ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

PLAGIARIST OR PIONEER? THE TRUTH BEHIND SHAKESPEARE'S BORROWED PLOTS

Waqar Ahmed (PhD)
waqarahmedmalik2020@gmail.com
University of Mianwali
Saba Fatima
sabaafatima413@gmail.com
University of Mianwali.
Sidra Bakhtawar
sidrabakhtawar23@gmail.com
University of Mianwali

1. Abstract

William Shakespeare is widely renowned as the zenith of emotional depth and a dramatic mastermind. A close historical investigation reveals that Shakespeare conceived practically none of his own plots, instead relying entirely on pre-existing histories, foreign stories, travel accounts, and Norse legends. Furthermore, by examining how Shakespeare transformed raw source material through structural innovation, reflective psychological depth, and unrivaled command of humor, dialogue, wit, and versification, the paper shows how simple narrative recovery became immortal art. This research examines whether Shakespeare's extensive copying reflects creative inadequacy or a cautious artistic strategy. By studying the modern literary theory of imitatio and the commercial constraints of Elizabethan theatre, this research argues that plot variation was a socially authorized foundation of Renaissance drama. Lastly, the research bridges traditional adaptation practices with modern academic property frameworks, assessing the modern meaning of plagiarism against modern ethics of innovation.

2. Introduction

Imagine a master storyteller sitting down to draft a dramatic section ordained to mesmerize viewers for hundreds of years. Yet when the curtain is finally drawn up, each section of the plot is borrowed. A prince dressing his father, a distressed king wandering a windy, rainy desert, a Venetian commander consumed by distrust, or an emigrant enchanter on a solitary island—none of these stories were created by the author. Instead, they were pulled straight from longstanding archives, foreign parables, and historical records. Under today's legal standards and strict copyright, anyone relying heavily on someone else's plots would face public outrage, severe repercussions, and copyright lawsuits. Yet, this defines the usual writing procedure of William Shakespeare.

For centuries, Shakespeare has sat at the apex of dramatic art, generally renowned as a master creator of human passion. Yet, a careful look behind the scenes of Jacobean and Elizabethan theatres reveals a striking reality: Shakespeare rarely conceived his own plots from scratch. Whether he drew the story of Hamlet from Norse vengeance legends, adapted ancient British folklore for King Lear, translated Italian text into Othello, or molded The Tempest from nautical tales of colonist exploration, borrowing was simply how the playhouse industry worked.

This raises a central question for researchers and bookworms today: Was Shakespeare an artistic innovator who developed drama, or just history's most renowned plagiarist? To find out, we have to set aside modern ideas about academic property and step back into the Renaissance—a time

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

when novelty had nothing to do with who possessed a story, and everything to do with how competently it could be restated.

3. Research Questions

The study is organized around two central inquiries:

A. To what level was William Shakespeare's dependence on pre-existing sources a deliberate artistic choice rather than a sign of creative inadequacy, observed through the lens of Renaissance *imitatio* and the Elizabethan theatre?

B. How does Shakespeare's artistic transformation of source material in plays such as *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Othello*, and *The Tempest* reexplain our understanding of literary creativity, and how do these historical practices contrast with modern plagiarism backgrounds?

4. Literature Review

Assessing the fine line between creative editing and academic theft needs examining how classifications of innovation have shifted across diverse periods. Building on this historical context, Vickers (2017) encounters the outdated label of "plagiarist" often applied to William Shakespeare, noting that lifting plot constructions was standard practice in traditional theater rather than a sign of creative indolence. Early introductory work by Paull (1927) coined a vital variation between spiteful literary theft and the age-old, recognized tradition of drawing on communal cultural folklore and narrative impact. Thomas (2000) examines this same epoch, enquiring how true plagiarism could even be in a literary system administered by *imitatio* rather than modern copyright regulations. Even so, Thomas notes that infrequent historical murmurs about textual stealing disclose that early modern authors still protected subtle anxieties about misattribution, authorship, and proprietorship.

To recognize how these canons changed over time, we must also study the basic power and economic structures. Randall (2001) examines how descriptions of plagiarism evolved alongside monetary pressures, increasing profit limits, and changing legal boundaries of literary ownership. Taking this growth into the modern era, Posner (2009) maps out plagiarism beyond legal scholarship, literature, and the arts, examining how market forces and evolving skills continue to redefine our modern passion with intellectual asset theft. Similarly, Turell (2004) examines how literary translation and language boundaries complicate these questions, revealing how heavy reliance on a source text often blurs the line between true translation and complete adoption.

Returning to the Renaissance stage, scholars have meticulously observed how the writers and scholars of that age reacted to plagiaristic works. Austin (1955) unravels historical claims surrounding suspected early modern claims against Shakespeare, shedding light on the subtle ways Elizabethan and Jacobean spectators observed copying. Showing this process in action, Smith (1920) examines Shakespeare's creative procedure in *As You Like It*, showing how the playwright habitually drew raw narrative frameworks from existing prose romances while inserting his own signature mechanical cleverness, stylistic skill, and creative depth.

5. Research Gap

While existing scholarship examines Shakespeare's adaptation through Renaissance *imitatio* (Vickers, 2017) or analyzes plagiarism through modern legal frameworks (Posner, 2009), previous studies treat historical borrowing and contemporary intellectual property as isolated domains. Furthermore, existing textual analyses lack a cohesive synthesis connecting the industrial pressures of the Elizabethan playhouse with Shakespeare's linguistic and psychological

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

transformation. This study bridges this gap by linking early modern compositional norms with modern plagiarism debates, demonstrating how transformative aesthetic mastery redefines literary originality.

6. Methodology

To determine whether Shakespeare deserves to be called a plagiarist, this article utilizes a historical and comparative approach. Rather than judging an Elizabethan playwright by twenty-first-century legal rules, we must examine the cultural, commercial, and artistic norms of early modern England. The investigation is driven by the two primary research questions detailed above, focusing on the high-speed practicalities of the Renaissance theater business alongside the classical tradition of *imitatio*.

The study traces how Shakespeare gathered material for iconic plays like *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Othello*, and *The Tempest* by looking at older historical texts, foreign novellas, and travel journals. By setting these raw source materials side by side with Shakespeare's final scripts, the research evaluates how deep character psychology, structural brilliance, and linguistic mastery turned simple plot recycling into groundbreaking art, bridging the gap between historical adaptation and modern expectations of originality.

7. Theoretical Framework

This paper is guided by the concepts of early modern authorship and the classical literary philosophy of *imitatio*, meaning imitation. In today's literary world, authorship is tightly bound to legal copyright, where being original means creating completely novel, proprietary content.

However, this study operates on the understanding that Renaissance literature was built on a communal, remix-oriented culture. Under the umbrella of *imitatio*, writers never viewed borrowing as theft. Rather, taking well-known myths, historical chronicles, and classic stories was seen as the ultimate test of an author's talent—a way to join an ongoing dialogue with the great minds of the past and present. Viewing the topic through this lens lets us separate modern legal definitions of plagiarism from early modern artistic standards, showing that true creativity in Shakespeare's era was measured by *how* an existing tale was reshaped and elevated, not *who* thought of it first.

8. Discussion

Deliberate Choice or Creative Insufficiency?

The sheer output of William Shakespeare—thirty-three to thirty-seven plays covering comedy, history, and tragedy—often leads modern viewers to assume his heavy reliance on existing plots was simply a byproduct of burnout or a shortcut to save time. After all, a look at heavyweights like *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Othello*, and *The Tempest* reveals that he rarely dreamt up a storyline from nothing. Instead, he systematically sifted through Scandinavian revenge epics, mythical British chronicles, Italian short stories by writers like Cinthio, and contemporary logs of sea voyages. Even so, writing this off as a lack of imagination completely misinterprets the literary culture of early modern England and the fast-paced demands of the London stage.

To understand why this was not a sign of creative failure, one must first consider the commercial reality of Renaissance theater. Public venues like the Globe and the Rose operated on an exhausting, high-frequency schedule. Acting troupes required a constant stream of fresh material to feed an urban audience that treated going to the theater much like modern audiences treat streaming television or going to the cinema. In that kind of environment, inventing complex plotlines from thin air was wildly inefficient. Writers were meant to function as rapid adapters and arrangers of narrative frameworks, not isolated novelists protecting exclusive intellectual property.

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

More importantly, choosing familiar stories played directly into what the audience wanted. Elizabethan and Jacobean theatergoers did not buy tickets to experience the suspense of an unpredictable plot twist; instead, they paid to see *how* a well-known story would be brought to life. Much like modern moviegoers happily walking into yet another cinematic take on *Romeo and Juliet* or a fresh superhero reboot, Renaissance crowds already knew the general outlines of tales like Lear's madness or the Moor's jealousy. The thrill of the show came from the execution—watching the poetic weight, rhetorical flair, and psychological depth a master dramatist could squeeze out of an old tale.

This habit was not born out of laziness, but was deeply drilled into him through formal schooling. Through the framework of *imitatio*, the grammar school education Shakespeare received taught him that true mastery of language meant studying, digesting, and creatively rivaling past models. Lifting a plot was never seen as intellectual theft; it was simply treated as a blank slate. By borrowing an existing narrative, Shakespeare freed his mind from the exhausting mechanics of structural plotting, leaving him free to pour his actual genius into what mattered most: complex character motivations, moral dilemmas, and transcendent poetry. Far from proving he lacked imagination, his intentional use of source material served as the ideal launchpad for his creativity to shine.

Aesthetic Transformation, Enduring Worth, and the Modern Plagiarism Debate

Once we establish that Shakespeare's use of pre-existing plots was a calculated, culturally accepted method rather than a sign of creative fatigue, the focus shifts entirely to the quality of execution. Did pulling stories from Nordic lore, historical chronicles, Italian tales, and travel logs ruin the artistic value of his plays, or does their survival prove the opposite? Furthermore, if a writer tried this exact trick today, could they avoid being labeled a plagiarist?

To judge the true merit of Shakespeare's work, we have to look past the borrowed skeletons of his plots and examine the rich texture of his rewrites. In *Othello*, Shakespeare took a flat, moralistic Italian story by Giraldi Cinthio about a nameless Moor and a generic villain and transformed it into a heartbreaking psychological exploration of systemic bias, raw jealousy, and manipulated trust. In *Hamlet*, he took a bloody, familiar revenge yarn and turned it into an existential masterpiece exploring human consciousness, grief, and hesitation. Similarly, his shaping of *King Lear* from ancient folklore deepened a grim tale into a brutal meditation on aging and cosmic justice, while *The Tempest* spun simple sailors' logs into a brilliant allegory concerning power, civilization, and artistry itself.

In every single case, Shakespeare's true brilliance lay not in inventing the narrative arc, but in completely reimagining human interiority, moral shades of gray, and poetic expression. The plot points were nothing more than scaffolding; the building constructed around them was entirely unique. This profound metamorphosis explains why his plays continue to rule the global literary landscape centuries later. Their lasting value depends entirely on the universal truth of their human portraits, showing that the original source text was simply raw clay waiting for a master sculptor.

Still, this brings up a very real modern dilemma: Can a contemporary author use this exact approach today without being accused of plagiarism? The answer rests entirely on how laws and cultures have evolved. In the twenty-first century, intellectual property laws, strict copyright acts, and modern ethical codes judge authorship through a vastly different lens than the Renaissance. Today, taking an existing story, changing up the dialogue, and publishing it as a new original work without clear permission or licensing will lead straight to legal disaster and public disgrace.

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.04 No.01 (2026)

Even so, modern entertainment industries run on a variation of *imitatio* every single day. Hollywood is built on book-to-screen adaptations, historical revamps, franchise reboots, and modern translations of classic myths (such as West Side Story, a clear modern adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*). The vital line drawn today is transparency and transformation. A modern creator *can* use older stories safely—as long as those narratives sit safely in the public domain, are properly licensed, or are framed transparently as adaptive remixes or parodies.

Ultimately, while a modern writer cannot lift a living author's plot without facing legal consequences, Shakespeare's core philosophy remains very much alive. He serves as an eternal reminder that true originality has never been about inventing a plot out of thin air. Instead, it is about what an artist chooses to do with our shared inheritance of human storytelling—proving that how a narrative is told will always count for far more than who dreamed it up first.

9. Conclusion

The ongoing debate surrounding William Shakespeare's reliance on borrowed plots ultimately comes down to how different historical eras define authorship and originality. Analyzing his work through the early modern lens of *imitatio* and the high-pressure environment of the Elizabethan playhouse reveals that his habit of borrowing was neither a failure of imagination nor an act of intellectual theft. Rather, it was a deliberate, culturally validated approach meant to engage audiences through the brilliant retelling of familiar material. Whether he grabbed Scandinavian lore for Hamlet, British chronicles for King Lear, Italian prose for Othello, or travel logs for The Tempest, Shakespeare treated history and folklore as raw scaffolding.

Crucially, Shakespeare's greatness shines not only in his ability to twist this material into something fresh, smart, and innovative, but also in his peerless command of sharp dialogue, subtle wit, humor, and brilliant versification. Backed by deep psychological insight, structural genius, and breathtaking poetry, he turned ordinary cultural currency into immortal art, securing the timeless value of his thirty-seven plays across the centuries. While modern copyright laws prevent contemporary writers from casually lifting plots without permission or legal penalties, the core philosophy of adaptation remains as vibrant as ever. Shakespeare reminds us that creative genius is rarely born from a vacuum; instead, true art lies entirely in what a creator does with the shared pool of human storytelling—proving beyond a doubt that the art of the telling will always outweigh the invention of the tale.

10. References

Vickers, B. (2017). 'Upstart Crow'? The Myth of Shakespeare's Plagiarism. *The Review of English Studies*, *68*(284), 244-267.

Thomas, M. W. (2000). Eschewing credit: Heywood, Shakespeare, and plagiarism before copyright. *New Literary History*, *31*(2), 277-293.

Randall, M. (2001). *Pragmatic plagiarism: Authorship, profit, and power*. University of Toronto Press.

Posner, R. A. (2009). *The little book of plagiarism*. Pantheon. Paull, H. M. (1927).

THE ETHICS OF PLAGIARISM. *Fortnightly*, *122*(728), 202-216.

Smith, D. V. (1920). Plagiarism in" As You Like It". *The English Journal*, *9*(9), 491-508.

Austin, W. B. (1955). A Supposed Contemporary Allusion to Shakespeare as a Plagiarist. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, *6*(4), 373-380.

Turell, M. T. (2004). Textual kidnapping revisited: The case of plagarism in literary translation. *The International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, *11*(1), 1-26.