SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation, 2025; 18(1): 78–98
doi: 10.33542/JTI2025-1-06

Shakespeare's Biblical Intertextuality: Translating Righteousness in Henry Bolingbroke's Discourse into Spanish

Luis J. Conejero-Magro, Universidad de Extremadura

Abstract
Ambiguity is one of the main characteristics of Shakespeare's style, and his portrayal of the figure of the monarchs in his tetralogy is a prime example of such a feature. This article delves into the biblical imagery and rhetorical strategies employed by Henry Bolingbroke (later King Henry IV) in Richard II*. It examines how Shakespeare's portrayal of Bolingbroke's rhetoric draws on scriptural notions of divine right, power and morality, particularly in the context of his ascent to the throne. Through a contrastive analysis of Bolingbroke's speeches in Spanish translations, the article explores the translators' treatment of his rhetorical manipulation of scriptural language, shedding light on the interplay between religious intertextuality and cultural adaptation.*

Keywords*: translation; intertextuality; Shakespeare;* Richard II*; Bible; kingship*

1. Intertextuality and translation[1]

The intertextuality permeating any literary composition helps to ensure its timeless texture. This is because any composition which reflects the essence of previous literature necessarily echoes aspects of the latter (Kristeva [1969] 1980; Plett 1991; Allen 2000), and this is in fact the core function of intertextuality. A literary composition is inevitably a conflation of previous texts and ideas, so that a text which is subject to these intertextual frames will be more in keeping with the earlier literature. Lawrence Venuti (2009: 157) encapsulates the connection between texts by stating that "[e]very text is fundamentally an intertext, bound in relations to other texts which are somehow present in it and from which it draws its meaning, value and function". Far from diminishing its originality, this characteristic enhances it as it prompts readers or viewers to recognize the interplay between texts. Marlène Bichet (2017: 6) similarly asserts that intertextual references "in a text call for a different level of reading, because the reader is presented with […] the voices of other texts". This holds true for Shakespeare's dramatic works as well. A thorough examination of the plays authored by the Elizabethan playwright reveals the extent to which Shakespeare drew upon pre-existing sources in crafting his works (Bullough 1957–75).

Regarding the subject matter explored in this article, Shakespeare's *Richard II*, it is evident that the playwright possessed a deep understanding of various historical (Muir 1978) and socio-religious (Mayer 2006; Estill 2011) sources. This article aims to investigate the biblical framework employed by Henry Bolingbroke during the deposition of Richard II in the

[1] The research conducted for this article has been supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, the State Research Agency, and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) through the Project *Shakespeare's Religious Afterlives: Text, Reception and Performance* (PID2021-123341NB-I00), led by Dr. Cerezo Moreno (UNED, Spain), funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033/ERDF, EU. The author is also a member of the Research Group of the Government of Extremadura (Junta de Extremadura), at the Universidad de Extremadura, GI on English Literary Authors and their Reception in Spanish (HUM021).

play, and to examine its portrayal across the five most renowned Spanish translations of *Richard II*.[2] These translations were carried out by Luis Astrana Marín (1941), José María Valverde (1967), Ángel Luis Pujante (2008), Delia Pasini (2009) and Juan Fernando Merino (2012). Delving into the pivotal role of biblical allusions in these works is crucial for comprehending their literary significance, particularly in terms of the development of Henry Bolingbroke's before and after his ascent to the throne. Analysing these intertextual passages not only enhances our understanding of the narrative, where themes of kingship and legitimacy abound, but also sheds light on Shakespeare's innovative approach to political representation. The depiction of Richard II, a medieval monarch facing rebellion and eventual deposition by his cousin Bolingbroke, serves as the foundation for Shakespeare's second tetralogy (*Richard II*, *1 Henry IV*, *2 Henry IV* and *Henry V*). Furthermore, identifying and dissecting these intertexts constitutes just the initial phase in translating literary compositions into foreign languages. Translation is intricately intertwined with intertextuality, as articulated by Venuti, who underscores its twofold nature of decontextualization and *recontextualization*. According to Venuti (2009: 162; italics in the original), "[the] foreign text is not only decontextualized, but *re*contextualized insofar as translating rewrites it in terms that are intelligible and interesting to receptors, situating it in different patterns of language use, in different cultural values, in different literary traditions, in different social institutions, and often in a different historical moment".

Thus, the theory of intertextuality becomes an essential tool in retaining the meaning and the texture of any given work of literature in another language. Faithful translation involves rendering these intertexts not only into a foreign language, but into a foreign culture. When translators unwittingly ignore the original authority of a text in attempting to render it into another language, they are not only translating word for word, but they are also transmuting the original sense of it, failing to retain its substance (Baumann 2013). Translating is the act of construing the author's message from his or her words, and the only suitable tools for doing so are semiotic. This semiotic apparatus has evolved as the theory of intertextuality.

This theory therefore provides a supporting framework for analysing literature and identifying the socio-cultural structure in which a literary text is framed. Thus, applying the theory of intertextuality to the translation of Shakespeare's *Richard II* demands a linguistic model. After considering the most representative developments in the current theory of intertextuality (Harberer 2007), this article will partly make use of the model proposed by Venuti, as its scope for translation fulfils most of the needs of an analysis rooted in intertextual studies. Venuti (2009: 158) asserts that "translation […] involves three sets of intertextual relations: (1) those between the foreign text and other texts; (2) those between the foreign text and the translation; and (3) those between the translation and other texts". Essentially, these intertextual relations suggest that three stages are necessary for analysing the biblical compound within the context of Early Modern drama. The first stage involves examining the relationship between Shakespeare's plays and the version of the Bible he consulted, namely the 1560 edition of the *Geneva Bible*.[3] The second stage focuses on the equivalence between Shakespeare's original text and its Spanish translation. Lastly, the third stage entails

[2] The first translation into Spanish of Shakespeare's *Richard II* was Francisco Nacente's *Ricardo II*, translated from the French and included in Nacente's *Los grandes dramas de Shakespeare, primera version Española por renombrados literatos* (2 volumes) (1870–71), Barcelona: Francisco Nacente.

[3] As Naseeb Shaheen (1999: 422) notes, "Shakespeare most likely had the *Geneva Bible* in mind" when he wrote most of his plays. Following Shaheen, Stephen Marx (2000) confirms that Shakespeare definitely used the 1560 *Geneva Bible* to consult certain religious texts.

contextualizing the Spanish translation with the Spanish versions of the Bible. This study will concentrate on the second stage: the alignment between the original biblical intertextuality and its Spanish translation. As for the third stage, the corpus of Spanish Bibles used for this analysis encompasses those most emblematic for the Spanish audience, either because of their sales figures or their frequency of use during Sunday mass (Fletcher and Ropero 2008: 482). These Bibles include the *Sagrada Biblia: Versión Oficial de la Conferencia Episcopal Española* ('The Sacred Bible: Official Version of the Spanish Bishops Conference' 2012), the *Sagrada Biblia: Nácar-Colunga* ('The Sacred Bible: Nácar-Colunga' [1944] 1953), the *Sagrada Biblia: Bóver-Cantera* ('The Sacred Bible: Bóver-Cantera' 1947), the *Sagrada Biblia* ('The Sacred Bible' 1972) and the *Biblia del Peregrino* ('The Pilgrim's Bible' 1993). Quotations from the Spanish Bible in this study are sourced from *The Sacred Bible: Official Version of the Spanish Bishops' Conference* (2012). Indeed, the usefulness of the theory of intertextuality lies in analysing the different intertexts in the context of both the *hypertext* (the Bible) and the *hypotext* (*Richard II*), to use Genette's terminology ([1966–72] 1982). In short, the methodology used in this article juxtaposes Shakespeare's *Richard II* with five Spanish translations of the play, and at the same time identifies and analyses the biblical intertexts in the speeches of Richard's enemy, Henry Bolingbroke.

2. Distribution of intertexts in Bolingbroke, the rebel

Throughout the second tetralogy, from the beginning of *1 Henry IV* and also in *2 Henry IV*, Henry Bolingbroke makes it very clear that he is not a semi-divine type of being, nor does he have the same sacred connection to the divinity that Richard II claimed for himself in the first play of Shakespeare's tetralogy, which precedes the two parts of *Henry IV*. Nevertheless, as this article will show, there is a clear difference between the exiled rebel Bolingbroke trying to recover what Richard has taken from him, and the crowned and enthroned Henry IV. Specifically, Bolingbroke resembles a man of the people who presents himself as a popular king, and even Richard and other characters speak of him as such. It is interesting to observe the duplicity of meaning in the term *popular* in the second tetralogy. No one would question the unblemished popularity of either the enthroned Henry IV or Henry V, and this is also characteristic of the just and benevolent rule of each one during their respective reigns. However, as Paul Prescott notes, the term *popularity* implies something quite different when it comes to Richard II and the libertine prince Hal, Henry IV's son and the future Henry V. Prescott (2010: 272) states that:

> '[P]opular' carries negative connotations [when] Henry IV says that his predecessor Richard II 'enfeoffed himself to popularity' (*2 Henry IV*, 3.2.69) [or when] Hal's errant youth is retrospectively described as 'fill'd up with riots, banquets, sports', and as one incapable of shunning 'open haunts and popularity'. (*1 Henry IV*, 1.1.90)

It is clear from the rhetorical value of the biblical references and the way in which Richard's two successors use language both as young men and crowned monarchs, that a *modus operandi* is at work which, in the context of the transition from old monarch to usurper, bears a considerable resemblance to the theoretical framework of "mediated unction" (Cruz Cruz 2013: 42). Although this unction still comes from God, it is channelled through the people, and the concept was driven by principles advocated by the thinkers of the School of

Salamanca[4] (Conejero-Magro 2020). Ton Hoenselaars (2010: 144) very succinctly describes this characteristic relation between language and politics in Richard II and Henry V as follows:

> The successful Machiavellian Bolingbroke is a realist to whom facts matter, but he is also emphatically apoetic. Unlike Richard II, he refuses to let simile and metaphor affect his perception of the material world of politics: [...]. (*Richard II*, 1.3.257–60)

In fact, herein lies the difference between Richard II and his successors. Richard is keen to find quotes from the Bible which legitimise his authority. Bolingbroke/Henry IV (young man and king), on the other hand, as well as Prince Hal before and after his coronation as Henry V, make an apparent effort to acquaint themselves with and speak to people of all classes and social groups, in order to (learn how to) communicate better with all their subjects. Bolingbroke's intertextual processes are fed by characters or passages from the Bible which help him describe and present himself not only as a king, but as a "correct and courteous" (Burton 1973: 178) politician. As the next section will demonstrate, this is exemplified by Bolingbroke comparing himself to Abel in both the first reference and the intertext which permeates his words when he returns from exile.

2.1. Intertext analysis: Bolingbroke as Abel, the sacrificial victim

This section considers the first instance where Henry Bolingbroke transposes words from the Bible. It involves the words he utters as Duke of Hereford before the monarch and the court in the first scene of *Richard II*. Bolingbroke accuses Mowbray of murdering Gloucester, and refers to this criminal act as follows:

> Which blood, like sacrificing Abel's, cries
> Even from the tongueless caverns of the earth
> To me for justice and rough chastisement.
> (*Richard II*, 1.1.104–6)[5]

In this reference to humanity's first murder, captured in Genesis (4:1–17), those who hear his words at the palace, as well as readers or theatre audiences, can immediately see how the accuser is intentionally aggravating the situation with his condemnation. What is not immediately clear is that the murder attributed to Mowbray has an anticipatory function. This example of intertextuality becomes vitally important not only as it is the first time it is introduced by one of the three monarchs in the four plays which make up the second tetralogy, but also because for the first time it establishes the compelling historical parallel between the struggle for power in these four texts and that of the Wars of the Roses. Similarly, as can be deduced from the transposition involved in this example, the use of the intertextual borrowing from Genesis highlights the importance of this passage. Scott Schofield (2011: 40) sets out as follows Shakespeare's possible motives for drawing on this intertextual support:

> Since Bolingbroke assumes the role of appellant and Mowbray that of defendant, it is to be expected that Bolingbroke will *accuse* Mowbray. But how he accuses him is what is of interest to us here. By comparing the death of Gloucester to that of the Old

[4] The School of Salamanca was a 16th-century intellectual movement led by Spanish theologians and jurists, notably Francisco de Vitoria, that redefined natural law, human rights and international law, influencing modern political and economic thought.

[5] All citations from the play are from *King Richard II*, ed. Charles R. Forker (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2002), and are quoted in the text by act, scene and line.

> Testament Abel, … Shakespeare's decision … invites his readers to reevaluate the passage above and the larger Cain-Abel narrative in relation to several important themes from the first act. In this instance, readers are being asked not simply to recall the particulars of Genesis 4:8–10, but also to consider the larger commentary behind this Biblical passage.

As Charles R. Forker rightly suggests, the crime that Mowbray has supposedly committed, the crime Bolingbroke will commit in eliminating Richard II and the guilt hanging over Richard II for killing Gloucester, of which readers or audiences are not yet aware, form part of a dialectic construct in the fabric of the play which has its counterpart in the story of Cain and Abel in Genesis. Forker (2002: 188–9) notes:

> [Abel's] blood cried out from the earth for retribution, unlike that of Christ whose blood promised salvation (Hebrews, 12.24). Ironically, it is Richard rather than Mowbray who has shed the blood of a close kinsman (…). Proleptically, we have an additional irony, for as God punished Cain with exile, so Bolingbroke will punish Gloucester's slayer with dethronement. But the exile of Bolingbroke-Cain precedes the murder of Richard, whereas the punishment of Richard-Cain follows the murder of Gloucester.

It is worth noting the versatility and subtlety of the dynamic this analeptic-proleptic exchange lends the passage and even the entire play. As noted, the aesthetic potential the text acquires at this point responds to the intertextual function of the above-mentioned Old Testament narrative in Spanish: "¿Qué has hecho? — le dijo Él —. La voz de la sangre de tu hermano está clamando a mí desde la tierra" (Génesis 4:10).[6] In this sense, there are unfortunate and unforgiveable mistranslations in two of the Spanish versions, which break the parallel Shakespeare draws in such a masterly way between the narrative from Genesis and the plot of the play. In effect, by translating "blood, like sacrificing Abel's" (1.1.104) as "sangre que, como la de Abel mientras sacrificaba" ('blood that, like that of Abel while he was sacrificing', 1967: 927) and "[sangre] que, como la del inmolante Abel" ('[blood] that, like that of the sacrificing Abel', 2008: 132) respectively, neither Valverde nor Pujante indicate that it is the blood of the innocent Abel which is crying from the depths of the earth. On the one hand, Valverde's translation appears to allude to the blood of the animals Abel was sacrificing to Yahweh:

(1) [...] sangre que, como la de Abel mientras sacrificaba, clama hacia mí, desde las mismas cavernas de la tierra, pidiéndome justicia y duro castigo. (Valverde 1967: 927)

'[...] blood that, like that of Abel while he was sacrificing, cries to me from the very caverns of the earth, demanding justice and harsh punishment'.

Similarly, Pujante's text characterises Abel as the person making the sacrifice, thereby moving away from the quote from the Old Testament. This impression is reinforced by the use of the present participle active (PPA) form *inmolante* ('inmolated'), which suggests Abel as the active agent of the sacrifice rather than its recipient.

[6] In English: "What hast thou done? the voyce of thy brother's blood cryeth vnto me from the earth." (Genesis 4:10, *Geneva Bible*).

(2) [...] [sangre] que, como la del inmolante Abel,/desde las fosas mudas de la tierra/a mí clama justicia y duro castigo. (Pujante 2008: 132)

'[...] [blood] that, like that of the sacrificing Abel,/from the mute pits of the earth/cries out to me for justice and harsh punishment'.

In the other translations, Astrana, Pasini and Merino all maintain this intertextual relationship perfectly. However, as the phrasing in Astrana's version (*después del sacrificio*, 'after the sacrifice') is somewhat ambiguous regarding whose sacrifice is being referenced and who committed it, Pasini's and Merino's texts appear to be the clearest in preserving the intended intertextual link.:

(3) [...] sangre que, como la de Abel después del sacrificio, clama hasta desde las mudas cavernas de la tierra, pidiéndome justicia y riguroso castigo. (Astrana 1941: 967)

'blood which, like that of Abel after the sacrifice, cries out to me even from the mute caverns of the earth, asking me for justice and rigorous punishment'.

(4) [...] y esa sangre, como la del Abel sacrificado, me llama/aun desde las mudas cavernas de la tierra/clamando por justicia y riguroso castigo. (Pasini 2009: 548)

'and that blood, like that of the sacrificed Abel, calls out to me/even from the mute caverns of the earth/crying out for justice and rigorous punishment'.

(5) [...] sangre que, igual que la de Abel sacrificado, clama/hasta el fondo de las cavernas mudas de la tierra/exigiendo de mí justicia y áspero castigo. (Merino 2012: 540)

'and that blood, like that of the sacrificed Abel, calls out to me/even from the mute caverns of the earth/crying out for justice and rigorous punishment'.

2.2. Intertext analysis: Bolingbroke carries out God's will

Later, when the proposed joust between Bolingbroke and Mowbray fails to take place because Richard II breaks it off with the command: "Let them lay by their helmets and their spears/And both return back to their chairs again" (1.3.119–20), the monarch decides to punish the two knights by banishing them. On hearing King Richard order him into exile, Bolingbroke responds in words which at first might appear identical to those used by Richard to deify himself, but which have a radically different meaning. Bolingbroke's exact words are "Your will be done" (1.3.144). This feudal terminology used by Bolingbroke to show he will comply with the monarch's orders clearly suggests the words of Jesus when he prays to the Father: "[t]hy will be done" (Matthew 6:10 and Luke 11:2) in the Lord's Prayer (Matthew 6:9–13) and in Gethsemane when he addresses the Father: "if thou wilt, take away this cup from me; nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done" (Luke 22:42). On the one hand, Bolingbroke is making use of a prayer which in a certain sense identifies him with Christ himself, and even makes him out to be the scapegoat, especially in his allusion to the speech in the Garden of Gethsemane.

Consequently, the intertextuality which inspires Bolingbroke's words to the monarch on hearing he has been sentenced to exile shows he is declaring Richard to be nothing short of an almost divine superior. Unlike Richard in the rest of the scene, Bolingbroke on this occasion

therefore uses words which were spoken by Jesus to proclaim the fragility resulting from his human condition, rather than his power per se.

Roman Catholic and Orthodox, as well as Protestant catechism dictates how this crucial moment in both the source and translated texts is to be understood. Its effect on readers and audiences who adhere to monophysitism, such as those sometimes found in old churches in the Near East or in North-East Africa, would no doubt be slightly different, as monophysitism only admits the divine nature of Christ. However, taking into account only a western, Spanish-speaking readership, almost all the translations compared in this study reproduce and preserve the allusion to the words of Jesus in Matthew 6:10: "hágase tu voluntad" ('thy will be done') and in Luke 22:42: "no se haga mi voluntad, sino la tuya" ('not my will, but thine be done'). Astrana, Valverde, Pasini and Merino convey *will* as 'voluntad', thereby preserving the way the reference intervenes in the text.

(1) Cúmplase vuestra voluntad. (Astrana 1941: 973)

'Let your will be fulfilled'.

(2) Se hará vuestra voluntad: (…). (Valverde 1967: 935)

'Your will shall be done'.

(3) Hágase vuestra voluntad. (Pasini 2009: 557)

'Let you will be done'.

(4) Se hará vuestra voluntad. (Merino 2012: 551)

'Your will shall be done'.

Pujante, on the other hand, decides to use the noun *deseo* ('wish'), distancing himself from the original text from the Gospels and losing the intertextuality.

(5) Cúmplase vuestro deseo. (Pujante 2008: 141)

'Let your desire be fulfilled'.

2.3. Intertext analysis: Bolingbroke, wandering vagabond

Bolingbroke's first words on his return to England at first appear to leave a very different impression to his previous ones, but in reality, they do not differ substantially. His initial words represent an attempt to emphasise his position as an innocent victim while still recognising Richard's superiority as he compares him to God the Father. Equally, by distancing himself from any resemblance to Cain the traitor, he is reinforcing this characterisation as victim which makes him more reminiscent of Abel. When he receives a scolding from his uncle York, regent at the time in Richard II's absence, Bolingbroke makes a blunt reference to the injustice of his forced exile, thereby protesting his innocence.

Faced with the accusation that his rebelliousness constitutes a serious act of insurrection against a monarch York still considers to be anointed ("Com'st thou because the anointed King is hence?" [2.3.96]), Bolingbroke defends himself by suggesting that he is no Cain: "Will you permit that I shall stand condemned/A wandering vagabond[?]" (2.3.118–9). This is a clear echo of the grievance expressed by the wretched Cain. The intertext from Genesis 4:12–14: "a vagabond and a renegade shalt thou be in the earth" helps him to demonstrate that his cousin

Richard is not exactly Abel, even if this involves Bolingbroke having to compare himself to Cain. It becomes clear that Bolingbroke attributes to himself neither the divine nature of someone who considers himself to be chosen by God, nor the characteristics of a criminal whose envy drives him to kill his brother. The future Henry IV already presents himself as a normal, ordinary man with a disposition that heralds a new mentality.

The five Spanish translations analysed here convey this appropriately, as any reference to *vagabundo*, *fugitive* or *errante* are valid choices which encapsulate the punishment Yahweh metes out to Cain ("andarás por [la tierra] fugitivo y errante", 'a vagabond and a runnagate shalt thou be in the earth') and which the latter repeats in the words of the condemned (Génesis 4:12–14). Astrana, Valverde, Pujante, Pasini and Merino remain faithful to the text from Genesis, and their versions therefore involve the above-mentioned transposition.

(1) [...] ¿permitiréis que sea condenado a errar como un vagabundo, que mis títulos y derechos sean arrancados a la fuerza de mis armas? (Astrana 1941: 985)

'Will you allow me to be condemned to wander as a vagabond, and my titles and rights to be torn from the power of my weapons?'

(2) [...] ¿vais a permitirme que quede condenado como vagabundo errante, y que mis derechos y privilegios se arranquen por fuerza de mis armas? (Valverde 1967: 957)

'Will you allow me to be condemned as a wandering vagabond [...]?'

(3) [...] ¿vais a permitir que siga condenado/al vagabundeo, mientras me arrancan por la fuerza/mis fueros y derechos [...]? (Pujante 2008: 164)

'Will you allow my condemnation to vagabondage to continue[...]?'

(4) [...] ¿permitiréis que yo permanezca condenado/como un vagabundo errante, mis derechos y privilegios/[...]? (Pasini 2009: 580)

'Will you allow me to remain condemned as a wandering vagabond [...]?'

(5) [...] ¿vais a permitir que se prolongue mi condena/a errar cual vagabundo, mis títulos y bienes/arrancados por la fuerza [...]? (Merino 2012: 576)

'Will you allow my sentence to wander as a vagabond to be prolonged [...]?'

2.4. Intertext analysis: Bolingbroke and the imagery of Pilate

In the first scene of act III, Bolingbroke's words as he pronounces Bushy and Green's death sentence are infused with an intertextuality which also distances him from the aura of divinity to which his cousin Richard so relentlessly aspired:

> [...] yet to wash your blood
> From off my hands, here in the view of men
> I will unfold some causes of your deaths: (3.1.5–7)

In this case it is the image of Pilate washing his hands that interacts with what Bolingbroke conveys after he has passed the sentence. Once again, commentary on this passage may have fallen far short of the mark. Shaheen (1999: 463), admittedly, draws attention to the use of imagery reflecting the attitude of Pontius Pilate in this same passage from the play. However,

he limits himself to identifying its biblical source and to reminding his readers that Shakespeare makes use of this same reference from the Gospels in two other places in the play (4.1.239–42 and 5.6.50), as well as in *Macbeth* when Lady Macbeth entreats her husband to wash his guilt from his hands and to smear the innocent hands and faces of Duncan's servants with his blood. Because a clear structural or semantic connection can be traced from the Gospels to the target text in the phrase "to wash your blood/From off my hands" (3.1.5–6), audiences can see that the intertextuality is intentional. They therefore find themselves facing contradictions in determining the intention behind how this reference is used. In fact, Matthew's description of Pilate when "he took water and washed his hands" (Matthew 27:24), and the words of the Prefect of Judea in declaring before the crowd "I am innocent of the blood of this just man; look you to it" (ibid.), bear too much resemblance to the assertion that Bolingbroke is innocent of the deaths of Bushy and Green just before he decapitates them. For this reason, one interpretation of this intertextual phenomenon is that Bolingbroke, at least in this case, is, or is acting, too much like Pilate. Another equally valid interpretation of this specific intertext is that it is simply a very trite, almost ritual formula used by people in general, and employed by Bolingbroke to absolve himself of any responsibility. It could represent a normal use of language, which intends neither to deify nor to demonise.

If the present analysis were a comparison between Shakespeare's characters and biblical ones, the intertexts considered so far would lead to the conclusion that in *Richard II* Bolingbroke resembles Pilate, whereas Richard is presented as Samuel trying to cling to power when he does not deserve it (Conejero-Magro 2023: 27–28). It becomes particularly important, especially from the point of view of the theory of intertextuality, that "[t]he Christological images are Shakespeare's" (2014: 76), as Janet Clare has shown in contrasting Holinshed and Hall's chronicles with Shakespeare's text. They do not come from and have not been copied from the texts of the chronicles, although "perhaps [they were] prompted by Holinshed's mediation of Richard's sense of his own position when he returns from Ireland to be confronted by Bolingbroke" (ibid.). The shift in power dynamics between Richard II and Henry Bolingbroke shows that authority has effectively transferred to Bolingbroke, leaving Richard no longer in control of events but instead subject to Bolingbroke's plans. In other words, although "this transfer of power is not formalized until the abdication scene, it has in fact occurred; and Richard's role in Act IV is subtly different from all that has preceded it". For this reason, "Richard is the victim of Bolingbroke's inexorable progress, and his protest takes the form of the inverted coronation-rite" (Clare, 2014: 85).[7]

The way the reference mediates between the words of Bolingbroke and those of the Evangelist is duplicated in four of the five translations compared in this study. The texts of Astrana, Valverde, Pujante and Pasini preserve the reference to the original New Testament corpus from Matthew 27:24: "Pilate [...] took water and washed his hands before the multitude", which is in Spanish "Pilatos (…) tomando agua, se lavó las manos delante del pueblo" (Mateo 27:24).

[7] For more information on the development of the character of Bolingbroke and the pomposity involved in the overthrow of Richard II in this play by Shakespeare, see the work of José María Rodríguez García, "Paradoxical Time and Providential History in Shakespeare and Bacon" (1999), which includes a study of the opinions of twentieth-century commentators on the character of Henry Bolingbroke.

(1) Sin embargo, para lavar nuestras manos de vuestra sangre, debo aquí públicamente descubrir algunas causas de vuestra muerte. (Astrana 1941: 986)

'However, to wash our hands of your blood, I should here publicly uncover some causes of your death'.

(2) Sin embargo, para lavar vuestra sangre de mis manos, aquí, a la vista de estos hombres. (Valverde 1967: 960)

'However, to wash your blood from my hands, here, in the sight of these men'.

(3) Mas para lavar/vuestra sangre de mis manos, aquí, ante todos,/expondré algunas causas de vuestra condena. (Pujante 2008: 168)

'But to wash your blood from my hands, here, before everyone, I shall expose some the causes of your condemnation'.

(4) Sin embargo, para lavar mis manos/de vuestra sangre, aquí, a la vista de estos hombres,/revelaré algunas de las causas de vuestra muerte. (Pasini 2009: 583)

'However, to wash my hands of your blood, here, in the sight of these men, I will reveal, some of the causes of your death'.

However, in Merino's version, *lavar* ('wash') becomes *limpiar* ('clean'), distancing itself from Pontius Pilate's act of (ir)responsibility, as *lavar* and not *limpiar* is the verb which appears in the Holy Scriptures.

(5) Mas para limpiar mis manos/de vuestra sangre, aquí a la vista de los hombres/develaré unos cuantos causales de vuestra muerte. (Merino 2012: 579)

'But to cleanse my hands of your blood, here, in the sight of these men, I will uncover a few causes of your death'.

2.5. Intertext analysis: Bolingbroke and the bread of banishment

Later on in this same scene, Bolingbroke reprimands Bushy and Green for their part in his exile by Richard, which had forced him to taste "the bitter bread of banishment" (3.1.21). The image of *bitter bread* or *bread of tears* ("bread of affliction" in 1 Kings 22:27, 2 Chronicles 18:26; "bread of adversity" in Isaiah 30:20 and 'bread of tribulation' in Deuteronomy 16:3), which constitutes the biblical intertext in these words of Bolingbroke, is not only very common in the Scriptures, but also the origin of a series of expressions and sayings in English and Spanish. There is no doubt in this case that Bolingbroke is making use of one of these recurrent word strings involving the English expression *bitter bread* in order to highlight the seriousness of the sentence and the magnitude of his suffering as a consequence of his exile. The result is random or chance intertextuality. In this sense, Bolingbroke's use of this biblical reference is no different from that which any other character might use.

However, the use Green makes of the biblical text in his response is radically different. This character, a genuinely mediaeval man loyal to Richard II, passes judgement on Bolingbroke before he dies, and this judgement is not human but divine in character. The judgement is one of eternal damnation which, as such, could only be issued from God. Nevertheless, Green, emulating Richard, very directly assumes this authority in his response: "heaven will [...]/plague injustice with the pains of hell" (3.1.33–4). Once again, a stark

contrast emerges as a result of the intertext, not only between two world views and two eras, but also between two different styles. In comparing the example of how Green's words are transposed, it is worth noting that the latter's world view, which conforms to Richard II's own, is reflected in the eschatological nature of his damning judgement. In contrast, Bolingbroke's world view is manifest in the type of standard phrase involved in the metaphor he uses to express his exile, which is more or less an idiom in contemporary usage. The source of the intertext Green uses can be found in Psalm 18:4: "The paines of hell came about me", and 116:3: "When the snares of death compassed me, and the griefs of the grave caught me: when I found trouble and sorrow". It might also be noted that curiously these biblical quotes do not come from the *Geneva Bible* but from the *Bishop's Bible* (1569). As Shaheen (1999: 408) indicates, the way this is adjusted is interesting, and because it occurs very infrequently, it seems Shakespeare is not using—nor is he inspired by—the Genevan translation of the Bible, which is the most common source text in the process of acquisition involved in biblical intertexts. The quote in this Bible reads "sorowes of the graue" (Ps. 18:5; the numbering system for the verses of the Psalms in the *Geneva Bible* varies by one number), and "griefes of the graue" (Ps. 116:3) rather than *pains* as in other versions of the Bible.

As is to be expected, in the case of Bolingbroke's intertext, the translators of the versions analysed here convey the original Elizabethan text, but in no way suggest "bread of affliction" (1 Kings 22:27; 2 Chronicles 18:26) "bread of adversity" (Isaiah 30:20) or "bread of tribulation" (Deuteronomy 16:3). Astrana, Valverde and Pujante present the phrase "el amargo pan del destierro" ('the bitter bread of exile', 1941: 987; 1967: 960 and 2008: 168), where Pasini and Merino opt for "el pan amargo del destierro" ('the bread bitter of exile', 2009: 583 and 2012: 580), changing the order of the words but not the effectiveness of the intertextuality. The five Spanish passages dissociate themselves from the scriptural source text. It is nevertheless noteworthy that the *Traducción al Lenguaje Actual de la Biblia*, though not one of the Bibles contrasted in this article (rather than being a translation of the Holy Scriptures, it is really an adaptation which brings the biblical language more in line with a colloquial register, so to speak) does in fact capture "bitter bread" in Psalm 80:5, even if it is not one of the examples of *bitter bread* in the previous English text.

As in the previous intertextual borrowing mentioned, the translators do not draw on the scriptural source, which makes their choices inadequate. No doubt because the intertextuality appears by chance, as the form of the previous text is not particularly striking and its origin cannot easily be discerned, the authors of the translations studied in this article do not draw on the Old Testament text, so they detach themselves from the acquisition process. Astrana, Valverde, Pujante, Pasini and Merino convey the nominal phrase "the pains of hell" by "las penas del infierno" (1941: 987; 1967: 961; 2008: 168; 2009: 584 and 2012: 580). Their suggested translations do not therefore correspond fully to the form and function of the original text, as the versions of the Bible consulted here prefer the following: "lazos del [a]bismo" ('the snares of the abyss', Psalm 116:3 in the *Versión Oficial de la Conferencia Episcopal* and in the *Biblia del Peregrino*, and Psalm 18:6 in the *Biblia del Peregrino*), "lazos del infierno" ('the bonds of hell', Psalm 116:3 in the *Sagrada Biblia*), "cuerdas del infierno" ('the strings of hell', Psalm 18:6 in the *Sagrada Biblia*), "redes del abismo" ('the nets of the abyss', Psalm 18:6 in the *Versión Oficial de la Conferencia Episcopal*), "ataduras del sepulcro" ('the bonds of the tomb', Psalm 18:6 in the *Biblia Nácar-Colunga*) and "ansiedades del sepulcro" ('the anxieties of the tomb', Psalm 116:3 in the *Biblia Nácar-Colunga*). In fact, none of the options from the Scriptures were chosen in the translated passages compared here, meaning that the biblical intertext was lost.

2.6. Intertext analysis: Bolingbroke and the bosom of Abraham

The last of Henry Bolingbroke's speeches with biblical discourse before his coronation involves normal usage, at least in referring to the dead. It concerns how he delivers his blessing when Carlisle announces the death of Thomas Mowbray. The formula he uses is "Sweet peace conduct his sweet soul to the bosom/Of good old Abraham!" (4.1.104–5). The way in which this reference is used reformulates the words in Luke 16:22, where Luke stresses that all men are equal, regardless of the wealth of the person who dies: "And it was so that the beggar died, and was carried by the Angels into Abraham's bosom, [and the] rich man also died, and was buried." Once again, it is clear that the future Henry IV's biblical references and allusions descend, so to speak, from the heavens and become established in everyday, or earthly reality.

The translations also reduce the speech to this level, so that the key to this change of style lies in the way the intertext is formulated. In transposing the echoes of Luke 16:22 into Bolingbroke's language ("fue llevado por los ángeles al seno de Abrahán", 'taken by the angels to the bosom of Abraham'), the translators create a rhetorical model which retains the common touch and human condition which Bolingbroke continues to convey. Astrana, Valverde and Pasini thus opt for the nominal phrase "al seno del buen viejo Abraham" ('to the bosom of good old Abraham!', 1941: 996, 1967: 978 and 2009: 603):

(1) ¡Que la dulce paz conduzca su alma al seno del buen viejo Abraham! (Astrana 1941: 996)

'May sweet peace lead his soul to the bosom of good old Abraham!'

(2) ¡Dulce paz lleve su dulce alma al seno del buen viejo Abraham! (Valverde 1967: 978)

'May sweet peace carry his sweet soul to the bosom of good old Abraham!'

(3) Que la dulce paz conduzca su alma al seno/del buen viejo Abraham. (Pasini 2009: 603)

'May sweet peace lead his soul to the bosom/of good old Abraham.'

Merino, meanwhile, chooses the expression "el seno del buen anciano Abraham" ('the bosom/of the good old Abraham!', 2012: 602), and Pujante prefers the simplified form "al seno de Abrahán" ('to the bosom of Abraham.', 2008: 188), eliminating the original Elizabethan "good old" Abraham (4.1.105):

(4) ¡Que la tierna paz lleve su tierna alma hasta el seno/del buen anciano Abraham! (Merino 2012: 602)

'May tender peace carry his tender soul to the bosom/of the good old Abraham!'

(5) Que la santa paz lleve su alma santa/al seno de Abrahán. (Pujante 2008: 188)

'May holy peace carry his holy soul/to the bosom of Abraham.'

All the translations compared here clearly maintain the biblical intertext.

3. Distribution of intertexts in Bolingbroke, the silent king

After his coronation and transformation into Henry IV, the tone of Henry Bolingbroke's language barely appears to change in terms of the way it is infused with biblical discourse. From the very start, it is noticeable and very significant that during his coronation ceremony and Richard's dethroning (from 4.1.108 to 4.1.334 in *Richard II*) he does not mention a single word from the Bible or anything which suggests it. The importance of this scene from a neo-historical point of view lies in its significance in Elizabethan England. It is consequently not surprising, considering the political divisions of Elizabeth I's era, that this scene was censored until 1608 and had, as Forker says, "its [own] history" (2002: 49). Forker (2002: 364) says specifically:

> [t]he censorship under Elizabeth would not suffer [this scene] to be printed, and it first appears in the Fourth Quarto, of 1608 [because the] reason of this veto was that Elizabeth, strange as it may appear, was often compared with Richard II. The action of the censorship renders it probable that it was Shakespeare's *Richard II* (and not one of the earlier plays on the same theme) which, as appears in the trial of Essex, was acted by the Lord Chamberlain's Company before the conspirators, at the leader's command, on the evening before the outbreak of the rebellion (February 7, 1601).

Henry Bolingbroke's silence resounds, at least from the perspective from which this article analyses the scriptural discourse. In his comments on this scene, Lawrence Dawson very succinctly sums up the power relations between Richard II, who is trying to emulate Phaeton, and Henry Bolingbroke who is juggling silence. Dawson (2000: 97) says:

> Richard dominates the last acts of his play, turning the victors into supporting players in the drama of his downfall. Even Bolingbroke – the future King Henry IV – is a dramatically dim figure compared to the Phaeton-like Richard. In the great scene of Richard's deposition [...] Bolingbroke is, as Richard calls him, a 'silent King' (4.1.280), upstaged by the royal martyr acting his tragic script. Bolingbroke can 'seize the crown' (4.1.172), but he cannot so easily assume the mantle of legitimacy; he can take the *wordly* power, but not the aura of divinely sanctioned kingship (emphasis in the original).

This silence in no way means that all his speeches are devoid of biblical references; far from it. It simply means that his allusions to the Bible will never have the almost deifying function they had for Richard. It is precisely this linguistic marker which distinguishes the two monarchies. The subtle difference in the language of the deposed Richard II is the result of what Jean-Christophe Mayer (2006: 121) calls the "extraordinary power of Shakespeare's Parliament scene". Mayer (2006: 74) states specifically:

> Bolingbroke wished to create a spectacle out of Richard II's abdication ('that in common view/He may surrender ...' (4.1.156–7), but it is precisely the staging of his abdication which escapes him – despite the fact that he had prepared the ground for it – because Richard finally upstages Bolingbroke by playing the tragic victim. Against all odds, the irony of *Richard II* is that its eponymous king ultimately conducts his own deposition ceremony and holds the attention of a Parliament of which we as an audience are also members: 'Now mark me how I will undo myself' (4.1.203). Such is the extraordinary power of Shakespeare's Parliament scene.

3.1. Intertext analysis: Henry IV, forgiving king

After Henry IV's coronation, when Aumerle's mother begs the new monarch's pardon on behalf of her son, Henry also makes some remarks where he draws on the Bible, not in order to sing his own praises but in recognition of the fact that he too is a sinner begging God's forgiveness: "I pardon him as God shall pardon me" (5.3.130). Specifically, as befits a mediaeval Christian prince, a strong echo of the New Testament can be detected in his response. This involves his reference to the part of the Lord's Prayer where Christ invites everyone, including kings, to admit that they are sinners and ask God for forgiveness, just as they forgive those who trespass against them "For if ye do forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you./But if ye do not forgive men their trespasses, no more will your Father forgive you your trespasses" (Matthew 6:14–15).

This message is repeated further on in the same book of the Gospels: "So likewise shall my heavenly Father do unto you, except ye forgive from your hearts, each one to his brother their trespasses" (Matthew 18:35). It can also be found elsewhere such as in the Book of Mark: "But when ye shall stand, and pray, forgive, if ye have anything against any man, that your Father also which is in heaven, may forgive you your trespasses" (Mark 11:25). In fact, this is the line that indicates the attitude of the new monarch, Henry IV, when he lets the duchess know that he will grant her son a pardon.

The five translations considered in this article suggest the quote from the above-mentioned passages from the Gospels which convey this message of forgiveness: "si vosotros perdonáis a otros sus faltas, también os perdonará a vosotros vuestro Padre" ('For if ye do forgiue men their trespasses, your heauenly Father will also forgiue you', Matthew 6:14–15); "[a]sí hará con vosotros mi Padre celestial si [...] perdonare cada uno a su hermano" ('So likewise shall mine heauenly Father doe vnto you, except ye forgiue from your hearts eche one to his brother', Matthew 18:35) and "perdonadlo primero, para que vuestro Padre [...] os perdone" ('forgiue, if ye haue any thing against any man, that your Father also which is in heauen, may forgiue you', Mark 11:25). The ways in which Astrana, Valverde, Pujante, Pasini and Merino transpose these passages maintain the quote from the New Testament and are therefore valid options in terms of translation.

(1) Le perdono, para que Dios me perdone. (Astrana 1941: 1005)

'I forgive him, so that God may forgive me'.

(2) Le perdono, así Dios me perdone. (Valverde 1967: 995)

'I forgive him, may God forgive me likewise'.

(3) Le perdono, y Dios me perdone a mí. (Pujante 2008: 206)

'I forgive him, and may God forgive me'.

(4) Yo lo perdono, como Dios me perdonará a mí. (Pasini 2009: 621)

'I forgive him, just as God will forgive me'.

(5) Le perdono, como Dios ha de perdonarme a mí. (Merino 2012: 622)

'I forgive him, as God must forgive me'.

3.2. Intertext analysis: Henry IV, the personification of both Abel and Cain

Another occasion on which Henry IV enriches his language with biblical imagery is when he is told of the death of King Richard, which he himself has in fact caused. His lament and his very cynical condemnation of the executioner who carries out his orders are those of someone boasting the utmost authority, and indeed responsibility. Henry IV, presented with the body of the deposed monarch by Exton the executioner, says to Exton with very unconvincing remorse, "With Cain go wander through shades of night" (5.6.43). Forker has expanded on this interesting allusion to Genesis, maintaining and defending the idea of parallels between this scene in which Henry IV compares Richard's killer, Exton, with the killer of Abel, and the first time the story of Cain and Abel from Genesis is mentioned, just before Richard II banishes Thomas Mowbray. In this way, Forker is suggesting that the same contextual distance can be established as that between the biblical characters Abel and Cain. At the beginning of the play Cain was Richard II and now he is Henry IV himself. Forker (2002: 188–9) says:

> But the exile of Bolingbroke-Cain precedes the murder of Richard, whereas the punishment of Richard-Cain follows the murder of Gloucester. Bolingbroke invokes the story again in 5.6.43-4, where, with a further ironic twist, Exton rather than the King is identified with the first murderer. In both cases, interestingly, Bolingbroke associated the agent of murder (Mowbray, Exton) with Cain (Richard, Henry IV) who is ultimately responsible.

This case, just like the intertext in the words of Bolingbroke (1.1.104) in the first example considered above, involves an identifiable intertext. Moreover, as Shaheen points out, it seems that Shakespeare retained the context of Daniel's Chronicle *Civil Wars* (1595) but interpolated into it the above-noted intertext. Shaheen (1999: 388) asserts:

> [t]he closest parallel in Shakespeare's sources occurs in Daniel: 'The outcast of the world' (3.459, stanza 81). Daniel's context is identical with Shakespeare's. Both statements are said of Exton, Richard's murderer. Shakespeare seems to have transformed that line in Daniel into a explicit biblical reference.

In the consulted Spanish versions of the Bible, on two occasions, the Old Testament text characterises Cain as fugitive and wanderer. In Genesis (4:12–14) this reads as follows:

> 'Cuando la labres, te negará sus frutos y andarás por ella fugitivo y errante.' Dijo Caín a Yahvé: 'Insoportablemente grande es mi castigo. Ahora me arrojas de esta tierra; oculto a tu rostro habré de andar fugitivo y errante por la tierra, y cualquiera que me encuentre me matará'.[8]

It can therefore be concluded that any translator who conveys *go wander* with 've(te) a errar' is recreating the same intertextual process. This is the case with four of the five translators studied in this article. The way Astrana, Valverde, Pasini and Merino structure this demonstrates the relationship with the first book of the Bible.

(1) Ve a errar con Caín a través de las sombras de la noche. (Astrana 1941: 1008)

'Go wander with Cain through the shadows of the night'.

[8] In English: "[...] a fugitiue and a vagabonde shalt thou be in the earth" and "Behold, thou hast cast me out this day from the earth, and from thy face shall I be hid, and shall be a vagabonde and a runnagate in the earth [...]" (Genesis 4:12, 14, *Geneva Bible*).

(2) Vete a errar con Caín a través de las sombras de la noche. (Valverde 1967: 1000)

'Go wander with Cain through the shadows of the night'.

(3) Con Caín vete a errar por las tinieblas nocturnas. (Pasini 2009: 627)

'With Cain, go wander through the nocturnal darkness'.

(4) Ve con Caín a errar entre las sombras de la noche. (Merino 2012: 630)

'Go with Cain to wander among the shadows of the night'.

Pujante's (2008: 212) suggestion, on the other hand, contains the verbal phrase "[ir] a vagar", which is an inappropriate choice that dissociates itself from the scriptural reference.

(5) Ve con Caín a vagar entre las sombras. (Pujante 2008: 212)

'Go with Cain to roam among the shadows'.

3.3. Intertext analysis: Henry IV, the would-be crusader

Henry IV's act of contrition at this point simply characterises him as a mediaeval monarch who feels guilty about having usurped the throne from a legitimate king. The same occurs in a much more striking way with King Henry's suggestion that he make amends and repair the damage by going to the Holy Land to wash all traces of the crime from his hands: "I'll make a voyage to the Holy Land/To wash this blood off from my guilty hand" (5.6.49–50). In a logical sense, the monarch's feelings here are not even remotely consistent with an interpretation of the play involving the new doctrine on divine right formulated by the School of Salamanca. This is because Shakespeare was using a technique with which his audience and readership were, and remain, very familiar. It expressed and embodied narratives in the present using language and anecdotes from the past.

The sources of the intertextuality which feed the royal discourse in this scene at this critical moment are clear. Equally, this is an example of specific and repeated intertextuality, as it is Bolingbroke himself in 3.1.5–6 who appropriated this reference from the Bible, as analysed above. In this instance it involves Matthew's description of Pilate when he washes his hands before the crowd (Matthew 27:24).

In this case, just as in the analysis of the five translations of the intertext in 3.1.5–6, the translations of "to wash this blood from off my guilty hand" by Astrana, Valverde, Pujante and Pasini draw on the verb *lavar* ('to cleanse'), so that the transposition is maintained in the Spanish texts.

(1) Haré un viaje a Tierra Santa para lavar de esta sangre mi culpable mano. (Astrana 1941: 1008)

'I will make a journey to the Holy Land to wash from this blood my guilty hand'.

(2) Haré un viaje a Tierra Santa para lavar esta sangre de mis manos culpables. (Valverde 1967: 1000)

'I will make a journey to the Holy Land to wash this blood from my guilty hands'.

(3) Voy a hacer peregrinaje a Tierra Santa/para lavar de mis manos esta mancha. (Pujante 2008: 212)

'I will go on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land/to wash this stain from my hands'.

(4) Yo me iré de viaje a la Tierra Santa/para lavar la sangre de mi mano condenada. (Pasini, 2008: 627)

'I will go on a journey to the Holy Land/to wash the blood from my condemned hand'.

On the other hand, the translation by Merino breaks the link with the Scriptures by opting for the verb *limpiar* ('cleanse'), in the same way as in 3.1.5–6.

(5) Yo emprenderé un viaje a Tierra Santa/para limpiar de esta sangre mi culpable mano. (Merino 2012: 630)

'I will undertake a journey to the Holy Land/to cleanse my guilty hand of this blood.'

4. Concluding remarks

The intertexts examined in this article demonstrate how Henry Bolingbroke employs biblical passages to justify his claim to the English throne, particularly to juxtapose his demeanour or his attitude with that of Richard II, who asserts his immunity through divine right. Henry's citations from the Bible, aimed at portraying himself as a more capable ruler than his cousin Richard, are generally accurately translated into Spanish across the analysed versions. However, it is worth noting that, except for José María Valverde's rendition, each of the translations reviewed here contains at least one error in translating the biblical references into Spanish. Valverde's translation comes closest to capturing Shakespeare's original biblical allusions. Overall, though, the five translations effectively convey the Elizabethan playwright's intention regarding the stark contrast between the situation of the biblical quotations and the monarch's discourse context. By employing a public spectacle, Shakespeare skilfully exposes a corrupt court and underscores the dire consequences of power manipulation, inviting the audience to perceive the dissonance between these contexts.

Table 1 shows the intertexts in the speeches of Henry Bolingbroke in *Richard II* which have been analysed in this article, where text A is the Bible and text B is Shakespeare's play. Table 1 demonstrates very clearly the references Bolingbroke makes to the story of Cain and Abel in Genesis, where he goes as far as to compare himself to Cain. It also illustrates the references he makes to the words of Pontius Pilate after Jesus is arrested, where he compares himself to the Roman governor. In fact, unlike in the language used by Richard II, Bolingbroke takes very few of his intertexts from characters involving salvation such as David, Saul or Jesus. In fact, although he borrows intertexts from the words of Jesus in the Gospels, it should be noted that their function is to convey his humility, rather than to glorify himself.

Table 1: Bolingbroke's intertexts in *Richard II*

Play in question (text B)	Position – text B	Character text B	Character text A	Framework text – text A	Source text – text A
RII	1.1.104–6	Bolingbroke	God to Cain	Old Test.	Gen. 4:1–17
RII	1.3.144	Bolingbroke	Jesus	New Test.	Matthew 6:10; Luke 11:2 and Luke 22:42
RII	2.3.118–9	Bolingbroke	Cain	Old Test.	Gen. 4:12–14
RII	3.1.5–7	Bolingbroke	Pilate	New Test.	Matthew 27:24
RII	3.1.21	Bolingbroke	(*bitter bread* is a recurring image)	Old and New Test.	Various
RII	4.1.104–5	Bolingbroke	Jesus	New Test.	Luke 16:22
RII	5.3.130	Bolingbroke	Jesus	New Test.	Matthew 6:14–15; Matthew 18:35 and Mark 11:25
RII	5.6.43	Bolingbroke	God to Cain	Old Test.	Gen. 4:12–14
RII	5.6.49–50	Bolingbroke	Pilate	New Test.	Matthew 27:24

From the analysis of the three biblical intertexts embedded in the character of Henry Bolingbroke after his coronation in act V of *Richard II* (Section 3 in this article), it can be concluded that the rationale for these examples of acquisition is the exact opposite of the reasoning behind Richard II's biblical references. However, there is a radical difference between the function of Henry Bolingbroke's intertexts before his coronation and after he becomes King Henry IV. On the one hand, Henry IV presents himself from the start as a king who has sinned, in other words as just another ordinary citizen wearing nothing like the aura of a divine court with which the previous monarch frequently and persistently enveloped himself. On the other hand, Henry's choices of biblical intertextuality after he has become king publicly affirm his power and royal authority. As noted above, in the example of Henry Bolingbroke's last two intertexts in this play, his hypocrisy when he receives Richard II's body is indeed surprising. It is clear that his words on seeing his cousin's body present, in themselves, an interesting ambiguity: "Though I did wish him dead,/I hate the murderer, love him murdered" (5.6.39–40). This ambiguity in his words reinforces the ambiguity of the character himself. The way in which the Crown has apparently made him more brutal means that in his last biblical intertexts his ability to conceal his feigned humility, or to demonstrate it more clearly, is compromised. This is just one of the faces of Henry Bolingbroke which commentators on the play have been studying for more than half a century. In fact, Bolingbroke is seen as "a manifestation [...] of the actual Machiavellian philosophy" (Ribner 1948: 178) or a "schemer" whose "speeches [...] betray calculation in their over-humility, over-sweetness" (Hill 1961: 115–6). On the contrary, he is also considered an instrument of divine providence

who has come to save England from Richard II's maladministration. Logically, these two ways of understanding the character of Bolingbroke work in tandem, as is so often the case in Shakespeare's plethora of characters.

References

Allen, Graham. 2000. *Intertextuality*: *The New Critical Idiom*. London: Routledge.

Baumann, Klaus-Dieter. 2013. The interdisciplinary concept of translational intertextuality, illustrated on the basis of LSP text networks. *Synaps* 29: 7–17.

Bible and Holy Scriptures Conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament. (Geneva Bible). 1560. Geneva: Rouland Hall.

Biblia del Peregrino. 1993. Translated by Luis Alonso Schökel. Bilbao: Egea y Mensajero.

Bichet, Marlène. 2017. The treatment of intertextuality in translation studies: A case study with the 2009 English translation of Simone de Beauvoir's *Le Deuxième Sexe*. *New Voices in Translation Studies* 17: 1–30.

Bullough, Geoffrey. 1957–75. *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare* (8 vols). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul and New York: Columbia University Press.

Burton, Dolores. 1973. *Shakespeare's Grammatical Style: A Computer-Assisted Analysis of 'Richard II' and 'Anthony and Cleopatra'*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Clare, Janet. 2014. *Shakespeare's Stage Traffic: Imitation, Borrowing and Competition in Renaissance Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conejero-Magro, Luis Javier. 2020. The School of Salamanca in the 16th century and the way kingship is canvassed in Shakespeare's *Richard II*. *Sederi: Yearbook of the Spanish and Portuguese Society for English Renaissance Studies* 30: 7–28. doi: 10.34136/sederi.2020.1.

Conejero-Magro, Luis Javier. 2023. 'Our golden crown': Analysis of religious intertextuality in Shakespeare's *Richard II*, and its translation into Spanish. *Critical Survey* 35(2): 22–36. doi: 10.3167/cs.2023.350203.

Cruz Cruz, Juan. 2013. La *Translatio* del Poder al Soberano: Una Teoría Jurídico-Política en el Siglo de Oro. *Medievalia* 16(2): 37–43. doi: 10.5565/rev/medievalia.147.

Estill, Laura. 2011. *Richard II* and the Book of Life. *Studies in English Literature* 51(2): 283–303. doi: 10.1353/sel.2011.0012.

Fletcher, James and Alfonso Ropero. 2008. *Historia general del Cristianismo*. Barcelona: Editorial Clie.

Forker, Charles R. 2002. Introduction and Notes. *King Richard II*. Arden Shakespeare (3rd Series). London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Genette, Gérard. (1966–72) 1982. *Figures of literary discourse*. Translated by Jane E. Lewis. Paris: Seuil; Berkeley, California and Oxford: Berkeley and Oxford University Presses.

Harberer, Adolphe. 2007. Intertextuality in theory and practice. *Literatüra* 49(5): 54–67.

Hill, Ronald Frederick. 1961. Dramatic Techniques and Interpretation in *Richard II*. In Russell Brown, John & Harris, Bernard (eds.), *Early Shakespeare*. (Vol. 3). London: Stratford-upon-Avon Studies, Edward Arnold. 101–21.

Hoenselaars, Ton. 2010. Shakespeare's English history plays. In De Grazia, Margareta & Wells, Stanley (eds.), *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare: Cambridge Companions to Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 137–52.

Kristeva, Julia. (1969) 1980. *Word, dialogue and novel*. Translated by Alice Jardine, Thomas Gora and Léon S. Roudiez and edited by Toril Moi. Paris: Seuil and New York: Columbia University Press. 143–73.

Marx, Stephen. 2000. *Shakespeare and the Bible*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Mayer, Jean-Christophe. 2006. *Shakespeare's hybrid faith: History, religion and stage*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Muir, Kenneth. 1978. *The sources of Shakespeare's plays*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Nacente, Francisco. 1870–71. *Los grandes dramas de Shakespeare, primera versión española por renombrados literatos* (2 volumes) (1870–71). Barcelona: Francisco Nacente.

Plett, Heinrich F. 1991. *Intertextuality*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Prescott, Paul. 2010. Shakespeare and popular culture. In De Grazia, Margareta & Wells, Stanley (eds.), *The New Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare: Cambridge Companions to Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 269–84.

Rodríguez García, José María. (1999). Paradoxical Time and Providential History in Shakespeare and Bacon. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 12: 149–64.

Sagrada Biblia: Bóver-Cantera. 1947. Translated by José María Bóver and Francisco Cantera. Barcelona: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos.

Sagrada Biblia: Nácar-Colunga. (1944) 1953. Translated by Eloíno Nácar Fuster and Alberto Colunga Cueto (5th edition). Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos.

Sagrada Biblia. 1972. Edited by Serafín de Ausejo. Barcelona: Editorial Herder.

Sagrada Biblia, La. Versión Oficial de la Conferencia Episcopal Española. 2012. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos.

Schofield, Scott. 2011. Cain's Crime of Secrecy and the Unknowable Book of Life: The Complexities of Biblical Referencing in *Richard II*. In DeCook, Travis & Galey, Alan (eds.), *Shakespeare, the Bible, and the Form of the Book: Contested Scriptures*. London: Routledge. 40–56.

Shaheen, Naseeb. 1999. *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays*. Newark: Delaware University Press and London: Associated University Press.

Shakespeare, William. (1595) 1941. *Obras Completas de William Shakespeare* (4th edition). Translated by Luis Astrana Marín. Madrid: Aguilar.

Shakespeare, William. (1595) 1967–8. *Teatro Completo: William Shakespeare*. Translated by José María Valverde. Barcelona: Planeta.

Shakespeare, William. (1595) 2008. *William Shakespeare. Teatro Selecto*. Translated by Ángel Luis Pujante Álvarez-Castellanos. Madrid: Espasa Libros.

Shakespeare, William. (1595) 2009. *William Shakespeare, Obras Completas – IV. Dramas históricos*. Translated by Delia Pasini and edited by Pablo Ingberg. Barcelona: Losada.

Shakespeare, William. (1595) 2012. *William Shakespeare – Obras Completas III: Dramas Históricos*. Translated by Juan Fernando Merino and edited by Andreu Jaume. Barcelona: Random House Mondadori.

Shakespeare, William. (1595) 2002. *King Richard II*. Arden Shakespeare (3rd Series, 2nd edition). Edited by Charles R. Forker. London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Venuti, Lawrence. 2009. Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation. *Romance Studies* 27(3): 157–73.

Luis J. Conejero-Magro
Universidad de Extremadura
E-mails: conejeroluis@unex.es / conejerouex@gmail.com