Studies of Shakespeare’s involvement in the manuscript play *Sir Thomas More* usually have sought to confirm, question or deny that the writer nominated by W. W. Greg as Hand D can be identified as Shakespeare.\(^1\) That debate is no longer so pressing. A review of wide-ranging evidence and collocation study by MacD. P. Jackson and the vocabulary analysis of Timothy Irish Watt leave the matter in little doubt, and there is no longer any need to treat the question as controversial.\(^2\)

The present article, taking the identity of Hand D as Shakespeare as its premise, will move forward to re-evaluate Shakespeare’s contribution to the revision in two specific ways. First, it will offer a new explanation for a textual crux at the beginning of the Hand D section; this will challenge the usual view that Shakespeare was working in isolation from the other revisers. Second, it will reassess Shakespeare’s overall contribution to the revision by considering his involvement in two short further additions that were copied out and pasted into the main manuscript. One of them is generally accepted as by Shakespeare already. The other has been hitherto unattributed, but it will be argued here that it may well combine lines by Shakespeare and by Heywood.

Shakespeare’s role in the revision is distinctly complex. Nevertheless, one aspect of Shakespeare’s contribution is his willingness to collaborate by way of deferring some matters to Hand C. As a result, Hand C, the theatre scribe and annotator who is the key figure in the making of the revision, was prompted to make a sustained and variegated series of interventions in the revision, introducing detailed adjustments to the Shakespeare passage that are almost anxious in their complexity.

The following discussion is developed on grounds that will not be argued in detail but summarized here.\(^3\) The Original Text is a fair copy in the hand of Anthony Munday. The complete script, including leaves subsequently removed, was submitted for licensing to the Master of the Revels, Edmund Tilney. Tilney returned it with instructions to leave out the entire insurrection episode that dominates the first half of the play, and he made further deletions affecting the portrayal of More’s arrest in the second. He did not mark any of the revisions, and probably saw none of them. The statistics relating to the revision itself suggest a wholly remarkable enterprise. Probably in 1603–04, a
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team of four revisers contributed the five Additions. These amount to no less than eight separately scripted passages occupying seven leaves and two paper slips. The revisions replace all or almost all of five scenes in the Original Text, and add new material in a further two scenes. In the redeveloped play, the insurrection is not abandoned but largely reworked. The scene depicting the long-haired ruffian Falconer is split in two; the sections are positioned before and after the scene showing the visit of Erasmus in a single scenic sequence.

Of the revisers, Henry Chettle and Thomas Dekker can be identified with confidence purely on the basis of their handwriting. Shakespeare’s part-authorship of this play is far more rigorously demonstrated than it is, for instance, of Pericles, or, for instance, George Peele’s part-authorship of Titus Andronicus, or Thomas Middleton’s of Timon of Athens. Heywood is another matter: the attribution is very plausible but not wholly secure, and when I refer to ‘Heywood’ it should be understood with an appended query: ‘Heywood(?);’ nevertheless, the correlations that will be noted later between part of Addition V and Heywood’s works strengthen the ascription, and there is little reason to doubt it.

**ADDITION II**

The theatrical provenance of the revisions would no doubt illuminate the matters considered here if it was known, but must remain tantalizingly beyond the scope of the present investigation. Shakespeare’s collaboration with Chettle, Dekker and Heywood poses a problem that has given a particular inflexion to textual study of the manuscript, and in particular the insurrection sequence in Addition II, which contains the work of Shakespeare, Heywood, Dekker, and at least one other dramatist. Peter W. M. Blayney offers a precise and elaborated account of how Shakespeare worked separately from the other playwrights. Rejecting the simpler interpretation that Tilney saw only the Original Text, Blayney envisages a sequence in which Tilney first required alterations to the insurrection episode; Shakespeare acted as the first reviser, scripting the Hand D passage; Tilney then reviewed the manuscript again and disallowed the whole insurrection; then the other revisers, with what Blayney himself calls ‘surprising optimism’, attempted to preserve the insurrection in modified form. Blayney’s case rests on two foundations: the stage direction ‘Manett Clowne’ at the end of the revised scene 4, along with the absence of an entry direction for More in scene 6 as revised by Shakespeare. These are clues, Blayney argues, that point to a lost original, which has been replaced by the existing scene 5. In it, the insurrection would have continued unabated. The missing sequence would have begun with the Clown on stage and would have developed towards More’s entrance, before resuming at the top of the first page of the surviving Shakespeare addition.

Blayney’s work influences much subsequent thinking about Shakespeare’s role. For instance the Revels editor Giorgio Melchiori argues that the Hand D passage was the first section of Addition II to be written. When Hand C later reviewed Heywood’s revised scene 4, he envisaged that the
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8 Scene numbers are based on those in Greg’s Malone Society Reprint, except that Greg identifies Sc. 5 in the revised version as Sc. v*. For issues affected by page layout such as the ‘Manett Clowne’ stage direction, see John S. Farmer, ed., The Book of Sir Thomas Moore (Hathclin MSS. 7568, c. 1590–96), Tudor Facsimile Texts, Folio Series (London, 1910; repr. New York, 1970), or the digital facsimiles on CD-ROM in the British Library.

Clown would remain on stage as if to address the audience, but that this business would be pre-empted by the return of the other rebels as at the beginning of scene 6; subsequently the revisers changed their mind and decided to revive the Guildhall scene, scene 5 (p. 307). All this, according to Melchiori, happened after an initial concern about the possibility of censorship but before Tilney actually saw the manuscript. Melchiori avoids Blayney’s posited double submission to Tilney and speculated lost passage of first-stage revision. But the revision in two or more stages with Shakespeare as the first reviser is still fully in place, with the ‘Manett Clowne’ direction offering vital evidence.

Since Melchiori wrote it has been established that the supposed problem of the Clown remaining on stage at the end of scene 4 is imaginary. The manuscript page containing the scene (fo. 7a) is in Heywood’s hand. In it, Heywood wrote a two-line speech for the Clown up the right margin of the page; Hand C added the stage direction ‘Manett Clowne’ below it (that is to say, alongside the right edge of the page). Hand C’s additional ink-marks are crucial. He inscribed a half-box around the stage direction, and further lines leading from it via the bottom right-hand corner to the end of the speech at the bottom of the page, which is spoken by Lincoln. Eric Rasmussen has convincingly pointed out that these establish that the stage direction takes effect at the end of Lincoln’s speech. ‘Manett Clowne’ therefore stipulates that the Clown remains on stage to make his final speech. Consequently there is no reason to suppose that he remained on stage after that speech.

Equally, the first lines of scene 6 as it survives at the top of a new leaf (fo. 8), being the beginning of the passage in Shakespeare’s hand, lend no support to the idea that the leaf continues action that would have begun on a censored and now lost preceding leaf. The passage shows all the characteristics of a new scene:

*Lincoln.* Peace, hear me! He that will not see a red herring at a Harry groat, butter at eleven pence a pound, meal at nine shillings a bushel, and beef at four nobles a stone, list to me. (6.1–4)

The dramatic effect of the main speaker claiming his platform amidst a general hubbub is similar, for example, to the opening of *Titus Andronicus* 3.1, ‘Hear me, grave fathers; noble Tribunes, stay!’, *Julius Caesar* 1.2, ‘Peace ho! Caesar speaks’ (after Caesar calls ‘Calpurnia’), and especially *Coriolanus* 1.1, ‘Before we proceed any further, hear me speak.’ It would, moreover, be an odd and very unexpected coincidence if this Shakespearian scene-opener were actually a mid-scene passage that just happened to fall precisely at the top of a new leaf of paper.

The one and only substantial difficulty in the surviving script lies in the omission of an entrance for Thomas More. At the foot of fo. 7b, after the end of scene 5, Hand C wrote a detailed stage direction to initiate scene 6:

*Enter Lincoln. Doll. Clown. George betts williamson others / And A Sergaunt at arms.*

This accurately and in detail identifies the requirements for the first passage in the scene. Arguably this is not the place where More’s entrance would occur. Some lines into the scene, after 6.31, Shakespeare himself supplied a stage direction for the entry of the law-and-order party who are going to confront the rebels:

*Enter the L. maier Surrey Shrewsbury*

This is probably the more logical point for More to enter, but again he is not named. Sixteen lines later, More has his first speech. It is well recognized that the stage directions in early modern play scripts are often incomplete or inconsistent. But, in a situation where the stage directions are specific and detailed, the omission of an entrance for the play’s titular role and the scene’s leading speaker is of a different order.


10 Eric Rasmussen, ‘Setting Down what the Clown Spoke: Improvisation, Hand B, and The Book of Sir Thomas More’, *The Library,* 13 (1991), 126–36, p. 136. Fo. 7b is reproduced on p. 133. Rasmussen understands the direction to anticipate further improvisation by the Clown, but as he is given lines to speak this inference is superfluous.
from the relatively minor matters of detail that are usually left unnoted. It requires explanation.

My suggestion is that, here as elsewhere, part of Hand C’s technology for co-ordinating this exceptionally complex revision lay in the manipulation of paper. He copied the new scene 5 and the stage direction for scene 6, not after the revisions of scene 4 and scene 6 as Blayney proposes, but before either of them. When fo. 7 was given to Heywood, it would already have contained on the verso scene 5 and Hand C’s opening direction for scene 6, leaving the blank recto into which he was to write his revision of scene 4. As for the purpose of the stage direction itself, far from indicating that Hand C was clearing matters up after Shakespeare had submitted his work, it indicates that he was anticipating the revised passage before it was written. It either gives Shakespeare an initial steer when revising the scene as it appeared in the Original Text, or provides a basis for Hand C himself to review the script when marrying the sections together – perhaps Hand C had both objectives in view. The stage direction contrasts with Hand C’s annotation of the Hand D passage, as its position on the previous leaf indicates in itself. Hand C wrote the opening direction on fo. 7 rather than fo. 8, the first Hand D leaf, because he was not at that stage dealing with the Hand D leaves – for the simple reason that Shakespeare had not yet written onto them.

But there was an unintended consequence. Shakespeare took no benefit from Hand C’s stage direction. Nor could he have done so if, as I propose, fo. 7, where it was written, was in Heywood’s hands when Shakespeare was writing. As already indicated, Shakespeare supplied no opening entry for the scene. He might have been aware that Hand C had dealt with the matter already. Or perhaps he understood, as did Heywood in revising both scene 4 and scene 9, that the provision of opening stage directions was a task that was to be left to Hand C at the reviewing stage, when his audit of stage directions at the beginning of each addition would play an important role in his co-ordination of the various sections into a continuous script.

In contrast, when Shakespeare reached the mid-scene arrival of the earls and the Mayor he supplied the needed stage direction. But there may have been a question about More’s entrance in his mind. The words he wrote would comfortably have fitted on a single line; the division into two lines allows very ample space both to the left and right, as it were inviting Hand C to annotate. Shakespeare may have recognized that a key staging issue was unresolved. The layout suggests that even as he took responsibility for the ongoing action, he was inviting and indeed legitimizing the work of the annotator, anticipating that he would make alterations. His approach is just the same as when, earlier in the same passage, he left speech-prefixes for ‘other’ (6.5, 9), or, more briefly ‘oth’ (6.14) or merely ‘o’ (6.21): the decision as to which citizens should speak was thereby handed over to Hand C.

But the cogency of assuming that fo. 7b had already been completed before Heywood got to work on it has not as yet been fully demonstrated. Two points will emerge. First, despite Hand C’s role as co-ordinator, when he annotated the Shakespeare section he faced exactly the same predicament as had Shakespeare before him, with even more idiosyncratic results. Second, his annotation of the Shakespeare pages was discontinuous with his writing of the opening stage direction in fo. 7b. When these two conclusions are put together, it becomes clear that in terms of the sequence of events the opening stage direction is separated from Hand C’s annotation of the Shakespeare pages quite simply by Shakespeare’s own writing. The clarity of the staging requirements in
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11 The paste-in slips are a conspicuous example. Otherwise, the main revision was conceptualized as a series of leaves as follows: scenes 4–5 (Heywood and ?Chettle), one leaf; scene 6 (Shakespeare), two leaves; scene 8 (Dekker), two leaves; Heywood, end of scene 9, one leaf. Some of the extant pages are not those prepared by the dramatists but contain Hand C’s transcriptions. If Chettle drafted the revised Sc. 5 as copied by Hand C, each of the four dramatists would have been initially given two leaves (though Heywood’s included a page filled by Hand C, and none of the dramatists completely used his allocation).
both Shakespeare’s script and Hand C’s annotation of it suffer as a result.

In revising Shakespeare’s contribution, Hand C made a series of very particular and detailed alterations. The speeches Shakespeare had vaguely given to ‘other’ were distributed cogently between the citizens. Clown Betts, a new role introduced into the revision mainly by Heywood, was given two of these speeches. Hand C, aware of the possible confusion between the Clown and his brother George, wrote ‘Ge’ against Shakespeare’s prefix ‘bettes’ at 6.36. Shakespeare had supplied two ambiguous and apparently contradictory speech prefixes for ‘Sher’ at 6.32 and 35 against speeches that cannot be uttered by the same speaker; Hand C gave one of them to the Lord Mayor and the other to the rioting citizen Williamson. Hand C also sought to strengthen the role of the rebel leader Lincoln, assigning to him a speech that Shakespeare had given to Betts (6.99) and another that he had given to ‘all’ (6.158). Further, Hand C deleted three lines that Shakespeare had written, and wrote the words ‘tell me but this’ (6.129) to bridge over his cut; he was evidently reading the passage for intelligibility and introduced the cut because he could not follow the sense. These changes are all practical, looking forward to the play as it could be staged rather than backward to Shakespeare’s intentions. They assert in strong terms the theatrical ownership of the script. They are compatible with alterations he made elsewhere in the play that will be described below in demonstrating a degree of fine-tuning that brings the script very close to the requirements of the stage. The scrutiny is remarkably detailed and thorough. Yet the generous space around Shakespeare’s stage direction remained vacant. In the script as Hand C left it, More still remained without an entry. Hand C, like Shakespeare, failed to make any connection between the stage direction he himself had supplied and the script as Shakespeare had written it.

One further alteration that Hand C made to Shakespeare’s script relates directly to the problem of More’s missing entrance. Against the first speech-prefix for the Sergeant-at-arms, which appears at 6.21 (a few lines before Shakespeare’s entry for the Mayor, Surrey and Shrewsbury), Hand C wrote the word ‘Enter’. Compared with the missing entry for More, this is fine-tuning. But here, uniquely, the annotation causes a new difficulty. In the stage direction initiating the scene, as quoted above, Hand C had already provided an entrance for ‘A Sergaunt at armes’. This is forgotten at the point where he annotated the conflicting direction ‘Enter’ opposite the Sergeant’s speech. The resulting duplication falls in the same passage, beginning with Hand C’s stage direction at the foot of fo. 7b, as the manuscript’s silence over that most crucial matter, getting More on stage. Nowhere else in the entire play is Hand C incompetent in this fashion even once, let alone twice. A simple conclusion follows. It is not hard to understand why Hand C should follow Shakespeare in proceeding without reference to fo. 7 if this, the leaf onto which Hand C had previously written the opening stage direction for the scene, inconveniently remained with Heywood throughout.

The absence of the main character, rather than testifying to Shakespeare’s isolation, therefore reflects the nature of the script as an exceptionally intricate collaboration between him and others. It is inevitable that one part of a manuscript in preparation is detached from another part when writers work in physical isolation one from another. The assumption that Shakespeare was scripting in parallel with Heywood explains the key difficulties in the complex sequence of revisions identified collectively as Addition II. We see the advantage and the disadvantage of using multiple revisers. The advantage is that progress can be speeded up by having them work simultaneously; the disadvantage is that while they are doing so they are blind to each other’s endeavours. In other words, the unusual failure of both an experienced dramatist and an assiduous annotator to deal with a key matter of staging is an immediate consequence of the fragmented process of the revision. The complexities lie, not as Blayney supposed, in the intricacies of lost stages of revision, but in the simultaneity of different parts of the revision as it survives.
Addition V

But this is not the only time that Shakespeare and Heywood were composing the revisions in parallel. They are the two dramatists who come into view once again in Additions III and V. These revisions were written after Hand C had copied out the long Addition IV, which contains the scene that conflates the Falconer and Erasmus episodes (scene 8). Hand C then copied Additions III and V into slips that had been cut from the same leaf of paper. After Hand C’s transcription, the slips were pasted onto cancelled pages of the Original Text in positions that establish the place of each passage within the sequence of the revision: Addition III between the Original Text and Addition IV; Addition V between Addition IV and the reversion to the Original Text.

Addition III is a short soliloquy of twenty-one lines spoken by More. It introduces scene 8. More in his new capacity as Lord Chancellor meditates on his mistrust of high office. His words act as a prologue to his game of dressing his manservant as himself to test whether Erasmus can spot the deception. The speech is a key passage for articulating More’s awareness of his humble origin, and his bemused wariness towards the dangerous accessory of political power. Addition V also consists of a soliloquy by More, and, like Addition III, it had no other content when Hand C first copied it. Its obvious function is to connect the revised and now composite scene 8 with scene 9, in which the interlude, The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom, is performed before city dignitaries at More’s house. In Addition V More notes how ‘Friends go and come’ (9.6): Erasmus has sailed away for Rotterdam, but now the Lord Mayor is about to arrive. The implication, as in Addition III, is: such it is to be famous. The powerful lead lives of episodic encounter with other great men, and if you are Thomas More you value their friendship. Seen in conjunction, the two soliloquies show the revisers’ desire to give stronger coherence to the play’s fragmented middle scenes. They both use More as the adhesive, placing him in a semi-choric role. They both also develop the audience’s awareness that he is the play’s central figure, and they both elaborate on his state of mind. They are, indeed, More’s only soliloquies in the entire play. In all these respects the design is palpable.

Addition III has been convincingly attributed to Shakespeare on stylistic grounds. The parallels that have been identified with Shakespeare would provide a fair basis for attributing the speech to him even if he were not elsewhere identified in the play. Shakespeare is by a very considerable measure likelier to have written the speech than any of the other dramatists involved in the play, and the case for his authorship is indeed strong relative to any other dramatist of the period.

The overall authorship of Addition V has not previously been considered in any detail. The first five and a half lines, spoken by a Messenger, are a late addition to the original soliloquy, copied into the margin by Hand C. They can safely be ascribed to Heywood, because Hand C copied them from a draft Heywood had written at the end of Addition VI. The main soliloquy is as follows:

Why, this is cheerful news. Friends go and come. Reverend Erasmus, whose delicious words Express the very soul and life of wit, Newly took sad leave of me, with tears Troubled the silver channel of the Thames, Which, glad of such a burden, proudly swelled And on her bosom bore him toward the sea. He’s gone to Rotterdam. Peace go with him! He left me heavy when he went from hence, But this recomforts me: the kind Lord Mayor, His brethren aldermen, with their fair wives Will feast this night with us. Why, so’ t should be. More’s merry heart lives by good company. Good gentlemen, be careful; give great charge Our diet be made dainty for the taste. For, of all people that the earth affords, The Londoners fare richest at their boards.

SHAKESPEARE AND HAND C IN SIR THOMAS MORE

No investigation of authorial traits can hope to amass quantitative evidence from such a short sample. Even if one attempts instead to identify individual items that correlate the text with the work of other dramatists of the period, it cannot be expected that a short passage will yield many items of evidence that would not individually be paralleled in the work of more than one dramatist. But if the pool of dramatists is reduced to those who can be identified on prima facie grounds as credible candidates, there are good chances of discovering affinities and disaffinities between the passage and the particular writers in question. Indeed, in attribution study it is common to assess the competing claims of as few as two collaborators. In the case of Sir Thomas More, two is too small a number, as there were four known dramatists involved in the revision, with Munday potentially present also as author or co-author of the Original Text.

I conducted a study for locutions unique to one dramatist among these five, by searching the online databases Literature Online (Lion) and Early English Books Online (EEBO). It is necessary to deploy both databases as Lion has fuller records of plays, particularly in that it includes the major manuscripts, whereas EEBO contains a much wider range of prose, which is a significant part of the output of Munday, Dekker and Heywood. Single words provided no clear evidence; the most distinctive word ‘recomforts’ has no exact parallel but does have parallels based on variant forms in Munday, Shakespeare and a work attributed to Chettle. The evidence depends, then, on phrases and sequences of words. Searches can be limited to the exact phrase or, if that provides no parallels, extended to variations on the phrase or its constituents identified by conducting proximity searches (identifying two or more elements in proximity but not necessarily adjacent) or searches of variant forms (identifying parts of a verb, singulars and plurals, adverbials, etc.).

This investigation reveals no significant evidence in favour of Chettle or Dekker. In contrast, Shakespeare, the putative author of the equivalent soliloquy in Addition III, and Heywood, the author of the first lines of Addition V, are firmly in the frame. There are two parallels with Munday, which are different in kind. These may be considered first. Where Addition V has ‘give great charge’ (9.19) Munday writes ‘gave great charge’. Heywood comparably has ‘gives him great charge’, so Munday is not uniquely singled out. More noteworthy, the passage ‘the Thames, / Which, glad of such a burden, proudly swelled / And on her bosom bore him toward the sea’ (9.10–12) has an unusually strong parallel in ‘as the very Thames appeared proude of this gallant burden, swelling her breast to beare them with pompe and Majestie’ (London’s Love, 1610, sig. C3).¹¹ Unlike ‘gave great charge’, this goes beyond a coincidence of ordinary locutions and indeed it exceeds in significance any other individual parallel between More’s speech and any other dramatist. It suggests conscious and specific reuse of a known pre-existing text. The specificity can be measured by noting that EEBO identifies no more than three of the five components in any early modern text. This single parallel might testify either to the presence of Munday in the writing of Addition V or the influence of the revised play on his later writing. The paucity of distinct parallels with Munday elsewhere in the speech, and the absence of any other indication that he was involved in the Additional Passages at all, point to the latter explanation, and suggest that Munday is consciously drawing on the speech in his later pageant. The provisional conclusion that Munday was familiar with the play in its revised version is interesting in its own right, but takes us no further in analysing the authorship of the speech.

Phrases paralleled in Shakespeare’s work include: ‘this is [adj.] news’ (9.6; Coriolanus, 5.4.52; Anthony and Cleopatra, 1.2.93), ‘[plural noun] go and come’ (9.6; Henry V, 3.2.8), ‘burden . . . swelled . . . bosom’ (9.11–12; ‘Swell, bosom, with thy freight’, Othello, 3.3.452), ‘proudly swelled’ (9.11; ‘proud swelling’, King John, 4.3.148, the only instance of an immediate collocation of ‘proud swell’ and variants), ‘He’s

¹¹ Quotations from printed texts by Heywood are from the original editions as reproduced in EEBO.
John Jowett

gone... Peace go with him’ (9.13; ‘Art thou gone too? All comfort go with thee’, 2 Henry VI, 2.4.88), ‘left me heavy’ (9.14; cf. ‘heavy leave’, two instances, the only ones of ‘heavy’ qualifying ‘leave’ and its variants, both with ‘take’: cf. ‘take sad leave’, 9.9), ‘merry heart lives’ (9.18; 2 Henry IV, 5.3.49, but from an existing song: ‘light heart lives’, Love’s Labour’s Lost, 5.2.18, with ‘merry’ at 5.2.16), ‘our diet’ (9.20; Twelfth Night, 3.3.40, here also referring to a diet that is to be arranged: ‘I will bespeak our diet’), ‘dainty for the taste’ (9.20; i.e. ‘dainty for... [noun]’, ‘dainty for such tread’, Love’s Labour’s Lost, 4.3.277; i.e. ‘dainty’ qualified by phrase with ‘taste’, ‘Dainties to taste’, Venus and Adonis, 164, ‘the daintiest that they taste’, 2 Henry VI, 3.2.326). Of these, the qualification of ‘leave’ or ‘to be left’ with ‘heavy’ is found in no other play of the period; ‘[plural noun] go and come’ is found only twice in any other plays offering parallels (by John Lyly and William Alexander), ‘dainty for’ and ‘proud swell’ are properly paralleled in only one play each (by Christopher Marlowe and John Fletcher respectively), and the few instances of ‘our diet’ in the drama lack the shared idea of an arrangement that is to be made.

Two lines deserve special consideration, as they contain conflicting evidence not so far presented. ‘Express the very soul and life of wit’ (9.8) has Shakespeare parallels for ‘words express the [ ... ] of’ (‘words express / The manner of’, Sonnet 140.3–4) and ‘the very soul and life of wit’ (8; ‘the soul of wit’, Hamlet, 2.2.91). But it has Heywood parallels in ‘express the... life’ (cf. various instances of ‘expressed to the life’, etc., though this is a set expression of different meaning) and ‘the very soul and life of’ (cf ‘the very life and spirit of’). These phrases all break down into commonplace ideas except in one respect: ‘the soul of wit’ is probably a Shakespeare coinage, as the earliest instance identified in EEBO is dated 1603, a few years after the probable earliest text Hamlet was written. The line ‘Troubled the silver channel of the Thames’ (9.10) has affinities with both Shakespeare and Heywood. But there is a particularly striking Shakespeare parallel for the image in Julius Caesar, where ‘tears’ are wept into a ‘channel’ until it swells: ‘weep your tears / Into the channel, till the lowest stream / Do kiss the most exalted shores of all’ (1.1.58–60). Where Addition V has ‘troubled the silver channel’, Shakespeare writes ‘Troubles the silver spring’, 2 Henry VI, 4.1.72. Lion offers no other instance of ‘troubl’ the silver’ in drama of the period, making it a strong parallel. Heywood, for his part, has the more mundane ‘channel of the’ (but compare Shakespeare’s ‘the sweet channel of her’); he writes ‘Faire Thamesis, upon whose silver breast’ (but the image is Spenserian, and Shakespeare describes another English river, the Trent, as silver in 1 Henry IV, 3.1.90), and the collocation ‘channel...swell’ (but Shakespeare has ‘channel...o’erswell’). The reference to the Thames is firmly locked into Shakespearean imagery. The balance of probability for this line too lies firmly with Shakespeare.

Elsewhere in the passage, the specifically Heywood-favoured expressions are: ‘which, glad of such a burden’ (9.11; ‘who glad of such a purchase’, Gynaikeion, 300), ‘with their faire wiues’ (9.16; Hierarchy of the Blessed Angels (1635), 501), ‘will feast this night’ (9.17; Silver Age (1613), sig. C4), ‘so’t should be’ (9.17; ‘so’t must be’, Life of Merlin (1641), 250; ‘so it must be’, Pleasant Dialogues (1637), sig. L2), ‘of all people’ (9.21; one straightforward instance, one in collaboration and one in translation), ‘all...that the earth affords’ (9.21; ‘all that the earth brings’, Hierarchy, 441; ‘the earth affords’, Hierarchy, 421), ‘the earth affords...richest’ (9.21–2; cf. ‘Scarce can the world afford a richer prize’, Four Prentices (1615), sig. G4v) and the rhyme ‘affords...boards’ (9.21–2; Troia Britannia (1609), 224). Several of these features are combined in Heywood’s:

14 The collocation of dainty and taste is also in Heywood, but not dainty for.

15 It might be observed that the Shakespeare parallels under immediate consideration belong to the years immediately before the revision of Sir Thomas More, where Heywood’s works are later; Heywood could therefore have been influenced not only by Addition V itself but by Shakespeare’s writing elsewhere. But no such special explanation is necessary.
In Addition V the feasters are Londoners; ‘Londoners’ is Heywood favoured, and in one passage he notes ‘How great and magnificent the Londoners feast be even amongst themselves...as also the ordinary Tables of the Lord Maior and the Sheriffs’ (Whittington, sig. C3v). Heywood is evidently the only one of the five dramatists to use the contraction ‘so’t’. The passage with the rhyme in Heywood’s /T/i/o/a/B/r/i/t/a/n/i/a happens to be close in content to ideas in the soliloquy:

I passe the Citty gates, my Barke I boord,  
The fauourable winds calme gales affoord,  
And fill my sailes, vnto your Land I steare,  

Turning beyond the revisers to the larger picture, Lion and EEBO identify two instances of ‘with their fair wives’ in all literature in the period, of which one is by Heywood. He also wrote ‘with faire wiues’, describing London citizens ‘in the richest sort being garnish’t out’ and ‘good Cittizens / And their faire wiues’ (2 If You Know Not Me, sigs. E1v, E2v). Heywood’s is the only other instance of ‘will feast this night’; the absence of any other parallel to the internal collocations ‘will feast this’ and ‘feast this night’ testifies that the full four-word collocation is a particularly strong one. He is the only professional dramatist to use the phrase ‘so’t [modal] be’ before Richard Brome.

Considering the shortness of Addition V, the evidence for both dramatists is moderately strong and, in contrast with Munday, recurrent. With the doubtful exception of 1.8 and 1.11, where Shakespeare is nonetheless quite distinctly favoured, the indications of two different dramatists are far from mutually cancelling. The mix of parallels coherently suggests a history of initial drafting by Shakespeare and revision by Heywood. Outside the two lines with mixed affinities, the Heywood parallels occur in two short clusters:

The kind Lord Mayor,  
His brethren aldermen, with their fair wives  
Will feast this night with us. Why, so’t should be.

For, of all people that the earth affords,  
The Londoners fare richest at their boards.

The city consciousness is clear. Moreover, five of these six lines are consistent to the point of duplication with the information in the Messenger’s speech that Heywood had initially drafted at the end of Addition VI:

My honourable lord, the Mayor of London  
Accompanied with his lady and her train  
Are coming hither, and are hard at hand  
To feast with you. A sergeant’s come before  
To tell your lordship of their near approach.

It is Heywood who would have been most immediately aware of the speech’s content.16 If the Heywoodian lines are omitted, the residual passage reads:

Why, this is cheerful news. Friends go and come.  
Reverend Erasmus, whose delicious words  
Express the very soul and life of wit,  
Newly took sad leave of me, with tears  
Troubled the silver channel of the Thames,  
Which, glad of such a burden, proudly swelled  
And on her bosom bore him toward the sea.  
He’s gone to Rotterdam. Peace go with him!  
He left me heavy when he went from hence,  
But this recomforts [and delights my soul].  
More’s merry heart lives by good company.  
Good gentlemen, be careful; give great charge  
Our diet be made dainty for the taste.

The bracketed words conjecturally restore a pentameter, on the assumption that Heywood altered these or similar words to make way for ‘the kind lord Mayor’. It is of course possible that he cancelled or altered more, or that the conjectured words are off the mark. Nevertheless, the passage as presented above can otherwise be offered as a tentative addition to the canon of Shakespeare’s writing.

---

16 It is at least possible that Heywood intended to replace the Messenger’s speech with his additions to More’s speech, but that Hand C misunderstood or took a different view.
It is proposed, then, that Heywood undertook in the soliloquy to provide extra information to set the scene and to underscore the social importance of the Mayor’s visit. The celebration of Londoners’ ‘richest’ diet, suggests London’s ascendance as a trading city – as does ‘the silver channel of the Thames’ once it is set in relation to these lines. This is entirely compatible with the London-oriented patriotism of Heywood’s work elsewhere.

Shakespeare, unlike Heywood, did not engage in celebration of London’s civic dignity. Moreover, if Shakespeare wrote on the Shakespearian theme of citizens rioting partly over food shortages in Scene 6, he is unlikely to have written ‘The Londoners fare richest at their boards’ without a trace of irony. The highly metaphoric language in the first half of the speech, however, is distinctly Shakespearian. The description of the Thames that ‘proudly swelled’ (9.11) when bearing Erasmus away has a suggestive parallel in the Hand D passage of Sir Thomas More itself: ‘Whiles they are o’er the bank of their obedience / Thus will they bear down all things’ (6.46–7). The proudly swelling river recalls various similar personifying images in Shakespeare more specifically: ‘I have seen / Th’ambitious ocean swell’ (Julius Caesar, 1.3.6–7), ‘The ocean, overpeering of his list’ (Hamlet, 4.5.97), or ‘Proud Cleopatra when she met her Roman, / And Cydnus swelled above the banks’ (Cymbeline, 2.4.70–1). Enobarbus’ description of Cleopatra’s barge also involves the personified elements taking on themselves the emotional resonance of the occasion, in much the same manner as More’s description of Erasmus’s ship: ‘The winds were love-sick’, and the water was ‘amorous’ of the oar-strokes (Antony and Cleopatra, 2.2.201–4).

The two descriptions of Cleopatra both come from plays written later than the revisions of Sir Thomas More, demonstrating that the influence does not flow from Shakespeare to another reviser. The part-erotic, part-maternal tenor of More’s lines – tears, channel, burden, proudly swelled, bosom, bore – are entirely in Shakespeare’s manner. So too is the fluidity of syntax and metre, as indicated by the high incidence of enjambment.

The provisional conclusion is that Shakespeare undertook to write both of the soliloquies for More that appear in Additions III and V. Addition III remained unaltered (and indeed is rather awkwardly bedded into the scene that follows), whereas Addition V was expanded by Heywood. The provisionality in this statement has to be acknowledged. The searchable databases available at the present, though huge, are not complete. The conflicting indications in 9.8 and 9.11 point to a vulnerability in the method – though one that leaves the evidence locally ambiguous rather than invalidating the method itself. Findings presented here are based on soft evidence; the parameters for inclusion and exclusion are malleable, and the value attributable to the findings varies. Although every effort has been made to pursue the investigation in a rigorous and even-handed way, the possibility remains that there may be undetected counter-evidence – or, for that matter, undetected evidence in support. The case presented here is a far cry from, for example, Ian Watt’s investigation of Hand D, and his claims for near certainty are not echoed here. Nevertheless, it is very hard to imagine, in the light of the present findings, that a more persuasive account of the writing of Addition V will emerge. A fair summation of the case would be that it is significantly more probable than improbable that Shakespeare and Heywood both played a part in the writing of Addition V.

Shakespeare’s involvement in Sir Thomas More is often explained in terms of his established skill in treating scenes of popular tumult in such a way that they would not be disallowed by the Master of the Revels. More’s speeches in the Hand D section have been admired for their arrestingly expressive quality and their articulation of a humane and passionately reasoned opposition to xenophobia. But if we take into account Shakespeare’s probable involvement in Additions III and V, different perspectives emerge. Shakespeare now is the dramatist who makes More deeply articulate. Of course More has plenty to say in the play’s later scenes showing his arrest and its aftermath. But they are all of a similar tone, one that contrasts with the earlier scenes. In the later part of the play More’s whimsy
becomes a mask that conceals introspection, no doubt with the intention of forestalling the attention of the Master of the Revels, though the note of reserved pious stoicism has its own dramatic logic.

In contrast, Shakespeare’s More speaks openly and generously. His words are not constrained by the need to avoid religious controversy. He is indeed an entirely secular figure, who is concerned with the polis, with the individual’s role within the polis, and with the vulnerable theatricality of power. In the paste-in soliloquies he talks about his father; he describes his guests as his friends; in both instances he places his sense of self within the wider pattern of emotive relationships.

In short, to attribute Addition III and the first draft of Addition V to Shakespeare is to posit his responsibility for dimensions of character not seen elsewhere in the play except in the Hand D section. But the highlighting of More’s role has a structural as well as characterological aspect. If scene 6 places More at the heart of things, Additions III and V place him in threshold positions. The episodes that neighbour these passages are connected and put in context; and the audience is assured that More’s interiority is the space to watch. Such an account places Shakespeare in a specific and crucial role in the process of revision: no longer ignorant and isolated, but knowingly and responsibly shaping the action.

**HAND C**

Even on this view, it remains far from the case that Shakespeare was the key player in the overall inception of the revisions. That role can belong only to Hand C. We have seen how his transcription of scene 5 and his manipulation of the leaf into which it was written were a purposeful steering device, and it is likely that throughout his work he used the distribution of leaves of paper as a method of controlling the work of his contributors.\(^{17}\) From the point when he transcribed scene 5 in Addition II and scene 8 in Addition IV, his measures to orchestrate the revision were persistent and multifaceted. His inscription, and presumably cutting and pasting, of Additions III and V provide an obvious case in point. But Addition V is fascinating because it reveals the full complexity of the revision process alongside the diversity of Hand C’s interventions as he sought to rein in the textual dispersal and co-ordinate the components.

The full history of Addition V runs something like this.\(^{18}\) As I have posited, Shakespeare wrote a short soliloquy, and Heywood expanded it. In this state it was copied by Hand C and pasted into the main manuscript. Heywood supplemented the soliloquy, using spare paper in another leaf. Hand C incorporated these lines into Addition V, writing them up the left margin of both the underlying leaf of the Original Text into which the slip was pasted and the slip itself. As his original transcript lacked an opening stage direction, he now added the direction ‘Enter a Messenger to moore.’ The last line of the marginal insert, ‘More why this is cheerful &c’, serves both to supply the otherwise missing speech-prefix and to connect the Messenger’s speech to More’s soliloquy at 9.6 by means of a short duplication.

But Hand C had not finished. Subsequently he wrote in the corner below the insert at the beginning of Addition V (or to the left of it if the leaf is turned to read it) a boxed stage direction, reading ‘Mess / T Goodal’. This establishes that the messenger who speaks to More is to be played by the actor Thomas Goodale. Demonstrably, Hand C considered the script as requiring fine and, one might expect, late-stage adjustment for performance. The annotations are informed by a clear eye to casting requirements that extended to minor roles. But Hand C had another object in view, which was to reinforce the point of textual connection between Addition IV and Addition V. To this end, he wrote a second and equivalent stage direction in the margin of Addition IV itself to the left of 8.247–8:

\(^{17}\) The paper of the revisions is of a single but mixed stock. On the import of paper in stocks combining the product of different manufacturers in a single locality, see Allan H. Stevenson, ‘Watermarks are Twins’, Studies in Bibliography, 4 (1955), 60.

\(^{18}\) Apart from the present proposal about the authorship of the Addition, the sequence was first fully described in Melchiori, ‘The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore’.
‘Enter a messenger here’\textsuperscript{19} As with Hand C’s interventions elsewhere in the manuscript, he used duplication as a technique for highlighting the link between separated sections of text.

Dekker subsequently broke this link when he wrote a new ending to scene 8 (258–91), taking advantage of a blank half page below Hand C’s transcription. Hand C was alert to the situation. It was presumably he who scribbled out his own direction halfway down the page for the messenger to enter. He wrote two reference marks consisting of a cross in a circle, one at the foot of Dekker’s new end to scene 8, the other inside the box he had drawn around the opening entry of scene 9. Elsewhere, the same reference mark was used to link the Original Text and Addition VI. By this device, in both cases, the continuity of the text across the two sections is clearly indicated. The reference marks are therefore a shorthand equivalent to the duplication of stage directions.

Hand C’s interventions around Addition V resemble those in the Hand D passage in scene 6 only insofar as they are detailed and complex. In other respects they differ completely. Rather than reflecting a single review, they are individual acts in a cumulative sequence. Rather than responding to the internal difficulties and uncertainties presented by a rough draft, they respond to a sequential growth in the text through three stages of revision. Where for the circumstantial reasons explained above Hand C was unable to make an effective transition between authorial stints in Addition II, here he takes repeated and effective measures to ensure that very continuity. The contrast in procedure again highlights the peculiarity of his failure to establish a good join between fos. 7 and 8. He co-ordinated the writing of at least three dramatists in Additions IV and V, work completed in five separate stages; he did so successfully.

The word ‘co-ordinate’ is here possibly a misleading understatement: dramatic writing was usually commissioned rather than being spontaneously offered, and Hand C may have had a role here too. The persistence of Shakespeare, Heywood, and Dekker in all putting forward new material after the initial job of reworking scenes 4–6 and scenes 8–9 had been completed is one of the more remarkable aspects of what was already a remarkable project: why did they not consider the job done? It should be noted further that the revisions cannot be broken down into a simple two-stage pattern whereby the add-ons were agreed at a specific moment: as we have seen, at the point where Hand C added stage directions to Additions IV and V he had not anticipated that Dekker would supplement Addition IV. The peculiar sequence of add-ons may well testify not to the dramatists’ individual urges to generate more and more passages of new dialogue, but to Hand C’s evolving awareness of dramatic requirements. The fragmented nature of the writing and the complexity of Hand C’s work are closely related.

The soliloquies of Additions III and V have been explained already in terms of character and play structure. No more might be said about them if it were not that Addition V is found in an area of the text where Hand C was demonstrably preoccupied with issues of casting. Apart from its dramatic effectiveness, a short soliloquy is a convenient device for creating a wider gap in time between adjacent scenes. In \textit{2 Henry IV}, for example, Shakespeare provided a soliloquy for Falstaff at the end of 3.2, the scene in which Falstaff recruits soldiers from the peasantry of Gloucestershire; it certainly made excessive demands on the theatre company. In \textit{Sir Thomas More}, as we have seen, Addition V contains the play’s only annotation in which an actor is named. The space between the previous scene, scene 8, and the main action of the scene begun in Addition V, scene 9, was widened further by Dekker’s last-minute new ending for scene 8. The adding of both the Addition V soliloquy beginning scene 9 and the extra Falconer–Morris dialogue at 258–91, and the expansion of the Addition V soliloquy with the extra Messenger speech, suggest a common tactic of filling out the dialogue in order to manage the action more effectively. The

\textsuperscript{19} The stage direction was written a few lines before the end of Addition IV as Hand C had copied it; either the final exchange between Falconer and Morris was added after the stage direction, or its position is anticipatory.
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annotation naming Goodale gives further testimony to the difficulty in doing so.

The reason is clear if we present all the stage directions for the early part of scene 9 as Munday had written them:

Enter S'r. Thomas Moore, M. Roper, and Serving men setting stooles.

Enter his Lady.

Ent. Player.

En. Lady.

The waytes playes, Enters Lord Maior, so many Aldermen as may, / the Lady Majoress in Scarlet, with other Ladies and Sir Thomas / Moores daughters, Seruaunts carrying lighted Torches by them.

After this, the players enter in role to perform the interlude. Irrespective of how many or few aldermen enter, this passage makes heavier demands on the cast than any other moment in the play. Like the recruiting scene in 2 Henry IV, it presents exceptional demands of costuming – the aldermen’s and ladies’ robes, and the players’ costumes and properties for their parts (the Vice carries a bridle). It also requires special lighting effects, which need both the preparation of torches and the nomination of actors to carry them. There are also musical demands, which are already flagged up in the Original Text itself where a duplicating marginal note reads ‘waites play / hautbois’. If the role-changes and the spectacular requirements of the scene presented an exceptional difficulty, the extra playing time beforehand would be welcome if not necessary.

Seen thus, it becomes clearer that it was Hand C, the theatrical annotator demonstrably thinking about acting personnel, who most likely called for the added passages. As for the dramatists, Dekker’s extension of Addition IV (like Heywood’s extension of scene 9) is primarily a comedic filler whose effect on the play is purely local. Heywood symptomatically writes the speech-prefix ‘clo’ against one of the speeches for the Vice Inclination, suggesting that he was developing both episodes to bolster the parts for the same comic actor. Shakespeare too was supplying lines mainly for a single actor, the player of More himself. If there still remains some truth in the observation that Shakespeare writes as if without full awareness of the work of his fellow revisers, much the same is true of the other three. The personal consciousness that overarches the revisions is Hand C’s, and Hand C’s only.

Plays have different dimensions of creative organization, and this article presents an account of two contrasting types of play-making. Shakespeare writes as a theatre poet, Hand C as a theatre co-ordinator. If it is no revelation that they conformed to their functions, the diversity and range of both contributions is remarkable. Hand C does far more than would be expected of a theatre functionary, or than can be found in the work of other annotators in play manuscripts of the period. Indeed, he plays an astonishingly full and diverse role in the artistic co-ordination of the revision. I would argue that he is one of the co-authors of the revisions: the only identifiable figure to understand them and organize them as a whole, the only figure working directly and more or less in alignment with the intentions of all the dramatists, the only figure who can be described as having overall intentionality for the revision, and so in a real sense its maker.

The work of each segment of the revision seems isolated, dependent on a process of co-ordination that he alone supplied. But in the case of Shakespeare the contribution is essential to securing the theatrical effectiveness and dramatic coherence of the first two-thirds of the play. Even in the disadvantaged and hemmed-in position from which he

---

20 This annotation is transcribed by Greg as ‘waites play / here’, and ascribed to Hand C. If so, it would be his only intervention in the Original Text, and in fact the script looks more like Munday himself. The present reading and attribution are Blayney’s, as recorded and adopted in the Revels edition.
writes as one collaborator on a revision, he nudges
the play towards greater eloquence and intensity. The constraints under which he wrote were those of his colleagues as well, but he made a greater virtue of this necessity. John Jones has described the Hand D passage, in contrast with his work on plays of sole authorship, as lacking in imagina-
native involvement with the play as a whole; it is not quite 'wonderful through belonging to a particular masterpiece, this and no other'.
Yet Shakespeare indeed thought beyond the needs of the local moment, and partly shared with Hand C in sensing the dramatic work. In Addition II, the purely circumstantial and local difficulty arising from the distribution of sheets of paper was not overcome. Shakespeare deliberately held back from the kind of theatrical fine-tuning that would be best done when his contribution to Addition II was placed in the context of the other revisions. But from the present account it emerges that there is no slackness in Shakespeare’s imagina-
tively mature involvement in the play’s dialogue and structure.

22 Heywood’s contribution is also diverse in terms of the range of interventions he makes (including, for instance, annota-
tion of the Original Manuscript), though for circumstantial reasons such as paper-saving that fail to indicate an overall co-ordination of the project.