still … bagpipe Somerset plausibly suggests that a small bagpipe refers to a bagpipe without any air in it; cf. Tilley, B34: ‘he is like a bagpipe, he never talks till his belly is full’. ‘Bagpipe’ was also used figuratively to mean an inflated and senseless talker, a windbag (OED n. 4a).
164-6 Omne … bestia Latin, meaning: ‘every animal is either rational or irrational. Man is rational; beasts irrational. Therefore every animal is either man or beast’ (Somerset); loosely translated by Cranmer at 167-74.
’Mongst all the creatures in this universe,
Or on the earth or flying in the air,
Man only reason hath; others only sense.
So what is only sensual is not man
But beast, for man both sense and reason hath.
So every creature, having one of these,
Is sure or man or beast, and so all beasts
Are not four-footed.

WILL SUMMERS That’s certain: a louse has six.
CRANMER I beseech your grace.
PRINCE Away, William.
WILL SUMMERS Not a word more, as I am William.
CRANMER For many beasts have wings serving instead of feet, and some
have horns, of which we thus esteem: animal cornutum non habet dentes
supremos; no horned beast hath teeth above the roof.
WILL SUMMERS That’s a lie: a cuckold has.
PRINCE Thrust the fool out of the presence, there.
WILL SUMMERS Well, cedant arma togae; the scholars shall have the fool’s place.
Exit. 185

PRINCE Well, Cranmer, you have made me able to prove a man no beast, if
he prove not himself so; we’ll now leave this. And now resolve me for divinity.
Cranmer, I love ye, and I love your learning; speak, and we’ll hear ye.
God give ye truth that you may give it me.
This land, ye know, stands wavering in her faith
Betwixt the Papists and the Protestants;
You know we all must die, and this flesh
Part with her part of immortality.
Tutor, I do believe both heaven and hell;
Do you know any third place for the soul’s abode
Called purgatory, as some would have me think?
For from my sister Mary and her tutors
I have oft received letters to that purpose.

167  this universe: the earth, as the abode of mankind (OED universe n. 4a; first recorded in 1630)
169  Cf. Valiant Welshman: ‘Beasts onely are the subjects of bare sense: / But man hath reason and intelligence’ (H4).
Man only: none but man
170  sensual: disyllabic; endowed with the faculty of sensation
172  every: ev’ry
180-1  animal … supremos: Latin, translated by Cranmer later in the same speech. Although the specific source of this passage is unknown, numerous parallels can be found in Aristotle’s De Partibus Animalium (Parts of Animals); see in particular III. ii and iii, 661a-4a.
181  roof: i.e. of the mouth
184  cedant arma togae: Latin, meaning: ‘let arms yield to the toga’, i.e. let violence give way to the law. The expression, deriving from Cicero’s De Officiis (I.77), appears in several texts of the period.
186-200 *The Prince, like the King elsewhere in the play, moves between prose and verse; the medium is dictated largely by the rhythm of the text, as well as by Q1’s original layout.
187  resolve: determine, settle; used here with double object, as per OED v. 17b
190  wavering: wav’ring
192  Metrically short; perhaps spoken with a pause after the caesura.
we … die: Cf. Tilley, M505: ‘all men must die’ and D142: ‘death is common to all’.
193  her … immortality: the soul
194  heaven: hea’en
198  I have elided, as I’ve
I love ye, Cranmer, and shall believe whate’er ye speak. Therefore, I charge ye, tell the truth.

CRANMER How thinks your grace? Is there a place of purgatory, or no?

PRINCE Truly, I think none. Yet must I urge to you what’s laid to me. This world, you know, hath been five thousand years still increasing, still decreasing, still replenished; how long it will be, none knows but He that made it. We all do call ourselves God’s children, yet sure some are not. But think ye, tutor, that the compass of that heaven and hell is able to contain those souls so numberless, that ever breathed since the first breath was given, without a tertium or a third place?

CRANMER

Who puts these doubts within your grace’s head

Are like their own belief, slight and unregarded,

And is as easily answered and confuted:

*Quod est infinitum, non habet finem;*
*Caelum est opus Dei, opus Dei est infinitum:*
*Ergo, Caelum est infinitum.*

That which is infinite hath no end at all,

For that eternity, that everlasting essence,

That did concord heaven, earth and hell to be,

Is of Himself all infinite. That heaven and hell are so,

His power, his works and words do witness it,

For what is infinite hath in itself no end;

Then must the heavens, which is His glorious seat,

Be incomprehensible containing Him.

Then what should need a third place to contain

A world of infinites so vast and main?

202-8 *These lines scan as verse only with much elision and the introduction of some short verse lines. It is possible, as per Somerset (see t.n.), that the Prince’s speech was intended as a combination of verse and prose.

202 urge press upon

laid told, put forward (OED lay v.1 26a). Q3’s ‘said’ also makes sense, but this reading perhaps came about as a result of the compiler’s misreading of ‘I’ as long ‘s’, rather than as a deliberate act of emendation.

203 five thousand years A common belief; cf. Calvin, *Institution of Christian Religion*; ‘there is lyttell more than fiue thousande yeaeres passed sins the creation of the worlde’ (III.xxi, f. 240v).

204 replenished ‘fully or abundantly stocked’ (OED adj. 2a)

205 We ... not Drawing on the Calvinist doctrine of predestination, whereby only God’s elect could achieve salvation.

206 compass extent, space (OED n.1 8a)

208 tertium Cf. Tarlton’s News: ‘yes my good brother, there is *Quoddam tertium* a third place that all our great grandmothers haue talke of’ (3).

210 slight unimportant, unsubstantiated

212-14 Latin, meaning: ‘Whatever is infinite has no end. The universe is the work of God; the work of God is infinite. Therefore the universe is infinite’ (Somerset). Cranmer’s exposition of the argument (215-24) may take something from Thomas Aquinas’s Commentary on Aristotle’s *De caelo*; see especially I.22: ‘Whether the universe is infinite by eternal duration’.

217 concord create, fashion

heaven hea’en, as at 218

218 A rare heptameter line; perhaps the reason for Somerset’s rendering of the speech (excluding 221-4) as prose. It is possible that Cranmer speaks in prose here; however, given the clear scanse of the majority of these lines, the lineation of Q1 is retained in this edn.

221 heavens hea’ens

222 incomprehensible boundless, limitless

224 main of great size (OED adj. 2a)
PRINCE

I thank ye, Cranmer, and do believe ye. What other proofs have been maintained to me, Or shall be, you shall know and aid me in them. Enough for this time. –


TYE

In music may your grace ever delight, Though not in me; music is fit for kings, And not for those knows not the chime of strings.

PRINCE

Truly, I love it, yet there are a sort, Seeming more pure than wise, that will upbraid at it, Calling it idle, vain and frivolous.

TYE

Your grace hath said, indeed they do upbraid That term it so, and those that do are such As in themselves no happy concords hold; All music jars with them, but sounds of good. But would your grace a while be patient, In music’s praise, thus will I better it. Music is heavenly, for in heaven is music; For there the seraphins do sing continually, And when the best was born, that ever was man, A choir of angels sang for joy of it. What of celestial was revealed to man Was much of music. ’Tis said the beasts did worship, And sang before the deity supernal; The kingly prophet sang before the Ark, And with his music charmed the heart of Saul;

226 proofs beliefs set forth as truths maintained put forward, contended; cf. ‘laid’ (202)
229-30 Both metrically short and presumably spoken with a pause after the initial caesura.
233 chime musical concord (OED n.1 5). This slightly predates the earliest recorded use in 1608.
235 pure Applied mockingly to Puritans (OED adj. 4a); as Somerset notes, one of the things the Millinery Petitioners asked for in 1603-4 was reformation of music in church. upbraid censure, find fault with
237-40 Cf. MV: ‘The man that hath no music in himself, / Nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds, / Is fit for treasons, stratagems and spoils’ (5.1.83-5).
239 concords agreement, harmony; with a pun on concord as the opposite of discord, dissonance
240 jars falls with harsh effect (OED jar v.1 4)
sounds of good perhaps sermons and prayers heavenly … heaven hea’enly … hea’en seraphins alternative form of ‘seraphim’; the biblical creatures with six wings, seen in Isaiah’s vision (Isaiah, 6.2-3)
the best i.e. Christ ever e’er
celestial trisyllabic; of or pertaining to heaven
the … supernal Revelation, 4.8 speaks of four beasts that ‘ceased not day nor night’ in singing God’s praises.
supernal heavenly, divine
ingly prophet King David, who sang with ‘all the house of Israel’ before the Ark of the Covenant (2 Samuel, 6.5).
with … Saul Cf. 1 Samuel, 16.23: ‘David took an harp and played with his hand, and Saul was refreshed and was eased’.

225 do] I do Elze 228 SD] this edn 228-30] this edn; Q1 lines Tye / ye I; Elze lines time. I then prose; prose in Somerset choir] (Quire)
And if the poet fail us not, my lord,  
The dulcet tongue of music made the stones  
To move, irrational beasts and birds to dance;  
And last, the trumpet’s music shall awake the dead,  
And clothe their naked bones in coats of flesh  
T’appear in that high house of parliament,  
When those that gnash their teeth at music’s sound  
Shall make that place where music ne’er was found.

PRINCE  
Thou givest it perfect life, skilful Doctor;  
I thank thee for the hono...
Yet 'mongst these many strings be one untuned,
Or jarreth low or higher than his course,
Not keeping steady mean amongst the rest,
Corrupts them all: so doth bad men the best.

TYE

Enough, –
Let voices now delight his princely ear.

PRINCE

Doctor, I thank you, and commend your cunning.
I oft have heard my father merrily speak
In your high praise, and thus his highness saith:
England one God, one truth, one doctor hath
For music’s art, and that is Doctor Tye,
Admired for skill in music’s harmony.

TYE

Your grace doth honour me with kind acceptance,
Yet one thing more: I do beseech your excellence
To deign to patronize this homely work,
Which I unto your grace have dedicate.

PRINCE

What is the title?

TYE

*The Acts of the Holy Apostles* turned into verse,
Which I have set in several parts to sing;
Worthy acts,
And worthily in you rememberèd.

PRINCE

I’ll peruse them and satisfy your pains,
And have them sung within my father’s chapel. –
[to Tye and Cranmer] I thank ye both. Now I’ll crave leave a while
To be a little idle. Pray, let our linguists,
French and Italian, tomorrow morn be ready;
I must confer with them, or I shall lose
My little practice. So, good den, good tutors.

Exit.
CRANMER

Health to your highness, God increase your days:
The hope of England, and of learning’s praise.

[Exeunt.]

[5.1]

Enter BONNER[,] and GARDINER reading.

BONNER

What have ye here, my Lord of Winchester?

GARDINER

Heretical and damnèd heresies,
Precepts that Cranmer’s wisdom taught the Prince;
The Pope and we are held as heretics.
What think’st thou, Bonner, of this wavering age?

BONNER

As seamen do of storms: yet hope for fair weather.
By’r lady, Gardiner, we must look about;
Luther hath sown well, and England’s ground
Is fat and fertile to increase his seed.
Here’s lofty plants! What, bishops and prelates?
Ay, nobility temporal! But we shall temper all
At the return of our high cardinal.

GARDINER

Bonner, ’tis true, but in meantime we must
Prevent this rancour that now swells so big
That it must out or break; they have a dangerous head,
And much I fear.

BONNER

What, not the King, I hope?

GARDINER

’Tis doubtful he will bend, but sure
Queen Katherine’s a strong Lutheran; heard ye not

304 hope of England  Cf. 3.2.30: ‘he is all our hopes’.
5.1 Location: Whitehall Palace, the King’s main residence in 1546, at which time Queen Katherine Parr was accused of heresy and treason (see passages from Foxe in Appendix 2).
1 What … here  Cf. Dent, W280.2: ‘What have we here?’.
3 Precepts rules, maxims
5 wavering wav’ring; inconstant in resolution or allegiance
6 As … storms  Cf. Tilley, S908: ‘after a storm comes fair weather’.
7 Gardiner Gard’ner
look about be wary; proverbial (Dent, L427.1).
Cf. the title Look About You.
8 gather head acquire strength
10 fat rich (OED adj. 9a)
increase his seed spread his ideas; continuing the sowing metaphor
11 Here’s lofty plants!  Cf. Tilley, W238: ‘an ill weed grows apace’. ‘Lofty’ is used here to mean both tall and haughty. Possibly, Bonner takes possession of Gardiner’s paper and comments on its contents.
12 temporal secular, lay; as in Lords Temporal
temper control, overrule (OED v. 7), with an obvious pun on ‘temporal’ and ‘temper all’
13 the … cardinal  i.e. Wolsey’s return from France (see 3.2.225-7 and n.)
15 rancour animosity
16 head leader
18 bend submit, yield (OED v. 10)
19 Katherine’s Kath’rine’s
Lutheran Luth’ran
How in presence of the King and Cardinal,  
She did extirp against his Holiness?  

BONNER  
But had our English cardinal once attained  
The high possession of Saint Peter’s chair,  
He’d bar some tongues that now have scope too much.  
’Tis he must do’t, Gardiner, ’tis a perilous thing;  
Queen Katherine can do much with England’s King.

GARDINER  
Ay, Bonner, that’s the sum of all:  
There must be no queen, or the abbeys fall.

[Enter QUEEN KATHERINE, LADY MARY and Attendants.]

BONNER [aside to Gardiner]  
See where she comes with the King’s sister,  
And from the Prince’s lodging; let’s salute her.

GARDINER [to Queen Katherine]  
Good morrow to your majesty.

QUEEN KATHERINE  
Good morrow to my reverend lords of London and of  
Winchester. Saw ye the King today?

BONNER  
His highness was not yet abroad this morning,  
But here we will attend his excellence.

QUEEN KATHERINE [to Lady Mary]  
Come, sister, we’ll go see his majesty.

LADY MARY  
We will attend ye, madam.

QUEEN KATHERINE  
Gentlemen, set forward. – Good morrow, lords.

[Exeunt Queen Katherine, Lady Mary and Attendants.]

GARDINER  
Ill morrow must it be to you or us,  
Conspirators ’gainst men religiöus. –  
Bonner, these Lutherans do conspire, I see,  
And scoff the Pope and his supremacy.

BONNER  
Let’s strike in time, then, and incense the King,  
And suddenly their states to ruin bring.  

[Trumpets sound.]

21 extirp See 3.2.95n.  
22 cardinal card’nal  
23 Saint Peter’s chair See 1.3.43n.  
24 bar prevent, prohibit  
25 Gardiner Gard’ner  
26 Katherine Kath’rine  
27 sum gist, essence  
28 the abbeys fall A reference to the Dissolution  
of the Monasteries (see 5.5.123n.). In reality  
the monasteries were destroyed seven years  
before Queen Katherine’s marriage to King  
Henry.  
34 abroad outdoors  
39 ill wretched; harmful (OED adj. 5, 3a)  
41 Lutherans Luth’rans  
42 scoff deride, mock  
43 in time in timely fashion; at an opportune  
moment  
44 incense provoke, enrage (OED v.² 3b)
The trumpets sound; it seems the King is coming.
We’ll watch and take advantage cunningly.

Enter the KING, QUEEN [KATHERINE], LADY MARY, BRANDON, SEYMOUR, GREY, and DUDLEY.

KING Where’s Brandon?
BRANDON My liege?
KING Come hither, Kate.
BRANDON Did your grace call?
KING I’ll speak wi’ ye anon, I’ll speak wi’ ye anon. – Come, Kate, let’s walk a little. – Who’s there? My lords of London and of Winchester; welcome, welcome. By this your master the Cardinal, I trow, has parted with the Emperor, and set a league between the French and him. Mother of God, I would ourself in person had been there, But Wolsey’s diligence we need not fear. Ha! Think ye he will not?

GARDINER No doubt he will, my lord.

KING Ay, Gardiner, ’twill be his best policy; Their friendship must advance his dignity, If e’er he get the papal governance.

DUDLEY [aside to the other lords] And that will never be, I hope.
SEYMOUR [aside to the other lords] ’Twere pity it should.
GREY [aside to the other lords] He’s proud enough already.
KING Ha! What’s that ye talk there?

BRANDON They say, my lord, he’s gone with such a train As if he should be elected presently.
KING ’Fore God, ’tis a gallant priest! Come hither, Charles; prithee let me lean o’ thy shoulder. – By Saint George, Kate, I grow stiff methinks.

QUEEN KATHERINE Will’t please your highness sit and rest yourself?

45 *King* I follow Elze in emending Q1’s ‘Queene’; only the King’s (and very occasionally the Prince’s and Emperor’s) entrances are marked with fanfares.

46 We’ll watch Yet another possibility for using the Fortune’s stage posts as a means of concealment.

51 *n1k.wi ye Q1’s ‘we’ is perhaps a contracted form of the expression given in Q3: ‘we ye’, adopted in this edn.

anon soon, presently

52 Who’s there? The King’s question is prompted by the sight of Bonner and Gardiner. In walking with Queen Katherine it seems the King inadvertently approaches the part of the stage where the bishops have been hiding.

53 trow presume

54-4 has parted … him See 3.2.225-6.

58 Gardiner Gard’ner

policy course of action

59 advance his dignity Elze’s conjecture, ‘his dignity advance’, is persuasive in that it forms a rhyming couplet with the following line. I have, however, retained Q1’s reading on the basis that the rhyme might not have been intended in this instance.

61-3 SDD Thus Dudley, Seymour, Grey and Brandon talk amongst themselves (see p. 183).

67 gallant showy in appearance; extravagant (OED adj. 1a, 3)

67-8 let … shoulder Cf. HS: ‘Enter KING Henry, leaning on the Cardinal’s shoulder’ (1.2.0.1-2).
KING  No, no, Kate, I’ll walk still; Brandon shall stay mine arm. I’m fat and pursy, and ’twill get me a stomach. Sawest the Prince today, Kate?

QUEEN KATHERINE  Ay, my good lord.

KING  God bless him and make him fortunate. I tell ye, lords, the hope that England hath is now in him. ’Fore God, I think old Harry must leave ye shortly; well, God’s will be done. Here’ll be old shuffling then, ha! Will there not? Well, you say nothing; pray God there be not. I like not this difference in religion. Ay, God’s dear lady, an I live but seven years longer, we’ll take order thoroughly.

BONNER  We hear that Luther out of Germany
Hath writ a book unto your majesty,
Wherein he much repents his former deeds,
Craving your highness’ pardon, and withal
Submits himself unto your grace’s pleasure.

KING  Bonner, ’tis true, and we have answered it,
Blaming at first his haughty insolence
And now his lightness and inconstancy,
That writ he knew not what so childishly.

GARDINER  Much bloodshed there is now in Germany
About this difference in religion,
With Lutherans, Arians and Anabaptists,
As half the province of Helvetia
Is with their tumults almost quite destroyed.

QUEEN KATHERINE  Methinks ’twere well, my royal sovereign,
Your grace, the Emperor and the Christian Kings

70 stay support
71 pursy short of breath (OED adj.1), but also perhaps corpulent, unwieldy (adj.2)
get … a stomach build up an appetite
73-4 the hope … him Cf. 3.2.31-2 and see n.
75 God’s … done Cf. the Lord’s Prayer: ‘Thy will be done’ (Matthew, 6.10).
shuffling evasive dealing or conduct; more generally, change
76 Well … nothing The King evidently waits to see if Queen Katherine responds before speaking these words.
78 take order take steps, set measures for reform
thoroughly See t.n. for likely pronunciation.
79-87 See pp. 52-3 on links between this passage and Grafton’s Abridgement (1562). The King’s answer, published in Latin in 1526, was published in English in 1528.
85 Blaming censuring, condemning
86 lightness fickleness, thoughtlessness
88-92 A reference to the wars of religion in Germany and Switzerland (c. 1529-31) in which Zwingli, leader of the Reformation in Switzerland, was killed.
89 difference diff’rence
90 Lutherans Luth’rans
Arians adherents of the doctrine of Arius (256-336), a presbyter of Alexandria who denied that Christ was of the same essence or substance with God
Anabaptists a sect of Protestantism which grew up in Germany in the early 1520s. Anabaptists rejected the baptism of infants and denied state supremacy over religion.
91 Helvetia Switzerland
94 Emperor Emp’ror
Christian Kings See 1.4.304-5.

Would call a council and peruse the books
That Luther writ against the Catholics
And superstitions of the Church of Rome;
And if they teach a truer way to heaven,
Agreeing with the Hebrew Testament,
Why should they not be read and followèd?

KING    Thou sayest well, Kate. So they agree with the scriptures, I think ’tis lawful to peruse and read them. – Speak, bishops.

GARDINER  Most unlawful, my dear sovereign,
Unless permitted by his Holiness.

QUEEN KATHERINE  How prove ye that, my lord?

KING    Well said, Kate; to them again, good wench. – Lords, give us leave a while; avoid the presence there. –

We’ll hear the bishops and my queen dispute.

[Exeunt all but the King, Queen Katherine, Bonner and Gardiner.]

QUEEN KATHERINE    I am a weak scholar, my lord, but on condition that your highness, nor these reverend lords, will take no exceptions at my woman’s wit, I am content to hold the argument. –

[to Bonner and Gardiner] And first, with reverence to his majesty,
Pray tell me, why would ye make the King believe
His highness and the people under him
Are tied so strictly to obey the Pope?

BONNER    Because, fair queen, he is God’s deputy.

QUEEN KATHERINE    So are all kings, and God himself commands
The King to rule and people to obey,
And both to love and honour him.

96 Catholics trisyllabic
97 superstitions religious observances or ceremonies thought to be of an idolatrous nature
98 heaven hea’en
99 Hebrew Testament the Old Testament
101 So provided that (see Abbott, no.133)
103 sovereign trisyllabic; possibly ‘dear’ is disyllabic
104 his Holiness the Pope

109-11 *A prose–verse transition, prompted in this instance by Queen Katherine’s change of tone and address.

109 I … scholar Cf. 5.4.99: ‘My puny scholarship’.
110 exceptions objection, offence; dissatisfaction (OED exception n. 6a, 6b)

110-11 woman’s wit woman’s intellect. The proverb ‘The wit of a woman is a great matter’ (Tilley, W568) may also be of relevance.
111 hold engage in, undertake
112-15 The argument here highlights the extent of Rowley’s alteration of chronology: the King declared himself supreme head of the Church of England under the Act of Supremacy in 1534, almost nine years before he married Katherine.
112 reverence rev’rence
116 deputy earthly representative
117-19 Cf. Romans, 13.1: ‘the powers that be, are ordained of God’. King James’s coronation sermon was preached upon this text.
But you that are sworn servants unto Rome,
How are ye faithful subjects to the King
When first ye serve the Pope, then after him?

GARDINER
Madam, these are that sect of Lutherans
That makes your highness so mistake the scriptures;
Your slender argument’s thus answerèd:
Before the King, God must be worshippèd.

QUEEN KATHERINE
’Tis true, but pray ye, answer this:
Suppose the King by proclamation
Commanded you and every of his subjects,
On pain of death and forfeit of his goods,
To spurn against the Pope’s authority.
Ye know the scripture binds ye to obey him,
But this I think: if that his grace did so,
Your slight obedience all the world should know.

KING God’s mother, Kate, thou’st touched them there.– What say ye to that, Bonner?
BONNER
Were it to any but her majesty,
These questions were confuted easily.

QUEEN KATHERINE
Pray tell the King, then, what scripture have ye
To teach religion in an unknown language?
T’instruct the ignorant to kneel to saints,
By barefoot pilgrimage to visit shrines,
For money to release from purgatory
The vilest villain, thief or murderer?
All this the people must believe you can,
Such is the dregs of Rome’s religiön.

GARDINER
Ay, those are the speeches of those heretics,
Cranmer, Ridley and blunt Latimer,
That daily rail against his Holiness,
Filling the land with hateful heresies.
QUEEN KATHERINE
Nay, be not angry, nor mistake them, lords;
What they have said or done was mildly followed,
As by their articles is evident.

KING
Where are those articles, Kate?

QUEEN KATHERINE
I’ll go and fetch them to your majesty,
And pray your highness view them graciously.

KING
Go, fetch them, Kate. –

Exit Queen [Katherine].

Ah, sirrah, we have women doctors, now I see!
Mother o’ God, here’s a fine world the whilst,
That ’twixt so many men’s opinions
The holy scriptures must be banded thus.

GARDINER
God grant it breed no further detriment
Unto your crown and sacred dignity.
They that would alter thus religiōn,
I fear they scarcely love your royal person.

KING
Ha! Take heed what you say, Gardiner.

GARDINER
My love and duty to your majesty
Bids me be bold to speak my conscience.
Unless your safety and your life they hate,
Why should they daily thus disturb the state?
To smooth the face of false rebellion,
Proud traitors will pretend religiōn;
For under colour of reformatiōn,
The upstart followers of Wycliffe’s doctrine
In the fifth Henry’s days arose in arms,
And had not diligent care prevented them,
Their powers had suddenly surprised the King.
And, good my liege, who knows their proud intent
That thus rebel against your government?

153 articles fundamental tenets or beliefs
158 Cf. Foxe: ‘A good hearing, quoth he, it is when
Women become such Clerks’ (1132).
doctors teachers, instructors
159 here’s … world Cf. Dent, Exclusive, W872.11:
‘Here’s a good world’.
161 *banded tossed about. Cf. 1.4.119 and see n.
scarcely too little
168 Bids compels, commands (OED bid v. 10)
171 smooth the face disguise, hide the true intent;
cf. 3H6: ‘And smooth the frowns of war with
peaceful looks’ (2.6.32)
KING  
Shrewd proofs, by'r lady; and by Saint Peter,  
I swear, we will not trust their gentleness.  
Speak, Gardiner, and resolve us speedily:  
Who’s the ringleader of this lusty crew?

BONNER  
Unless your highness please to pardon us,  
We dare not speak, nor urge your majesty.

KING  
We pardon what ye speak; resolve us speedily.

GARDINER  
Then if your royal person will be safe,  
Your life preserved and this fair realm in peace,  
And all these troubles smoothly pacified,  
The Queen, dear lord, must be removed from you.

KING  
Ha! The Queen? Bold sir, advise ye well;  
Take heed ye do not wrong her loyalty.

GARDINER  
See here, my liege, are proofs too manifest;  
Her highness with a sect of Lutherans  
Has private meetings, secret conventicles,  
To wrest the grounds of all religion,  
Seeking by tumults to subvert the state,  
The which, without your majesty’s consent,  
Is treason capital against the crown.

BONNER  
And seeing, without the knowledge of your grace,  
They dare attempt these dangerous stratagems,  
’Tis to be feared, which heaven we pray prevent,  
They do conspire against your sacred life.

GARDINER  
Why else should all these private meetings be,  
Without the knowledge of your majesty?

KING  
Mother o’ God, these proofs are probable,  
And strong presumptions do confirm your words. –  
Within there, ho!

180 Shrewd having dangerous or injurious conse-
quences (OED adj. 4)  
proofs arguments  
gentleness outward friendliness  
Gardiner Gard’ner  
resolve determine the facts. The King’s plea is  
repeated at 186.  
lusty insolent, arrogant (OED adj. 6)  
urge advise (OED v. 2a)  
193 proofs evidence  
195 conventicles gatherings, assemblies  
196 wrest distort, pervert (OED v. 6a, 6b)  
199 capital punishable by death (OED adj. 3c)  
201 stratagems devices, schemes  
202 heaven hea’en  
206 probable capable of being proved, demonstr-
able (OED adj. 3)  
207 presumptions suppositions, instinctive feel-
ings  

180 Shrode/berlady  191 Ha/Haw  195 Have/conventicles/conuentickells  206 o’/a
Enter COMPTON [with a letter].

COMPTON
My lord?

KING
Sir William Compton, see the doors made fast;
Double our guard, let none come near our person.
Summon the council to confer with us;
Bid them attend us in the privy chamber.

COMPTON
Here is a letter for your majesty
From Martin Luther out of Germany.

KING
Damnéd schismatic, still will he trouble us
With books and letters. Leave it [taking the letter from Compton] and be gone. –

Exit Compton.

[to Bonner and Gardiner] The villain thinks to smooth his treachery
By fawning speeches to our majesty;
But by my George, lord bishops, if I live,
I’ll root his favourites from England’s bounds.
What writes his worship? [Reads the letter.]

GARDINER [aside to Bonner]
Now, Bonner, stir, the game is set afoot;
The King is now incensed. Let’s follow close
To have Queen Katherine shorter by a head;
These heresies will cease when she is dead.

KING
Holy Saint Peter, what a knave is this!
Erewhile he writ submissively to us,
And now again repents his humbleness. –
Bishops, it seems, being touched with our reply,
He writes thus boldly to our majesty. –
Gardiner, look here. He was deceived, he says, when he thought to find
John Baptist in the courts of princes, or resident with those that are clothed in purple.
Mother o’ God, is’t not a dangerous knave?

210 William disyllabic
210 fast secure
214 a letter written in response to the King’s answer (see 84-7)
216 schismatic one who promotes or countenances schism in the Church
218 smooth cover up, conceal; cf. ‘smooth the face’ at 171
219 fawning flattering
221 root drive, remove (OED v. 1 3a)
favourites trisyllabic
224 bounds boundaries, borders
224 incensed inflamed with wrath, enraged (OED adj. 2 2)
225 Katherine Kath’rine
227 shorter … head i.e. beheaded
228 Erewhile some time ago, formerly
230 Somerset suggests two possible meanings: that Luther was touched (= vexed) by King Henry’s reply; or that the role of bishops in the Church was touched (= touched upon, mentioned) in that reply. Both make sense in context.
231-4 “One of King Henry’s clearest switches between the mediums of verse and prose (and back again).
232-4 He was … purple Taken almost verbatim from Grafton’s Abridgement (1562); see p. 53.
232-3 John Baptist i.e. John the Baptist, who baptised Christ (see Matthew, 3.13-17)
233 resident present
234 dangerous haughty, arrogant (OED adj. 1a)
GARDINER
False Luther knows he has great friends in England,
Else durst he not thus move your majesty.

KING
We’ll cut his friends off ere they grow too strong,
And sweep these vipers from our state ere long.
No marvel, though, Queen Katherine plead for him:
That is, I see, the greatest Lutheran.
How is your counsels we proceed in these?

BONNER
’Twere best your grace did send her to the Tower,
Before they further do confer with her.

KING
Let it be so. Go, get a warrant drawn,
And with a strong guard bear her to the Tower;
Our hand shall sign your large commission.
Let Cranmer from the Prince be straight removed,
And come not near the court on pain of death.
Mother o’ God, shall I be baffled thus
By traitors, rebels and false heretics?
Get articles for her arraignment ready;
If she of treason be convict, I swear,
Her head goes off were she my kingdom’s heir.

[Trumpets sound. Exeunt.]

[5.2]

Enter the PRINCE, CRANMER, TYE, [BROWNE]
and the Young Lords.

PRINCE
Cranmer.

CRANMER
My lord?

5.1.235–5.2.2

235 *knows This edn follows Elze in emending Q1’s ‘knaues’. This seems to have been either a misreading of the underlying MS or poor memory on the part of the compositor, who had set ‘knaue’ in the previous line.
great powerful, influential
236 move incite, provoke
237 cut … off i.e. remove his followers
238 vipers villains, scoundrels (OED n. 2)
239 marvel surprise

Katherine Kath’rine
244-53 Go … heir Cf. Foxe: ‘before they departed the place, the king … hadde giuen commande-ment … to consult togither about the drawing of certaine articles against the queene, wherein hir life might be touched’ (1132).

246 large commission i.e. a commission (= authoritative instruction) given ‘at large’, granting the bishops permission to act at their own discretion (Somerset)

247 straight immediately
249 baffled deceived, hoodwinked (OED baffle v. 4)
251 articles charges
arraignment accusation before a tribunal; indictment
252 convict i.e. convicted
253 were she even if she were

5.2 Location: the Prince’s lodging.

0.1-2 BROWNE … Lords Q1 does not name Browne specifically, but the dialogue confirms his presence in this scene. The copy-text’s ‘the young lords’ might perhaps refer to Browne and the Marquess; however, the number of boys required to perform the play allows for the possibility that another of the Prince’s unnamed schoolfellows might also have made an appearance (as per Appendix 3b). Since the Marquess does not speak in this scene, his presence is only conjectural and Q1’s non-prescriptive wording is retained.

235 knows [Elze; knaues Q1 239 Katherine] (Katherne) 249 o’ (a) 253 heir [aire] SD Trumpets this edn 254 Exeunt] (Exit)
PRINCE
Where is Francesco, our Italian tutor?

CRANMER
He does attend your grace without, my lord.

PRINCE
Tell him anon we will confer with him. –
We’ll ply our learning, Browne, lest you be beaten;
We will not have your knighthood so disgraced.

BROWNE I thank ye, good my lord. An your grace would but a little ply your learning, I warrant ye, I’ll keep my knighthood from breeching.

PRINCE
Faith, Ned, I will. –

[Enter 1 SERVANT with a letter.]

How now, what letter’s that?

1 SERVANT From your grace’s sister, the Lady Mary.

PRINCE
Come, [taking the letter] give it me; we guess at the contents. –

[Exit 1 Servant.]

Cranmer, my sister oft hath writ to me,
That you and Bishop Bonner might confer
About these points of new religiōn.
Tell me, tutor, will ye dispute with him?

CRANMER
With all my heart, my lord, and wish the King
Would deign to hear our disputatiōn.

[Enter 2 SERVANT with another letter.]

PRINCE
What hast thou there?

2 SERVANT A letter from your royal sister, young Elizabeth.

[Hands over the letter. Exit 2 Servant.]

PRINCE
Another letter ere we open this!
Well, we will view them both immediately. –
[to Cranmer and Tye] I pray ye, attend us in the next chamber,
And tutors, if I call ye not before,
Give me some notice if the King my father
Be walked abroad; I must go visit him.

**TYE**

We will, fair prince. [Exeunt all but the Prince.]

**PRINCE**

What says my sister, Mary? She is eldest,
And by due course must first be answerèd.

[Reads aloud.] *The blessed mother of thy redeemer, with all the angels and holy saints, be intermissers to preserve thee of idolatry. To invoke the saints for help—*

Alas, good sister, still in this opinion.
These are thy blinded tutors, Bonner, Gardiner,
That wrong thy thoughts with foolish heresies;
I'll read no further. To Him will Edward pray
For preservation that can Himself preserve me,
Without the help of saint or ceremony.
What writes Elizabeth? Sweet sister, thou hast my heart,
And of Prince Edward's love hast greatest part.

[Reads aloud.] *Sweet prince, I salute thee with a sister's love; Be steadfast in thy faith, and let thy prayers Be dedicate to God only, for 'tis He alone Can strengthen thee and confound thine enemies; Give a settled assurance of thy hopes in heaven. God strengthen thee in all temptatiöns And give thee grace to shun idolatry. Heaven send thee life to inherit thy election.*

*Thy loving sister, Elizabeth.*

Loving thou art, and of me best beloved.
Thy lines shall be my contemplation's cures,
And in thy virtues will I meditate.

---

26 **Be walked abroad** leaves his private room
28-9 **She ... answered** Cf. KL: ‘Goneril, / Our eldest born, speak first’ (1.1.53-4).
30 **The ... redeemer** the Virgin Mary
31 **intermissers** probably ‘mediators’. The word is not recorded in OED; however, ‘intermissers’ may derive from the noun ‘interruption’ (first recorded in 1647) or ‘intermisse’ (1612), both meaning ‘intervention’. Elze’s suggestion (‘intercessors’) is also possible, though the etymology is further removed.
32 **invoke** call upon in prayer
34 **blinded** deluded
35 **wrong** deceive, mislead
36-8 **To ... ceremony** Cf. the sentiments of Elizabeth’s letter (41-50), and cf. Queen Katherine’s speech on the ‘superstitions of the Church of Rome’ (5.1.97).
39 **salute** greet
43 **dedicate** dedicated, devoted
45 **settled assurance** firm guarantee
47 **shan’t** avoid, eschew
48 **Heaven** hea’en
50 **life ... election** As Somerset notes, this can mean either mortal life to inherit the throne, or eternal life ‘to come into salvation’ in Christ.
52 **cures** cares, concerns (OED n.1 a). Elze suggests emending to ‘cares’, but the sense remains the same.
To Christ I’ll only pray for me and thee.
This I embrace; away, idolatry! –

Enter CRANMER [and TYE].

How now, Cranmer, where’s the King?
CRANMER
Conferring with his council, gracious prince;
There is some earnest business troubles him.
The guards are doubled, and commandment given
That none be suffered to come near the presence.
God keep his majesty from traitors’ hands.
PRINCE
Amen, good Cranmer. What should disturb him thus?
Is Cardinal Wolsey yet returned from France?
TYE
Ay, my good lord, and this day comes to court.
PRINCE
Perhaps this hasty business of the King
Is touching Wolsey and his embassage.
CRANMER
Pray God it be no worse, my lord.

Enter COMPTON.

TYE
Here comes Sir William Compton from his highness.
COMPTON
Health to your excellency.
PRINCE
What news, Sir William?
COMPTON
The King expects your grace’s company,
And wills your highness come and speak with him. –
And, Doctor Cranmer, from his majesty
I charge ye speedily to leave the court,
And come not near the Prince on pain of death
Without direction from the King and peers.
CRANMER
Sir, I obey ye. God so deal with me
As I have wished unto his majesty.
PRINCE
Cranmer banished the court? For what, I pray?

COMPTON
I know not, gracious lord, pray pardon me;
'Tis the King’s pleasure, and trust me I am sorry
It was my hap to bring this heavy message.

CRANMER
Nay, good Sir William, your message moves not me;
My service to his royal majesty
Was always true and just, so help me heaven. –
[to the Prince] Only I pray your grace to move the King
That I may come to trial speedily,
And if in aught I have deserved death,
Let me not draw another minute’s breath.  
Exeunt Cranmer [and Tye].

COMPTON
Will ye go, my lord?

PRINCE
Not yet. We are not your prisoner, are we, sir?

COMPTON
No, my dear lord.

PRINCE
Then go before, and we will follow ye;
Your worship will forget yourself, I see. –
My tutor thrust from court so suddenly?
This is strange.

Enter TYE.

TYE
The Queen, my lord, is come to speak with you.

PRINCE
Avoid the presence, then, and conduct her in;
I’ll speak with her and after see the King.

Enter Queen [Katherine].

QUEEN KATHERINE [to Tye]
Leave us alone, I pray ye.  

PRINCE
Your grace is welcome. How fares your majesty?

---

78 banished i.e. banished from
81 hap lot, duty
82 William disyllabic
84 just loyal, steadfast

84 me] ye Q4-4  85 SD] this edn  87 aught] (ought)  88 SD Exeunt] (Exit) and Tye] Somerset  93 SD] Else  94-5] Else; one line in Q1  95 SD] Else; opp. 93 Q1  98 SD] Else subst.; Enter Queene. | after 96 Q1  99 SD1] this edn  SD2] Else
85-8 In Foxe’s account, the King is already convinced of Cranmer’s innocence at the time of his trial. Rowley, it seems, alters the narrative to allow Prince Edward a more significant role in events.
88 move urge, entreat (OED v. 31a)
QUEEN KATHERINE
Never so ill, dear prince, for now I fear,
Even as a wretched caitiff, killed with care,
I am accused of treason and the King
Is now in council to dispose of me;
I know his frown is death, and I shall die.

PRINCE
Who are your accusers?
QUEEN KATHERINE I know not.

PRINCE
How know ye then his grace is so incensed?
QUEEN KATHERINE
One of my gentlemen, passing by the presence,
Took up this bill of accusations,
Wherein twelve articles are drawn against me;
It seems my false accusers lost it there.
Here they accuse me of conspiracy,
That I with Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley
Do seek to raise rebellion in the state,
Alter religion and bring Luther in,
And to new government enforce the King.

PRINCE
Then that’s the cause that Cranmer was removed.
But did your highness e’er confer with them,
As they have here accused ye to the King?
QUEEN KATHERINE
Never, nor ever had I one such thought,
As I have hope in Him my soul hath bought.

PRINCE
Then fear not, gracious madam, I’ll to the King,
And doubt not but I’ll make your peace with him.
QUEEN KATHERINE
O plead for me, tell him my soul is clear;
Never did thought of treason harbour here.

101 ill miserable, wretched (OED adj. 5)
102 Even e’en caitiff one in a piteous situation (OED n. 2)
care sorrow, anguish
104 in council in discussion with his coun-
cillors. Possibly ’in counsel’ (= in secret;
OED counsel n. 5c) is intended here, i.e.
‘the King is secretly planning to dispose of
me’.
105 his … death Cf. H8: ‘Wherefore frowns he thus? ’Tis his aspect of terror. All’s not well’
(5.1.87-8).
107 incensed enraged
109 Took up came across. Cf. Foxe: ‘the bill of
articles … falling from the bosome of one
of the foresaid counsellors, was found and
taken vp of some godlie person, and brought
immediatlie vnto the Queene’ (1133).

5.2.101–125
bill document, list. The wording here indicates
that Queen Katherine has the bill in her hands
as she speaks (see also 112n.).
111 lost it mislaid or dropped it
112 Here The queen perhaps points to a specific
item on the bill.
113 with … Ridley Unhistorical, since all three
perished under Queen Mary I.
114 raise stir up, instigate (OED v. 1 4a)
117 cause reason
120 ever at any time (Abbott, no. 39)
125 harbour dwell (OED v. 7)

104 council] (counsell) 106] this edn; Q1 lines accusers. / not. / 118 e’er] (ere)
As I intended to his sacred life,  
So be it to my soul, or joy or grief.

Prince
Stay here till I return; I'll move his majesty  
That you may answer your accusers presently.  
Exit.

Queen Katherine
O I shall never come to speak with him;  
The lion in his rage is not so stern  
As royal Henry in his wrathful spleen,  
And they that have accused me to his grace  
Will work such means I ne'er shall see his face.  
Wretched Queen Katherine, would thou hadst been  
Kate Parr still, and not great England’s Queen.

Enter Compton.

Compton
Health to your majesty.

Queen Katherine
Wish me, good Compton, woe and misery.  
This giddy, flattering world I hate and scoff;  
Ere long, I know, Queen Katherine’s head must off.  
Came ye from the King?

Compton
I did, fair queen, and much sad tidings bring.  
His grace in secret hath revealed to me  
What is intended to your majesty,  
Which I, in love and duty to your highness,  
The best I can in this extremity,  
[Kneels.] Then on my knees I dare entreat your grace  
Not to reveal what I shall say to you,  
For then I am assured that death’s my due.

126–7 as … soul Cf. Cranmer’s words at 76–7,  
‘God … majesty’.  
127 or joy or grief either joy or grief. Cf. 1.2.292.  
128 move urge, entreat  
129 presently immediately  
131-2 The … stern Cf. Proverbs, 20.2: ‘The fear of the King is like the roaring of a lion: he that provoketh him unto anger sinneth against his own soul’ and Tilley, L308: ‘As fierce as a lion’.  
136 Metricaly short. Possibly, ‘Parry’ is intended in place of ‘Parr’: ‘Parry’ is used twice in Q1 (see t.ns), though in this instance Q1 reads ‘Parre’. Alternatively, the line begins with three stressed syllables.  
139 giddy ‘circling round with bewildering rapidity’ (OED adj. 2d); cf. R3: ‘I fear, I fear,  
’twill prove a giddy world’ (2.3.5). ‘Giddy’ may also refer to the wheel of Fortune, and Queen Katherine’s lack of control over her situation (Somerset); cf. H5: ‘giddy Fortune’s furious fickle wheel’ (3.6.26).  
140 flattering flatt’ring; suggestive of pleasurable yet delusive beliefs, pleasing to the imagination (OED adj. 2a)  
141 scoff deride  
142 Katherine’s Kath’rine’s  
143–7 Taken largely from Foxe (1133), though it was the physician Thomas Wendy rather than Compton who came to help the Queen in her distress (Compton died in 1528).  
147 extremity time of extreme urgency or need (OED n. 7a)  
150 Cf. Foxe: ‘he stood in danger of his life, if euer he were knowne to vtter the same to any liuing creature’ (1133).
QUEEN KATHERINE
   I will not, on my faith; good Compton, speak,
   That with thy sad reports my heart may break.

COMPTON
   Thus then at your fair feet my life I lay,
   In hope to drive your highness' cares away.
   You are accused of high conspiracy
   And treason 'gainst his royal majesty.
   So much they have incensed his excellency,
   That he hath granted firm commissiön
   To attach your person and convey ye hence,
   Close prisoner to the Tower; articles are drawn,
   And time appointed for arraignment there.
   Good madam, be advised; by this I know
   The officers are sent to arrest your person.
   Prevent their malice, haste ye to the King;
   I'll use such means that you shall speak with him.
   There plead your innocency; I know his grace
   Will hear ye mildly, therefore delay not.
   If you be taken ere you see the King,
   I fear ye never more shall speak to him.

QUEEN KATHERINE
   O Compton, 'twixt thy love and my sage fear,
   I feel ten thousand sad vexations here.
   Lead on, I pray, I'll be advised by thee;
   The King is angry and the Queen must die.

Exeunt.

[5.3]

Enter BONNER and GARDINER with the commission.

GARDINER
   Come, Bonner, now strike sure, the iron's hot;
   Urge all thou canst, let nothing be forgot;
   We have the King's hand here to warrant us.
   'Twas well the Cardinal came and so luckily,
Who urged the state would quite be ruinèd
If that religion thus were alterèd;
Which made his highness, with a fiery spleen,
Direct out warrants to attach the Queen.

BONNER
’Twas excellent; that cedar, once o’erthrown,
To crop the lower shrubs let us alone.

GARDINER
Those articles of accusatiön
We framed against her, being lost by you,
Had like to overthrow our policy,
Had we not stoutly urged his majesty.

BONNER
Well, well; what’s now to be done?

GARDINER
A guard must be provided speedily
To bear her prisoner unto London Tower,
And watch convenient place to arrest her person.

BONNER
Tush! Any place shall serve, for who dare contradict
His highness’ hand? Even from his side we’ll hale her
And bear her quickly to her longest home,
Lest we and ours by her to ruin come.

GARDINER
About it, then; let them untimely die
That scorn the Pope and Rome’s supremacy.

Exeunt.

[5.4]

Enter the KING and PRINCE, the GUARD before them.

KING
Guard, watch the doors and let none come near us
But such as are attendant on our person.--
Mother o’ God, ’tis time to stir, I see,
When traitors creep so near our majesty.
Must English Harry walk with armèd guards
Now in his old age? Must I fear my life,
By hateful treason of my queen and wife?

PRINCE
I do beseech your royal majesty
To hear her speak ere ye condemn her thus.

KING
Go to, Ned, I charge ye speak not for her; she’s a dangerous traitor.

[Knocking from within.]

How now, who knocks so loud there?

1 GUARD
’Tis Cardinal Wolsey, my lord.

KING
An it be the devil, tell him he comes not here;
Bid him attend us till our better leisure.

Heyday, more knocking? Knock irons on his heels and bear him hence. Who is’t?

1 GUARD
Sir William Compton, my liege.

KING
Is’t he? Well, let him in.

Compton, ye knock too loud for entrance here;
You care not, though the King be ne’er so near.
Say ye, sir? Ha!

---

3 stir move, act
6 old age King Henry was fifty-two when he married Katherine Parr; he died just four years later.
fear fear for
11 SD from within from within the backstage tiring-house, i.e. from outside the presence chamber. See also 20 SD.
13 An it elided, as an’t
14 till i.e. not until
leisure freedom, opportunity
21 Heyday an exclamation denoting surprise; Q1’s spelling (see t.n.) may indicate pronunciation

25 Knock ... heels chain him in leg irons; with a pun on ‘knocking’
24-8 ‘Q1’s lineation is ambiguous here (see t.n.). Unlike Elze and Somerset, I view the first line only as prose.
24 let him in Since he is able to inform the King who is at the door, 1 Guard is presumably positioned at the back of the stage. This in turn allows him to let Compton in without exiting the stage himself.
28 Say ye i.e. what say ye

---

5.4.3–28
COMPTON
   I do beseech your pardon for my boldness.
KING
   Well, what’s your business?
COMPTON
   The Queen, my lord, entreats to speak with you.
KING
   Body o’ me, is she not ’rested yet?
   Why do they not convey her to the Tower?
   We gave commission to attach her presently.
   Where is she?
COMPTON
   At the door, my sovereign.
KING
   So near our presence? – [to the Guard] Keep her out, I charge ye!
   Bend all your halberds’ points against the door;
   If she presume to enter, strike her through. –
   Dare she presume again to look on us?
PRINCE [Kneels.]
   Upon my knees, I do beseech your highness
   To hear her speak.
KING
   Up, Ned, stand up; I will not look on her. –
   [to the Guard] Mother o’ God, stand close and guard it sure;
   If she come in, I’ll hang ye all, I swear.
PRINCE
   I do beseech your grace.
KING
   Sir boy, no more; I’ll hear no more of her.
   Proud slut, bold trait’ress and forgetful beast,
   Yet dare she further move our patience?
PRINCE
   I’ll pawn my princely word, right royal father,
   She shall not speak a word to anger ye.
KING
   Will you pawn your word for her? Mother o’ God,

29 *your This edn follows Q3 in emending Q1’s ‘you’; this seems to be an elision of the expression ‘I do beseech you of your pardon’ (cf. Oth., 3.3.215).
32 Body o’ me a common oath, seen also in H8 ’rested Although ‘rested’ (= stopped, put to rest) also works here, Q1’s meaning seems to be ‘arrested’. Cf. CE, 4.2.42.
34 presently immediately
36 SD Guard plural
37 halberds’ See 3.2.135n.
39 The King may speak this line aloud to himself rather than directly to Prince Edward.
42 Up … up Despite the King’s request, it is likely that Edward continues to kneel, perhaps until 53.
43 it the door
47-8 Cf. R3: ‘False-boding woman, end thy frantic curse, / Lest to thy harm thou move our patience’ (1.3.246-7).
47 slut a bold or impudent woman; not necessarily with sexual connotations
48 move exasperate, try (OED v. 25h)
49 pawn give, pledge

Q3; you Q1 32 o’ (a) ’rested (rested) 35 Else; Q1 lines she? / Soveraigne. / 36 SD] this edn 37 halberds’] (Holbeards) 39 on] vpon Qg3-4 40, 43 SDD] this edn 43 o’ (a) 51 o’] (a)
The Prince of Wales, his word is warrant for a king,  
And we will take it, Ned. – [to a member of the Guard] Go, call her in. –

Enter QUEEN [KATHERINE, weeping and kneeling before the King].

Sir William, let the guard attend without.  
Reach me a chair; all but the Prince depart. –  
[to Queen Katherine] How now, what, do you weep and kneel?  
Does your black soul the guilt of conscience feel?  
Out, out, you’re a traitor!

QUEEN KATHERINE
A traitor? O you all-seeing powers,  
Here witness to my lord my loyalty.  
A traitor? O then you are too merciful!  
If I have treason in me, why rip ye not  
My ugly heart out with your weapon’s point?  
O my good lord, if it have traitor’s blood  
It will be black, deformed and tenebrous;  
If not, from it will spring a scarlet fountain,  
And spit defiance in their perjured throats  
That have accused me to your majesty,  
Making my state thus full of misery.

KING
Canst thou deny it?

QUEEN KATHERINE
Else should I wrongfully accuse myself.  
Of my dear Lord, I do beseech your highness  
To satisfy your wrongèd queen in this.  
Upon what ground grows this suspiciôn,  
Or who thus wrongfu[lly accuseth me  
Of cursed treason ’gainst your majesty?

KING
Some probable effects myself can witness,  
Others our faithful subjects can testify.

52 warrant surety; justifying reason or ground for action (OED n.1 8a)
53 SD1 a ... Guard Likely 1 Guard, who seems (as at 12 and 23) to be positioned nearest to the door. The guardsmen exit the stage as a group at 55.
54 William disyllabic
55 Reach ... chair Cf. 1.4.150. Compton presumably moves a chair for the King before departing the stage.
57 black foul, hateful; evil (OED adj. 10). Cf. 65.
58 witness prove
59 ugly both in nature and appearance
60 traitor’s Q2’s ‘trait’rous’ is an equally plausible reading.
65 tenebrous dark in colour
67 spit defiance Cf. MM: ‘but as she spitted in his face, so she defied him’ (2.1.82-3) and R2: ‘I do defy him, and I spit at him’ (1.1.60).
69 state situation; state of mind
70 Of ... Lord ‘for the Lord’s sake’ (see Abbott, no. 169)
71 satisfy make atonement or reparation (OED v. 2b)
72 effects examples (of treasonous behaviour)
73 can The repetition of the word in this line may be the result of eye-skip or poor memory on the part of the compositor.
Have you not oft maintained arguments,  
Even to our face, against religion?  
Which, joined with other complots, shows itself,  
As it is gathered by our loyal subjects,  
For treason capital against our person.  
God’s holy mother, you’ll remove us quickly  
And turn me out. Old Harry must away,  
Now in mine age, lame and half bed-rid,  
Or else you’ll keep me fast enough in prison.  
Ha! Mistress, these are no hateful treasons, these!

QUEEN KATHERINE

Heaven on my forehead write my worst intent,  
And let your hate against my life be bent;  
If ever thought of ill against your majesty  
Was harboured here, refuse me, gracious God.  
To your face, my liege; if to your face I speak it,  
It manifests no complot nor no treason,  
Nor are they loyal that so injure me.  
What I did speak was as my woman’s wit;  
To hold out argument could compass it.  
My puny scholarship is held too weak  
To maintain proofs about religion.  
Alas, I did it but to waste the time,  
Knowing as then your grace was weak and sickly,  
So to expel part of your pain and grief,  
And for my good intent they seek my life.  
O God, how am I wronged!

KING

Ha! Say’st thou so? Was it no otherwise?

QUEEN KATHERINE

What should I say, that you might credit me?  
If I am false, heaven strike me suddenly.

80 Even e’en 81 complots plots, conspiracies 82 gathered deduced 84 remove i.e. from position, depose. Perhaps murder is also implied (Somerset). 86 in mine age See 6n. 87 fast secure 89 Heaven hea’en on … intent make my sins known. The forehead reference may stem from the Bible’s description of the Whore of Babylon: ‘in her forehead was a name written, A mystery, that great Babylon that mother of whoresoms, and abominations of the earth’ (Revelation, 17.5). 90 bent directed, inclined 92 harboured entertained within the breast (OED harbour v. 4); cf. ‘harbour here’ (5.2.125) 93 To your face an expression of sincerity 95 injure slander; wrong
KING  Body o’ me, what everlasting knaves are these that wrong thee thus!
Alas, poor Kate. Come, stand up, stand up; wipe thine eyes, wipe thine eyes.

[Queen Katherine rises.] ’Fore God, ’twas told me that thou wert a traitor; I
could hardly think it, but that it was applied so hard to me. God’s mother,
Kate, I fear my life, I tell ye. King Harry would be loath to die by treason now,
that has bid so many brunts unblemished, yet I confess that now I grow stiff;
my legs fail me first, but they stand furthest from my heart, and that’s still
sound, I thank my God. Give me thy hand [taking her hand]; come, kiss me,
Kate. [They kiss.] So, now I’m friends again. Whoreson knaves, crafty varlets!
Make thee a traitor to old Harry’s life? Well, well, I’ll meet with some on
them, ‘Sfoot! Come, sit on my knee, Kate. [Queen Katherine sits.]
Mother o’ God, he that says thou’rt false to me,
By England’s crown, I’ll hang him presently!

QUEEN KATHERINE
When I have thought of ill against your state,
Let me be made the vilest reprobate.

KING
That’s my good Kate, but by the Mary God,
Queen Katherine, you must thank Prince Edward here,
For but for him thou’dst gone to th’ Tower, I swear.

QUEEN KATHERINE
I shall be ever thankful to his highness,
And pray for him and for your majesty.

KING
Come, Kate, we’ll walk a while i’th’ garden here. –
Who keeps the door there?

[Enter COMPTON.]
KING

Sir William Compton, here,
[removing his ring and handing it to Compton]
take my ring.
Bid Doctor Cranmer haste to court again;
Give him that token of King Henry’s love.
Discharge our guards, we fear no traitor’s hand;
Our state, beloved of all, doth firmly stand.
Go, Compton.
COMPTON

I go, my lord.

KING

Bid Wolsey haste him to our royal presence;
Great Charles, the mighty Roman Emperor,
Our nephew, and the hope of Christendom,
Is landed in our fair dominion
To see his uncle and the English court;
We’ll entertain him with imperial port. –
[to the Prince] Come hither, Ned.

Enter BONNER and GARDINER with the Guard.

GARDINER [aside to the Guard]
Fellows, stay there, and when I call, come forward.
The service you pursue is for the King,
Therefore I charge you to perform it boldly;
We have his hand and seal to warrant it.
1 GUARD [aside to Gardiner]
We’ll follow you with resolution, sir.
The Church is on our side; what should we fear?
GARDINER [aside to Bonner]
See yonder, she’s talking with his majesty;
Think you we may attempt to take her here?

131-3  

133  

Our nephew  

140  

141  

143 imperial port  

144 SD 2. From Gardiner’s speech at 151-2, it is clear that the bishops and guardsmen enter out of sight (and thus out of earshot) of the King, Queen Katherine and Prince Edward, hence the asides.

145  

148 hand and seal  

150 the Church i.e. the Roman Catholic Church  

152 take arrest
BONNER [aside to Gardiner]

Why should we not? Have we not firm commission
To attach her anywhere? Be bold, and fear not. – [aside to the Guard] Fellows, come forward.

KING

How now, what’s here to do?

QUEEN KATHERINE

The bishops, it seems, my lord, would speak with you.

KING

With bills and halberds? Well, tarry there, Kate,
I’ll go myself. – [to Gardiner] Now, wherefore come you?

GARDINER

As loyal subjects to your state and person,
We come to apprehend that traitorous woman. [Indicates Queen Katherine.]

KING

Ye are a couple of drunken knaves and varlets!
God’s holy mother, she is more true and just
Than any prelate that suborns the Pope,
Thus to usurp upon our government.
Call you her traitor?
You’re lying beasts and false conspirators.

BONNER

Your majesty hath seen what proofs we had.

KING

Hear you, Bonner? You are a whoreson coxcomb! What proofs had ye, but treasons of your own inventions?

QUEEN KATHERINE

O my dear lord, respect the reverend bishops;
Bonner and Gardiner love your majesty.

KING

Alas, poor Kate, thou thinkest full little what they come for.
Thou hast small reason to commend their loves,
That falsely have accused thy harmless life.

QUEEN KATHERINE

O God, are these mine enemies?

---

153 firm commission strict or unaltering command
154 To attach elided, as I attach
155 come forward As the following part-line makes clear, members of the guard step forward at Bonner’s command into view of the King.
157 bills and halberds See notes to 2.1.62 SD, 2.1.176 and 3.2.135.
tarry wait, stay
161 *Ye are I follow Elze in expanding Q1’s ‘Y’are’ to highlight the natural emphasis of the line.
drunken used here as a general epithet; as Somerset notes, no recorded sense in OED fits the context. Perhaps used simply to indicate that the bishops had become drunk on power.
varlets See 116n.
162 just righteouse in the eyes of God (OED adj. 10)
163 suborns supports, aids (OED suborn v. 3)
164 usurp encroach, infringe
168-9 *This edn follows Somerset in setting the King’s angry outburst as prose. Q1 appears to set as two verse lines (as per t.n.), although the justification of type in the first line obscures the intended layout.
168 whoreson See 116n.
coxcomb fool; arrogant or vain individual (OED n. 3a)
171 Gardiner Gard’ner
172-4 Cf. Foxe: ‘Ah poore soule, quoth he, thou little knowest howe euill hee deserueth this grace at thy hands’ (1134).
173 small little, no
174 harmless innocent (OED adj. 3). Cf. ‘Harmless Richard’ in 2H6 (2.2.27).
GARDINER
   We have your highness’ hand to warrant it.

KING
   Let’s see it, then.

GARDINER
   ’Tis here, my liege. [Hands paper to the King.]

KING
   So, now ye have both my hands to contradict what one hand did. [Rips
   paper in two.]
   And now our word again shall serve as warrant
   To bear you both as prisoners to the Fleet,
   Where you shall answer this conspiracy. –
   [to the Guard] You fellows that came to attach the Queen,
   Lay hands on them, [indicating Bonner and Gardiner] and bear them to
   the Fleet.

QUEEN KATHERINE [Kneels.]
   O I beseech your highness on my knees,
   Remit the doom of their imprisonment.

KING
   Stand up, good Kate, thou wrong’st thy majesty
   To plead for them that thus have injured thee.

QUEEN KATHERINE
   I have forgotten it, and do still entreat
   Their humble pardons at your gracious feet.

KING
   Mother of God, what a foolish woman’s this! –
   [to Bonner and Gardiner] Well, for her sake, we revoke our doom,
   But come not near us as you love your lives;
   Away, and leave us. You are knaves and miscreants,
   Whoreson caitiffs, come to attach my queen!

QUEEN KATHERINE
   Vex not, my lord, it will distemper you.

KING
   Mother o’ God, I’ll temper some on’t for’t. –
   [Exeunt Bonner and Gardiner.]
Enter BRANDON.

How now, Brandon?

BRANDON The Emperor, my lord.

KING Get a train ready, there. Charles Brandon, come, We’ll meet the monarch of imperial Rome. –
[to the Prince] Go, Ned, prepare yourself to meet the Emperor, We’ll send you further notice of our pleasure. –
[to the Guard] Attend the Prince, there. –

[Exit the Prince, escorted by some of the Guard.]

Enter Cardinal [WOLSEY] and WILL [SUMMERS, followed by PATCH, who remains at the door.]

Welcome, Lord Cardinal,

Hath not your tedious journey into France Disturbed your grace’s health and reverend person?

WILL SUMMERS No, no, ne’er fear him, Harry. He has got more by the journey; he’ll be Pope shortly.

KING What, William! How chance I have not seen you today? I thought you would not have been the hindmost man to salute me.

WILL SUMMERS No more I am not, Harry, for yonder is Patch behind me. I could never get him before me since thou conjuredst him i’th’ Great Chamber. All the horse i’th’ town cannot haul him into thy presence, I warrant thee.

KING Will he not come in?

WILL SUMMERS Not for the world; he stands watching at the door. He’ll not stir while the Cardinal come; then the fool will follow him everywhere.

WOLSEY I thank you, William. I am beholden to you still.

WILL SUMMERS Nay, my lord, I am more beholden unto you; I thank your fool for it. We have ransacked your wine-cellar since you went into France.

---

199 monarch ... Rome affirming Charles V’s position as ruler of the Holy Roman Empire. Possibly, ’Rome’ was intended to rhyme with ’come’ in the previous line.

202 SD2 some ... Guard While the order to ’attend the Prince’ is evidently spoken to members of the guard, it appears from the repeated instruction at 267 that some of the group remain behind on stage; possibly only one guardsman (perhaps 1 Guard) exits here.

203 tedious wearisome, but also disagreeable, troublesome (OED adj. 1a, 2)

205 fear worry about, fear for

210 last

214 Not ... world Apparently a proverbial phrase, unrecorded in Tilley and Dent, but used by a number of contemporary dramatists, including Shakespeare (LLL, 2.1.99), Dekker (Patient Grissil, 4.2.171) and Marlowe (1 Tamburlaine, 4.2.125).

215 stir move, budge

216 Wolsey’s tone is undoubtedly sarcastic here.

218 ransacked Q1’s archaic ‘ransacked’ presumably reflects Summers’s pronunciation.
Do you blush, my lord? Nay, that’s nothing; you have wine there is able to set a colour in any man’s face, I warrant it.

KING Why, William, is the Cardinal’s wine so good?

WILL SUMMERS Better than thine, I’ll be sworn. I’ll take but two handfuls of his wine, and it shall fill four hogsheads of thine. Look here, else! [Pulls a handful of gold from his pocket.]

WOLSEY Mort dieu.

WILL SUMMERS More devil, is’t not? For without conjuring, you could never do it. But I pray you, my lord, call upon mort dieu no longer, but speak plain English. You have deceived the King in French and Latin long enough, o’ conscience.

KING Is his wine turned into gold, Will?

WOLSEY The fool mistakes, my gracious sovereign.

WILL SUMMERS Ay, ay, my lord, ne’er set your wit to the fool’s. Will Summers will be secret now and say nothing. If I would be a blab of my tongue, I could tell the King how many barrels full of gold and silver there was: six tuns filled with plate and jewels; twenty great trunks with crosses, crosiers, copes, mitres, maces, golden crucifixes, besides the four hundred and twelve thousand pounds that poor chimneys paid for Peter-pence. But this is nothing, for when you are Pope, you may pardon yourself for more knavery than this comes to.

KING Go to, fool, you wrong the Cardinal. – But grieve not, Wolsey, William will be bold. I pray you, set on to meet the Emperor; The mayor and citizens are gone before,
The Prince of Wales shall follow presently, 
And with our George and collar of estate, 
Present him with the Order of the Garter. 
Great Maximilian, his progenitor, 
Upon his breast did wear the English cross, 
And underneath our standard marched in arms, 
Receiving pay for all his warlike host; 
And Charles with knighthood shall be honourèd. 

Begin, Lord Cardinal, greet his majesty, 
And we ourself will follow presently. 

WOLSEY
I go, my sovereign. 

[Exeunt Wolsey and Patch.]

WILL SUMMERS [Calls after Wolsey.] Fair weather after ye. – Well, an e’er he come to be Pope, I shall be plunged for this. 

QUEEN KATHERINE William, you have angered the Cardinal, I can tell you. 

KING ’Tis no matter, Kate, I’ll anger him worse ere long; 
Though for a while I smooth it to his face, 
I did suspect what here the fool hath found. 
He keeps, forsooth, a high court legatine, 
Taxing our subjects, gathering sums of gold, 
Which he belike hath hid to make him Pope. 
A God’s name, let him; that shall be our own. 
But to our business: come, Queen Katherine, 
You shall with us to meet the Emperor; 
Let all your ladies be in readiness. –

244 George See 1.4.5n. 
collar of estate the ornamental gold chain worn by members of the Order of the Garter (see 245n.); from the chain hung the jewelled George
245 Order … Garter the oldest and highest British Order of Chivalry, founded by Edward III in 1348. Members of the order wore a garter of dark blue velvet, edged with gold, just below the left knee.
246 Great Maximilian i.e. Maximilian I (Holy Roman Emperor from 1508), Charles V’s grandfather 
progenitor ancestor; political predecessor
247-9 Upon … host Cf. Holinshed: ‘the emperour Maximilian came from Aire to the kings campe before Termwine the twelffe of August [1513], wearing a crosse of saint George as the kings souldier, & receiuing of him salarie for service’ (821).
247 the English cross the George
248 standard flag bearing the ensign of a king or nation
249 warlike valiant 
host army, group of followers (OED n.1a)
250 Charles the Emperor 
251 Cardinal card’nal
253 SD Presumably Patch leaves with Wolsey here, thus underlining Summers’s words at 214-15.
254 Fair … ye Proverbial (Tilley, W217).
255 plunged thrust into hell; cast into difficulty or misfortune (OED plunge v. 8b)
257 ere before
258 smooth it act to conceal knowledge, pretend friendship; use flattering or complimentary language (OED smooth v. 9b, 5a). Cf. 2H6: ‘That smooth’st it so with king and common-well’ (2.1.22).
260 forsooth in truth 
high powerful, authoritative 
legatine of or pertaining to a legate. At the time of Campeius’s visit in 1518, Wolsey was declared ‘legate a latere’ and acquired temporary legatine powers; in 1524 he was granted legatine powers for life (Jack, ODNB).
261 Taxing our subjects Wolsey exercised his powers of jurisdiction to the full and is said to have ‘vsed great extortion, with excessiue taxes and lones, and valuation of euery mans substance’ (Foxe, 899).

gathering gath’ring
belike in all likelihood
A God’s name in God’s name, for God’s sake. 

Cf. 2.1.56.
[to the Guard] Go, let our guard attend the Prince of Wales;
Upon ourself, the lords and pensioners
Shall give attendance in their best array.
Let all estates be ready. – [Trumpets sound. [Exeunt Guard.]
Come, fair Kate,
The Emperor shall see our English state. [Exeunt.]

[5.5]

[Trumpets sound.
Enter EMPEROR, Cardinal [WOLSEY], [Lord] Mayor, and Gentlemen.

WOLSEY [to the Emperor]
Your majesty is welcome into England;
The King our master will rejoice to see
Great Charles the royal Emperor’s majesty.

EMPEROR
We thank your pains, my good Lord Cardinal,
And much our longing eyes desire to see
Our kingly uncle and his princely son,
And therefore, when you please, I pray, set on.

WOLSEY
On, gentlemen, and meet the Prince of Wales,
That comes forerunner to his royal father
To entertain the Christian Emperor. – [Exeunt Gentlemen.]

Meanwhile, your majesty may here behold

268 pensioners the body of gentlemen serving as guards or attendants to the monarch within the royal palace; gentlemen-at-arms (OED n. 3a). This royal bodyguard was instituted by King Henry in 1509.

270 all estates all ranks, everyone (OED estate n. 5). The ‘estates of the realm’ were the broad social orders of society, typically divided into three groups: clergy, nobility and commoners. Cf. R3: ‘And equally indeed to all estates’ (3.7.212).

270SD *sound. I move Q1’s direction to coincide with the guardsmen’s exit, which acts in turn as a cue for King Henry’s own. Presumably Summers, Brandon, Queen Katherine and the King begin to make their exit after the guardsmen, remaining on stage just long enough for the King to complete the concluding rhyming couplet.

271 state either ‘realm’ or ‘splendour’

5.5 Location: City of London, somewhere alongside the River Thames (see line 13). The Emperor’s visit to England took place in 1523; he was in fact met by the Marquess Dorset at Calais and then by Cardinal Wolsey at Dover (Holinshed, 873). Wolsey’s defiance of the Emperor (lines 78-81), however, did not occur until 1527. Rowley conflates events to stress both Wolsey’s corruption and the strength and amicability of the relationship between the King and Emperor in their endeavour for a peaceful Christian union.

0.1 sound Elze and Somerset omit this direction; they do, however, repeat the SD ‘sound’ at the end of 5.4. Presumably this is a result of the editors’ varying interpretation of the layout of Q1, in which the SD is printed midway between the end of 5.4 and the entrance direction at 5.5.0. In this edn, the trumpets sound not for the King’s exit (they have in fact already sounded for this purpose at 5.4.270) but for the Emperor’s entrance. As at 16.1 and 42 SD2.1, I move the SD from its original marginal position.

3 Emperor’s Emp’ror’s

4 We … pains elided form of ‘we thank you for your pains’ (as per Qq3-4), where pains = troubles. Cf. AW, 5.1.33.

6 uncle See 5.4.140n.

10 entertain welcome, receive as guest
This warlike kingdom’s fair metropolis,
The City, London, and the River Thames,
And note the situation of the place.

EMPEROR
We do, my lord, and count it admirable.
But see, Lord Cardinal, the Prince is coming.

[Trumpets] sound.
Enter the PRINCE with a Herald before him, bearing the collar and garter,
the Guard and Lords attending.

Well met, young cousin.

PRINCE
I kiss your highness’ hand, [Kisses the Emperor’s hand.]
And bid you welcome to my father’s land;
I shall not need infer comparisons.
Welcome beyond compare, for so your excellency
Hath honoured England in containing you,
As with all princely pomp and state we can,
We’ll entertain great Charles the Austrian.
And first, in sign of honour to your grace,
I here present this collar of estate,
This golden garter of the knighthood’s order,
An honour to renown the Emperor.
Thus as my father hath commanded me,
I entertain your royal majesty.

EMPEROR
True, honoured offspring of a famous king,
Thou dost amaze me, and dost make me wish
I were a second son to England’s lord,
In interchange of my imperial seat,
To live with thee, fair hope of majesty.
So well our welcome we accept of thee,
And with such princely spirit pronounce the word,  
Thy father’s state can no more state afford.

PRINCE
Yes, my good lord, in him there’s majesty;  
In me there’s love with tender infancy.  

WOLSEY
The trumpets sound, my lord; the King is coming.

PRINCE
Go, all of you attend his royal person,  
Whilst we observe the Emperor’s majesty.

[Exeunt Wolsey, the Guard and the Herald.]

[Trumpets sound.]

Enter the Heralds first, then the Trumpets, next the Guard,  
then [the] Mace-bearer and Swordbearers,  
then the Cardinal [WOLSEY], then BRANDON, then the KING,  
after him QUEEN [KATHERINE], LADY MARY, and Ladies attending.

KING
Hold! Stand, I say.

BRANDON
Stand, gentlemen.

WOLSEY
Cease those trumpets, there.

KING
Is the Emperor yet come in sight of us?

WOLSEY
His majesty is hard at hand, my lord.

KING
Then, Brandon, sheathe our sword and bear our maces down,

37 state ... state Playing on the various meanings of the word: the first instance refers to the King’s affluent position or ‘estate’, while the second refers to the splendour of the Prince’s greeting (OED n. 15, 16).  
afford provide
41 all of you Since Wolsey and an unspecified number of heralds and guardsmen re-enter with the King two lines later, it seems it is to them that the Prince directs his command. See pp. 191-2.  
observe pay respectful or courteous attention to (OED v. 4)  
Emperor’s Emp’ror’s
42 SD2 The sheer grandeur of this entry seems intended to match that of Holinshed’s account, in which ‘the cardinal with three hundred lords, knights, and gentlemen of England was readie to receiue him, and with all honour that might be’ (873).  
43 Stand i.e. to attention  
45 Cease those trumpets Presumably the trumpet-ers continue to play as the procession enters and begins to cross the stage.  
47 hard at hand nearby, in close proximity (see OED hard adv. 6a and ‘hard by’); one of the expressions Sykes deemed ‘Rowleyan’ (61)  
48 This is either a regular hexameter line or a pentameter in which the name ‘Brandon’ acts as a hypermetrical interjection.  
sheathe ... down i.e. as a demonstration of peace sword ... maces Cf. 42 SD2.3, where the singular and plural are reversed; perhaps, as Somerset suggests, this was an attempt on Rowley’s part to improve the metre of the line.
In honour of my lord, the Emperor.

Forward again.

BRANDON On gentlemen, afore. –

Sound, trumpets, and set forwards.

[Trumpets sound as the train moves towards the Prince and Emperor.]

PRINCE Behold my father, gracious Emperor.

EMPEROR We’ll meet him, cousin. –

[to the King] Uncle of England, King of France and Ireland, Defender of the ancient Christian faith,

With greater joy I do embrace thy breast

Than when the seven electors crownèd me

Great Emperor of the Christian monarchy.

KING Great Charles, the first Emperor of Almain, King of the Romans, Semper Augustus, warlike King of Spain and Sicily, both Naples, Navarre and Aragon, King of Crete and great Jerusalem, Archduke of Austria, Duke of Milan, Brabant, Burgundy, Tyrol and Flanders,

With this great title I embrace thy breast,

And how thy sight doth please, suppose the rest. –

Sound, trumpets, while my fair Queen Katherine

Gives entertainment to the Emperor. –


We dwell here but in an outward continent,

54-5 After 1521, King Henry’s official royal style was ‘Henry the Eighth, by the Grace of God, King of England and France, Defender of the Faith and Lord of Ireland’; he did not assume kingship of Ireland until 1541.

56 embrace thy breast ‘greet you’ (see also 63)

57 seven se’en electors the men responsible for electing a King of the Romans (a title used by German monarchs) who would stand for the position of Holy Roman Emperor, the candidate, if successful, was subsequently crowned by the Pope. Charles V was elected King of the Romans in June 1519, but his coronation did not take place until 1530.

58 Emperor Emp’ror

59 Almain Germany. ‘Emperor of Almain’ was not an official title, though Charles was King of Germany from 1519-1530.

King of the Romans See 57n., electors.

60 Semper Augustus Latin for ‘forever August’, part of Charles V’s lengthy style and a reference to Rome’s first Emperor, Gaius Julius Caesar Augustus (63 BC-14 AD)

King … Naples Charles became King Charles I of Castile, León, Aragon and Sicily, as well as King Charles IV of Naples, in March 1516.

Navarre an autonomous community in northern Spain. Although from 1520 onwards the arms of Navarre were incorporated into Charles’s coat of arms, the Kingdom of Navarre was never under his jurisdiction.

61-2 King of Crete … Duke of Milan Neither title formed a part of Charles’s official style.

61 Archduke of Austria See 23n.

62 Brabant … Flanders Charles became Duke of Brabant (a duchy of the Holy Roman Empire) and Burgundy in 1506; although not Duke, he also became Count of Flanders in 1506 and Count of Tyrol in 1519.

66 Gives entertainment to welcomes, greets. While Holinshed describes how the Queen received the Emperor ‘with all the ioy that might be’ (873), it must be remembered that the Queen in question was not Katherine Parr, but Charles’s aunt, Katherine of Aragon.

68 outward existing on the outskirts, in this case of mainland Europe continent the main landmass of a country or kingdom, as distinct from its islands (OED n. 4a)
Where winter’s icicles hang on our beards,
Bordering upon the frozen Orcadês,
Our mother-point, compassed with the Arctic Sea,
Where raging Boreas sties from winter’s mouth;
Yet are our bloods as hot as where the sun doth rise.
We have no golden mines to lead you to,
But hearts of proof, and what we speak, we’ll do.

EMPEROR

We thank you, uncle, and now must chide you.
If we be welcome to your country,
Why is the ancient league now broke betwixt us?
Why have your heralds, in the French king’s cause,
Breathed defiance ’gainst our dignity,
When face to face we met at Landersey?

KING

My heralds to defy your majesty?
Your grace mistakes; we sent ambassadors
To treat a peace between the French and you,
Not to defy you as an enemy.

EMPEROR

Yet uncle, in King Henry’s name he came,
And boldly to our face did give the same.
WOLSEY [aside]

Hell stop that fatal-boding Emperor’s throat,
That sings against us this dismal raven’s note.

KING

Mother of God, if this be true, we see
There are more kings in England now than we. –
Where’s Cardinal Wolsey? Heard you this news in France?

WOLSEY

I did, my liege, and by my means ’twas done,
I’ll not deny it; I had commission
To join a league between the French and him,
Which, he withstanding as an enemy,
I did defy him from your majesty.

KING

Durst thou presume so, baseborn cardinal,
Without our knowledge to abuse our name?
Presumptuous traitor, under what pretence
Didst thou attempt to brave the Emperor?
Belike thou meant’st to level at a crown,
But thy ambitious crown shall hurl thee down.

WOLSEY

With reverence to your majesty, I did no more
Than I can answer to the Holy See.

KING

Villain, thou canst not answer it to me,
Nor shadow thy insulting treachery!
How durst ye, sirrah, in your embassage,
Unknown to us, stamp in our royal coin
The base impression of your cardinal hat,
As if you were copartner in the crown?
Ego et rex meus; you and your king must be
In equal state and pomp and majesty.
Out of my presence, hateful impudence!

WOLSEY
Remember, my liege, that I am cardinal
And deputy unto his Holiness.

KING
Be the devil’s deputy, I care not, I;
I'll not be baffled by your treachery.
You're false abusers of religion:
You can corrupt it and forbid the King,
Upon the penalty of the Pope’s black curse,
If he should pawn his crown for soldiers’ pay,
Not to suppress an old, religious abbey;
Yet you at pleasure have subverted four,
Seizing their lands, tunning up heaps of gold,

---

109-10 stamp … hat One of a number of articles drawn up against Wolsey and presented to King Henry during the parliament of October 1530 (Foxe, 908; Holinshed, 912). See Appendix 2.
109 stamp impress
110 base morally low, dishonourable (OED adj. 10b); also with reference to ‘base metal’. The suggestion is that Wolsey has diminished the value of the King’s coin by defiling it with his own symbolic image. Cf. 98, baseborn.
cardinal hat card’nal hat; the red hat worn by a cardinal, symbolic of his office
111 copartner one with an equal share; in this instance, in monarchical authority. Cf. Foxe, which tells how Wolsey ‘thought himselfe equall with the King’, becoming ‘more like a Prince then a Priest’ (899).
112 Ego … meus Latin for ‘I and my King’. This was the second of the articles drawn up against Wolsey (see 109-10h. and Appendix 2).
113 state … pomp … majesty position, splendour and authority; perhaps used synonymously here
114 hateful either full of hatred or inspiring hatred in others (OED adj. 1, 2a); both senses fit the context
impudence Used here as a noun (unrecorded in OED); perhaps a version of ‘impudence’ (n.), as in Dryden’s Evening’s Love: ‘Peace, impudence; and see my face no more’ (19; E3). The word was probably intended to rhyme with ‘be’ and ‘majesty’ in the previous lines.
117 devil’s deputy Echoing the language of Foxe, in which the Pope is labelled ‘the man of Sinne, the sonne of perdition, enemy to Christ, the deuils deputie and lieutenant’ (1552).
118 baffled subjected to public disgrace; deceived, hoodwinked (OED baffle v. 1, 4). Cf. 5.1.249.
120 forbid restrain, exclude; defy, challenge (OED v. 2a, 2e)
121 penalty risk or threat of punishment
122 be the King for soldiers’ pay i.e. in order to cover the cost of the King’s expensive foreign campaigns
123 suppress reduce to inactivity; deprive of position or power (OED v. 1a). A reference to the Dissolution of the Monasteries: the series of administrative and legal processes of the 1530s and ’40s by which King Henry disbanded and appropriated the income of hundreds of religious properties.
124 subverted demolished, razed to the ground; overtthrown (OED subvert, v. 1a, 2)
125 tunning storing, barrelling

---

112 et] (&) 114 impudence] impudence Elze 119 You’re] (Y’are)
Secret conveyance of our royal seal
To raise collections to enrich thy state,
For which, sir, we command you leave the court;
We here discharge you of your offices.
You that are Caiaphas, or great cardinal,
Haste ye with speed unto your bishopric;
There keep you till you hear further from us.
Away, and speak not.

WOLSEY
Yet will I proudly pass as cardinal,
Although this day define my heavy fall.

Exit.

EMPEROR
I fear, King Henry and my royal uncle,
The Cardinal will curse my progress hither.

KING
No matter, cousin, beshrew his treacherous heart;
He’s moved my blood to much impatience.
Where’s Will Summers?

Enter WILL SUMMERS.

Come on, wise William. We must use your little wits to chase this anger from our blood again. What art thou doing?

WILL SUMMERS I am looking round about the Emperor. Methinks ‘tis a strange sight, for though he have seen more fools than I, yet I never saw no more emperors but him.

EMPEROR Is this Will Summers? I have heard of him in all the princes’ courts in Christendom.

WILL SUMMERS La ye, my lord.

You have a famous fool of me,
I can tell ye;
Will Summers is known far and near, ye see.

---

126 The seventh article drawn up against Wolsey (see 109-10m. and Appendix 2).
127 state condition of living; social standing (OED n. 1a, 14a)
128 Caiaphas a Jewish high priest, regarded in the New Testament as Christ’s main antagonist; it was Caiaphas who sat as chief priest in the council that ‘sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death’ (Matthew, 26.59)
129 keep remain, stay
130 Yet still
131 conveyance either transportation or cunning contrivance (OED n. 2a, 11b)
132 royal seal the King’s device, impressed upon wax as evidence of monarchical attestation or authenticity
133 state condition of living; social standing (OED n. 1a, 14a)
134 heavy solemn, grievous (OED adj. 1 23). Cf. ‘this heavy message’ at 5.2.81.
135 progress journey
136 beshrew evil befall, the devil take (cf. 2.3.86)
137 treacherous treach’rous
138 moved agitated, provoked
139 wise William Perhaps drawing on the proverb: ‘Even a fool sometimes speaks a wise word’ (Tilley, F449).
140 little wits Cf. 3.1.81: ‘We have but a little wit between us’ and Old Fortunatus: ‘I am out of my little wits to see this’ (1.2.109-10).
141 La ye an exclamation suggestive of surprise or admiration
142 The seventh article drawn up against Wolsey (see 109-10m. and Appendix 2).
KING Ay, are you rhyming, William? Nay, then I am for ye. I have not rhymed with ye a great while, and now I’ll challenge ye, and the Emperor shall be judge between us.

WILL SUMMERS Content, my lord, I am for ye all. Come but one at once, and I care not.

KING Say ye so, sir? — Come, Kate, stand by me. — We’ll put you to a nonplus presently.

QUEEN KATHERINE To him, Will.

WILL SUMMERS I warrant you, madam.

KING Answer this, sir: The bud is spread, The rose is red, The leaf is green.

WILL SUMMERS A wench, ’tis said, Was found in your bed, Besides the Queen.

QUEEN KATHERINE God-a-mercy for that, Will; [handing him money] there’s two angels for thee.

— I’faith, my lord, I am glad I know it.

KING God’s mother, Kate, wilt thou believe the fool? He lies, he lies! — Ah, sirrah William, I perceive an’t had been so, you would have shamed me before the Emperor. Yet, William, have at you once more: In yonder tower, There is a flower That hath my heart.

152 rhyming OED provides the general meaning ‘versifying’ (rhyme, v. 1) but does not record any sense pertaining to the construction of witty or deriding rhymes. Cf., though, Cym: ‘Will you rhyme upon’t, / And vent it for a mock’ry?’ (5.3.55-56).

155 Content ‘I am content’, ‘agreed’. Cf. 3.1.85.

158 you Q2’s alternative reading ‘him’ is also valid, if it is assumed that this line is addressed to Queen Katherine; the reading in this edn indicates instead that the King, now backed up by the Queen, turns his attention back to Summers and the ensuing competition.

160 nonplus a state of perplexity or confusion; a standstill. Cf. Tilley, N206: ‘He is put to a nonplus’.

162-4 *As with other examples of Summers’s Skeltonics, I follow Elze in setting as verse. The King’s words, although spoken innocently, have bawdy connotations (see Williams on ‘bud’, ‘rose’, ‘leaf’ and ‘green’), perhaps prompting the nature of Summers’s reply.

165 wench Possibly just ‘woman’; however, given the subject matter of Summers’s reply, the more meaning-laden sense ‘prostitute’ is probably intended (OED n. 1a, 2).

167 Besides other than

173-5 These lines, as Wilson notes (xi), were previously printed in Puttenham’s Art of English Poesy, with only minimum alteration on Rowley’s part (the second line in Puttenham reads ‘There lieth a flowre’). However, while Puttenham’s narrator records the beginning of the reply (‘Within this hower, she will, &c.’), the rest was said to have been presented ‘in so vncleanly termes as might not now become me by the rule of Decorum to vtter’ (III.225). Whether the rhyme was well known at the time, or whether Rowley supplied his own unsavoury reply, is uncertain.

174 flower woman; connoting ‘the freshness of virginity’ (Williams, 128-9)
WILL SUMMERS
   Within this hour
   She pissed full sour
   And let a fart.

EMPEROR    He’s too hard for you, my lord; I’ll try him one veny myself. What say you to this, William?
   An emperor is great,
   High is his seat;
   Who is his foe?

WILL SUMMERS
   The worms that shall eat
   His carcass for meat,
   Whether he will, or no.

EMPEROR    Well answered, Will. Yet once more I am for ye: A ruddy lip,
   With a cherry tip,
   Is fit for a king.

WILL SUMMERS
   Ay, so he may dip
   About her hip
   I’t the other thing.

EMPEROR    He’s put me down, my lord.

WILL SUMMERS    Who comes next, then?

KING      The Queen, William; look to yourself. – To him, Kate.

QUEEN KATHERINE    Come on, William; answer to this:
   What cold I take,
   My head doth ache;
   What physic’s good?

177 full used as an intensive; very, exceedingly (OED adv. 1a).
179 hard quick-witted, skilful. Cf. Wolsey’s words at 3.1.52.
     veny a hit or thrust in fencing, a wound or blow (OED n.2 1a); used figuratively here (as in definition 1b) to mean a sharp retort. Cf. 2 If You Know Not Me: ‘Then ward your lips well, or you’ll have the first veney’ (scene 12; TLN 1756).
182 seat status, position
184-5 Cf. Tilley, M253: ‘A man is nothing but worms’ meat’.
186 whether … no Proverbial (Dent, W400.1), where ‘will’ = want, intend.
188-93 Perhaps a corruption of the proverb ‘Free of her lips free of her hips’ (Tilley, L325). The Emperor’s words, like the King’s at 162-4, have bawdy connotations which Summers uses to his advantage (see Partridge, ‘lip’).
188 ruddy red in colour, rosy
189 cherry again denoting colour, but perhaps also hinting at sweetness
191 dip plunge in and out; used here with obvious sexual reference
193 tother thing sexual organs; here, the vagina (see Partridge, ‘thing’). Cf. ‘another thing’ in TGV (3.1.340).
194 put me down defeated or humiliated me
196 look to yourself be prepared, stay focused
198 cold Unlike Somerset (see t.n.), I regard Q1’s ‘could’ as a variant spelling of ‘cold’ and thus treat this as a modernisation rather than an emendation. ‘To take cold’ was a common phrase (see OED cold n. 5b); that Summers repeats the word ‘cold’ in his reply further strengthens the case for its inclusion in the Queen’s opening rhyme.
200 physic’s remedy’s
WILL SUMMERS
Here’s one will make
The cold to break,
And warm your blood.

QUEEN KATHERINE I am not repulsed at first, William. Again, sir:
Women and their wills
Are dangerous ills,
As some men suppose.

WILL SUMMERS
She that puddings fills,
When snow lies o’th’ hills,
Must keep clean her nose.

KING
Enough, good William; y’are too hard for all.
– My lord, the Emperor, we delay too long
Your promised welcome to the English court.
The honourable Order of the Garter
Your majesty shall take immediately,
And sit installed therewith in Windsor Castle;
I tell ye, there are lads girt with that order
That will ungird the proudest champion.

201 Here’s one Summers presumably points to the King as ‘one’ who can cure the Queen by means of sexual intercourse. The use of the word ‘make = mate, match with (OED v.2) supports this interpretation.
203 warm your blood To warm the blood was to rebalance the humours and thus to rid the body of illness. Given the nature of Summers’s reply, the expression no doubt refers also to the hot-bloodedness associated with passion and sexual desire.
204 repulsed repelled, deterred (OED repulse, v.1b; repulsed, adj.); the sense ‘disgusted, offended’ might also have been intended, though the earliest recorded use in this context is 1816
205 See ‘Women will have their wills’ (Tilley, W723) and related proverbs (W626, W715).
206 ills evils
208 puddings coarse slang for penises (OED pudding, n.9a) or vaginas/wombs (Williams, Dictionary, 1107); both can be seen to fit the context here: either Summers implies that the Queen, as a woman, is filled with puddings (= penises) during sexual intercourse, or that women’s bodies are filled with, i.e. fundamentally composed of, puddings (= vaginas/wombs).
210 keep … nose Although it fits the context here, the meaning ‘to stay out of trouble’ or ‘to behave properly’ is not recorded in OED until 1887 (see nose, n.; PI, e (b)). Possibly, as Somerset suggests, the line is a reference to the typical disfigurement of the bridge of the nose that occurs in syphilis (see also Williams, 218-19), and thus to the tell-tale signs of sexual promiscuity.
211 William disyllabic y’are The copy-text form is retained in this instance since the verb ‘are’ is emphatic.
212 Emperor Emp’ror
214 Order … Garter See 5.4.245n. Charles, nominated to the Order of Garter by King Henry VII in 1508, had in fact been a member of the order for fifteen years prior to his visit to England; on this occasion he did, however, ‘ware his mantell of the garter’ and sit ‘in his owne stall’ (Holinshed, 873).
215 installed to be invested with an office or dignity by being seated in an official stall. Knights of the Garter were invested in the Garter Throne Room at Windsor Castle.
217 gilt equipped with the sword of knighthood (OED gird, v.3)
218 ungird to divest of, or free from, a girdle; used figuratively here to mean unhorse, disarm. Cf. R2: ‘He would unhorse the lustiest challenger’ (5.3.19).
219 proudest bravest, most valiant (OED proud, adj. 6a)
220 champion combatant
[to the train] Set forwards, there; regard the Emperor’s state. –
[to the Emperor] First, in our court, we’ll banquet merrily,
Then mount on steeds and, girt in complete steel,
We’ll tug at barriers, tilt and tournament;
Then shall ye see the yeomen of my guard
Wrestle, shoot, throw the sledge or pitch the bar,
Or any other active exercise.
Those triumphs past, we’ll forthwith haste to Windsor;
Saint George’s knight shall be the Christian Emperor.  

Exeunt omnes.

FINIS

219  **Set forwards** The King’s words here presum-
ably mark a cue for action on the part of the many actors still on stage. It is likely that the actors would have left the stage in staggered procession so that, by the time the King finishes speaking, only himself, the Emperor and possibly Prince Edward remain in position; these characters then exit together at the play’s conclusion, perhaps to the sound of trumpets.

**regard** be mindful of

221-2  Cf. Holinshed: ‘the more to honor his presence, royall iustes and tourneies were appointed, the which were furnished in most triumphant maner’ (873).

220  **steeds** large, courageous horses ridden in tournaments or during state occasions

221  **girt … steel** in full armour

222  **tug** contend, compete (*OED* v. 2a)

223  **barriers, tilt and tournament** See 2.3.161n.

224  **yeomen … guard** the King’s official bodyguards

225  **sledge** i.e. sledge-hammer

**pitch the bar** a form of athletic exercise in which a solid metal bar was tossed through the air

226  **triumphs** tournaments, festivities (*OED* triumph, n. 4)

227  **Saint George’s knight** i.e. a knight of England
Appendices
Appendix 1: Timeline of Rowley’s life and work

The following timeline includes all aspects of Rowley’s life discussed in the Introduction to Samuel Rowley above, both personal and professional. Possible or conjectured movements are marked with an asterisk.

Rowley’s name appears frequently throughout the pages of Henslowe’s Diary from late 1598 onwards. While the evident increase in Rowley’s responsibilities within the company is recorded here, the timeline does not include each individual mention of Rowley in the Diary; rather, it focuses on those entries that mark specific or defining moments in Rowley’s career, either as a playwright or as an actor or sharer. Undated letters such as those written to Henslowe concerning the procurement of and/or payment for new plays (see Figs. 5–8) are not included here, since their precise relation to other events – and thus their position in the timeline – is uncertain.

1560–70s Rowley was born, very likely to parents Mary and Robert Rowley of Ely. Possibly, he attended Pembroke College, Cambridge before moving to London.

*Mid-1580s Possibly, Rowley authored (or had a hand in) the Queen’s Men’s play The Famous Victories of Henry V (printed in 1598 but performed in the mid- to late 1580s). He may also have acted for this company.

*Mid-1580s to early 1590s Rowley may have had some input in the comic additions to Greene’s Orlando Furioso. This work could have been undertaken either for the Queen’s Men in the late 1580s or for the combined Admiral’s/Strange’s Men in the early 1590s.

*Early 1590s Rowley may have co-authored The Taming of a Shrew (printed in 1594), performed by the Earl of Pembroke’s Men. It is also possible that he acted for this company before joining the Admiral’s Men. Rowley’s input in this play may predate his potential work on Orlando Furioso, particularly if the latter were undertaken for the Admiral’s/Strange’s Men.

*1590s Possibly, Rowley co-authored Wily Beguiled (printed in 1606). The Epilogue’s reference to ‘a circled round’ indicates that the play (if performed by the Admiral’s–Prince Henry’s Men) must have been written before the company’s move to the Fortune in Autumn 1600.

7 April 1594 Rowley married Alice Coley at St Michael, Crooked Lane. This is the earliest definite mention of Rowley’s name in historical records.

*December 1594–January 1595 Perhaps the first appearance of Rowley’s name in Henslowe’s Diary.

3 June 1597 Rowley performed in Frederick and Basilea.
3 August 1597  The first definite mention of Rowley in *Henslowe’s Diary*: Rowley acted as witness to one of Henslowe’s loans.

c. 1598  Rowley performed in *The Battle of Alcazar*.

8 March 1598  Rowley’s autograph signature appears for the first time in a personnel list in *Henslowe’s Diary*. Evidently, he held a prominent position in the Lord Admiral’s Men at this time.

16 November 1598  Rowley bound himself as Henslowe’s ‘covenente Servant’ until Shrovetide 1600. From this point onwards, Rowley’s responsibilities in the Lord Admiral’s Men seem to have increased and his name appears frequently in the pages of *Hensowe’s Diary*. Possibly, the binding contract marked the inception of sharer status.

c. 1600  Rowley performed (or at least helped out backstage) in 2 *Fortune’s Tennis*.

10 July 1600  Rowley’s name was included in two separate personnel lists that documented the company’s prominent shareholders.

c. 4 April 1601  Rowley wrote to Henslowe about the play *The Conquest of the Indies* (see Fig. 4).

24 December 1601  Rowley and his co-author William Borne were paid for the play *Judas*.

4 October 1602  Rowley performed in *1 Tamar Cam*.

27 September 1602  Rowley was paid for the play *Joshua*.

22 November 1602  Rowley and Borne were paid for their ‘adicyones’ to Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*.

March 1603–March 1604  Rowley wrote *When You See Me, You Know Me*, performed at the Fortune c. April 1604.

15 March 1604  Rowley marched alongside a number of his fellow players as part of the King’s royal entrance into London.

*Early 1600s*  Possibly, Rowley revised the manuscript play *Thomas of Woodstock* in the first decade of the seventeenth century.

30 April 1606  Rowley’s name was included in a licence permitting the Prince’s Men to play at the Fortune and elsewhere.

1610  Rowley’s name appears in a list of members of the Prince’s Household.

*12 October 1610*  A Samuel Rowley (very likely this Samuel Rowley) acted as surety with Edward Hide for Hugh Evans and Robert Wakefield of Whitechapel.

*1610–11*  A Samuel Rowley (again, likely this Samuel Rowley) was a member of the Middlesex jury panel.

8 November 1612  Rowley and others of Prince Henry’s Men were granted livery for Prince Henry’s funeral.
11 January 1613  Rowley’s name appears in a licence permitting the newly named Elector Palatine’s Men to play at the Fortune and elsewhere.

25 March 1616  Rowley and others of the Elector Palatine’s Men were on tour in Cambridge. For some reason, they were sent away from Cambridge University and commanded to ‘playe noe moore’ within a five-mile radius of the city.

*1618  A Samuel Rowley (very likely this Samuel Rowley) was named as constable of Whitechapel.

*1 April 1620  Possibly, Rowley worked as an agent who collected rent for Edward Alleyn (see Fig. 3).

27 July 1623  Rowley’s play Richard III; Or, the English Profit [Prophet?] was licensed by Henry Herbert.

29 October 1623  Rowley’s ‘new Comedy’ Hard Shift for Husbands; Or, Bilbo’s the Best Blade was licensed by Henry Herbert.

6 April 1624  Rowley’s ‘new Comedy’ A Match or No Match was licensed by Henry Herbert.

23 July 1624  Rowley’s will was written.

*1 September 1624  A Samuel Rowley (very likely this Samuel Rowley) acted as foreman of the Middlesex jury.

20 October 1624  Rowley was buried in the parish of St Mary Matfelon, Whitechapel.

4 December 1624  Rowley’s will was proved by his wife, Alice.
Appendix 2: Source material

Rowley’s prominent sources are discussed in the Critical Introduction, above (pp. 46–60). The transcriptions below include longer passages from the historical chronicles, as well as the ballad ‘Martin said to his Man’ and fuller quotations from the King and Cobbler chapbook than those included in the commentary to the Edited Text.

The sources are arranged here in the order in which they appear to have been utilised in When You See Me. In each case, the corresponding act and scene numbers from this edition are given in bold. Specific line numbers are included where relevant.

ACT 2

The Pleasant and Delightful History of King Henry 8th. and a Cobbler

In addition to other disguised king plays, the anonymous King and Cobbler chapbook seems to have been the inspiration behind the episode of King Henry’s night-walk into the City of London (act 2, scene 1; mentioned in act 1, scene 4), as well as its continuation in the Counter prison (act 2, scene 3). Although in his own version of the narrative the comedy of the King’s disguised identity is most keenly felt through the character of Black Will rather than the Cobbler, there are enough parallels between When You See Me and the chapbook to suggest that Rowley knew of the folktale, or at least some version thereof. The earliest extant edition of the folktale was printed in 1670 (Wing P2530); it is from this edition that the below citations are taken.

[1.4.355–68; 2.1]

CHAP. I. How King Henry the 8th. used to visit the Watches in the City, and how he came acquainted with a merry and a Jovial Cobbler.

It was the Custome of King Henry the Eigth, to Walk late in the Night into the City Disguised, to take notice how the Constastables [sic] and Watch performed their Duty. […] This he did oftentimes, without the least discovery who he was, returning home to White-Hall early in the morning.

(A3r–v)

[2.3]

CHAP. V. The Coblers Entertainment in the King’s Celler; and how he met with his new Friend Harry Tudor, and how he come to know him to be the King.

(B2r)

[2.3.35–139]

[1]n good faith (added the Cobler) I am resolved to be Merry with you, since I have the good fortune to meet with you at last. I that you shall, replied the King, we will be as merry as Princes. With that he call’d for a large Glass of Wine, and drank to the Cobler the King’s good Health. […] When of a sudden several of the Nobles came into the Celler, extraordinary rich in Apparel, who all stood bare to Harry Tudor,
which put the Cobler into a great amazement at first, but recovering himself, he lookt more wishfully upon Harry Tudor: when presently he knew him to be the King.

(B2–B3′)

‘Martin said to his Man’

The third verse of the ballad ‘Martin said to his Man; or, Who’s the fool now?’ is the source for the Cobbler’s words at 2.1.48–51. As noted in the commentary, it is uncertain whether the actor playing the Cobbler was intended to sing or speak these words: either way, it is likely that the words would have been familiar to at least some members of the playhouse audience. The ballad was in circulation before 9 November 1588, when it was entered in the Stationers’ Register to Thomas Orywn (Arber, Transcript, vol. 2, p. 506). The earliest extant version, from which the below transcription is taken, is printed in Thomas Ravenscroft’s Deuteromelia (1609), STC 20757, D1v–D2v.

[2.1.48–51]

[First verse laid out under musical notation.]

*Martin said to his man fie man, fie, O Martin said to his man Who’s the fool now? Martin said to his man fill thou the cup and I the can, thou hast well drunken man, who’s the fool now.

I see a sheepe shering corne,
    Fie man, fie:
I see a sheepe shearing corne,
    Who’s the fool now?
I see a sheepe shearing corne,
And a couckold blow his horne,
Thou hast well drunken man,
    who’s the fool now?

I see a man in the Moone,
    Fie man, fie:
I see a man in the Moone,
    Who’s the fool now?
I see a man in the Moone,
Clowting of Saint Peters shoone,
    Thou hast well, &c.

I see a hare chase a hound,
    Fie man, fie:
I see a hare chase a hound,
    who’s the fool now?
I see a hare chase a hound,
Twenty mile aboue the ground,
Thou hast well drunken man,
    Who’s the fool now?

I see a goose ring a hog,
    Fie man, fie:
I see a goos ring a hog,
    Who’s the fool now?
I see a goose ring a hog,  
And a snayle that did bite a dog,  
Thou hast well, &c.

I see a mouse catch the cat,  
Fie man, fie:  
I see a mouse catch the cat,  
Who’s the foole now?  
I see a mouse catch the cat,  
And the cheese to eate the rat,  
Thou hast well drunken man,  
Who’s the foole now?

ACT 3

Holinshed

The following passage from Holinshed – itself taken largely from Hall’s The vnion (ff. lvi⁺ᵇ) – concerns the marriage between Lady Mary and Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk which took place in 1515. As noted in the Critical Introduction, the death threat uttered by King Henry in When You See Me does not originate in the historical chronicles and was likely fabrication on Rowley’s part. Other deviations from the chronicles are noted in the commentary.

[3.2.173–215]

At this time was much communing, and verelie (as it appeared) it was intended, that the king in person would passe the sea to Calis, and there on the marches of the same, the French king and queene to come and see the king their brother: and for the same iournie manie costlie works were wrought, much rich apparell prouided, and much preparation made against the next spring: but death which is the last end of all things let this iournie. For before the next spring the French king died at the citie of Paris, the first daie of Ianuarie, when he had beene married to the faire ladie Marie of England foure score and two daies whom he so feruentlie loued, that he gaue himselfe ouer to behold too much hir excellent beautie bearing then but eighteen yeares of age, nothing considering the proportion of his owne yeares, nor his decaied complexion; so that he fell into the rage of a feauer, which drawing to it a sudden flux, ouercame in one instant the life, that nature gaue ouer to preserue anie longer. He was a king iust & much beloued of his people, but touching his condition, neither before he was king, nor after he had the crowne he neuer found constancie nor stabilitie in either fortune.

[...]

The king of England being aduertised of the French kings death, caused a solemn obseque to be kept for him in the cathedrall church of S. Paule, with a costlie hearse: at which manie nobles were present. After this he sent a letter to comfort the queene his sister, requiring to know hir pleasure, whether she would continue still in France, or returne into England. And when he was aduertised of hir mind (which was to returne into England) the duke of Suffolke, sir Richard Wingfield deputie of Calis, and doctor West, with a goodlie band of gentlemen and yeomen, all in blacke, were sent into France, and comming to Paris, were well receiued of the new French king, Francis the first of that name who was the next heire male of the bloud roiall and of the same line of the dukes of Orleance.

[...]
The counsell of France (by the kings appointment) assigned forth hir dowrie, and the duke of Suffolke put in officers, and then was the queene deliuered to the duke by indenture, who behaued himselfe so towards hir, that he obtained hir good will to be hir husband. It was thought, that when the king created him duke of Suffolke, he perceived his sisters good will towards the said duke; and that he meant then to haue bestowed hir vpon him; but that a better offer came in the waie. But howsoever it was now, he wan hir loue; so as by hir consent, he wrote to the king hir brother, meekelie beseeching him of pardon in his request, which was humblie to desire him of his good will and contention.

The king at the first staid, but after long sute, and speciallie by meane of the French queene hir selfe, and other the dukes freends, it was agreed that the duke should bring hir into England vnmarried, and at his returne to marrie hir in England: but for doubt of change he married hir secretlie in Paris at the house of Clugnie, as was said. After he had received hir with hir dower appointed, & all hir apparell, iewels, and houshold stuffe deliuered, they tooke leaue of the new French king, and so passing thorough France, came to Calis; where she was honourable interteined, and after openlie married with great honour vnto the said duke of Suffolke. Doctor West (as then nominated bishop of Elie) remained behind at Paris, to go through with the full conclusion of a new league betwixt the king of England, and the new French king.

(pp. 835–6)

ACT 5

Foxe

As noted in the Critical Introduction, parts of act 5 of Rowley’s *When You See Me* (scenes 1 and 4, and the latter half of scene 2 in particular) rely heavily upon Foxe’s account of the accusations of heresy and treason levelled against Queen Katherine Parr in 1546; indeed, much of the dialogue between the King and Queen is taken almost verbatim from this source. Some of the key players differ in Rowley’s account: Bonner, as Gardiner’s co-plotter, replaces the Lord Chancellor Thomas Wriothesley, and the part historically played by Doctor Thomas Wendy is shared in *When You See Me* between Sir William Compton and Prince Edward. It should also be noted that the historical King Henry, unlike the King in Rowley’s play, was no longer a Roman Catholic at the time of Winchester’s (i.e. Gardiner’s) accusations.

Foxe’s account of ‘The storie of Queene Katherine Parr’ (pp. 1131–4), cited only briefly in the commentary, is reproduced here at length. The ‘storie’ is divided so as to better highlight parallels between it and the text of Rowley’s play.

[5.1.93–207 and 242–53]

About the same time aboue noted, which was about the year after the king returned from Bullein, hee was informed that Queene Katherine Parre, at that time his wife, was verie much guien to the reading and studie of the holie Scriptures: and that she for that purpose had retained diuers well learned and godlie persons, to instruct her throughly in the same, with whom as at all times conuenient she vsed to haue priuate conference touching spirituall matters: so also of ordinarie, but especiallie in Lent euyry day in the afternoone for the space of an houre, one of hir said chaplains in hir priuie chamber made some collation to hir and to hir Ladies and Gentlewomen of her priuie chamber, or other that were disposed to heare: in which sermons, they oft times touched such abuses as in the church then were rife. Which things as they were not secretlie done, so neither were their preachinges vniknowne vnto the king. Whereof at
the first, and for a great time, he seemed very wel to like. Which made hir the more bold (being indeede become very zealous toward the Gospell, and the professors thereof) frankly to debate with the king, touching Religion, and therein flatlie to discover hir selve: oftentimes wishing, exhorting & perswading the king, that as hee had to the glorie of God and his eternall fame, begun a good and a godly worke in banishing that monstrous Idoll of Rome, so he would throughlie perfect and finish the same, cleansing and purging his church of England, cleane from the dregs thereof, wherein as yet remained great superstition.

And albeit the king grew towards his latter ende, verie sterne and opinionate, so that of fewe he could be content to be taught, but worst of all to be contended withal by argument: notwithstanding towards her he refrained his accustomed maner (vnto others in like case vsed) as appeared by great respects, either for the reuerence of the cause, whereunto of himselfe he seemed well inclined, if some others could have ceased from seeking to peruerit him, or else for the singular affection which vntill a very small time before his death, he alwaies bare vnto hir. For neuer handmaid sought with more carefull diligence to please hir mistresse, then she did with all painfull indeuour applie hir selfe by all vertuous meanes, in all things to please his humour.

Moreover, besides the vertues of the mind, shee was indued with very rare gifts of nature, as singular beautie, fauor, and comely personage, being thinges wherein the king was greatlie delighted: and so enioyed she the kings fauor, to the great likelihoode of the setting at large of the Gospell within this Realme at that time, hadde not the malicious practise of certaine enemies professed against the truth (which at that time also were very great) preuented the same, to yee vtter alienating of the kings mind from Religion, and almost to the extreame ruine of the Queene and certaine others with hir, if God had not maruellouslie succoured her in that distresse. The conspirers and practisers of her death, were Gardiner bishop of Winchester, Wrisley then lorde Chancellor, and others more aswell of the kings priuie chamber, as of his priuie Counsell. These seeking (for the furtherance of their vngodly purpose) to reuiue, stirre vp, and kindle euill & pernitious humours in their prince and Soueraigne lord, to the intent to depriue hir of this great fauour, which then she stood in with the king (which they not a little feared would turne to the vtter ruine of their Antichristian sect, if it should continue) and thereby to stop the passage of the gospell: and consequentlie, hauing taken awaie hir, whoe was the onelie Patronesse of the professours of the truth, openlie without feare of checke or controlment, with fire and sword, after their accustomed maner, to inuade the small remainder (as they hoped) of that poore flocke, made their wicked entrie vnto this their mischieuous enterprise, after this maner following.

The kinges maiestie, as you haue heard, misliked to be contended withall in any kind of argument. This humour of his, although not in smaller matters, yet in causes of Religion as occasion serued, the Queene would not stick in reuerent terms and humble talke, entring with him into discourse with sound reasons of Scripture, nowe and then to contrarie. The which the king was so well accustomed vnto in those matters, that at her handes he tooke all in good part, or at the least didde neuer shewe countenance of offence thereat: which did not a little appall her aduersaries, to heare and see. During which time, perceiuing hir so throughlie grounded in the kings fauor, they durst not for their liues once open their lippes vnto the king in any respect to touch her, either in her presence, or behinde her backe: And so long she continued this her accustomed vsage, not onelie of hearing priuate Sermons (as is saide) but also of her free conference with the king in matters of Religion, without all perill, vntill at the last by reason of his sore legge (the anguishe whereof beganne more and more to increase) hee waxed sicklie, and therewithall froward, and difficult to bee pleased.

In the time of this his sicknesse, he had left his accustomed maner of comming and visiting of the queene, and therefore she, according as she understooode him by such
assured intelligence as she had about him, to be disposed to have her company, sometimes being sent for, other sometimes of her self would come to visit him, either at after dinner or after supper, as was most fit for her purpose. At which times she would not fail to use all occasions to move him, according to her manner, zealously to proceed in the reformation of the Church. The sharpness of the disease had sharpened the kings accustomed patience, so that he began to shew some tokens of misliking; and contrary unto his manner, upon a daie, breaking off that matter, he took occasion to enter into other talk, which somewhat amazed the queen. To whom notwithstanding in her presence, he gave neither euill word nor countenance, but knit vp all arguments with gentle wordes & louing countenance: and after other pleasant talke, she for that time tooke her leaue of his majestie. Who after his manner, bidding her farewell sweet heart (for that was his usuall terme to the queen) licenced her to depart.

At this visitation chanced the bishop of Winchester aforesaid to be present, as also at the queens taking her leaue (who verie well had printed in his memorie the kings suddaine interrupting of the queen in her tale, & falling into other matter) and thought that if the yron were beaten whilst it was hot, & that the kings humour were holpen, such misliking might followe towards the queen, as might both ouerthrow her and al her indeuors: and onely awaited some occasion to renew into the kings memorie, the former misliked argument. His expectation in that behalfe did nothing faile him. For the king at that time shewed himselfe no lesse prompt and ready to receiue any information, then the bishop was maliciouslie bent to stir vp the kings indignation against her. The king immediatlie vpon her departure from him, vseid these or like words: A good hearing, quoth he, it is when Women become such Clearks, and a thing much to my comfort, to come in mine olde daies to be taught by my wife.

The Bishop hearing this, seemed to mislike that the queen should so much forget her selfe, as to take vpon her to stande in any argument with his majiestie, whom he to his face extolde for his rare vertues, and speciallie for his learned judgement in matters of Religion, aboue, not onely Princes of that and other ages, but also aboue doctors professed in Diuinitie, and said that it was an vnseemlie thing for any of his Maiesties subiects to reason and argue with him so malapertlie, and greeuous to him for his part and other of his majesties counsellors and seruants, to heare the same: and that they all by prove knewe his wisedome to be such, that it was not needefull for any to put him in mind of any such matters: inferring moreover how dangerous and perillous a matter it is, and euer hath beene for a prince to suffer such insolent words at his subiectes handes: who as they take boldnesse to contrary their soueraign in wordes, so want they no will, but onely power and strength to ouerthwart them in deedes.

Besides this, that the religion by the queene so stiflie maintained, did not onely disallow and dissolue the policie and politicke gouernment of princes, but also taught the people that al things ought to be in common, so that what colour soeuer they pretended, their opinions were indeede so odious, and for the princes estate so perillous, that (sauing the reuerence they bare vnto her for his maiesties sake) they durst bee bolde to affirme that the greatest subiect in this land, speaking those words that she did speake, and defending those arguments that she did defend, had with indifferent iustice, by lawe deserved death.

Howbeit for his part he woulde not nor durst not, without good warrant from his majestie, speake his knowledge in the queenes case, although very apparant reasons made for him, & such as his dutifull affection towards his majestie, and the zeal and preseruation of his estate, woulde scarslie give him leaue to conceiue, though the vettering thereof might thorough her, and hir faction, be the vetter destruction of him, and of such as indeed did chiefly tender the Princes safetie, without his majiestie would take vpon him to bee their protector, and as it were their buckler. Which if he would doe (as in respect of his own safetie he ought not to refuse) hee with others of his faithful Counsellors, could within short time disclose such treasons, cloked with
this cloke of heresie, that his maiestie shoulde easilie perceiue, howe perillous a matter it is, to cherish a Serpent within his owne bosome. Howbeit he would not for his parte willinglie deale in the matter, both for reuerent respect aforesaid, and also for feare least the faction was growne already too great there with ye princes safetie to discouer ye same. And there withall with heauie countenance and whispering together with them of that sect there present, he held his peace.

These and such other kinds of Winchesters flattering phrases, maruellouslie whetted the king both to anger and displeasure towards the queene, and also to be jealous and mistrustful of his owne estate. For the assurance whereof princes vse not to be scrupulous to doe any thing. Thus then Winchester with his flattering words, seeking to frame the kings disposition after his owne pleasure, so far crept into the king at that time, & with doubtfull feares hee with other his fellowes, so filled the kings mistrustfull minde, that before they departed the place, the king (to see belike what they would doe) hadde giuen commandement, with warrant to certaine of them made for that purpose, to consult together about the drawing of certaine articles against the queene, wherein hir life might be touched: which the king by their persuasions pretended to bee fullie resolued not to spare, hauing any rigor or colour of law to countenance the matter. With this commission they departed for that time from the king, resolved to put their pernitious practise to as mischieuous an execution.

(pp. 1131–2)

[5.2.101–73]

[...] The Queene all this while compassed about with enimies and persecutours, perceiued nothing of all this, nor what was working against her, and what traps were laid for her by Winchester and his fellowes: so closely the matter was conueyed. But see what the Lorde God (whoe from his eternall throne of wisdome, seeth and dispatcheth all the inuention of Achitophell, and comprehendeth the wilie beguilie themselues) did for his poore handmaiden, in rescuing hir from the pitte of ruine, whereinto she was readie to fall vnawares.

For as the Lord would, so came it to passe, that the bill of articles drawne against the Queene, and subscribed with the kings own hand (although dissemblinglie ye must vnderstand) falling from the bosome of one of the foresaid counsellors, was found and taken vp of some godlie person, and brought immediatlie vnto the Queene. Who reading there the articles comprised against hir, and perceiuing the kings owne hande vnto the same, for the sudden feare thereof, fell incontinent into a great melancholie and agonie, bewailing and taking on in such sort, as was lamentable to see, as certaine of her Ladies and Gentlewomen being yet aliue, which were then present about her, can testifie.

The king hearing what perplexitie she was in, almost to the perill and danger of her life, sent his Phisitions vnto her. Who trauelling about hir, and seeing what extreamitie shee was in, did what they could for hir recouerie. Then Wendy, who knew the case better then the other, and perceiuing by hir words what the matter was, according to that the king before had told him: for the comforting of her heauie mind, began to break with her in secret maner, touching the said articles devised against hir, which he himself, he said, knew right well to be true: although he stood in danger of his life, if euer he were knowne to vtt the same to any liuing creature. Neuerthelesse, partlie for the safetie of hir life, and partlie for the discharge of his owne conscience, hauing remorse to consent to the sheading of innocent bloud, he could not but give hir warning of that mischiefe that hanged ouer hir head, beseeching hir most instantlie to vse all secrecie in that behalfe, and exhorted hir somewhat to frame & conforme hir self vnto the kings mind, saying he did not doubt, but if she would so doe, and shewe hir humble submission vnto him, shee should finde him gratious and fauourable vnto hir.
It was not long after this, but the king hearing of the dangerous state wherein she yet still remained: came unto hir him selfe. Unto whom after that she had vterted hir grieue, fearing least his maiestie (she said) had taken displeasure with hir, and had vterlie forsaken hir: he like a louing husband with sweet and comfortable words, so refreshed and appeased hir carefull mind, that she vpon the same began somewhat to recouer, and so the king after he had taried there about the space of an houre, departed.

After this the Queene rememberring with hir selfe the words that maister Wendy had said vnto hir, deuised howe by some good oportunitie she might repaire to the kings presence. And so first commanding hir ladies to conuey awaie their bookes, which were against the lawe, the next night following after supper, she (waited vppon onelie by the ladie Harbert, hir sister and the ladie Lane, who caried the candle before hir) went vnto the kings bedchamber, whom she found sitting and talking with certaine Gentlemen of his chamber. Whome when the king did behold, verie cuurteouslie he welcomed hir, & breaking off the talke, which before hir comming he had with the Gentlemen aforesaid, began of himselfe, contrary to his maner before accustomed to enter into talk of Religion, seeming as it were desirous to be resolved by the Queene of certaine doubts which he propounded.

[5.4.56–128]

The Queene perceiuing to what purpose this talk did tend, not being vnprouided in what sort to behaue hir selfe towards the king, with such answeres resolued his questions as the time and oportunitie present did require, mildeleie and with a reuerent countenance answering againe after this maner.

[Marginal note: The Queens politike submission to the king.] Your Maiestie, quoth she, doth right well knowe, neyther I my selfe am ignorant, what great imperfection and weakesse by our first creation, is allotted vnto vs women, to be ordained and appointed as inferiour and subiect vnto man as our head, from which head all our direction ought to proceed, and that as God made man to his owne shape and likenesse, whereby he being indued with more speciall gifts of perfection, might rather be stirred to the contemplation of heauenly things, and to the earnest endeauour to obey his commandements: euen so also made he woman of man, of whom and by whom shee is to bee gouerned, commanded and directed. Whose womanly weakesse, and naturall imperfection, ought to be tolerated, ayded, and borne withal, so that by his wisedome such thinges as bee lacking in hir, ought to be supplied.

Sithens therefore that God hath appointed such a naturall difference betweene man and woman, and your Maiestie beeing so excellent in giftes and ornamentes of wisedome, and I a seely poore woman so much inferior in all respectes of nature vnto you: howe then commeth it nowe to passe that your maiestie in such diffuse causes of Religion, will seeme to require my iudgement? Which when I haue vterted and saide what I can, yet must I, and wil I, referre my judgement in this and all other cases to your Maiesties wisedome, as my onely anker, supræme head and gouernour here in earth next vnder God, to leane vnto.

Not so by saint Marie, quoth the king. You are become a Doctor, Kate, to instruct vs (as wee take it) and not to bee instructed, or directed by vs.

If your Maiestie take it so, quoth the Queene, then hath your maistry very much mistaken me, who hath euer been of the opinion, to think it very vnseemly & preposterous for the woman to take vpon hir the office of an instructor or teacher to hir lord and husband, but rather to learne of hir husband, & to bee taught by him. And where I haue with your maiesties leaue heretofore byn bold to hold talke with your
maiesty, wherein somtimes in opinions there hath seemed some difference, I haue not
done it so much to maintaine opinion, as I did it rather to minister talk, not only to the
end your maiesty might with lesse greefe passe ouer this painfull time of your
infirmitie, beeing intentiue to our talk, and hoping that your maiesty should reape some
ease therby: but also that I hearing your maisties learned discourse might receiue to
my selfe some profit thereof. Wherin I assure your maistry I haue not missed any part
of my desire in that behalfe, alwaies referring my selfe in al such matters vnto your
maiesty, as by ordinance of nature it is convenient for me to doe.

[ Marginal note: Perfect agreement between the king and the Queene.] And is it
euen so sweet hart, quoth the king? And tended your arguments to no worse end? Then
perfect friendes wee are now againe, as euer at any time heretofore: and as he sate in his
chaise imbracing her in his armes and kissing her, he added this saying: That it did him
more good at that time to hear those words of her owne mouth, then if hee had heard
present newes of an hundred thousande pounds in money falne vnto him. And with
great signes and tokens of maruellous ioye and liking, with promises and assurances,
neuer againe in any sort more to mistake her, entring into other very pleasant discourses
with the Queene and the lordes, & gentlemen standing by, in the ende (being verie farre
on the night) he gaued hir leaue to depart. Whom in her absence to the standers by, hee
gaued as singular and as effectuous commendations, as before time to the bishop and the
Chancellor (who then were neither of them present) he seemed to dislike of hir.

Now then, God be thanked, the kings mind was cleane altered, and he detested in
his hart (as afterwaeres hee plainelie shewed) this Tragicall practise of those cruell
Caiphases: who nothing vnderstanding of the Kings well reformed minde, and good
disposition towards the Queene, were busilie occupied about thinking & prouiding for their
next daies labor, which was the day determined to haue caried the Queene to the Tower.

(p. 1133)

[5.4.145–94]
The daie and almost the houre appointed being come, the K. being disposed in the
after noone to take the ayre (waited vpon with two Gentlemen only of his bed
chamber) went into the garden, whither the Queene also came, being sent for by the
king himselfe, the three ladies aboue named, alone waiting vpon hir. With whom the
King at that time disposed himselfe to be as pleasant as euer hee was in all his life
before: When suddenly in the midst of their mirth, the houre determined beeing come,
in commeth the lord Chancellor into the garden with a fortie of the Kings Garde at
his heeles, with purpose in deede to haue taken the Queene, togither with the three
ladies aforesaid, whome they had before purposed to apprehend alone, euen then vnto
the Tower. Whome then the king sternelie beholding, breaking off his mirth with the
Queene, stepping a little aside, called the Chancellour vnto him. Who vpon his knees
spake certaine words vnto the King, but what they were (for that they were softlie
spoken, and the King a good prettie distance from the queene) it is not well knowne,
but it is most certaine that the kings replying vnto him, was knaue, for his answere:
yea arrant knaue, beast, and foole, and with that the K. commanded him presently to
auant out of his presence. Which wordes although they were vtttered somewhat lowe,
yet were they so vehementlie whispered out by the King, that the queene did easilie
with hir Ladies aforesaid ouer heare them: which had beene not a little to hir comfort,
if she had knowne at that time the whole cause of his comming so perfectlie, as after
shee knew it. Thus departed the lord Chancellor out of the kinges presence as he came,
with all his traine, the whole mould of all his devise being vttterlie broken.

The king after his departure, immediatlie returned to the Queene. Whom she
perceiuing to be verie much chafed (albeit comming towards hir, he enforced himselfe to
put on a merrie countenance) with as sweet words as she could vttter, indeuoured to
qualifie the king his displeasure, with request vnto his Maiestie in the behalfe of the lord Chancellor, whome he seemed to be offended withall: saying for his excuse, that albeit she knew not what iust cause his majestie had at that time to be offended with him, yet she thought that ignoranACE, not will, was the cause of his error, and so besought his maiestie (if the cause were not very hainous) at hir humble sute to take it.

[Marginal note: The Q. maketh excuse for hir enemy.]
Ah poore soule, quoth he, thou little knowest howe euill hee deserueth this grace at thy hands. Of my word (sweet hart) he hath beene towards thee an arrant knaue, and so let him goe. To this the queen in charitable maner replying in few words, ended that talke: hauing also by Gods onlie blessing happilie for that time and euer, escaped the dangerous snares of her bloudie and cruell enemies for the gospels sake.

(pp. 1133–4)

Holinshed

The following passage relates to the accusations made against Wolsey in act 5, scene 5 of Rowley’s When You See Me. These derive from the articles drawn up against the Cardinal and presented to King Henry VIII during the parliament of October 1530, just short of one month before Wolsey’s death. Articles 7, 2 and 4, in that order, are drawn upon in this scene. The articles (minus number 8) are also printed in Foxe (p. 908).

[5.5.108–13 and 126–7]

During this parlement was brought downe to the commons the booke of articles, which the lords had put to the king against the cardinall, the chiefe wherof were these.

1 First, that he without the kings assent had procured to be a legat, by reason whereof he tooke awaie the right of all bishops and spirituall persons.

2 Item, in all writings which he wrote to Rome, or anie other forren prince, he wrote Ego & rex meus, I and my king: as who would saie, that the king were his seruant.

3 Item, that he hath slandered the church of England in the court of Rome. For his suggestion to be legat was to reforme the church of England, which (as he wrote) was Facta in reprobum sensum.

4 Item, he without the kings assent carried the kings great seale with him into Flanders, when he was sent ambassador to the emperour.

5 Item, he without the kings assent, sent a commission to sir Gregorie de Cassado, knight, to conclude a league betwenee the king & the duke of Ferrar, without the kings knowledge.

6 Item, that he hauing the French pockes presumed to come and breath on the king.

7 Item, that he caused the cardinals hat to be put on the kings coine.

8 Item, that he would not suffer the kings clerke of the market to sit at saint Albons.

9 Item, that he had sent innumerable substance to Rome, for the obteining of his dignities, to the great impouerishment of the realme.

These articles, with manie more, read in the common house, and signed with the cardinals hand, was confessed by him. And also there was shewed a writing sealed with his seale, by the which he gaue to the king all his mooueables and vnmooueables.

(p. 912)
Appendix 3: Doubling charts

As discussed in the section on ‘Actors and casting’ (pp. 65–77), two possible doubling charts have been constructed for Rowley’s *When You See Me*: a minimum cast chart (a), which demonstrates how all forty-two speaking roles could have been covered by the twelve adult and five boy actors required to perform the dialogue of the play, and a fuller doubling chart (b) that covers, in addition to the forty-two speaking parts, the numerous mute and supernumerary roles required to perform the play in its entirety. The roles in this second chart are divided between the eighteen adult and five boy actors that come together in the play’s largest on-stage grouping in act 5, scene 5 (see p. 74).

The first of the two doubling charts is self-explanatory. All seventeen actors are listed – adults first and then boys – from the highest total number of speaking lines down to the lowest. The second chart is more complex. It, too, is divided into two sections, separating the adults’ from the boys’ roles; horizontal lines in each table separate out individual actors. Character names marked with an asterisk indicate principal speaking parts, i.e. parts of twenty-five or more lines for adults and ten or more lines for boys, while italicised names indicate mute roles. For each character, the chart documents in which scenes they make an appearance, as well as the number of lines spoken in each scene (an en-dash indicates that the character in question does not appear in a given scene). The number ‘0’ indicates the silent appearance of a speaking role (see, e.g., Gardiner in act 3, scene 1); it is distinguished from ‘n-s’ (‘non-speaking’), which is used only for mute roles. The far right-hand column provides the total number of lines for each role, plus, in bold, the total number of lines spoken by each actor.

3a. Minimum cast doubling chart (speaking roles only)

**Adults**
1. King = 1,003 lines
2. Will Summers / Black Will = 415 lines
3. Wolsey / 1 Servant = 249 lines
4. Bonnivet / Campeius / Constable / Porter / Cranmer / Emperor = 211 lines
5. Gardiner / Rooksby / Servant = 114 lines
6. Bonner / Cobbler = 111 lines
7. Paris / Patch / Messenger / Tye = 88 lines
8. Compton = 82 lines
9. Brandon / 2 Servant = 80 lines
10. Grey / 1 Watch / 1 Prisoner = 47 lines
11. Dudley / 2 Watch / 2 Prisoner = 36 lines
12. Seymour / Dormouse / 1 Guard = 21 lines

**Boys**
13. 2 Lady / Prince = 202 lines
14. 1 Lady / Queen Katherine = 161 lines
15. Lady Mary = 29 lines
16. Queen Jane / 1 Page / Marquess = 28 lines
17. Countess / Browne = 21 lines
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors' roles</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>4.2</th>
<th>5.1</th>
<th>5.2</th>
<th>5.3</th>
<th>5.4</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Will Summers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Wolsey</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mace-bearer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Black Will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendant (Prince's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Emperor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gardiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purse-bearer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Campeus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cranmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword-bearer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bonner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Constable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Compton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herald (re-entrance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Adult Actors

3b. Full doubling chart (with speaking and mute roles)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors' roles</th>
<th>Number of times</th>
<th>Act and scene numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Brandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bonnivet</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cobbler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendant (Prince's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpeter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Patch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mace-bearer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Watch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword-bearer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Prisoner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendant (King's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Guard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardsmen (twice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Adult Actors (continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors' roles</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>5.1</th>
<th>5.2</th>
<th>5.3</th>
<th>5.4</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>Number of lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooksby</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Servant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardsman (twice)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Mayor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Watch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Prisoner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messenger</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendant (King's)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardsman (twice)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardsman (twice)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeper</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentleman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n-s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Adult Actors (continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors' roles</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>5.1</th>
<th>5.2</th>
<th>5.3</th>
<th>5.4</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>Number of lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Prince</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Queen Katherine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lady Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Lord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Queen Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Browne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Boy Actors
### Appendix 4: Location of early modern editions

The table that follows documents the current locations and shelfmarks of the thirty-one known copies of Rowley’s *When You See Me*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current shelfmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Bodleian</td>
<td>Mal.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston Public Library</td>
<td>XG.3975.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Bodleian</td>
<td>Mal.186 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>C.34.e.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester College</td>
<td>Plays 4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>69159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ThULB</td>
<td>4 Art.lib.XIII, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Bodleian (1)</td>
<td>Mal.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bodleian (2)</td>
<td>Douce R130 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V&amp;A</td>
<td>Dyce 26 Box 38/6; ref. 8382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eton College</td>
<td>S.170. Plays 13 (05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petworth House</td>
<td>Old Plays 14 (04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>IUA10737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beinecke, Yale</td>
<td>Z77 184cs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>69139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houghton, Harvard</td>
<td>14433.26.6.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>PR2739 R8 W5 1621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Bodleian</td>
<td>Mal.214 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Library (1)</td>
<td>C.34.e.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Library (2)</td>
<td>C.12.f.2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester College</td>
<td>Plays 4.89 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V&amp;A</td>
<td>Forster 47,E Box 6/11; ref. 7542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>69157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folger Shakespeare (1)</td>
<td>STC 21420, copy 1, cs163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folger Shakespeare (2)</td>
<td>STC 21420, copy 2, cs432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clark, Los Angeles</td>
<td>PR2739,R8 W5 1632 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>IUA10738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newberry, Chicago</td>
<td>Case Y 135.R7972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beinecke, Yale</td>
<td>Ih R797 605cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>RHT 17th-492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other copies

Copies of Q1 were once owned by Sir John Harington (c. 1609–10) and by Henry Oxinden of Barham, Kent (c. 1663–5).\(^1\) A copy of Q3 was owned (or at least temporarily in the possession of) William Drummond of Hawthornden who, around 1621, compiled a ‘Catalogue of Comedies’ that he had either read or bought; Rowley’s play heads the list.\(^2\) In the 1630s–40s a copy of Q4 was owned by John Horne of Headington, Oxfordshire; after his death, his playbooks passed into the possession of John Houghton of Brasenose College, Oxford, then to James Herne, and finally to the library of Ralph Sheldon at Weston (Warwickshire).\(^3\) None of the abovementioned copies have been located, and it is possible that they no longer survive.

The location of another copy of Q2, once owned by bibliophile Henry Huth (b. 1815–d. 1878), is also currently unknown. The copy in question was sold on the forty-second day of the sale of Huth’s library on 3 July 1918 as lot number 6454; the physical description was given as follows: ‘(some margins cut into), mottled calf extra’. It was bought for £18 by Pickering & Chatto, who also purchased Huth’s ‘fine’ copy of ‘Rowley’s’ *The Noble Soldier*.\(^4\) Presumably the copy is now in a private collection.

---

\(^{1}\) Wiggins, *Catalogue*, vol. 5, entry 1441, p. 149.


\(^{3}\) Wiggins, *Catalogue*, vol. 5, entry 1441, p. 149.

Appendix 5: Bibliographical descriptions and copy-specific information

1605 edition (Q1)

Greg 212 (a), STC 21417

TITLE

When you see me, | You know me. | Or the famous Chronicle Historie [ligature ‘ſt’] | of king Henry the eight, with the | birth and vertuous life of Edward | Prince of Wales. | As it was playd by the high and mightie Prince | of Wales his famuants. | By SAMVELL ROVVLY, famuant | to the Prince. | [woodcut mask ornament, extremities measuring 53 x 40 mm] | LONDON, | Imprinted for Nathaniell Butter, and are to be fold | in Paules Church-yeard neare Saint | Austines [swash ‘A’; ligature ‘st’] gate. 1605.

HALF-TITLE

[Lace ornament, 94 x 12 mm] | When you see me, | You know me.

RUNNING TITLES (divided as per the five sections of Q1; see also Appendix 7)

Sheets A–C: When you see me, you know me. on A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, B2, B3v, B4v, C1, C2, C3 and C4v

When you see me, you know me. on B3v and C2v

When you see me, you know me. on B4v, C1v and C4v

Sheets D–F: When you see me, you know me. on D2, D3v, D4v, E1, E2, E3v, E4v, F1, F2, F3v and F4v

When you see me, you knowe me. on D1, E4v and F4v

When you see me, thou art knowne me. on D3v, E3v and F3v

When you see me, you know me. on D4v

Sheet G: When you see me, you know me. throughout

Sheets H–I: When you see me, you know me. throughout

Sheets K–L: When you see mee, you know mee. throughout

COLLATION

4o: A–K4 L2
Leaves 1–3 typically signed (excluding A1 and L2); G and H fully signed.

CONTENTS

A1v: title-page
A1r: blank
A2v: half-title, initial and start of text
L2r: FINIS. [swash ‘N’] and ornament, 70 x 11 mm
L2v: blank
TYPOGRAPHY

Sheets A–C: 40–44 lines of small pica type per page
Measures of 96 mm and 79 mm.

Sheets D–F: 38 lines (average) of pica type per page
Measures of 115 mm and 90 mm.

Sheet G: 38 lines (average) of pica type per page
Measures of 156 mm and 87 mm.

Sheets H–I: 38 lines (average) of pica type per page
Measures of 156 mm and 89 mm in sheet H;
measures of 156 mm and 89 mm in sheet I.

Sheets K–L: 38 lines (average) of pica type per page
Measures of 156 mm and 81 mm.

CATCHWORDS FAILING TO CATCH

A4v King| King.
A4v marry| marrie
B1v King| King.
B2v We| L. Marie.
B3v King.| Kin.
B4v Bran.| Brand.
C1v Pach| Patch.
C2v lafe| lafe
C4v Gray| Gray.
C4v King| King.
D1v I Wat. God-| I Wat. Godyegodnight
D3v 2. VWatch| 2. Watch.
D4v Con-| Con.
E1v But| Enter
E2v Will.| VWill.
F2v Rookesbie| Rookesby,
F4v Then| Then
G1v paines| paynes,
G4v Prince.| Ile
H1v :Dud.| Dud.
H2v Ye| Yee
I1v Enter| Cran.
I4v Comp.| Compt:
K2v decei-| deceived

COPY-SPECIFIC INFORMATION (shelfmarks and press variants in Appendices 4 and 6)

Bodleian copy

178 x 133 mm, trimmed

Provenance: copy owned by Richard Heber (1773–1833); ‘BIBLIOTHECA
HEBERIANA’ stamp on first endpaper, plus acquisition note on
reverse of front board (he paid £4 14s 6d for the copy on 15 August
1821). Acquired by the Bodleian in 1834; part of Malone Collection.

Binding: bound as a single copy, prior to Heber’s ownership, in velum; holes
down the inside margins provide evidence of previous stab-stitching

Marginalia: missing SP supplied on G3v; pen marks on L1v mark Summers’s jests
Other: water staining to top outer corners of sheets A–E; minor rust marks in sheets K and L. Watermarks visible in all sheets but C, E and L.

Boston copy

162 x 109 mm, trimmed

Provenance: once owned by Thomas Pennant Barton, whose bookplate appears on the front pastedown. Acquired by the Boston Public Library in May 1873. The note ‘128 – 2.12.6’ may indicate that the copy was previously bought at auction, as lot number 128, for £2 12s 6d.

Binding: bound singly in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century between sturdy marbled boards with a dark red leather spine

Other: Severely cropped throughout. Watermarks visible in all sheets but A, C, I and L.

1613 edition (Q2)

Greg 212 (b), STC 21418

TITLE

WHEN YOV SEE ME, | You know me. | Or the famous Chronicle Hiforrie [ligature ‘ft’] of king | Henrie the Eight, with the birth and vertuous life | of EDVARD Prince of Wales. | As it was playd by the high and mightie Prince of Wales | his fervants. | By SAMVELL ROVLY, fervant | to the Prince. | [woodcut of Henry VIII, 88 x 97 mm] | AT LONDON, | ¶ Printed for Nathaniell Butter, and are to be ſold at his ſhop in Paules | Church-yard neare S. Austines [swash ‘A’; ligature ‘st’] gate. 1613.

HALF-TITLE

[Lace ornament within border, 105 x 19 mm] | When you ſee mee, | You know mee.

RUNNING TITLES

When you ſee me, you know me. [swash final ‘e’]

COLLATION

4:o: A–L4, signed on first three leaves of each gathering (excluding A1)

CONTENTS

A1*: title-page
A1*: blank
A2*: half-title, initial and start of text
L3*: FINIS. [swash ‘I’ (first occurrence); swash ‘N’] and lace ornament, 87 x 12 mm
L4*: blank

TYPOGRAPHY

38 lines (average) of pica type per page
Sheets A–D: measures of 104 mm and 157 mm
Sheets E–L: measures of 95 mm and 157 mm
CATCHWORDS FAILING TO CATCH

B4’ La. Mary.] Lady Mary.
C4’ Will.] Will.
D4’ 2 Watch.] 2 VWatch.
E1’ Enter] ¶ Enter
F1’ toge-[] together
F3’ Comp.] Comp

COPY-SPECIFIC INFORMATION (shelfmarks and press variants in Appendices 4 and 6)

Bodleian copy
173 x 124 mm, trimmed; lacks L4
Provenance: copy bequeathed by Edmund Malone (received by the Bodleian in 1821)
Binding: rebound singly in August 1927 between brown boards with dark brown leather spine
Other: title-page cropped so that only ‘AT LONDON’ is fully visible; the date ‘1613’ is supplied by hand. Some signatures and catchwords cropped. Watermarks visible in sheets A, H, I, K and L.

British Library copy
170 x 121 mm, trimmed; lacks L4
Provenance: MVSEVM BRITANNICVM stamp (in use from 1753–1836) on A1r and orange BRITISH MUSEUM stamp (in use from 1768–1944) on L3v indicate that the copy was donated to BL between 1768 and 1836
Binding: bound singly in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century in an armorial binding; red cover boards with identical gilt decoration and emblem on front and back panels. Evidence of previous stab-stitching.
Other: slightly cropped at the head. Watermarks visible in all sheets but F and I.

Worcester College copy
189 x 128 mm, trimmed; lacks L4
Provenance: unknown, but in the possession of Worcester College Library by the early twentieth century
Binding: rebound singly in the early twentieth century by C. H. Wilkinson, the then librarian of Worcester College; dark brown half-calf binding with colourful, feathered boards
Marginalia: the name ‘Robert’ is written in ink alongside the title-page woodcut and the names ‘Richard Skynner’ and ‘Andrew Cashe’ appear alongside the text on C2r and K4v and on H2r, respectively; on C2r the note ‘His Books 1617’ is written next to Skynner’s signature. On I2v Elizabeth’s letter to Prince Edward (5.2.41–50) is written out in full (see Fig. 12 on p. 141), and a number of line drawings and patterns appear in sheets K and L.
Other: some repair work to title-page and to leaves B3 and L4. Watermarks visible in all sheets but A and L.
Huntington copy
176 x 125 mm, trimmed; lacks L4
Provenance: once owned by Robert Hoe (bookplate on front pastedown); acquired by Henry E. Huntington in 1912. The note ‘6/6/-’ evidently represents the price paid for the copy.
Binding: bound singly in the early twentieth century by T. Aitken (note on endpaper). Goatskin binding with intricate gilt tooling; each leaf edged in gold.
Other: title-page slightly cropped at the foot, affecting the imprint. Some minor repair work evident throughout; more extensive work on leaves B2 and D1. Many leaves heavily stained. Watermarks visible in all sheets but L.

Harry Ransom Center copy
169 x 119 mm, trimmed (title-page trimmed at 175 mm x 119 mm and folded horizontally along the imprint to prevent overhang)
Provenance: once owned by John L. Clawson (bookplate on front pastedown); sold as lot number 688 in the sixth session of the Clawson sale on 24 May 1926. Now a part of the Carl Howard Pforzheimer (1879–1957) Collection.
Binding: rebound singly in the mid-nineteenth century by Riviere & Son. Dark brown morocco with gilt lettering on front cover board and spine; leaves edged with gold.
Other: slightly cropped at the foot throughout, obscuring some signatures and catchwords; some damage to leaves A3 and A4. Watermarks visible in all sheets.

ThULB copy
187 x 140 mm, trimmed
Provenance: owned by historian Johann Andreas Bose (1626–1674), who became Professor of History at the University of Jena in 1656; purchased from Bose’s widow for 2,000 Thalers in 1675/6 by the Saxon-Ernestine Dukes for use in the Academic Library
Binding: bound singly in a wrapper of thin card, stitched together with fine string
Other: pages in this copy have not been beaten flat – the small hillocks produced by the type indicate that the sheets were printed inner forme first. Watermarks visible in all sheets.

1621 edition (Q3)
Greg 212 (c), STC 21419

TITLE
WHEN YOV SEE ME, | You know me. | Or the famous Chronicle Hiſtory [ligature ‘ſt’] of king | Henrie the Eight, with the birth and vertuous life | of EDVWARD Prince of Wales. | As it was playd by the high and mightie Prince of Wales | his feruants. | By SAMVELL ROVVLY, ſeruant | to the Prince. | [woodcut of Henry VIII, 88 x 97 mm] |
AT LONDON, ¶ Printed for Nathaniel Butter, and are to be sold at his shop in Paules Church-yard neere S. Austines [ligature ‘st’] gate. 1621.

HALF-TITLE
[Lace ornament within border, 105 x 19 mm] | When you see mee, | You know me.

RUNNING TITLES
When you see mee, you know mee. [swash ‘e’, second occurrence] on A3v.
When you see mee, you know me. [swash ‘e’] on A3r, A4, B3, B4, C3r, C4v, D3r, D4v, E3r, E4v, F3r, F4v, G3r, G4v, H3v, H4v, I3, I4v, K3v and K4v.

When you see mee, you know mee. [swash ‘e’, second occurrence] on all other leaves.

COLLATION
4⁰: A–L⁴, signed on first three leaves of each gathering (excluding A1).

CONTENTS
A1r: title-page
A1v: blank
A2r: half-title, initial and start of text
L3v: FINIS. [swash ‘I’ (first occurrence); swash ‘N’] and lace ornament, 92 x 13 mm
L4: blank

TYPOGRAPHY
38 lines (average) of pica type per page.
Sheets A–D: measures of 104 mm and 157 mm
Sheets E–L: measures of 95 mm and 157 mm.

CATCHWORDS FAILING TO CATCH
B4r La. Mary.] Lady Mary.
C4v wele] wele
D3v King.] King
E1v Enter] ¶ Enter
E2v Enter] Enter,
E3r wine] Wine
F3v Comp.] Camp.

COPY-SPECIFIC INFORMATION (shelfmarks and press variants in Appendices 4 and 6)

Bodleian copy (1)
171 x 128 mm, trimmed; lacks L4
Provenance: like the Bodleian’s copy of Q1, this once belonged to Richard Heber (acquisition note on first endpaper, plus price ‘1.11.6’); it later became a part of the Malone Collection
Binding: bound either before or while in Heber’s possession in dark green morocco with marbled boards; gilt tooling on covers and spine
Other: slightly cropped at the head, affecting some running titles; damage to leaf L3, obscuring text in places. Watermarks visible in all sheets but A and L.

**Bodleian copy (2)**

177 x 125 mm, trimmed

Provenance: copy once belonged to Francis Douce (armorial bookplate on endpaper and acquisition note on front pasteboard: ‘Major Pearson’s sale, April 1788, lot 3932. Bt by Douce for 7/6d’); acquired by the Bodleian upon Douce’s death in 1834

Binding: bound with a copy of *The Noble Soldier* (1634), presumably under the assumption that both texts were authored by Rowley. Pre-nineteenth-century binding. Brown half-calf with marbled boards; gilt tooling and lettering on spine.

Other: title-page slightly cropped at the foot; other pages slightly cropped at the head, affecting some running titles. Two engraved images are glued on to the front pasteboard, perhaps depicting character types from the plays (one is a jester). Watermarks visible in all sheets but L.

**V&A copy**

173 x 125 mm, trimmed

Provenance: bequeathed by the Reverend Alexander Dyce (d. 1869)

Binding: rebound singly in the early to mid-nineteenth century while in Dyce’s possession; brown calf with gilt tooling. Evidence of previous stab-stitching.

Marginalia: a pencil note on the front endpaper reads: ‘collated perfect – A Dyce’; another note in Dyce’s hand on L4 v cites a line from the play: ‘God ye godnight & twenty, sir’ and provides its position in the text (‘D3’)

Other: cropped at both head and foot, affecting some running titles and catchwords; imprint severely cropped so that only ‘AT LONDON,’ is fully visible. Much discolouration (especially sheets G and I) and evidence of repair work on title-page. Watermarks visible in all sheets but L. Erroneously listed in the National Art Library catalogue as a copy of the 1605 edition.

**Eton College copy**

178 x 121 mm, trimmed; gathering L (see ‘Binding’) trimmed at 168 x 121 mm; lacks L4

Provenance: bequeathed by Anthony Morris Storer (d. 1799), book collector and previous student of Eton; acquired by Eton College in 1800

Binding: bound in the eighteenth century as part of a volume of five plays (the last of the five). Mottled calf, with gilt decoration on covers and spine. A blank leaf is inserted between leaves A1 and A2, and gathering L is taken from a (presumably now lost) copy of Q2 and bound in erroneously before gathering K.

Other: slightly cropped at the foot, affecting some catchwords; imprint severely cropped so that only the first line remains. Cropping also at fore-edge, affecting text in sheet B. Some evidence of repair work. Watermarks visible in sheets B, D, F, H, I and K.
Petworth House (National Trust) copy

180 x 125 mm, trimmed
Provenance: copy owned by George O’Brien Wyndham, the third Earl of Egremont of Petworth House (1751–1837)
Binding: bound in the late seventeenth century as part of a larger volume of ten play quartos (fourth in volume). Bound in sprinkled calf with a double gilt fillet frame and gilt centrepiece, depicting the earl’s coronet. Evidence of previous stab-stitching.
Other: title-page cropped at the foot, so that final line of imprint is missing; severe water staining throughout. Watermarks visible in all sheets.

University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign) copy

173 x 118 mm, trimmed
Provenance: once owned by the Reverend Henry Cunliffe (1826–1894), Vicar of Shifnal in Shropshire (diamond-shaped bookplate on front pastedown). The pencil note ‘15 My 47 Stonehill’ on the second endpaper presumably represents the sale of the copy.
Binding: rebound singly in the late nineteenth century by Riviere. Red mottled half-calf binding with gilt decoration on spine and in corners.
Other: trimmed throughout at an angle; severely cropped at the foot, affecting signatures, catchwords and imprint. Minor repair work evident on A1 and L1. Brown staining throughout sheet F; paper damage in sheet I, obscuring some text. Watermarks visible in all sheets but K.

Beinecke copy (Yale)

176 x 130 mm, trimmed; lacks title-page (see ‘Other’) and L4
Provenance: bookplates on the front pastedown indicate that the copy was owned by Edgar F. Leo (dates unknown) and John Camp Williams (1859?–1929); purchased by Yale for the Albert H. Childs (1961) Memorial Collection
Binding: bound singly in the early twentieth century by Riviere. Brown calf with gilt decoration; all leaves edged in gold.
Marginalia: throughout, a hand in pencil has added signatures to all unsigned pages
Other: extensive repair work evident throughout gathering A (A2 in particular); some damage to paper in sheets E and L. Watermarks visible in all sheets but L. The title-page is taken from a copy of Q2.

Huntington copy

Leaves separated, trimmed and inlaid into a larger book, measuring 219 x 169 mm; lacks L1 and L4; L3 mutilated (see ‘Other’)
Provenance: owned by actor John Kemble (1757–1823), and then – in 1821 – by William Spencer Cavendish, the 6th Duke of Devonshire (1790–1858); bought at auction by Henry E. Huntington in January 1914
Binding: bound singly in the early nineteenth century by MacDonald, in mottle red calf with decorative gilt tooling
Marginalia: a note in Kemble’s hand appears on D2v, alongside the episode of the King’s night-walk; ink has smudged, so only ‘and’ is legible
Other: title-page severely cropped at the foot, affecting the imprint; other pages cropped at the head, affecting running titles (also a result of the copy having been inlaid). Leaf L3 is mutilated so that a large portion of the bottom right-hand corner is missing. Extensive repair work evident throughout sheet L (especially to L3, where missing text is pencilled back in); minor repair work to sheet K. Watermarks visible in all sheets but K and L.

Houghton copy (Harvard)
172 x 121 mm, trimmed; lacks L4
Provenance: acquired by means of the Charles Minot (class of 1828) fund
Binding: rebound singly on 12 June 1905 by McNamee of Cambridge, MA in brown morocco with black, white and magenta marbled boards. Evidence of previous stab-stitching.
Marginalia: very faded writing on the title-page in what appears to be a seventeenth-century hand reads: ‘Will. Summers – Tarleton; [?] – Archer[?]’. Further marginalia on A2r over the opening SD reads: ‘Card. Tho. Wolsey a sonne[?]’ of Ipswich’; the same hand adds ‘Card’ before the opening SP ‘Woolsey’. Another reader has picked out one of Summers’s rhymes (‘In yonder tower …’) by writing ‘{{’ in the margin. Along the side of H3v, an early reader has practised his/her signature, but only a few letters are clear enough to read; the more modern signature of one Charles Deane appears on two of the front endpapers.
Other: title-page cropped at the foot, affecting imprint; minor repair work to leaves A1 and A2. Watermarks visible in all sheets but K.

Ohio State University copy
174 x 123 mm, trimmed; lacks title-page and L4
Provenance: copy contains the nineteenth-century bookplate of John Duerdin, as well as the signature of John Genest, dated 1827. In early 2012 it was in the possession of rare books collector Aaron Pratt; sold to the Ohio State University later that year (now a part of the Stanley J. Kahrl Collection of Renaissance and Restoration Drama).
Binding: bound singly in the 1820s; half-calf binding with marbled boards
Marginalia: nineteenth-century ink inscription detailing the play’s title and author on recto of front endpaper; a more formal hand provides a list of dramatis personae on the verso
Other: slightly cropped at the head, affecting some running titles; trimming at fore-edge affects text on A2v. Watermarks visible in all sheets but K.

1632 edition (Q4)
Greg 212 (d), STC 21420

TITLE
WHEN YOV SEE ME, | You know [swash ‘k’] mee. [swash ‘e’, second occurrence] | Or the famous Chronicle Hiſtorie [ligature ‘ſt’] of King | HENRY the Eight, with the
birth and vertuous | Life of EDVVARD Prince of Wales. | As [swash ‘a’] it was played by the High and Mighty Prince of Wales his | Servants. | By SAMVEL ROVLY, Servant to the Prince. | [woodcut of Henry VIII, 88 x 97 mm] | LONDON | Printed by B. A. and T. F. for Nath: [swash ‘N’] Butter, and are to be fold at his | shop in St. Pauls Church-yard, neare St. Auftins [swash ‘A’; ligature ‘ft’] Gate. | 1632.

HALF-TITLE

[Lace ornament, 100 x 23 mm] | VVHEN YOV SEE ME, | You know me.

RUNNING TITLES

When you ſee me, you know mee. [swash ‘e’, second occurrence] on A2v, A3v and A4v
When you ſee me, you know mee. [swash ‘e’] on A3v and A4v
When you ſee mee, you know mee. [swash ‘e’, second occurrence] on all other leaves

COLLATION

4vo: A–L3, signed on first three leaves of each gathering (excluding A1 and A3; ‘B2’ mistakenly printed as ‘B3’)

CONTENTS

A1r: title-page
A1v: blank
A2r: half-title, initial and start of text
L3v: rule, FINIS, and lace ornament, 96 x 11 mm
L4: blank

TYPOGRAPHY

38 lines (average) of pica type per page
Sheets A–E: measures of 107 mm and 157 mm
Sheets F–G: measures of 100 mm and 157 mm
Sheets H–I: measures of 98 mm and 157 mm
Sheets K–L: measures of 100 mm and 157 mm

CATCHWORDS FAILING TO CATCH

A3v King] King.
B4v La. Mary.] Lady Mary.
C4v we’le] weele
E1v Enter.] Enter
E2v Enter] Enter,
E3v wine] Wine
K3v Bran] Bran.

COPY-SPECIFIC INFORMATION (shelfmarks and press variants in Appendices 4 and 6)

Bodleian copy

172 x 129 mm, trimmed
Provenance: copy bequeathed by Edmund Malone (received in 1821)
Binding: rebound singly in October 1929 between brown boards with dark brown leather spine. An extra leaf is inserted between A1 and A2, on the back of which is a list of dramatis personae (not in Malone’s hand).

Marginalia: poor inking on G3v has led an early reader to write over a number of words. Several handwritten numbers appear at the top of F2v, but their meaning is not apparent.

Other: carelessly trimmed; severely cropped throughout at the head, affecting running titles. Minor repair work evident on E1; paper damage on H4 obscures some of the text. Watermarks visible in all sheets but I.

British Library copy (1)
170 x 126 mm, trimmed; lacks L4
Provenance: as per the BL’s copy of Q2 (above), the ‘MVSEVM BRITANNICVM’ and ‘BRITISH MUSEUM’ stamps (on A1r and L3v, respectively) indicate that the copy was acquired between 1768 and 1836

Binding: bound singly in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century in an armorial binding; ribbed red cover boards with gilt decoration. Evidence of previous stab-stitching.

Other: title-page cropped at the head and fore-edge; some running titles and catchwords cropped in later gatherings. Some evidence of repair work on title-page and on leaf A2. Watermarks visible in all sheets but D.

British Library copy (2)
174 x 124 mm, trimmed; lacks L4
Provenance: orange ‘BRITISH MUSEUM’ stamps on A1r and L3v indicate that the copy was donated to BL between 1768 and 1944

Binding: bound with a copy of The Noble Soldier some time during the reign of George III (1738–1820). Red half-calf with red cover boards and decorative gilt toothing. Evidence of previous stab-stitching.

Other: title-page cropped at the head; some running titles and catchwords cropped in early gatherings. Dark staining on L3 makes text difficult to read in places. Watermarks visible in all sheets.

Worcester College copy
174 x 123 mm, trimmed; lacks L4
Provenance: unknown, but in the possession of Worcester College Library by the early twentieth century

Binding: bound in the early twentieth century by C. H. Wilkinson, the then librarian of Worcester College Library, with a copy of Drue’s Duchess of Suffolk (Rowley’s play precedes Drue’s); dark brown half-calf binding with colourful, feathered boards

Other: cropped at the foot throughout, affecting some catchwords. Paper heavily stained in a number of gatherings. Watermarks visible in all sheets but D.

V&A copy
177 x 132 mm, trimmed; lacks L4
Provenance: bequeathed by John Forster (d. 1876)
Binding: rebound singly in the mid-nineteenth century while in Forster’s possession; red half-calf binding with boards covered in thick, textured green-grey paper. Evidence of previous stab-stitching.

Marginalia: a note on the second front endpaper, dated March 1816, reads: ‘J. Mitford. / 1815’ and provides some basic information on Rowley and the play; on the second back endpaper, the same hand transcribes lines from *When You See Me* – particularly Summers’s jests, which are listed as ‘Songs’ – and provides page numbers for each (‘X’s in the body of the copy indicate transcribed lines).

Other: title-page very slightly cropped at the head. Watermarks visible in all sheets but D.

**Huntington copy**

177 x 128 mm, trimmed; lacks L4

Provenance: owned by Francis Egerton, 3rd Duke of Bridgewater (1736–1803); acquired by Henry E. Huntington in the early 1910s

Binding: rebound in the nineteenth century in light brown calf, with elaborate tooing on each cover; tooing includes an enlarged detail from Egerton’s armorial bookplate

Other: leaves in gathering C slightly cropped at the head, affecting some running titles; repair work evident on title-page and on leaf D2 (the latter quite extensive). Watermarks visible in all sheets.

**Folger Shakespeare Library copy (1)**

175 x 137 mm, trimmed; lacks L4

Provenance: armorial bookplate of F. A. Marshall (dates unknown) on front pastedown. An undated cut-out, possibly from an auction catalogue, is glued onto the final front endpaper; it provides the number ‘1152’ (possibly a lot number) and the price £3 15s. Another acquisition note, dated 3/7/90, appears on final endpaper with the price £5.52[?].

Binding: rebound in the eighteenth century in sprinkled brown calf, with gilt tooled decorations at each corner; leaves edged in gold

Marginalia: numerous notes and markings throughout, including the expansion of SPP and the addition of missing (and pointing out of misplaced) SDD – almost as if marking up for a performance. Also a number of suggestions for corrections.

Other: running titles slightly cropped in early gatherings; repair work evident on the title-page down the spine edge, where paper appears damaged from the cords of a previous binding, and on leaves B1 and B3. Watermarks visible in all sheets.

**Folger Shakespeare Library copy (2)**

169 x 129 mm, trimmed

Provenance: unknown

Binding: copy disbound, but with remnants of board still visible down the spine edge. Binding cords still in place at bottom, just about holding the gatherings together (with the exception of L, which is loose).
Marginalia: a number of ‘X’s mark particular lines of text, from G₄ through to H₁; these relate to the Latin passages in 4.1 and the characters’ various interpretations of them.

Other: severely cropped at the foot, affecting the imprint, signatures, catchwords and some text; slightly cropped at the fore-edge, affecting text in early gatherings. Large water stain throughout G–I. Watermarks visible in all gatherings.

Clark copy
181 x 133 mm, trimmed
Provenance: owned by William Andrews Clark Jr (1877–1934), who bequeathed his library to UCLA. Pencil notes on L₄ suggest that the copy was bought on 4 July 1926 at Marcham, Oxfordshire.
Binding: rebound singly in half red morocco with red cloth-covered boards
Marginalia: numerous pencil notes throughout gatherings A–D and the first three leaves of E, commenting on and in many cases seeking to improve the text by correcting errors; the same hand provides comment on the metre and syllabification of a number of lines, perhaps suggesting that the text was being marked up for performance.
Other: Watermarks visible in all sheets but D.

University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign) copy
175 x 120 mm (title-page 173 x 120 mm), trimmed; lacks L₄
Provenance: once owned by Francis Egerton, 3rd Duke of Bridgewater (1736–1803); a stamp on A₁ – ‘DUPLICATE Bridgew’. Liby.’ – suggests that it was acquired after what is now the Huntington copy (see above). An acquisition note on the verso of the third front endpaper reads ‘30 Jan 46 Barry’.
Binding: rebound singly in the early twentieth century by the French Binders of Garden City, New York; mottled red calf with gilt tooling
Other: some repair work evident on title-page down spine edge; text often poorly inked. Watermarks visible in all sheets.

Newberry copy
173 x 118 mm (with some minor variation in later gatherings), trimmed; lacks L₄
Provenance: unknown, but in the possession of the Newberry Library by the very early twentieth century. The price £5 5s is noted on front pastedown.
Binding: rebound singly in the early twentieth century by Blackwell; dark brown mottled calf, with no tooling or embellishment on covers
Other: severely cropped at the head and foot throughout and slightly cropped at the fore-edge, affecting the imprint, signatures, catchwords and running titles, as well as the text itself; pages seemingly trimmed at an angle. Minor repair work evident on title-page at spine edge, with more extensive (and seemingly hasty) work in gatherings I–L (particularly leaves II and I2). Watermarks visible in all sheets.
Beinecke copy (Yale)

175 x 131 mm, trimmed; lacks L4

Provenance: unknown, but seemingly in the possession of Yale University by 1 October 1942 when it was examined by library staff (slip of paper on back pastedown); now a part of the Albert H. Childs (1961) Memorial Collection. Pencil note on pastedown gives price ‘$125.00’.

Binding: bound singly in the early to mid-twentieth century by Riviere & Son; mottled red calf with elaborate gilt decoration on covers and spine

Other: slightly cropped at the head, affecting some running titles; minor repair work evident on title-page and on leaves F1 and K1. Small portion of the title (at the top) in facsimile. Very uneven inking throughout, with heavy, blotchy ink in the inner formes of B and F in particular, and very pale ink (sometimes barely visible) in the outer formes of B and D. Watermarks visible in all sheets but K.

Princeton University copy

176 x 132 mm, trimmed; lacks G2–G3 (see ‘Other’) and L4

Provenance: copy includes bookplates of George Buchan Simpson (1820–1892); Willis Vickery (b. 1857), whose books were sold by the American Art Association in 1933; and Robert H. Taylor (Princeton graduate in 1930, d. 1985). The copy was acquired by Princeton University from the library of Doris L. Benz upon her death in 1984; it was bought at auction on 16 November that year. Now a part of the Robert H. Taylor Collection of English and American Literature.

Binding: bound singly by J. B. Brechin of Dundee in 1874, presumably while in the possession of Dundee-based collector G. B. Simpson. Bound in red, willow-grained calf with gilt border decoration; all leaves edged in gold.

Marginalia: on A2v someone has begun writing out a sum, with ‘19–16–0’ above ‘8–12–0’ and a further ‘8’ in the shillings column under a horizontal rule; on B2v the misprinted signature (see ‘Collation’, above) is corrected in pencil by a different hand

Other: some evidence of repair work on leaves F3, K1, K2 and l4; wax marks evident throughout gathering C and heavy water staining in gatherings I and L. An inky thumb-print appears over the catchword on leaf F2. Watermarks visible in all sheets but D and G. Leaves G2 and G3 are taken from a (presumably now lost) copy of Q3.
Appendix 6: Press variants

Each of the four early modern editions of Rowley’s *When You See Me* exhibits a number of press variants. The majority of these reflect corrections made either by the pressman or (more likely) by the compositor. Some, however, represent accidents at press, such as loose or pieing type, and are not therefore indicative of conscious intervention on the part of printing-house personnel. Such variants are set apart from the others and further information is provided where necessary. For each variant, the relevant signature is given, as well as the position of the text in this edition; the uncorrected and corrected states of each variant are provided and the copies divided accordingly. The abbreviations RT, SD, SP and CW denote a running title, stage direction, speech prefix and catchword, respectively.

Press variants in Q1

**Inner C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>In this edition</th>
<th>Uncorrected state</th>
<th>Corrected state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C3r</td>
<td>1.4.230</td>
<td>[SP and text] <em>Ling.</em> Well</td>
<td>[SP and text] <em>King.</em> Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Copies:</em> Bodleian</td>
<td><em>Copies:</em> Boston Public Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outer I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>In this edition</th>
<th>Uncorrected state</th>
<th>Corrected state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I2r</td>
<td>5.2.143</td>
<td><em>secret</em></td>
<td><em>secret</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Copies:</em> Boston Public Library</td>
<td><em>Copies:</em> Bodleian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two further variants are evident in Q1: in the outer forme of sheet B and in the inner forme of sheet I. Both constitute accidents at press. In the Bodleian copy, the word ‘I’ that heads the twelfth line of text on B1r (1.2.110 in this edition: ‘I am sure’) is slipping out of the measure; it is printed at a forty-five degree angle to the text and is positioned much lower than the rest of the line. In the Boston copy the text-line is intact. Possibly the accident occurred at an early stage in the process and was later rectified, suggesting in turn that the Boston copy contains the corrected state of the forme. However, it is also
possible that the Boston copy exhibits an early state, printed before the accident took place. The second variant can be found on I3v (5.4.20 in this edition), where the SD ‘knocks.’ (as it appears in the Bodleian copy) reads ‘knock’ in the Boston copy, with a faint mark inked to the bottom right-hand corner of the word. Again, it is difficult to determine which copy contains the earlier and which the later state of the forme.

Press variants in Q2

Outer H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>In this edition</th>
<th>Uncorrected state</th>
<th>Corrected state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4v</td>
<td>5.1.170</td>
<td>distrube</td>
<td>distrube</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copies: Bodleian, ThULB

Copies: British Library, Worcester College, Huntington, Harry Ransom Center

Outer K

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>In this edition</th>
<th>Uncorrected state</th>
<th>Corrected state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K4v</td>
<td>5.5.17</td>
<td>highnesse,</td>
<td>highnesse hand,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copies: Worcester College

Copies: Bodleian, British Library, Huntington, Harry Ransom Center, ThULB

Press variants in Q3

Outer B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>In this edition</th>
<th>Uncorrected state</th>
<th>Corrected state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2v</td>
<td>1.2.183</td>
<td>mee, but</td>
<td>mee, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2v</td>
<td>1.2.184</td>
<td>i’the</td>
<td>i’th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copies: Huntington

Copies: Bodleian (Malone), Bodleian (Douce), V&A, Eton, Petworth, Illinois, Beinecke, Houghton, Ohio
### Outer E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>In this edition</th>
<th>Uncorrected state</th>
<th>Corrected state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1r</td>
<td>2.1.157</td>
<td>boye</td>
<td>boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1r</td>
<td>2.1.182</td>
<td>peace or</td>
<td>peace, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1r</td>
<td>2.1.182</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2r</td>
<td>2.3.0 SD</td>
<td>[SD] Enter the</td>
<td>[SD] Enter, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2r</td>
<td>2.3.27</td>
<td>brough</td>
<td>brought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3r</td>
<td>2.3.42</td>
<td>nights’ or</td>
<td>nights, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3r</td>
<td>2.3.49</td>
<td>there</td>
<td>ther’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4r</td>
<td>2.3.130</td>
<td>carried</td>
<td>Cannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4r</td>
<td>2.3.131</td>
<td>breake</td>
<td>break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4r</td>
<td>2.3.162</td>
<td>bare the</td>
<td>beare thee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Copies:**
- Eton, Huntington, Houghton
- Copies: Bodleian (Malone), Bodleian (Douce), V&A, Petworth, Illinois, Beinecke, Ohio

### Inner G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>In this edition</th>
<th>Uncorrected state</th>
<th>Corrected state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G4r</td>
<td>4.1.152</td>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>Excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Copies:**
- Bodleian (Malone), Petworth

### Outer L

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>In this edition</th>
<th>Uncorrected state</th>
<th>Corrected state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1r</td>
<td>5.5.24</td>
<td>grace</td>
<td>Grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1r</td>
<td>5.5.25</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1r</td>
<td>5.5.25</td>
<td>estate</td>
<td>Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1r</td>
<td>5.5.30 SP</td>
<td>[SP] Empe.</td>
<td>[SP] Emp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1r</td>
<td>5.5.30</td>
<td>off-spring</td>
<td>Off-spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2r</td>
<td>5.5.129</td>
<td>offices</td>
<td>Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2r</td>
<td>5.5.135</td>
<td>fall,</td>
<td>fall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2r</td>
<td>5.5.139</td>
<td>bloold</td>
<td>blood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2r</td>
<td>5.5.146</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>Is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Copies:**
- Bodleian (Malone), Bodleian (Douce), V&A, Petworth, Illinois, Beinecke, Ohio

---
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The Eton College copy is excluded in this instance, since it is lacking its original gathering L (see Appendix 5).

Press variants in Q4

Outer B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>In this edition</th>
<th>Uncorrected state</th>
<th>Corrected state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1'</td>
<td>1.2.95</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1'</td>
<td>1.2.98</td>
<td>buried [upturned ‘i’]</td>
<td>buried [corrected ‘i’]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1'</td>
<td>1.2.101</td>
<td>and [upturned ‘a’]</td>
<td>and [corrected ‘a’]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2'</td>
<td>1.2.180</td>
<td>eyther,</td>
<td>eyther I,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2'</td>
<td>1.2.196</td>
<td>[loose line of text]</td>
<td>[stable line of text]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3'</td>
<td>1.2.237</td>
<td>Queene [upturned ‘n’]</td>
<td>Queene [corrected ‘n’]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4'</td>
<td>1.2.325</td>
<td>camst</td>
<td>cam’st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4'</td>
<td>1.3.4</td>
<td>Fherefore</td>
<td>Therefore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>[CW] And [loose text]</td>
<td>[CW] And [stable text]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copies: British Library (2), Huntington, Folger (1), Illinois

Copies: Bodleian, British Library (1), Worcester College, V&A, Folger (2), Clark, Newberry, Beinecke, Princeton

*The loose line of text mentioned here on B2' is that which reads: ‘I beseech your Grace command the foole forth of the’. In the Illinois copy, all that can be seen is ‘[…] command the foole fo’, followed by an ink smudge where the ‘r’ should be and the letter ‘t’ at an angle to the rest of the text. The Folger (1) and British Library (2) copies present intermediate states of this variant: the former reads ‘[…] command the foole forth o’ and the latter ‘[…] command the foole forth’. Significantly, the line is intact in the Huntington copy (which is in an otherwise uncorrected state), suggesting in turn that this may be the earliest of the four copies. Possibly, it was the increasing severity of this
press-accident – and thus the compositor’s need to rectify it – that prompted the other corrections in this forme. The variant catchword on B4v demonstrates the same pattern of deterioration: in the Illinois copy it is absent altogether, while in the Folger (1) and British Library (2) copies only the ‘n’ and the edge of the ‘d’ are visible; the word appears in full in the Huntington copy.

**Inner F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>In this edition</th>
<th>Uncorrected state</th>
<th>Corrected state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2′</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>[CW] Lound</td>
<td>[CW] Sound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Copies:*  
British Library (2), Folger (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Significantly, this is the only variant in the forme – the playtext itself remains the same in all thirteen extant copies.

**Outer H**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>In this edition</th>
<th>Uncorrected state</th>
<th>Corrected state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1′</td>
<td>4.1.209</td>
<td>doubts</td>
<td>doubts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1′</td>
<td>4.1.229</td>
<td>Lectorer</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2′</td>
<td>5.1.21</td>
<td>holinesse</td>
<td>Holinesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4′</td>
<td>5.1.150</td>
<td>Fillin g</td>
<td>Filling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4′</td>
<td>5.1.156</td>
<td>gratiously</td>
<td>graciously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4′</td>
<td>5.1.160</td>
<td>somany</td>
<td>so many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Copies:*  
Worcester College, Huntington, Folger (2), Clark, Beinecke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There are a number of other variants evident in Q4, all of which constitute accidents at press. These can be found respectively on E2′ (the progressive pieing of the catchword ‘Enter’), K2′ (the progressive pieing of the catchword ‘Call’), and K3′ (where the gap between the first ‘r’ and the ‘o’ of the word ‘Emperour’ is larger in some copies than it is in others).
Appendix 7: Q1 headline analysis

Using a methodology similar to that proposed by Randall McLeod, I have used transparencies to conduct a detailed headline analysis of Q1 *When You See Me*. Since all headlines in the Boston copy are severely cropped, the information below necessarily derives from the Bodleian copy (Mal. 829), the sole witness to the patterns of headline recurrence in this edition.

The following table highlights the differing patterns of recurrence seen across the five printers’ sections of Q1 (see Bibliographical Introduction, above). The half-sheet L, most likely imposed using the work and turn method of half-sheet imposition (pp. 143–4), is set slightly apart from the main table. An asterisk (*) next to a headline indicates that only a part of the headline was re-used, with some movement or replacement of running-title text as well as the spacing type that surrounds and justifies it; a hash (#) indicates that the same running-title text was used, but that the spacing type used to justify it was altered, either intentionally or accidently; and a cross (†) indicates that, although the same headline was used, some textual change has been made to the running title concerned, with no significant change in spacing or justification. In no instance is the labelling of the headlines intended to imply the order in which they were set and/or imposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sheet</th>
<th>Outer forme</th>
<th>Inner forme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1v</td>
<td>2v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>a^*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2d</td>
<td>2e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2h</td>
<td>2i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1v</td>
<td>1v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2m</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TP: title-page; HT: half-title

1 For the text of the running titles, see the bibliographical description of Q1 on p. 347.
As seen in the table above, certain patterns of recurrence begin to emerge within the
different sections of the text. In the opening section (A–C), two skeleton formes were
used to print sheet A. It seems likely that the inner forme of sheet B was imposed next,
for both headlines used to impose the inner forme of sheet A, headlines d and e, were
reused, along with headlines b and c from the outer forme of sheet A (the only alteration
occurs in headline b, in which the text of the running title seems to have shifted slightly
to the left). The outer forme of sheet B takes the remaining headline from outer A
(headline a) and adds three new headlines: f, g and h. As with headline b in the inner
forme of this sheet, there is some alteration to the running-title text of headline a: while
the ‘you know me’ part of the running title was reused, the ‘When you see me’ part was
not, and it is likely that this portion of the text pied, either as the compositor removed
the headline from the wrought-off forme or as he went to impose it around new
letterpress. The pattern of headline recurrence becomes more obvious in sheet C, where
all four headlines from inner B were reused in inner C, and where all but one of the
headlines used for outer B were reused in outer C.

A similar method of imposition can be seen in section two (sheets D–F). Two
skeletons were constructed for sheet D, one for the inner forme and one for the outer
forme. Three of the headlines from inner D were reused in inner E, with some
modifications (headline n appears more indented on E4’ than on D1’, and the
upturned ‘n’ of ‘know’ on D4’ was rectified before the reappearance of the headline
on E2’); the fourth headline from inner D (headline o) was reused in the outer forme
of sheet E, along with three new headlines: r, s and t. Possibly, headline u was
imposed around the type-pages of inner E before inner D was removed from the
press. The imposition of headlines in sheet F was comparatively straightforward, with all
four headlines from inner E recurring in the same relative positions in inner F, and
all four headlines from outer E recurring in the same relative positions in outer F. The
only differences occur in headlines o and p, in which running-title text appears
slightly more indented on sheet F than on sheet E. The appearance of headline q(†)
on F2’ is identical to that on E2’.

A different method of imposition was employed in section 3, for only one set of
four headlines was used to print both the inner and outer forme of sheet G. Although the
relative positions of the headlines appear to have switched between formes, this
arrangement could have come about if pages were imposed as follows:
Thus $1^v=2^v$, $2^v=1^r$, $3^v=4^v$ and $4^v=3^v$. Given the arrangement of headlines in this sheet, it is possible that sheet G was imposed using a single skeleton forme. As Blayney shrewdly points out, however, ‘four bones do not make a skeleton’ – in other words, just because the same four headlines appear in the same relative positions does not necessarily mean that the whole skeleton structure was reused. The possibility therefore remains that a second skeleton forme was constructed, and that the four headlines ($v$, $w$, $x$ and $y$) were simply transferred from one forme to the other.

Section 4 (sheets H–I) also sees the use of a single set of four headlines to complete both formes of each sheet. In the case of sheet H, it is clear that more than one skeleton was used, for the relative positions of the four headlines in the inner and outer formes are not the same. On first glance, sheet I seems a more plausible candidate for one-skeleton printing, since the headlines follow the same pattern of recurrence as seen in sheet G. What disproves the hypothesis in this instance, however, is the modified justification of running-title text that is evident between I3\textsuperscript{v} and I4\textsuperscript{v} (the text is more indented on the former than on the latter). This shift in spacing most likely occurred during the transference of the headline from the wrought-off forme to the imposing forme – such movement could not have occurred had the skeleton remained locked tightly in position on the chase.

Sheet K in section 5 marks a return to the two-skeleton printing that characterises the earlier sheets of Rowley’s play. Eight new headlines were constructed for imposition around the inner and outer formes of this sheet, and only one of these, headline 2\textit{m}, made its way from sheet K onto the half-sheet L.

***

Combined with other aspects of the text, as discussed in the Bibliographical Introduction above, the various patterns of headline recurrence evident in Q1 When You See Me further highlight the disruption at specific moments in the text’s production. This not only significantly strengthens the case for shared printing, but also demonstrates the different methods of imposition employed by the text’s printers.

---

Appendix 8: Photographs of the copy-text

The following photographs of Q1 (Bodleian copy, Mal. 829) are reproduced here by kind permission of the Bodleian Library, Oxford. The final blank page (L2v) is not included.
When you see me,
You know me.

A1v–A2v; TLN 1–32; 1.1.1–29 in this edition
372

A3–A4; TLN 118–203; 1.1.112–1.2.59 in this edition
B1\textsuperscript{v}–B2\textsuperscript{r}; TLN 289–370; 1.2.141–220 in this edition
The Child was dead, and all the world was dead. The Queen was dead, and all the world was dead. The King was dead, and all the world was dead. The Court was dead, and all the world was dead. The Castle was dead, and all the world was dead. The City was dead, and all the world was dead. The Country was dead, and all the world was dead. The World was dead, and all the world was dead.

B2r–B3r; TLN 371–453; 1.2.221–301 in this edition
B3v–B4r; TLN 454–534; 1.2.302–1.3.37 in this edition
When you for me are saying...

B4v–C1r; TLN 535–619; 1.3.38–1.4.68 in this edition
C1v–C2r; TLN 620–702; 1.4.68–147 in this edition
Get all of you away, and do not presume
We cannot yet command our patience,
Reach me a chair.

Brand. Now will, or ne'er make the king but first,
And with thine mouth say, I smite his spine.
That we his counsel may content with him,
And by my honor, I do reward thee well,
Too him good will.

Will. Not too fast, I pray, lest will Summermore bee
feege againe, I knowe his qualities as well as the best
an ye. For ever when he's angry, and no body dare
speak to him, ye shall me in by the head and shoulders,
and then wee shall fall to buxum, but I know who has
the worst art but we go, my Lords, stand aside, and there
not till I call ye, let my comin Parch and I alone, and
he goe to boxing, wee fall both upon him, thus cerne
but and the worst come. bee for the Cardinals
foole shall paye for.

Bras. Wie you bell skill, good william, llenoce feege,
Vynelle I fee him sooner.

Wil. Where ar thou cofin, alas poor foole, heire rep
under the table, vp cofin, fee noathing, the bonnets
paue, I warrant thee.

Parch. Is the king gone, cofin? we are all friends now.
The Lords are gone to dinner, and thou and I must
waste zane singings table.

Parch. Nor I bide not, I would not waste vp such
a Lord, for all the luings in the land, I thought he would
have killed my Lord Cardinals, he looked for his company.
will. Foe, he did but left with him, but tell thee cofin
the rarest tricke to bee reuengd at paffes, and hee
shew thee the finest point, and thou: doth.

Parch. Obearne, O bearne, give mee cofin, and I doe
what to e er, this.

Wil. He stand behind the boll here, and thou shalt goe
soon, beddinge behind him, as hee is readinge, yonder,
sirily, he will not tell where to set him.

Parch. Fear him not, he shall not be angry.

Wil. No no, for then he thow me my fells, and after hee feez who thinketh

life and be not her as a malter bee, and thew bee a moyd man
by it, for all the housse shall see him nuggers meet in his armes, he
dandle the up and down with hand, and soe then thou was a football.

Page. O fay, I come cofin, I see you my fay, & Iles was to lowd
that he could not believe that the dukes come.

Will. So doe not scare nothing. as thou wert the dueil himself
littely coute the I warrant thee, I would not have such a contynuing
for twentie crounes, but soe he has made away, he make him merry
enough, I doubt it not, to more cofin hee lookes to your counsembt

Page. Beo.

King. Our all take sace that and tumeble at my fette.

For thus hee spayne thee vp and downe the housse.

Parch. Help, cofin help.

Will. No cofin now he's consiting, I dare not come neere him.

King. Who set this part to ferre to trouble me,

Ed, Com, What is, this lands lefing there, the tolle, ha, ha,

Where Compen, Mother a God praye found his gird, as the touched
old villaine in christendome, make good Sir William, because
the tolle duit not come merke of the, seeing we anger, first this fillet
 signs lefing to behold the lef biltterd L. (Chaine) hee nee lea.

Will. He know whether you have done soe, knowing such, my cofin,
were kase ye oure of your kin els.

King. Much, more pach hollers bell. (Van Angell) to buy you points

Parch. cofin hee has made such a finging in my head

fay. All the better cofin and your head fulla lings

pipe. By, your fette may fall a dancingly & face charges to the

King. Will Summermore prethee tell me why did thou send him fay,
how the matter stood with the next that drawnd thy but. I knowe
keep it removed, but it the battale grew too hot, might so properly
a plate boll made all the Counse mbt, a pitiful case as pallass, the

C-3: TLN 703-84: 1418-224 in this edition
When you see me, you know me.

Enter the Constable and Watch, [Pritchett,] Cobbe, being one having a Long-bow.

Constable. Come neighbours, we have a straight command. Our watches be severally lookt into; Much theft and murder was committed lately. There are two strangers, merchants of the Stylliard. Cruelly flame, sound floating on the Thames. And greatly are stoves had in suspect. As places sitting for no better use, Therefore be careful and examine all. Perhaps we may attach the murderers.

1 Watch. Nay, I assure ye, master Constable, these new houses are places of much slaughter and redemption, and many cruel deeds of equity and wickedness are committed there, for divers good men loose both their money and their computation by them. I would see how they yee neighbours.

Pritchett.

Cob. Neighbour Cake, I know you're a man of courage, and for the merry corollar of Lysimachus, thou art as low as Saint Paulus. Cain looke as high as Pudus: I have in my drapers walke to the fences as well as my neighbours: by it the mad wenchs fall to burdering once, and cast men into the Thames; I have done with them: there no dealing off they cast fire in one hand, and water in the other.

Cob. Well matters we are new plott about the Kings. And I know ye all sufficient in the knowledge of it. I need not to repeat your charge again. Good neighbours, ye your greatest care I pray, And if commonly persons trouble ye, Call and Ile come to spy your goodnight.

Exit Constable.

1 War. God.

2 War. Nay.

3 War. God.
...in this edition...
When you see me, you know me.

Thou cuff my head asunder, but twas no play, thou layest open enough, I should have cured at my pleasure.

Nay, have thou guard fall there.

Well, Childish to a man of valour, when thou shouldst have borne thy buckler here, thou lettest it fall to thy knees, thou gauest mee a wipe, but twas more chance that had we not been parted, I had taught thee a little School play I warrant thee.

Brandon, what here, porter, who keeps the gate there?

Nay, who knocks so fast?

Enter Brandon and Compton hastily.

Compton. Stand by, sir.

Porter. Keep to back I say, whether will ye presume among the prisoners?

Bram. Sirrah to the Court, and we must in.

Porter. Why sir, the court not kept I say to day.

Bram. Ye see when the king is about.

All happen in haste to our Sovereigne.

Well, Somner, the King.

Sir. Lord beleeche the me.

Add. We all innate your grace to pardon us.

King. Stand vp good men I shall ye Brandon for differing vs, we shall not offend our time so well this monarch but thereof no remedy now the worst is this, the court good fellows must be removed the sooner.

Ye all are couriers yet, Nay, say, come forward.

Even now you know we were more familiar.

You fee publickires hold not always courtes,

I am found out, and so think will you.

Go ye, let him be removed to Norgate.

This place thee is too secure for him.

Weeked ye still further words for his follow you.

Sir. He lobbyist for his Grace.

King. Theres no grace in the nor none for thee.

Go, away with him.

Exit Somner and Porter.

Well, Somner, I call to Tyburne presently.

King. Gentlemen, you that have bee wronged by my feruants and the Cardinall shall give me nearer notes of thy

Bash

John, what is thy name, and how much debt they owe yet.

Both what they are, and how much debt they owe yet.

Send your petitions to the Court to me.

And do not think you shall have remedy.

The effect of Angers, drink to King Harris, healthy.

The effect of Angers, drink to King Harris, healthy.

The effect of Angers, drink to King Harris, healthy.

Thence withal, much wrong King men may do.

The which their matters you content into.

The which their matters you content into.

This they respect, you well subject grace.

King. When I, Black Friar, may come nearer man,

I came nearer you though ye set still to my play.

You, both Lord, your Majesties the left hand, and buckler man in Europe, ye eye at close to your wards, carry your point as fast, that too enter comes nearer ye for gullient Fence-play.

King. Nay now ye let us.

Well, For God, ye brake my head most gallantly.

King. But now but by chance ye know, but now your heads broke, you look at a player I, in turn.

Well. And your grace will give me leave, I put it vp and show my ways presently.

King. Nay, godly, the Keeper will deny we that pridled me.

Come hither, fyrst, because ye shall know King Harris loves a man, & if not, then all the more, all ye, the see the Angels for thee, marries shall be to keep ye, ye are not only till we have another we for ye. You can break through watch, you stand without to valiantly I ye that do see amongst your countries enemies.

Well. The warts sweet King, is my delight, my desire, my desire to give the me, to be a tattled Corporal, and to give me now to forward to ask brave attempts, and dash them against a Castle wall.

King. Twill be, I shall not court me, I shall take him in.

Well, gold digg, your Majesty shall come drink to your health.

King. Begone sir, keeper. I thank you for our lodging.

Exit.
When ye see me, ye shall know me.

And once a quarter we desire such sport.

Exit.

Enter the Cardinal reading a letter, Sommer in his Bishop's Robes.

VVe, my reverend Lord of London,
Ou list the friendly king of France is dead,
And in his death, our hopes are hindered:
And in his place, the emperor is raised,
That we shall cross him forth, I doubt it not.

Enter the Bishop of Lincoln.

Som, your grace by letters from Cologne,
I doubt not but shall send you your full content,
For I that must be your faithful way to work,
And that we shall, in the English Cardinal.

Enter the Duke of York.

Pace, come to our Lord Cardinall;
He bring you to the King of France;
In whom you know we durst not,
He gave his angel,
For he gave me a blow of an ear, and I care not.

Pace, how you do well, William,
The life I thank your grace;
I had lay your Lordship hard,
And the two new offices were come.

Pace, your Lordship will be well guarded, &= we follow you.
When you see me, you know me.

The King's fool, and the Cardinals', and we are no small fools, I affirme you.

Yet, noinde, my counsellor, I see something too square to be set on your dace, marry, and you see me on your shoulder, the fool shall ride you.

If you have a fool, you have a better, William, I have a quarrell to you since our last meeting.

Marry your Lord, I see he is a man of sense, and will never lose his wit.

You speak plain, William.

Yet, you know fools to flatter, I warrant you.

Well, wait till they try your wit anon, what say you to this?

The bells hang high, and lowe they cry, what do they speak?

Well, if you should dyes, then none would cry, though your neck should break.

Well, you are something better, William: But come on, once more, I am for you. A rod in schoole, a whip for a fool, is always in season.

Well, A balter and a rope, for him that would be pomegranate in his right and reason.

Well, Hees too hard for me, I will give him over, come tell me Wull, what the newses at Court?

Well, Marry my Lord, they say the King must be married this morning.

Well, married Wull, to whom I reheare?

Well, Wull, to my Lady Catherine Parr, I was once by, when he was wooing her, and then I doubted they would go together shortly.

Well, Holy Saint Peter shield his Majestie,

She is the hope of Luton's here, and he be Queene, the Protestants will fare.

And Cramner, Tutor to the Prince of Wales,

Will boldly speake, and say Rome Religion,

But Bishops weal to Courie immediately,

And plot the downfall of the Lutherans: You two are Tutoris to the Princes Mary.

Still you see me, you know me.

When you see me, you know me.

Still ply her to the Paper obedience,

And make her take the name of Protesstants.

Let it be said that Luteron and Rome,

Chief teachers of the faire Elizabeth,

Are not found Catholikes, nor friends to Rome.

If he be a fool, hee shall not remonstrate

This better they should dye, then thousands fall.

Come follow vs, Marry, and Wull, and I:

Exitantes.

Yloll, Your Lordship mad, his he be at the wedding, he was most well the King ride to set over, and now tell him out, but alas, one, if he be married, let him play with his Queene to night, and then to morrow hee call for me, where is no fool, to till the wine

What shall we do now?

Wull, Hee goe get the key of the wine-feller, and thou and I keep a paillage there to night.

Wul, VVe have but little wine betweene vs already, and do we should have none at all.

Wull, When our wits be gone, we clepe slape eath feller, and lye without our wits for one night.

Wull, Content, and then eth morning wake but wet them with an other cup more, and that shall be a riser for all day.

Come, thou good Queene, let no bodie goe with vs, lest they be drunk before vs, for fooles are innocents, and must be accelerating to no mans overthrow.

Sound Trumpets.

Exit King, Queen Katherine Cardinell, Semer, Duke ofGosn, and other Companions, crying: Huy, Huy.

Quee, VVelcome Queene Katherine, set thee by our side, Thy light Queene, like vs thus dignified, Earle, Baron, Count, and Gentlemen.

Against thee, we clepe be clepe lie challenger, To fight at Turnaments, at Fite, and Turnament.

In honore of the faire Queene Katherine, Queene, VVetake your highnesse, and becesseth your grace.

Exit.
...
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teeth about the roof.

Will. That's a lie, a Cuckold has.

Dr. Throstle the Fool out of the presence there.

W. Well, Cuckold are they, the Sholes shall hate the Foolish place.

Dr. Well, Comer, you have made me able to prove a man no beef, if he prove not himself for, ye know how he may ly, doth ye love, and I love your Learning, speak and we hear you.

God give ye truth that you may give me.

This Land ye know has hands unarmed in her book.

Betwixt the Papists and the Protestants.

You know we all must die, and thus faith

Part, with her part of immortallitie.

Tutor, I doe believe both Heaven and Hell.

Do you know any third place for the soules abode.

Cald d' Purgatorie, as forsothe I would have me think.

For from my Sister Marie and line Tutors,

I have receiv'd Letters to that purpose.

11Oue ye Comer, and shall belowe when ye Speake.

Therefore I charge yet all the truth.

Com. How think you your Grace is there a place of Pur.

P. Truly I think none, yet must I vrgo you what I sayd.

To me, this world you know hath beene the Countur and your Soul entwining, full deceiving, full deceiving.

How long will be, more know but be that made it.

We all do call our Fathers children, ye are free as are not.

But think ye there is one that can tame this heaven & hell.

That able to contain those soules so numerably.

That ever breathed since the first breath was given.

Without a Teremor, or a third place.

Who puts these doubts within your Grace's head.

Are like their name believe, false and unverified,

Quoddam infinitum, non habet formam.

Caecum est spatii Divi, spatii Divit est infinitum.

Ego Caecum, est infinitum.

That which is infinite hath no end at all,

For that eternity, that everlastling silence,

...
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Our hand shall from this present world be taken,
Let us now from this life farewell and go.
And come where the soul is made unto
By Jesus Christ the Son of God, whose
Grace and Power doth extend to all the world.

If the end of life be come, the soul is
Hallowed, clothed in the garb of God's
Goodness, and wrought up to the image of
Christ, and the glory of God.

From thence go we to Kingdomb of glory.
We shall live in the presence of the
Spirit, and be with God for ever and ever.

Well have we served the Lord in this life,
And now we shall serve him eternally.
By the grace of God, we shall be happy
And joyous in the presence of the Lord.
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Come ye from the King.

Comp. That then is your last time, you are accord of high conformity.

That he is your last time, you are accord of high conformity.

Comp. That then is your last time, you are accord of high conformity.

That he is your last time, you are accord of high conformity.

Comp. That then is your last time, you are accord of high conformity.

That he is your last time, you are accord of high conformity.

Come ye from the King.

Comp. That then is your last time, you are accord of high conformity.

That he is your last time, you are accord of high conformity.

Come ye from the King.

Comp. That then is your last time, you are accord of high conformity.

That he is your last time, you are accord of high conformity.

Come ye from the King.
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When you see me, you know me.

Then any Prefete, that Subornes the Pope:
Then to viope upon our government
Call ye her trayor! Ye lying, beetle and fals
conspirators.

Ben: Your Maiesty hath scene what proofs we had.

King: Here you Banner, you are a whorden concomb,
What proofs had ye, but treafons of your owne inventions?

Queen: O my deare Lordes, respect the revered
Bishoppes.

Banner and Gardiner loves your Maiestie.

King Als gours Kake, thou shalt, it full little what
they come for.

Thou hast small reason to commend their loves,
That falsely have accusd thy barmefull life.

Queen: O Lord, are these mine enemies?

Gard: We have, your highness hands to warnaunt it.

King Lets see it then.

Gard: That be my Liege.

King: So now ye see both my hand to contravide
what one hand di ded: and now our word is, the shall serve
as warrant to bee you, both as princes to the fleet,
Where you shall answer this conspiraci.
you follows that came to attacque the Queen,
lay hands on them, and bee to the fleet.

Queen: O I beeprach, thy highness on my knees,
Remember this matter of their imprisonment.

King: Stand up good Kake, thou strong, thy Maiestie,
To plead for them that thou hast know a faire
Queen: I have not gotten it, and do still interate
Thee humble peradons at thy gracious feet.

King: Mother of God, what a foolish wouman's this.

Queen: O for her sake we revoke our doome.

Well for her sake we revoke our doome.

But not on seer, as ye love your lives?
Away and leave you, ye are Leaues and ranitants.
When Canon Carter come to attacque my Queen
Queen: Vex not my Lord, it will defenest you.

Enter Elizst. King
When you see me, you know me,
deceived the king in French and Latin long enough a
confidence.
King. His wine turned into gold, \textit{I.P.}
Woman. The fool and traitor, my gracious Sovereign.
Sir. I, my Lord, we're set your wit to the fool, \textit{with Summer.} We'll be secret now, and say nothing, if I
would be a blab of my tongue. I could tell the King
how many barrels full of gold and silver there was five
times filled with plate and jewels, twenty great tuns
with Crockets, Crockets, Crockets, Maises, golden
Crucifixes, besides the four hundred and twelve thou-
sand pound that poor Chumney paid for Peter's prince.
But this is nothing, for when you are Pope, you may
pardon your foes for more than this.
King. Go too far, you wrong the Cardinal,
But grieve not Wolfeley, William, I will be bold.
I pray you set your wit to the Emperor,
The Mayor and Citizens are gone before,
The Prince of Wales will follow presently,
And with our George and colon of efface,
Present him with the order of the Garter
Great Maximilian his regent,
Upon his breast did wear the English Crocket,
And void, me, our standard, search in arms,
Receiving pay for all his marshals then.
And Glover, with long gladness shall be honored
By him, Lord Cardinal, greet his Majesty,
And we our fetes will follow presently.

When your Majesty is welcome into England,
The King our Master, will envoys to see
Great Charles the royal Emperor Majesty.

Empire. We thank your pains, my good Lord Cardinal,
And much our longing eyes desires to see
Our longsick and his princely forme,
And therefore wish you peace and success.
When you are Pope, you shall be plump.

Well and where you come to be Pope, I shall be plump.
for this,
Queen. William, you have angered the Cardinal I can
tell you.
King. Tis no matter, Kate, He anger him with his eyes
Though for a while I smooth it to his face; (long).
I did suffer what here the fool hath found,
He keepes fortho, a high Count Legantius.

When you see me, you know me.
Taxing our fabric, gathering summe of gold,
Which he desire hath hid to make him Pope.
A God's name to him, that shall be our own.
But to our benefices, come Queen Katherine,
You shall wish us to meete the Emperor,
Let all your Ladies be in readiness,
Go, let our guard attend the Prince of Wales,
Upon our lists, the Lords and Privy Councillers
Shall give audience in their best array
Let all esquires be ready, come faire Kate,
The Emperor shall see our English plate.

Enter: Emperor, Cardinall, Mayor, and Gentlemen.

When your Majesty is welcome into England,
The King our Master, will envoys to see
Great Charles the royal Emperor Majesty.

Empire. We thank your pains, my good Lord Cardinal,
And much our longing eyes desires to see
Our longsick and his princely forme,
And therefore wish you please and success.
When you are Pope, you shall be plump.

Well and where you come to be Pope, I shall be plump.
for this,
Queen. William, you have angered the Cardinal I can
tell you.
King. Tis no matter, Kate, He anger him with his eyes
Though for a while I smooth it to his face; (long).
I did suffer what here the fool hath found,
He keepes fortho, a high Count Legantius.

When you see me, you know me.
Taxing our fabric, gathering summe of gold,
Which he desire hath hid to make him Pope.
A God's name to him, that shall be our own.
But to our benefices, come Queen Katherine,
You shall wish us to meete the Emperor,
Let all your Ladies be in readiness,
Go, let our guard attend the Prince of Wales,
Upon our lists, the Lords and Privy Councillers
Shall give audience in their best array
Let all esquires be ready, come faire Kate,
The Emperor shall see our English plate.

Enter: Emperor, Cardinall, Mayor, and Gentlemen.

When your Majesty is welcome into England,
The King our Master, will envoys to see
Great Charles the royal Emperor Majesty.

Empire. We thank your pains, my good Lord Cardinal,
And much our longing eyes desires to see
Our longsick and his princely forme,
And therefore wish you please and success.
When you are Pope, you shall be plump.

Well and where you come to be Pope, I shall be plump.
for this,
Queen. William, you have angered the Cardinal I can
tell you.
King. Tis no matter, Kate, He anger him with his eyes
Though for a while I smooth it to his face; (long).
I did suffer what here the fool hath found,
He keepes fortho, a high Count Legantius.

When you see me, you know me.
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Not to dye you an enemy.

Empire: Yet Vincile in King Henry’s name be thou, And boldly to our face did thee give fame.

Cardinal: He did stop that fall in both Emperors throne, That sags again the third of the wild Raving stone.

King: Mother of God, in this he be true, we see, There are more kings in England now then we.

Where Cardinal Wolsey? I heard you this news in France. Wolsey, I did my Liege, and by my instants was done.

Ile not deny in I had Commission To own a league between the French and him, Which he with standing as an enemy, I did defie him from your Majesty.

King: Dull thou presume to base-borne Cardinal, Without our knowledge to abuse our names, Presumptuous traitor, under what pretense Dull thou attempt to brave the Emperor? Behold thou meanest to level at a crown, But thy ambitious crown shall hie thee down.

Woful! With reverence to your Majesty, I did no more Then I can answer to the holy face. Valiant, thou canst not answer it to me. Not shadow thy insulting treachery

How dull ye fir, in your ambuscage, Vexknife to v, flampus in your small annoy. The base inspection of your Cardinal hat. As if you were co-pirates in the Crowns.

Eyes & Ears: ye and your King must be In equal state, and postipe, and Mattielli. Out of my presence but full impudence.

Wode. Remember my Liegeth that Iam Cardinal And despise into his holiness.

King: Be the devilish Deputies, I care not, I he not be bated by your treachery. Yare false abusers of religion, You can corrupt it, and for the King, Upon the primate of the Pope, blest are ye. If
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