THE TROUBLESOME REIGN OF KING JOHN: A CRITICAL EDITION

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
JOSEPH FRANCIS DOMINIC
1969

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

THE TROUBLESOME REIGN OF KING JOHN:

A CRITICAL EDITION

presented by

Joseph Francis Dominic

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in English

George D. Price
Major professor

Date 29 August 1969

O-169

R61
R-024
mf: 029

ABSTRACT

THE TROUBLESOME REIGN OF KING JOHN:
A CRITICAL EDITION

By

Joseph Francis Dominic

The Troublesome Reign of King John was published anonymously in 1591 by Thomas Orwin for Sampson Clarke. Two subsequent quartos (both reprints of the previous quarto) appeared in 1611 and in 1622 with Shakespeare's name abbreviated on the title pages. Later editions were published in 1878 and 1913, each providing a certain amount of textual criticism based on incidental bibliographic facts. These later editions, however, deal mostly with the problems of authorship and of sources, and they concentrate mainly on the play's literary relationship to Shakespeare's King John. The present edition is offered as a critical text of The Reign; it attempts to synthesize both bibliography and textual criticism in developing a working hypothesis for the history and relationship of all quartos of the play. All three extant copies of Q1 have been collated, as well as one copy each of the 1611 and 1622 quartos.

The introduction consists of seven chapters. Chapter I establishes the literary and historical significance of The Reign as the earliest English play to combine a serious historical purpose with the downfall of an English hero who is not predestined by Dame Fortune. Chapter II deals with the elusive question of authorship, and concludes that the play contains a few of the idiosyncrasies found in the plays of George Peele. However, the case for Peele's authorship is at best tentative. There are also signs that at least one other hand may have contributed to The Reign. The study of sources is reviewed in Chapter III. Aside from Holinshed's Chronicles which provided the main elements of the plot, the author of The Reign relied on John Foxe's Acts and Monuments for the strong Protestant characterization of King John. There is ample evidence to suggest that the Historia Maior of Matthew Paris and Polydore Vergil's Anglica Historia likewise were consulted. Chapter IV examines the integrity of the text. Extensive comparison with numerous examples from acknowledged "bad quartos" shows that the text of The Reign has very few suspicious features, and that it is by most standards "good" text. Chapter V discusses the relationship of the play to Shakespeare's King John. All significant differences between the two plays are noted; however, the discussion

centers upon "conceptual differences" in purpose and characterization. The separate roles of Arthur, Hubert, the Bastard, and King John are analyzed, and are found to exhibit highly distinct differences which should preclude any suspicion that The Reign is a memorial reconstruction of Shakespeare's King John. The similarities, on the other hand, seem quite obviously the result of Shakespeare's close conformity to The Reign as he worked at redirecting the energies of a potentially powerful play. Chapter VI hypothesizes two probable alternatives for printer's copy: either the copy was a previously printed one; or it was an easy-to-read transcript of the author's foul papers in a final stage. In Chapter VII (The Text) the printing process and compositorial practice are dealt with in detail, and a rationale is educed for the choice of copy text. The Chapter also contains a listing of all previous editions of the play. Following this is the old-spelling text of The Reign, which includes textual notes (collations) and glossarial notes at the foot of each page. Explanatory notes are found at the end of the text.

THE TROUBLESOME REIGN OF KING JOHN:

A CRITICAL EDITION

By

Joseph Francis Dominic

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of English

1969

66729
4-23-70

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Professor George R. Price who provided the impetus for this study, and whose skillful guidance and persistent energies saw it through to completion;

To Professors Lawrence Babb, William Whallon and Harry Hoppe for their guidance and cooperation;

And to my wife, Joan, for her understanding and encouragement.

NOWLEDGME

T OF ABB

hpter

I. TH

II. A

III. S

IV.

V.

VI.

VII.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	iv
INTRODUCTION	
Chapter	
I. THE PLAY	1
II. AUTHORSHIP	10
III. SOURCES	20
IV. INTEGRITY OF THE TEXT	43
V. CONCEPTUAL DIFFERENCES	86
VI. PRINTER'S COPY	119
VII. THE TEXT	130
A. Early Editions	130
B. Later Editions	146
C. The Present Edition	147
Copy Text	147
Textual Procedure	149
TEXT OF THE PLAY	
THE TROUBLESOME REIGN of King John, Parts I and II, with textual notes and glossarial notes	153
EXPLANATORY NOTES	245
BIBLIOGRAPHY	255

ABBREVIATIONS

Arber	Edward Arber, Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers (5 vols.) (1876-94).
Bullough	Geoffrey Bullough, Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare (vol. IV) (1966).
Chambers	E. K. Chambers, The Elizabethan Stage (4 vols.) (1923).
Furness	Horace H. Furness, King John (Variorum ed.) (1919).
Fleay	Frederick G. Fleay, The Troublesome Reign of King John (1878).
Holinshed	Raphael Holinshed, Chronicles (vol. III) (1587).
Honigmann	E. A. J. Honigmann, King John (New Arden ed.) (1954).
Jolliffe	J. E. A. Jolliffe, Angevin Kingship (1955).
K.J.	Shakespeare's King John; all quotations are from the Honigmann edition.
Munro	F. J. Furnivall and John Munro, The Troublesome Reign of King John (1913).
McDiarmid	Matthew McDiarmid, "Concerning The Troublesome Reign of King John" (Notes and Queries) (1957).
The Reign	This shortened form is used throughout for The Troublesome Reign of King John. However, T.R. is used when citing lines from the play.
Tilley	Morris P. Tilley, Dictionary of . . . Proverbs (1950).

ABBREVIATIONS (cont.)

Warren	W. L. Warren, *King John* (1961).
Wilson	John Dover Wilson, *King John* (C.U.P. ed.) (1936).

The customary abbreviations are used for periodicals and well-known works. *O.E.D.* (*Oxford English Dictionary*) is the primary source for all word and phrase glosses.

The Roman numerals I and II are used to represent the two parts of *The Reign* when identifying lines (e.g., I.v.36; II.vi.16). There are no act or scene divisions in the original.

I. THE PLAY

Literary historians generally agree that The Reign is one of the earliest of the English history plays. Irving Ribner, for example, calls it "the most important of the plays dating from the Armada period and the most advanced both in dramatic technique and in the execution of serious historical purpose."[1] Statements like Ribner's set The Reign apart from several of its contemporaries which deal only peripherally with historical matters. The Famous Victories of Henry V, for example, written sometime in 1586-87 was a very popular play, but does not function, in the main, as a "history play." It pays no particular attention to fact, or purpose, or even historical progression. The play's main link with the history-play tradition, is that it probably is the first such work to derive its central character from history; a genuine English hero is used rather than a legendary one. There is, to be sure, an overabundance of patriotic vaunting by Henry V, but this is not a distinguishing

[1]Irving Ribner, The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare (Oxford, 1956), p. 80.

element of the history play. Also there is no really clear treatment of Henry V; he is simply a romantic hero who contributes action to a series of very loosely connected episodes.

A more technically advanced play is Tamburlaine (c. 1587), one of the most popular plays of its decade. By many critics it is referred to as the source of the English history play. Irving Ribner writes that it "provides the first clear treatment of an actual historical figure within the form of the heroic play . . . "[2] But even in Marlowe's play the episodes are held together only by the re-appearance of Tamburlaine, the romantic hero whose megalomania actuates every episode of the drama. The Reign, however, which claims in its preface to have been modelled on Tamburlaine,[3] represents two major advancements over the latter. First, it uses the perplexing problems of John's reign to illustrate the political strife in England under Elizabeth; second, it portrays John's downfall as being caused by his own acknowledged weakness of character, not by the fickleness of Fortune.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 63.

[3] This comparison with Tamburlaine was no doubt an attempt to ride the wave of Richard Jones's extremely popular edition of Marlowe's play in 1590.

The contemporary allusions in The Reign are probably not so finely contrived as Lily Bess Campbell suspects.[4] However, the two crucial issues of Elizabeth's reign, namely, the legitimacy of her crown, and the justifiability of rebellion against her, are very prominently parallelled in The Reign. For example, Arthur's rival claim to John's crown (which claim was supported by Rome) mirrors the situation of Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, who posed a similar threat to Elizabeth. Moreover, Mary had the support of Spain, the Papacy, and numerous English Catholics. In this connection, Miss Campbell notes that supporters of Mary's cause referred to the John-Arthur situation in the same light as Elizabeth's treatment of Mary Stuart.[5]

Irving Ribner suggests that the main contemporary allusion in The Reign focuses on the question of loyalty to the crown, and he notes that:

> a great fear of Elizabethan Englishmen was that powerful Catholic nobles might obey the Papal Bull which had excommunicated Elizabeth and had urged Catholics to rise against her and support the designs of King Philip of Spain.[6]

---

[4]Lily Bess Campbell, Shakespeare's Histories (San Marino, California, 1947), p. 154 ff.

[5]Ibid., pp. 142-3.

[6]Ribner, p. 82.

A similar situation arises in The Reign, when Salisbury, Pembroke, and Essex, convinced of John's tyranny, summon Lewis of France to invade England, thereby committing treason. While such a situation exists in the play, England's cause is lost. The lesson is quite clear; rebellion against even a de facto sovereign with a disputed claim to the throne can bring only chaos to England.

Also unique in such an early play is the characterization given King John.[7] Structurally, the play focuses on John's protracted but successful attempt to consolidate his hold on the crown in Part I, as well as his abrupt decline and death in Part II. In de casibus tragedy this pattern of rise and fall is normally dependent upon the whims of Fortune. The author of The Reign breaks from convention, however, by not using Fortune as the controlling element at every turn. In fact, he strives to make it clear that even though John's misfortunes supposedly develop out of his conflict with Rome, they also emanate partly from his own moral weakness; but they are never the result of Fate.[8]

---

[7]For a more comprehensive treatment of John's characterization in both plays, see Chapter Five, "Conceptual Differences."

[8]See Farnham, p. 406. He notes that "Even Constance, the mother of Arthur, whose tongue is 'tunde to storie forth mishap' and who does not neglect to mention the sorrows of Dido and the wreck of Troy, curses only her enemies, not Fortune."

By II.ii John's introspection is intensified by his guilt feelings over Arthur's death; this, together with the prophecy of Peter that he will lose his crown by Ascension Day, and the rebellion of his nobles, besiege John with "distracted passions" and "disturbed thoughts." He breaks under the severe mental strain and begs hell for aid, as he tells Faulconbridge: "A mad man, Philip, I am mad indeed,/My hart is mazd, my senses all foredone" (II.ii.113-14). In scene viii, John, near death, is painfully aware of his own isolation: "Shameless my life; and shamefully it ends,/Scorn'd by my foes, disdained of my friends" (II.viii.95-6). This innovative, and strongly subjective portrayal of John suggests to Willard Farnham that John "is rightfully entitled to consideration as one of the precursors of Macbeth on the Elizabethan stage."[9] However this may be, the attempt by the author of The Reign to paint John's collapse as largely the result of his own inferior character, creates a major flaw in the overall portrayal of King John. For his principal struggle is supposed to be with Rome, and his only real merit as king is supposed to grow out of his defiance of the Pope. But the playwright loses sight of this objective, for, with the death of Arthur (II.i.) John's personal

[9]Farnham, p. 407.

frustrations become obsessive. From this point on, it is the intense mental and physical suffering of King John that directs our emotional response. S. C. Zen Gupta notes that these "two issues, ecclesiastical and political, lie apart, and the principal defect of this play is that it lacks dramatic concentration and unity of spirit."[10] The criticism is quite valid, for the author of The Reign begins with a portrayal of John as the "warlike Christian" against Papal oppression, but is sidetracked by John's role in the death of Arthur. The result is that John's conflict with Rome is obscured by his own personal and political problems which eventually reduce him to a state of remorse and despair.

When viewed in the light of its highly dramatic compression of chronicle history, The Reign's few structural inconsistencies are quite insignificant. In I.i. 241ff., for example, Philip Faulconbridge experiences a momentary trance in which he voices confirmation that Coeur-de-Lion was his father. Prior to this, both John and Eleanor have told him how much he resembles Coeur-de-Lion. However, after the parentage dispute ends (I.i.314), the Bastard needlessly badgers his mother into telling who

---

[10]S. C. Zen Gupta, Shakespeare's Historical Plays, (Oxford, 1964), p. 103.

his father was. This confrontation is redundant and merely prolongs an already lengthy scene. In I.xiii.184ff. the Prophet of Pomfret tells John that before noon of Ascension Day, he will lose his crown. Then in II.ii.llff., John, observing that it is noon of Ascension Day, wishes that it were midnight, so that his troubles were over. The Reign's author then has John hang the Prophet at noon, apparently forgetting the significance of "noon" in the prophecy in Part I.[11] Finally, in II.iii.lff. the name Chester suddenly appears in the stage direction, but he has no lines in the scene. The Bastard and Essex engage in a heated debate over Chester's apparent banishment, which is discussed as though the audience knows what has transpired between John and Chester. But we do not, for Chester has never been mentioned before this. Now none of these incidents is so disproportionate as to cause serious misunderstanding. They are quite likely the kinds of inconsistencies that would result from the arduous task of rearranging numerous historical facts to suit a dramatic context.

The verse is almost painfully regular, and the style is undistinguished. Unlike the language of Shakespeare's King John, which skillfully utilizes definite

---

[11]In Shakespeare's play John does in fact threaten to hang Peter at noon of Ascension Day. See K. J., IV.ii.155-7.

patterns of imagery (see Honigmann, lxii.-lxv.), The Reign relies upon a rather unpoetic and highly routine use of imagery. All nature, for example, "birds, bubbles, leaves, and mountains," proclaim that Faulconbridge is son of Coeur-de-Lion (I.i.255ff.). When the Bastard is angry with Lymoges for flaunting the lionskin of his father, his rage is housed in "This heart, that choler keeps a consistory" (I.ii.139). Constance refers to all the blood spilled between the armies of France and England as "closing the crannies of the thirsty earth" (I.iv.207). She also refers to her son's youth as a "fountain" which she makes "muddy" by her prolonged ranting (I.iv.232ff.). John calls himself a "Fox" (I.v.105); Constance's voice is an "organ" (I.x.20); Arthur is a "flower" (I.xiii.222). Where Shakespeare uses imagery to reinforce a central notion or theme, the author of The Reign relies on it solely for momentary effect.

The Reign's position as the earliest English play to use history for mirroring contemporary political problems is quite firmly established. What is more significant, though, is its attempt to portray John as something larger than the one-dimensional hero of Tamburlaine. For it goes beyond the limits of conventional characterization evident in its predecessors, by making its hero fail, not because of Fortune's whims, but because of John's own inherent

ubtess as a

n destruct

ually resp

ab-scrimi

omfortab

nself and

weakness as a man. Though Rome bears part of the blame for his destruction, John openly acknowledges that his sins are equally responsible (II.viii.66ff.). Relentless in his self-recrimination to the end, John conveys a strangely uncomfortable image of a king whose moral weakness destroys himself and almost a kingdom.

II. AUTHORSHIP

The authorship of The Reign has never been firmly established.[1] Over the years critics and literary historians have made various attributions, but the list of probable candidates has remained open. Many early critics attributed the play to Shakespeare, but this soon developed into somewhat of a practical joke. Alexander Pope supposedly elaborated on the joke by naming Shakespeare and William Rowley as authors of The Reign.[2] Frederick G. Fleay thought that possibly four people had been responsible for the play; he suspected that Shakespeare produced the plot, while Greene, Peele, and Lodge presumably wrote the text.[3] Richard G. White was of the opinion that Greene, Peele, and Marlowe all had a hand in the play.[4] However, William J. Courthope suggested that the quality of dramatic

---

[1]F. J. Furnivall and John Munro, eds., The Troublesome Reign of King John (London, 1913), pp. xi-xiv. Hereafter called "Munro."

[2]Ibid., p. xii., and note 2.

[3]Frederick G. Fleay, ed., The Troublesome Reign of King John (London, 1878), p. 34.

[4]Richard G. White, Shakespeare Studies (Boston, 1886), p. 14.

workmanship was above the genius of Peele, Greene, or even Marlowe.[5] Much of this early attribution seems to have been sheer guesswork. John Dover Wilson does not attribute the play to any specific hand, but summarily dismisses Shakespeare's involvement in it.[6] E. A. J. Honigmann, editor of the Arden King John (1954), likewise makes no specific attributions of authorship, but, regarding previous theories that Peele was the probable author, he suggests that Peele was only imitated.[7]

H. Dugdale Sykes, in a book[8] which has provoked sharp critical response from Muriel St. Claire Byrne[9] regarding his indiscriminate listing of parallels as proof of authorship, tried to prove that George Peele alone was the author of The Reign. He lists numerous word and phrase parallels between all of Peele's plays and The Reign, many of which, however, are quite unconvincing. Compare, for

---

[5]William J. Courthope, History of English Poetry (London, 1926), IV., p. 465.

[6]John Dover Wilson, ed., King John (Cambridge University Press, 1936), p. xxxii.

[7]E. A. J. Honigmann, ed., King John (Harvard University Press, 1954), p. lv., note 2.

[8]H. Dugdale Sykes, Sidelights on Shakespeare (Stratford, 1919), pp. 98-125.

[9]Muriel St. Claire Byrne, "Bibliographical Clues in Collaborate Plays," Library, 4th series, vol. 13 (1932-33), pp. 21-48.

example: "Philip, some drink! O for the frozen Alps . . . " (T. R., II.viii.58-9), and "Drink, drink, I say, give drink or I shall die" (Alphonsus of Aragon, IV.).[10] The above example, like so many of Syke's parallels, indicates very little, if any, thought correspondence, and it was his failure to sort out various grades of parallels that elicited Miss St. Claire Byrne's criticism of his method. Sykes, however, identifies other correspondences between the two plays. He suggests that the blank verse is similar to Peele's with its end-stopped lines and lack of much enjambment. He also notes that the verse, although it consists for the most part of regular iambic pentameters, is sometimes written in rhymed fourteeners, rhymed decasyllabic couplets, and Skeltonic rhymes, all of which are frequent verse patterns in Peele's works.[11] Sykes next attempts to show that, of all the dramatists of the period, Peele was the most fiercely anti-papal and "intensely national," two sentiments which are significant for the dramatic development of The Reign.[12] All Sykes really shows, however, is that George Peele used similar versification, coarse language, and expressed the same kind of antagonism toward Rome which appears in The Reign.

---

[10]Sykes, p. 124.

[11]Ibid., p. 104.

[12]Ibid., pp. 104-05.

Other correspondences between the works of Peele and The Reign which have not, to my knowledge been discussed, should be mentioned here. For example, The Reign is an extremely ambitious effort to telescope sixteen years of chronicle history into a single dramatic whole. Peele undertook equally challenging efforts in Edward I and in David and Bethsabee; the former covers a period of twenty-two years, from "Edward's return to England in 1274 until Balliol's defeat in 1296,"[13] and the latter spans a period of fifty years in the Old Testament. For this reason, David Horne calls David and Bethsabee Peele's greatest dramatic achievement.[14] In another vein numerous observations have been made about The Reign's poor attempt to imitate Marlowe's "mighty line" (one example is I.i. 417-18). It should be noted that similar attempts by Peele are much more effective (cf. Edward I, I. 11-12). In regard to the repetition of words, the author of The Reign often repeats single words, sometimes for dramatic effect, but more frequently because he is at a loss for words (cf. I.viii. 17-19 and ix. 1). Peele is notorious for the latter type of repetition:

---

[13]Frank S. Hook, ed., Edward I, in The Dramatic Works of George Peele (New Haven, 1961), p. 13.

[14]David Horne, The Life and Minor Works of George Peele (New Haven, 1952), p. 93.

> To see King Edward and the lovely Queene,
> Sit lovely in England's stately throne
> (Edward I, 266-7);
>
> And lovelie England to thy lovely Queene,
> Lovelie Queene Elinor, unto her turne thy eye
> (701-02).

It should be noted, however, that even though this kind of repetition is present in The Reign to a degree, the adjective "lovely" is not used in the above manner. From a stylistic point of view the verse of The Reign is much more rhetorical than poetic, and is controlled more by passionate and sentimental language, than by imagery. This is also the case with much of Peele's dramatic verse.

With regard to stage directions, Peele frequently indulges in precise literary description:

> Enter Lluellen running out before and David with a halter ready to hang himself (Edward I, 2109).
>
> Alarum, a charge, after long skirmishes, assault florishe. Enter King Edward with his traine and Balioll prisoner. Edward speaketh (2208).

The same type of stage direction can be found in The Reign:

> Excursions. The Bastard chaseth Lymoges the Austrich Duke and maketh him leave the Lyons skinne (T. R., I.iii.).

We find, however, only three directions of this nature in The Reign, none of which convinces one that Peele was the author. It should be noted, too, that Peele does not use the word "excursion" in stage directions. There is, moreover, nothing so irregular about The Reign's directions which would distinguish them from other play-text directions of

the period. As is the case with most of the alleged correspondences between Peele and The Reign, they are only approximate, and frequently could include several other playwrights of the late 1580's.[15] Critics have not been convinced of Peele's authorship of the play for a variety of reasons, the weakest of which is that The Reign is anonymous, whereas Peele always signed his plays in some fashion. The most compelling objection, however, is raised by Arthur M. Sampley, who argues that the play has a reasonably dramatic organization of plot episodes, whereas Peele tends to be more episodic and disjointed, frequently substituting spectacle for action.[16] Since a book by David Horne is forthcoming on the subject of Peele's authorship of several anonymous plays, the foregoing has merely been an attempt to locate the focal points of the controversy. For the moment, all that can be said regarding Peele's authorship of The Reign is that he is at the head of the list.

Whether The Reign is the work of only one person is another issue that appears unsolvable. The topic has

---

[15]Greene and Lodge are most frequently suspected of having a hand in the play, and Honigmann suggests (p. 175) that "Samuel Rowley, whom various T. R. tricks recall," might also have been involved.

[16]Arthur M. Samply, "Plot Structure in Peele's Plays as a Test of Authorship," PMLA, vol. 51 (1936), pp. 689-701.

engendered more guesswork than evidence, however. Collier[17] was the first critic to mention the preponderance of end rhyme in Part I (we find fifty-three instances of such in Part I, compared with only eleven in Part II). But in view of the fact that Part I is more than 600 lines longer than Part II, and since the instances of end rhyme are rather evenly distributed throughout both parts, this fact is slim evidence for assigning more than one author for the play. There are two scenes of stock comedy in the play (I.xi. and II.vi.99ff.), which Ulrici suspected were by another hand, as well as the long scene before St. Edmundsbury (II. iii.).[18] Regarding the latter scene, Fleay noted that it unnecessarily listed four new speaking parts (Bewchamp, Clare, Chester, and Percy).[19] But only two of these, Bewchamp and Percy, actually speak (one line apiece), and Chester has to be on stage since his banishment becomes a topic of discussion. That a different hand was at work here is quite possible; however, this could also be the result of foul-papers confusion where the author's revision

---

[17]John P. Collier, The History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of Shakespeare: and Annals of the Stage to the Restoration (2nd edition, London, 1879), III., p. 73.

[18]Herman Ulrici, Shakespeare's Dramatic Art (London, 1876), p. 445.

[19]Fleay, p. 34.

failed to tie up loose ends. Fleay likewise noted the monosyllabic pronunciation of the name "Lewes" (Liooz) throughout scene iii., whereas the name is dissyllabic elsewhere in the play.[20] This is Fleay's most compelling piece of evidence for a second author's hand in II. iii. of The Reign.

Fleay tries to strengthen his case for more than one author by making two rather tenuous assertions. He notes, first, that one writer was fonder of prose than the other.[21] Granted that of the 204 lines of prose in The Reign, 160 occur in Part I., and it is also true that a pattern for using prose is more evident in Part I, where official confrontations and reported messages are frequently in prose; however, Part I exhibits the same general inconsistency as Part II. in the use of prose, namely, the failure of the author to adhere to prose throughout an entire speech, once he has begun with prose. As such, there is very little peculiarity in the use of prose. Fleay also cites the fondness of one writer for scriptural references,[22] but again, these are so infrequent that

---

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid., p. 35.

[22] Ibid., p. 35.

they reveal nothing about an author's style. E. A. J. Honigmann likewise notes the presence of two different styles in The Reign, "the one pretentious using many blustering words and larded with Latin tags" which he suspects might be the hand of Samuel Rowley. But he notes that both Chettle and Munday are equally plausible alternatives, and he is wise enough to stop here.[23] He concludes, however, with a speculation which diminishes the two-author theory by suggesting that "The two styles may be due to the lapses of one author at times falling below his best."[24]

I have been unable to discover corroborative evidence that more than one author was responsible for The Reign. There are only three scenes which exhibit enough of difference to be suspect (the two comic scenes mentioned above and scene iii. of Part II), and it is most likely that the hand responsible for the two comic scenes had nothing to do with scene iii. of Part II. After a number of frustrating investigations, the only confident statement that I can make regarding the authorship of The Reign is that the same hand was responsible for most of Part I. and Part II. Sykes has demonstrated enough

---

[23]Honigmann, p. 175.

[24]Ibid.

convincing phrase parallels between Parts I and II to show that one author definitely had a major share in the composition of both parts.[25] It is, therefore, misleading to conjecture, as some critics have done in the past, that the two parts of the play are separate domains of two different authors. It seems logical to suspect another hand in the comic scenes as well as in scene viii. of Part II (the poisoning of King John), for the principal writer would have been so thoroughly involved in weaving into dramatic form the untidy threads of the John narrative, that it would have been time-saving to have another writer be responsible for scenes which could be written without reference to the chronicles. But again, we are using the double-edged weapon of conjecture, which is sometimes interesting, and which sometimes reveals the writer's lack of imagination, but almost never proves a thing. The facts have been extremely elusive in this matter of authorship, and it seems quite unlikely that the text of The Reign will ever reveal enough information to formulate any conclusive theories.

---

[25]Sykes, p. 101.

III. SOURCES

Historically, the first four years of John's reign were occupied with persistent threats against his right to rule by Arthur of Brittany, eldest son of Geoffrey of Anjou. John's first war with Philip, king of France began in 1199 and ended in May, 1200, with a peace treaty consolidated by the marriage of John's niece Blanche (the Spanish princess) to the Dauphin Lewis, and by John's giving up several of his French possessions. In 1202 King Philip pushed for greater claims in Arthur's behalf, which led to the breaking of the treaty (1202), the subsequent capture of Arthur by the English army, and finally his death in 1203.

The second phase of John's reign began in 1205 with the dispute over the selection of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Pope Innocent III broke tradition by rejecting John's candidate and appointing Stephen Langton, whom John renounced because of his background of service in France. John subsequently defied Rome, bringing down excommunication on his own head and interdict on the faithful of England (1208). Finally, in

1212 Philip the French king severed diplomatic ties with John. This launched England into several foreign wars which the treasury was incapable of supporting. John, in the face of extreme necessity, surrendered his crown to the papal legate (1213) and received it back again, five days later, as a vassal to Rome.

The final phase of John's stormy reign began with his alienation of many English nobles, which resulted in his surrender of a traditional Angevin prerogative, ira et malevolentia,[1] with the signing of Magna Carta (1215). John, however, had no intention of granting the nobles the few rights they were demanding, and so they sought and received aid from France. But John died suddenly before the French invasion of England ever took place, and after two years of sporadic fighting the war between France and England ended (1218).[2] Historical fact in The Reign, however, is always subservient to dramatic purpose, with the result that the pressing issues of John's reign are never really clarified. To begin with, John's deeply

---

[1]See J. E. A. Jolliffe, Angevin Kingship (London, 1955), p. 93: " . . . The king's anger was as unquestioned as the wrath of God; it could be coupled with it . . . Its impact might be direct and unconcealed, and, with a kind of innocence, admitted . . . ."

[2]The above three paragraphs adapted from Geoffrey Bullough, Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, vol. IV. (London, 1966), pp. 9-10.

complicated nature is glossed over in the prologue where he is labelled as "the warlike Christian." The embassy of Chatillion, the French messenger, lacks historicity as does the Bastard, Faulconbridge's slaying of Lymoges. The latter is a combination of that noble and of Leopold, Duke of Austria, who died in 1195, four years before the play's action even begins. The betrothal of the historical Blanche did not grow out of the conflict between England and France before the walls of Angiers. John's trouble with his barons is brought on by the death of Prince Arthur; however, the result of this conflict is not Magna Carta. In fact Magna Carta is never mentioned in The Reign, probably because the Tudor monarchy would have been quite hostile to any dramatization of an English king's overt submission to the nobility. These are only a few examples of the rearrangement and omission of facts by the author of The Reign to suit his play's purpose.

The main story line of The Reign derives from Holinshed's brief chronicle of King John, which borrowed heavily from Matthew Paris and Polydore Vergil. This fact is quickly substantiated by so many critics that there is no need to belabor the point further. What is more significant, however, is the variety of source material which the author of The Reign apparently consulted

in addition to Holinshed and Foxe.[3] Though much of the evidence for his widespread reading of the available chronicles is tentative, the author of The Reign diversified his plot and characterization enough to indicate that he at least knew of several sources, even though he rarely copied source material directly. This makes identification of specific sources even more difficult.

The derivation of the name "Faulconbridge" along with his strong characterization presents the most difficulty for source attribution. Critics agree that Faulconbridge is compounded of the more notorious bastards of history, and we suspect that bastard-lore would have been common knowledge to dramatists familiar with the chronicles. There seems to be a distinct similarity between the bastard's persistence to learn of his parentage in scene i of The Reign and Hall's account of Dunois, the Bastard of Orleans' boisterous demands to have his parentage revealed.[4] None of the other chroniclers describes this scene at all, and this is the only

---

[3]John Foxe's Actes and Monuments (1583 ed.) appears to have been the main source of The Reign's portraya l of John as a martyr-hero.

[4]See Edward Hall, The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke, Text III., civ, 1548. Bullough likewise concurs in this source.

substantial basis we find for the bastard's characterization in The Reign.

The problem of sources becomes even more complex when one attempts a derivation of the name "Faulconbridge." Furness provides the most comprehensive treatment of the topic.[5] He mentions the "continuation of Hardyng's Chronicle" which makes a slight reference to "Faulconbridge, the erle of Kent, his [i.e., Richard's] bastard, a stout-hearted man," and indicates that Malone first suggested this as a possible source of the family name. Furness next refers to Matthew Paris's account of the exploits of Falcasius de Breute (Fawkes de Brente), who reportedly sacked the Abbey of St. Albans and extorted a large sum of money from the Abbot during the latter part of John's reign. Most critics have accepted this source because the Latin name suggests possible phonetic conjunction with the name Faulconbridge. Furness, however, was not convinced of the authenticity of the source because, not only did the aural connection seem strained, but also the bastard was notorious in comparison to the Faulconbridge of The Reign. Furness also refers to one Eustace Fauconbridge (d.1228) who first appears in 1199 as a royal justice, and during

[5]Horace H. Furness, Jr. ed., The Life and Death of King John (London, 1919), pp. 6-9.

the whole of John's reign, as well as during the early years of Henry III, and who is mentioned in the records[6] as taking part in various judicial proceedings. And too, both Matthew Paris and Coggeshall note that Fauconbridge was elected bishop, and that the election was confirmed by the papal legate, Pandulph.[7] Only Matthew Paris, however, records the appointment of Fauconbridge as guard for Fawkes de Brente after the surrender of Bedford Castle.[8] Since the evidence that we cite later on makes Matthew Paris a very likely source for the author of The Reign, these scattered references in Paris to Eustace Fauconbridge could very well have provided the name for the bastard of The Reign.

E. A. J. Honigmann tries to link the name Faulconbridge to the Robin Hood plays of Munday and Chettle, as a traditional source for the cuckoldry of Faulconbridge senior. He suggests an intimate connection between these plays and Looke About You (1600), where we find a character Sir Richard Faulconbridge, whose wife was seduced by "Prince Richard." Honigmann, though, does not put

---

[6]See Dictionary of National Biography, s.v. "Faulconbridge, Eustace."

[7]Matthew Paris, Historia Major, iii. (1571), 66; The English Chronicle of Radulph of Coggeshall ed. J. Stevenson, Rolls Series, 1875, p. 188.

[8]Matthew Paris, iii., p. 87.

much faith in the validity of this derivation. He assembles more facts as he refers to The Famous History of George, Lord Fauconbridge Bastard Son to Richard Cordelion, a prose pamphlet which, he writes, "combines two stories, 1) about Richard and the Austrian princess, Claribel, and 2) about Richard and Lady Faulconbridge."[9] He concedes, however, that the different versions are a "stumbling block," and simply assumes that Shakespeare was the inventor of the Faulconbridge story, just because he used the name periodically. Professor Honigmann's conjecture is, of course, possible, but not very probable since we show later that the evidence overwhelmingly suggests that The Reign preceded Shakespeare's King John.

To turn to a more comprehensive study of sources, John Elson[10] was the first critic to show how extensively The Reign makes use of several sources. He first discusses Bale's Kynge Johan which was written sometime between 1538 and 1540, and possibly was revised between 1560 and 1563.[11] This play is not commonly accepted as

---

[9]Honigmann, p. xxiii.

[10]John Elson, "Studies in the King John Plays," in Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies (The Folger Library, 1948), pp. 183-97.

[11]See the Malone Society Reprint Edition of John Bale's Kynge Johan (Oxford University Press, 1931), p. xvii.

a source for The Reign, since it is believed to have survived in only one manuscript copy. Elson, however, felt that the concluding lines of that play referred to a performance before the Queen when she visited the town of Ipswich in 1560-61, which could imply that the play had been available in more than one manuscript. Elson cites as internal evidence of source, the "more than a hundred parallels" which he has accumulated, of which only forty, he feels, are definitely similar in language to The Reign. Regarding the comparision of John with King David (T. R. II.viii.,93ff.) he asserts that "no reference to David in any connection with John is to be found in Foxe or Holinshed." He alludes to the linking of the two names in Matthew Paris, but notes that Paris's reference has far different implications from Bale's. In Paris's history, Hubert, the archbishop of Canterbury delivered a speech at John's coronation in which he stressed the fact that John, like David, had been made king by election, not by hereditary right (thinking obviously of Prince Arthur's claim to the English throne). It was in this respect alone that John and David were compared in Matthew Paris.[12]

---

[12]Elson, pp. 192-3.

Elson next turns to the poisoning scene in both plays and suggests that there is a stronger possibility of relationship between these. He cites the following lines, which are spoken by the monk:

> I hope in a whyle to wurke some feate abroade
> (Kynge Johan, l. 1964)
>
> . . . Now my Lord I goe about my worke
> (T. R. II.vi.143).[13]

However, there is very little, if any, correspondence between these two lines, and one suspects that the one hundred so-called parallels mentioned by Elson (but not cited) are of pretty much the same quality. There is absolutely no evidence which would indicate that the manuscript of Kynge Johan had ever been available to the author of The Reign. It seems logical to assume that Bale's play might have helped to sustain a strong anti-catholic sentiment in the 1580's in England, but there is very slight evidence of actual contact between the two plays.

Elson identifies Polydore Vergil's Anglica Historia[14] as another source for The Reign, and since, after Matthew Paris, Polydore Vergil is the chronicler most frequently cited by Holinshed, the allegation deserves consideration. Elson first notes the use of a rather strange

---

[13]Ibid., p. 193.

[14]Elson's page references are to the 1557 edition of Polydore Vergil.

noun ("langor") in the blinding scene: "Ile to the King, and say his will is done,/And of the langor tell him thou art dead" (T. R., I.xii.130-1). He suggests that the word "languor" hardly fits the agony of having one's eyes put out, but that it might have been prompted by Vergil's phrase "angore animi absumptu," describing John's mental anguish that preceded his death.[15] If The Reign's author was indeed familiar with Vergil, Elson's distinction between "angore" and "langor" is ingeniously derived. He then points to another phrase relationship, where the Bastard mildly rebukes John for his demented behavior: "My Lord these motions are as passions of a mad man" (T. R., II.ii.112). Vergil twice refers to John's behaving like a mad man: "amenti similis" and "furenti similis."[16] But Holinshed and Foxe, on the other hand, are both more sympathetic to John than is Vergil, and they do not even imply this aspect of John's nature.

Elson finds another parallel between The Reign's description of the loss of John's army at the Wellstream and Vergil's description of same. Though Holinshed probably suggested the general incident, Vergil adds a few

---

[15]Elson, p. 194.

[16]Elson, p. 195.

specifics. He notes how the sea first rushed in against the river thereby creating turbulence:

The Reign reads similarly at this point:

> The impartial tyde, deadly and inexorable
> came raging in with billowes threatening death.
> (T. R., II.vi.48-9)

Vergil also emphasizes the "spirited and active horse" which carried the Bastard out of the Wellstream; whereas, Holinshed and Paris fail to mention the bastard's horse at all.[17] Geoffrey A. Bullough, the most recent compiler of criticism on the John plays concurs with Elson on the above source.[18]

Matthew Paris is likewise a logical possibility for source material for The Reign since his Chronica Majora supplied Holinshed with a major portion of his facts on King John. Professor Honigmann, however, tries to show that it was Shakespeare who first resorted to Paris for information on the John story, not the author of The Reign; however, the only real basis he has for this conjecture is in Paris's description of the disaster at the Wellstream.[19] In an article which appeared in 1957 Matthew McDiarmid revealed his findings on the subject.[20] He agrees with

---

[17]Elson, p. 196.

[18]Bullough, p. 6.

[19]Honigmann, pp. xv.-xvi.

[20]Matthew McDiarmid, "Concerning the Troublesome Reign of King John," Notes and Queries, n.s. IV. (1957), pp. 435-38.

Honigmann that Shakespeare did consult Paris, but he emphasizes that the author of The Reign did likewise. In defending his theory, McDiarmid works from the same quotation that Honigmann used, which we reproduce here so that the reader may follow the argument.

> . . . In fluvio qui Wellestrem dicitur, carretas omnes, bigas, et summarios, cum thesauris . . . inopinato eventu amisit. Aperta est enim in mediis fluctibus terra, et voragines abyssus, quae absorbuerunt universa cum hominibus et equis, ita quod nec pes unus evasit, qui casum regi nunciaret. Rex tamen cum exercitu suo vix elapsus, nocte sequenti apud Abbatiam, que Suenesheud dicitur, pernoctavit. Ubi, ut putabatur, de rebus a fluctibus devoratis tantam mentis incurrit tristitiam, quod acutis correptus febribus, coepit graviter infirmari. (McDiarmid, p. 436)

The relevant passage from The Reign follows:

> When in the morning our troupes did
> gather head,
> Passing the washes with our carriages,
> The impartiall tyde deadly and
> inexorable;
> Came raging in with billowes
> threatning death,
> And swallowed up the most of all the
> men,
> Myselfe upon a Galloway right free,
> well pacde,
> Out stript the flouds that followed,
> wave by wave,
> I so escapt to tell this tragick tale.
> (T. R., II.vi.46-53)

Honigmann makes four associations between Shakespeare's King John and the above passage from Paris;[21] however,

---

[21]Honigmann, pp. xv.-xvii.

McDiarmid, in a closer scrutiny of the Latin, shows that there are also four parallels between T. R. and Paris. First, he indicate The Reign's usage of "carriages" which is a translation of "carretas," and then states that "swallowed up the most of all our men" is an acceptable translation of Paris's "absorbuerunt universa cum hominibus." He also notes that "so escaped to tell this tragic tale" corresponds to "ita evasit, qui casum regi nunciaret," and finally, that "unexpected news" is the same as the latin "inopinato eventu."[22] Honigmann assumes that the phrase "nocte sequenti" was translated as "on the following night," thereby attempting to strengthen his case for Shakespeare's use of Paris (Shakespeare has the tragedy occur at night, V.vi.39). The Reign, however, has the disaster occur in the morning. McDiarmid argues that The Reign's author had to be using Paris if one translates the above Latin as "when the night followed," for he would then have surmised that the loss had occurred that morning.

McDiarmid also tries to draw some relationship between Philip Faulconbridge's bewildering trance after he is convinced that Coeur de Lion was his father ("Philipus atavis edite Regibus," I.i.231) and Matthew Paris's

---

[22]McDiarmid, p. 436.

description of King John as "atavis regibus magnis procreatus."[23] Rather than being the actual source for Fauconbridge's line, though, this statement in Paris probably only suggested to The Reign's author the opening line of Horace's first ode: "Maecenas atavis edite regibus." McDiarmid also notes an interesting parallel between Matthew Paris and the description, in The Reign of John's reaction to the combined events of the French landing and Peter's prophecy that he would lose his crown on Ascension Day.

> Rex denique, his auditis ac medullitus intellectis, confusus est valde et mente nimis perturbatus, videns undique sibi periculum imminere . . . instabat enim Dies Dominicae Ascenionis.[24]

and

> Disturbed thoughts, foredoomers of
> mine ill . . .
> Strange prophecies of imminent
> mishaps,
> Confound my wits and dull my
> senses so . . .
> Ascension Day is come. (T. R., II.ii.1-7)

The tone of frustration is accurately imitated by the author of The Reign, and McDiarmid feels that "medullitus intellectis" and"mente nimis perturbatus" probably suggested the words "dull my senses." In this association, as with the

---

[23]Ibid., p. 437.

[24]Ibid., p. 437.

others involving Paris and The Reign, the evidence is a bit strained, but McDiarmid's case for Matthew Paris as a source is certainly no less convincing than Honigmann's theory that Shakespeare consulted Paris.

The most compelling evidence of source reading (aside from Holinshed) on the part of The Reign's author is found in John Foxe's Actes and Monuments (1583 ed.). John Dover Wilson in his New Cambridge edition of King John writes that the author of The Reign consulted Foxe in only one instance, that being Foxe's mention of the fact that in the poisoning scene, after the monk had drunk from the poison cup, his bowels burst. Wilson notes that The Reign "attributes this affliction of the bowels to John himself"[25] (see T. R., II.viii.112). Honigmann likewise concedes this one reading of Foxe by The Reign's author, but he tries to show that Shakespeare used Foxe much more extensively.[26] There is evidence, however, that the author of The Reign was more closely associated with Actes and Monuments than with the other chronicles. John Elson's thorough study of Foxe displays quite convincingly that the author of The Reign knew Foxe almost as well as he did Holinshed. Elson begins by quoting two speeches by Pandulph

---

[25]Wilson, p. 190, note 30.

[26]Honigmann, p. xiv.

which denounce John, as well as John's scathing retort (T. R., I.v.86-90). He then tries to show that even though Boswell-Stone had designated Holinshed as the source for these speeches, The Reign's author relied more heavily on his reading of Foxe, as evidenced by his repeated use of words like: "cursed," "accurse," "all those," "whatsoever," "fealties," "warre," "agaynst thee;" words not found in Holinshed. Another peculiar derivation from Foxe seems to be The Reign's spelling of Swinshead Abbey as "Swinsted," the identical spelling used by Foxe.[27]

Elson next examines the poisoning of John (T. R., II.viii.), an episode for which Holinshed most likely provided the outline. Elson notes, however, that Holinshed "assigns to the monk a motive wholly absent in the play: that in a fit of spite against his rebellious subjects, John threatened to bring about a tremendous rise in the price of grain," a motive which Holinshed apparently derived from Caxton's Chronicle of Brut. Foxe also gives Caxton credit for the poisoning story, but omits all mention of the above motive. Elson then lists six points where Foxe's narrative and The Reign converge:

1) the monk first takes counsel with his abbot concerning his contemplated murder;

---

[27]See Elson, p. 188.

2) the abbot praises the monk and absolves him in advance of the deed;
3) the monk obtains his poison from what he calls in the play 'the inwards of a toad';
4) the monk speaks of his drink as one that 'shall make all England glad' [in T. R. it is 'the merriest draught yt ever was dronk in England'];
5) the monk uses the word wassail in reference to the drink; ["wassell" in T. R., II.viii.30]
6) The King pledges the monk.[28]

Of these six, only the last point is found in Holinshed. It should be noted, however, that these correspondences can be found in Bale's Kynge Johan, but Elson further substantiates his theory that the author of The Reign was relying on Foxe. He notes that in the early editions of Foxe there appeared a woodcut divided into six panels "printed on an inserted sheet somewhat smaller than the folio page." These individual panels each contain captions printed from type and probably set in slots cut into the wood block. The illustration in the third panel shows a monk offering King John the cup of poison with the words, "Wassail my liege," the same words as the monk in The Reign. The fourth panel shows the monk, alone, bending over a small table, extracting the bowels of a toad, and the caption reads: "The monk tempereth his

---

[28]Ibid., p. 189.

poyson into a Cup to give ye King." The remaining three panels show, in order, John lying on a bench dead, the monk stretched out dead on the floor with a grimace of anguish, and the abbot offering a Mass for the dead monk, with the caption: "A perpetuall Masse sung dayly in Swinsted for ye Monke that Poysoned King John." This is the same promise made by the abbot in The Reign (II.vi. 140-41). The visual similarity between these woodcuts and what is described in The Reign strongly suggests that the author had some contact with this part of Foxe's work.[29]

Elson refers to another series of illustrations in Foxe which he feels are a possible source for John's cynical speech, mimicking the Pope's reaction to Pandulph's message that he (John) had defied Rome:

> With a taunt vaunting upon his toes
> He urdge a reason why the English
> Asse [my italics]
> Disdaignd the blessed ordinance of
> Rome?
> The title (reverently might I
> inferre)
> Became the Kings that earst have
> borne the load . . .
> (T. R. I,xiii.15-19)

Elson tries to explain the source of the demeaning epithet, "English Asse" by pointing to a series of twelve woodcuts

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 189-90.

entitled "The Proud Primacie of Popes Paynted out in Tables" (in the two-volume editions of Foxe printed from 1570 on). These woodcuts bear such titles as the following: "Emperours kissing the Popes feete;" "Pope Coelestinus IV crowning the Emperour Henricus VI with his feete;" "Fredericus I Emperour shent for holding Pope Adrians styrrup on the wrong side." Elson notes the prevalent use of the word "foot" and its demeaning implications for the King in each instance, and he suggests that the "common concept of the ass as a submissive beast of burden would readily explain the association between the epithet and the papal equitations pictured in Foxe."[30] Even though this might be a striking coincidence, as Elson cautions, it does seem to shed an interesting light on the nature of John's reactions.

Apart from Elson, we find four other possible instances of the use of Foxe as a source by the author of The Reign. In Part II of The Reign (sc.ii.) John, realizing that all the odds are against his keeping the Crown without the aid of Rome, begrudgingly surrenders his crown in vassalage to Rome. However, he maintains his bitter antagonism right to the very end and plans to deceive Pandulph. He speaks:

---

[30] Ibid., p. 191.

> Peace John, here comes the Legate of
> the Pope,
> Dissemble thou . . . (T. R., II.ii.173-4)

and

> Accurst indeede to kneele to such a
> drudge,
> . . . No John submit again dissemble
> yet . . .
> (T. R., II.ii.191-5)[31]

In Shakespeare's play, on the other hand, King John goes through with the submission as a matter of political expediency; he is angry, as Holinshed writes, but he does not deceive, and there is none of the bitterness toward Rome that one finds in The Reign. McDiarmid finds further evidence in this same scene that The Reign's author was relying on Foxe. He cites John's defeatist speech after his submission to Rome: "Since I submitted me to the Church of Rome . . . never a thing has prospered with me" (Foxe, 1837 ed., p. 338). He then notes the parallelism in The Reign: "Philip, I tell thee man,/Since John did yeeld unto the Priest of Rome,/Nor he nor his have prospred on the earth" (T. R., II.viii.94-96).[32] The thought is identical between the two statements and the word "prospered" is the key verb in both.

---

[31]See Foxe's description: "The king thus compassed about on every side with enemies, and fearing the sequel thereof . . . sent speedy ambassadors to the pope . . . pretended to work and entreat his peace and reconciliation . . . (1837 ed.) p. 331.

[32]McDiarmid, p. 435.

Another correspondence between Foxe and The Reign involves the deathbed confession of the Viscount Meloun to the rebellious English nobles.[33] Meloun reveals the French king's plan to have the English nobles killed after the rebellion, and includes as a reason for making this confession, " . . . the freedom of my soul,/That longs to leave this mansion free from guilt . . . (T. R., II.v.25-6). Likewise Foxe, in relating Meloun's confession notes his "great conscience."[34] Holinshed, on the other hand, says very little about Meloun's motive; he has Meloun beg that the nobles believe him on the peril of his soul.[35] A final reference that strongly indicates that Foxe was a favorite source for The Reign's author is found in John's parting actions. Urged on by the Bastard, he begs God's forgiveness of his nobles that had rebelled (T. R., II.viii.). Foxe is the only major chronicler to mention this aspect of John's death, thereby relieving some of the inherent wickedness in John's character.[36]

---

[33]Honigmann also cites this correspondence, but only in relation to Shakespeare's use of Foxe, p. 136, n. 42.

[34]Foxe (1837 ed.), p. 339.

[35]Holinshed, iii. 193.

[36]Foxe, p. 341.

The above facts indicate that the author of The Reign relied most heavily for his story on Holinshed and Foxe; however, he was obviously familiar enough with Matthew Paris and Polydore Vergil to be able to add more dramatic impact to episodes which Holinshed merely glossed over. The story of John was, of course, a familiar one, but there seems to have been enough confusion regarding the Tudors' response to John, to allow the author freedom of detail in shaping his main character. The highly significant facts of John are ignored, and his role as king and powerful leader are subsumed by his ultimate role as martyr for the cause of English supremacy over Rome. For this latter role The Reign's author found a powerfully suggestive characterization in Foxe; to reinforce the role, he merely had to invent two scenes which implicated the Catholic Church in actions that were every bit as underhanded and villainous as John's political career (T. R., I.xi. and II.viii.). Thus the Pope and the entire Catholic church are cast in the role of antagonist as John is somewhat relieved of the baneful reputation which Matthew Paris and Polydore Vergil strove to create. But the author of The Reign displays throughout an artistic concept of historicity; seldom do his sources dictate to him. He liberally

invents facts while staying within the actual boundaries of history, as he reshapes the legend of John to suit the thesis of his drama.

IV. INTEGRITY OF THE TEXT

Since Peter Alexander first suggested in 1939 that The Reign is a "bad quarto," a reconstruction of Shakespeare's King John "issued in a stolen or garbled version,"[1] critics have, from time to time, been suspicious of its integrity. E. A. J. Honigmann is the most recent critic to try to support this conjecture of his former mentor, by showing that Shakespeare could have written his play without The Reign, and he assumes from the outset, that The Reign is a "derivative" form of King John. However, the word "derivative" has such broad connotations, and Honigmann fails to observe consistency when discussing the provenance of the text. He first refers to the text of The Reign as "derivative"[2] but not necessarily "reported."[3] He later mentions that "John was probably the first of Shakespeare's plays to be pirated,"[4] thereby

---

[1]Peter Alexander, Shakespeare's Life and Art (London, 1939), p. 85.

[2]Honigmann, p. xliii., n. 1.

[3]Ibid., p. lvi.

[4]Ibid., p. lxxii.

suggesting a dimension that is not necessarily implied by the word "derivative." Still later, he personifies his notion of derivative in a textual comment on King John (I.i.p.6) by suggesting that a "pirate witnessed a very brief whisper" between Essex and the Sheriff. Resorting to another label in Appendix C, he observes that the play "has textual features common in bad quartos."[5] In Appendix B he returns to his notion of "piracy" by pointing to the "so-called" confusion of the sequence of events surrounding the citizens' of Angiers' demands for a parley in The Reign (I.iv.); this alleged confusion Honigmann notes, "we know to be the hallmark of piratical memorization."[6] Our question at this point is why does Professor Honigmann choose to soften the bad-quarto implication with a term like "derivative." Our guess is that a term was needed comprehensive enough to include all the bad-quarto stigmata in The Reign and also a term that was general enough to cover those numerous aspects of the play which do not conform to a bad-quarto theory. The evidence that he offers for this theory is extremely fragmentary, and he habitually makes up in inference what he fails to corroborate with fact.

---

[5]Ibid., p. 174.

[6]Ibid., p. 173.

What is most misleading about Honigmann's approach, however, is his failure to make suitable accommodations for certain prominent facts which seriously weaken his tentative position. The length of The Reign, for example, is 2936 lines; yet Honigmann glosses over this fact with the casual assumption that derivative texts are longer than their sources. Most experts, however, agree that memorial reconstruction accounts for the noticeable shortness of "bad Quartos."[7] And none of the critics (not even Honigmann) has argued that the shortness of the two parts of The Reign (Part I. has 1,766 lines and Part II has 1,170 lines) warrants investigation, since neither part could have been staged separately. It has been argued that either the printer or the bookseller was responsible for the two-part publication in an attempt to gain extra profits. That this was the case seems evident from both the title page and the preface ("To the Gentlemen Readers") to Part I. Neither makes reference to the fact that this is the first part of a two-part production, and both include a

---

[7]Leo Kirschbaum, "An Hypothesis Concerning the Origin of Bad Quartos," PMLA, 60 (1945), p. 704.

reference to the death of John, which occurs near the end of Part II.

Another peculiarity which Honigmann prefers to ignore is the almost complete absence of Shakespearean rhetoric, something which one would surely expect to find in a play stolen from Shakespeare. Most critics have pointed to this incongruity and have indicated its importance for any comparison of textual provenance between the two plays. Regarding the increased number of speaking parts in The Reign Honigmann, again, says nothing. The fact that The Reign has forty speaking parts compared with twenty-six in Shakespeare's play would seem to weaken Honigmann's argument, since bad quartos commonly have abbreviated casts in comparison with the "good text." It likewise has two crudely comical scenes which are entirely lacking in King John: the Bastard's raid on Swinstead Abbey (I.xi.) and the monk's plan to poison King John, which unnerves the monk's superior, who overhears the plan and suspects that the plot is against his own life (II.vii. 99ff.). Professor Honigmann again neatly sidesteps these differences with his gloss that derivative texts usually "embellished" their originals (xliii.). However, the term embellish implies elaboration and improvement, not an entire change of mood and concept, which is what we find

in The Reign. More significant differences between the two plays are discussed in my next chapter; however, since Professor Honigmann has speculated a bad quarto origin for the text of The Reign, it is necessary at this point to analyze the text with regard to commonly observed bad-text stigmata and to try to determine the extent of the corruption, if any.

In his book on the bad quarto of Romeo and Juliet[8] Professor Harry Hoppe examines an exhaustive number of bad-quarto stigmata, both external and internal. Using this listing as a frame of reference, we will attempt to show that The Reign not only fails the test for memorial reconstruction, but that some of its "suspicious" features are equally attributable to causes other than memorial reconstruction. Professor Hoppe's first category under "External Evidence" is descriptive stage directions, the kind which make an obvious attempt to explain stage business, and as such would be superfluous to the seasoned actor. At the outset, though, Hoppe cautions that this type of sign for bad quarto is not reliable, since an author who readily visualized the action as he wrote "would be especially

---

[8]Harry R. Hoppe, The Bad Quarto of Romeo and Juliet (Ithaca, N. Y., 1948).

prone to utilize descriptive directions."[9] And lest the casual critic be too eager to categorize all descriptive stage directions under a bad-quarto heading, Hoppe cites prompt copy as another possible source of descriptive directions and notes that this type of direction is not peculiar to bad texts.

Hoppe finally emphasizes that the distinguishing feature of bad quarto stage directions is the description of various kinds of stage business that a dramatist would have left up to the actor's discretion.[10] The Reign has several descriptive stage directions; however, they do not exhibit this feature.

> Enter the Shrive and whispers the Earle of Salsbury in the eare (I.i.65).
> They summon the Towne, the Citizens appeare upon the walls (I.ii.192).
> Enter the Kings Herolds with Trumpets to the wals of Angiers: they summon the Towne (I.iv.1).
> Enter the nobles and crowne King John, and then crie God save the King (I.xiii.84).
> He leapes and bruising his bones, after he wa[k]s from his traunce, speaks thus (II.i.11).

At first glance, these directions appear to describe the action as seen by someone possibly reporting the stage business; however, there is nothing so peculiar about them

---

[9] Ibid., p. 81.

[10] Ibid., p. 82.

that the playwright could not have been the author. We find the same kind of direction, with a tendency toward literary expression, in 1 Henry IV (a "good" play text):

> As they are sharing, the Prince and Poins
> set upon them; they all run away; and
> Falstaff, after a blow or two, runs away
> too, leaving the booty behind them
> (1 Henry IV, II.iii.110).

Professor Leo Kirschbaum notes the following stage direction found in Thomas Lord Cromwell (1602, a good text) also as indicative of the author's copy or of a transcript:

> Here within they must beate with their
> hammers (I.ii.10).

and

> Cromwell in his study with bagges of
> money before him casting of
> account (II.i.).[11]

Many directions like the above can also be found in prompt books, but, regarding the almost impossible task of separating prompt book directions from those possibly written by the author, Kirschbaum notes that "one can no more expect a dramatist not to use playhouse directions occasionally than he can expect a scribe not to copy stage directions that brighten the text."[12] Still another possible origin for these descriptive directions lies, as

---

[11]Leo Kirschbaum, Shakespeare and the Stationers (Columbus, Ohio, 1955), p. 172.

[12]Ibid.

Kirschbaum speculates (see above), in the transcription process. If one or two of the original actors had been involved in transcribing the copy for the press, it would have been quite natural for them to flesh out the stage directions so that the text for readers would be accurately descriptive. Only after considering these various explanations for the appearance of descriptive and summarizing stage directions, should one suspect memorial reconstruction as a probable source.

Another suspicious type of stage direction is the kind which "suits the action of the character to the words of the dialogue."[13] The Reign does contain one direction of this nature: "Enter Philip leading a Frier, charging him to show where the Abbots golde lay" (I.xi.1). The first line of text then reads: "Come on you fat Franciscans, dallie no longer, but show me where the Abbots treasure lyes, or die." One possible explanation apart from memorial reconstruction, however, is transcription, where those actors involved in making the copy for the press amateurishly relied on the first line of text for a fuller stage direction. An equally possible source, too, is the author who, on occasion, was prone to using descriptive directions with a literary bent.

---

[13]Hoppe, p. 84.

The final category of stage directions is the "fairly long direction describing vigorous action which involves several characters"[14] and which is usually a substitute for dialogue and action. Professor Hoppe notes, however, that this type of direction is not very frequent in bad texts. Following are three stage directions from The Reign which Professor Honigmann suggests are suspicious,[15] and which, again, appear at first glance, to be of the same type mentioned by Hoppe.

> Excursions. The Bastard chaseth Lymoges the Austrich Duke, and maketh him leave the Lyons skinne (I.iii.l).
> Excursions. The Bastard pursues Austria, and kills him (I.vi.l).
> Excursions. Elianor is rescued by John, and Arthur is taken prisoner. Exeunt. Sound Victorie (I.viii.l).

The first of these directions is fairly lengthy, but involves only two characters. The second one is short and involves only two characters, and neither is a complete substitute for dialogue, as the Bastard has a short speech after each direction. The third stage direction seems to fit Hoppe's category precisely. However, as with the other types of directions mentioned above, it is quite probable that here again we have the author at

---

[14] Ibid., p. 91.

[15] Honigmann, p. 174.

qork. This third direction comprises scene viii of Part I, and, like the other two directions, indicates a need for practically no dialogue, except the shouts, curses, and exclamations that would have accompanied the very brief action. Since this kind of dialogue would have had to be extemporaneous and therefore subject to constant change, the author would not have had to be very specific. And if the above three directions were not totally authorial, there is every likelihood that either transcription or the prompt-book produced them.[16] So, Honigmann's suggestion that these three directions are similar to those found in bad quartos has very little significance for the possible origin of the text of The Reign.

The next section of Professor Hoppe's book has to do with Stage Adaptations, which, he speculates, are due to the reporter's being unfamiliar with every aspect of the play. This, he explains, accounts for the frequent reduction of cast, elimination of scenes, and shortening of lengthy speeches found in bad quartos. In The Reign there is obviously no reduction of cast (on the contrary, it has forty speaking parts compared with twenty-six for King John), and there does not appear to have been any

---

[16]In The Shakespeare First Folio (Oxford, 1955), p. 252, W. W. Greg notes that excursions and alarums and notes for music are all signs of the prompt book.

elimination of scenes. But in Part II (scene iii.) three new characters are introduced in the stage direction: Chester, Bewchampe, and Clare. For Chester and Clare this is their first and only advertised appearance in the play (they were presumably part of the anonymous band of English nobles who rebelled against John); however, Bewchampe is the only one who actually has a speech. Chester, though, is required to be on stage because he is the subject of the nobles' first grievance against John, whom they make guilty for "reprehending him in most unchristian crimes" (II.iii.48). This is the audience's first clue that previously something had gone wrong between John and Chester; however, the incident is only alluded to, not portrayed. The confusion appears to have been due to the author, who either omitted the earlier incident, or was careless about introducing new characters half-way through the play. If this was not foul-papers confusion, it could very well have been the result of another author collaborating on the play, who was unfamiliar with what part of the cast actually had speaking parts (we note later that this scene also contains the peculiar pronunciation of the name Lewes as "Liooz"; whenever it is used elsewhere in the play, it is dissyllabic). These irregularities, however, obviously had nothing to do with Shakespeare's play since the

above characters are not named in King John. There is no apparent alteration in the various speeches, and the acting parts seem to have been preserved in their entirety. The continuity of both dialogue and speech sequence indicates that there was no stage adaptation of the kind implied by Hoppe's statement.

Under "Metrical Dislocations" Professor Hoppe lists as a sign of bad quartos "the sporadic printing of the verse as prose."[17] Here again The Reign does not conform to bad quarto standards. In 2,900 lines of text it prints only four short verse speeches as prose. Three of these are on the same page in Part II (D4v), and the fourth speech is on the very next page (E1r). This very likely could have happened during transcription, or could just as well have been the result of the compositor's inability to distinguish these lines which had been revised and written consecutively in the margin. Under this same heading Professor Hoppe notes that "even more suggestive of error due to memory is the substitution of prose for verse."[18] But this is impossible to detect in The Reign not only because much of the verse is prosaic anyway, but also because the author is not very meticulous in adhering

---

[17]Hoppe, p. 107.

[18]Hoppe, p. 108.

to set patterns for using prose. For example, the messengers speak prose only part of the time, and a few of the more important confrontations begin in prose (see the beginning of the parentage dispute, I.i.66ff., and John's verbal battle with Pandulph, I.v.63ff.), but eventually revert back to verse after fifteen or twenty lines. Part II is a bit more irregular, especially in sc. viii where the Frier begins with a verse line, but speaks prose in the next three lines. Then three lines follow in verse, and lines ten through forty are in prose. Then, the rest of the scene (120 lines) is in regular blank verse. The most likely cause of these sporadic alterations in verse patterns is the author himself, who seems to have been quite careless. Another possible source of these irregular metrics could have been the transcription process where one or two actors tried to hurry the process by reading the lines aloud while the scribe pieced together only those words that stuck in his memory.

Another peculiarity of bad quartos is mislineation, a term which roughly refers to the addition or omission of a word or words which causes irregularity in the verse. Detection of this, however, depends largely on comparison with an acknowledged "good text." Part I. contains four very obvious instances of mislineation, but this is due, in

each instance, either to the transcription process or to the compositor. Two of these cases involve omission of one word:

> Know you not, Omne simile non est idem?
> Or have read in. Harke ye good sir . . .
> (I.i.197-8).

and

> And first exployt your Grace did___
> enioyne
> (I.iv.43).

In the first example the name of the author could have momentarily escaped the playwright, so that he left the space blank and simply omitted to fill it in later. There is also the possiblility that the name may have been written in such a manner as to be illegible to the scribe or compositor. In the second example the omission of the pronoun "me" after the word "did" was probably compositorial. The third example involves an addition of three words ("worse than a") in the following: "Base heardgroome, coward, peasant, worse than a threshing slave . . . " (I.ii.144). This could have been a lapse on the part of the author, but it seems more probable that here we have an actor's interpolation which slipped into the text during transcription. The same reasoning might also explain the clumsy line: "Ah be not so ingrate to digge your Mother's grave" (II.v.41). The exclamatory "Ah" ruins the meter. These four examples are quite insignificant, however, and are quite common in play texts of the period as well as in playhouse manuscripts.

The ne

ith sub-metri

ines syllabl

ing by at le

to be a blank

uses spring

nitations c

n insertion

portions of

of two or m

The Reign,

with occas

instances

but where

blurring

power, to

five line

Ex, Glv

Mc, Ebr

Part II

Mr, B2

sixteen

figure

The next section of Professor Hoppe's book deals with sub-metrical lines (those which are short by one to three syllables) and extra-metrical lines (those which are long by at least one syllable) which the author intended to be a blank verse. Professor Hoppe notes that such features spring from a variety of causes: "paraphrase, substitutions of equivalent words or phrases, substitutions or insertions of anticipations and recollections from other portions of the play, summary, expansion, or combinations of two or more of these causes."[19] The verse structure of The Reign, however, consists of a fairly regular blank verse with occasional end rhyme. If we ignore the numerous instances where the final word in the line is two syllables, but where strong emphasis on the first syllable resulted in slurring over the second syllable (E.g., England, Salsbury, power, tower, glorious, presence, heaven), we find only five lines that are extra-metrical in Part I. (C1r, C2r, F3v, G1v, G2r) and four that are sub-metrical (B2v, B4v, D1r, E3r), nineteen alexandrines, and five fourteeners. Part II. contains only four extra-metrical lines (C4v, E2v, B1r, B2r), three that are sub-metrical (C2r, D4r, E2v), sixteen alexandrines, and four lines of fourteeners. These figures would seem to represent normal deviation in the use

---

[19]Hoppe, p. 112.

of metrics for sixteenth century play texts, and they are not attributable to the variety of causes mentioned above. Hoppe then briefly reviews two miscellaneous types of bad-quarto signs: 1) ignorance of which characters were present and had lines to speak in certain scenes, and 2) occasional erroneous assignment of speeches. Neither of these signs, to my knowledge, appears in The Reign.

Hoppe's Chapter IV treats the internal signs of bad quartos, namely, the transposition of words and phrases, as well as anticipation and recollection. The language of The Reign and King John, though, is so totally different that it is almost impossible to even discuss these signs with any degree of profit. There are somewhere in the neighborhood of forty verbal parallels between the two plays (Dover Wilson lists eighteen of these in his introduction of the New Cambridge edition of King John, pp. xxvi.-xxvii., and the rest will be found in the textual notes of this edition); however, the majority of these parallels occur at precisely the same time in both plays, so that there are no evident examples of anticipation and recollection. A more important issue is the subject of "borrowings." Several critics have accused The Reign's author of being a "chronic borrower" without any precise information about the alleged evidence for this attribution. Much of what has been called borrowing, can

be classified as individual usage of cliche, jargon, slang, and a whole list of dramatic expressions which would have been a common part of any Elizabethan playwright's active vocabulary. In the past a conventional technique for proving that one author borrowed from another, was to accumulate an impressive list of similarly used words and phrases. But Miss Muriel St. Claire Byrne seriously cautions the ardent parallel hunter against careless assumptions.[20] She specifically attacks the attempt of H. Dugdale Sykes to prove The Reign's authorship by indiscriminately assembling similar words and phrases as highly suspect. In her article Miss St. Claire Byrne issues five caveats to the parallel hunter and concludes that verbal parallels demand very careful, qualitative grading, because mere verbal parallelism is of very little value without some evaluation of the thought content.

An article by Professor Rupert Taylor[21] seems to have set the precedent for labelling the author of The Reign a "chronic borrower." It consists of an enormous list of comparisons between The Reign and at least thirteen other contemporary plays, and while some of the

---

[20]St. Claire Byrne, "Bibliographical Clues," p. 24.

[21]Rupert Taylor, "A Tentative Chronology of Marlowe's and Some Other Elizabethan Plays," PMLA, LI (1936), pp. 643-688.

parallels do indicate similarity of thought, the majority of them do nothing more than show that numerous English playwrights in the late sixteenth century had a rather common vocabulary. Thus, his conclusion that the author of The Reign was a "chronic borrower" is quite misleading.

Taylor begins with a comparative list of parallels between Marlowe's Edward II and The Reign and cites two examples in which there appears to be some contact between the two plays; however, he lists twenty-nine other parallels which sharply lack the kind of qualitative grading urged by Miss St. Claire Byrne. For example, Taylor cites the following from The Reign:

> By my prescience ere Ascension day
> Have brought the sun unto his usual
> height,
> Of crown, Estate, and Royal dignity,
> Shalt thou be clean despoiled and
> dispossessed.
> (T. R. I.xiii.184-7)

He suggests that this passage was derived from the following line in Edward II: "And yet ere that day come/The king shall lose his crown" (265-6). The thought, of course, is similar but there is very little in Marlowe's line that would suggest the elaborate rhetoric of The Reign. It appears that the borrowing could easily have been the other way around. Yet the two plays are so close in time to each other, that it is very difficult to establish priority from verbal borrowing alone. Critics generally agree on 1590-91 as the

probable composition date for Edward II (it was entered in the Stationer's Register in 1593 and published in 1594), and they also agree that 1589-90 is the more likely date of composition date for The Reign. This conjecture alone reduces the probability that The Reign's author did the borrowing. Matthew McDiarmid suggests that Marlowe did indeed borrow from The Reign on the basis of the dissimulation scene between Edward and the Archbishop which has no basis in the chronicles, but which is very similar to the portrayal of John's dissimulation with Pandulph in The Reign (II.ii.).[22] In Edward II the Archbishop of Canterbury threatens Edward with deposition and promises to elect another king, if Edward's minion, Gaveston, is not exiled immediately. After the exit of the rebellious subjects, Edward taunts "Proud Rome, that hatchest such imperial grooms." McDiarmid argues that since Shakespeare's King John does not dramatize this dissimulation, the only possible source is The Reign.[23]

Taylor's article next cites twenty-two parallels between The Reign and Marlowe's The Massacre at Paris; however, only four of these bear any close similarity.

---

[22]McDiarmid, p. 435.

[23]Ibid.

llowing is an e

hich Taylor then

f Malta:

Good wor

Go to s

he only simila

ance," a comm

aylor is equa

hich he notes

example, he ci

from both play

borrowed the

Peace

To so

I'll

And

It is certa

a commonpla

wrights.

by sixteen

most commo

Feversham

Following is an example of the nine "so-called" parallels which Taylor then suggests between *The Reign* and *The Jew of Malta*:

> Good words, sir sauce, your betters are
> in place
> (*T. R.*, I.ii.129).
>
> Go to sirra sauce, is this your question
> (*J. of M.*, l.1256).

The only similarity here is in the demeaning epithet, "sir sauce," a common slang usage of the late sixteenth century. Taylor is equally unconvincing with the eleven parallels which he notes between *The Reign* and Marlowe's *Dido*. For example, he cites a reference to the Daedalus-Icarus myth from both plays on the assumption that *The Reign's* author borrowed the line:

> Peace Arthur, peace, thy mother makes
> thee wings
> To soar with peril after Icarus
> (*T. R.*, i.ii.108-9).
>
> I'll frame me wings of wax like Icarus
> And oer his ships will soar unto the
> sun
> (*Dido*, ll.1651-2).

It is certainly misguided to assume that the usage of such a commonplace reference shows borrowing between two playwrights. For, of the numerous mythological references used by sixteenth century playwrights, this was perhaps among the most common. Taylor's twenty-seven parallels with *Arden of Feversham* and the thirty-two parallels with *Soliman and*

Hereda are equally

respondence of thou

similarities. How

links between Peel

genuine.[24] Dugdal

tionships between

but neither Dover

Veale was respons

credible parallel

his automatic as

who did the borr

composition for

fully acknowled

unknown, so tha

assumption. Ma

could easily h

of two charact

derive from Ma

dily borrowed

about the pre

conclusive),

imitative qua

---

[24]May

[25]McI

Perseda are equally suspicious; they show very little correspondence of thought and are mostly one and two word similarities. However, some of the similarities that he finds between Peele's Edward I and The Reign seem quite genuine.[24] Dugdale Sykes has made some convincing relationships between The Reign and several of Peele's plays, but neither Dover Wilson nor Honigmann are convinced that Peele was responsible for the play. Taylor also cites some credible parallels between Richard III and The Reign, but his automatic assumption that it was The Reign's author who did the borrowing is not so acceptable. The date of composition for The True Tragedy of Richard III (the commonly acknowledged source for Shakespeare's play) is unknown, so that there is nothing to substantiate Taylor's assumption. Matthew McDiarmid suggests that the borrowing could easily have been reversed. He notes that the names of two characters in The True Tragedy, Tressel and Berkely, derive from Marlowe's Edward II, which he indicates, probably borrowed from The Reign.[25] If McDiarmid is correct about the precedence of the latter (his evidence is not conclusive), then previous notions about the notoriously imitative quality of The Reign will have to be modified.

---

[24]Taylor, pp. 649-50.

[25]McDiarmid, p. 435.

Regardless

listed by Professo

latched; his inter

seven, thirty-two

defeating. To su

many words and ph

Taylor presumes,

have followed Ta

notorious borrow

Editor of the

a 'shameless bo

between Titus

McDiarmid, how

Shakespeare's

a definite suc

Holinshed, wh

power is mete

nobles.[27] Or

The Reign's

Cairncross,

comments tha

---

[26] J.

Harvard Un

[27] Mc

Regardless of McDiarmid's arguments, the parallels listed by Professor Taylor are, for the most part, far fetched; his interminable lists of twenty-four, twenty-seven, thirty-two parallels, etc., between plays are self-defeating. To suggest that a playwright remembered as many words and phrases from as many plays (thirteen) as Taylor presumes, is highly incredible. Yet other critics have followed Taylor in labelling The Reign's author as a notorious borrower. For example, Professor J. C. Maxwell (editor of the New Arden Titus Andronicus) calls the author a "shameless borrower" on the basis of a reliable parallel between Titus (V.I.125-7) and The Reign (II.viii.81-6).[26] McDiarmid, however, points out that nothing is known of Shakespeare's source in this instance; whereas, there is a definite suggestion for the lines of The Reign in Holinshed, where the blame for the collapse of the royal power is meted out equally to John and to the rebellious nobles.[27] Once again, there is no real basis for accusing The Reign's author of borrowing. Also Professor Andrew S. Cairncross, in his introduction to the New Arden 2 Henry VI, comments that The Reign is "full of echoes of various plays,

---

[26]J. C. Maxwell, ed. New Arden Titus Andronicus (Harvard Univ. Press, 1953), p. xxvi.

[27]McDiarmid, p. 435.

which include 3 Hen

as indeed there fo

produces no evidenc

author did the bor

Dover Wils

xxii.) suspected

authors of 2 & 3 H

edition of The Re

then if we accept

Henry VI, we stil

no possible way

The Reign. Cair

show the priorit

phrase "divine

also found in T

fact that the p

rials, but tha

Richard story.

phrases of not

---

[28]Andr
(Harvard Univ

[29]Alfr
(London, 1942

[30]And
(Harvard Uni

which include 3 Henry VI and Richard III."[28] The echoes are indeed there for the latter two plays, but Cairncross produces no evidence for his assumption that The Reign's author did the borrowing.

Dover Wilson (see the C. U. P. King John, p. xxxii.) suspected that the borrowings were made by the authors of 2 & 3 Henry VI and Richard III from the 1591 edition of The Reign. Alfred Hart assumed this also.[29] Even if we accept Cairncross's date of 1590 for 2 and 3 Henry VI, we still must consider the fact that there is no possible way of proving that these two plays preceded The Reign. Cairncross does, however, make an attempt to show the priority of Richard III by noting its use of the phrase "divine instinct" from Act II. iii. 42, which is also found in The Reign (II.iii.172).[30] He mentions the fact that the phrase does appear in the John source materials, but that it does occur in Holinshed under the Richard story. Now this method of attributing words and phrases of not uncommon usage to a particular source is

---

[28]Andrew S. Cairncross, ed. New Arden 2 Henry VI (Harvard Univ. Press, 1957), p. xlvi.

[29]Alfred Hart, Stolne and Surreptitious Copies (London, 1942), p. 353.

[30]Andrew S. Cairncross, ed. New Arden 3 Henry VI (Harvard Univ. Press, 1964), pp. xliv.-xlv.

quite misleading.

no words used by a

source materials, m

author. The implic

is a severe handic

ions based on such

above discussion

in the various th

The Reign's langu

evidence to prove

Chronic borrowe

To retur

Chapter (V) deal

that is compreh

clear guideline

from those four

that repetitio

as bad, and ev

words and expr

repetition in

sometimes dra

result of eit

the work. It

repetition t

quite misleading. For Cairncross is here suggesting that two words used by an author which are not found in his source materials, must have been borrowed from another author. The implications of such a theory would seem to be a severe handicap to individual creativity, and opinions based on such a theory are extremely tenuous. The above discussion is an attempt to reveal basic weaknesses in the various theories about the parasitical quality of The Reign's language, and we find that there is little evidence to prove that the author was any more of a "chronic borrower" than his colleagues.

To return to Professor Hoppe's study, his next chapter (V) deals with "repetitions" (165ff.) in a way that is comprehensive, but he is unable to provide any clear guidelines for distinguishing good-text repetitions from those found in bad texts. But it should be noted that repetition is a common feature of good texts as well as bad, and every playwright sometimes repeats favorite words and expressions. There is, to be sure, frequent repetition in The Reign; some of it is intentional and sometimes dramatically effective; some of it is also the result of either poor craftsmanship, or haste to finish the work. It would be misleading, though to refer to the repetition the way Professor Honigmann does:

'. . . repetition

ind a good deal of

he Reign. For exa

Elianor.

Constance.

nd

Bastard.

John. A

his type of repe

play texts, wher

than what is bei

usaic rhetorica

llowing:

Is this
Is this
Is this
And yet
Is thi
And ye

The pattern is

"King" appears

"han" in the

mphasizing J

31Hon

" . . . repetition of words and phrases ad nauseam."[31] We find a good deal of single word and phrase repetition in The Reign. For example:

> Elianor. Ile finde a time to triumph
> in thy fall.
> Constance. My time is now to triumph
> in thy fall
> (I.vii.17-18).

and

> Bastard. My Lord, these motions are
> as passions of a mad man.
> John. A mad man, Philip, I am mad
> indeed
> (II.ii.112-13).

This type of repetition is quite common in sixteenth century play texts, where rhetorical style is often more important than what is being said. The Reign also makes use of formulaic rhetorical patterns like the questions in the following:

> Is this the King that never lovd a Frier?
> Is this the man that doth contemne the Pope?
> Is this the man that robd the holy Church,
> And yet will flye unto a Friory?
> Is this the man whome all the world abhorres,
> And yet will flye unto a Friory?
> (II.vi.84ff.).

The pattern is obviously contrived for effect, as the word "king" appears in the first line but is then changed to "man" in the next line, in both segments of the speech, emphasizing John's loss of title. Bad quarto hunters might

---

[31]Honigmann, p. 175.

s tempted to label

anticipation; howev

purpose as it sets

emphasizes John's

repetition of sing

while some of this

effective too. A

lament after his

of the Wellstrea

The worl

It loath

Who piti

But to

Repetition of t

juxtaposition c

ytic of despai

author does ha

"claim" elever

a penchant fo

interjection

mother, Ah bo

favorite (th

beginning a

be tempted to label the first "And yet will flye," etc. as anticipation; however, the line has a definite rhetorical purpose as it sets off the two parts of the speech and also emphasizes John's presumptuous nature. We also find much repetition of single words within certain speeches, and while some of this is sheer clumsiness, some of it is quite effective too. An example of the latter is John's weary lament after his army has just been destroyed by the tides of the Wellstream:

> The world hath wearied me and I have
> wearied it:
> It loathes I live. I live and loath
> myself.
> Who pities me? to whom have I been
> kinde?
> But to a few, a few will pitie me

(II.vi.4-7).

Repetition of the verbs "wearied" and "pities" and the juxtaposition of "loath" and "live" re-emphasize the rhetoric of despair. It should be noted also that The Reign's author does have a few favorite words. We find the noun "claim" eleven times and "tyrant" twelve times, and he has a penchant for beginning speeches with the sympathetic interjection "Ah" when extreme concern is evident (Ah mother, Ah boy, Ah Hubert, etc.). He likewise has three favorite (the adjective is perhaps misleading) ways of beginning a sentence:

Short tale

Dare lay my

And art th

owever, the first

is found only thr

is not the kind o

nemorial reconstr

Under the

labels phonetic

of memorial reco

and Juliet he gi

phonetic spelli

"sorcery," "ger

tient," "anenst

does have five

hearings; howe

than memorial

same quality

Chatillion sp

"Roghbert" th

else in the

of "Newdigat

32Hog

Short tale to make . . . (II.iii.79 and II.vi.40).

Dare lay my hand/life . . . (I.i.19 and II.vi.107).

And art thou gone . . . (I.iii.1; I.xiii.227; II.iii.149).

However, the first two types occur only twice, and the third is found only three times in the entire play. Surely this is not the kind of repetition that one would attribute to memorial reconstruction.

Under the heading "Mishearings" Professor Hoppe labels phonetic spellings and mishearings as possible signs of memorial reconstruction. From the bad quarto of Romeo and Juliet he gives the following examples of bad-text phonetic spellings: "a sies" for "assize," "sosserie" for "sorcery," "gerasles" for "graceless," "empation" for "impatient," "anenstrewment" for "an instrument."[32] The Reign does have five instances of spellings which could be mishearings; however, these are attributable to causes other than memorial reconstruction, and none of these is of the same quality as Hoppe's examples. We find the name Chattilion spelled Shattilion on A3r; Hubert is spelled "Hughbert" three times on page A4r of Part II., but nowhere else in the play. There is the last name "Nidigate" instead of "Newdigate," "was" for "wakes," and "tree" instead of

---

[32]Hoppe, p. 178.

three." These spe

the transcription

the scribe making

words read by some

ays in The Reign

spelling. Hoppe'

es 'Paraphrase,"

self-evident, and

find no such sig

The abov

nature of bad qu

exhibit possible

ations are equa

'bad quartos,"

corruption anal

extremely weak

the play has u

and has been f

Capell, in his

Reign has the

tilated or "s

of critics si

---

[33]See

speare (Oxfo

"three." These spellings more than likely occurred during the transcription process, and either were the result of the scribe making an aural spelling or of mishearing the words read by someone else. Of the other incorrect spellings in The Reign, none suggests mishearing or phonetic spelling. Hoppe's final three categories of bad-text signs are "Paraphrase," "Summary," and "Expansion;" the terms are self-evident, and it is sufficient to note briefly that we find no such signs in The Reign.

The above discussion seems to attest to the elusive nature of bad quarto stigmata, for even where The Reign does exhibit possible bad quarto features, the alternative explanations are equally probable. And in comparison with other "bad quartos," which reveal, more or less, the kinds of corruption analyzed by Professor Hoppe, The Reign makes an extremely weak showing. It should be mentioned here, that the play has undergone previous bad-quarto investigation, and has been favorably acquitted. As early as 1768 Edward Capell, in his edition of King John pointed out that The Reign has the signs of a first draft rather than of a multilated or "surreptitious impression,"[33] and the majority of critics since have expressed similar contentions.

---

[33]See F. P. Wilson, Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare (Oxford University Press, 1953), pp. 114-15.

Professor Leo Kirsc

1939 article "A Cer

follow-up article

of the Shakespeare

Stationers, 1955)

The Reign as a ba

fact, whenever he

the implication t

text, for King J

Hart's book Stol

uses as a major

to liberate The

In Chapter III,

tries to modify

bad quartos are

plays or first

or rewritten b

gaze the vocab

as other pairs

---

[34]Leo

P. E. S., XIV

[35]Kirs

[36]See

pp. 245, and

[37]Har

Professor Leo Kirschbaum does not list the play in his 1938 article "A Census of Bad Quartos,"[34] nor in his follow-up article of 1945.[35] And in his book-length study of the Shakespeare bad quartos (Shakespeare and the Stationers, 1955) he again finds no evidence to assign The Reign as a bad text of Shakespeare's King John. In fact, whenever he does mention the play, it is always with the implication that it is the source play, in a good text, for King John.[36] We should note too that Alfred Hart's book Stolne and Surreptitious Copies, which Hoppe uses as a major point of reference for his study, attempts to liberate The Reign from all bad-quarto implications. In Chapter III, "Vocabularies of the Bad Quartos," Hart tries to modify the then "widely accepted belief that the bad quartos are wholly or in part Shakespeare's source plays or first sketches, which were subsequently revised or rewritten by him."[37] He makes use of a chart to compare the vocabularies of The Reign and King John as well as other pairs of alleged source plays, and he begins with

---

[34]Leo Kirschbaum, "A Census of Bad Quartos," R. E. S., XIV (1938), pp. 20-43.

[35]Kirschbaum, "An Hypothesis," pp. 697-715.

[36]See Kirschbaum, Shakespeare and the Stationers, pp. 245, and 374, n. 171.

[37]Hart, p. 23.

the statement that

ext." Then, for

lines, the number

the number of word

finally the numbe

rather than try t

correspondences,

finds that the "

is very small."[3

quartos of Hamle

lar to it, and

words peculiar

good text like

King John has l

ge of words co

harts is unusu

again notes th

texts like The

total vocabul

Hart's eviden

John were wri

[38]Har

[39]Har

the statement that each of the plays therein has a "sound text." Then, for each play, he lists the total number of lines, the number of words in the vocabulary of each play, the number of words common to each pair of plays, and finally the number of words peculiar to each play itself. Rather than try to explain Hart's numerous word tests and correspondences, I will simply note his conclusions. He finds that the "number of words peculiar to any bad quarto is very small."[38] As examples of this he uses the bad quartos of Hamlet (Q1) which contains only 295 words peculiar to it, and Romeo and Juliet (Q1) which has only 207 words peculiar to it. In comparison, Hart shows that a good text like The Reign has 1,310 peculiar words, and King John has 1,611. He then concludes that the percentage of words common to bad quartos and their parallel texts is unusually high (from 87% to over 93%), but he again notes that the percentage of words common to good texts like The Reign, and King John is only 50% of the total vocabulary of the two plays.[39] In short, all of Hart's evidence points to the fact that The Reign and King John were written quite independently of each other.

---

[38]Hart, p. 25.

[39]Hart, p. 27.

It has bee

now that Professo

Bacon's textual o

equally plausible

defines his use o

quently applies t

like "pirate" an

out of his argum

very confusing i

if the text of

struction, how

rhetoric, vocab

King John? Eve

bad quarto wer

suspect that

speare's play.

memorial reco

eye and a tal

one can estab

origin that

sible origin

suspicions.

Sin

necessarily

It has been the purpose of the above discussion to show that Professor Honigmann's suppositions about The Reign's textual origin pale sharply in the light of other equally plausible explanations. Since he never accurately defines his use of the term "derivative" which he frequently applies to the text of The Reign, and since terms like "pirate" and "memorial reconstruction" slip in and out of his argument quite readily, one is left with some very confusing implications about the two plays. Indeed, if the text of The Reign was the result of memorial reconstruction, how does one explain the drastic difference in rhetoric, vocabulary, imagery, and characterization from King John? Even if the internal and external signs of a bad quarto were more pronounced, it would be difficult to suspect that The Reign was a surreptitious text of Shakespeare's play. The investigation of texts for signs of memorial reconstruction requires more than a suspicious eye and a talent for interesting speculation, and unless one can establish a consistent argument for bad quarto origin that will sustain itself in the face of other possible origins, then there is little point in rehearsing suspicions.

Since the whole matter of textual integrity is necessarily linked with the acting company that owned the

play, as well as v
necessary to revi
ken to the public
clarify the prove
attempts to show
owned the play,
been guilty of a
1590's. Using C
fessor Honigmann
ily downhill af
Richard Tarlton
some of their p
(liv). He ther
strates convin
their own play
Edward Allyn
the statement
to the effect
another copy
the Queen's m
of 1591. Th

40Hor

41W.
London, 19

play, as well as with the printer and publisher, it will be necessary to review briefly the relationship of the Queen's Men to the publication of their plays in order to further clarify the provenance of The Reign's text. Honigmann attempts to show that the Queen's men (who had originally owned the play, if we can believe the title page) may have been guilty of a number of reconstructions during the early 1590's. Using Chambers as his source of information, Professor Honigmann notes that the Queen's men had gone steadily downhill after the death of their chief comedian, Richard Tarlton, in 1588, and that later in the 1590's some of their plays appeared in print in "debased" texts[40] (liv). He then refers to a study by Greg[41] which demonstrates convincingly that the Queen's men reconstructed their own play Orlando Furioso after having sold it to Edward Allyn in 1592. Greg, however, dismisses as gossip the statement recorded in A Defense of Cony Catching (1592) to the effect that the author of Orlando, Greene, sold another copy of the play to the Admiral's company, after the Queen's men had left on provincial tour in the summer of 1591. Though this has no bearing on the corruption of

---

[40]Honigmann, p. liv.

[41]W. W. Greg, Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements (London, 1922).

that text by the C

kind of double-dea

in the late 1580'

argument reads li

that his case is

On the b

abridgement of Q

that they were r

From the recon

small step, for

successes of ot

of three Queen'

The True Trage

Shrew (1594),

Again, though,

Queen's men ir

that it is ea

structing the

sold them: "

other compan

is right . .

[42]Hor

[43]Ho

that text by the Queen's men, it does give an idea of the kind of double-dealing that seems to have been quite common in the late 1580's. From this point, then, Honigmann's argument reads like that of the defense attorney who knows that his case is very weak.

On the basis of Greg's theory about the Queen's abridgement of Orlando Furioso alone, he strongly suggests that they were responsible for other corrupt texts as well: "From the reconstruction of their own plays it would be a small step, for a hard-up company, to the plagiarism of the successes of other companies."[42] Honigmann then makes note of three Queen's plays that turned up in corrupt texts: The True Tragedie of Richard III (1595), The Taming of A Shrew (1594), and The Famous Victories of Henry V (1598). Again, though, he makes no case for the involvement of the Queen's men in these specific corruptions, but concludes that it is easy to believe that they made a habit of reconstructing their own plays for themselves, after they had sold them: "This company admittedly passed on plays to other companies and reconstructed them for itself, if Greg is right . . . "[43] However, Greg's article does not imply

[42]Honigmann, p. liv.

[43]Honigmann, p. lv.

this, nor in fact,

contention.

From 1594

appeared in print

their' plays were

how many instanc

rants be attribu

Orlando Furioso

copy of that pla

Greg's theory i

(1594), also ge

a bad quarto, c

by the Queen's

when they sold

might also hav

still do not

for Shakespea

struction of

only two bad

been respons

Bad-

of a Shrew

greement a

peare's pl

this, nor in fact, do we find any evidence to support such a contention.

From 1594 to 1602 twelve of the Queen's plays appeared in print. Honigmann suggests that "a number of their" plays were published in "debased texts," but in how many instances can the poor condition of the printed texts be attributed to the Queen's men? The quarto of Orlando Furioso was published in 1594 from a reconstructed copy of that play made apparently by the Queen's men, if Greg's theory is correct. The True Tragedy of Richard III (1594), also generally believed to have been published in a bad quarto, could very well have been a reconstruction by the Queen's men. However, since it is not known exactly when they sold the play, nor is it known to whom, that text might also have been corrupted by another company. Critics still do not agree as to whether this was the source play for Shakespeare's Richard III, or whether it was a reconstruction of an unknown play. Nevertheless, these are the only two bad texts for which that company appears to have been responsible.

Bad-quarto signs have been identified in The Taming of a Shrew (1594); however, there is still widespread disagreement as to whether it is the source play for Shakespeare's play (as Hart tried to illustrate), or whether it

is merely a corru
in the Stationers
year by Peter Sho
appeared the adv
by the Right hon
It has been sugg
the same time as
pivotal questio
stationer or Pe
they sold the p
Queen's player
larities of th
Burby, as Honi
played by the
men were resp
is more than
in the summe
in his intro
ably the occ
of the memo
Henry VI],

44Gr
45Ci

is merely a corrupt version of that play. It was entered in the Stationers Register in 1594 and printed in the same year by Peter Short for Cuthbert Burby. On the title page appeared the advertisement: "As it was sundry times acted by the Right honourable the Earle of Pembrook his servants." It has been suggested that the Queen's men sold the play at the same time as Orlando Furioso (in 1592); however, the pivotal question is, to whom did they sell the play, the stationer or Pembroke's men, or either party? If indeed they sold the play directly to the stationer, then the Queen's players are to be held accountable for the irregularities of that text. But, if they did sell the play to Burby, as Honigmann presumes, why "was it advertised as played by the obscure Pembroke's men?"[44] That Pembroke's men were responsible for the inconsistencies in the text is more than likely. It is known that this company "broke" in the summer of 1593, and, as Andrew S. Cairncross notes in his introduction to 3 Henry VI, "The breaking was probably the occasion for the compiling, by some of the actors, of the memorial or quarto versions of two plays [2 & 3 Henry VI], and doubtless of others in their repertory."[45]

---

[44]Greg, p. 363.

[45]Cairncross, 3 Henry VI, p. xvi.

Some crit

Ire Chronicle Hi

ad been entered

as not publishe

ore prominent o

lay for Shakesp

of that play. I

eventually that

of showing that

with the final

uld the play

published.

Anothe

tion of critic

it is not cer

the Queen's m

in May, 1594,

in 1598. Va

struction of

challenged t

discovered

been Shakes

the text of

Some critics still argue the possibility that The True Chronicle History of King Leir (a Queen's play which had been entered in the Stationers Register in 1594, but was not published until May, 1605) is a corrupt text. The more prominent opinion, however, is that it is the source play for Shakespeare's King Lear, and not a reconstruction of that play. Even if critical opinion were to concur eventually that the play is a bad quarto, there is no way of showing that the Queen's players had anything to do with the final printed state of the text, since they had sold the play (in 1594-5) ten years before it was ever published.

Another Queen's play which has incurred the suspicion of critics is The Famous Victories of Henry V; however, it is not certain that this was the actual play owned by the Queen's men. It was entered in the Stationers Register in May, 1594, and the earliest extant edition was printed in 1598. Various scholars have labelled it a memorial reconstruction of a lost play. Seymour Pitcher, however, has challenged this position by arguing that certain annotations discovered in a copy of Halle's Chronicles appear to have been Shakespeare's and that these notes are close enough to the text of The Famous Victories to suggest that the same

hand was responsil

the play, the cen

responsible for t

opinion generally

of an earlier pl

is recorded in H

1594; this appar

and is commonly

speare's Henry

for the reconst

dence that the

they had sold t

between that t

this period th

play, since th

apparently bo

the fact that

of that year.

The f

speculation

the alleged

46Sey

horship

t New York

ferences,

hand was responsible for both.[46] Regardless of who wrote the play, the central question for our purposes is, who is responsible for the poor quality of the text? Critical opinion generally regards this text as an abridged version of an earlier play, Henry the Fifth or harey the Vth which is recorded in Henslowe's Diary from November, 1595 to July, 1596; this apparently had been the original Queen's play, and is commonly regarded as the possible source for Shakespeare's Henry V. That the Queen's men were responsible for the reconstruction is doubtful (Pitcher finds no evidence that the play is a memorial reconstruction), for if they had sold the play in 1594-5, three years intervened between that time and the publication in 1598. During this period they presumably had nothing to do with the play, since they broke in 1594 (May) and since Creed had apparently bought the play prior to that, as evidenced by the fact that he registered it for publication on May 14 of that year.

The facts, then, do not lend themselves to easy speculation about the involvement of the Queen's men in the alleged corruption of several play texts which had

---

[46]Seymour Pitcher, The Case for Shakespeare's Authorship of 'The Famous Victories' (State University of New York, 1961). See chapter entitled "Facts and Inferences," pp. 163-96.

been known as the
appeared in print
Orlando Furioso
tentatively be a
King Leir and Th
corruption but
bad quartos. W
role of the Que
of bad play tex
Profes
Queen's player
the "suspiciou
mentions seve
appear to cor
The Reign. P
imply only th
but hardly n
reveal the f
recorded con
in 1587-88,
a printer.
"leave off"

47R
bookseller
I. 555; V.

been known as theirs. Out of twelve Queen's plays which appeared in print between 1594 and 1605, two bad texts (Orlando Furioso and The True Tragedy of Richard III) can tentatively be assigned to them. Three others, A Shrew, King Leir and The Famous Victories exhibit some signs of corruption but have not been shown convincingly to be bad quartos. What is more important, though, is that the role of the Queen's players in the alleged reproduction of bad play texts is highly conjectural.

Professor Honigmann extends his theory about the Queen's players' involvement with bad quartos to include the "suspicious career" of Thomas Orwin, printer. He mentions several facts about Orwin which, at first sight, appear to corroborate his suspicions about the text of The Reign. However, the incidents referred to by Honigmann imply only that Thomas Orwin's career was indeed colorful, but hardly notorious. The Stationers Register and McKerrow reveal the following facts about Orwin.[47] His first recorded confrontation with the law appears to have been in 1587-88, before he had been entered in the hall book as a printer. The Court of Star Chamber had ordered that he "leave off" printing until the charges against him of

---

[47]R. B. McKerrow, A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers (London, 1910), p. 208; also, Arber, I. 527; I. 555; V. li.

printing certain

Walter) could b

Orwin as master

letter on his be

February 8, 158

pute with his w

nor of the ourc

by the Company

appears to hav

Bishop Whitgif

sincerest apo

along with th

was promptly

undamaged.

Orwin and th

about Orwin'

suspicious

the typical

Aln
tir
th
wa

48

49

p. 47, n.

printing certain Popish books (Jesus Psalter and Our Ladies Psalter) could be cleared.[48] The Company, though, admitted Orwin as master printer after it had received a favorable letter on his behalf from the Archbishop of Canterbury. On February 8, 1589, Orwin was engaged in an apparent labor dispute with his workmen, but we know nothing of the dispute, nor of the ourcome. Then in 1591 his presses were seized by the Company; the offense is not recorded, but Orwin appears to have been guilty this time. A letter from Archbishop Whitgift, dated August 30, 1591, vouched for Orwin's sincerest apology, and requested the return of his presses, along with the permission to resume printing.[49] Permission was promptly granted, and Orwin's presses were returned undamaged. This is the last recorded conflict between Orwin and the law, and while these incidents imply something about Orwin's penchant for trouble, there is nothing really suspicious about them. Leo Kirschbaum's statement about the typical Elizabethan trade printer puts the case plainly:

> Almost every Elizabethan stationer at one time or another fell foul of his guild or the government. It is just as wrong to wax righteous about the typical stationer's

---

[48] Ibid.

[49] W. W. Greg, A Companion to Arber (Oxford, 1967), p. 47, n. 142.

trade pe
true pir
cation.5

The prin

been of moderate

a veteran of th

had married Joa

printing busine

son and John K.

cialized in th

itable return,

short treatis

works, eight

also received

lets, treati

Marshe. Con

as indicatio

ability, fo

disputes (1

Burby, and

It should

Speare and

50

51

Court of
P. 46.

> trade peccadilloes as it is to confuse true piracy and unauthorized publication.[50]

The printing house of Thomas Orwin seems to have been of moderate size and rather successful, and his wife, a veteran of the trade, collaborated on the venture. Orwin had married Joan Robinson in 1587, thereby inheriting the printing business of her two former husbands, George Robinson and John Kingston. Orwin was a trade printer who specialized in the kind of work that insured a quick and profitable return, namely, pamphlets, ballads, and numerous short treatises. In addition, he owned the rights to other works, eight of which had belonged to George Robinson. He also received the rights to some ninety odd books, pamphlets, treatises which previously had belonged to Thomas Marshe. Contrary to Honigmann's assumption, there is even an indication that Orwin had some reputation for respectability, for he was appointed arbitrator in two printing disputes (1593), the one between John Danter and Cuthbert Burby, and the other between John Danter and Henry Chettle.[51] It should be noted here, finally, that in his book, Shakespeare and the Stationers, 1955, Leo Kirschbaum compiles

---

[50]Kirschbaum p. 47.

[51]W. W. Greg and Eleanor Boswell, Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1576-1602 (London, 1930), p. 46.

trade biograp

of bad quarto

referred to

In a

bility that

been a "stoc

merely use

tion with o

ter: two

Laurers (1

printed),

with at th

three were

that mean

a legal d

case in

illegall

obisne.5

extent

legal i

trade biographies for twenty-one Elizabethan publishers of bad quartos, and the name Thomas Orwin is not even referred to in passing.

In a footnote Honigmann then suggests the possibility that the bookseller, Sampson Clarke, might have been a "stooge" publisher and that he allowed Orwin to merely use his name.[52] Clarke's name appears in connection with only five publications in the Stationers Register: two ballads (1587-88), Lodge's Alarum against Usurers (1584), Greene's Menaphon (1589, which Orwin printed), and The Reign (1591). Having no facts to work with at this point, Honigmann conjectures that the latter three were all "potentially dangerous works," whatever that means. Clarke does appear to have been involved in a legal dispute in 1585, as one of the defendants in a case in which certain stationers had been charged with illegally printing and selling The ABC and Little Catechisme.[53] Neither the disposition of the case, nor the extent of Clarke's guilt is known. Again, this kind of legal involvement was quite common for an Elizabethan

---

[52]Honigmann, p. lvi.

[53]Arber, ii. 791-2.

ginter. J.

ake publish

contrary.

E. J

various amb

well as for

involvement

several pl

tures are

in the lig

longer sup

the small

regard to

in establ

alternat

actual f

The Reic

because

ously w

accepte

establi

nation

printer. J. Dover Wilson noted that he was a "respectable publisher"[54] and the record indicates nothing to the contrary.

E. A. J. Honigmann is to be credited for noting various ambiguities related to the text of The Reign, as well as for his interesting speculation about the possible involvement of the Queen's men with the corruption of several play texts. On the surface, at least, his conjectures are seductive; however, once the evidence is viewed in the light of equally plausible alternatives, it can no longer support his one-dimensional theory. Unfortunately, the small bit of history that has been preserved for us in regard to the Queen's men is of very little significance in extablishing certain alternatives. And in this matter, alternative explanations are the closest we can get to actual fact. Honigmann's theory about the provenance of The Reign's text presents a very distorted picture, simply because he was willing to ignore certain facts which seriously weaken that theory. In order for a viewpoint to be accepted which sharply challenges a position that has been established by time and by a past that has yielded up information grudgingly, it must categorically examine and then

---

[54]Wilson, p. xvii.

ndrite the

holmann

refute the traditionally accepted position. This Professor Honigmann has not been able to accomplish.

V. CONCEPTUAL DIFFERENCES

Substantial differences between The Reign and King John are readily apparent from a cursory reading of the two plays. To begin with, The Reign is more than 340 lines longer than its counterpart, and includes eight separate scenes which do not appear in Shakespeare's play.[1] There is also a noticeable difference between the number of speaking parts in each play. Assuming some judicious doubling with messengers, The Reign has forty speaking parts compared with just twenty-five in King John. Critics have pointed to sharp contrasts in rhetorical style and dialogue; for example, the rhetoric of The Reign is much more repetitious and distracting, and the style much more flaccid than in Shakespeare's play.[2] What little imagery there is in The Reign appears impulsively and is not nearly so effective as that which we find in King John, which, by

---

[1]For a listing of corresponding scenes between the two plays, see Munro, pp. 155-61.

[2]See Robert A. Law, "On the Date of King John," Studies in Philology, vol. 54 (1957), pp. 121-2.

ontrast, closely

ation.[3] By ther

o two very diff

poses, a much mo

highly independe

y each author.

ences as they p

burgh), Philip

ot only to sh

to point out th

The Reign as a

Shake

eight to ten

throne of Eng

John. Becau

less against

opponent. I

older (sixte

ways of pol

not given m

[3]T

following:

Imagery (H

Spurgeon,

I. A. J. P

contrast, closely integrates theme, imagery and characterization.[3] By themselves, these contrasting elements point to two very different artists at work. However, for our purposes, a much more significant area of contrast lies in the highly independent conceptualization of four key characters by each author. We will attempt to analyze these differences as they pertain to Arthur of Brittany, Hubert (de Burgh), Philip Faulconbridge, the Bastard, and King John, not only to show their significance for each play, but also to point out the tenuousness of any theory that would regard The Reign as a corrupt text of Shakespeare's King John.

Shakespeare portrays Arthur as a very young boy (eight to ten years old) who is the rightful heir to the throne of England, but whose right has been usurped by John. Because of his youth and innocence, Arthur is helpless against his more cunning and politically seasoned opponent. In The Reign, on the other hand, Arthur is older (sixteen to eighteen years) and more adept in the ways of policy; but his claim to the throne of England is not given much credibility. The main reason for this

---

[3]This subject has been fully dealt with in the following: Wolfgang Clemen, The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery (Harvard Univ. Press, 1951), p. 86ff., Caroline Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery (New York, 1935), p. 246ff.; E. A. J. Honigmann, King John, pp. lxi.-lxv.

difference in ch
must be made to
reinforce this i
poor, helpless
is not to come
also from his f
is not so sign
limned too sym
play illustrat
the key words
Shakespeare m
cence and goo
ity of the a
suades Huber
appeal to Hu

Are
In
Tha

and

Ha
I
T
A

difference in characterization is that Shakespeare's John must be made to appear a tyrant and a villain; what could reinforce this image more than his intention to murder the poor, helpless prince? In The Reign, however, John's fall is not to come solely from his part in Arthur's death, but also from his fight with Rome. Thus, the death of Arthur is not so significant, and as a result, Arthur is not limned too sympathetically. The "blinding scene" in each play illustrates this difference forcefully. In King John the key words used by Arthur are "heart" and "mercy," as Shakespeare makes him the pathetic boy-child whose innocence and goodness are in violent contrast to the criminality of the act. Arthur, exhausted by fear, finally persuades Hubert to refrain from blinding him with an overt appeal to Hubert's sense of human compassion:

> Are you sick, Hubert? you look pale today.
> In sooth, I would you were a little sick,
> That I might sit all night and watch with you (IV.i.28-30).

and

> Have you the heart? When your head did but ache,
> I knit my handkercher about your brows,
> The best I had, a princess wrought, it me . . .
> And with my hand at midnight held your head . . . (IV.i.41-5).

Arthur's appeal
to sympathy. Ir
a completely loc
Lxii., he cool
mortal sin and
destruction of
dramatic, as H
raphy of "obedi
and the scene
between obedi
of-God. Arth
dramatic thar
case is hard
77-9). Sure
way from Sha
subtle imag
not the tot
in The Reig
Th
in the two
ix.) as ch
ranks slic
quite pro
scene ii.
ual actic

Arthur's appeal is powerfully emotional and moves Hubert to sympathy. In The Reign on the other hand, Arthur makes a completely logical argument. From the opening lines of I.xii., he coolly cautions Hubert against committing a mortal sin and incessantly reminds him of the impending destruction of his immortal soul. This plea is much less dramatic, as Hubert responds with the conventional philosophy of "obedience to the king no matter what" (my italics), and the scene slumps into a tedious and protracted debate between obedience-to-sovereign vs. obedience-to-the-law-of-God. Arthur's plea here is less emotional and much less dramatic than in King John: "Advise thee, Hubert, for the case is hard,/To loose salvation for a Kings reward" (I.xii. 77-8). Surely if The Reign's scene had been derived in any way from Shakespeare's we should expect some trace of the subtle imagery with which Arthur emotionally disarms Hubert, not the totally different concept of the scene which we get in The Reign.

The role of Hubert is likewise conceived differently in the two plays. In The Reign he first appears (in scene ix.) as chamberlain to John; his title is "de Burgh" and he ranks slightly subordinate to Pembroke and Salisbury. He is quite prominent in the latter half of Part I.; however, by scene ii. (line 43) of Part II he performs his last individual action when he is dispatched by John to officiate at the

hanging of the
use for him, an
Shakespeare's p
the title de Bu
citizens of Ang
negotiations w
their sparing
few confidant
the crucial d
play, Hubert
as important
Reign Hubert
John's death
John at the
be asked at
derive his
borrowing
author hav
apparent m
O
speare wa
of King J
speeches
sens of

hanging of the Prophet of Pomphret. John has no further use for him, and he silently disappears from the play. In Shakespeare's play, however, Hubert is a Frenchman (without the title de Burgh) who first appears as spokesman for the citizens of Angiers (II.i.201ff.). After his successful negotiations with France and England which result in their sparing the town, he joins the inner circle of John's few confidants (III.ii.), as he is enlisted by John for the crucial disposal of Arthur. From this point in the play, Hubert becomes John's most indispensible ally, almost as important as the Bastard. Contrary to his role in The Reign Hubert maintains his importance to John right to John's death; and it is he, not the Bastard, who is with John at the time of the poisoning. Now the question must be asked at this point, where did the author of The Reign derive his very different conception of Hubert if he was borrowing from Shakespeare? And why would The Reign's author have gone to the trouble of changing the role of an apparent major character?

On the other hand, is there not evidence that Shakespeare was the one who did the adapting? The first folio of King John manifests some confusion in the assignment of speeches in II.i.201ff., where Hubert represents the citizens of Angiers against the armies of France and England.

Where the "Citi

Reign, the foli

initially had

ently changed

role to Hubert

replaces "Citi

change the sp

Konigmann cle

speech heads

intended to

papers turne

the change w

Konigmann's

on the one

resolution

his theory

King John.

from in Th

since the

from note

play, or

that ever

---

pp. xxxv

Where the "Citizen" speaks out for the townspeople in The Reign, the folio text of Shakespeare's play shows that he initially had intended to use the same character; he apparently changed his mind, however, and decided to give this role to Hubert, for at II.i.325 the speech head "Hubert" replaces "Citizen." But Shakespeare then neglected to change the speech head "Cit."(II.i.200).[4] Professor Honigmann cleverly solves this problem by changing all the speech heads to Hubert on the basis that Shakespeare had intended to do this anyway, but since the latter's foul papers turned up as printer's copy for the first folio, the change was not complete. T. M. Parrott, reviewing Honigmann's edition of King John applauds this innovation on the one hand, but on the other, notes that Honigmann's resolution of the speech head problem unwittingly weakens his theory that The Reign was derived from Shakespeare's King John. Parrott asks where the title "Citizen" came from in The Reign, if it is a reconstruction of King John, since the derivative text would necessarily have been made from notes taken at actual performances of Shakespeare's play, or from the prompt-book. However, he points out that even for those early performances, the speeches assigned

---

[4]See Honigmann's discussion of this in King John, pp. xxxvi.-xxxvii.

n Shakespeare's
ave been correc
his as it may,
wo characters
f the confusi
n Shakespeare
wn play by el
The a
terizations o
but become ev
conceptions
King John, t
the status o
labels him
development
intention i
"backbone"
Shakespear
nation tha
the Bastar
Bonjour e

in Shakespeare's foul papers to "Citizen" would presumably have been corrected in the prompt-book to "Hubert."[5] Be this as it may, The Reign exhibits no confusion between the two characters Hubert and Citizen; and whatever the extent of the confusion in the First Folio, it was most likely due to Shakespeare's innovative tendencies to tighten up his own play by eliminating unnecessary characters.

The above differences in relation to the characterizations of Arthur and Hubert (de Burgh) are significant, but become even more so in light of the two very different conceptions of Philip Faulconbridge, the Bastard, and of King John, the two main characters in each play. Regarding the status of the Bastard in Shakespeare's play, John Munro labels him as most important from the viewpoint of character development, and suggests that it had been Shakespeare's intention in remodelling The Reign to make the Bastard the "backbone" of the story. He does not feel, however, that Shakespeare ever quite achieved the independent characterization that he had intended.[6] J. Dover Wilson notes that the Bastard is the "real hero"of King John,[7] and Adrien Bonjour extends this by suggesting that the play actually

---

[5]T. M. Parrott, A review of the Arden edition of King John, J. E. G. P., vol. LV (1956), pp. 300-01.

[6]Munro, p. xxxvi.

[7]Wilson, King John, p. lx.

has two heroes,
ard throughout
your was the f
analysis which
rises to becom
play.[8]

Profe
agrees that J
"if he is not
refers to the
Falstaff, To
aspect of th
likeable, na
that Shakesp
tional chor
in the char
label him a
re
ac
ta
Al
co
it

8
R. L. H.,

has two heroes, John through the first half, and the Bastard throughout the remainder of the play. Professor Bonjour was the first critic to develop the structural analysis which shows that as John declines, the Bastard rises to become the ultimate controlling figure of the play.[8]

Professor Honigmann disagrees with this theory and argues that John is the central figure in the play, and "if he is not the hero, he is certainly the villain."[9] He refers to the Bastard as a type, in the mold of Mercutio, Falstaff, Touchstone, Autolycus, and identifies the one aspect of the bastard's character that makes him immensely likeable, namely, his irrepressible candor. He also notes that Shakespeare's Bastard sometimes speaks as the unintentional chorus. Reese likewise points out the choric element in the characterization of the Bastard, but hesitates to label him as "heroic." He does feel that the Bastard

> redeems and crowns the play, since the action is seldom as interesting or important as his independent vision of it . . . Although implicated in the action, Faulconbridge stands outside it and surveys it, not consistently but at least with

---

[8]Adrien Bonjour, "The Road to Swinstead Abbey," E. L. H., XVIII. (1951), p. 270ff.

[9]Honigmann, King John, p. lxx.

enough de
its signi

ugh M. Richmond

f Shakespeare's

serves in many

consciousness of

ost critics are

ric of The Rei

s a much crude

imary functio

ot such casua

distinctions b

The Ba

spirit and ag

is pride, an

f England.

a rough-neck

Austrian Duk

his mother,

In King John

sympathetic

10M.
p. 279.

11H
(New York,

enough detachment to be able to deepen its significance by his commentary.[10]

Hugh M. Richmond sees the Bastard as the "symbolic pivot" of Shakespeare's King John, and as a personality which "serves in many ways to reflect the relatively detached consciousness of the audience . . . ."[11] In contrast, most critics are content to observe the lackluster rhetoric of The Reign's Bastard, and they simply dismiss him as a much cruder form of Shakespeare's character, whose primary function is for the purpose of comic effect. But such casual observations gloss over the very subtle distinctions between the two characterizations.

The Bastard of both plays is totally English in spirit and aggressiveness, staunchly nationalistic in his pride, and firmly dedicated to preserving the heritage of England. But the Bastard of The Reign is much more of a rough-neck, whose noisy persistance in demanding that the Austrian Duke fight him, as well as his rude response to his mother, place him in the ranks of the street ruffian. In King John (I.i.268ff.) Shakespeare's Bastard is at least sympathetic toward his mother after her confession regarding

---

[10]M. M. Reese, The Cease of Majesty (New York, 1961), p. 279.

[11]Hugh M. Richmond, Shakespeare's Political Plays (New York, 1967), p. 104.

her seduction by Ric

the Bastard first th

name his father, an

confession, he cold

"Come, Madame come,

shared equall twix

speare's Bastard i

however, he gradua

enlightened visio

counterpart in Th

to develop this i

for the preserva

pulsion to serve

ever insight he

The rea

opment of the B

the different p

play is perhap

his motives so

theless makes

12See

treaty at Ang

composition!"

13Rees

cynical and

her seduction by Richard Coeur-de-Lion. But in The Reign the Bastard first threatens her with death if she will not name his father, and then, after she tearfully makes her confession, he coldly ignores any touch of compassion: "Come, Madame come, you neede not be so loth,/The shame is shared equall twixt us both" (T. R. I.i.384-5). Shakespeare's Bastard is a bit awkward in the beginning also; however, he gradually develops a cynically independent and enlightened vision of England's troubles;[12] whereas his counterpart in The Reign, even though he too matures, fails to develop this independent vision, and he simply exists for the preservation of the conventional order. His compulsion to serve and to please John gets in the way of whatever insight he might develop.

The reason for the two different strands of development of the Bastard is quite understandable in view of the different purpose of each playwright. Shakespeare's play is perhaps one of his most pessimistic[13] and although his motives sometimes lack precise clarification, he nevertheless makes it quite plain that if ever rebellion against

---

[12]See especially the Bastard's long speech after the treaty at Angiers which begins, "Mad world! Mad kings! Mad composition!" (King John, II.i.561-98).

[13]Reese observes (p. 280) that "King John is the most cynical and disillusioned of the histories."

a dishonest king is

John's guilt blatant

he subtly suggests

gal king, and as su

author of The Reign

weak man, adds ano

John the martyr-he

the duplicity of P

John of The Reign

speare's play, an

as villains. Wit

purpose, The Reig

subordinate to J

makes clear. Fr

more prominently

lines to John's

play, however,

twenty-four lin

independence t

point out that

philosophy of

dent vision th

From

link with Joh

a dishonest king is justified, it is here. He never reveals John's guilt blatantly, but through the eyes of the Bastard he subtly suggests that John was indeed an usurper, an illegal king, and as such, was doomed to destruction. But the author of The Reign, while he portrays John as a basically weak man, adds another more prominent dimension by making John the martyr-hero whose failure is precipitated more by the duplicity of Rome than by his own lack of strength. John of The Reign is not the usurper that we find in Shakespeare's play, and it is Rome and the Pope who are clothed as villains. With this noticeably different emphasis in purpose, The Reign's author then makes the Bastard strictly subordinate to John, as the total of lines assigned to each makes clear. From scene v. of Part II where he figures more prominently in the plot, the Bastard speaks only 300 lines to John's 522. He is more prominent in Shakespeare's play, however, where, in the same sequence, he speaks only twenty-four lines less than John. This is not to deny any independence to the Bastard of The Reign, but merely to point out that in the role of spokesman for the conventional philosophy of order, he is denied the dramatically independent vision that Shakespeare's character achieves.

From the very beginning of The Reign the Bastard's link with John is absolute, even to the extent that John

pathically interfer

the Bastard gets his

begins at I.ii.129

I.vi. (a total of 4

is over the Austria

lion's skin coat,

Richard. This irr

his father's death

vile insults are

Limoges refuses b

John, who has bee

breach of diploma

mandy (I.v.45ff)

Shakespeare's Ki

quite distastefu

ishness: "We l

(III.i.60). Wh

between John an

subtle emotiona

---

[14]Honig

is also snubbe

(I.i.64); by I

(II.i.147); by

160). These

tionally from

unethically interferes in his dispute to make certain that the Bastard gets his way. The Bastard-Austria dispute begins at I.ii.129 and continues intermittently through I.vi. (a total of 496 lines). Simply stated the dispute is over the Austrian Duke's flagrant wearing of Coeur-de-Lion's skin coat, which Lymoges had won when he killed Richard. This irritates the Bastard and he wants to avenge his father's death right there. His repeated curses and vile insults are aimed at forcing Lymoges to fight, but Lymoges refuses because the Bastard has no rank. Then John, who has been enjoying the brouhaha, strikes a severe breach of diplomacy by making Faulconbridge Duke of Normandy (I.v.45ff) so that Lymoges will have to fight. Shakespeare's King, on the contrary, considers the wrangle quite distasteful and scolds Philip openly for his childishness: "We like not this; thou dost forget thyself" (III.i.60). Where The Reign develops close comradeship between John and the Bastard, Shakespeare interjects a subtle emotional distance.[14]

---

[14]Honigmann points out (p. lxxi.) that the Bastard is also snubbed by several others in King John: by Eleanor (I.i.64); by Lady Faulconbridge (I.i.227, 243); by Austria (II.i.147); by Salisbury (IV.iii.94) and by Lewis (V.ii. 160). These instances further serve to isolate him emotionally from the influence of John.

It might be

some sort of indepe

Swinstead (I.xi.);

humor for comic rel

ster by reinforci

dependence on John

gets his first cha

news of Arthur's

English nobles.

maintain order, a

wary of the noble

and despair (lin

buoy up John's s

fit not the seas

this treason" (

as the Bastard

Finally, in an

ment on the sta

is not very pe

of Italy/Hath

(145-46). Joh

patches the Ba

nobles at St.

nobles by ack

It might be argued that The Reign's Bastard achieves some sort of independence in his ransacking of the Abbey at Swinstead (I.xi.); however, this scene which employs coarse humor for comic relief serves more to subordinate the character by reinforcing his image as a roughneck and his sole dependence on John for identity. By II.ii the Bastard gets his first chance to give John moral support, after the news of Arthur's unfortunate death and the rebellion of the English nobles. John begins to fear his own inability to maintain order, and when cautioned by the Bastard to be wary of the nobles (II.ii.73ff.), he lapses into self-pity and despair (line 95ff). The Bastard feebly attempts to buoy up John's spirits with: "These curses (good my Lord) fit not the season:/Help must descend from heaven against this treason" (lines 105-06). John orders him to go; then as the Bastard starts to leave, John tells him to stay. Finally, in an aside the Bastard, confused, tries to comment on the state of John's predicament, but his analysis is not very penetrating: " . . . This is the cursed priest of Italy/Hath heapt these mischiefes on this haplesse Land" (145-46). John then apologizes for his behavior and dispatches the Bastard to dissemble with the rebel English nobles at St. Edmundsbury. At the Church he confronts the nobles by acknowledging his lack of communicative skills

(something which Sha
then proceeds to ac
John's every action
he tells them was h
II.iii.103), to the
caused by Arthur's s
awareness of John'
his usual vein to
and undying obedi
finally comes ali
the few powerful
kill John, please
soules . . . " (
vision, as he st
ditional order.
behaves quite d

After h
with his life f
bastard of The
is on the way
has come to ta
makes the mist
nality. John
tired and hun
ttles of seat

(something which Shakespeare's Bastard never does), but then proceeds to acquit himself quite favorably. He defends John's every action, from the banishment of Chester (which he tells them was brought on by Chester's own indiscretion, II.iii.103), to the death of Arthur, which, he argues, was caused by Arthur's own hand. Not once does he betray any awareness of John's role in the death. He then proceeds in his usual vein to make the conventional pleas for solidarity and undying obedience to the lawfully anointed king. He finally comes alive, as he charges the nobles, in one of the few powerful lines of the play: "Ayd lewes, leave God, kill John, please hell,/Make havock of the welfare of your soules . . . " (II.iii.128-8). But his vision is John's vision, as he strengthens his role as preserver of the traditional order. We see later that Shakespeare's Bastard behaves quite differently in the same situation.

After having lost his army and having barely escaped with his life from the flood waters of the Wellestream, the Bastard of The Reign meets John, who is sick with fever and is on the way to Swinstead Abbey. By this time, the Bastard has come to take his secondary role so seriously that he makes the mistake of scolding the king for his lack of formality. John is preparing to dine with the monks, and he is tired and hungry so that he tells them to ignore the formalities of seating. The Bastard, however, feels compelled to

remind the king tha

nky and cautiously

procedures:

My lord, I

Honors cha

do her wor

as if your

To which John imp

you tell me much

surfet of sorrow'

not learned to v

spective as guar

John's faithful

avenges John's r

Abbey.

In comp

acterized as th

Instead is give

personality th

Reign's Bastar

rebellious nob

outer walls o

shocks him in

remind the king that this would be a serious breach of dignity and cautiously tells John to observe the proper table procedures:

> My lord, I am loth to allude so much
> to the proverb
> Honors change manners: a King is a
> King, though fortune
> do her worst, and we as dutiful in
> despight of her frowne,
> as if your highnes were now in the
> highest type of dignity
> (II.viii.12-15).

To which John impatiently replies: "Come, no more ado, and you tell me much of dignitie, youle mar my appetite in a surfet of sorrow" (II.viii.16-17). The bastard still has not learned to view things outside of his very narrow perspective as guardian of the status quo. But he remains John's faithful servant to the end, and he forthrightly avenges John's murder by killing the Abbot of Swinstead Abbey.

In comparison, Shakespeare's Bastard is not characterized as the rigid defender of the status quo, but instead is given a more independent vision and a strong personality that is able to stand on its own. Like The Reign's Bastard, he is sent by John to mingle with the rebellious nobles, but what he sees when he arrives at the outer walls of the castle where Arthur's dead body lies shocks him into fiery indignation. He angrily accuses

Robert of the dread

Robert denies that

death, the Bastard

re-confirms Arthur

imminent trouble f

wrested pomp:"

> How easy
> From fortl
> the Life,
>
> Is fled t
> Now for t
> Doth dogg
> And snarl
> Now powe
>
> Meet in

He makes no atte

tion that he unc

troubles.

In V.i.

death and of th

tard's duty to

make the stand

appeal to John

a king:

> Be gr
>
> Let n

Hubert of the dreadful deed (IV.iii.116ff.), and when Hubert denies that he had anything to do with Arthur's death, the Bastard utters a very pessimistic speech that re-confirms Arthur's right to the crown and laments the imminent trouble for England because of the "decay of wrested pomp:"

> How easy dost thou take all England up
> From forth this morsel of dead royalty
> the Life, the right and truth of all
> this realm
> Is fled to Heaven . . .
> Now for the bare-picked bone of majesty
> Doth dogged war bristle his angry crest
> And snarleth in the gentle eyes of peace:
> Now powers from home and discontents at
> home
> Meet in one line; and vast confusion
> waits . . .
> (IV.iii.142-52).

He makes no attempt to absolve John and gives every indication that he understands the real reason for England's troubles.

In V.i., after John has been told of Arthur's death and of the revolt of his nobles, it is the Bastard's duty to instill courage in him; but rather than make the standard appeal to God, he makes a powerful appeal to John for self-actuation and strength worthy of a king:

> Be great in act, as you have been in
> thought;
> Let not the world see fear and sad
> distrust

Govern the
Be stirrin

Threaten t

Of braggir

That borr

Grow grea
The daunt

The exhortation c

vating, by compa

imagine how the

mann suggests, c

impressive rhet

Bastard is bear

trouble, and it

brings the news

has just lost r

and has narrow

endured mental

heaven: "With

tempt us not

with John at

receiving the

burden; the s

shifted to t

her dogged d

> Govern the motion of a kingly eye!
> Be stirring as the time, be fire with
> fire,
> Threaten the threat'ner, and outface
> the brow
> Of bragging horror: so shall inferior
> eyes,
> That borrow their behaviours from the
> great,
> Grow great by your example and put on
> The dauntless spirit of resolution
>
> (V.i.45-53).

The exhortation of The Reign's Bastard is inert and unmotivating, by comparison, and it is extremely difficult to imagine how the author, if he had been a "pirate" as Honigmann suggests, could have totally ignored Shakespeare's impressive rhetoric. By this time in the play, Shakespeare's Bastard is bearing an ever increasing share of England's trouble, and it does not stop. For in V.vi.37-8 Hubert brings the news of John's death by poisoning. The Bastard has just lost most of the king's army in the Wellstream and has narrowly escaped with his own life, and he has endured mental anguish almost as severe as John's. He begs heaven: "Withhold thine indignation, mighty heaven/And tempt us not to bear above our power." Since he was not with John at the time of the poisoning, the Bastard's receiving the news is the final transfer of the remaining burden; the sympathy of the audience has subtly been shifted to the Bastard as he now represents England and her dogged determination to survive against all odds.

The Bastard

independence, for

end. As John dies

the audience, not

as God. Throughou

from that of Shak

from the protecti

ties of the drama

is forced to rem

he was always th

being able to tr

ant thought. H

his lack of ins

rigidly convent

and his inabil

all of these q

Reign from his

unlikely that

derivative te

time to rearr

the Bastard,

The

is in the de

have noted t

The Bastard in The Reign never quite achieves this independence, for John is the central character to the very end. As John dies, it is his anguish and sorrow that hold the audience, not the Bastard's faint admonitions to call on God. Throughout, his role is significantly different from that of Shakespeare's Bastard who is able to emerge from the protective covering of John and re-direct the energies of the drama. The Reign's Bastard, on the other hand, is forced to remain in the background; during John's life he was always there to support, cajole, and obey, never being able to translate the lessons he learned into coherent thought. His unmitigated subordination to King John, his lack of insight into England's real dilemma, his rigidly conventional trust in God to solve all problems, and his inability to see beyond his own very limited role, all of these qualities differentiate the Bastard of The Reign from his counterpart in Shakespeare. It is quite unlikely that someone hastily trying to put together a derivative text of Shakespeare's play would have had the time to rearrange the characterization of Faulconbridge, the Bastard, with such a subtle change of tone.

The most significant alteration in role, however, is in the development of King John. Historians generally have noted that John's most fatal blunder was his intent to

murder prince Arthu

succumbing to Rome

confused reputatio

form the basis for

overwhelming evide

chronicles to sui

Shakespeare's Joh

more distasteful

evil, who method

ical chess witho

both as a man a

tainly no more

as the central

some measure of

tyrs must suff

of England; as

to achieve emo

which is tota

This

pointed out h

15Ric

Why Shakespe

because we d

nize the sub

ation, "neit

clearly."

murder prince Arthur; this combined with his weakness in succumbing to Rome contributed to his death and to his confused reputation. Even though these two situations form the basis for the plot of both John plays, there is overwhelming evidence that each author interpreted the chronicles to suit his own purpose. The result is that Shakespeare's John is a rather cold character who becomes more distasteful simply because he is a figurehead of evil, who methodically goes through the motions of political chess without ever understanding his own inadequacy both as a man and as a king.[15] In The Reign John is certainly no more likeable than Shakespeare's king; however, as the central figure of the play, he at least derives some measure of sympathy by virtue of his suffering. Martyrs must suffer and John is indeed a martyr for the cause of England; as such this portrayal of King John is able to achieve emotional rapport between king and audience which is totally lacking in Shakespeare's play.

This essential difference between the two plays is pointed out by John Dover Wilson in his New Cambridge

---

[15]Richmond notes (pp. 100-3) that one of the reasons why Shakespeare's John generates an ambivalent response is because we dislike him as a person, yet are forced to recognize the substantial fact of his kingship, and in his situation, "neither the very bad nor the very good appears clearly."

edition of King John
the hero, whereas i
rights in the crown
John of The Reign
hale's Kynge Johan
his people to the
at the hand of a p
he suggests that
ical problems, he
who likens himsel
great king who l
finds nothing ei
speare's John, w
(lix.) is portra
essential diffe

In The
king (in the pr
"warlike chris
set himself ag
position throu
intention, nar
was grossly i

16 See
E. L. H., 33

edition of King John. He states that in The Reign John is the hero, whereas in King John "he is an usurper with no rights in the crown at all" (xliv.). He observes that John of The Reign is not completely like the hero of John Bale's Kynge Johan, "a Moses of the reformation who leads his people to the frontiers of the promised land, and dies at the hand of a poisoner, before he enters it" (lix.). He suggests that even though John has both moral and political problems, he dies "a repentant sinner and a martyr," who likens himself to David of the Old Testament, a once great king who likewise failed the Lord. Wilson, however, finds nothing either edifying or admirable about Shakespeare's John, who "far from being the hero of the play" (lix.) is portrayed as a murderer.[16] Herein lies the essential difference between the two Kings.

In The Reign John is established, from the beginning (in the preface "To the Gentlemen Readers"), as the "warlike christian," who "for Christ's true faith . . . set himself against the man of Rome." John's primary position throughout the play accurately defines the author's intention, namely, to show John not so much as a king who was grossly incapable of ruling England (as we see in

---

[16]See John Sibly, "The Anomalous Case of King John," E. L. H., 33 (1966), pp. 418-21.

Shakespeare's play

able dimension as

establish a preced

To begin,

Chatillion, the F

weak; whereas in

John in France's

as "borrowed," t

later in the pla

reply to the Bas

cated by the no

departs, Eliano

possession" rat

maintains him

on the other h

in I.ii., Arth

land, realisti

Crowne is muc

present vanta

in his Brothe

raigne." The

implying tha

Arthur's, wh

of John's k

Shakespeare's play), but rather to give him a more favorable dimension as the first king to boldly defy Rome, and establish a precedent for Henry VIII.

To begin, there is in The Reign no accusation by Chattilion, the French ambassador, that John's title is weak; whereas in King John Chattilion immediately greets John in France's name, and then addresses John's majesty as "borrowed," to which accusation John does not reply. Later in the play (IV.ii.161ff.) he also fails to make reply to the Bastard's statement that John has been implicated by the nobles in Arthur's death. After Chattilion departs, Elianor then reminds John that it is his "strong possession" rather than his "right" to the throne which maintains him as king (I.i.40). The author of The Reign, on the other hand, tries to strengthen John's title. For in I.ii., Arthur, claiming the right to the throne of England, realistically observes: "Ah Mother possession of a Crowne is much,/And John as I have heard reported of,/For present vantage would adventure farre./The world can witnes in his Brother's time,/He tooke upon him rule and almost raigne." The Reign's author follows the chronicles by implying that John's right to the crown was as strong as Arthur's, whereas Shakespeare emphasizes the illegality of John's kingship.

John's def

in which the two k

hands of the autho

Philip, King of Fr

of John's niece B

John's defiance o

to enlist Philip

The Reign the Fr

(it takes only t

unmitigated betr

tility of the fo

sking more symp

other hand, por

rity and loyalt

glances, he pl

France and Engl

intention of h

stubborn pers

only because

Resentful of

easier to bre

speare's con

betrayal, so

from the who

John's defiance of Pandulph is the next episode in which the two kings receive different treatment at the hands of the authors. Prior to this incident, John and Philip, King of France, consolidated a pact by the marriage of John's niece Blanche to Lewis, the Dauphin. However, John's defiance of Rome is then shrewdly used by Pandulph to enlist Philip as the Church's ally against John. In The Reign the French king thinks nothing of betraying John (it takes only three short lines--I.v.111ff.). What this unmitigated betrayal does, however, is reinforce the hostility of the forces crushing down on John, thereby generating more sympathy for his cause. Shakespeare, on the other hand, portrays Philip of France as having more integrity and loyalty. When Pandulph urges him to change allegiances, he pleads with Pandulph to honor the truce between France and England (II.i.150). Philip reconfirms his every intention of honoring the truce made with John, and, after stubborn persistance (thirty lines) he finally relents, only because his primary allegiance is to the Church. Resentful of the whole business, he tells John that it is easier to break a truce than his faith (III.i.188). Shakespeare's conceptualization of this scene mitigates Philip's betrayal, so that John gathers up very little sympathy from the whole affair.

After th

enerates a more

brings his ruin.

isposed of, he

rown, he summo

hat is at once

annot simply

tries to appea

rders are mor

For on his li

I.ix.31-3) Sh

as his comman

ants Arthur

K. J

Hul

K.

Hu

K.

Hu

K.

As Profes

After this incident in The Reign John's paranoia generates a more perplexing situation which eventually brings his ruin. Sensing that until prince Arthur is disposed of, he will be unable to keep control over the crown, he summons Hubert de Burgh and issues a command that is at once ambiguous and restrictive. Since he cannot simply give a command to have Arthur murdered, he tries to appease his conscience, with the result that his orders are morally cautious: "Hubert, keepe him safe,/ For on his life doth hang thy Soveraignes blisse" (T. R. I.ix.31-3) Shakespeare's John, however is blatantly guilty, as his command implies no moral scruples whatever; he wants Arthur dead.

K. John. . . . Good Hubert, Hubert,
Hubert, throw thine eye
On yon young boy; I'll tell
thee what, my friend,
He is a very serpent in my way;
And wheresoe'er this foot of
mine doth tread,
He lies before me: dost thou
understand me?
Thou art his keeper.
Hub. And I'll keep him so
That he shall not offend your
majesty.
K. John. Death.
Hub. My Lord?
K. John. A grave.
Hub. He shall not live.
K. John. Enough (K. J. III.ii.69-80).

As Professor Honigmann notes, both Johns mean the same

thing;[17] however,
because of his mor
John is a villain
of his charge.

The next
portrayal of John
King John, IV.ii
in the face of e
John wants to be
tries to set the
enumerating the
Rome and the Po
conscious as it
symbolically,
cally. The no
John delivers
surface his re
as a show of
in Shakespear
King, however
he feels no
no outward a
Reign. Shak

[17]Hor

thing;[17] however, John in The Reign appears less guilty because of his moral apprehensiveness, whereas Shakespeare's John is a villain because of the unscrupulous directness of his charge.

The next scene in which we find variations in the portrayal of John occurs in The Reign, I.xiii and in King John, IV.ii. To consolidate the loyalty of his nobles in the face of expected countermeasures by Rome and France, John wants to be re-invested as king. In The Reign John tries to set the stage for the acceptance of his idea by enumerating the ways in which he has severed relations with Rome and the Pope. But his speech is nervously self-conscious as it reinforces the necessity to free England symbolically, since she has already been set free physically. The nobles assent to the coronation, after which John delivers another long speech which brings to the surface his real motives for this second coronation, namely, as a show of strength against Arthur. The parallel scene in Shakespeare (IV.ii.1ff.) reveals a much more confident king, however. Scene ii opens with John already recrowned; he feels no compulsion to justify the action and manifests no outward anxiety nor the fears which plague John in The Reign. Shakespeare's John is much more of a political

---

[17]Honigmann, King John, p. 169.

aricature; he has
swiftness and mere
them reasons for
implies that his
reason" once he r
sists in wearing
coolly and unscr
title. In The F
the audience, fo
he is not certa
of Arthur.

In The
from Hubert tha
ing (I.xiii.20
"then with him
left alone af
fragmentation
John desperat
by transferr
in this game
nent, and th
John also t
the rationa
anyway (lin

caricature; he has consolidated his title with calculated swiftness and merely reminds his nobles that he has given them reasons for this second coronation (40-42), and then implies that his re-investiture will have its "better reason" once he receives news of Arthur's death. He persists in wearing the unflinching mask of expedience as he coolly and unscrupulously works to preserve his unstable title. In The Reign, however, John is not so removed from the audience, for he does show inner anxieties, and further, he is not certain whether he can accept the potential murder of Arthur.

In The Reign John is next seen receiving the news from Hubert that Arthur died as a consequence of the blinding (I.xiii.207ff.). Seemingly untouched, John declares: "Then with him dye my cares" (line 215); however, when left alone after the departure of his angered nobles, the fragmentation of his conscience becomes very apparent. John desperately tries to avoid individual responsibility by transferring the blame to the devil, as he swears that in this game of cards the devil is unmistakably his opponent, and that luck will not be with him (lines 238-9). John also tries to jettison some of his guilt feelings with the rationalization that Arthur had been guilty of treason anyway (line 240). Realizing, however, that Arthur's death

has not freed him
even greater evil
John laments his
will, his birthda
Again, this sequ
as a very comple
for he pathetica
both his own sp
ical situation.
the audience's
to his essentia
direct culpabi
play. In IV.i
and strongly i
coldly and fla
There is no s
John's admiss
criminal admi
murder and h
enhance his
Shak
he then tri
Hubert; in
(Hubert) wh
him out as

has not freed him, but instead, that it has created an even greater evil, namely, the rebellion of his nobles, John laments his wrong doing, and curses his crown, his will, his birthday, and his mother's womb in that order. Again, this sequence of events adds to John's portrayal as a very complex, but at the same time, very human king, for he pathetically demonstrates his inability to fight both his own spiritual weakness and the paradoxical political situation. The Reign's author has deftly transferred the audience's attention from John's specific moral guilt to his essential human weakness; thus John escapes the direct culpability borne by his counterpart in Shakespeare's play. In IV.ii. of King John when the nobles taunt John and strongly implicate him in the death of Arthur, he states coldly and flatly: "They burn in indignation./I repent:/ There is no sure foundation set on blood" (IV.ii.103-4). John's admission is clear cut and dispassionate; he is the criminal admitting his guilt. He had calculated Arthur's murder and his glib confession of guilt only serves to enhance his villainous stature.

Shakespeare's John becomes even more distasteful as he then tries to shift the blame for Arthur's death onto Hubert; in cowardly fashion he tells Hubert that it was he (Hubert) who prompted the murder because nature had marked him out as a murderer:

John.

Both the audi
direct commar
three lines
the favor.
his share of
He rebukes
deed, and a
(T. B., I.xi
that Huber
In
nobles is
guilty co
sympathy
nobles to
recourse
sively p
more pat
there./

John. This murther had not come into my
mind;
But taking note of thy abhorr'd
aspect,
Finding thee fit for bloody
villainy,
Apt, liable to be employ'd in
danger,
I faintly broke with thee of
Arthur's death . . .
(IV.ii.223-7).

Both the audience and Hubert know that John had given a direct command to murder Arthur, but now he takes forty-three lines to try to indict the very man who had done him the favor. In The Reign, John does not try to alleviate his share of the guilt by making a scape-goat out of Hubert. He rebukes him briefly for having gone through with the deed, and angrily calls him a "dull conceipted peasant" (T. R., I.xiii.264), but not once does John so much as imply that Hubert must bear the burden of the guilt.

In The Reign (II.ii.) John's alienation from his nobles is strongly emphasized, but theirs is plainly the guilty course. Again the character of John strains for sympathy as he observes that Fortune is permitting these nobles to commit such a traitorous act (line 74). Having recourse to no external nor internal powers, John impulsively petitions Hell for aid, thereby reducing himself to more pathetic status: "Then Hell for me, if any power be there./Forsake that place, and guide me step by step,/To

poison, strangle,

(II.ii.98-101).

John to "avoid th

of Heaven. This

apologizes to Fa

his sins that no

of the repentant

Shakespeare's J

wrongs." John'

well as mental,

he rejoins huma

speare avoids

tion is to gra

the audience's

In Th

is again purp

back the nobl

France has a

John reluct

relinquishi

act would h

John's mann

cowardly.18

18See

feeling th

was disgra

such senti

poison, strangle, murder in their steps/These traitors" (II.ii.98-101). The Bastard, for the first time, advises John to "avoid these curses," and to seek instead the aid of Heaven. This brings John back momentarily, for he apologizes to Faulconbridge, and then confesses that it is his sins that now make England "miserable." In the mold of the repentant sinner (a guise that we never find on Shakespeare's John) he vows to "amend and right the people's wrongs." John's anguish has been intensely physical as well as mental, and it is by admitting his weakness that he rejoins humanity and resolves to make amends. Shakespeare avoids any such portrayal with John, for his intention is to gradually move John farther and farther from the audience's sympathy.

In The Reign (II.ii.176ff.) John's apparent guilt is again purposely mitigated. Having been unable to win back the nobles who had deserted him, and realizing that France has already taken the coastal territory of England, John reluctantly sends for Pandulph for the purpose of relinquishing his sovereignty to Rome. Even though the act would have appeared distasteful to Tudor audiences, John's manner here is what makes the surrender seem less cowardly.[18] He dissembles with Pandulph, fakes his sorrow

---

[18]See Warren, p. 210: "A generation later there was a feeling that John's submission of the kingdom to the papacy was disgraceful . . . . In John's own time there was no such sentiment."

and repentance
that he is sin
such inclinati
verge of cance
to Pandulph,
that the Fren
mental anguis
ible sufferi
can. Shakes
in this mann
of the Pope
out. John
standards.
the crown t
Pandulph to
makes no fu
ception of
purposeful
As M. M.
is careful
by desper
expedienc

and repentance for having defied Rome, convinces Pandulph that he is sincere; then privately scolds himself for having such inclinations, and momentarily appears to be on the verge of cancelling the whole plan. John finally gives in to Pandulph, however, when a messenger arrives with the news that the French fleet has landed in Kent. Again, John's mental anguish produces uncontrollable vacillation and visible suffering by which he achieves what little sympathy he can. Shakespeare, on the other hand, does not treat John in this manner (V.i.1ff.). John's decision to become vassal of the Pope is politically motivated and swiftly carried out. John displays no remorse or sense of betrayal of his standards. Act V opens directly with John's giving over the crown to Pandulph and receiving it back; he then urges Pandulph to confront the French in England's behalf, and makes no further reference to the deed. Shakespeare's conception of the action is more dramatic, granted, but it purposefully reinforces John's unmitigated use of policy. As M. M. Reese says of John's surrender: "Shakespeare . . . is careful to insist that surrender was not forced on John by desperate necessity . . . It is a deliberate act of expediency."[19]

---

[19]Reese, p. 274.

The f

the two Kings

In The Reign

Sorely weake

rebellion of

Was
The
As

He undersco

even "deat

Bastard an

English ar

death (vi

poisoned

sent John

after dr

from his

calling

Abbot a

theme h

by the

curse t

spends

He aga

'plag

The final conceptual difference in the depiction of the two Kings is evident in the manner in which each dies. In The Reign John dies a prolonged yet very human death. Sorely weakened by fever, and bitterly disheartened by the rebellion of his nobles, John laments:

> Was ever any so unfortunate,
> The right idea of a cursed man,
> As I, poor I, a triumph for despite?
> (II.vi.56-8).

He underscores his imminent death with the admission that even "death scorns so vile a prey" (II.vi.8), and when the Bastard announces news of the debacle which befell the English army at the Wellstream, John bitterly wishes for death (vi.54-55). Then in scene viii John is deceptively poisoned by a monk; however, the following lines then present John in a curiously pathetic manner. Immediately after drinking the poison, John warns Philip not to drink from his cup; he then makes a short slur on the monk by calling him a "Devill," whereupon the Bastard labels the Abbot a devil also. This reinforces the highly significant theme here, namely, that John and England had been defeated by the wiles of Rome. John, however, does not continue to curse the monks, or the abbey, or even Rome. Instead he spends his final moments in vituperative self-reflection. He again acknowledges his sins and calls the poison a "plague" inflicted on him for his sins (lines 65-5). He

finally sl

whispering

from heave

be damn'd

believing

confessio

quality)

that he

then, ux

to heave

had bee

himself

duce "

in ful

separa

(line

his n

of J

the

thro

whi

att

a

to

finally slips into delirium and stammers that the devil is whispering in his ear advising him not to hope for grace from heaven. John confesses to the Bastard that he "must be damn'd for Arthur's sudden death" (line 76), and, believing that his sins are too great to be forgiven (a confession which gives John's anguish a more pathetic quality), he laments that he was not killed in battle so that he could have been spared such a shameful death. But then, urged suddenly to call on God, John raises his voice to heaven as he likens himself to the prophet David, who had been unable to "build the Lord a house." He consoles himself with the notion that his stock will someday produce "a kingly branch" (Henry VIII) that will accomplish in full what John succeeded only partly in doing, total separation with Rome. After some more preliminaries (lines 58-153), John, raising his hand in forgiveness of his nobles, dies.

In Shakespeare's play only the brief announcement of John's poisoning is dramatized (V.vii.28ff.), and then the scene switches to Swinstead Abbey where John, in the throes of death, makes four very short speeches, all of which are image-ridden with references to his soul's attempts to leave the body. When he says that there is a hell within him (line 46), John is not only referring to the internal heat caused by the poison, but also to

the hell cau
though, is v
sympathy. A
mental vert
condition:
module of c
John dies c
England; re
giving his
remote dea
hand of e

I

cited in
ferent fo
away the
John's i
obscures
ondary
mistic
as an u
brings
charac
nor is
Though
spear

the hell caused by his sins. The reference to his guilt, though, is very slight so as not to draw upon the audience's sympathy. And where The Reign actually portrays John's mental vertigo, Shakespeare's John merely mentions the condition: "And then all this thou seest is but a clod/And module of confounded royalty" (V.vii.57-8). Shakespeare's John dies quickly, promising nothing for the future of England; nor is he allotted the favorable gesture of forgiving his rebellious nobles. Shakespeare's John dies a remote death, the main emphasis of which is the relentless hand of eternal justice, striking down a wicked king.

In the above scene, as in the numerous instances cited in this section, Shakespeare achieves a sharply different focus than his counterpart in The Reign. He pares away the secondary virtues of The Reign's John (mainly, John's introspection and his debilitating mental condition), obscures John's fight with Rome, or at least makes it secondary to the real plot, and casts John in a darkly pessimistic shadow. For Shakespeare's John is beyond redemption; as an usurper he is destined for destruction, and Shakespeare brings this off without ever producing sympathy for his character. John of The Reign, however, is not an usurper, nor is he characterized as the tyrant that he calls himself. Though his portrayal is not nearly so compact as Shakespeare's John, his essential weakness is used to cover over

the futility
effort to red
struggle agai
in vain. The
alluded to i
certain role
authors. It
Honigmann's
Shakespeare
omits what
John and el
trays as o
strongly i
bored play
different

the futility of his reign. The Reign's author makes every effort to reduce John's guilt by emphasizing his brave struggle against Rome, so that in the end his death is not in vain. The various differences in characterization alluded to in this chapter point sharply to the fact that certain roles were conceived quite independently by the authors. It is therefore impossible to accept Professor Honigmann's theory that The Reign is a derivative text of Shakespeare's King John, for The Reign in most cases, omits what is essential to Shakespeare's conception of John and elaborates on situations that Shakespeare portrays as only incidental. These differences, in short, strongly imply that Shakespeare took a dramatically belabored play and totally re-wrote it, telling a slightly different story with a very different impact.

There

in relation t

and the natur

Stability of

the main poi

somewhere or

erate skept

foul-papers

copy manusc

and the se

Chapter Fo

logical to

prompt bo

papers[2] (

Text (Un

unpublis
p. 90)
teristi
prompt-

VI. PRINTER'S COPY

There have been long-standing differences of opinion in relation to the transmission of Elizabethan play texts and the nature of the printer's copy. In his book The Stability of Shakespeare's Text E. A. J. Honigmann capsulizes the main points of view on this subject, and himself ends up somewhere on the side of Fredson Bowers, who advises "moderate skepticism" in accepting the established tests for foul-papers copy, on the basis that an "intermediate fair copy manuscript" must have existed between the foul papers and the second fair copy.[1] Since we have already shown in Chapter Four that The Reign is not a "bad quarto," it is logical to suppose that the printer's copy was either the prompt book (or a transcript thereof), the author's foul papers[2] (or a transcript), or a fair copy. Fredson Bowers

---

[1]E. A. J. Honigmann, The Stability of Shakespeare's Text (University of Nebraska Press, 1965), p. 21.

[2]Gerald M. Pinciss (The Queen's Men 1583-1592, unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1967, p. 90) notes that the text of The Reign "displays characteristics of those quartos which combine foul papers and prompt-book."

summarizes sever

since my views

choose to quote

> If an a
> retaine
> them, a
> was di
> manusc
> to be
> book u
> for wh
> of evi
> foul p
> the fa
> serve
> trans
> graph
> marke
> notes
> be gi
> hand
> foul
> scri
> foul
> copy
> made
> tra
> cou
> if
> unl
> ins
> scr
> use
> to
> co
> tr

3

Elizabetha

1955), p.

summarizes several alternatives clearly and directly, and since my views would mainly be an echo of his words, I choose to quote him at length.

> If an author submitted a fair copy and retained his foul sheets, even destroying them, and if this fair copy, as rarely, was directly made into the prompt, any manuscript given to the printer would need to be a scribal transcript of the prompt book unless we are to assume something for which we have not the slightest scrap of evidence, that the company required the foul papers to be turned over along with the fair copy. However, if the fair copy served only as the basis for the final transcript of the prompt book, this autograph fair copy sometimes, but not always, marked with the censor's and prompter's notes, would be preserved and hence could be given to the printer. On the other hand, if the author turned over only his foul papers, and if the company transcribed these directly into prompt, the foul papers would become the printer's copy. Of else, if a scribal fair copy was made of the foul papers, and a prompt book transcribed from this, the printer's copy could have been the original foul papers, if these were preserved (as would seem unlikely in ordinary circumstances), or instead, and rather more probably, the scribal fair copy which was no longer of use except as insurance against accident to the prompt book. In both cases, of course, the prompt book itself might be transcribed for the printer.[3]

---

[3]Fredson Bowers, On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists (University of Pennsylvania Library, 1955), p. 23.

To be

McNerrow list

that the prom

to actors to

required for

time of entr

the scene, h

the audienc

as a gloss;

none of the

total of tw

could be c

noted at l

teen entri

before tha

Since not

would see

Part I

are two

also omi

the exit

Printer

XII (19

To begin with the alternative of prompt copy, McKerrow lists the following peculiarities as evidence that the prompt-book was printer's copy: 1) warnings to actors to be ready for entry, or of properties required for later use; 2) properties noted at the time of entry which the character will require later in the scene, but either must not or need not exhibit to the audience at the time of entry; 3) actors' names as a gloss; 4) anticipatory entries. Q_1 exhibits none of the above signs of theatrical origin.[4] Of the total of twenty-seven entries in the play, only eleven could be considered as "timed," i.e., the entrance is noted at least one line before the actor speaks. Fourteen entries are simultaneous, i.e., noted immediately before the actor's speech, and three entries are late. Since not even half of the entries are "timed," this would seem to eliminate the probability of prompt copy. Part I fails to note entries at A4r and C2r, and there are two entries for Constance on E3v and E4r; Part II also omits two entries (D3r and B1r). Nearly half of the exits are omitted from the play.

---

[4]Paraphrased from R. B. McKerrow, "The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts," Library, 4th series, XII (1932), pp. 271-2.

Since th

prompt-copy for

possibilities, r

main difficulty

encumbered the

Bowers, for exa

authorial fair

as uniform as

ratus such as

He further not

tain vague ass

directions.[7]

copy that was

for the eyes

the author wo

his text. I

"fair copy"

and actors h

authorial ha

demands of

was writing

[5]S

Editing in

[6]S

[7]I

Since the evidence rules out the possibility of prompt-copy for Q1, we now must consider the other two possibilities, namely, foul papers or fair copy. The main difficulty here, however, is that the critics have encumbered the subject with inconsistent terminology.[5] Bowers, for example, cautions against believing that "an authorial fair copy expressing final intention could be as uniform as a prompt book in regularizing of the apparatus such as speech prefixes and stage directions."[6] He further notes that the final copy was liable to contain vague assignment of speeches and permissive stage directions.[7] Since we are presumably dealing here with copy that was initially intended for the theater and not for the eyes of readers, we probably should suspect that the author would have been less methodical in regularizing his text. It is also important to note that the term "fair copy" as used in transactions between dramatists and actors had different shades of meaning depending on authorial habit, time allotted for composition, and the demands of the theatrical company for which the author was writing.

---

[5]See J. C. Maxwell's review of Bower's book On Editing in R. E. S., VIII (1957), p. 294.

[6]See Bowers, On Editing, p. 127.

[7]Ibid.

By "foul

'rough drafts."

uses the term t

in a shape sati

a fair copy."[8]

tion is not ri

are already, i

this to be a v

has suggested

useful at all

much interlin

leaves, with

printed from

too is a val

For our disc

to include a

regardless

position of

scribe.

In

Kirschbaum

8

9

10

subject.

By "foul papers" some experts mean the author's "rough drafts." Fredson Bowers is more specific when he uses the term to mean " . . . the last completed draft in a shape satisfactory to [the author] for transfer to a fair copy."[8] But Honigmann suggests that this distinction is not rigorous enough since Bower's "foul papers are already, in part at least, a fair copy,"[9] and we find this to be a valid objection. Professor George R. Price has suggested that if the term "foul papers" is to be useful at all, it should be taken to mean a copy with much interlineation, with marginal additions, even added leaves, with passages struck out,[10] so that an edition printed from such copy would reflect this revision. This too is a valid guideline which deserves consideration. For our discussion, however, we extend Bower's definition to include all rough drafts, even the final revised copy, regardless of its state, which would have preceded composition of the fair copy, either by the author or by a scribe.

In his book Shakespeare and the Stationers Leo Kirschbaum lists the most commonly suspected features of

---

[8]Ibid.

[9]Honigmann, The Stability, p. 18.

[10]Taken from Professor Price's notes to me on this subject.

"foul papers,"
speech prefix
is incorrectl
afterthoughts
positor coul
He also note
two or three
hand.[11] It
degree, all
scribal fai
the scribe
mind the p
varied fro
we will at
foul paper
transcrib
from a pr
Chapter
the copy
mind, of
original

---

pp. 158

The Rei
scribe

"foul papers," namely, variation in stage directions and speech prefixes, and revision as evidenced by verse which is incorrectly lined, due to the author's having written afterthoughts in the margin "in such a way that the compositor could not recognize line beginnings and endings." He also notes that "permissive directions" (e.g., "Enter two or three," etc.) are frequently signs of the author's hand.[11] It should be mentioned at this point that, to a degree, all of the above features could appear in a scribal fair copy, depending on the degree of care that the scribe used in regularizing the text. Keeping in mind the probability that characteristics of foul papers varied from author to author and even from play to play, we will attempt to show that the copy for Q1 was probably foul papers in a final, revised form, which may have been transcribed for the press.[12] If,however, Q1 was set up from a previously printed copy (as we conjecture in Chapter Seven), then the above hypothesis pertains to the copy for that previously printed edition, keeping in mind, of course, that we are one step removed from the original.

---

[11]Leo Kirschbaum, Shakespeare and the Stationers, pp. 158-60.

[12]Gerald M. Pinciss (The Queen's Men) feels that The Reign bears signs that "the manuscript had been transcribed by the book-keeper to serve as prompt-copy" (p. 103).

Profes
Kenigmann edi
1956, pp. 297
refers to as
attributed to
speech ascri
four entries
and most imp
text. One
copy, whoev
copy should
the names
the parent
play (the
in Part II
successive
obvious
Eleanor a
foreign
The gene
speech h
sixteen
occurs
bridge
speech

Professor T. M. Parrott, in his review of the Honigmann edition of King John (in J. E. G. P., vol. 55, 1956, pp. 297-305) suggests that many of what Honigmann refers to as "bad Quarto features" in The Reign can be attributed to foul papers (p. 302). To begin with, seven speech ascriptions are omitted in Part II of The Reign. Four entries are also omitted from the play, the first and most important of which occurs on the third page of text. One would suspect that if Q1 was printed from fair copy, whoever had been responsible for making the fair copy should have supplied this omission. For it involves the names of the Faulconbridges, the main characters of the parentage dispute, which is the longest scene in the play (the other omitted entries are at C2r, and D3r, B1r in Part II). We also find two entries for Constance on successive pages in Part I., E3v and E4r. There are very obvious variations in speech heads for King John, Queen Eleanor and Pandulph; however, these are not necessarily foreign to the fair copy, as Bowers indicates (see above). The generic label "Bastard" is used interchangeably as a speech head with "Philip." In Part I we find "Philip" sixteen times thru page B4v; then the title "Bastard" occurs fifteen times thru E3v. Then on D4r both Faulconbridge and the French King are named "Philip" in the speech ascriptions. Thru page G1r we find "Philip," and

then "Bastard

found in Part

which the nat

original MS,

uniform is m

of fair copy

accepted to

this featur

Bot

labelled th

following

as evidenc

En

B

F

These st

would ha

identifi

papers,

There i

apeare

then "Bastard" four more times. The same variation is found in Part Two. Now, McKerrow advises that "a play in which the names are irregular, was printed from the author's original MS, and . . . one in which they are regular and uniform is more likely to have been printed from some sort of fair copy."[13] Since this opinion is not overwhelmingly accepted today, however, we cannot place full confidence in this feature of "foul-papers."

Both Sir Walter Greg and Professor Honigmann have labelled the text of The Reign as foul. Greg cites the following three entries (which Honigmann calls "permissive") as evidence:

> Enter Peter a Prophet with people (I.xi.110).
>
> Enter King John with two or three and the Prophet (II.xii.110).
>
> Enter K. John, Bastard, Pandulph, and many priests with them (II.iv.1).[14]

These stage directions no doubt reflect the author, who would have been more or less unconcerned about the specific identification of minor characters, not only in his foul papers, but also in his fair copy, if one had been made. There is a likelihood, then, as Bowers has noted, that

---

[13]R. B. McKerrow, "A Suggestion Regarding Shakeapeare's Manuscripts," R. E. S., XI (1935), p. 464.

[14]Cf. Honigmann, King John, p. 175, note 1.

permissive di

author's "fin

copy.

We a

been incorre

infrequently

110 reads:

iniustly do

of this lin

a complete

ble explan

positor mi

and simply

or, the ve

margin ne

to distin

as prose

play (on

have bee

writing

was unal

sible e

faulty

ever,

permissive directions like the above could occur in the author's "final copy," and would also show up in his fair copy.

We also find five instances where the verse has been incorrectly lined, a feature that should only occur infrequently in a fair copy. In Part II, on C1v, line 110 reads: "With you to make a colour to your crime iniustly do impute to his default." Now the second part of this line which begins "iniustly," etc., is obviously a complete line of verse by itself. There are two possible explanations for this mislineation; either the compositor missed the line the first time through the page, and simply went back and added it to the previous line; or, the verse may have been hastily rewritten in the margin next to line 110 so that the compositor was unable to distinguish two separate lines. We find verse printed as prose in four separate speeches near the end of the play (on pages D4v and E1r of Part II). This also could have been caused by the author's revision or by his writing of the lines in such a way that the compositor was unable to detect the presence of verse. Another possible explanation is that the compositors, because of faulty casting off, were forced to try to save space; however, in only one instance (on E1r) is a line of type made

up, so that we
rect lining of
We conj
The Reign was
we note both K
"established t
differentiate
two fairly obv
(see chapter
during a time
actor or acto
play or who
also possibl
sible for th
ings which m
to the scri
"Chattilion
of text; it
for "Hubert
Part Two,
"Newdigate
None of th

up, so that we suspect this was not reason for the incorrect lining of the verse.

We conjectured above that the printer's copy for The Reign was probably a transcript of foul papers, and we note both Kirschbaum's and Honigmann's caution that "established tests for foul papers will sometimes fail to differentiate foul papers from transcripts."[15] We find two fairly obvious instances of actor's interpolation (see chapter Four), which could have gotten into the text during a time when the copy was being read aloud by an actor or actors who had either taken part in the actual play or who had seen it performed several times. It is also possible, however, that the author himself was responsible for the interpolations. We also find several spellings which may have been caused by reading the copy aloud to the scribe. Note the following: "Shattilion" for "Chattilion" (this spelling occurs on the very first page of text; it may also have been compositorial); "Hughbert" for "Hubert" (this is found three times on page A4r of Part Two, but nowhere else in the play); "Nidigate" for "Newdigate;" "was" for "wakes" and "tree" for "three." None of the above represents the type of mishearing

---

[15]Cf. Honigmann, The Stability, p. 10.

associated with

well be the res

sections of the

the transcript

procedure if t

though the abo

convincing, th

In fact, much

foul papers c

Taken togethe

toward the pr

author's foul

transcribed

publisher.

16See

of mishearin

associated with memorial reconstruction,[16] but could very well be the result of mishearing by the scribe, who had sections of the play read to him periodically to speed up the transcription process. This would have been a likely procedure if there was pressure to complete the job. Even though the above evidence for transcription is not wholly convincing, the probability must at least be considered. In fact, much of what is presented above in support of foul papers copy admits the possibility of fair copy also. Taken together, however, the evidence points more heavily toward the probability that the printer's copy was the author's foul papers in a revised form that may have been transcribed in some haste in order to be sold to the publisher.

---

[16]See Hoppe, The Bad Quarto, p. 178ff., for examples of mishearings connected with memorial reconstruction.

The ea

without entry

1611 (Q2), an

descriptions

A Bibliograph

Only three c

Cambridge (T

Except for t

blurred page

quite good.

for the pre

The headlin

parts, "The

John" (rec

1Q

quent edit

title page

tions were

for adver

VII. THE TEXT

A. Early Editions

The earliest editions of The Reign were published without entry in the Stationers Register in 1591 (Q1), 1611 (Q2), and 1622 (Q3).[1] Complete bibliographical descriptions for all three editions are found in Greg's A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama, pp. 178-9. Only three copies of Q1 are extant: Trinity College Cambridge (TCC), the Huntington (Hunt.) and the Folger. Except for the Huntington copy, which has three heavily blurred pages (A4r, A4v, B1r), the printing of Q1 is quite good. The entire text is in black letter, except for the prefaces to both parts, which are in italic type. The headline is regular throughout and consists of two parts, "The troublesome Raigne" (versos), and "of King John" (rectos). One minor irregularity appears in Part I,

[1] Q1 was published anonymously, but the two subsequent editions attributed the play to Shakespeare on their title pages. The accepted opinion is that these attributions were strictly an attempt to use Shakespeare's name for advertisement.

on C3v, where t

(running title)

the result of

skeleton from

replacement.

(Part I), whe

Br and C2v (

ger's speech

speech is in

quite often

does not det

Punc

sive, and i

there also

which is f

in England

capitaliza

quent with

emphasis

Brother,

Countrey

nally in

(Oxford

on C3v, where the last three letters of the word "Raigne" (running title) are turned and inverted. This was probably the result of the letters falling out during transfer of skeleton from one form to another, and their careless replacement. Margins are consistent except at B1v and E1r (Part I), where one line is indented on each page, and at B4r and C2v (Part II) where the first line of the messenger's speech is marginally correct, but the rest of the speech is indented. Leading is used conservatively and quite often inconsistently in both parts; however, this does not detract from the appearance of the printed page.

Punctuation is generally careful and not excessive, and in addition to the regular question mark (?), there also appears another type of question mark (':) which is frequently found in Black letter books printed in England between 1580-1590.[2] In addition to regular capitalization for proper names (swash capitals are frequent with names in italic type), capitals are used for emphasis with many common nouns like: Father, Mother, Brother, Youth, Ladie, Bastard, Realm, Sonne, Sire, Countrey, Madame.

Stage directions (including entries) are normally in roman type, and where proper names occur within

---

[2]R. B. McKerrow, An Introduction To Bibliography (Oxford, 1928), p. 316.

the stage direc

ever, has two e

D2v and on E3r.

either flush wi

less between t

are set to coi

indented. Co

are used throu

uniformly set

margin; they

are in roman

Catchwords a

nally, and a

word include

Signatures

regular thr

Q1

suggest the

printed ed

signed A3r

signature

prelimina

the stage directions, they are in italics. Part II, however, has two entire stage directions in italic type on D2v and on E3r. Short stage directions (one line) are set either flush with the left margin or are centered more or less between the margins. Directions of two or more lines are set to coincide with the speech-head margin and are indented. Correct Latin and conventional end punctuation are used throughout. Speech heads are in italic and are uniformly set two to three spaces in from the left hand margin; they have no end punctuation generally. Exits are in roman type and have conventional end punctuation. Catchwords are set flush with the right hand margin normally, and are very concise. Only once does the catchword include more than one word (Part II, D4r, "Monk My"). Signatures are set in black letter generally, and are regular throughout.

Q1 exhibits three bibliographical features which suggest the possibility that it is a reprint of an earlier printed edition. The first page of text in both parts is signed A3r. McKerrow notes that whenever we find this signature sequence, we can be fairly certain that "the preliminaries, including the title page, were set up first."[3]

---

[3]Ibid., pp. 189-91.

It was customar
with the first
the title page
finished. Wit
the compositor
title pages a

A sec

of only two p
which occur
three copies
other correc
show up; hov
highly unus
seem to ind
thorough, c
usual, only
necessary.
more plaus
consist o
vice vers
punctuati
edition c
not only
a previo
composit

It was customary for the Elizabethan type-setter to begin with the first page of text and sign that page B1r, leaving the title page and preliminaries till the job was just about finished. With Q1 of The Reign, however, it seems as though the compositor was working from a copy which already had title pages and prologues.

A second peculiar feature of Q1 is the appearance of only two press corrections for the entire text, both of which occur in the same gathering (B) of Part I. With only three copies of Q1 extant, it is more than likely that other corrections were made during printing which do not show up; however, two variants in 2,936 lines of text is highly unusual, even with just three copies. This would seem to indicate either that the proofing was relentlessly thorough, or that the copy was a printed one, so that, as usual, only the minimum of proof-reading was considered necessary. We have evidence that the latter conclusion is more plausible from the mere twenty press errors, which consist of foul case, turned letters (mostly "u" for "n" and vice versa), single word repetition, and mistakes in end punctuation. What is significant here is that in a quarto edition of forty-eight leaves the typographical errors are not only minimal, but also unimportant. If the copy was a previously printed one, this would obviously justify the compositors' apparent slighting of proof-reading.

Finally

beforehand that

if thirty-six

find only six

text. Part I

and Part II ha

C1r, C4v); th

Now, if the c

printed copy,

casting off

off is the i

and below ir

the beginni

ple, the fi

are sandwic

below the

Throughout

always app

pages F2r

leading.

but incon

D4v, E1r,

tions in

ent use

was prob

Finally, there is evidence that the printer knew beforehand that the job would require only twelve sheets if thirty-six lines of type were used per page, for we find only six deviations from this pattern in the entire text. Part I has one page with thirty-five lines (G4r), and Part II has four thirty-five line pages (A3v, B3v, C3r, C4v); thirty-seven lines appear on page E2r (Pt.II). Now, if the compositor was not working from a previously printed copy, the only explanation for the above is faulty casting off of copy. Another sign that the copy was cast off is the inconsistent use of leading (spacing) above and below internal stage directions (stage directions at the beginning of scenes have normal leading). For example, the first five internal stage directions in Part I are sandwiched into the text with no leading above or below the direction (on pages A4r, B3v, C1v, C3v, C2r). Throughout the rest of Part I, however, some leading is always apparent with internal directions, except for pages F2r and G3v, which again show directions with no leading. The internal directions in Part II have adequate but inconsistent leading, except for pages B4v, D3v, D4r, D4v, E1r, E1v, where there is none. Now these few variations in the number of lines per page, and the inconsistent use of leading are conventional signs that the copy was probably cast off; however, we should then expect to

find additional
formes, for exa
consecutively c
heads to allow
neither of the
conclude, ther
Reign was not
copy was at l

Since
setting up of
some evidence
Reign. Howe
yields no ev
by formes.
consists of
versos. Th
forme shows
vice versa
This order
using only
tion sugge

4
"Notes on
library,
crossbars

find additional indications that the type was set by formes, for example, maybe two short speeches printed consecutively on one line, or abbreviation of speech heads to allow more space for the lines. However, neither of these features is evident in The Reign. We conclude, therefore, that if the 1591 edition of The Reign was not set up from a previously printed copy, the copy was at least cast off before type was set.

Since casting off copy was preliminary to the setting up of type by formes, one should expect to find some evidence of the latter in the running titles of The Reign. However, an examination of the running titles yields no evidence from which to infer that type was set by formes. Part I uses only one set of titles, which consists of two separate series for rectos and two for versos. The transfer of running titles from forme to forme shows the following order: inner B to outer B (or vice versa), inner C to outer C, etc. throughout Part I. This order implies consecutive printing on one press using only one skeleton.[4] This one-skeleton type operation suggests that type may not have been set by formes,

---

[4]The term skeleton, as used by Fredson Bowers in "Notes on Running Titles as Bibliographical Evidence," Library, 4th series, XIX (1938-39), 315, includes "the crossbars, furniture, and running titles of a forme."

since setting h

than one skelet

skeleton would

the whole volu

the outer form

In Pa

for both rect

that the two

cessively and

both inner a

with those f

stitution of

The transfer

B to outer

gatherings,

---

5 Se

bethan Prin

Society of

poses that

that "ther

time." Th

printers,

rently.

6

7

Part II i

tiaphy of

ment is n

appear in

much late

since setting by formes normally implies the use of more than one skeleton.[5] As Professor Bowers notes: "One skeleton would print the inner forme of each sheet in the whole volume, and the second would be used to perfect the outer formes, or vice versa."[6]

In Part II there is carryover of the two series for both recto and verso titles from Part I, indicating that the two parts of the play were probably printed successively and without much delay.[7] The running titles on both inner and outer formes of "B" and "D" seem identical with those found in Part I, except for the possible substitution of the capital letter "R" in the word "Raigne." The transfer of skeleton to forme always moves from inner B to outer B, etc., just as in Part I. The "C" and "E" gatherings, however, show a bit more irregularity in that

---

[5]See William H. Bond, "Casting Off Copy by Elizabethan Printers: A Theory," Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 42 (1948), 281-91. On p. 284 he proposes that the use of one set of headlines merely suggests that "there was never more than one forme imposed at a time." This is related to his theory that Elizabethan printers, in many cases, did not impose formes concurrently.

[6]Bowers, "Running Titles," p. 325.

[7]This would seem to invalidate Greg's opinion that Part II is bibliographically independent" (see A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama, p. 178). His statement is no doubt based on the fact that new signatures appear in Part II, which could mean that it was printed much later than Part I, or possibly even in another shop.

at least four r
and two in the
sents only a s
gathering shou
A more likely
set of four t
skeleton, for
"C" and "E."
the delay cau
skeleton fro
forme of the
operation ca
The Warres
and Cambise
have been a
speed up th
In
that there
is necessa
sible sig
mainly wi
the remai
produce e

at least four new letters appear, two in the verso titles and two in the rectos. It is unlikely that this represents only a substitution of letters, since the "D" gathering should also show these same substituted letters. A more likely explanation, however, may be that another set of four titles was put together along with a second skeleton, for machining the inner and outer formes of "C" and "E." Presumably, this would have saved some of the delay caused by the rinsing and transferring of the skeleton from the last forme of one sheet to the first forme of the next. Examples of this two-skeleton type of operation can be found in other plays of the same period: The Warres of Cyrus (1594), Promos and Cassandra (1578), and Cambises (no date).[8] The additional skeleton might have been an effort on the part of the compositors to speed up the printing of Part II.

In order to corroborate our earlier conjecture that there is no evidence that type was set by formes, it is necessary to examine compositorial practice for possible signs that one compositor concentrated his work mainly within certain formes, while another worked on the remaining formes. However, Part I not only fails to produce evidence that the compositors worked in this

---

[8]Bowers, "Running Titles," p. 324.

fashion, but al
ments for compo
peculiar about
all set in ita
capitals are f
with the regul
tion except f
Part I and se
however, coir
Nor
reveal consi
The name Phi
conbridge, t
as well. It
of those ar
viated (on
the line fr
is used as
deviation
variant sp
identifyin
for Queen
"Elianor"
both spel
D2v, D3r)

fashion, but also fails to produce positive page assignments for compositors. To begin with, there is nothing peculiar about the typography of speech heads. They are all set in italic type; all have italic capitals (swash capitals are frequent but appear to have been mixed in with the regular capitals), and there is no end punctuation except for the occurrence of a period four times in Part I and seven times in Part II. These divergencies, however, coincide with no other compositorial habits.

Nor does the spelling of speech heads in Part I reveal consistent differences in compositorial practice. The name Philip, for example, is used for Philip Faulconbridge, the Bastard, and for Philip, King of France, as well. It occurs fifty-six times in Part I; fifty-two of those are spelled "Philip," and only four are abbreviated (on pages B3r, B3v, C2r, F2r), mostly to prevent the line from running over. The generic name Bastard is used as a speech head nineteen times in Part I with no deviation in spelling. Even two names which do show variant spellings in Part I fail to provide any clues for identifying compositors. For example, the speech head for Queen Elianor appears as "Elinor" ten times and as "Elianor" twenty-five times. The foil happens to be that both spellings occur on six pages (A3r, A3v, B3r, C2v, D2v, D3r). Again, the speech ascription for the Earl of

Salisbury appe
bury" five tim
three differen
"Salisbury" ((
bury," "Elian
"Salsbury" an
not coincide
identify comp
In r
entries), th
include prop
This patter
where a dif
with, the e
the proper
except tha
"Penbrooke
Part I, it
only posi
work in p
V
direction
which th
left-han
short di

Salisbury appears as "Salsbury" three times and as "Salisbury" five times; both spellings appear on page A4r. On three different pages we find the spellings "Elianor" and "Salisbury" (C4v, D4r, E3r); on A3r the spellings "Salsbury," "Elianor," and "Elinor" occur; on page C2r we find "Salsbury" and "Elinor." These variations, however, do not coincide with any other habits which might serve to identify compositors.

In relation to stage directions (the term includes entries), they are normally in roman type, and where they include proper names, only the names are in italic type. This pattern is broken only once in Part I (page F4v) where a different compositor seems evident. To begin with, the entire direction is in roman type, including the proper names; this alone would not be so significant except that the name for the Earl of Pembroke is spelled "Penbrooke," whereas every other time the name is used in Part I, it is always spelled with an "m." This is the only positive sign that at least two compositors were at work in Part I.

Variation occurs in the setting up of short stage directions. Part I has seventeen one-line directions, of which the first nine (A3v to E2v) are set flush with the left-hand margin. Throughout the rest of the play these short directions are more or less centered to the right

of the speech

stances occur

formes, one i

dence for set

since no shor

formes, we ha

no basis for

to correlate

habits fails

in Part I a

left margin

are set thr

all indente

entries ar

In

in Part I,

have the

the case,

D4v and E

after the

ever, on

line as

On page

with the

out to

of the speech head margin. Now, since the first six instances occur on inner formes, and the last three on outer formes, one is tempted to suggest that this might be evidence for setting by formes. Unfortunately, however, since no short stage directions appear on the opposite formes, we have no possible means of comparison, and hence, no basis for this kind of conjecture. Even the attempt to correlate these discrepancies with other compositorial habits fails. There are fourteen longer stage directions in Part I and these are set either two spaces in from the left margin to coincide with the speech head margin, or are set three spaces from the left-hand margin. They are all indented and have correct end punctuation. Only two entries are omitted in Part I (on pages A4r and C2r).

In relation to exits, catchwords, and signatures in Part I, we find that exits are in proper Latin and have the correct end punctuation; roman type is normally the case, but two exits show up in italic type on pages D4v and E3r. These exits are normally set up immediately after the period and on the same line as the text. However, on pages A4r, E4r, and F4v they are set on the same line as the text, but flush with the right hand margin. On page F2v the exit is set underneath the line and flush with the right-hand margin, but only because the line runs out to the margin. Part I omits eight exits (A4r, C4r,

C4v, B2r, F3r,
these variatio
habits appear
they do not.

Catch
of just one w
Part I. On
the sentence
the speech h
inadvertentl
been the ca
on page C4r
for Bastard
italic, whi
With regard
letter and
signatures
pattern.
five signa
Part II h
explanati
B2r, the
italic ty
tently d
bility i

C4v, E2r, F3r, G1r, G2v, G3v). Again, it would seem that these variations should correspond to other compositorial habits appearing on the same pages, but, unforunately, they do not.

Catchwords are very concise and normally consist of just one word. There are only two irregularities in Part I. On page B2r the catchword is the first word of the sentence that begins the next page ("was"); however, the speech head "Robert" appears to have been omitted inadvertently by the compositor, where it should have been the catchword. There is an error in the use of type on page C4r where the catchword is "Ba-" (abbreviation for Bastard), but the abbreviation is in roman type, not italic, which is the customary type for speech heads. With regard to signatures, they are normally in black letter and are regular throughout. The set position of signatures varies somewhat, but not in any predictable pattern. One peculiarity, however, is the occurrence of five signatures in italic type (Part I, B2r, D2r, E2r; Part II has two, on pages A2r, and C3r). A possible explanation for this might be that, except in the case of B2r, the first word of each subsequent page required italic type, so that the compositor could have inadvertently drawn type from the same fount. Another possibility is that since the irregularity nearly always occurs

on the third p
taken place at
above peculia
fications can
ence of at le
on both inner
itor was inv
Beyond this,
ments for th
Part
than Part I
seven speec
spellings,
verse as p
(on D3r an
directions
the same v
of speech
speech he
positoria
A3r, A4r,
omission
possibly
The catc
speech

on the third page set, a change of compositors might have taken place at these pages. Again, however, none of the above peculiarities coincide so that some positive identifications can be made. The evidence points to the presence of at least two compositors who worked intermittently on both inner and outer formes. Possibly a third compositor was involved with F4v and much of the "F" gathering. Beyond this, we are unable to make specific page assignments for the compositors.

Part II contains more bibliographic peculiarities than Part I, and these consist mainly of the omission of seven speech heads, the repeated occurrence of two new spellings, "Penbrooke" and "Phillip," and the printing of verse as prose on D4v and E1r. Part II omits two entries (on D3r and B1r), the same number as Part I. The stage directions, exits, catchwords, and signatures all exhibit the same variety as in Part I. To return to the matter of speech heads, it would seem that the omission of seven speech heads in Part II should be some indicator of compositorial error (ommitted speech heads occur on pages A3r, A4r, B1r, B4r, B4v, C2v, C4v). However, that the omissions are due to foul copy and not the compositor, is possibly illustrated by an incorrect catchword on page C2r. The catchword, "The," is the first word of the messenger's speech on the next page (C2v), but the speech head

"Messenger" sh

however, it is

possible that

the speech hea

that no speec

used as catch

we conjecture

from this te

used by the

transcriptic

Rega

to the thre

on page A4r

Part II sho

ant spelli

Philip (16

(5). Bibl

of proper

iant spel

other com

---

itors di

See T. H

5th seri

into var

has prov

variatio

"Messenger" should have been the catchword for page C2r; however, it is omitted from the text on C2v. Now it is possible that the compositor, in haste, simply overlooked the speech head; however, the more likely explanation is that no speech head appeared in his copy, so that he simply used as catchword, the first word of the speech. In short, we conjecture that the above speech heads were omitted from this text because they did not appear in the copy used by the compositor, and that this was the result of transcription, or of hasty revision by the original author.

Regarding differences in spelling,[9] in addition to the three instances where Hubert is spelled "Hughbert" on page A4r (which probably occurred during transcription), Part II shows three proper names with consistently variant spellings: Pembrooke (8 instances) and Penbrooke (12); Philip (16) and Phillip (15); Salsbury (18) and Salisbury (5). Bibliographers concur that variation in the spelling of proper names is compositorial; however, since the variant spellings of the above names fail to cohere with any other compositorial signs, it is again impossible to make

---

[9]It is generally agreed that Elizabethan compositors did not always follow the spellings of the copy. See T. H. Hill, "Spelling and the Bibliographer," Library, 5th series, vol. XVIII (1963), 17-18. Our investigation into variant spellings of words other than proper names has proven fruitless. In most cases, there is not enough variation to be significant.

positive ident

different spe

page, we can,

spellings rep

since we hav

for the name

compositors

though both

ever, these

with other

identificat

pages are

"Penbr
"Pembr

"Phili
"Phill

First, it

be found

Also, bot

formes o

note tha

can be f

inner fo

main di

For exa

three t

positive identification of compositors. Since the two different spellings of "Pembroke" never appear on the same page, we can, with confidence, suppose that the two spellings represent two different compositors. Again, since we have so many instances of the variant spellings for the name Philip, we can assume that two different compositors are responsible for these variations, even though both spellings appear together on page D3r. However, these two sets of variant spellings do not correlate with other evidence which might provide compositorial identifications. The variant spellings and corresponding pages are listed below:

"Penbrooke":	A3v, B4r, B1v, C2v, C2r, E1r, E4v, E4r.
"Pembrooke":	A4v, B4v, C1v, C4v, D2v, D1v.
"Philip":	B1v, B2v, D1r, D1v, D3r, E3r, E4r, E4v.
"Phillip":	B4v, C4v, D34, D3v, E1v, E2r, E2v.

First, it should be noted that both forms of "Pembroke" can be found in the inner and outer formes of C gathering. Also, both spellings of the name Philip occur in both formes of the B, D, and E gatherings. Second, we should note that the variant spellings Salsbury-Salisbury also can be found in both formes of gathering C, and on the inner forme of E; however, these two spellings are the main disruptive element in trying to identify compositors. For example, the Pembroke-Salsbury combination appears three times (on pages A4v, C1v, D2v); but we also find

Pembroke-Salisbu

Salsbury appear

therefore conje

are not signifi

nts occur toge

Phillip on pag

only once on D

the Pembroke-I

based only on

on two differ

dence for su

Pembroke wit

By the same

compositor

Philip with

that some

which woul

elusive, lo

dence poi

tors (and

to settin

that "ne

conventi

("Dividi

Bibliogr

He refe

Pembroke-Salisbury on C4v and Div; then Penbrooke and Salsbury appear together on A3v, C2r, and E1r. We can therefore conjecture that the Salsbury-Salisbury variants are not significant. The Pembroke -Philip/Phillip variants occur together three times; we find Pembroke and Phillip on pages B4v and C4v, and Pembroke and Philip only once on D1v. There appears to be some link between the Pembroke-Phillip combination, but this conjecture is based only on the fact that the two names appear together on two different pages, B4v and C4v, and there is no evidence for supposing that the same compositor who spelled Pembroke with an "m" always spelled Phillip with two "ll's." By the same token, we find no evidence to assume that the compositor who spelled Penbrooke with an "n" always spelled Philip with one "l." We have not overlooked the possibility that some of the spellings were the result of the copy, which would make compositorial identification even more elusive.[10] Suffice it to say that the various bits of evidence point to the possibility that at least two compositors (and possibly three) worked in varying degrees in

---

[10]In regard to the matter of spelling as a clue to setting by formes Professor George R. Price points out that "neither this alone, nor in combination with [other conventional] tests really demonstrates setting by formes" ("Dividing the Copy for Michaelmas Term," Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, vol. 60, 1966), p. 332. He refers, however, only to Michaelmas Term.

Part II of Th

evidence of c

Part I and mo

signs that in

formes, make

QI of The Re

that the cop

1. In Twe
Number
fore t
Tonson

2. In Mis
viz. "
Shakes
The Me
Satyr
By th
Print
gate

3. In Vo
found
Famil
Henr

4. In V
ed.
of T

5. In
Ori
Joh
191
tex

Part II of The Reign. In conclusion, we suggest that the evidence of only one set of running titles being used for Part I and most of Part II, coupled with no demonstrable signs that individual compositors worked within certain formes, make it impossible to determine if the type for Q1 of The Reign was set by formes. We have shown, however, that the copy had at least been cast off.

B. Later Editions

1. In Twenty of the Plays of Shakespeare, Being the whole Number printed in Quarto During his Life -time, or before the Restoration, ed. George Steevens, London, for Tonson, Payne, and Richardson, 1760.

2. In Miscellaneous Pieces of Antient English Poesie, viz. The Troublesome Raigne of King John, Written by Shakespeare, Extant in no Edition of his Writings. The Metamorphosis of Pigmalion's Image, and certain Satyres. By John Marston. The Scourge of Villanie, By the same. All printed before the year 1600, Printed for Robert Horsefield, at the Crown in Ludgate Street, 1764.

3. In Vol. II of Six Old Plays on which Shakespeare founded his Measure for Measure, Comedy of Errors, Taming the Shrew, King John, K. Henry IV, and K. Henry V, King Lear, ed. J. Nichols, London, 1779.

4. In Vol. 14 of Collins' School and College Classics, ed. F. G. Fleay, London, 1878. Based on 1591 edition of T.R. Text is modernized and has notes and intro.

5. In The Troublesome Reign of King John': Being the Original of Shakespeare's 'Life and Death of King John,' eds. F. J. Furnivall and John Munro, London, 1913. Based on Fleay's edition. Contains modernized text and scene division. Appendix I has a table of

correspond
dix II ha
Textual n

6. In Vol. 1
Variorum
London, 1
of T.R. a
textual r

7. In Vol.
speare,
1591 edi
Very lit

Copy Text

Si

The Reign,

editions,

serve as

fest the

namely, s

indicatir

composed

repeated

their cc

the rem

II of Q

correspondences between The Reign and King John; Appendix II has a time analysis of The Reign by P. A. Daniel. Textual notes.

6. In Vol. 19 of The Life and Death of King John, A New Variorum Edition Shakespeare, ed. Horace Howard Furness, London, 1919. Contains mere reprint of 1591 edition of T.R. and short critical excerpts on the play. No textual notes.

7. In Vol. IV of Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, ed. Geoffrey Bullough, London, 1966. Reprints 1591 edition of The Reign with a lengthy introduction. Very little textual criticism and sparse textual notes.

C. The Present Edition

Copy Text

Since Q1 (1591) is the earliest extant edition of The Reign, and since Q2 (1611) and Q3 (1622) are reprint editions, the Trinity College Cambridge copy of Q1 will serve as copy text for this edition. Both Q2 and Q3 manifest the two general features of a reprint edition, namely, signing of the first page of text with A2 or A3, indicating that the preliminaries and title page had been composed previously; and the appearance of numerous errors repeated by the compositors of the later editions from their copy, the first.

The first page of text in Q2 is signed A2r, and the remaining signatures are consecutive through M1v. Part II of Q2 corresponds with Part II of Q1 line for line, and

the catchword

numerous erro

"fanzen frie

ently a turn

pen." Q2 re

stance, moth

entry, but

tion, "Ente

reprints (E

where the r

first speed

and in the

This same

84v of Q1,

"Lord Eust

Vescy is

between t

has an er

Lubber"

importan

likewise

on E2v

prints

(Pt. II

the mor

the catchwords are identical up to L4r. Q2 also reprints numerous errors from Q1. On E3v of Q1 we find the phrase "fanzen friers," where the first "n" of fanzen is apparently a turned letter and the word should have read "fauzen." Q2 reproduces "fanzen" (E2r). On E3v of Q1 Constance, mother of prince Arthur, is included in the group entry, but on the very next page (E4r) we find the direction, "Enter Constance alone," a duplication which Q2 also reprints (E2r). Q1 shows ambiguous speech heads on D4r, where the name Philip is used for two speeches. In the first speech the name refers to Faulconbridge, the Bastard, and in the next speech it is used for the king of France. This same ambiguity is found on D1v in Q2. In Part II, B4v of Q1, the list of defected nobles reads as follows: "Lord Eustace, Vescy, Lord Cressy," etc. Since Eustace Vescy is the full name, however, there should be no comma between the two. Q2 duplicates this error. Q1 likewise has an errant comma between the common epithet, "Abbey, Lubber" on E2r (Pt.II) which Q2 reproduces. Q1 omits an important speech head (Pandulph) on C4v (Pt. II) which Q2 likewise omits. Again, Q1 has "tree" instead of "three" on E2v (Pt. II) which Q2 fails to correct. Finally, Q1 prints three short verse speeches as prose on D4v and E1r (Pt. II) which Q2 fails to reset. Q2 does correct some of the more obvious mistakes in Q1; however, it reproduces

enough of sam

print of Q1.

only three co

for press co

tion. But e

only two pre

fallibility,

have not hi

made by Q2,

did he conf

typographic

stantive e

line repri

page. Q3

in Q2; but

by Q2, and

spellings

fore, tha

ial, and

authority

Textual

text of

enough of same to indicate that it is a word for word reprint of Q1. It can be objected that the existence of only three copies of Q1 drastically reduces the evidence for press corrections, and this indeed is a tenable objection. But even with just three copies, the appearance of only two press corrections comes very close to human infallibility, a trait for which Elizabethan compositors have not hitherto been known. Regarding the corrections made by Q2, if this was the original author at work, why did he confine his emendations to trivial features like typographical errors, while ignoring the majority of substantive errors? Q3 likewise appears to be a line for line reprint of Q2, as the catchwords correspond on every page. Q3 corrects some of the duplicate errors reprinted in Q2; but again, it reproduces typographical errors made by Q2, and it follows quite accurately the modernized spellings initiated by Q2. It is our conclusion, therefore, that the changes made in Q2 and in Q3 are not authorial, and hence their reprint variants have no claim to authority.

Textual Procedure

This edition of The Reign is offered as a critical text of the play, as derived from collation of the three

extant copie

also been co

this edition

tual notes,

each page,

ings of all

of later ed

these are a

punctuatio

tual notes

below the

off only h

placed at

direction

enclosed

additions

sance Dr.

to the l

0.1, for

rection

fers to

of the

lowing

places

and v

betwee

extant copies of Q1. One copy each of Q2 and Q3 has also been collated. Regarding general textual procedure, this edition follows Q1 as closely as possible. The textual notes, which appear above the line at the bottom of each page, record all substantive variants, and the readings of all quartos are cited. When suggested emendations of later editors (principally Fleay and Munro) are adopted, these are also noted. Variants of accidentals (spelling, punctuation, capitalization) are not recorded in the textual notes. Words cited in the glossarial notes appear below the line at the bottom of each page, and are set off only by a square bracket. Explanatory notes are placed at the end of the text. Additions to the stage directions are adapted from the Munro edition, and are enclosed in square brackets, as are all other editorial additions. Following the method of the Regents Renaissance Drama Series, stage directions are keyed decimally to the line before or after which they occur. A note on 0.1, for example, refers to the first line of a stage direction at the beginning of a scene. A note on 84.1, refers to the first line of the direction following line 84 of the text. Line numbers begin anew with each scene.

The old spellings are retained except for the following: speech heads are normalized throughout; "j" replaces "i," and long "s" is altered to round "s," and v is substituted for medial "u." Distinctions between italic and roman type are ignored. The

variant form

and the amper

omission of

lently expan

corrected.

changes have

eral princi

with a peri

independent

ated by a

cate inter

single spe

variant form of question mark (':) is regularized (?), and the ampersand and the bar over vowels to indicate omission of a following nasal consonant, have been silently expanded. Obvious errors in spacing have been corrected. Since the punctuation of Q1 is adequate, changes have been made only in accordance with two general principles: 1) individual speeches are always ended with a period, question mark, or exclamation point; 2) independent clauses not joined by conjunctions are separated by a mark of punctuation. Dashes are used to indicate interrupted speeches or shifts of address within a single speech.

TEXT OF THE PLAY

THE

TROUBLESOME RAIGNE

of John, King of England, with the discoverie of King Richard Cordelions Base sonne (vulgarly named, the Bastard Fawconbridge): also the death of King John at Swinstead Abbey.

As it was (sundry times) publikely acted by the Queenes Majesties Players, in the honourable Citie of London.

[Device]

Imprinted at London for Sampson Clarke, and are to be solde at his shop, on the backeside of the Royall Exchange.

1591.

Characters of the Play

King John
Queen Eleanor, his mother
William Marshal, Earl of Pembroke
The Earl of Essex
The Earl of Salisbury
Chattilion, Ambassador from France
Thomas Newdigate, Sheriff of Northamptonshire
Philip Faulconbridge, bastard son of King Richard I, by
  Lady Faulconbridge, Sir Robert's wife
Robert Faulconbridge, son and heir of Sir Robert Faulconbridge
Lady Faulconbridge
Philip, the French King
Lewis, the Dauphin, Philip's son
Lymoges, the Austrian Duke
Constance, mother of Arthur, and widow of Geoffrey, Duke
  of Brittany
Arthur, Duke of Brittany, son of Constance
Blanche, niece to Queen Eleanor, daughter of the King of Spain
  (Alphonso IX)
Citizens of Angiers
English Herald
French Herald
Pandulph, Legate from the See of Rome
A Messenger to the French King
Hubert de Burgh, Chamberlain to King John
Two Franciscan Friars
Alice, the nun
Friar Laurence
Peter, Prophet of Pomfret
Boy
English Nobles
Trumpeters and Soldiers

[The following appear in Part II only]

The Earls of Chester, Bewchamp, Clare
The Earl of Percy

Viscount
The Abbot
Thomas, m
Earl Big
Prince He
Four ind

Viscount Melun, confidant to Lewis
The Abbot of Swinstead
Thomas, monk of Swinstead, who poisons King John
Earl Bigot of France
Prince Henry, afterwards King Henry III of England
Four individual messengers (these could double in Part I)

To the Gentlemen Readers.

You that with friendly grace of smoothed brow
Have entertaind the Scythian Tamburlaine,
And given applause unto an Infidel:
Vouchsafe to welcome (with like curtesie)
A warlike Christian and your Countreyman.
For Christs true faith indur'd he many a storme,
And set himselfe against the Man of Rome.
Until base treason (by a damned wight)
Did all his former triumphs put to flight,
  Accept of it (sweete Gentles) in good sort,
  And thinke it was preparde for your disport.

11. See John Dover Wilson, ed., King John (Cambridge University Press, 1936), p. xviii, n.1. He feels that this last line is conclusive proof that the preface was written expressly for publication. There is, however, nothing in the line, nor in the entire preface to indicate this was the case.

[Part I]

[Scene i]

Enter K. John, Queene Elinor his mother, William Marshal Earle of Pembrooke, the Earles of Essex, and of Salisbury.

ELINOR Barons of England, and my noble Lords;
Though God and Fortune have bereft from us
Victorious Richard scourge of Infidels,
And clad this Land in stole of dismall hieu:
Yet give me leave to ioy, and ioy you all,
That from this wombe hath sprung a second hope,
A King that may in rule and vertue both
Succeede his brother in his Emperie.
JOHN My gracious mother Queene, and Barons all;
Though farre unworthie of so high a place,
As is the Throne of mightie Englands King:
Yet John your Lord, contented uncontent,
Will (as he may) sustaine the heavie yoke
Of pressing cares, that hang upon a Crowne.
My Lord of Pembrooke and Lord Salsbury,
Admit the Lord Shattilion to our presence;
That we may know what Philip King of Fraunce
(By his Ambassadors) requires of us.
ELINOR Dare lay my hand that Elinor can gesse
Whereto this weightie Embassade doth tend:
If of my Nephew Arthur and his claime,
Then say my Sonne I have not mist my aime.

Enter Chattilion and the two Earles.

JOHN My Lord Chattilion, welcome into England:
How fares our Brother Philip King of Fraunce?
CHATT. His Highnes at my comming was in health,
And wild me to salute your Majestie,
And say the message he hath given in charge.
JOHN And spare not man, we are preparde to heare.
CHATT. Philip by the grace of God most Christian
K. of France, having taken into his guardain and protection

22.1. Shakespeare's King John begins here.
33-4. Ireland...Main] See K.J., I.i.7-15.

Arthur Duke of Brittaine, son and heire to Jeffrey thine elder brother, requireth in the behalfe of the said Arthur, the Kingdom of England, with the Lordship of Ireland, Poitiers, Anjow, Torain, Main: and I attend thine aunswere.

JOHN A small request: belike he makes account
That England, Ireland, Poiters, Anjow, Torain, Main,
Are nothing for a King to give at once:
I wonder what he meanes to leave for me.
Tell Philip, he may keepe his Lords at home
With greater honour than to send them thus
On Embassades that not concerne himselfe,
Or if they did, would yeeld but small returne.

CHATT. Is this thine answere?

JOHN It is, and too good an answer for so proud a message.

CHATT. Then King of England, in my Masters name,
And in Prince Arthur Duke of Britaines name,
I doo defie thee as an Enemie,
And wish thee to prepare for bloodie warres.

ELINOR My Lord (that stands upon defiance thus)
Commend me to my Nephew, tell the boy,
That I Queene Elianor (his Grandmother)
Upon my blessing charge him leave his Armes,
Whereto his head-strong Mother pricks him so:
Her pride we know, and know her for a Dame
That will not sticke to bring him to his ende,
So she may bring her selfe to rule a Realme.[2]
Next wish him to forsake the King of Fraunce,
And come to me and to his Unckle here,
And he shall want for nothing at our hands.

CHATT. This shall I doo, and thus I take my leave.

JOHN Pembrooke, convay him safely to the sea,
But not in haste: for as we are advisde,
We meane to be in Fraunce as soone as he,
To fortefie such townes as we possesse
In Anjou, Torain and in Normandy. Exit Chatt.

Enter the Shrive [Thomas Newdigate, with the brothers Philip and Robert Faulconbridge, and their Mother, Lady Faulconbridge] and whispers the Earle of Sals. in the eare.

SALIS. Please it your Majestie, heere is the Shrive of North-

---

48. wish] recommend.
55. sticke] scruple, stand upon terms.

hamptonshire, with certaine persons that of late committed
a riot, and have appeald to your Majestie beseeching your
Highnes for speciall cause to heare them.
JOHN Wil them come neere, and while we heare the cause,
Goe Salsbury and make provision,
We meane with speede to passe the sea to Fraunce. [Exit Salis.
Say Shrieve, what are these men, what have they done?
Or wheretoo tends the course of this appeale?
SHRIVE Please it your Majestie these two brethren unnaturally falling at odds about their Fathers living have broken your Highnes peace, in seeking to right their own wrongs without cause of Law, or order of Justice, and unlawfully assembled themselves in mutinous manner, having committed a riot, appealing from triall in their Countrey to your Highnes:[3] and here I Thomas Nidigate Shrieve of Northhamptonshire, doo deliver them over to their triall.
JOHN My Lord of Essex, will the offenders to stand foorth, and tell the cause of their quarrell.
ESSEX Gentlemen, it is the Kings pleasure that you discover your griefes, & doubt not but you shall have justice.
PHILIP Please it your Majestie, the wrong is mine; yet wil I abide all wrongs, before I once open my mouth to unrippe the shamefull slaunder of my parents, the dishonour of myself, & the wicked dealing of my brother in this princely assembly.
ROBERT Then by my Prince his leave shall Robert speake,
And tell your Majestie what right I have
To offer wrong, as he accounteth wrong.
My Father (not unknowen unto your Grace)
Receivd his spurres of Knighthood in the Field,
At Kingly Richards hands in Palestine,
When as the walls of Acon gave him way:
His name Sir Robert Fauconbridge of Mountbery.
What by succession from his Auncestours,
And warlike service under Englands Armes,
His living did amount too at his death
Two thousand Markes revenew every yeare.
And this (my Lord) I challenge for my right,
As lawfull heire to Robert Fauconbridge.

78. cause] course Q2-3.

---

68. riot] No riot is mentioned in K.J., I.i.44-51.
70. cause] case.
78. cause] process.
85. discover] make known.
88. unrippe] lay open.
97. Acon] Acre.
102. Two thousand Markes revenew] A mark was equivalent to 13s. 4d. In K.J., I.i.69, the inheritance is "five hundred pound."

PHILIP I
By certaine
How should m
But I am hei
JOHN For
Or make a qu
Speake, is
ROBERT
I not denie
Mine elder
As he can m
JOHN A
Thy Brothe
Explaine t
ROBERT
Base borne
Indeede th
My Father
And here
But I (my
Both to m
He is no
Then (gra
The livin
And let
JOHN
ELINO
The womb
All hone
But gold
MOTH
That se
And sca
For hon
Let me
Let not
Of such
Doth m
JOH
And fe
PHI
But fo

PHILIP If first-borne sonne be heire indubitate
By certaine right of Englands auncient Lawe,
How should myselfe make any other doubt,
But I am heire to Robert Fauconbridge?
JOHN Fond youth, to trouble these our Princely eares
Or make a question in so plaine a case:
Speake, is this man thine elder Brother borne?
ROBERT Please it your Grace with patience for to heare;
I not denie but he mine Elder is,
Mine elder Brother too: yet in such sort,
As he can make no title to the Land.
JOHN A doubtfull tale as ever I did heare,
Thy Brother and thine elder, and no heire:
Explaine this darke Aenigma.
ROBERT I graunt (my Lord) he is my mothers sonne,
Base borne, and base begot, no Fauconbridge.
Indeede the world reputes him lawfull heire,
My Father in his life did count him so,
And here my Mother stands to proove him so:
But I (my Lord) can proove, and doo averre
Both to my Mothers shame and his reproach,
He is no heire, nor yet legitimate.
Then (gracious Lord) let Fauconbridge enjoy
The living that belongs to Fauconbridge,
And let not him possesse anothers right.
JOHN Prove this, the land is thine by Englands law.
ELINOR Ungracious youth, to rip thy mothers shame,
The wombe from whence thou didst thy being take.
All honest eares abhorre thy wickednes,
But gold I see doth beate downe natures law.
MOTHER My gracious Lord, & you thrice reverend Dame,
That see the teares distilling from mine eyes,
And scalding sighes blowne from a rented heart:
For honour and regard of womanhood,
Let me entreate to be commaunded hence.
Let not these eares receive the hissing sound
Of such a viper, who with poysoned words
Doth masserate the bowels of my soule.
JOHN Ladie, stand up, be patient for a while:
And fellow, say, whose bastard is thy brother.
PHILIP Not for my selfe, nor for my mother now:
But for the honour of so brave a Man,

118. this] his Q3.
140. receive] heere receive Q2-3.

---

122. count] reckon.

Whom he accuse
Here I beseech
To count him n
ROBERT No
Charge thee b
To be a Basta
Sonne to your
Thus bluntly,
ELINOR Yo
Nor of thy S
ROBERT T
As that your
And all (sav
Shall sweare
First when r
In Germanie
The King la
And all the
And at my F
My Mother w
Sixe weeks
But more th
His featur
And all th
He is no c
Then graci
And let me
That am h
JOHN
ROBERT
JOHN
My Brothe
And what
That hono
In absen
This wil
ELINO

172. Lo

---

150. ma
167. S

169. f
169. l
176. S
179. t

Whom he accuseth with adulterie:
Here I beseech your Grace upon my knees,
To count him mad, and so dismisse us hence.
ROBERT Nor mad, nor mazde, but well advised, I
Charge thee before this royall presence here
To be a Bastard to King Richards self,
Sonne to your Grace, and Brother to your Majestie
Thus bluntly, and—
ELINOR Yong man thou needst not be ashamed of thy kin,
Nor of thy Sire. But forward with thy proofe.
ROBERT The proofe so plaine, the argument so strong,
As that your Highnes and these noble Lords,
And all (save those that have no eyes to see)
Shall sweare him to be Bastard to the King.
First when my Father was Embassadour
In Germanie unto the Emperour,
The King lay often at my Fathers house;
And all the Realme suspected what befell:
And at my Fathers back returne agen
My Mother was delivered as tis sed,
Sixe weeks before the account my Father made.
But more than this: looke but on Philips face,
His features, actions, and his lineaments,
And all this Princely presence shall confesse,
He is no other but King Richards Sonne.
Then gracious Lord, rest he King Richards Sonne,
And let me rest safe in my Fathers right,
That am his rightfull sonne and onely heire.
JOHN Is this thy proofe, and all thou hast to say?
ROBERT I have no more, nor neede I greater proofe.
JOHN First, where thou saidst in absence of thy Sire
My Brother often lodged in his house:
And what of that? base groome to slaunder him,
That honoured his Embassador so much,
In absence of the man to cheere the wife.
This will not hold, proceede unto the next.
ELINOR Thou saist she teemde six weeks before her time.

172. Lord] Lords Q3.

---

150. mazde] bewildered, delirious.
167. Sixe weeks] In K.J., I.i.113, the time period is a more realistic "fourteen weeks."
169. features] outward appearance.
169. lineaments] contours of the face.
176. Shakespeare gives more evidence; see K.J., I.i.107.
179. base] low-born.

Why good Sir Squ
To make account
Spit in your har
Many mischaunces
To make a woman
JOHN And wh
In action, feat
Therein I holde
I never saw so
Of Richard Cord
ROBERT Ther
And let me have
ELINOR Nay
Know you not,
Or have read i
Twas thus I wa
She lay wit
King Richard n
this fashion.
ROBERT Ma
I crave my ri
So be thou ju
JOHN Why
Nor canst tho
But thou shal
This is my do
Irrevocable,
For thou know
His mother a
And as they
ROBERT M
To give away
Unto themsel
That she wil
Or he will
It may not
JOHN Lo
doome. Esse
ESSEX L
Father to t
MOTHER
ROBERT

---

197. Omne.
198. read
209. doome
218. Or..
224. Moth
du

Why good Sir Squire are you so cunning growen
To make account of womens reckonings:
Spit in your hand and to your other proofes:
Many mischaunces hap in such affaires
To make a woman come before her time.
JOHN And where thou saist he looketh like the King
In action, feature and proportion:
Therein I holde with thee, for in my life
I never saw so lively counterfet
Of Richard Cordelion, as in him.
ROBERT Then good my Lord, be you indifferent Judge,
And let me have my living and my right.
ELINOR Nay heare you Sir, you runne away too fast:
Know you not, Omne simile non est idem?
Or have read in. Harke ye good sir,
Twas thus I warrant, and no otherwise,
She lay with Sir Robert your Father, and thought uppon
King Richard my Sonne, and so your Brother was formed in
this fashion.
ROBERT Madame, you wrong me thus to jest it out,
I crave my right: King John as thou art King,
So be thou just, and let me have my right.
JOHN Why (foolish boy) thy proofes are frivolous,
Nor canst thou chalenge any thing thereby.
But thou shalt see how I will helpe thy claime,
This is my doome, and this my doome shall stand
Irrevocable, as I am King of England.
For thou knowst not, weele aske of them that know,
His mother and himselfe shall ende this strife:
And as they say, so shall thy living passe.
ROBERT My Lord, herein I chalenge you of wrong,
To give away my right, and put the doome
Unto themselves. Can there be likelihood
That she will loose?
Or he will give the living from himselfe?
It may not be my Lord. Why should it be?
JOHN Lords keepe him back, and let him heare the
doome. Essex, first aske the Mother thrice who was his Sire?
ESSEX Ladie Margaret Widow of Fauconbridge, Who was
Father to thy Sonne Philip?
MOTHER Please it your Majestie, Sir Robert Fauconbridge.
ROBERT This is right, aske my felow there if I be a thiefe.

---

197. Omne...idem] "Likeness is not necessarily the same as identity."
198. read in.] A name is missing. Bullough suggests Galen.
209. doome] decision, judgement.
218. Or...himselfe] Or give up his claim to the inheritance.
224. Mother] Shakespeare keeps Lady Faulconbridge off stage during this dispute.

JOHN Aske
ESSEX Ph
PHILIP M
not taken so
you to aske
JOHN Say
PHILIP I
father that
I thinke to
JOHN Es
And so an e
ROBERT
ESSEX I
JOHN Yo
ELINOR
PHILIP
What saist
Quo me rap
What winde
Or whence
Me thinke
That Phil
The whist
Whistle i
The bubli
Records l
Birds in
Filling
Birds, b
Ring in
Fond mar
How are
Forgetfu
Thy Fat
These t
And wel

227. th
245. pr
261. m

---

228. Y
241. T
243.
251.
261.

JOHN Aske Philip whose Sonne he is.
ESSEX Philip, who was thy Father?
PHILIP Mas my Lord, and thats a question: and you had not taken some paines with her before, I should have desired you to aske my Mother.
JOHN Say who was thy Father?
PHILIP Faith (my Lord) to answere you sure he is my father that was neerest my mother when I was gotten, & him I thinke to be Sir Robert Fauconbridge.
JOHN Essex, for fashions sake demaund agen, And so an ende to this contention.
ROBERT Was ever man thus wrongd as Robert is?
ESSEX Philip, speake I say, who was thy Father?
JOHN Yong man, how now, what, art thou in a traunce?
ELINOR Philip awake, the man is in a dreame.
PHILIP Philippus atavis aedite Regibus.
What saist thou Philip, sprung of auncient Kings?
Quo me rapit tempestas?
What winde of honour blowes this furie forth?
Or whence proceede these fumes of Majestie?
Me thinkes I heare a hollow Eccho sound,
That Philip is the Sonne unto a King:
The whistling leaves upon the trembling trees
Whistle in consort I am Richards Sonne:
The bubling murmur of the waters fall,
Records Philippus Regius filius:
Birds in their flight make musicke with their wings,
Filling the ayre with glorie of my birth:
Birds, bubbles, leaves, and mountaines, Eccho, all
Ring in mine eares, that I am Richards Sonne.
Fond man, ah whether art thou carried?
How are thy thoughts ywrapt in Honors heaven?
Forgetfull what thou art, and whence thou camst.
Thy Fathers land cannot maintaine these thoughts,
These thoughts are farre unfitting Fauconbridge:
And well they may; for why this mounting minde

227. thy Father] thy thy Father (Folger).
245. proceede] proeede (TCC) (Hunt.); proeeede (Folger).
261. mounting] monnting (TCC) (Hunt.) (Folger).

---

228. Mas] Philip is swearing "by the Mass."
241. The last half of the following line is a translation.
243. "Whither did the storm take me"? Cf. Horace, Epistles, I.i.15.
251. "Philip royal Son" (Bullough).
261. Cf. K.J., I.i.16: "And fits the mounting spirit like my selfe."

Doth soare t
Why how now
And knowest
Wilt thou u
Goe loose t
No, keepe t
What ere th
JOHN Sp
PHILIP
Philip, th
It will no
Say I am s
Let land a
That makes
Base to a
Than Knigh
Please it
ROBERT
His faltr
MOTHER
PHILIP
JOHN
By wilfu
Robert,
God give
ELINO
PHILI
The poor
And wit
Help ha
Let Phi
ELIN
But che
As long
Hencefo
And wa
Who sh
JOH
How mu
Rise u

264.
270.
276.

291.
295.

298.
301.

Doth soare too high to stoupe to Fauconbridge.
Why how now? knowest thou where thou art?
And knowest thou who expects thine answere here?
Wilt thou upon a frantick madding vaine
Goe loose thy land, and say thy selfe base borne?
No, keepe thy land, though Richard were thy Sire,
What ere thou thinkst, say thou art Fauconbridge.
JOHN Speake man, be sodaine, who thy Father was.
PHILIP Please it your Majestie, Sir Robert—
Philip, that Fauconbridge cleaves to thy jawes:
It will not out, I cannot for my life
Say I am sonne unto a Fauconbridge.
Let land and living goe, tis honors fire
That makes me sweare King Richard was my Sire.
Base to a King addes title of more State,
Than Knights begotten, though legittimate.
Please it your Grace, I am King Richards Sonne.
ROBERT Robert revive thy heart, let sorrow die,
His faltring tongue not suffers him to lie.
MOTHER What head-strong furie doth enchaunt my sonne?
PHILIP Philip cannot repent, for he hath done.
JOHN Then Philip blame not me, thy selfe hast lost
By wilfulnesse, thy living and thy land.
Robert, thou art the heire of Fauconbridge,
God give thee joy, greater than thy desert.
ELINOR Why how now Philip, give away thine owne?
PHILIP Madame, I am bold to make my selfe your nephew,
The poorest kinsman that your Highnes hath:
And with this Proverb gin the world anew,
Help hands, I have no lands, honour is my desire;
Let Philip live to shew himselfe worthie so great a Sire.
ELINOR Philip, I think thou knewst thy Grandams minde:
But cheere thee boy, I will not see thee want
As long as Elinor hath foote of land;
Henceforth thou shalt be taken for my sonne,
And waite on me and on thine Unckle heere,
Who shall give honour to thy noble minde.
JOHN Philip kneele down, that thou maist throughly know
How much thy resolution pleaseth us,
Rise up Sir Richard Plantaginet K. Richards Sonne.

264. thine answere] thy answer Q3.
270. Sir Robert—] Sir Robert Fau— (Fleay).
276. title] titles Q3.

---

291. This proverb is cited in Tilley, p.287.
295. foote of land] Cf. K.J., I.i.182-3, "A foot of honour better than I was,/But many a many foot of land the worse."
298. minde] disposition.
301. Sir Richard] this is the only use of the name in the play.

PHILIP
Worthie th
Or basest
JOHN
To checke
Essex, th
And towar
Ile ceaze
Into my
The Pope
With gol
Thus for
And marc

Mane

PHIL
leasure
MOTH
cret,
the bo
PHI
But su
I woul
MO
PH
How t
In th
I am
This
Main
That
What
I ca
If
For
Be
His
To

33

3
3

3
3

PHILIP Graunt heavens that Philip once may shew himself
Worthie the honour of Plantaginet,
Or basest glorie of a Bastards name.
JOHN Now Gentlemen, we will away to France,
To checke the pride of Arthur and his mates:
Essex, thou shalt be Ruler of my Realme,
And toward the maine charges of my warres,
Ile ceaze the lazie Abbey lubbers lands
Into my hands to pay my men of warre.
The Pope and Popelings shall not grease themselves
With golde and groates, that are the souldiers due.
Thus forward Lords, let our commaund be done,
And march we forward mightely to Fraunce. Exeunt.

Mane[n]t Philip and his Mother.

PHILIP Madame I beseech you deigne me so much
leasure as the hearing of a matter that I long to impart to you.
MOTHER Whats the matter Philip. I thinke your sute in secret, tends to some money matter, which you suppose burns in the bottome of my chest.
PHILIP No Madam, it is no such sute as to beg or borrow,
But such a suite, as might some other grant,
I would not now have troubled you withall.
MOTHER A Gods name let us heare it.
PHILIP Then Madame thus, your Ladiship sees well,
How that my scandall growes by meanes of you,
In that report hath rumord up and downe,
I am a bastard, and no Fauconbridge,
This grose attaint so tilteth in my thoughts,
Maintaining combat to abridge my ease,
That field and towne, and company alone,
Whatso I doo, or wheresoere I am,
I cannot chase the slaunder from my thoughts.
If it be true, resolve me of my Sire,
For pardon Madame, if I thinke amisse.
Be Philip Philip and no Fauconbridge,
His Father doubtles was as brave a man.
To you on knees as sometime Phaeton,

332. my thoughts] (Fleay); thy Ql.

---

309. Abbey lubbers] a term of reproach for idle people.
312. groates] An English groat coined in 1351-2 was equal to four pence. Its last issue was in 1662.
328. tilteth] struggles, fights.
337. Phaeton] was actually the son of Phoebus Apollo and the nymph Clymene; however, he grew up in the household of Merops, King of Aethiopia, and husband to Clymene. See Ovid, Metamorphoses, ii. 1ff.

Mistrusting silly Merop for his Sire,
Strayning a little bashfull modestie,
I beg some instance whence I am extraught.
   MOTHER Yet more adoo to haste me to my grave,
And wilt thou too become a Mothers crosse?
Must I accuse myself to close with you?
Slaunder myself to quiet your affects:
Thou moovst me Philip with this idle talke,
Which I remit, in hope this mood will die.
   PHILIP Nay Ladie mother, heare me further yet,
For strong conceipt drives dutie hence awhile:
Your husband Fauconbridge was Father to that sonne,
That carries marks of Nature like the Sire,
The sonne that blotteth you with wedlocks breach,
And holds my right, as lineall in discent
From him whose forme was figured in his face.
Can Nature so dissemble in her frame,
To make the one so like as like may be,
And in the other print no character
To chalenge any marke of true discent?
My brothers minde is base, and too too dull,
To mount where Philip lodgeth his affects,
And his externall graces that you view
(Though I report it) counterpoise not mine:
His constitution plaine debilitie,
Requires the chayre, and mine the seate of steele.
Nay, what is he, or what am I to him?
When any one that knoweth how to carpe,
Will scarcely judge us both one Countrey borne.
This Madame, this, hath drove me from myselfe:
And here by heavens eternall lampes I sweare,
As cursed Nero with his mother did,
So I with you, if you resolve me not.
   MOTHER Let mothers teares quench out thy angers fire,
And urge no further what thou doost require.
   PHILIP Let sonnes entreatie sway the mother now,
Or els she dies: Ile not infringe my vow.

---

340. instance] facts, proof. 340. extraught] descended; see 3 Henry VI, II.ii.142, "Shamst thou not, knowing whence thou art extraught."
343. close with] come to terms with.
348. conceipt] thought, ideas.
352. lineall] due by right of birth.
358. too too] exceedingly (not a repetition of "too" but a provincialism).
360. graces] pleasing features.
369. Cf. K.J., I.i.253-8.
374. infringe] break.

MOTHER U
Blab my misc
Some power
Or take fro
Why wish I
The fault i
I blush, I
PHILIP
MOTHER
PHILIP
The shame
Ist not a
To be so c
Good Mothe
MOTHER
My honour
My shame,
All maimd
And when
Or if tho
To moove
To yeeld
The migh
Who temp
That son
But let
Upbraid
That sh
Why sta
With pr
When to
That Pr
Rich Ex
For ho
Whose
For fa
PHI
My Sis
Gods
There
I mar
Ile a
By bl

375.
392.
399.

401.
403

MOTHER Unhappy taske: must I recount my shame,
Blab my misdeedes, or by concealing die?
Some power strike me speechlesse for a time,
Or take from him awhile his hearings use.
Why wish I so, unhappy as I am?
The fault is mine, and he the faultie frute,
I blush, I faint, oh would I might be mute.
PHILIP Mother be briefe, I long to know my name.
MOTHER And longing dye to shrowd thy Mothers shame.
PHILIP Come Madame come, you neede not be so loth,
The shame is shared equall twixt us both.
Ist not a slacknes in me worthie blame,
To be so olde, and cannot write my name?
Good Mother resolve me.
MOTHER Then Philip heare thy fortune and my griefe,
My honours losse by purchase of thy selfe,
My shame, thy name, and husbands secret wrong,
All maimd and staind by youths unruly sway.
And when thou knowest from whence thou art extraught,
Or if thou knewst what sutes, what threates, what feares,
To moove by love, or massacre by death,
To yeeld with love, or end by loves contempt,
The mightines of him that courted me,
Who tempred terror with his wanton talke,
That something may extenuate the guilt.
But let it not advantage me so much:
Upbraid me rather with the Romane Dame
That shed her blood to wash away her shame.
Why stand I to expostulate the crime
With pro & contra, now the deede is don,
When to conclude two words may tell the tale,
That Philips Father was a Princes Son,
Rich Englands rule, worlds onely terror hee,
For honours losse left me with childe of thee:
Whose Sonne thou art, then pardon me the rather,
For faire King Richard was thy noble Father.
PHILIP Then Robin Fauconbridge I wish thee joy,
My Sire a King, and I a landles Boy.
Gods Ladie Mother, the word is in my debt,
There's something owing to Plantaginet.
I marrie Sir, let me alone for game,
Ile act some wonders now I know my name.
By blessed Marie Ile not sell that pride

375. taske] Qq; talke (Bullough).
392. maimd] Q2; maind (TCC) (Hunt.) (Folger).
399. extenuate] Q2; extennate (TCC) Hunt.) (Folger).

---

401. Romane Dame] Lucrece.
403. expostulate] debate, discuss.

For Englands
Sit fast the
Awsy good Mo

[Scene ii]

Enter Ph
stance,

FR.KING
Yong Arthu
Scaring pr
Brave Aust
Is also co
And all ou
And, but f
Pleading
Twice sho
To coole
Till I ha
Controld
Or made a
CONSTA
To offer
Will sen
As shall
If so, f
ARTHU
And John
For pre
The wor
We took
Then mu
That he
I rathe
Sounds
And so
Than l
For qu
LEW
Brave
Have
Yet n
Engla

11.
17.

For Englands wealth, and all the world beside.
Sit fast the proudest of my Fathers foes,
Away good Mother, there the comfort goes. Exeunt. 420

[Scene ii]

Enter Philip the French King and Lewes, Limoges,[1] Constance, and her sonne Arthur.

FR.KING Now gin we broach the title of thy claime
Yong Arthur in the Albion Territories,
Scaring proud Angiers with a puissant siedge:
Brave Austria, cause of Cordelions death,[2]
Is also come to aide thee in thy warres;
And all our Forces joyne for Arthurs right.
And, but for causes of great consequence,
Pleading delay till newes from England come,
Twice should not Titan hide him in the West,
To coole the fet-locks of his wearie teame,
Till I had with an unresisted shock
Controld the mannage of proud Angiers walls,
Or made a forfet of my fame to Chaunce.
CONSTANCE May be that John in conscience or in feare
To offer wrong where you impugne the ill,
Will send such calme conditions backe to Fraunce,
As shall rebate the edge of fearefull warres:
If so, forbearance is a deede well done.
ARTHUR Ah Mother, possession of a Crowne is much,
And John as I have heard reported of,
For present vantage would adventure farre.
The world can witnes in his Brothers time,
He tooke upon him rule and almost raigne:[3]
Then must it follow as a doubtfull poynt,
That hee'le resigne the rule unto his Nephew.
I rather thinke the menace of the world
Sounds in his eares as threats of no esteeme,
And sooner would he scorne Europaes power,
Than loose the smallest title he enjoyes;
For questionles he is an Englishman.
LEWES Why are the English peereles in compare?
Brave Cavaliers as ere that Iland bred,
Have livde and dyde, and darde and done inough,
Yet never gracde their Countrey for the cause:
England is England, yeelding good and bad,

5. also] om. Q3.

---

11. shock] attack.
17. rebate] dull.

And John of England is as other Johns.
Trust me young Arthur, if thou like my reede,
Praise thou the French that helpe thee in this neede.
LYMOGES The Englishman hath little cause I trow,
To spend good speaches on so proud a foe.
Why Arthur heres his spoyle that now is gon,
Who when he livde outroude his Brother John:
But hastie curres that lie so long to catch,
Come halting home, and meete their overmatch.
But newes comes now, heres the Embassadour.

Enter Chattilion.

FR.KING And in good time, welcome my Lord Chattilion:
What newes? will John accord to our commaund.
CHATT. Be I not briefe to tell your Highnes all,
He will approach to interrupt my tale:
For one selfe bottome brought us both to Fraunce.
He on his part will try the chaunce of warre,
And if his words inferre assured truth,
Will loose himselfe and all his followers,
Ere yeeld unto the least of your demaunds.
The Mother Queene she taketh on amaine
Gainst Ladie Constance, counting her the cause
That doth effect this claime to Albion,
Conjuring Arthur with a Grandames care,
To leave his Mother; willing him submit
His state to John and her protection,
Who (as she saith) are studious for his good:
More circumstance the season intercepts:
This is the summe, which briefly I have showne.
FR.KING This bitter winde must nip some bodies spring,
Sodaine and briefe, why so, tis harvest weather.
But say Chattilion, what persons of accompt are with him?

---

36. Johns] a commonplace nickname; e.g., "John-a-Dogs," "John-a-Dreams," "John-a-Nokes."
41. heres...gon] i.e., "this lion's skin I took as spoil from Richard, now dead."
42. outroude] outshot (with the bow).
43. hastie] quick-tempered, irritable. 43. lie] in this context "hie" would seem to make more sense. I have not been able to locate the exact proverb; but "hie" meaning "hasten" or "run," could explain the "halting" (limping) in the next line.
43. catch] chase.
50. selfe bottome] same ship.
55. taketh on amaine] carries on vehemently.
58. Conjuring] imploring.
61. studious] sollicitous.
66. accompt] importance.

CHATT. Of England Earle Pembrooke and Salsbury,
The onely noted men of any name.
Next them a Bastard of the Kings deceast,
Ahardy wilde head, tough and venturous,
With many other men of high resolve.
Then is there with them Elinor Mother Queene,
And Blanch her Neece daughter to the King of Spaine.
These are the prime Birds of this hot adventure.

Enter John & his followers, Queene [Elinor], Bastard, [Blanche], Earles, &c.

FR.KING Me seemeth John an over-daring spirit
Effects some frenzie in thy rash approach,
Treading my Confines with thy armed Troupes.
I rather lookt for some submisse reply
Touching the claime thy Nephew Arthur makes[5]
To that which thou unjustly dost usurpe.
JOHN For that Chattilion can discharge you all,
I list not plead my Title with my tongue.
Nor came I hether with intent of wrong
To Fraunce or thee, or any right of thine;
But in defence and purchase of my right,
The Towne of Angiers: which thou doost begirt
In the behalfe of Ladie Constance Sonne,
Wheretoo nor he nor she can lay just claime.
CONSTANCE Yes (false intruder) if that just be just,
And headstrong usurpation put apart,
Arthur my Sonne, heire to thy elder Brother,
Without ambiguous shadow of discent,
Is Soveraigne to the substance thou withholdst.
ELINOR Misgovernd Gossip, staine to this resort,
Occasion of these undecided jarres,
I say (that know) to check thy vaine suppose,
Thy Sonne hath naught to doo with that he claymes.
For proofe whereof, I can inferre a Will,
That barres the way he urgeth by discent.[6]
CONSTANCE A Will indeede, a crabbed Womans will,
Wherein the Divell is an overseer,
And proud dame Elnor sole Executresse:
More wills than so, on perill of my soule,

---

69. This line echoed in K.J., II.i.65.
70. wilde head] unbridled character.
74.1. Munro's direction erroneously supplies the name "Faulconbridge."
81. discharge you all] clear up everything for you.
90. Cf. K.J., II.i.121.
91. elder brother] meaning Geoffrey.
95. jarres] disagreements.
98. inferre] procure.

Were never
ARTHUR
The law in
Where righ
ELINOR
To soare w
And trust
I pitie m
CONSTA
Readie to
Sorrow be
That mini
But who
That you
For fear
I theres
That ham
ELINO
Immodest
I tell
But jus
FR.K
JOHN
LEWI
BAS
LYM
BAS
BLA
belong
Ah Ric
LY
Shoul
BA
My Fa
A tho
110.
131.

107
109
112
120
122
128

12
12

1

Were never made to hinder Arthurs right.
ARTHUR But say there was, as sure there can be none,
The law intends such testaments as voyd,
Where right discent can no way be impeacht.
ELINOR Peace Arthur peace, thy mother makes thee wings
To soare with perill after Icarus,
And trust me yongling, for the Fathers sake,
I pitie much the hazard of thy youth.
CONSTANCE Beshrew you els how pitifull you are,
Readie to weepe to heare him aske his owne;
Sorrow betide such Grandames and such griefe,
That minister a poyson for pure love.
But who so blinde, as cannot see this beame,
That you forsooth would keepe your cousin downe,
For feare his Mother should be usde too well?
I theres the griefe, confusion catch the braine,
That hammers shifts to stop a Princes raigne.
ELINOR Impatient, frantike, common slanderer,
Immodest Dame, unnurtred quarreller,
I tell thee I, not envie to thy Son,
But justice makes me speake as I have don.
FR.KING But heres no proof that showes your son a King.
JOHN What wants, my sword shal more at large set down.
LEWES But that may breake before the truth be knowne.
BAST. Then this may hold till all his right be showne.
LYMOGES Good words sir sauce, your betters are in place.
BAST. Not you sir doughtie with your Lions case.
BLANCH Ah joy betide his soule, to whom that spoile
belongd,
Ah Richard how thy glorie here is wrongd.
LYMOGES Me thinkes that Richards pride, & Richards fall,
Should be a president t'affright you all.
BAST. What words are these? how doo my sinews shake?
My Fathers foe clad in my Fathers spoyle,
A thousand furies kindle with revendge,

110. the] thy Q3.
131. Ah joy betide] Qq; Joy 'tide (Fleay).

---

107. impeacht] challenged, called into question.
109. Cf. Ovid, Metamorphoses, viii.
112. Beshrew you els] a curse upon you besides.
120. shifts] stratagems, ingenious devices.
122. unnurtred] untrained, uneducated.
128. BAST.] Beginning with the stage direction at l. 74 Philip Faulconbridge is referred to as "Bastard" and so the name will appear in speech heads throughout the rest of the play.
128. this] i.e., the Bastard's sword, on which his hand rests.
129. Good...place] i.e., "speak more humbly in the presence of more valiant men."
134. president] precedent.

This hart
Searing my
How doth A
Delay not
Disrobe h
Thy Fathe
Base hear
What make
Shamst th
To grace
Too prec
Scarce c
Unto the
From act
But arme
For by l
Twice w
Till I
And spl
Philip
Let not
LYM
Let th
And ta
Pawne
BLA
That v
BA
If sh
FR
That
And t
Me se

144.
159.

138
138
140
144
146
148
150
15
16
16
17

This hart that choller keepes a consistorie,
Searing my inwards with a brand of hate:
How doth Alecto whisper in mine eares?
Delay not Philip, kill the villaine straight,
Disrobe him of the matchles moniment
Thy Fathers triumph ore the Savages.
Base heardgroome, coward, peasant, worse than a threshing slave,
What makst thou with the Trophei of a King?
Shamst thou not coystrell, loathsome dunghill swad,
To grace thy carkasse with an ornament
Too precious for a Monarchs coverture?
Scarce can I temper due obedience
Unto the presence of my Soveraigne,
From acting outrage on this trunke of hate:
But arme thee traytor, wronger of renowme.
For by his soule I sweare, my Fathers soule,
Twice will I not review the Mornings rise,
Till I have torne that Trophei from thy back,
And split thy heart, for wearing it so long.
Philip hath sworne, and if it be not done,
Let not the world repute me Richards Sonne.
LYMOGES Nay soft sir Bastard, harts are not split so soone,
Let them rejoyce that at the ende doo win:
And take this lesson at thy foemans hand,
Pawne not thy life, to get thy Fathers skin.
BLANCH Well may the world speake of his knightly valor,
That winnes this hide to weare a Ladies favour.
BAST. Ill may I thrive, and nothing brooke with mee,
If shortly I present it not to thee.
FR.KING Lordings forbeare, for time is comming fast,
That deedes may trie what words cannot determine,
And to the purpose for the cause you come.
Me seemes you set right in chaunce of warre,

144. worse than a] Qq; om. (Fleay).
159. split] spilt Q3.

---

138. choller] bile, which causes irascibility.
138. consistorie] meeting place.
140. Alecto] in Greek mythology, one of the three furies.
144. heardgroome] shepherd.
146. coystrell] knave. 146. dunghill] indicating low birth.
146. swad] a foolish (country) fellow.
154. review] see again.
159. Nay soft] speak softly, go slow.
165. brooke] be endurable.
166. In K.J. the Bastard does not attempt to woo Blanch.
170. set...warre] you are taking a chance with war.

Yeelding no other reasons for your claime,
But so and so, because it shall be so.
So wrong shalbe subornd by trust of strength:
A Tyrants practize to invest himselfe,
Where weake resistance giveth wrong the way.
To check the which, in holy lawfull Armes,
I in the right of Arthur Geffreys Sonne,
Am come before this Citie of Angiers,
To barre all other false supposed clayme,
From whence or howsoere the error springs.
And in his quarrell on my Princely word,
Ile fight it out unto the latest man.
JOHN Know King of Fraunce, I will not be commaunded
By any power or Prince in Christendome,
To yeeld an instance how I hold mine owne,
More than to answere, that mine owne is mine.
But wilt thou see me parley with the Towne,
And heare them offer me alleageance,
Fealtie and homage, as true liege men ought.
FR.KING Summon them, I will not beleeve it till I see it, and when I see it Ile soone change it.

They summon the Towne: the Citizens appeare upon the walls.

JOHN You men of Angiers, and as I take it my loyall Subjects, I have summoned you to the walls: to dispute on my right, were to thinke you doubtfull therein, which I am perswaded you are not. In few words, our Brothers Sonne, backt with the King of Fraunce, have beleagred your Towne upon a false pretended title to the same: in defence whereof I your liege Lord have brought our power to fence you from the Usurper, to free your intended servitude, and utterly to supplant the foemen, to my right and your rest. Say then, who keepe you the Towne for?
CITIZEN For our lawfull King.
JOHN I was no lesse perswaded: then in Gods name open your gates, and let me enter.
CITIZEN And it please your Highnes we comptroll not your title, neither will we rashly admit your entrance: if you bee lawfull King[7] with all obedience we keepe it to your use, if not King, our rashnes to be impeached for yeelding, with-

200-201. who keepe] who who (TCC) (Hunt.) (Folger).

---

173. subornd] procured.
174. invest]furnish with power.
185. instance] proof. 185. how...owne] of what I claim.
200. right...rest] cf. K.J., IV.ii.55, "If what in rest you have, in right you hold."
202. CITIZEN] in K.J. II.i.201ff., this role is given to Hubert.
208. impeached] censured.

out more considerate triall: we answere not as men lawles,
but to the behoofe of him that prooves lawfull.
JOHN I shall not come in then?
CITIZEN No my Lord, till we know more.
FR.KING Then heare me speake in the behalfe of Arthur Sonne of Geffrey elder Brother to John, his title manifest without contradiction to the Crowne and Kingdom of England, with Angiers and divers Townes on this side the sea: will you acknowledge him your liege Lord, who speaketh in my word to intertaine you with all favours as beseemeth a King to his subjects, or a friend to his wel-willers: or stand to the perill of your contempt, when his title is prooved by the sword.
CITIZEN We answere as before: till you have prooved one right, we acknowledge none right; he that tries himselfe our Soveraigne, to him will we remaine firme subjects, and for him, and in his right we hold our Towne as desirous to know the truth as loath to subscribe before we knowe: More than this we cannot say, and more than this we dare not doo.
FR.KING Then John I defie thee in the name and behalfe of Arthur Plantaginet thy King and cousin, whose right and patrimonie thou detainest, as I doubt not ere the day ende in a set battell make thee confesse: whereunto with a zeale to right I challenge thee.
JOHN I accept the challenge, and turne the defiance to thy throate. [Exeunt]

[Scene iii]

Excursions. The Bastard chaseth Lymoges the Austrich Duke, and maketh him leave the Lyons skinne.

BAST. And art thou gone, misfortune haunt thy steps,
And chill colde feare assaile thy times of rest.
Morpheus leave here thy silent Eban cave,
Besiedge his thoughts with dismall fantasies,
And ghastly objects of pale threatning Mors.
Affright him every minute with stearne lookes,
Let shadowe temper terror in his thoughts,
And let the terror make the coward mad,

232. the challenge] thy Q2-3.

---

210. behoofe] advantage.
222. tries] demonstrates, prooves.
[Scene iii]
0.1 Scene iii] om. from K.J.
3. Morpheus] in Greek mythology, the god of dreams; see the story of Ceyx and Alcyone in Ovid's Metamorphoses, XI.
3. Eban] i.e., ebon, black.

And in his madnes let him feare pursute,
And so in frenzie let the peasant die.
Here is the ransome that allays his rage,
The first free hold that Richard left his sonne:
With which I shall surprize his living foes,
As Hectors statue did the fainting Greekes.[1] Exit.

[Scene iv]

Enter the Kings Herolds with Trumpets to the wals of Angiers: they summon the Towne.

ENG.HEROLD John by the grace of God King of England, Lord of Ireland, Anjou, Toraine, &c. demaundeth once again of you his subjects of Angiers, if you will quietly surrender up the Towne into his hands?
FR.HEROLD Philip by the grace of God King of Fraunce, demaundeth in the behalfe of Arthur Duke of Britaine, if you will surrender up the Towne into his hands, to the use of the said Arthur.
CITIZENS Herolds goe tell the two victorious Princes, that we the poore Inhabitants of Angiers, require a parle of their Majesties.
HEROLDS We goe.

Enter the Kings, Queene Elianor, Blaunch, Bastard, Lymoges, Lewes, Chattilion,[1] Pembrooke, Salisbury, Constance, and Arthur Duke of Britaine.

JOHN Herold, what answere doo the Townsmen send?
FR.KING Will Angiers yeeld to Philip King of Fraunce?
ENG.HEROLD The Townsmen on the wals accept your Grace.
FR.HEROLD And crave a parley of your Majestie.
JOHN You Citizens of Angiers, have your eyes
Beheld the slaughter that our English bowes
Have made upon the coward frawdfull French?
And have you wisely pondred therewithall
Your gaine in yeelding to the English King?
FR.KING Their losse in yeelding to the English King.
But John, they saw from out their highest Towers

[Scene iii]
14. statue] stature Q3.
[Scene iv]
12.2 Chattilion] Castilean Qq.

[Scene iv]
0.1 Trumpets] i.e., Trumpeters.

The Chevaliers of Fraunce and crossebow shot
Make lanes of slaughtred bodies through thine hoast,
And are resolvde to yeelde to Arthurs right.
JOHN Why Philip, though thou bravest it fore the walls,
Thy conscience knowes that John hath wonne the field.
FR.KING What ere my conscience knows, thy Armie feeles
That Philip had the better of the day.
BAST. Philip indeede hath got the Lyons case,
Which here he holds to Lymoges disgrace.
Base Duke to flye and leave such spoyles behinde:
But this thou knewst of force to make mee stay.
It farde with thee as with the marriner,
Spying the hugie Whale, whose monstrous bulke
Doth beare the waves like mountaines fore the winde,
That throwes out emptie vessells, so to stay
His furie, while the ship doth saile away.
Philip ti thine: and fore this Princely presence,
Madame I humbly lay it at your feete,
Being the first adventure I atchievd,
And first exployt your Grace did enjoyne:
Yet many more I long to be enjoynd.
BLANCH Philip I take it, and I thee commaund
To weare the same as earst thy Father did:
Therewith receive this favour at my hands,
T'incourage thee to follow Richards fame.
ARTHUR Ye Citizens of Angiers, are ye mute?
Arthur or John, say which shall be your King?
CITIZEN We care not which, if once we knew the right,
But till we know we will not yeeld our right.
BAST. Might Philip counsell two so mightie Kings,
As are the Kings of England and of Fraunce,
He would advise your Graces to unite
And knit your forces gainst these Citizens,
Pulling their battered walls about their eares.
The Town once wonne then strive about the claime,
For they are minded to delude you both.
CITIZEN Kings, Princes, Lords & Knights assembled here,
The Citizens of Angiers all by me
Entreate your Majestie to heare them speake:
And as you like the motion they shall make,
So to account and follow their advice.

43. did enjoyne] did me enjoyne Q2-3.
60. assembled] assemble Q3.

---

24. Chevaliers] cavalry.
26. See K.J., II.i.300-311.
27. bravest it] act defiant, boast.
51. right] legitimate, legal king.
52. right] prerogative; see K.J., II.i.325-33.

JOHN. FR.KING Speake on, we give thee leave.
CITIZEN Then thus: whereas that yong and lustie knight
Incites you on to knit your kingly strengths:
The motion cannot choose but please the good,
And such as love the quiet of the State.
But how my Lords, how should your strengths be knit?
Not to oppresse your subjects and your friends,
And fill the world with brawles and mutinies:
But unto peace your forces should be knit
To live in Princely league and amitie:
Doo this, the gates of Angiers shall give way
And stand wide open to your harts content.
To make this peace a lasting bond of love,
Remains one onely honorable meanes,
Which by your pardon I shall here display.
Lewes the Dolphin and the heire of Fraunce,
A man of noted valor through the world,
Is yet unmaried: let him take to wife
The beauteous daughter of the King of Spaine,
Neece to K.John, the lovely Ladie Blanche,
Begotten on his Sister Elianor.
With her in marriage will her unckle give
Castles and Towers as fitteth such a match.
The Kings thus joynd in league of perfect love,
They may so deale with Arthur Duke of Britaine,
Who is but yong, and yet unmeete to raigne,
As he shall stand contented everie way.
Thus have I boldly (for the common good)
Delivered what the Citie gave in charge.
And as upon conditions you agree,
So shall we stand content to yeeld the Towne.
ARTHUR A proper peace, if such a motion hold;
These kings beare armes for me, and for my right,
And they shall share my lands to make them friends.
ELINOR Sonne John, follow this motion, as thou lovest
Thy mother,
Make league with Philip, yeeld to any thing:
Lewes shall have my Neece, and then be sure
Arthur shall have small succour out of Fraunce.

65. FR.KING] PHILIP Qq; Philip, speake on Q3.
88. Kings] King Q3.
94. conditions] condition Q3.

---

66. lustie] arrogant.
79. pardon] permission.
80. Dolphin] The old French word was not Dauphin but Daulphin, and so the old English form is Dolphin; see Furness, p.135.
90. unmeete] incompetent.
93. gave in charge] ordered me to say.

JOHN Brother of Fraunce, you heare the Citizens:
Then tell me, how you meane to deale herein.
CONSTANCE Why John, what canst thou give unto thy Neece,
That hast no foote of land, but Arthurs right?
LEWES Byr Ladie Citizens, I like your choyce,
A lovely Damsell is the Ladie Blanche,
Worthie the heire of Europe for her pheere.
CONSTANCE What Kings, why stand you gazing in a trance?
Why how now Lords? accursed Citizens
To fill and tickle their ambicious eares,
With hope of gaine, that springs from Arthurs losse.
Some dismall Plannet at thy birthday raignd,
For now I see the fall of all thy hopes.
FR.KING Ladie, and Duke of Britaine, know you both,
The King of Fraunce respects his honor more,
Than to betray his friends and favourers.
Princesse of Spaine, could you affect my Sonne,
If we upon conditions could agree?
BAST. Swounds Madam, take an English Gentleman:
Slave as I was, I thought to have moovde the match.
Grandame you made me halfe a promise once,
That Lady Blanch should bring me wealth inough,
And make me heire of store of English land.
ELINOR Peace Philip, I will looke thee out a wife,
We must with pollicie compound this strife.
BAST. If Lewes get her, well, I say no more:
But let the frolicke Frenchman take no scorne,
If Philip front him with an English horne.
JOHN Ladie, what answere make you to the King of France?
Can you affect the Dolphin for your Lord?
BLANCH I thanke the King that likes of me so well,
To make me Bride unto so great a Prince:
But give me leave my Lord to pause on this.
Least being too too forward in the cause,
It may be blemish to my modestie.
ELINOR Sonne John, and worthie Philip K. of Fraunce,

118. Than] Then Q3.
120. conditions] condition Q3.

---

106. but...right] but what is Arthur's by right.
107. Byr] contracted form of "By our."
109. pheere] mate.
112. This may have been the germ of Shakespeare's line: "That smooth-faced gentleman, tickling Commodity...."(K.J.,II.i. 573).
119. affect] love.

Doo you confer a while about the Dower,
And I will schoole my modest Neece so well,
That she shall yeeld assoone as you have done.
CONSTANCE I,theres the wretch that broacheth all this ill,
Why flye I not upon the Beldames face,
And with my nayles pull foorth her hatefull eyes.
ARTHUR Sweete Mother cease these hastie madding fits:
For my sake, let my Grandame have her will.
O would she with her hands pull forth my heart,
I could affoord it to appease these broyles.
But mother let us wisely winke at all:
Least farther harmes ensue our hastie speach.
FR.KING Brother of England, what dowrie wilt thou give
Unto my Sonne in marriage with thy Neece?
JOHN First Philip knowes her dowrie out of Spaine
To be so great as may content a King:
But more to mend and amplifie the same,
I give in money thirtie thousand markes.
For land I leave it to thine owne demaund.
FR.KING Then I demand Volquesson, Torain, Main,
Poiters and Anjou, these five Provinces,
Which thou as King of England holdst in Fraunce:
Then shall our peace be soone concluded on.
BAST. No lesse than five such Provinces at once?
JOHN Mother what shall I doo? my brother got these lands
With much effusion of our English bloud:
And shall I give it all away at once?
ELINOR John give it him, so shalt thou live in peace,
And keepe the residue sanz jeopardie.
JOHN Philip bring forth thy Sonne, here is my Neece,
And here in mariage I doo give with her
From me and my Successors English Kings,
Volquesson, Poiters, Anjou, Torain, Main,
And thirtie thousand markes of stipend coyne.
Now Citizens, how like you of this match?
CITIZEN We joy to see so sweete a peace begun.
LEWES Lewes with Blanch shall ever live content.
But now King John, what say you to the Duke?
Father, speake as you may in his behalfe.
FR.KING K.John, be good unto thy Nephew here,
And give him somewhat that shall please thee best.

---

142. I] Ay. 142. broacheth] introduces, produces.
145. hastie] impulsive, quick-tempered.
148. affoord] spare. 148. broyles] disturbances.
155. mend] improve.
158. Volquesson] ancient name for the region now called the Vexin.
159. One of the two lines in The Reign identical with K.J.,II.i.

JOHN Arthur, although thou troublest Englands peace,
Yet here I give thee Brittaine for thine owne,
Together with the Earledome of Richmont,[2]
And this rich Citie of Angiers withall.
ELINOR And if thou seeke to please thine Unckle John,
Shalt see my Sonne how I will make of thee.
JOHN Now every thing is sorted to this end,
Lets in and there prepare the mariage rytes,
Which in S. Maries Chappell presently
Shalbe performed ere this Presence part. Exeunt.

Manent Constance and Arthur.

ARTHUR Madam good cheere, these drouping languishments
Adde no redresse to salve our awkward haps.
If heavens have concluded these events,
To small availe is bitter pensivenes:
Seasons will change, and so our present griefe
May change with them, and all to our reliefe.
CONSTANCE Ah boy, thy yeares I see are farre too greene
To looke into the bottome of these cares.
But I, who see the poyse that weighteth downe
Thy weale, my wish, and all the willing meanes
Wherewith thy fortune and thy fame should mount,
What joy, what ease, what rest can lodge in me,
With whom all hope and hap doth disagree?
ARTHUR Yet Ladies teares, and cares, and solemne shows,
Rather than helpes, heape up more worke for woes.
CONSTANCE If any Power will heare a widdowes plaint,[3]
That from a wounded soule implores revenge;
Send fell contagion to infect this Clyme,
This cursed Countrey, where the traytors breath,
Whose perjurie as prowd Briareus,
Beleaguers all the Skie with misbeliefe.
He promist Arthur, and he sware it too,
To fence thy right, and check thy foemans pride:
But now black-spotted Perjure as he is,
He takes a truce with Elnors damned brat,
And marries Lewes to her lovely Neece,
Sharing thy fortune, and thy birth-dayes gift

---

188. S. Maries] Cf. K.J.,II.i.538. Furness and Halliwell identified this with the church at Ronceray.
190. languishments] sorrows.
191. awkward haps] unfavorable fortunes.
198. poyse] burden.
202. hope and hap] Fleay notes the punning on "hope," "hop" and "hap" as frequent in pre-Shakespearean plays.
209. Briareus] In Greek mythology, one of the three hundred-handed giants, sons of Uranus and Ge.
214. brat] a child (implies insignificance; not pejorative).

Betweene these lovers: ill betide the match.
And as they shoulder thee from out thy owne,
And triumph in a widowes tearefull cares:
So heavens crosse them with a thriftles course.
Is all the bloud yspilt on either part,
Closing the cranies of the thirstie earth,
Growne to a lovegame and a Bridall feast?
And must thy birthright bid the wedding banes?
Poore helples boy, hopeles and helples too,
To whom misfortune seemes no yoke at all.
Thy stay, thy state, thy imminent mishaps
Woundeth thy mothers thoughts with feeling care,
Why lookst thou pale? the colour flyes thy face,
I trouble now the fountaine of thy youth,
And make it moodie with my doles discourse,
Goe in with me, reply not lovely boy,
We must obscure this mone with melodie,
Least worser wrack ensue our malecontent. Exeunt.

[Scene v]

Enter the King of England, the King of Fraunce, Arthur, Bastard, Lewes, Lymoges, Constance, Blanche, Chattilion, Pembrooke, Salisburie, and Elianor.

JOHN This is the day, the long desired day,
Wherein the Realmes of England and of Fraunce,
Stand highly blessed in a lasting peace.
Thrice happie is the Bridegroome and the Bride,
From whose sweete Bridale such a concord springs,
To make of mortall foes immortall friends.
CONSTANCE Ungodly peace made by an others warre.
BAST. Unhappie peace, that ties thee from revenge.
Rouse thee Plantaginet, live not to see
The butcher of the great Plantaginet.

219. tearefull] fearful Q3.
[Scene v]
0.2. Constance] Coustance (TCC) (Hunt.) (Folger).
10. Plantaginet] Plantiginet (TCC) (Hunt.) (Folger).

[Scene iv]
220. thriftles] unsuccessful.
221-2. Cf. 3 Henry VI, II.iii.15, "Thy brother's blood the thirsty earth hath drunk."
233. mone] moan. 233. with melodie] Bullough suggests that music probably followed before Scene v.
[Scene v]
8. unhappie] unfortunate. 8. ties] prevents, keeps

Kings, Princes, and ye Peeres of either Realmes,
Pardon my rashnes, and forgive the zeale
That caries me in furie to a deede
Of high desert, of honour, and of armes.
A boone O Kings, a boone doth Philip beg
Prostrate upon his knee: which knee shall cleave
Unto the superficies of the earth,
Till Fraunce and England graunt this glorious boone.
JOHN Speake Philip, England graunts thee thy request.
FR.KING And Fraunce confirmes what ere is in his power.
BAST. Then Duke sit fast, I levell at thy head,
Too base a ransome for my fathers life.
Princes, I crave the Combat with the Duke
That braves it in dishonor of my Sire.
Your words are past nor can you now reverse
The Princely promise that revives my soule,
Whereat me thinks I see his sinnews shake:
This is the boon (dread Lords) which granted once
Or life or death are pleasant to my soule;
Since I shall live and die in Richards right.
LYMOGES Base Bastard, misbegotten of a King,
To interrupt these holy nuptiall rytes
With brawles and tumults to a Dukes disgrace:
Let it suffice, I scorne to joyne in fight,
With one so farre unequall to my selfe.
BAST. A fine excuse, Kings if you wilbe Kings,
Then keepe your words, and let us combat it.
JOHN Philip, we cannot force the Duke to fight,
Being a subject unto neither Realme:
But tell me Austria, if an English Duke
Should dare thee thus, wouldst thou accept the challendge?
LYMOGES Els let the world account the Austrich Duke
The greatest coward living on the Earth.
JOHN Then cheere thee Philip, John will keepe his word.
Kneele downe; in sight of Philip King of Fraunce
And all these Princely Lords assembled here,
I gird thee with the sword of Normandie,
And of that land I doo invest thee Duke:
So shalt thou be in living and in land
Nothing inferiour unto Austria.
LYMOGES K. John, I tell thee flatly to thy face
Thou wrongst mine honour: and that thou maist see
How much I scorne thy new made Duke and thee,
I flatly say, I will not be compeld:

---

24. braves it] struts arrogantly.
42. Els] If I do not.
48. This investiture does not occur in K.J.

And so farewell Sir Duke of low degree,
Ile find a time to match you for this geere. Exit.
JOHN Stay Philip, let him goe, the honors thine.
BAST. I cannot live unles his life be mine.
ELINOR Thy forwardnes this day hath joyd my soule,
And made me thinke my Richard lives in thee.
FR.KING Lordings lets in, and spend the wedding day
In maskes and triumphs, letting quarrells cease.

Enter a Cardynall from Rome.

PAND. Stay King of France, I charge thee joyn not hands
With him that stands accurst of God and men.
Know John, that I Pandulph, Cardinall of Millaine, and
Legate from the Sea of Rome, demaund of thee in the name of
our holy Father the Pope Innocent, why thou dost (contrarie
to the lawes of our holy mother the Church, and our holye
father the Pope) disturbe the quiet of the Church, and dis-
anull the election of Stephen Langton, whom his Holines hath
elected Archbishop of Canterburie: this in his Holines name
I demaund of thee?[1]
JOHN And what hast thou or the Pope thy maister to doo
to demaund of me, how I employ mine owne? Know sir Priest as
I honour the Church and holy Churchmen, so I scorne to be
subject to the greatest Prelate in the world. Tell thy
Maister so from me, and say, John of England said it, that
never an Italian Priest of them all, shall either have tythe,
tole, or poling penie out of England, but as I am King, so
wil I raigne next under God, supreame head both over spirituall
and temprall: and hee that contradicts me in this, Ile make
him hoppe headlesse.[2]
FR.KING What King John, know you what you say, thus to
blaspheme against our holy father the Pope.

66. from] of Q3.
81. temprall] temrall (TCC) Hunt.) (Folger).

---

56. match] fight, combat. 56. geere] the lion skin.
56. Note the different handling of the challenge (III.i.129-33) and John's retort (l. 134ff.) in K.J.
65. Pandulph] Pandulph (not a cardinal) came as a papal legate to England in July, 1207, to determine the succession to the See of Canterbury. He is here confused (as he is in the Chronicles) with Pandulphus Masca, cardinal of Milan.
67. Pope Innocent] Innocent III (Lothar of Segni), pontificate, 1198-1216.
72. Warren (pp.159-68) gives a comprehensive analysis of this struggle.
83. This line is very similar to K.J.,III.i.88.

JOHN Philip, though thou and all the Princes of Christendome suffer themselves to be abusde by a Prelates slaverie, my minde is not of such base temper. If the Pope will bee King in England, let him winne it with the sword; I know no other title he can alleage to mine inheritance.

PAND. John, is this thine answere?

JOHN What then?

PAND. Then I Pandulph of Padoa, Legate from the Apostolick See, doo in the name of S. Peter and his successor our holy Father Pope Innocent, pronounce thee accursed discharging every of thy subjects of all dutie and fealtie that they doo owe to thee, and pardon and forgivenes of sinne to those of them whatsoever, which shall carrie armes against thee, or murder thee:[3] this I pronounce, and charge all good men to abhorre thee as an excommunicate person.[4]

JOHN So sir, the more the Fox is curst the better a fares: if God blesse me and my Land, let the Pope and his shavelings curse and spare not.

PAND. Furthermore I charge thee Philip King of France, and al the Kings and Princes of Christendome, to make war uppon this miscreant: and whereas thou hast made a league with him, and confirmed it by oath, I doo in the name of our aforesaid father the Pope, acquit thee of that oath as unlawful, being made with an heretike; how saist thou Philip, doost thou obey?

JOHN Brother of Fraunce, what say you to the Cardinall?

FR.KING I say, I am sorrie for your Majestie, requesting you to submit your selfe to the Church of Rome.

JOHN And what say you to our league, if I doo not submit?

FR.KING What should I say? I must obey the Pope.

JOHN Obey the Pope, and breake your oath to God?

FR.KING The Legate hath absolvde me of mine oath:
Then yeeld to Rome, or I defie thee heere.[5]

JOHN Why Philip, I defie the Pope and thee,
False as thou art, and perjurde K. of Fraunce,
Unworthie man to be accompted King.
Giv'st thou thy sword into a Prelates hands?
Pandulph, where I of Abbots, Monkes and Friers
Have taken somewhat to maintaine my warres,
Now will I take no more but all they have.[6]
Ile rowze the lazie lubbers from their Cells,
And in despight Ile send them to the Pope.[7]

---

101. This proverb cited in Tilley, p. 239; also in Greene's Friar Bacon, xii. 124.
102. shavelings] a term of contempt for a tonsured ecclesiastic.
126. lubbers] clumsy fellows.

Mother, come you with me, and for the rest
That will not follow John in this attempt,
Confusion light upon their damned soules.
Come Lords, fight for your King that fighteth for your good.
FR.KING And are they gone? Pandulph thy selfe shalt see
How Fraunce will fight for Rome and Romish rytes.
Nobles, to armes, let him not passe the seas.
Lets take him captive, and in triumph lead
The K. of England to the gates of Rome.
Arthur, bestirre thee man, and thou shalt see
What Philip K. of Fraunce will doo for thee.
BLANCH And will your Grace upon your wedding day
Forsake your Bride and follow dreadfull drums:
Nay, good my Lord, stay you at home with mee.
LEWES Sweete heart content thee, and we shall agree.
FR.KING Follow me Lords, Lord Cardynall lead the way,
Drums shalbe musique to this wedding day. Exeunt.

[Scene vi]

Excursions. The Bastard pursues Austria, and kills him.

BAST. Thus hath K. Richards Sonne performde his vowes.
And offered Austrias bloud for sacrifice
Unto his fathers everliving soule.
Brave Cordelion, now my heart doth say,
I have deservde, though not to be thy heire
Yet as I am, thy base begotten sonne,
A name as pleasing to thy Philips heart,
As to be cald the Duke of Normandie.
Lie there a pray to every ravening fowle:
And as my Father triumpht in thy spoyles,
And trode thine Ensignes underneath his feete,
So doo I tread upon thy cursed selfe,
And leave thy bodie to the fowles for food. Exit.

[Scene vii]

Excursions. Arthur, Constance, Lewes, having taken
Q. Elianor prisoner.

CONSTANCE Thus hath the God of Kings with conquering arme

[Scene vii]
0.1 See K.J., III.ii.6ff.

Dispearst the foes to true succession.
Proud and disturber of thy Countreyes peace,
Constance doth live to tame thine insolence,
And on thy head will now avenged be
For all the mischiefes hatched in thy braine.
ELINOR Contemptuous dame unreverent Dutches thou,
To brave so great a Queene as Elianor.
Base scolde hast thou forgot, that I was wife,
And mother to three mightie English Kings?
I charge thee then, and you forsooth sir Boy,
To set your Grandmother at libertie,
And yeeld to John your Unckle and your King.
CONSTANCE Tis not thy words proud Queene shal carry it.
ELINOR Nor yet thy threates proud Dame shal daunt my minde.
ARTHUR Sweete Grandame, and good Mother leave these brawles.
ELINOR Ile finde a time to truimph in thy fall.
CONSTANCE My time is now to triumph in thy fall,
And thou shalt know that Constance will triumph.
ARTHUR Good Mother weigh it is Queene Elianor.
Though she be captive, use her like herselfe.
Sweete Grandame beare with what my Mother sayes,
Your Highnes shalbe used honourably.

Enter a Messenger.

MESS. Lewes my Lord, Duke Arthur, and the rest,
To armes in hast; King John rallies his men,
And ginnes the fight afresh: and sweares withall
To lose his life, or set his Mother free.
LEWES Arthur away, tis time to looke about.
ELINOR Why how now dame, what is your courage coold?
CONSTANCE No Elianor, my courage gathers strength,
And hopes to lead both John and thee as slaves:
And in that hope, I hale thee to the field. Exeunt.

7. unreverent] Q2; unrevent (TCC) (Hunt.) (Folger).
25. rallies] (Fleay); relyes Qq.

---

8. brave] defy, challenge.
10. She was wife to Henry II and mother to Richard I and John.
14. carry it] win the fight.
20. weigh] consider.
21. use...herself] treat her like the Queen that she is.

[Scene viii]

Excursions. Elianor is rescued by John, and Arthur is taken prisoner.[1] Exeunt. Sound victorie.

[Scene ix]

Enter John, Elianor, and Arthur [as] prisoner, Bastard, Pembrooke, Salisbury, and Hubert de Burgh.

JOHN Thus right triumphs, and John triumphs in right.
Arthur thou seest, Fraunce cannot bolster thee:
Thy Mothers pride hath brought thee to this fall.
But if at last, Nephew thou yeeld thy selfe
Into the gardance of thine Unckle John,
Thou shalt be used as becomes a Prince.
ARTHUR Unckle, my Grandame taught her Nephew this,
To beare captivitie with patience.
Might hath prevayld not right, for I am King
Of England, though thou weare the Diadem.
ELINOR Sonne John, soone shall we teach him to forget
These proud presumptions, and to know himself.
JOHN Mother, he never will forget his claime,
I would he livde not to remember it.
But leaving this, we will to England now,
And take some order with our Popelings there,
That swell with pride, and fat of lay mens lands.
Philip I make thee chiefe in this affaire,
Ransack the Abbeys, Cloysters, Priories,
Convert their coyne unto my souldiers use:
And whatsoere he be within my Land,
That goes to Rome for justice and for law,
While he may have his right within the Realme,
Let him be judgde a traitor to the State,
And suffer as an enemie to England.
Mother, we leave you here beyond the seas,
As Regent of our Provinces in Fraunce,
While we to England take a speedie course,
And thanke our God that gave us victorie.
Hubert de Burgh take Arthur here to thee,
Be he thy prisoner: Hubert keepe him safe,

---

12. know himselfe] learn his place.
16. take some order] take disciplinary measures.
20. This mulcting of the clergy was common practise by John when he needed money for war. For example, in 1210, after his return from a military expedition in Ireland, John extorted 100,000 pounds from the regular clergy (Hol.iii.174).

For on his life doth hang thy Soveraignes crowne,
But in his death consists thy Soveraignes blisse:
Then Hubert, as thou shortly hearst from me,
So use the prisoner I have given in charge.
HUBERT Frolick yong Prince, though I your keeper bee,
Yet shall your keeper live at your commaund.
ARTHUR As please my God, so shall become of me.
ELINOR My Sonne to England, I will see thee shipt,
And pray to God to send thee safe ashore.
BAST. Now warres are done, I long to be at home
To dive into the Monkes and Abbots bags,
To make some sport among the smooth skin Nunnes,
And keepe some revell with the fauzen[1] Friers.
JOHN To England Lords, each looke unto your charge,
And arme yourselves against the Romane pride. Exeunt.

[Scene x]

Enter the K. of Fraunce, Lewes his sonne, Cardinall Pandolph [the] Legate.

FR.KING What, every man attacht with this mishap?
Why frowne you so, why droop ye Lords of Fraunce?
Me thinkes it differs from a warlike minde
To lowre it for a checke or two of chaunce.
Had Lymoges escapt the bastards spight,
A little sorrow might have servde our losse.
Brave Austria, heaven joyes to have thee there.
PAND. His sowle is safe and free from Purgatorie,
Our holy Father hath dispenst his sinnes,
The blessed Saints have heard our orisons,
And all are Mediators for his soule,
And in the right of these most holy warres,
His holines free pardon doth pronounce
To all that follow you gainst English heretiques,
Who stand accursed in our mother Church.[1]

[Scene ix]
44. fauzen] (Munro); fanzen Qq.
[Scene x]
0.2 Pandolph [the] Legate] Pandolph Legate, and Constance Qq.

[Scene x]
1. attacht with] affected by.
2. droop] languish.
4. for a checke] for a bad turn; also in Chess, "check" is the position of the king when he is vulnerable to attack.
9. dispenst] remitted the punishment due to his sins.

Enter Constance alone.

FR.KING To aggravate the measure of our griefe,
All malcontent comes Constance for her Sonne.
Be briefe good Madame, for your face imports
A tragick tale behinde thats yet untolde.
Her passions stop the organ of her voyce,
Deepe sorrow throbbeth misbefalne events,
Out with it Ladie, that our Act may end
A full Catastrophe of sad laments.
CONSTANCE My tongue is tunde to storie forth mishap:
When did I breath to tell a pleasing tale?
Must Constance speake? let teares prevent her talke:
Must I discourse? let Dido sigh and say,
She weepes againe to heare the wrack of Troy:
Two words will serve, and then my tale is done:
Elnors proud brat hath robd me of my Sonne.
LEWES Have patience Madame, this is chaunce of warre:
He may be ransomde, we revenge his wrong.
CONSTANCE Be it ner so soone, I shall not live so long.
FR.KING Despaire not yet, come Constance, goe with me,
These clowdes will fleet, the day will cleare againe.
PAND. Now Lewes, thy fortune buds with happie spring,
Our holy Fathers prayers effecteth this.
Arthur is safe, let John alone with him,
Thy title next is fairst to Englands Crowne:
Now stirre thy Father to begin with John,
The Pope says I, and so is Albion thine.
LEWES Thankes my Lord Legate for your good conceipt,
Tis best we follow now the game is faire,
My Father wants to worke him your good words.
PAND. A few will serve to forward him in this,
Those shal not want: but lets about it then. Exeunt.

---

16. measure] dimension.
17. malcontent] in the literal sense; her entrance is announced and her conventional melancholy garb and posture are noted.
18. imports] implies, conveys.
20. organ...voyce] Cf. Twelfth Night, I.iv.33, "Thy small pipe/ Is as the maiden's organ, shrill and sound."
23. Catastrophe] denouement.
30. brat] child (no pejorative connotation).
41. I] Ay.
42. good conceipt] favorable opinion.
44. worke him] to convince him of.

[Scene xi][1]

Enter Philip leading a Frier, charging him to show where the Abbots golde lay.

BAST.[2] Come on you fat Franciscans, dallie no longer,
but shew me where the Abbots treasure lyes, or die.
FRIAR Benedicamus Domini, was ever such an injurie.
Sweete S. Withold of thy lenitie, defend us from extremitie,
And heare us for S. Charitie, oppressed with austeritie.
In nomini Domini, make I my homilie,
Gentle Gentilitie grieve not the Cleargie.
BAST. Grey gownd good face, conjure ye,
ner trust me for a groate,
If this wa[i]ste girdle hang thee not
that girdeth in thy coate.
Now balde and barefoote Bungie birds
when up the gallowes climing,
Say Philip he had words inough
to put downe with ryming!
FRIAR A pardon, O parce, Saint Fraunces for mercie,
Shall shield thee from nightspells and dreaming of divells,
If thou wilt forgive me, and never more grieve me.
With fasting and praying, and Haile Marie saying.
From black Purgatorie a penance[3] right sorie,
Frier Thomas will warme you,
It shall never harme you.
BAST. Come leave off your rabble,
Sirs hang up this lozell.
2.FRIAR For charitie I beg his life,

1. Franciscans] Franciscan Q3.
21. warme] warn (Fleay) (Munro).

---

3. Benedicamus Domini] "Let us praise the Lord." But Domini is ungrammatical; the correct form should be Domino.
4. S. Withold] a fictitious (and abusive) name, probably derived from "wittol," a cuckold or simpleton.
5. S. Charitie] Honigmann (p.87, n.173) quotes the following: "Sweete Saint Charitee the Catholiques comen othe."
6. In nomini Domini] "In the name of the Lord"; nomini should be nomine.
8. good face] a term of contempt. Tilley quotes the contemporary proverb:"He carries two faces under the hood" (p. 199).
12. balde] tonsured. 12. Bungie birds] a bung was a cutpurse; Bullough offers that there may have been a Franciscan priory at Bungay in Suffolk.
15. put...down] get the better of you; also a pun on hanging.
16. parce] "spare me."
24. lozell] scoundrel.

Saint Frauncis chiefest Frier,
The best in all our Covent Sir,
to keepe a Winters[4] fier.
O strangle not the good olde man,
my hostesse oldest guest,
And I will bring you by and by
unto the Priors chest.
BAST. I, saist thou so, and if thou wilt the frier is at libertie,
If not, as I am honest man, Ile hang you both for companie.
FRIAR Come hether, this is the chest though simple to behold,
That wanteth not a thousand pound in silver and in gold.
Myselfe will warrant full so much, I know the Abbots store,
Ile pawne my life there is no lesse to have what ere is more.
BAST. I take thy word, the overplus unto thy share shall come,
But if there want of full so much, thy neck shall pay the sum.
Breake up the Cofer, Frier.
FRIAR Oh I am undun, faire Alice the Nun
Hath tooke up her rest in the Abbots chest,
Sancte benedicite, pardon my simplicitie.
Fie Alice, confession will not salve this transgression.
BAST. What have wee here, a holy Nun? So keepe me God in health,
A smooth facte Nunne (for ought I know) is all the Abbots wealth.
Is this the Nonries chastitie? Beshrewe me but I thinke
They goe as oft to Venery, as niggards to their drinke.
Why paltrey Frier and Pandar too, yee shamelesse shaven crowne,
Is this the chest that held a hoord, at least a thousand pound?
And is the hoord a holy whore? Wel be the hangman nimble,
Hee'le take the paine to paye you home, and teach you to dissemble.
NUN O spare the Frier Anthony, a better never was
To sing a Dirige solemnly, or read a morning Masse.
If money be the meanes of this, I know an ancient Nunne,
That hath a hoord this seaven yeares, did never see the sunne;
And that is yours, and what is ours, so favour now be shown,
You shall commaund as commonly, as if it were your owne.

28. Winters] Vintners Q2-3.

---

40. want...much] is not that amount.
44. simplicitie] foolishness.
47. for ought] for anything; i.e., I'm sure.
48. Beshrew me] curse me.
53. pay you home] chastise you thoroughly.
55. Dirige] The Latin antiphon, sung at the Catholic burial service, which begins: "Dirige, Domine, Deus meus, in conspectu tuo viam mean"(Ps. 5).

FRIAR Your honour excepted.
NUN I Thomas, I meane so.
BAST. From all save from Friers.
NUN Good Sir, doo not think so.
BAST. I thinke and see so: why how camst thou here?
FRIAR To hide her from lay men.
NUN Tis true sir, for feare.
BAST. For feare of the laytie: a pitifull dred
When a Nunne flies for succour to a fat Friers bed.
But now for your ransome my Cloyster-bred Conney,
To the chest that you speake of where lyes so much money.
NUN Faire Sir, within this presse, of plate & money is
The valew of a thousand markes, and other thing by gis.
Let us alone, and take it all, tis yours Sir, now you know it.
BAST. Come on sir Frier, pick the locke, this geere dooth cotton hansome,
That covetousness so cunningly must pay the letchers ransom.
What is in the hoord?
FRIAR Frier Laurence, my Lord. Now holy water help us,
Some witch, or some divell is sent to delude us:
Haud credo Laurentius, that thou shouldest be pend thus
In the presse of a Nun. We are all undon,
And brought to discredence if thou be Frier Laurence.
FRIAR [Laurence] Amor vincit omnia, so Cato affirmeth,
And therefore a Frier whose fancie soone burneth:
Because he is mortall and made of mould,
He omits what he ought, and doth more than he should.
BAST. How goes this geere? the Friers chest filde with a fausen Nunne,
The Nunne again locks Frier up, to keep him from the Sun.
Belike the presse is purgatorie, or penance passing grievous:
The Friers chest a hel for Nuns. How do these dolts deceive us!
Is this the labour of their lives to feede and live at ease,
To revell so lasciviously as often as they please.
Ile mend the fault or fault my ayme, if I do misse amending,

81. Laurence] Laureuce (TCC) (Hunt.) (Folger).
92. or fault] or fail Q3.

---

69. Conney] rabbit; also, a slang expression, with sexual implications, for the female.
71. presse] cupboard.
72. gis] shortened form of "Jesus."
74. geere...hansome] business prospers favorably.
79. haud credo] I can hardly believe.
82. The line is Vergil's (Ecl. X.69), not Cato's.
83. fancie soone burneth] caprice (desire) rages straightaway.
84. mould] earth, dirt.
88. Belike] likely. 88. passing] surpassing, beyond.
92. fault my ayme] miss my mark.

Tis better burn the cloisters down than leave them for offending.
But holy you, to you I speake, to you religious divell,
Is this the presse that holdes the summe to quite you for your evill?
NUN I crie Peccavi, parce me, good Sir I was beguild.
FRIAR Absolve Sir, for charitie she would be reconcilde.
BAST. And so I shall, sirs binde them fast, this is their absolution,
Go hang them up for hurting them, hast them to execution.
FRIAR LAUR. O tempus edax rerum
Give children bookes, they teare them.
O vanitas vanitatis, in this waning aetatis,
At threescore welneere to goe to this geere,
To my conscience a clog to dye like a dog.
Exaudi me Domine, sivis me parce
Dabo pecuniam, si habeo veniam.
To goe and fetch it, I will dispatch it,
A hundred pounds sterling for my lives sparing.

Enter Peter a Prophet, with people.

PETER Hoe, who is here? S. Fraunces be your speed,
Come in my flock, and follow me, your fortunes I will reed.
Come hether boy, goe get thee home, and clime not overhie:
For, from aloft thy fortunes stands in hazard; thou shalt die.
BOY God be with you Peter, I pray you come to our house a Sunday.
PETER My boy show me thy hand, blesse thee my boy,
For in thy palme I see a many troubles are ybent to dwell,
But thou shalt scape them all and doo full well.
BOY I thanke you Peter, theres a cheese for your labor: my sister prayes ye to come home, & tell her how many husbands she shall have, and shee'l give you a rib of bacon.

110. fortunes] fortune Q3.

---

95. quite] acquit.
96. Peccavi...me] I have sinned, spare me.
100. tempus...rerum] "Time, consumer of all things." This phrase is found in Thomas Nashe's preface to Greene's Menaphon (1598).
102. waning aetatis] declining age.
103. geere] nonsense, foolish business.
104. clog] a weight, impediment. 104. dye...dog] Cf. Tilley,167.
105-106. Exaudi...veniam] "O Lord hear my prayer. Spare me if you will. I'll give money, if I have permission...."(Bullough).
111. clime not overhie] aspire not too high.
116. a many] a horde of. 116. ybent] inclined.

PETER My masters, stay at the towns end for me, Ile come to you all anon: I must dispatch some busines with a Frier, and then Ile read your fortunes.

BAST. How now, a Prophet? Sir prophet whence are ye?

PETER I am of the world and in the world, but live not as others by the world: what I am I know, and what thou wilt be I know. If thou knowest me now be answered: if not, enquire no more what I am.

BAST. Sir, I know you will be a dissembling knave, that deludes the people with blinde prophecies: you are him I looke for, you shall away with me: bring away all the rabble, and you Frier Laurence remember your raunsome- a hundred pound, and a pardon for your selfe, and the rest come on. Sir Prophet, you shall with me, to receive a Prophets rewarde.

Exeunt.

[Scene xii]

Enter Hubert de Burgh with three men.

HUB. My masters, I have shewed you what warrant I have for this attempt; I perceive by your heavie countenances, you had rather be otherwise imployed, and for my owne part, I would the King had made choyce of some other executioner: onely this is my comfort, that a King commaunds, whose precepts neglected or omitted, threatneth torture for the default. Therefore in briefe, leave me, and be readie to attend the adventure: stay within that entry, and when you heare me crie, God save the King, issue sodainly foorth, lay handes on Arthur, set him in this chayre, wherin (once fast bound) leave him with me to finish the rest.

ATTENDANTS We goe, though loath. Exeunt.

HUB. My Lord, will it please your Honour to take the benefice of the faire evening?

Enter Arthur to Hubert de Burgh.

ARTHUR Grammercie Hubert for thy care of me,
In or to whom restraint is newly knowen,
The joy of walking is small benefit,
Yet will I take thy offer with small thankes,
I would not loose the pleasure of the eye.
But tell me curteous keeper if you can,
How long the King will have me tarrie heere.

---

2. attempt] Cf. K.J., IV.i.6.
13. Hubert is speaking to Arthur, who is standing in the inner stage (Bullough).
14. faire evening] In K.J., IV.i.1, the time is early morning.

HUB.
God send

They

ARTHU
O helpe
God send
Tend no
HUB.
ARTH
What me
HUB
Harmfu
A dism
I fair
AR
HU
A wra
Death
Be d
A
Tis
What
Act
Yet
My
To
Pe
Re

HUB. I know not Prince, but as I gesse not long.
God send you freedome, and God save the King.

They issue forth.

ARTHUR Why how now sirs, what may this outrage meane?
O helpe me Hubert, gentle keeper helpe:
God send this sodaine mutinous approach
Tend not to reave a wretched guiltles life.
HUB. So sirs, depart, and leave the rest for me.
ARTHUR Then Arthur yeeld, death frowneth in thy face,
What meaneth this? Good Hubert plead the case.
HUB. Patience yong Lord, and listen words of woe,
Harmfull and harsh, hells horror to be heard:
A dismall tale fit for a furies tongue.
I faint to tell, deepe sorrow is the sound.
ARTHUR What, must I die?
HUB. No newes of death, but tidings of more hate,
A wrathfull doome, and most unluckie fate:
Deaths dish were daintie at so fell a feast,
Be deafe, heare not, its hell to tell the rest.
ARTHUR Alas thou wrongst my youth with words of feare,
Tis hell, tis horror, not for one to heare:
What is it man? if it must needes be don,
Act it, and end it that the paine were gon.
HUB. I will not chaunt such dolour with my tongue,
Yet must I act the outrage with my hand.
My heart my head, and all my powers beside,
To aide the office have at once denide.
Peruse this letter, lines of treble woe,
Read ore my charge, and pardon when you know.

Hubert, these are to commaund thee, as thou tendrest our quiet in minde and the estate of our person, that presently upon the receipt of our commaund, thou put out the eyes of Arthur Plantaginet.

ARTHUR Ah monstrous damned man, his very breath infects the elements,
Contagious venyme dwelleth in his heart,
Effecting meanes to poyson all the world.
Unreverent may I be to blame the heavens
Of great injustice, that the miscreant

---

27. reave] take away.
37. doome] sentence, judgment.
50. tendrest...minde] have a care for our peace of mind.
59. miscreant] criminal, villain.

Lives to oppresse the innocents with wrong.
Ah Hubert, makes he thee his instrument
To sound the tromp that causeth hell triumph?[1]
Heaven weepes, the Saints doo shed celestiall teares,
They feare thy fall, and cyte thee with remorse,
They knock thy conscience, mooving pitie there,
Willing to fence thee from the rage of hell:
Hell, Hubert, trust me, all the plagues of hell
Hangs on performance of this damned deede.
This seale, the warrant of the bodies blisse,
Ensureth Satan chieftaine of thy soule:
Subscribe not Hubert, give not Gods part away.
I speake not onely for eyes priviledge,
The chiefe exterior that I would enjoy:
But for thy perill, farre beyond my paine,
Thy sweete soules losse, more than my eyes vaine lack;
A cause internall, and eternall too.
Advise thee Hubert, for the case is hard,
To loose salvation for a Kings reward.
HUB. My Lord, a subject dwelling in the land
Is tyed to execute the Kings commaund.
ARTHUR Yet God commands, whose power reacheth further,
That no commaund should stand in force to murther.
HUB. But that same Essence hath ordaind a law,
A death for guilt, to keepe the world in awe.
ARTHUR I plead not guiltie, treasonles and free.[2]
HUB. But that appeale my Lord concernes not me.
ARTHUR Why, thou art he that maist omit the perill.
HUB. I, if my Soveraigne would remit his quarrell.
ARTHUR His quarrell is unhallowed false and wrong.
HUB. Then be the blame to whom it doth belong.
ARTHUR Why thats to thee if thou as they proceede,

76. cause] case Q3.
88. remit] omit Q2-3.

---

64. cyte] arouse, annoy.
69. warrant...blisse] the guarantor of your physical well-being.
69. the bodies] Bullough suggests "thy" as an emendation.
71. Gods part] the soul.
75. vaine lack] useless (senseless) loss.
78. loose] lose.
80. tyed] obliged.
88. quarrell] i.e., John's contest against Arthur.
91. they] John and his henchmen.

Conclude their judgement with so vile a deede.
HUB. Why then no execution can be lawfull,
If Judges doomes must be reputed doubtfull.
ARTHUR Yes where in forme of Lawe in place and time,
The offender is convicted of the crime.
HUB. My Lord, my Lord, this long expostulation,
Heapes up more griefe, than promise of redresse;
For this I know, and so resolvde I end,
That subjects lives on Kings commaunds depend.
I must not reason why he is your foe,
But doo his charge since he commaunds it so.
ARTHUR Then doo thy charge, and charged be thy soule
With wrongfull persecution done this day.
You rowling eyes, whose superficies yet
I doo behold with eyes that Nature lent:
Send foorth the terror of your Moovers frowne,
To wreake my wrong upon the murtherers
That rob me of your faire reflecting view:
Let hell to them (as earth they wish to mee)
Be darke and direfull guerdon for their guylt,
And let the black tormenters of deepe Tartary
Upbraide them with this damned enterprise,
Inflicting change of tortures on their soules.
Delay not Hubert, my orisons are ended,
Begin I pray thee, reave me of my sight:
But to performe a tragedie indeede,
Conclude the period with a mortall stab.
Constance farewell, tormentor come away,
Make my dispatch the Tirants feasting day.
HUB. I faint, I feare, my conscience bids desist:
Faint did I say, feare was it that I named?
My King commaunds, that warrant sets me free:
But God forbids, and he commaundeth Kings.
That great Commaunder counterchecks my charge,
He stayes my hand, he maketh soft my heart.
Goe cursed tooles, your office is exempt,
Cheere thee yong Lord, thou shalt not loose an eye,
Though I should purchase it with losse of life.
Ile to the King, and say his will is done,
And of the langor tell him thou art dead;
Goe in with me, for Hubert was not borne
To blinde those lampes that Nature pollisht so.
ARTHUR Hubert, if ever Arthur be in state,

---

105. eyes] stars. 105. superficies] surface.
112. Tartary] the infernal regions, beneath even Hades, where the wicked are punished; see the Aeneid, Bk. 6.
127. exempt] remitted.
134. in state] in a position of power.

Looke for amends of this received gift
I tooke my eysight by thy curtesie,
Thou lentst them me, I will not be ingrate.
But now procrastination may offend
The issue that thy kindnes undertakes:
Depart we Hubert to prevent the worst. Exeunt.

[Scene xiii]

Enter King John, Essex, Salisbury, Pembrooke.

JOHN Now warlike followers resteth ought undon
That may impeach us of fond oversight?
The French have felt the temper of our swords,
Cold terror keepes possession in their sowles,
Checking their overdaring arrogance
For buckling with so great an overmatch.
The Arche proud titled Priest of Italy,
That calles himselfe grand Viccar under God
Is busied now with trentall obsequies,
Masse and months minde, dirge and I know not what
To ease their sowles in painefull purgatory,
That have miscaried in these bloudy warres.
Heard you not Lords when first his holines
Had tidings of our small account of him,
How with a taunt vaunting upon his toes
He urgde a reason why the English Asse
Disdaignd the blessed ordinance of Rome?
The title (reverently might I inferre)
Became the Kings that earst have borne the load,
The slavish weight of that controlling Priest:
Who at his pleasure temperd them like waxe
To carrie armes on danger of his curse,
Banding their sowles with warrants of his hand.
I grieve to thinke how Kings in ages past
(Simply devoted to the Sea of Rome)

---

1. resteth ought undon] does anything remain undone?
2. fond] foolish, careless.
6. buckling] engaging.
9. trentall obsequies] Obsequies which include thirty masses.
10. months minde] monthly services in memory of the deceased.
12. miscaried] perished.
14. small account] low estimate.
15. taunt...toes] speaking a scornful jibe as he raised himself on his toes.
23. Banding] binding.
25. Simply] ignorantly.

Have run i
But now fo
Sith we h
That did
It restet
Be reproc
PEMB.
Once were
Your Cit
God save
Pardon m
Your Hig
Would b
What it
JOHN
Thou kn
Essex g
About t

Ent

Philip
Are Fr
What
Tell
BA
The e
The
Are
Till
I do
You
J
This
Will
Cur
As
But
As
Dis
Bu

Ne
Wh

—

4
5
5
6

Have run into a thousand acts of shame.
But now for confirmation of our State,
Sith we have prund the more than needfull braunch
That did oppresse the true wel-growing stock,
It resteth we throughout our Territories
Be reproclaimed and invested King.
PEMB. My Liege, that were to busie men with doubts,
Once were you crownd, proclaimd, and with applause
Your Citie streets have ecchoed to the eare,
God save the King, God save our Soveraigne John.
Pardon my feare, my censure doth infer
Your Highnes not deposde from Regall State,
Would breed a mutinie in peoples mindes,
What it should meane to have you crownd againe.
JOHN Pembrooke performe what I have bid thee doo,
Thou knowst not what induceth me to this.
Essex goe in, and Lordings all be gon
About this taske, I will be crownd anon. [Exeunt all but John]

Enter the Bastard.

Philip, what newes; how doo the Abbots chests?
Are Friers fatter than the Nunnes are faire?
What cheere with Churchmen, had they golde or no?
Tell me how hath thy office tooke effect?
BAST. My Lord, I have performd your Highnes charge:
The ease bred Abbots and the bare foote Friers,
The Monkes, the Priors and the holy cloystred Nunnes,
Are all in health, and were my Lord in wealth,
Till I had tythde and tolde their holy hoords.
I doubt not when your Highnes sees my prize,
You may proportion all their former pride.
JOHN Why so, now sorts it Philip as it should:
This small intrusion into Abbey trunkes,
Will make the Popelings excommunicate,
Curse, ban, and breath out damned orisons,
As thick as hailestones fore the springs approach:
But yet as harmles and without effect,
As is the eccho of a Cannons crack
Dischargd against the battlements of heaven.
But what newes els befell there Philip?
BAST. Strange newes my Lord: within your territories,
Nere Pomfret is a Prophet new sprong up,
Whose divination volleys wonders foorth;

---

47. how...effect] the results of your performance of duty.
52. tolde] tolled.
55. sorts it] it turns out.
65. Pomfret] Pontefract, a small town about 175 miles north of London.

To him the Commons throng with Countrey gifts,
He sets a date unto the Beldames death,
Prescribes how long the Virgins state shall last,
Distinguisheth the mooving of the heavens,
Gives limits unto holy nuptiall rytes,
Foretelleth famine, aboundeth plentie forth,
Of fate, of fortune, life and death he chats,
With such assurance, scruples put apart,
As if he knew the certaine doomes of heaven,
Or kept a Register of all the Destinies.
JOHN Thou tellst me mervailes, would thou hadst brought the man,
We might have questiond him of things to come.
BAST. My Lord, I tooke a care of had I wist,
And brought the Prophet with me to the Court,
He stayes my Lord but at the Presence doore:
Pleaseth your Highnes, I will call him in.
JOHN Nay stay awhile, wee'l have him here anon,
A thing of weight is first to be performd.

Enter the Nobles and crowne King John, and then crie God save the King.

JOHN Lordings and friends supporters of our state,
Admire not at this unaccustomd course,
Nor in your thoughts blame not this deede of yours.
Once ere this time was I invested King,
Your fealtie sworne as Liegmen to our state:
Once since that time ambicious weedes have sprung
To staine the beautie of our garden plot:
But heavens in our conduct rooting thence
The false intruders, breakers of worlds peace,
Have to our joy, made Sunshine chase the storme.
After the which, to try your constancie
That now I see is worthie of your names,
We cravde once more your helps for to invest us
Into the right that envie sought to wrack.
Once was I not deposde, your former choyce;

69. state] death Q3.

---

79. See Joseph T. Shipley, Dictionary of Early English (New York, 1955), p.320: "A wise man saith not, had I wist." The Bastard says that he made certain that he would not use that excuse.
83. anon] directly.
86. Admire not] do not be surprised.
88. Once...time] on May 27, 1199, at Westminster Abbey; on April 14, 1202, John was crowned for the second time at Canterbury.
92. in...thence] for our protection rooting out.
98. wrack] subvert, overthrow.

Now twice been crowned and applauded King:
Your cheered action to install me so,
Infers assured witnes of your loves,
And binds me over in a Kingly care
To render love with love, rewards of worth
To ballance downe requitall to the full.
But thankes the while, thankes Lordings to you all:
Aske me and use me, try me and finde me yours.
ESSEX A boon my Lord, at vauntage of your words
We aske to guerdon all our loyalties.
PEMB. We take the time your Highnes bids us aske:
Please it you graunt, you make your promise good,
With lesser losse than one superfluous haire
That not remembred falleth from your head.
JOHN My word is past, receive your boone my Lords.
What may it be? Aske it, and it is yours.
ESSEX We crave my Lord, to please the Commons with
The libertie of Ladie Constance Sonne:
Whose durance darkeneth your Highnes right,
As if you kept him prisoner, to the end
Your selfe were doubtfull of the thing you have.
Dismisse him thence, your Highnes needes not feare,
Twice by consent you are proclaimd our King.
PEMB. This if you graunt, were all unto your good:
For simple people muse you keepe him close.
JOHN Your words have searcht the center of my thoughts,
Confirming warrant of your loyalties,
Dismisse your counsell, sway my state,
Let John doo nothing but by your consents.
Why how now Philip, what extasie is this?
Why casts thou up thy eyes to heaven so?

There the five Moones appeare.[1]

BAST. See, see my Lord strange apparitions.
Glauncing mine eye to see the Diadem
Placte by the Bishops on your Highnes head,
From foorth a gloomie cloude, which curtaine like
Displaide itselfe, I sodainly espied
Five moones reflecting, as you see them now:
Even in the moment that the Crowne was placte

---

105. ballance...requitall] make equall payment.
106. the while] meanwhile.
107. John expresses the same sentiment in K.J., IV.ii.43ff.
118. durance] confinement.
124. muse] wonder why.
130.1. The stage direction is late.

Can they app
JOHN Wha
Unusuall sig
Presagers o
Beleeve me
Philip thou
Fetch in th
PEMB. T
When with
They spot
ESSEX
Such meteo
That hastr

Enter

JOHN
BAST.
JOHN
That cal
Who by a
Canst bl
If fame
Decide
Portend
Breath
Thy div
Ile hor
PET
Presen
Where
Fowre
To wit
That
And s

141.
143.

144.
147.
148.

156
157
158
15

Gan they appeare, holding the course you see.
JOHN What might portend these apparitions,
Unusuall signes, forerunners of event,
Presagers of strange terror to the world:
Beleeve me Lords the object feares me much.
Philip thou toldst me of a Wizzard late,
Fetch in the man to descant of this show.
PEMB. The heavens frowne upon the sinfull earth,
When with prodigious unaccustomd signes
They spot their superficies with such wonder.
ESSEX Before the ruines of Jerusalem,
Such meteors were the Ensignes of his wrath
That hastned to destroy the faultfull Towne.

Enter the Bastard with the Prophet.

JOHN Is this the man?
BAST. It is my Lord.
JOHN Prophet of Pomfret, for so I heare thou art,
That calculatst of many things to come:
Who by a power repleate with heavenly gift
Canst blab the counsell of thy Makers will.
If fame be not true, or truth be wrongd by thee,
Decide in cyphering what these five Moones
Portend this Clyme, if they presage at all.
Breath out thy gift, and if I live to see
Thy divination take a true effect,
Ile honour thee above all earthly men.
PETER The Skie wherein these Moones have residence,
Presenteth Rome the great Metropolis,
Where sits the Pope in all his holy pompe.
Fowre of the Moones present fowre Provinces,
To wit, Spaine, Denmarke, Germanie, and Fraunce,
That beare the yoke of proud commaunding Rome,
And stand in feare to tempt the Prelates curse.

141. terror] terrors Q3.
143. me...Wizzard] Q2; me of me of Wizzard Q1.

---

144. descant] analyze, interpret.
147. wonder] unnatural events.
148. The siege and destruction of Jerusalem appears to have been commonly alluded to in connection with God's vengeance. At least two plays on this theme are known to have existed in the late 1580's and 90's: Jerusalem (1592) and The Destruction of Jerusalem (1584). See Wilson, p.124.
156. blab] reveal indiscreetly.
157. fame] reports, stories.
158. cyphering] mathematical analysis.
159. Clyme] realm, region.

The smalles
Impatient o
Doth figure
Who gins to
And seekes
This showes
Is figured
JOHN W
Giving app
But for th
Doo they e
To be infl
PETER
But on so
By my pre
Have brou
Of Crowne
Thou shal
JOHN
Villaine
If it be
If false
Hence wi
Lock hin
True or
Before
Cut off
Tut, tu
The roo
I and n
Frowne
The br
Pembro

173. S
200.

176.
179.
180.
188.
191.
196.

198

The smallest Moone that whirles about the rest,
Impatient of the place he holds with them,
Doth figure foorth this Iland Albion,
Who gins to scorne the Sea and State of Rome,
And seekes to shun the Edicts of the Pope:
This showes the heaven, and this I doo averre
Is figured in these apparitions.
JOHN Why then it seemes the heavens smile on us,
Giving applause for leaving of the Pope.
But for they chaunce in our Meridian,
Doo they effect no private growing ill
To be inflicted on us in this Clyme?
PETER The Moones effect no more than what I said:
But on some other knowledge that I have
By my prescience, ere Ascension day
Have brought the Sunne unto his usuall height,
Of Crowne, Estate, and Royall dignitie,
Thou shalt be cleane dispoyld and dispossest.
JOHN False Dreamer, perish with thy witched newes,
Villaine thou woundst me with thy fallacies:
If it be true, dye for thy tidings price;
If false, for fearing me with vaine suppose:
Hence with the Witch, hells damned secretarie.
Lock him up sure: for by my faith I sweare,
True or not true, the Wizzard shall not live.
Before Ascension day: who should be cause hereof?
Cut off the cause and then the effect will dye.
Tut, tut, my mercie serves to maime my selfe,
The roote doth live, from whence these thornes spring up,
I and my promise past for his delivry:
Frowne friends, faile faith, the divell goe withall,
The brat shall dye that terrifies me thus.
Pembrooke and Essex I recall my graunt,

173. State] Seat Q3.
200. goe] doe Q3.

---

176. figured] revealed.
179. But for] But because.
180. private] particular.
188. witched] influenced by witchcraft.
191. fearing] disturbing, scaring.
196. Cf. Tilley, p.90: "Remove the cause and the effect will cease." See also Greene's Friar Bacon, viii.75: "Ablata causa, tollitur effectus."
198. the roote] i.e., Arthur.

I will no
May murmu
I love yo
I would

Enter

How now
HUB.
Yong Ar
JOH
see it
HUB
Within
JOH
HUB
JOH
ES
PE
ES
A dec
Your
Unki
To c
What
Whe
As
The

Pro
Sa
Yo
Th

2
2

I will not buy your favours with my feare:
Nay murmur not, my will is law enough,
I love you well, but if I lovde you better,
I would not buy it with my discontent.

Enter Hubert.

How now, what newes with thee.
HUB. According to your Highnes strickt commaund
Yong Arthurs eyes are blinded and extinct.
JOHN Why so, then he may feele the crowne, but never
see it.
HUB. Nor see nor feele, for of the extreame paine,
Within one hower gave he up the Ghost.
JOHN What, is he dead?
HUB. He is my Lord.
JOHN Then with him dye my cares.
ESSEX Now joy betide thy soule.
PEMB. And heavens revenge thy death.
ESSEX What have you done my Lord? Was ever heard
A deede of more inhumane consequence?
Your foes will curse, your friends will crie revenge.
Unkindly rage more rough than Northern winde,
To chip the beautie of so sweete a flower.
What hope in us for mercie on a fault,
When kinsman dyes without impeach of cause,
As you have done, so come to cheere you with,
The guilt shall never be cast me in my teeth. Exeunt [Nobles].
JOHN And are you gone? The divell be your guide:
Proud Rebels as you are to brave me so:
Saucie, uncivill, checkers of my will.
Your tongues give edge unto the fatall knife:
That shall have passage through your traitrous throats.

215. dye] dies Q2-3.
222. chip] clip Q3.

---

204. will...enough] this was the Angevin prerogative, notably evident in John's previous order for the death of Peter.
222. Wilson suggests that this and the preceding line might have been derived from Euphues: "...a fine face...the beautie whereof is parched with the Sommers blase and chipped with the winters blast"; see Richard W. Bond, ed., The Works of John Lyly (Oxford, 1902), vol.i, p.202.
223. on] for.
224. impeach] a question.
225. See Tilley, p.621, "As they sow, so let them reap."
228. brave] defy.

But husht, breath not buggs words too soone abroad,
Least time prevent the issue of thy reach.
Arthur is dead, I there the corzie growes:
But while he livde, the danger was the more;
His death hath freed me from a thousand feares,
But it hath purchast me ten times ten thousand foes.
Why all is one, such luck shall haunt his game,
To whome the divell owes an open shame:
His life a foe that leveld at my crowne,
His death a frame to pull my building downe.
My thoughts harpt still on quiet by his end,
Who living aymed shrowdly at my roome:
But to prevent that plea twice was I crownd,
Twice did my subjects sweare me fealtie,
And in my conscience lovde me as their liege,
In whose defence they would have pawnd their lives.
But now they shun me as a Serpents sting,
A tragick Tyrant sterne and pitiles,
And not a title followes after John,
But Butcher, bloudsucker and murtherer.
What Planet governde my nativitie,
To bode me soveraigne types of high estate,
So interlacte with hellish discontent,
Wherein fell furie hath no interest?
Curst be the Crowne, chiefe author of my care,
Nay curst my will that made the Crowne my care:
Curst be my birthday, curst ten times the wombe
That yeelded me alive into the world.
Art thou there villaine, Furies haunt thee still,
For killing him whom all the world laments.
HUB. Why heres my Lord your Highnes hand and seale,
Charging on lives regard to doo the deede.

233. thy] my Q3.

---

232. buggs] terrifying (Bullough).
233. issue...reach] outcome of thy efforts.
234. corzie] grievance, trouble.
238. The sense is: a man who has enriched the devil with a public crime (so fostering Satan's kingdom), will be repaid ten times over with misfortunes.
241. frame] machine, lever.
243. roome] position, place.
253. To...estate] To portend for me positions of sovereignty.
260. In Ovid's Metamorphoses, iv.499, the Furies are drawn as tormentors who possessed the souls of the guilty with madness.

JOHN Ah dull conceipted peazant knowst thou not,
It was a damned execrable deede:
Showst me a seale? Oh villaine, both our souls
Have solde their freedome to the thrall of hell,
Under the warrant of that cursed seale.
Hence villaine, hang thy selfe, and say in hell
That I am comming for a kingdome there.
HUB. My Lord attend the happie tale I tell,
For heavens health send Sathan packing hence
That instigates your Highnes to despaire.
If Arthurs death be dismall to be heard,
Bandie the newes for rumors of untruth:
He lives my Lord the sweetest youth alive,
In health, with eysight, not a haire amisse.
This hart tooke vigor from this forward hand,
Making it weake to execute your charge.
JOHN What lives he? Then sweete hope come home agen.
Chase hence despaire, the purveyer for hell.
Hye Hubert, tell these tidings to my Lords
That throb in passions for yong Arthur's death:
Hence Hubert, stay not till thou has revealed
The wished newes of Arthurs happy health.
I goe my selfe, the joyfulst man alive
To storie out this new supposed crime. Exeunt.

The ende of the first part.

---

264. conceipted] witted.
267. thrall] bondage.
268. warrant] guarantee, protection.
271. attend] listen to.
275. Bandie] belie.
283. passions] sorrow, suffering.
287. storie out] to give the true story and thus blot out.

THE

Second part of the

troublesome Raigne of King
John, conteining the death
of Arthur Plantaginet,
the landing of Lewes, and
the poysning of King
John at Swinstead
Abbey.

As it was (sundry times) publikely acted by the
Queenes Majesties Players, in the ho-
nourable Citie of
London.

[Device]

Imprinted at London for Sampson Clarke,
and are to be solde at his shop, on the backe-
side of the Royall Exchange.

1591.

To the Gentlemen Readers.

The changeles purpose of determinde Fate
Give period to our care, or harts content,
When heavens fixt time for this or that hath end:
Nor can earths pomp or pollicie prevent
The doome ordained in their secret will.
Gentles, we left King John repleate with blisse
That Arthur livde, whom he supposed slaine;
And Hubert posting to returne those Lords,
Who deemd him dead, and parted discontent:
Arthur himselfe begins our latter Act,
Our Act of outrage, desprate furie, death;
Wherein fond rashnes murdreth first a Prince,
And Monkish falsnes poysneth last a King.
First Scene shews Arthurs death in infancie,
And last concludes Johns fatall tragedie.

8. returne] i.e., bring back to John.
14. infancie] Arthur is portrayed in The Reign as a young man in his middle teens; see Introduction, Chapter Four.

The Se
King J
the Fr
King

[Scene i]

Enter yo

ARTHUR
Crosse not
I venter li
And if I d
Peare gins
My holde w
And if I f
Better dea
Prison sa
Comfort a
Ile vente

He lea
his t

Hoe, who
Where is
Who hurt
Ay me p
Why cal
My fall
How wil
My deat
Sweet
Comfor
When s
My hea
My vit
I dye
And L

11.1.

2.
3.
5.
11.

19.
22.

The Second Part of The Troublesome Raigne of King John, containing the entraunce of Lewes the French Kings sonne: with the poysoning of King John by a Monke.

[Scene i]

Enter yong Arthur on the walls.

ARTHUR Now helpe good hap to further mine entent,
Crosse not my youth with any more extreames:
I venter life to gaine my libertie,
And if I die, worlds troubles have an end.
Feare gins disswade the strength of my resolve,
My holde will faile, and then alas I fall,
And if I fall, no question death is next:
Better desist, and live in prison still.
Prison said I? nay, rather death than so:
Comfort and courage come againe to me.
Ile venter sure: tis but a leape for life.

He leapes, and bruising his bones; after he wakes from his traunce, speakes thus:

Hoe, who is nigh? some bodie take me up.
Where is my mother? let me speake with her.
Who hurts me thus? speake hoe, where are you gone?
Ay me poore Arthur, I am here alone.
Why cald I mother, how did I forget?
My fall, my fall, hath kilde my Mothers Sonne.
How will she weep at tidings of my death?
My death indeed, O God my bones are burst.
Sweet Jesu save my soule, forgive my rash attempt,
Comfort my Mother, shield her from despaire,
When she shall heare my tragick overthrowe.
My heart controules the office of my toong,
My vitall powers forsake my brused trunck,
I dye, I dye, heaven take my fleeting soule, He dyes.
And Lady Mother all good hap to thee.[1]

11.1. wakes] (Fleay and Munro); was Qq.

---

2. Crosse] thwart.
3. venter] venture.
5. disswade] weaken.
11.1. wakes] Since "was" makes no sense in this context, it is obvious that the author intended "wakes."
19. burst] broken.
22. overthrow] death.

Enter Pem

ESSEX My
We must be
To undermin
Else shall
PEMB. M
I warrant y
But who is
Who in his
Cast out a
A pray for
SALIS.
My sinnew
ESSEX
If waterf
My eyes s
If sobbs
My heart
But boot
As might
Heere re
Let not
Live to
Give ha
Tis God
PEMB

Ente

HUB
The Ki
To vis
Did b
For e
I saw
Assur
Whome
He c

29.
32.
37.
47.
50.
51.

Enter Pembrooke, Salsburie, Essex.

ESSEX My Lords of Pembrooke and of Salsbury,
We must be carefull in our pollicie
To undermine the kepers of this place,
Else shall we never find the Princes grave.
PEMB. My Lord of Essex, take no care for that,
I warrant you it was not closely done.
But who is this? lo Lords the withered flowre
Who in his life shinde like the Mornings blush,
Cast out a doore, denide his buriall right,
A pray for birds and beasts to gorge upon.
SALIS. O ruthfull spectacle! O damned deede;
My sinnewes shakes, my very heart doth bleede.
ESSEX Leave childish teares brave Lords of England,
If waterfloods could fetch his life againe,
My eyes should conduit foorth a sea of teares,
If sobbs would helpe, or sorrowes serve the turne,
My heart should volie out deepe piercing plaints.
But bootlesse wert to breath as many sighs
As might eclipse the brightest Sommers sunne,
Heere rests the helpe, a service to his ghost,
Let not the tyrant causer of this dole,
Live to triumph in ruthfull massacres,
Give hand and hart, and Englishmen to armes,
Tis Gods decree to wreake us of these harmes.
PEMB. The best advise: but who commes posting heere?

Enter Hubert.[2]

HUB. Right noble Lords, I speake unto you all,
The King entreates your soonest speed
To visit him, who on your present want,
Did ban and cursse his birth, himselfe and me,
For executing of his strict commaund.
I saw his passion, and at fittest time,
Assurde him of his cousins being safe,
Whome pittie would not let me doo to death:[3]
He craves your company my Lords in haste,

60. Lords] Lord Q3.

---

29. undermine] win over by subtle means.
32. closely] secretely.
37. ruthfull] rueful.
47. dole] grief.
50. wreake] avenge.
51.1. Hubert] Q1 reads "Hughbert"; this spelling likewise occurs in the speech head for Hubert's second speech, and also in his exit at line 76.

To whome I wi
Who is in hea
ESSEX In
To Gods reve
Heere should
Calst thou t
And all tha
HUB. My
If heere I
Maugre the
Who gave me
That God th
Thunder rev
And as I t
So God lov
SALIS.
Some in th
Have throv
And sure
For yet t
ESSEX
Under our
To bid th
To claim
His titl
Besides,
Hath bar
This ha
The hol
Are wei
To make
PEMI
I will
SAL
But ai
ESS
To wit
And l

---

67. c
76. I

82.
83.

89.
90.
98.

To whome I will conduct young Arthur streight,
Who is in health under my custodie.
ESSEX In health base villaine, wert not I leave thy crime
To Gods revenge, to whome revenge belongs,
Heere shouldst thou perish on my Rapiers point.
Calst thou this health? such health betide thy friends,
And all that are of thy condition.
HUB. My Lords, but heare me speake, and kil me then,
If heere I left not this yong Prince alive,
Maugre the hastie Edict of the King,
Who gave me charge to put out both his eyes,
That God that gave me living to this howre,
Thunder revenge upon me in this place:
And as I tendred him with earnest love,
So God love me, and then I shall be well. Exit Hub.
SALIS. Hence traytor, hence; thy councel is heerin.
Some in this place appoynted by the King,
Have throwne him from this lodging here above,
And sure the murther hath bin newly done,
For yet the body is not fully colde.
ESSEX How say you Lords, shal we with speed dispatch
Under our hands a packet into Fraunce
To bid the Dolphin enter with his force
To claime the Kingdome for his proper right?
His title maketh lawfull strength thereto.
Besides, the Pope, on perill of his cursse,
Hath bard us of obedience unto John.
This hatefull murder, Lewes his true discent,
The holy charge that wee receivde from Rome,
Are weightie reasons, if you like my reede,
To make us all persever in this deede.
PEMB. My lord of Essex, well have you advisde,
I will accord to further you in this.
SALIS. And Salsbury will not gainsay the same,
But aid that course as far foorth as he can.
ESSEX Then each of us send straight to his Allyes,
To winne them to this famous enterprise,
And let us all yclad in Palmers weede,

---

67. condition] character.
76. Exit Hub.] In K.J. Hubert is accused of Arthur's murder by the Bastard, but he stays to protest his innocence.
82. packet] letter, dispatch.
83. bid...enter] Shakespeare seems to follow The Reign, not Holinshed, in having Lewis sent for prior to the meeting at St. Edmundsbury; cf. K.J., IV.ii.120-31.
89. charge] mandate.
90. reede] counsel.
98. Palmers weede] pilgrims' clothing, usually burlap.

The tenth of April at Saint Edmonds Bury
Meete to confer, and on the Altar there
Sweare secrecie and aid to this advise.
Meane while let us conveigh this body hence,
And give him buriall, as befits his state,[4]
Keeping his months minde, and his obsequies
With solemne intercession for his soule.
How say you Lordings, are you all agreed?
PEMB. The tenth of Aprill at Saint Edmonds Bury,
God letting not, I will not faile the time.
ESSEX Then let us all convey the body hence. Exeunt.

[Scene ii]

Enter King John, with two or three and the Prophet.

JOHN Disturbed thoughts, foredoomers of mine ill,
Distracted passions, signes of growing harmes,
Strange Prophecies of imminent mishaps,
Confound my wits and dull my senses so,
That every object these mine eyes behold
Seeme instruments to bring me to my end.
Ascension Day is come, John feare not then
The prodigies this pratling Prophet threates.
Tis come indeede: ah were it fully past,
Then were I careles of a thousand feares.
The Diall tells me, it is twelve at noone.
Were twelve at midnight past, then might I vaunt,
False seers prophecies of no import.[1]
Could I as well with this right hand of mine
Remove the Sunne from our Meridian,
Unto the moonsted circle of thantipodes,
As turne this steele from twelve to twelve agen,

[Scene ii]
8. this] that Q3.

[Scene i]
99. Saint Edmundsbury is located in Suffolk, about seventy-one miles northeast of London.
101. advise] plan. 101. Cf. K.J., IV.iii.11, where the nobles do not give specific reasons for meeting at Saint Edmundsbury.
108. letting] forbidding. 108. faile the time] be late.
[Scene ii]
2. distracted] divided.
16. Unto...thantipodes] The Antipodes were people supposedly living on the other side of the earth.

Then John the date of fatall prophecies
Should with the Prophets life together end.
But Multa cadunt inter calicem supremaque labra.
Peter, unsay thy foolish doting dreame,
And by the Crowne of England heere I sweare,
To make thee great, and greatest of thy kin.
PETER King John, although the time I have prescribed
Be but twelve houres remayning yet behinde,
Yet do I know by inspiration,
Ere that fixt time be fully come about,
King John shall not be King as heeretofore.
JOHN Vain buzzard, what mischaunce can chaunce so soone,
To set a King beside his regall seate?
My heart is good, my body passing strong,
My land in peace, my enemies subdewd,
Only my Barons storme at Arthurs death,
But Arthur lives: I there the challenge growes.
Were he dispatcht unto his longest home,
Then were the King secure of thousand foes.

[Enter Hubert]

Hubert, what news with thee; where are my Lords?
HUB. Hard news my Lord, Arthur the lovely Prince
Seeking to escape over the Castle walles,[2]
Fell headlong downe, and in the cursed fall
He brake his bones, and there before the gate
Your Barons found him dead, and breathlesse quite.
JOHN Is Arthur dead? then Hubert without more words hang the Prophet.
Away with Peter, villen out of my sight,
I am deafe, be gone, let him not speake a word.
Now John, thy feares are vanisht into smoake,
Arthur is dead, thou guiltlesse of his death.
Sweet Youth, but that I strived for a Crowne,

29. soone] om.Q3.

---

20. Multa...labra] "There's many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip" (Bullough). The author is Decimus Laberius (107-43 B.C., source unknown), a Roman playwright of no great distinction.
30. beside] off.
31. passing] exceedingly.
35. longest] eternal.
36. secure of] free from, safe from.
43. without more words] Fleay calls this phrase an actor's interpolation.

I could
Long li

Ente

JOH
BAS
Who wi
And wi
Kept h
JOH
While
But w
What
Or wh
Did
B
But
It l
Whic
Or a

I a
Mea
To
Or
Wo

Th
Ir
Hi
Th
I
P
T
A

I could have well affoorded to thine age
Long life, and happines to thy content.

Enter the Bastard.

JOHN Philip, what newes with thee?
BAST. The newes I heard was Peters prayers,
Who wisht like fortune to befall us all:
And with that word, the rope his latest friend,
Kept him from falling headlong to the ground.
JOHN There let him hang, and be the Ravens food,
While John triumphs in spight of Prophecies.
But whats the tidings from the Popelings now?
What say the Monkes and Priests to our proceedings?
Or wheres the Barons that so sodainly
Did leave the King upon a false surmise?
BAST. The Prelates storme and thirst for sharpe revenge:
But please your Majestie, were that the worst,
It little skild: a greater danger growes,
Which must be weeded out by carefull speede,
Or all is lost, for all is leveld at.
JOHN More frights and feares! what ere thy tidings be,
I am preparde: then Philip, quickly say,
Meane they to murder, or imprison me,
To give my crowne away to Rome or Fraunce;
Or will they each of them become a King?
Worse than I thinke it is, it cannot be.
BAST. Not worse my Lord, but everie whit as bad.
The Nobles have elected Lewes King,
In right of Ladie Blanche your Neece, his Wife:
His landing is expected every hower
The Nobles, Commons, Clergie, all Estates,
Incited chiefely by the Cardinall,
Pandulph that lies here Legate for the Pope,
Thinks long to see their new elected King.
And for undoubted proofe, see here my Liege
Letters to me from your Nobilitie,
To be a partie in this action:
Who under shew of fained holines,
Appoynt their meeting at S. Edmonds Bury,

---

64. It little skild] it mattered little.
75. In right of] by the legal claim of.
79. lies] i.e., lives in an official capacity.

There to c
The overth
JOHN W
Matcht wit
Why shines
Why doo th
And scatt
With all
But see t
Theres no
The heavy
Conspire
Then hel
Forsake
To poysc
These t
And dea
To wrea
What sa
BAST
Help m
JOH
Goe ge
BAS
Yet yo
JO
BA
JO
My he
And
Was
Dame
My o
Is d
And
All

89
90
91
93
95
10
1
1
1
1

There to consult, conspire, and conclude
The overthrow and downfall of your State.
JOHN Why so it must be: one hower of content,
Matcht with a month of passionate effects.
Why shines the Sunne to favour this consort?
Why doo the windes not breake their brazen gates,
And scatter all these perjurd complices,
With all their counsells and their damned drifts?
But see the welkin rolleth gently on,
Theres not a lowring clowde to frowne on them;
The heaven, the earth, the sunne, the moone and all
Conspire with those confederates my decay.
Then hell for me if any power be there,
Forsake that place, and guide me step by step,
To poyson, strangle, murder in their steps
These traitors: oh that name is too good for them,
And death is easie; is there nothing worse,
To wreake me on this proud peace-breaking crew?
What saist thou Philip? why assists thou not?
BAST. These curses (good my Lord) fit not the season:
Help must descend from heaven against this treason.
JOHN Nay thou wilt proove a traitor with the rest,
Goe get thee to them, shame come to you all.
BAST. I would be loath to leave your Highnes thus,
Yet you command, and I though grievd will goe.
JOHN Ah Philip, whether goest thou? come againe.
BAST. My Lord, these motions are as passions of a mad man.
JOHN A mad man Philip, I am mad indeed,
My hart is mazd, my senses all foredone,
And John of England now is quite undone.
Was ever King as I opprest with cares?
Dame Elianor my noble Mother Queene,
My onely hope and comfort in distresse,
Is dead, and England excommunicate,
And I am interdicted by the Pope,
All Churches curst, their doores are sealed up,

---

89. passionate effects] actions performed in suffering.
90. consort] conspiracy.
91. brazen gates] impregnable, imperishable.
93. drifts] purposes.
95. lowring] louring.
103. wreake] avenge.
105. season] circumstances.
110. grievd] offended.
112. motions] impulses, emotions.
114. mazd] bewildered.
119. Queen Eleanor died in 1204.
120. An interdict meant primarily that the people could not hear Mass or receive the sacraments.

And for the pleasure of the Romish Priest,
The service of the Highest is neglected;
The multitude (a beast of many heads)
Doo wish confusion to their Soveraigne;
The Nobles blinded with ambitions fumes,
Assemble powers to beat mine Empire downe,
And more than this, elect a forren King.
O England, wert thou ever miserable,
King John of England sees thee miserable:
John, tis thy sinnes that makes it miserable,
Quicquid delirant Reges, plectuntur Achivi.
Philip, as thou hast ever lovde thy King,
So show it now: post to S. Edmonds Bury,
Dissemble with the Nobles, know their drifts,
Confound their divelish plots, and damnd devices.
Though John be faultie, yet let subjects beare,
He will amend and right the peoples wrongs.
A Mother though she were unnaturall,
Is better than the kindest Stepdame is:
Let never Englishman trust forraine rule.
Then Philip shew thy fealtie to thy King,
And mongst the Nobles plead thou for the King.[3]
BAST. I goe my Lord: see how he is distraught,
This is the cursed Priest of Italy
Hath heapt these mischiefes on this haplesse Land.
Now Philip, hadst thou Tullyes eloquence,[4]
Then mightst thou hope to plead with good successe. Exit.
JOHN And art thou gone? successe may follow thee:
Thus hast thou shewd thy kindnes to thy King.
[To an attendant]
Sirra, in hast goe greete the Cardinall,
Pandulph, I meane, the Legate from the Pope.
Say that the King desires to speake with him.
Now John bethinke thee how thou maist resolve:
And if thou wilt continue England's King,
Then cast about to keep the Diadem;
For life and land, and all is leveld at.
The Pope of Rome, tis he that is the cause,

126. ambitions] ambitious (Munro).

---

132. "The people suffer for the mad acts of their kings" (Horace, Epistles, I.2.14).
135. Dissemble] pretend. 135. In K.J., V.ii, this explanation for Philip's presence at St. Edmundsbury is omitted.
137. faultie] liable to censure. 137. beare] be firm in their allegiance.
154. bethinke thee] make plans.
156. cast about] devise means.

He curseth t
From due obe
He animates
He gives awa
And pardons
And thus bl
Then John t
But finely
That hand
To cure th
Thy sinnes
T'abolish
But in thy
A King sha
Peace Joh
Dissemble
Yet with

Enter

PAND.
That dos
Why am
JOHN
The hol
Upon my
And doc
And vo
To tak
And ca
PAN
Cannot
Say wh
Thy C
And t
JC
And
Unsh
That
No J

192

161
16
17
18

19
19

He curseth thee, he sets thy subjects free
From due obedience to their Soveraigne:
He animates the Nobles in their warres,
He gives away the Crowne to Philips Sonne,
And pardons all that seeke to murther thee:
And thus blind zeale is still predominant.
Then John there is no way to keepe thy Crowne,
But finely to dissemble with the Pope:
That hand that gave the wound must give the salve
To cure the hurt, els quite incurable.
Thy sinnes are farre too great to be the man
T'abolish Pope, and Popery from thy Realme:
But in thy Seate, if I may gesse at all,
A King shall raigne that shall suppresse them all.
Peace John, here comes the Legate of the Pope,
Dissemble thou, and whatsoere thou saist,
Yet with thy heart wish their confusion.

Enter Pandulph.

PAND. Now John, unworthie man to breath on earth,
That dost oppugne against thy Mother Church:
Why am I sent for to thy cursed selfe?
JOHN Thou man of God, Vicegerent for the Pope,
The holy Vicar of S. Peters Church,
Upon my knees, I pardon crave of thee,
And doo submit me to the See of Rome,
And vow for penaunce of my high offence,
To take on me the holy Crosse of Christ,
And cary armes in holy Christian warres.
PAND. No John, thy crowching and dissembling thus
Cannot deceive the Legate of the Pope.
Say what thou wilt, I will not credit thee:
Thy Crowne and Kingdome both are tane away,
And thou art curst without redemption.
JOHN Accurst indeed to kneele to such a drudge,
And get no help with thy submission,
Unsheath thy sword, and sley the misprowd Priest,
That thus triumphs ore thee a mighty King:
No John, submit againe, dissemble yet,

192. thy] my Q3.

---

161. animates] incites.
166. finely] subtly.
172. A King...all] i.e., Henry VIII.
182. Shakespeare omits this submission scene; K.J.,V.i, opens with John's receiving back the crown from Pandulph.
191. drudge] abusive term meaning "common laborer."
193. misprowd] arrogantly proud.

For Pries
Yet holy
No time
Absolve
The utte
PAND
I rew a
One way
And onl
Thou m
Thy Cr
Defend
And wh
And se
Then
That
JO
Or gi
A mi
That
What
No:

Wha

of
be
it
fo

T
B
O
A
S

For Priests and Women must be flattered.
Yet holy Father thou thy selfe dost know,
No time too late for sinners to repent,
Absolve me then, and John doth sweare to doo
The uttermost what ever thou demaundst.
PAND. John, now I see thy harty penitence,
I rew and pitty thy distrest estate,
One way is left to reconcile thy selfe,
And only one which I shall shew to thee.
Thou must surrender to the See of Rome
Thy Crowne and Diademe, then shall the Pope
Defend thee from th'invasion of thy foes.
And where his Holinesse hath kindled Fraunce,
And set thy subjects hearts at warre with thee,
Then shall he cursse thy foes, and beate them downe,
That seeke the discontentment of the King.
JOHN From bad to woorse: or I must loose my realme,
Or give my Crowne for pennance unto Rome?
A miserie more piercing than the darts
That breake from burning exhalations power.[5]
What? shall I give my Crowne with this right hand?
No: with this hand defend thy Crowne and thee.

Enter Messenger.

What newes with thee?
MESS. Please it your Majestie, there is descried on the Coast of Kent an hundred Sayle of Ships, which of all men is thought to be the French fleete, under the conduct of the Dolphin, so that it puts the Cuntrie in a mutinie, so they send to your Grace for succour.
JOHN How now Lord Cardinall, whats your best advise?
These mutinies must be allayd in time
By pollicy or headstrong rage at least.
O John, these troubles tyre thy wearyed soule,
And like to Luna in a sad Eclipse,
So are thy thoughts and passions for this newes.
Well may it be, when Kings are grieved so,
The vulgar sort worke Princes overthrow.
PAND. K. John, for not effecting of thy plighted vow,
This strange annoyance happens to thy land:

---

202. estate] situation, position.
215. exhalations] meteors.
220. an hundred] Holinshed reports eighty great ships (iii. 201).
226. rage] martial spirit.
228. like...Eclipse] Cf. Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, ii.48:
"And dim fair Luna to a dark eclipse."

But yet
And not
JOHN
John wi
Come l
My Rea

[Scen

En
Cl

P
Whos
Infu
To p
Lor

Vow

By
Ph
Lo
Ap

S
T
T
T

But yet be reconcild unto the Church,
And nothing shall be grievous to thy state.
JOHN On, Pandulph, be it as thou hast decreed,
John will not spurne against thy sound advise,
Come lets away, and with thy helpe I trow
My Realme shall florish and my Crowne in peace. [Exeunt]

[Scene iii]

Enter the Nobles, Pembrooke, Essex, Chester, Bewchampe, Clare, with others.

PEMB. Now sweet S. Edmond[1] holy Saint in heaven,
Whose Shrine is sacred, high esteemd on earth,
Infuse a constant zeale in all our hearts
To prosecute this act of mickle waight,
Lord Bewchampe say, what friends have you procurde.
BEWCH. The L. FitzWater, L. Percy, and L. Rosse,
Vowd meeting heere this day the leventh houre.
ESSEX Under the cloke of holie Pilgrimage,
By that same houre on warrant of their faith,
Philip Plantagenet, a bird of swiftest wing,
Lord Eustace Vescy, Lord Cressy, and Lord Mowbrey,
Appointed meeting at S. Edmonds Shrine.
PEMB. Untill their presence ile conceale my tale,
Sweete complices in holie Christian acts,
That venture for the purchase of renowne,
Thrice welcome to the league of high resolve,
That pawne their bodies for their soules regard.
ESSEX Now wanteth but the rest to end this worke,
In Pilgrims habit commes our holie troupe
A furlong hence with swift unwonted pace,
May be they are the persons you expect.
PEMB. With swift unwonted gate; see what a thing is zeale,
That spurrs them on with fervence to this Shrine,
Now joy come to them for their true intent
And in good time heere come the warmen all

[Scene ii]
236. On] i.e., proceed; the emendation by Bullough to "Oh" is not justifiable.
238. trow] trust, am sure.
[Scene iii]
0.1. Neither Chester nor Clare have speeches in the play.
4. mickle] great, large.
11. Eustace Vescy] Qq erroneously have a comma between the two, for this is the character's full name.
23. fervence] intense desire.

That sweate

Enter th

Hap and he
BAST.
And all th
ESSEX
A right P
But silen
The servi
On stron
To ease
Should I
Which of
As canno
But lea
Plainel
Th'effe
To root
Tirant
If any
What k
Rules
First,
For re
Was s
But w
But t
That
Our
Whic
Migh
But
Abho

28.
48.

27
29
34
36
3
4
4
5

That sweate in body by the minds disease:

Enter the Bastard Philip, [Percy], &c.

Hap and heartsease brave Lordings be your lot.
BAST. Amen my Lords, the like betide your lucke,
And all that travaile in a Christian cause.
ESSEX Cheerely replied brave braunch of kingly stock,
A right Plantaginet should reason so.
But silence Lords, attend our commings cause:
The servile yoke that payned us with toyle,
On strong instinct hath framd this conventickle,
To ease our necks of servitudes contempt.
Should I not name the foeman of our rest,
Which of you all so barraine in conceipt,
As cannot levell at the man I meane?
But least Enigmas shadow shining truth,
Plainely to paint, as truth requires no arte,
Th'effect of this resort importeth this,
To roote and cleane extirpate tirant John,[2]
Tirant, I say, appealing to the man,
If any heere that loves him, and I aske,
What kindship, lenitie, or christian raigne
Rules in the man, to barre this foule impeach?
First, I inferre the Chesters bannishment,[3]
For reprehending him in most unchristian crimes,
Was speciall notice of a tyrants will.
But were this all, the devill should be savd,
But this the least of many thousand faults,
That circumstance with leisure might display.
Our private wrongs, no parcell of my tale
Which now in presence, but for some great cause
Might wish to him as to a mortall foe.
But shall I close the period with an acte
Abhorring in the eares of Christian men,

28. BAST.] (Fleay); om. Qq.
48. him] om. Q3.

---

27. heartsease] peace of mind, content.
29. travaile] travel, toil, labor (both meanings intended here).
34. framd...conventickle] planned this secret gathering.
36. rest] contentment.
39. shadow] obscure, conceal.
41. resort] assemblage.
47. inferre] mention, refer to.
52. display] unfold, display itself.
56. close the period] end this speech.

His Cosens
Untimely
Heere is
And on th
That who
Is culpa
To show
My Lord
Only I s
To moove
Whereof
It were
With ea
To disp
PEM
Which
And mo
I say
Hath
To al
Short
Hath
If ar
By p
This
That
To a
Who
Wha

Fai
Hat
To

60
82
8

6
6

His Cosens death, that sweet unguilty childe,
Untimely butcherd by the tyrants meanes.
Heere is my proofes, as cleere as gravell brooke,
And on the same I further must inferre,
That who upholds a tyrant in his course,
Is culpable of all his damned guilt.
To show the which, is yet to be describd.
My Lord of Pembrooke, shew what is behinde,
Only I say, that were there nothing else
To moove us but the Popes most dreadfull cursse,
Whereof we are assured if we fayle,
It were inough to instigate us all
With earnestnesse of sprit to seeke a meane
To dispossess John of his regiment.[4]
PEMB. Well hath my Lord of Essex tolde his tale,
Which I aver for most substanciall truth,
And more to make the matter to our minde,
I say that Lewes in chalenge of his wife,
Hath title of an uncontrouled plea
To all that longeth to an English Crowne.
Short tale to make, the See apostolick,
Hath offerd dispensation for the fault,
If any be, as trust me none I know
By planting Lewes in the Usurpers roome:
This is the cause of all our presence heere,
That on the holie Altar we protest
To ayde the right of Lewes with goods and life,
Who on our knowledge is in Armes for England.
What say you Lords?
SALIS. As Pembrooke sayth, affirmeth Salsburie:
Faire Lewes of Fraunce that spoused Lady Blanch,
Hath title of an uncontrouled strength
To England, and what longeth to the Crowne:

60. is] are Q3.
82. This] That Q3.
83. That] This Q3.

---

61. on the same] regarding the same matter.
65. behinde] not yet mentioned.
69. instigate] incite, stimulate.
71. regiment] authority.
74. And...minde] And further, to make the matter more acceptable to us.
75. Lewes] in this scene only it is monosyllabic ("Liooz").
75. challenge] by the claim.
76. uncontrouled] undisputed.
83. protest] solemnly swear.

In right
The Princ
Our purp
Is to inv
King of
And so t
And so t
BAST
My spee
As doth
But wha
I purp
For Ch
That m
For an
Me thi
As to
For A
He de
Which
Injus
But
Ther
I sa
To
Aga
Why
Yet
And
Whe
An
Gi
Wh
Bu
I
T
B
A

In right whereof, as we are true informd,
The Prince is marching hitherward in Armes.
Our purpose, to conclude that with a word,
Is to invest him as we may devise,
King of our Countrey in the tyrants stead:
And so the warrant on the Altar sworne,
And so the intent for which we hither came.
BAST. My Lord of Salsbury, I cannot couch
My speeches with the needfull words of arte,
As doth beseeme in such a waightie worke,
But what my conscience and my dutie will,
I purpose to impart.
For Chesters exile, blame his busie wit,
That medled where his dutie forbade:
For any private causes that you have,
Me thinke they should not mount to such a height,
As to depose a King in their revenge.
For Arthurs death, King John was innocent;
He desperat was the deathsman to himselfe,
Which you to make a colour to your crime
Injustly do impute to his default,
But where fell traytorisme hath residence,
There wants no words to set despight on worke.
I say tis shame, and worthy all reproofe,
To wrest such pettie wrongs in termes of right,
Against a King annoynted by the Lord.
Why Salsburie, admit the wrongs are true,
Yet subjects may not take in hand revenge,
And rob the heavens of their proper power,
Where sitteth he to whom revenge belongs.
And doth a Pope, a Priest, a man of pride
Give charters for the lives of lawfull Kings?
What can he blesse, or who regards his cursse,
But such as give to man, and takes from God?
I speake it in the sight of God above,
Theres not a man that dyes in your beliefe,
But sels his soule perpetually to payne.
Ayd Lewes, leave God, kill John, please hell,

110. Which] Q2-3; With Q1.

---

99. arte] practised skill.
100. doth beseeme] is appropriate.
103. busie wit] restless mind.
110. colour to] pretext for; in legal terminology "colour" meant an apparent or prima facie right.
111. Qq and all editions join this line to the previous one; it is obvious, however, that each is a separate verse line.
113. despight on worke] malice to work.
115. wrest] misconstrue.

Make havo
For heere
A troupe
If you de
If not,
For Lewe
A sensel
In brief
Our Pil
I came
Nor wil
Please
If not
PER
I let
PE
Will
That
Every
Well
Who

Fra
het
co

Make havock of the welfare of your soules,
For heere I leave you in the sight of heaven,
A troupe of traytors, foode for hellish feends;
If you desist, then follow me as friends,
If not, then doo your worst as hatefull traytors.
For Lewes his right, alas tis too too lame,
A senselesse clayme, if truth be titles friend.
In briefe, if this be cause of our resort,
Our Pilgrimage is to the Devils Shrine.
I came not Lords to troup as traytors doo,
Nor will I counsaile in so bad a cause:
Please you returne, wee goe againe as friends,
If not, I to my King, and you where traytors please. Exit.

PERCY A hote yong man, and so my Lords proceed;
I let him go, and better lost then found.

PEMB. What say you Lords, will all the rest proceed,
Will you all with me sweare upon the Aulter
That you wil to the death, be ayd to Lewes & enemy to John?
Every man lay his hand by mine, in witnes of his harts accord.
Well then, every man to Armes to meete the King
Who is alreadie before London.

Enter [a] Messenger.

PEMB. What newes Harrold?

MESS. The right Christian Prince my Maister, Lewes of Fraunce, is at hand, comming to visit your Honors, directed hether by the right honorable Richard Earle of Bigot, to conferre with your Honors.

PEMB. How neere is his Highnesse?

MESS. Ready to enter your presence.

Enter Lewes, Earle Bigot, with his troupe.

LEWES Faire Lords of England, Lewes salutes you all
As friends, and firme welwillers of his weale,

149.1. Enter...Messenger] Q2; Messenger Enter Q1.
151. MESS.] (Munro); om Qq.

---

138. troup] assemble together.
139. counsaile] take counsel with others.
140. Please you] if you choose to.
142. hote] in the literal sense, hot tempered.
150. Harrold] this word is not used in Part I.
158. weale] welfare.

At whose rec
Crossing the
He is in per
To undertak
The fulness
But worlds
Till time l
I must acq
The heaven
Have in th
Brought me
With smal
Your Citi
By some d
And from
Eccho ap
From the
To Troyn
With luc
Waving
The fea
Where a
Heavens
Temperd
Within
Giving
Thus F
Meanes
And m
World
SA
The
The

162
164

169
170
17
17

17
1

1
1

At whose request, from plenty flowing Fraunce
Crossing the Ocean with a Southern gale,
He is in person come at your commaunds
To undertake and gratifie withall
The fulnesse of your favours profferd him.
But worlds brave men, omitting promises,
Till time be minister of more amends,
I must acquaint you with our fortunes course.
The heavens dewing favours on my head,
Have in their conduct safe with victorie
Brought me along your well manured bounds,
With small repulse, and little crosse of chaunce.
Your Citie Rochester with great applause
By some devine instinct layd armes aside:
And from the hollow holes of Thamesis,
Eccho apace replide, Vive la roy.
From thence, along the wanton rowling glade
To Troynovant, your fayre Metropolis,
With luck came Lewes to shew his troupes of Fraunce,
Waving our Ensignes with the dallying windes,
The fearefull object of fell frowning warre;
Where after some assault, and small defence,
Heavens may I say, and not my warlike troupe,
Temperd their hearts to take a friendly foe
Within the compasse of their high built walles,
Giving me title, as it seemd they wish.
Thus Fortune (Lords) acts to your forwardnes
Meanes of content in lieu of former griefe:
And may I live but to requite you all,
Worlds wish were mine in dying noted yours.
SALIS. Welcome the balme that closeth up our wounds,
The soveraigne medcine for our quick recure,
The anchor of our hope, the onely prop,

---

162. gratifie withall] reward as well.
164-5. omitting...amends] i.e., I'm not making any promises until I achieve a certain measure of success.
169. bounds] border lands.
170. crosse of chaunce] misfortune.
173. Thamesis] Thames.
174. Vive la roy] See K.J., V.ii.104-5. Honigmann points out that the phrase appeared on many early playing cards (p.170).
175. wanton...glade] carefree rolling plain.
176. Troynouant] New London; the name was popularized by Geoffrey of Monmouth's legend.
178. See K.J., V.i.72, "...mocking the air with colors idly spread."
179. fell] dreadful.
185. forwardnes] advancement.

Whereon d
Without t
(Except a
We stray
No merva
We welco
LEWES
A holy h
I canno
But lik
In gene
Lord B
Giving
That t
To swe
Homage
I nee
Since
The t
Yet
My e
Your
And
All
For
In
The
Al
to
ri
T
s

Whereon depends our lives, our lands, our weale,
Without the which, as sheep without their heard,
(Except a shepheard winking at the wolfe)
We stray, we pine, we run to thousand harmes.
No mervaile then, though with unwonted joy,
We welcome him that beateth woes away.
LEWES Thanks to you all of this religious league,
A holy knot of Catholique consent.
I cannot name you Lordings, man by man,
But like a stranger unacquainted yet,
In generall I promise faithfull love:
Lord Bigot brought me to S. Edmonds Shrine,
Giving me warrant of a Christian oath,
That this assembly came devoted heere,
To sweare according as your packets showd,
Homage and loyall service to our selfe.
I neede not doubt the suretie of your wills;
Since well I know, for many of your sakes
The townes have yeelded on their owne accords:
Yet for a fashion, not for misbeliefe,
My eyes must witnes, and these eares must heare
Your oath upon the holy Altar sworne,
And after march to end our commings cause.
SALIS. That we intend no other than good truth,
All that are present of this holy League,
For confirmation of our better trust,
In presence of his Highnes sweare with me,
The sequel that my selfe shal utter heere.
I Thomas Plantaginet, Earle of Salisbury, sweare upon the
Altar, and by the holy Armie of Saints, homage and allegeance
to the right Christian Prince Lewes of Fraunce, as true and
rightfull King to England, Cornwall, and Wales, and to their
Territories: in the defence whereof I uppon the holy Altare
sweare all forwardnes. All the Eng. Lords sweare.
[ENG.LORDS] As the noble Earle hath sworne, so sweare we all.
LEWES I rest assured on your holy oath,
And on this Altar in like sort I sweare
Love to you all, and Princely recompence
To guerdon your good wills unto the full.

---

194. winking at] closing his eyes to.
196. unwonted] unaccustomed.
199. The conspiracies against Elizabeth were believed to be inspired by Catholics.
208. suretie] responsibility.
211. Yet...misbeliefe] Only as a formal display, not because I distrust your faith.
225. forwardnes] zeal, readiness.
230. K.J., V.ii begins here.

And since I am at this religious Shrine,
My good welwillers, give us leave awhile
To use some orisons our selves apart
To all the holy companie of heaven,
That they will smile upon our purposes,
And bring them to a fortunate event.

SALIS. We leave your Highnes to your good intent.
Exeunt Lords of England.

LEWES Now Vicount Meloun, what remaines behinde?
Trust me these traitors to their sovereigne State,
Are not to be beleevde in any sort.

MELOUN Indeed my Lord, they that infringe their oaths,
And play the rebells gainst their native King,
Will for as little cause revolt from you,
If ever opportunitie incite them so:
For once forsworne, and never after sound,
Theres no affiance after perjurie.

LEWES Well Meloun well, lets smooth with them awhile,
Untill we have asmuch as they can doo:
And when their vertue is exhaled drie,
Ile hand them for the guerdon of their help.
Meane while wee'l use them as a precious poyson
To undertake the issue of our hope.

FR.LORD Tis policie (my Lord) to bait our hookes
With merry smiles, and promise of much waight:
But when your Highnes needeth them no more,
Tis good make sure work with them, least indeede
They proove to you as to their naturall King.

MELOUN Trust me my Lord, right well have you advisde,
Venyme for use, but never for a sport
Is to be dallyed with, least it infect.
Were you instald, as soone I hope you shall:
Be free from traitors, and dispatch them all.

LEWES That so I meane, I sweare before you all
On this same Altar, and by heavens power,
Theres not an English traytor of them all,
John once dispatcht, and I faire Englands King,
Shall on his shoulders beare his head one day,

---

238. Vicount] Holinshed makes Meloun a Viscount also (ii.193). In K.J., however, he is a Count (IV.iii.15), and this meeting between him and Lewis is only alluded to (line 18).
245. forsworne] perjured, falsely sworn. 245. sound] morally healthy.
246. affiance] trust, faith.
247. smooth] use flattery.
250. guerdon] recompense.
256. Tis...them] get them safely under your control.
262. dispatch] kill.

But I wil
Nor shal
But peri
This hav
If ere I
Lay dow

Why so,
A smile
Beare
But in

Ent

Now fa
Have
The h
Leave
To re
And
Each
And

[Sc

A
R
T
A

But I will crop it for their guilts desert:
Nor shall their heires enjoy their Signories,
But perish by their parents fowle amisse.
This have I sworne, and this will I performe,
If ere I come unto the height I hope.
Lay downe your hands, and sweare the same with me.
The French Lords swear.
Why so, now call them in, and speake them faire.
A smile of France will feed an English foole.
Beare them in hand as friends, for so they be:
But in the hart like traitors as they are.

Enter the English Lords.

Now famous followers, chieftaines of the world,
Have we solicited with heartie prayer
The heaven in favour of our high attempt.
Leave we this place, and march we with our power
To rowse the Tyrant from his chiefest hold:
And when our labours have a prosprous end,
Each man shall reape the fruite of his desert.
And so resolvde, brave followers let us hence. [Exeunt]

[Scene iv]

Enter K. John, Bastard, Pandulph, and a many Priests with them.

PAND. Thus John, thou art absolvde from all thy sinnes,
And freed by order from our Fathers curse.[1]
Receive thy Crowne againe, with this proviso,
That thou remaine true liegeman to the Pope,
And carry armes in right of holy Rome.
JOHN I holde the same as tenaunt to the Pope,
And thanke your Holines for your kindnes showne.

[Scene iv]
1. PAND.] (Munro); om.Qq.
2. from] of Q3.

[Scene iii]
275. I was unable to identify this saying as a proverb.
276. Beare...hand] treat them outwardly.
279. heartie] heartfelt.
[Scene iv]
6. tenaunt] vassal.

BAST. A proper jest, when Kings must stoop to Friers,
Neede hath no law, when Friers must be Kings.

Enter a Messenger.

MESS. Please it your Majestie, the Prince of Fraunce,
With all the Nobles of your Graces Land,
Are marching hetherward in good aray.
Where ere they set their foote, all places yeeld:
Thy Land is theirs, and not a foote holds out
But Dover Castle, which is hard besiegd.
PAND. Feare not King John, thy kingdome is the Popes,
And they shall know his Holines hath power
To beate them soone from whence he hath to doo.

Drums and Trumpets. Enter Lewes, Melun, Salisbury,
Essex, Pembrooke, and all the Nobles from Fraunce,
and England.

LEWES Pandulph, as gave his Holines in charge,
So hath the Dolphin mustred up his troupes
And wonne the greatest part of all this land.
But ill becomes your Grace Lord Cardinall,
Thus to converse with John that is accurst.
PAND. Lewes of France, victorious Conqueror,
Whose sword hath made this Iland quake for fear;
Thy forwardnes to fight for holy Rome
Shall be remunerated to the full:
But know my Lord, K. John is now absolvde,
The Pope is pleasde, the Land is blest agen,
And thou hast brought each thing to good effect.
It resteth then that thou withdraw thy powers,
And quietly returne to Fraunce againe:
For all is done the Pope would wish thee doo.
LEWES But al's not done that Lewes came to doo.
Why Pandulph, hath K. Philip sent his sonne
And been at such excessive charge in warres,
To be dismist with words? K. John shall know,
England is mine, and he usurps my right.

11. your] you Q3.

---

8. proper jest] handsome joke.
12. good aray] martial order.
14. foote] twelve inches.
14-15. not...Castle] See K.J., V.i.30-1, "...nothing there holds out/ But Dover Castle."
36. charge] expense.

PAND. Lewes, I charge thee and thy complices
Upon the paine of Pandulphs holy curse,
That thou withdraw thy powers to Fraunce againe,
And yeeld up London and the neighbour Townes
That thou hast tane in England by the sword.
MELOUN Lord Cardinall, by Lewes princely leave,
It can be nought but usurpation
In thee, the Pope, and all the Church of Rome,
Thus to insult on Kings of Christendome,
Now with a word to make them carie armes,
Then with a word to make them leave their armes.
This must not be: Prince Lewes keep thine owne,
Let Pope and Popelings curse their bellyes full.
BAST. My Lord of Melun, what title had the Prince
To England and the Crowne of Albion,
But such a title as the Pope confirmde:
The Prelate now lets fall his fained claime:
Lewes is but the agent for the Pope,
Then must the Dolphin cease, sith he hath ceast:
But cease or no, it greatly matters not,
If you my Lords and Barrons of the Land
Will leave the French, and cleave unto your King.
For shame yee Peeres of England, suffer not
Your selves, your honours, and your land to fall:
But with resolved thoughts beate backe the French,
And free the Land from yoke of servitude.
SALIS. Philip, not so, Lord Lewes is our King,
And we will follow him unto the death.
PAND. Then in the name of Innocent the Pope,
I curse the Prince and all that take his part,
And excommunicate the rebell Peeres
As traytors to the King, and to the Pope.
LEWES Pandolph, our swords shall blesse our selves agen:
Prepare thee John, Lords follow me your King.
Exeunt [all but K. John, Pandulph and Bastard].
JOHN Accursed John, the divell owes thee shame,
Resisting Rome, or yeelding to the Pope, alls one.
The divell take the Pope, the Peeres, and Fraunce:
Shame be my share for yeelding to the Priest.
PAND. Comfort thy selfe K. John, the Cardnall goes
Upon his curse to make them leave their armes. Exit.

43. the] thy Q3.
60. your] our Q3.

---

47. insult on] scorn.
69. In K.J.,V.ii.163, Pandulph does not go quite this far with his authority.
78. Upon] in accordance with.

BAST.
Betake yo
To answe
The Engl
Their bo
God chee
Upon the
Then le
Are lea
JOHN
But let

[Scene

Ex

ME
My so
Conc
List
To b
Beho
Are
Cyt
Lif
And
Bi
O
Th
Th
An
B
W
T

BAST. Comfort my Lord, and curse the Cardinall,
Betake your self to armes, my troupes are prest
To answere Lewes with a lustie shocke:
The English Archers have their quivers full,
Their bowes are bent, the pykes are prest to push:
God cheere my Lord, K. Richards fortune hangs
Upon the plume of warlike Philips helme.
Then let them know his brother and his sonne
Are leaders of the Englishmen at armes.
JOHN Philip, I know not how to answere thee:
But let us hence, to answere Lewes pride. [Exeunt]

[Scene v]

Excursions. Enter Meloun with English Lords.

MELOUN O I am slaine, Nobles, Salsbury, Pembrooke,
My soule is charged, heare me: for what I say
Concernes the Peeres of England, and their State.
Listen,brave Lords, a fearfull mourning tale
To be delivered by a man of death.
Behold these scarres, the dole of bloudie Mars
Are harbingers from natures common foe,
Cyting this trunke to Tellus prison house;
Lifes charter (Lordings) lasteth not an hower:
And fearfull thoughts, forerunners of my end,
Bids me give Phisicke to a sickly soule.
O Peeres of England, know you what you doo?
Theres but a haire that sunders you from harme,
The hooke is bayted, and the traine is made,
And simply you runne doating to your deaths.
But least I dye, and leave my tale untolde,
With silence slaughtering so brave a crew,
This I averre, if Lewes win the day,
Theres not an Englishman that lifts his hand
Against King John to plant the heire of Fraunce,

[Scene v]
2. charged] heavy, burdened.
7. common foe] i.e., death.
8. Cyting] summoning. 8. Tellus...house] i.e., the earth.
11. Phisicke] cure, medicine.
14. traine...made] a trap was laid by dragging meat along the ground to make a scent for luring wild animals (OED,I,7).
15. simply] ignorantly.
18. If...day] Cf. K.J.,V.iv.39, "If Lewis by your assistance win the day."

But is a
I heard
Swore o
Two cau
The gre
That lo
The oth
For th
Misdou
No fre
But w
Pronou
That
Tis t
The s
Lift
Expe
Back
Your
That
Ah!
Pre
My
Lay
Fa
An
My

H
A
W
(

But is already damnd to cruell death.
I heard it vowd; my selfe amongst the rest
Swore on the Altar aid to this Edict.
Two causes Lords, makes me display this drift,
The greatest for the freedome of my soule,
That longs to leave this mansion free from guilt:
The other on a naturall instinct,
For that my Grandsire was an Englishman.
Misdoubt not Lords the truth of my discourse,
No frenzie, nor no brainsick idle fit,
But well advisde, and wotting what I say,
Pronounce I here before the face of heaven,
That nothing is discovered but a truth.
Tis time to flie, submit your selves to John,
The smiles of Fraunce shade in the frownes of death.
Lift up your swords, turne face against the French,
Expell the yoke thats framed for your necks.
Back warmen, back, imbowell not the clyme,
Your seate, your nurse, your birthdayes breathing place,
That bred you, beares you, brought you up in armes.
Ah! be not so ingrate to digge your Mothers grave,
Preserve your lambes and beate away the Wolfe.
My soule hath said, contritions penitence
Layes hold on mans redemption for my sinne.
Farewell my Lords; witnes my faith when wee are met in heaven.
And for my kindnes give me grave room heere.
My soule doth fleete, worlds vanities farewell.
SALIS. Now joy betide thy soule wel-meaning man,
How now my Lords, what cooling card is this?
A greater griefe growes now than earst hath been.
What counsell give you, shall we stay and dye?
Or shall we home, and kneele unto the King.
PEMB. My hart misgave this sad accursed newes:
What have we done? fie Lords, what frenzie moved
Our hearts to yeeld unto the pride of Fraunce?

---

26. "Conscience" is also the reason given in Foxe (but not in Holinshed) for Meloun's confession; see Honigmann, p.136.
28. This line is identical with K.J., V.iv.42. It should be noted that history says nothing about Meloun's grandfather.
30. idle] foolish.
38. imbowell...clyme] do not disembowel England.
42. In Caxton's Aesop, ed. R.T. Lenaghan (Harvard University Press, 1967), the sixth fable of Book II and the twenty-seventh of "The Fables of Auyan" both portray the wolf as trying to lure the lamb away from the herd.
49. cooling card] The term is from an unknown card game, and refers to anything that cools a person's enthusiasm.
53. misgave] had misgivings about.

If we pe
If we de
SALIS
That mad
And star
As wome
As for
And kne
PEM
Than t

[Scen

Er

J
For
Sick
The
It
Who
But
Why
Wh
I
Bu
No
Y

If we persever, we are sure to dye:
If we desist, small hope againe of life.
SALIS. Beare hence the bodie of this wretched man,
That made us wretched with his dying tale,
And stand not wayling on our present harmes,
As women wont: but seeke our harmes redresse.
As for my selfe, I will in haste be gon:
And kneele for pardon to our Sovereigne John.
PEMB. I, theres the way, lets rather kneel to him,
Than to the French that would confound us all. Exeunt.

[Scene vi]

Enter King John carried betweene two Lords.

JOHN Set downe, set downe the load not worth your pain,
For done I am with deadly wounding griefe:
Sickly and succourles, hopeles of any good,
The world hath wearied me, and I have wearied it:
It loaths I live, I live and loath my selfe.
Who pities me? to whom have I been kinde?
But to a few; a few will pitie me.
Why dye I not? Death scornes so vilde a pray.
Why live I not? life hates so sad a prize.
I sue to both to be retaynd of either,
But both are deafe, I can be heard of neither.
Nor death nor life, yet life and neare the neere,
Ymixt with death, biding I wot not where.
BAST. How fares my Lord, that he is caryed thus?
Not all the aukward fortunes yet befalne
Made such impression of lament in me.
Nor ever did my eye attaynt my heart
With any object moving more remorse,
Than now beholding of a mighty King,
Borne by his Lords in such distressed state.
JOHN What news with thee? If bad, report it straite:
If good, be mute, it doth but flatter me.
BAST. Such as it is, and heavie though it be
To glut the world with tragick elegies,
Once will I breath to agravate the rest,

[Scene v]
60. harmes] troubles.
65. confound] ruin, destroy.
[Scene vi]
1. See Richard III, I.ii.1, "Set down your honourable load...."
8. vilde] vile, despicable; this form of the word was very common between 1580 and 1650.

Another moane to make the measure full.
The bravest bowman had not yet sent forth
Two arrowes from the quiver at his side,
But that a rumor went throughout our Campe,
That John was fled, the King had left the field.
At last the rumor scald these eares of mine,
Who rather chose as sacrifice for Mars,
Than ignominious scandall by retyre.
I cheerd the troupes as did the Prince of Troy
His weery followers gainst the Mirmidons,
Crying aloud, S. George, the day is ours.
But feare had captivated courage quite,
And like the Lamb before the greedie Wolfe,
So heartlesse fled our warmen from the feeld.
Short tale to make, my selfe amongst the rest,
Was faine to flie before the eager foe.
By this time night had shadowed all the earth,
With sable curteines of the blackest hue,
And fenst us from the fury of the French,
As Io from the jealous Junos eye,
When in the morning our troupes did gather head,
Passing the Washes with our carriages,
The impartiall tyde deadly and inexorable,
Came raging in with billowes threatning death,
And swallowed up the most of all our men.
My selfe upon a Galloway right free, well pacde,
Out stript the flouds that followed wave by wave,
I so escapt to tell this tragick tale.[1]

37. had] hath Q3.

---

26. make...full] complete the story.
35. Mirmidons] In Lydgate's Troy Book, Bk. IV tells of the fierce struggle between the Trojans and their hero Troilus, and the Myrmidons (Mirundones), the principal allies of the Greeks. Troilus is finally attacked and killed by 3,000 of them.
38. See 3 Henry VI, I.iv.5, "Fly like ships before the wind/ Or lambs pursued by hunger-starved wolves."
44. fenst] fenc'd.
45. Io was priestess of Juno at Argos and was beloved by Jupiter. When Jupiter suspected Juno's jealousy, he changed Io into a white cow, and declared to Juno, that he had not been unfaithful. Juno then asked for the cow as a present, received her, and set the all-seeing Argus to guard her.
47. the Washes] the Wellstream estuary, a crossing four and one half miles long from Cross Keys to Long Sutton. Warren notes that it was necessary to have guides prodding the route with a long pole, because the sands were so treacherous.
51. Galloway...pacde] a well-bred, strong-gaited Galloway; a small but very strong riding horse, bred originally in Ireland.

JOHN
To end t
Was ever
The righ
As I, pc
My feve
How far
Present
My sick
I canno
BAS
Behold

Ent

AB
JC
Say
A
Your
F
What

For
Wer

No
As
If
Th
Bo
I
O

JOHN Griefe upon griefe, yet none so great a griefe
To end this life, and thereby rid my griefe.
Was ever any so infortunate,
The right Idea of a curssed man,
As I, poore I, a triumph for despight.
My fever growes, what ague shakes me so?
How farre to Swinsteed, tell me do you know?
Present unto the Abbot word of my repaire.
My sicknesse rages, to tirannize upon me,
I cannot live unlesse this fever leave me.
BAST. Good cheare my Lord, the Abbey is at hand,
Behold my Lord, the Churchmen come to meete you.

Enter the Abbot and certayne Monkes.

ABB. All health and happines to our soveraigne Lord the King.
JOHN Nor health nor happines hath John at all.
Say Abbot, am I welcome to thy house?
ABB. Such welcome as our Abbey can affoord,
Your Majesty shalbe assured of.
BAST. The King thou seest is weake and very faint,
What victuals hast thou to refresh his Grace?
ABB. Good store my Lord, of that you neede not feare,
For Lincolneshire, and these our Abbey grounds
Were never fatter, nor in better plight.
JOHN Philip, thou never needst to doubt of cates;
Nor King nor Lord is seated halfe so well,
As are the Abbeys throughout all the land.
If any plot of ground do passe another,
The Friers fasten on it streight:
But let us in to taste of their repast,
It goes against my heart to feed with them,
Or be beholden to such Abbey groomes.

Exeunt.

54. JOHN] om. Q3.
67. health] helpe Q3.

---

57. right Idea] true picture.
60. Swinsteed] John was on his way to Swineshead Abbey, not Swinstead, which is in Lincolnshire, approximately twenty-five miles from Swineshead Abbey. The author of The Reign probably got the spelling from Foxe (Holinshed spells it Suenesheued).
61. repaire] coming.
65. This and the following episode in which John is poisoned are not portrayed in Shakespeare's play.
76. cates] food, delicacies.
79. passe] excel (in quality).
80. The Friers] a two-syllable epithet (like"fauzen") has probably been omitted after "The."
80. fasten...streight] lay hold of it immediately.

Manet

MONK
Is this
Is this
And ye
Is thi
Is thi
And ye
Accur
Monck
If wi
Now
And
To p
Be t
And

He

An

A

D

Manet the Monke.

MONK Is this the King that never lovd a Frier?
Is this the man that doth contemne the Pope?
Is this the man that robd the holy Church
And yet will flye unto a Friory?
Is this the King that aymes at Abbeys lands?
Is this the man whome all the world abhorres,
And yet will flye unto a Friorie?
Accurst be Swinsteed Abbey, Abbot, Friers,
Moncks, Nuns, and Clarks, and all that dwells therein,
If wicked John escape alive away.
Now if that thou wilt looke to merit heaven,
And be canonizd for a holy Saint:
To please the world with a deserving worke,
Be thou the man to set thy cuntrey free,
And murder him that seekes to murder thee.

Enter the Abbot.

ABB. Why are not you within to cheare the King?
He now begins to mend, and will to meate.
MONK What if I say to strangle him in his sleepe?
ABB. What, at thy mumpsimus? away,
And seeke some meanes for to pastime the King.
MONK Ile set a dudgeon dagger at his heart,
And with a mallet knock him on the head.
ABB. Alas, what meanes this Monke to murther me?
Dare lay my life heel kill me for my place.
MONK Ile poyson him, and it shall ne'ere be knowne,
And then shall I be chiefest of my house.
ABB. If I were dead, indeed he is the next,
But Ile away, for why the Monke is mad,
And in his madnesse he will murther me.
MONK My Lord, I cry your Lordship mercy, I saw you not.
ABB. Alas good Thomas, doo not murther me,
And thou shalt have my place with thousand thanks.

---

102. What...mumpsimus] i.e., "are you at your stupid muttering"; the term derives from Pace's De Fructu (1517, p.80) in which there is a story about an illiterate English priest, who, when corrected for reading quod in ore mumpsimus in the Mass, replied, "I will not change my old mumpsimus for your new sumpsimus."

104. dudgeon dagger] a dagger with a wooden handle, being cheap and often regarded as an inferior, unreliable weapon. This makes the would-be assassin an even viler criminal.

107. Dare lay] I'll wager.

111. for why] because.

115. Qq and all previous editions attach this to the preceeding line as prose; it is, however, a separate verse line.

MONK I murther you! God sheeld from such a thought.
ABB. If thou wilt needes, yet let me say my prayers.
MONK I will not hurt your Lordship good my Lord:
But if you please, I will impart a thing
That shall be beneficiall to us all.
ABB. Wilt thou not hurt me, holy Monke? say on.
MONK You know, my Lord, the King is in our house
ABB. True.
MONK You know likewise the King abhors a Frier.
ABB. True.
MONK And he that loves not a Frier is our enemy.
ABB. Thou sayst true.
MONK Then the King is our enemy.
ABB. True.
MONK Why then should we not kil our enemy, and the King
being our enemy, why then should we not kill the King?
ABB. O blessed Monke! I see God moves thy minde
To free this land from tyrants slavery.
But who dares venter for to do this deede?
MONK Who dare? why I my Lord dare do the deede;
Ile free my Country and the Church from foes,
And merit heaven by killing of a King.
ABB. Thomas kneel downe, and if thou art resolvde,
I will absolve thee heere from all thy sinnes,
For why the deede is meritorious.
Forward, and feare not, man, for every month
Our Friers shall sing a Masse for Thomas soule.
MONK God and S. Francis prosper my attempt,
For now my Lord I goe about my worke. Exeunt.

[Scene vii]

Enter Lewes and his armie.

LEWES Thus victory in bloudy Lawrell clad,
Followes the fortune of young Lodowicke,
The Englishmen as daunted at our sight,

[Scene vi]
133. this] the Q3.

[Scene vi]
118-20. I will not...to us all] these three lines, as well as lines 132-3 are printed as prose in Qq and in all previous editions.
121-30. These lines are a travesty of syllogistic reasoning.
[Scene vii]
2. Lodowicke] the Latin form of "Lewis."

Fall as
Only two
Do nip u
Lord Mel
A brave
The oth
To thir
Gainst
Yee wa
Triump
The be
And t
We ha
What
Be re
And
The
Shal

Per
Wi
An
To

Fall as the fowle before the Eagles eyes.
Only two crosses of contrary change
Do nip my heart, and vexe me with unrest.
Lord Meluns death, the one part of my soule,
A braver man did never live in Fraunce.
The other griefe, I, thats a gall indeede
To thinke that Dover Castell should hold out[1]
Gainst all assaults, and rest impregnable.
Yee warlike race of Francus, Hectors sonne,
Triumph in conquest of the other part,
The better halfe of England is our owne,
And towards the conquest of the other part,
We have the face of all the English Lords,
What then remaines but overrun the land?
Be resolute my warlike followers,
And if good fortune serve as she begins,
The poorest peasant of the Realme of Fraunce
Shall be a maister ore an English Lord.

Enter a Messenger.

LEWES Fellow, what newes?
MESS. Pleaseth your Grace, the Earle of Salsbury,
Pembroke, Essex, Clare, and Arundell,
With all the Barons that did fight for thee,
Are on a suddeine fled with all their powers,
To joyne with John, to drive thee back againe.

Enter another Messenger.

MESS. Lewes my Lord, why standst thou in a maze?
Gather thy troups, hope not of help from Fraunce,
For all thy forces being fiftie sayle,
Conteyning twenty thousand souldyers,
With victuall and munition for the warre,
Putting from Callis in unluckie time,
Did crosse the seas, and on the Goodwin sands,
The men, munition, and the ships are lost.

29. not] Q2-3; out Q1.

---

5. crosses] misfortunes.
11. Cf. K.J., V.i.30-1.
16. have the face] have the approval.
23-27. Printed as prose in Qq and in previous editions.
28. maze] bewildered state.
33. Callis] Calais.
34. Goodwin sands] dangerous shoals off the coast of southeastern England, opposite Deal and Sandgate in Kent.
35. Cf. K.J., V.v.12-13.

Enter and

LEWES M
MESS. J
Flying the
As Pharaoh
So he and h
On Lincoln
The Barons
LEWES
MESS.
King John
The lesse
The lesse
And follow
LEWES
March afte
To chase
For John
Though ou
Phillip o

[Scene v:

Enter

1 FRI
Would a
2 FRI
might be
I merva:
1 FR
JOHN
ABB.

[Scene
39. S

40. e
51. w
[Scene
0.1. 1
5. t

Enter another Messenger.

LEWES More newes? say on.
MESS. John (my Lord) with all his scattered troupes,
Flying the fury of your conquering sword,
As Pharaoh earst within the bloody sea,
So he and his environed with the tyde,
On Lincolne washes all were overwhelmed,
The Barons fled, our forces cast away.
LEWES Was ever heard such unexpected newes?
MESS. Yet Lodowike revive thy dying heart,
King John and all his forces are consumde.
The lesse thou needst the ayd of English Earles,
The lesse thou needst to grieve thy Navies wracke,
And follow tymes advantage with successe.
LEWES Brave Frenchmen armde with magnanimitie,
March after Lewes who will leade you on
To chase the Barons power that wants a head,
For John is drownd, and I am Englands King.
Though our munition and our men be lost,
Phillip of Fraunce will send us fresh supplyes. Exeunt.

[Scene viii]

Enter two Friers laying a Cloth.

1 FRIAR Dispatch, dispatch, the King desires to eate,
Would a might eate his last for the love hee beares to Churchmen.
2 FRIAR I am of thy minde too, and so it should be and we
might be our owne carvers.
I mervaile why they dine heere in the Orchard.
1 FRIAR I know not, nor I care not. The King coms. [Exeunt]
JOHN Come on Lord Abbot, shall we sit together?
ABB. Pleaseth your Grace sit downe.

[Scene vii]
39. See Bale's Kynge Johan, "This noble Kynge Johan, as a fayth-
ful Moyses/ Withstode proude Pharao for hys poore
Israel" (lines 1,097-98).
40. environed with] encircled by.
51. wants a head] lacks a leader.
[Scene viii]
0.1. This entire scene is omitted from K.J.
5. mervaile] wonder.

JOHN
beggers
house,
BAST
verb, h
tune do
as if
JOH
nitie
cheer
knowe
AR
this
your
B
last
and
to
his
we
to
A

JOHN Take your places sirs; no pomp in penury, all beggers and friends may come; where necessitie keepes the house, curtesie is bard the table; sit downe Philip.

BAST. My Lord, I am loth to allude so much to the proverb, honors change manners: a King is a King, though fortune do her worst, and we as dutifull in despight of her frowne, as if your highnesse were now in the highest type of dignitie.

JOHN Come, no more ado, and you tell me much of dignitie, youle mar my appetite in a surfet of sorrow. What cheere Lord Abbot? methinks you frowne like an host that knowes his guest hath no money to pay the reckning.

ABB. No my Liege, if I frowne at all, it is for I feare this cheere too homely to entertaine so mighty a guest as your Majesty.

BAST. I thinke rather my Lord Abbot, you remember my last being heere, when I went in progresse for powtches, and the rancor of his heart breakes out in his countenance, to shew he hath not forgot me.

ABB. Not so my Lord, you, and the meanest follower of his majesty, are hartely welcome to me.

MONK Wassell my Liege, and as a poore Monke may say, welcome to Swinsted.

JOHN Begin Monke, and report hereafter thou wast taster to a King.

MONK As much helth to your highnes, as to my own hart.

JOHN I pledge thee kinde Monke.

MONK The merriest draught that ever was dronk in England. Am I not too bold with your Highnesse?

JOHN Not a whit, all friends and fellowes for a time.

MONK If the inwards of a Toad be a compound of any proofe: why so it workes.

JOHN Stay Phillip, wheres the Monke?

33. my] mine Q3.

---

11. bard] excluded from.
13. honors...manners] an often quoted proverb (see Tilley, p.318); see also K.J.,I.i.187, "New-made honour doth forget men's names."
17. mar] spoil.
21. cheere] food.
24. progresse] an official tour. 24. powtches] purses, money.
31. taster] to protect against poison, the taster ate part of every dish and sipped from every drink set before the king.
39. proofe] value, strength.
40. Stay] stop (i.e., don't drink).

BAST. He is dead my Lord.
JOHN Then drinke not Phillip for a world of wealth.
BAST. What cheere my Liege? your cullor gins to change.
JOHN So doth my life: O Phillip, I am poysond.
The Monke, the Devill, the poyson gins to rage,
It will depose my selfe a King from raigne.
BAST. This Abbot hath an interest in this act.
At all adventures take thou that from me.
There lye the Abbot, Abbey Lubber, Devill.
March with the Monke unto the gates of hell.
How fares my Lord?
JOHN Philip, some drinke, oh for the frozen Alps,
To tumble on and coole this inward heate,
That rageth as the fornace sevenfold hote,
To burne the holy three in Babylon.
Power after power forsake their proper power,
Only the hart impugnes with faint resist
The fierce invade of him that conquers Kings,
Help God, O payne! dye John, O plague
Inflicted on thee for thy grievous sinnes.
Philip, a chayre, and by and by a grave,
My leggs disdaine the carriage of a King.
BAST. Ah, good my Liege, with patience conquer griefe,
And beare this paine with kingly fortitude.
JOHN Me thinks I see a cattalogue of sinne,
Wrote by a fiend in Marble characters,
The least enough to loose my part in heaven.
Me thinks the Devill whispers in mine eares
And tels me tis in vayne to hope for grace,
I must be damned for Arthurs sodaine death.
I see I see a thousand thousand men
Come to accuse me for my wrong on earth,
And there is none so mercifull a God
That will forgive the number of my sinnes.
How have I livd, but by anothers losse?

55. three] (Munro); tree Qq.

---

44. In 1589 Henry III of France was poisoned by a Monk.
48. At...adventures] anyhow.
52. Cf. K.J.,V.vii.41-2.
55. three] The reference is obviously to Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego, who were condemned to death by fire for not worshipping the false idol erected by Nebuchadnezzar (see Daniel, 3:19).
56. i.e., one by one, the body's faculties lose their life.
65. Methinks I see] In Lodge and Greene's A Looking Glass for London and England, V.ii.1-30, the usurer, tormented in his conscience for the wrong he has done, uses this formula five times.

hat have I lovd, but wrack of others weale?
hen have I vowd, and not infringd mine oath?
here have I done a deede deserving well?
ow, what when, and where, have I bestowd a day
hat tended not to some notorious ill?
y life repleat with rage and tyranie,
raves little pittie for so strange a death.
r who will say that John disceasd too soone?
ho will not say he rather livd too long?
ishonor did attaynt me in my life,
nd shame attendeth John unto his death.
hy did I scape the fury of the French,
nd dyde not by the temper of their swords?
hamelesse my life, and shamefully it ends,
corn'd by my foes, disdained of my friends.
   BAST. Forgive the world and all your earthly foes,
nd call on Christ, who is your latest friend.
   JOHN My tongue doth falter: Philip, I tell thee man,
ince John did yeeld unto the Priest of Rome,
or he nor his have prospred on the earth:
urst are his blessings, and his curse is blisse.
ut in the spirit I cry unto my God,
s did the Kingly Prophet David cry,
(Whose hands, as mine, with murder were attaint)
I am not he shall buyld the Lord a house,
r roote these Locusts from the face of earth:
ut if my dying heart deceave me not,
rom out these loynes shall spring a Kingly braunch
hose armes shall reach unto the gates of Rome,
nd with his feete treade downe the Strumpets pride,
hat sits upon the chaire of Babylon.
hilip, my heart strings breake, the poysons flame
ath overcome in me weake Natures power,
nd in the faith of Jesu John doth dye.[1]

79. and] om.Q3.

76-79. The same rhetorical pattern is found in 3 Henry VI, II.v. 34-38.

99. David, after committing adultery with Bethsabee, ordered that her husband, Urias, be placed in the front ranks so that he would be killed in battle (see II Samuel, 11).

103. Kingly braunch] i.e., Henry VIII; see 3 Henry VI, III. ii. 126.

105-06. In the Book of Revelations the Whore of Babylon represents Rome, who was to be punished because she had seduced her people with the idolatrous worship of the state and its rulers (17:5).

BAST. See
Whose bowells
This is the fr
Are slaine and

Enter a Me

MESS. Ple
Which all th
Conducted by
Together wit
Doo crave to
BAST. Y
Your Majest
The Barons
O piercing
His speech
And see th

Enter
in the

HENRY
O Unckle
To be th
Ah, he i
BAST.
PAND
With si
With da
Their l
Then g
Lift u
SAL
And vo
And i
In sp
Who h
We c
H
P
And

122
13
14

1

AST. See how he strives for life, unhappy Lord,
e bowells are devided in themselves.
is the fruite of Poperie, when true Kings
slaine and shouldred out by Monkes and Friers.

Enter a Messenger.

MESS. Please it your Grace, the Barons of the Land,
ch all this while bare armes against the King,
ducted by the Legate of the Pope,
ether with the Prince his Highnes Sonne,
crave to be admitted to the presence of the King.
BAST. Your Sonne, my Lord, yong Henry craves to see
r Majestie, and brings with him beside
Barons that revolted from your Grace.
iercing sight, he fumbleth in the mouth,
speech doth faile: lift up your selfe my Lord,
see the Prince to comfort you in death.

Enter Pandulph, yong Henry, the Barons with daggers
in their hands.

HENRY O let me see my Father ere he dye:
Unckle, were you here, and sufferd him
be thus poysned by a damned Monke?
, he is dead, Father sweet Father speake.
BAST. His speach doth faile, he hasteth to his end.
PAND. Lords, give me leave to joy the dying King
th sight of these his Nobles kneeling here
th daggers in their hands, who offer up
eir lives for ransome of their fowle offence.
en good my Lord, if you forgive them all,
ft up your hand in token you forgive.
SALIS. We humbly thanke your royall Majestie,
d vow to fight for England and her King:
d in the sight of John our soveraigne Lord,
spight of Lewes and the power of Fraunce,
o hetherward are marching in all hast,
crowne yong Henry in his Fathers sted:
HENRY Help, help, he dyes, ah Father, looke on mee.
PAND. K. John, farewell: in token of thy faith,
nd signe thou dyest the servant of the Lord,

---

22. fumbleth] stutters.
30. to joy] to make happy.
41. This bit of ceremony is omitted from K.J., and John dies without forgiveness either for himself or for his nobles; see K.J., V.vii.28-58.
44. This entire line is not in the Munro edition.

Lift up thy ha
Thou dyedst th
Now joy betide

Enter a Me

MESS. Hel
With Ensignes
And all our
Expecting wh
BAST. Le
And beate th
PAND. P
And bring h
BAST. I
So shall we
HENRY
Let not a
But pull t
For they

[Scene i

A par

PAND
Require
That th
King Jo
See who
And he
Is now
HEN
To ke
Answe
And w
Or t
I te
For
And
Tha

10
12

: up thy hand, that we may witnes here
u dyedst the servant our Saviour Christ.[2]
joy betide thy soule: what noyse is this?

Enter a Messenger.

MESS. Help Lords, the Dolphin maketh hetherward
h Ensignes of defiance in the winde,
all our armie standeth at a gaze,
ecting what their Leaders will commaund.
BAST. Lets arme our selves in yong K. Henries right,
beate the power of Fraunce to sea againe.
PAND. Philip not so, but I will to the Prince,
bring him face to face to parle with you.
BAST. Lord Salsbury, your selfe shall march with me,
shall we bring these troubles to an ende.
HENRY Sweete Unckle, if thou love thy Soveraigne,
: not a stone of Swinsted Abbey stand,
: pull the house about the Friers eares:
r they have kilde my Father and my King.

Exeunt.

cene ix]

A parle sounded, Lewes, Pandulph, Salsbury, &c.

PAND. Lewes of Fraunce, yong Henry Englands King
quires to know the reason of the claime
at thou canst make to any thing of his.
ng John that did offend is dead and gone.
e where his breathles trunke in presence lyes,
d he as heire apparant to the crowne
now succeeded to his Fathers roome.
HENRY Lewes, what law of Armes doth lead thee thus,
o keepe possession of my lawfull right?
nswere in fine if thou wilt take a peace,
nd make surrender of my right againe,
r trie thy title with the dint of sword.
tell thee Dolphin, Henry feares thee not,
or now the Barons cleave unto their King,
nd what thou hast in England they did get.
LEWES Henry of England, now that John is dead,
hat was the chiefest enemie to Fraunce,

0. in fine] finally, in the end.
2. dint] force.

I may the rath
But Salsbury,
This strange
That you on B
SALIS. No
Agree with ho
BAST. My
LEWES Fa
Nor any Prin
To seeke to
Unles he hav
By treason
The Peeres
Are fled fr
But on conc
I am conte
HENRY
LEWES
BAST.
And at mo
Meanewhil
And there
But first
Lords ta
That by

They

Thus En
And blo
Let Eng
And al
Lewes,
For ne
The t
Dolph
Lords
With
If En
Nor

may the rather be inducde to peace.
t Salsbury, and you Barons of the Realme,
is strange revolt agrees not with the oath
at you on Bury Altare lately sware.
SALIS. Nor did the oath your Highness there did take
gree with honour of the Prince of Fraunce.
BAST. My Lord, what answere make you to the King?
LEWES Faith Philip this I say: It bootes not me,
or any Prince nor power of Christendome,
o seeke to win this Iland Albion,
nles he have a partie in the Realme
y treason for to help him in his warres.
he Peeres which were the partie on my side,
re fled from me: then bootes not me to fight,
ut on conditions, as mine honour wills,
am contented to depart the Realme.
HENRY On what conditions will your Highnes yeeld?
LEWES That shall we thinke upon by more advice.
BAST. Then Kings and Princes, let these broils have end,
nd at more leasure talke upon the League.
eanewhile to Worster let us beare the King,
nd there interre his bodie, as beseemes.
ut first, in sight of Lewes, heire of Fraunce,
ords take the crowne and set it on his head,
hat by succession is our lawfull King.

They crowne yong Henry.

hus Englands peace begins in Henryes Raigne,
nd bloody warres are closde with happie league.
et England live but true within it selfe,
nd all the world can never wrong her State.
ewes, thou shalt be bravely shipt to France,
or never Frenchman got of English ground
he twentith part that thou hast conquered.
olphin, thy hand: to Worster we will march:
ords all, lay hands to beare your Soveraigne
ith obsequies of honor to his grave:
f Englands Peeres and people joyne in one,
or Pope, nor Fraunce, nor Spaine can doo them wrong. [Exeunt]

Finis.

5. me] him Q3.

---

2. lawfull King] "As the heir of a crowned king, Henry had a better title than John; just as Henry V's was better than his father's" (Honigmann, p.146, n.102).

5. See K.J., V.vii.118; Honigmann, citing Matthew, xii.25, Mark, iii.24, Luke, xi.17, notes that "Armada pamphleteers popularized this watch-word" (p. 147).

Part I

[Scene i]

1. The name C
Chatelai
acter is
found it
France"
gested
was arc
Hubert
tiatio
of Chr
King J
Cante
of Na

2. The pla
Elea
agai
conc
how
wit

3. The b
co
Le
"H
re
t
t
l
r

4. I

e i]

ne name Chattilion could be a confusion with a title ("the Chatelain"), as Honigmann notes (p.3). However, the character is probably not historical, and the name is not found in Holinshed, where we find the title "Admiral of France" (iii. 555). It is possible that the name was suggested by a similar one, that of Henry de Chastillon, who was archdeacon of Canterbury in 1195. He was the agent for Hubert, archbishop of Canterbury (1198-9), in the negotiations arising out of Hubert's quarrel with the convent of Christ Church. In 1202 during the struggle between King John and the monks of St. Augustine's monastery at Canterbury, he excommunicated the monks. See Dictionary of National Biography, s.v."Chastillon."

he playwright here follows Holinshed (i. 158) in portraying Eleanor's jealousy toward Constance: "Elianor...was sore against hir nephue Arthur, rather mooved thereto by envie conceived against his mother...she saw if he were king, how his mother Constance would looke to beare most rule within the realme."

he bringing of a legal case to London seems to have been common in John's reign (see George W. Keeton, Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background, 1967). Keeton (p.119) notes: "Henry II, John's father, had accomplished numerous legal reforms, one group of which had the effect of securing the trial of all actions relating to the ownership of land in the King's courts, instead of the court of the feudal overlord from whom the land was held." John apparently had derived a marginal reputation as judge in the hearing of such individual cases. Regarding John's reputation as judge, Warren (pp.143-4) notes: "Whatever else one may say about John, there is no doubt that his royal duty of providing justice was discharged with a zeal and a tirelessness to which the English common law is greatly indebted."

egal knowledge is not the particular gift of The Reign's author. To begin with, Robert's argument is very unpersuasive. As Keeton (p.130) notes, "It is nothing but rumor, and alleged physical resemblance." John apparently knows the law, for he tells Robert that his "proofes are frivolous." But he then asks Essex to question Lady Faulconbridge, whose evidence would have been inadmissible. Philip is then asked to reveal who his own father was, and Keeton writes that his evidence is "not only inadmissible, but completely val-

ueless."
ply beca
was Coeu
last, th
ties,"
raised

5. Since the
since
the em

[Scene ii]

1. The err
with
tabli
Lion
the
Kyng
tifi
wel

2. The r
of
sl
ha
to
p

3. War
w

4.

ueless." The king finally awards the claim to Robert, simply because of Philip's inner conviction that his father was Coeur-de-Lion. Keeton (p.127) concludes: "From first to last, this lengthy trial scene abounds with legal absurdities," and the author was "plainly ignorant of the matters raised in bastardy suits."

Since the possessive "my" is used in line 329 and in 330, and since the Bastard is apparently talking about his own thoughts, the emendation "my" is inevitable.

ne ii]

The erroneous identification of Leopold, Archduke of Austria, with Widomar, Viscount of Lymoges, seems to have been an established tradition. George H. Needler (Richard Coeur de Lion in Literature, 1890, pp.56-7) first pointed out that the substitution of Austria for Lymoges in Wynkyn de Worde's Kynge Rycharde Cuer du Lyon was the source of their identification in The Reign. See also Honigmann, pp.xx-xxi, as well as Percy Simpson, Notes & Queries, Nov.12, 1898,p.386.

The name "Coeur de Lion" is derived from the legend which tells of how King Richard, imprisoned by the Duke of Austria, slew the lion which had been set upon him, by forcing his hand down its throat and tearing its heart. The story is told in Rastell's Pastyme of People (1529); see also Wilson, p. 110.

Warren writes (p.46) that John held the office of Justiciar while Richard was fighting in the Holy Lands. After having developed an alliance with Philip of France, John spread the rumor that Richard would never return, after he heard that Richard had fallen into the hands of Duke Leopold of Austria. John made a feeble attempt to seize the throne of England, but he was thwarted in this venture, and ended up paying part of Richard's ransom with his own lands. Warren calls John's assumption of authority in England during Richard's absence a "hollow mockery."

Professor J.C. Maxwell ("Peele and Shakespeare: A Stylometric Test," JEGP, vol.49, pp.557-61) identifies this peculiar construction which uses a possessive adjective as antecedent of a relative clause as a possible sign of Peele's hand. The Reign has nine instances of this: Part I, sc.ii, 41, 131, 163-4; sc.xiii, 11-12, 149-50, 239-40, 243-4; Part II, sc.ix, 41-2. In relation to Peele's authorship of The Reign, see Chapter Two, "Authorship."

[Scene ii]

5. Roger of W
appoint
pilgrim
this ap
Holinsh
mind t
brothe
See al

6. Honigma
to ma
prove

7. The ch
the
Simp
New
sug
tro
of

[Scene i

1. This
o
C
R
s

ne ii]

Roger of Wendover (circa 1190) writes that Arthur had been appointed heir to Richard before the latter left on his pilgrimage to the Holy Lands, but he also notes that this appointment was revoked at Richard's death in 1199. Holinshed (iii. 155) writes: "Richard I...preparing his mind to death, he ordained his testament...Unto his brother John he assigned the crown of England...." See also Furness, p.105, n.205.

Honigmann (p.32) notes that married women were not permitted to make wills for their lands and that a woman's will "was proverbially an influenced will."

The chronicles do not reveal any uncertainty on the part of the citizens of Angiers as to their true king. But Richard Simpson ("The Politics of Shakespeare's History Plays," in New Shakespeare Society's Transactions, I, 1874, pp.400-01) suggests that this passage probably alludes to Elizabeth's troubles in her claim to Calais, preceding the 1559 treaty of Cateau-Cambresis. I think not.

ene iii]

This is not a commonly known story. However, in The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye, trans. and printed by William Caxton, circa 1474 (ed. H. Oskar Sommer, London, 1894), Raoul Lefevre, a French medieval romancer, fabricated a story about Hector's funeral that was more appropriate to his own time. As he tells it, a tabernacle was constructed on top of which stood a great gold image of Hector with the face turned toward the Greeks, and in his hand was a naked sword to menace the Greeks. Inside this gold carcass the "masters put the body of Hector in flesh and bones, clad in his best garments and robes. It stood upon its feet and might endure for a long time in that wise without corruption because of certain science that the masters had set on the summit of the head of Hector, that is to say, a vessel that had a hole in the bottom. This vessel was full of fine balm that distilled and dropped down to a place above his head and so spread down in all the members of his body... And all the people would see Hector as he had been in life" (vol. II, 614-15). Margaret R. Scherer (The Legends of Troy in Art & Literature, London, 1963, p.94) notes that this striking statue can be found portrayed in a Franco-Flemish tapestry (Tournai, 1472), a part of the Burrell Collection in the Glasgow Art Gallery.

[Scene iv]

1. This is
than
the te
mally
the hi

2. Arthur'
fathe
of R

3. At thi
was
in
p.

[Scene v]

1. Holi
La
pa
th
L
h
W
J

2. Th

3. O

4.

5.

cene iv]

This is obviously a variant spelling of Chattilion, which more than likely occurred during the transcription process while the text was being read to the scribe. Castilean is normally the title given to the keeper of a castle; such was the historical Hubert de Burgh during the reign of John.

Arthur's grandfather, Conan le Petit, Duke of Brittany and father of Constance, was the first who called himself Earl of Richmond.

At this time, the historical Constance was not a widow, but was married to her third husband. Shakespeare follows suit in calling Constance a widow (K.J., II.i.32). See Wilson, p. 111, n.32.

Scene v]

Holinshed gives two reasons for John's action against Stephen Langton. He first notes that the appointment of Langton bypassed the bishop of Norwich, a protege of John's, to whom the position had previously been offered. In the second place Langton was an outsider; he had been educated at Rome and had taught for several years at the University of Paris. Warren feels that Innocent made a mistake by not allowing John an archbishop with whom he could co-exist amicably (p.164).

This and the previous speech are remarkably similar to speeches made by Pandulph and John in K.J., III. i. 62-86.

On December 12, 1580, the Cardinal of Como issued the famous letter which absolved any would-be murderer of Queen Elizabeth from sin, and pronounced the slaying a glorious deed.

This speech by Pandulph could well be a contemporary reference to the Papal Bull Regnans in Excelsis, in which Pius V excommunicated Elizabeth in 1570 and absolved all the subjects from allegiance to her. See Wilson, p.138. For a complete treatment of the similarities between the reigns of John and Elizabeth, see Lily B. Campbell, Shakespeare's Histories (San Marino, 1947), pp. 135-56.

Philip's betrayal of John takes only three short speeches here. But in Shakespeare's play the same situation occupies sixty-nine lines (III.i.117-186).

[Scene v]

6. This ex
Ange
with
is p
istr

7. The R
Pop
bis
str
ge
re
je
de
n
"
e
c
a

[Scene

1. Th

[Sce

1.

[S

1

ene v]

This exercise of vis et voluntas was a strong prerogative of Angevin kingship. Jolliffe (p.53) notes that "distraint, without judgment and carried to the extreme of harshness, is perhaps the most characteristic and effective administrative weapon of the twelfth century...."

The Reign overemphasizes the one tactless political move of Pope Innocent, namely, his making Stephen Langton Archbishop of Canterbury, and it totally ignores Innocent's strong impact among John's subjects. Jolliffe (p.320) suggests that Innocent's "remote but consistent censorship remained to fortify the growing conviction of John's subjects that the cardinal vice of their monarchy was the destruction of its men without judgment." Regarding this new power wielded by Innocent, Jolliffe further writes: "It was a virtue working primarily for spiritual righteousness, but also, though less directly, for rightness of action within an assumed frame of western common law, a law which in hard fact had scant respect."

ene viii]

This is a reference to John's startling, surprise victory at Mirabeau. A detachment of his army made a forced march of eighty-miles in forty-eight hours, and surprised the rebels, and rescued the Queen. Warren (pp.77-9) calls this one of John's most daring exploits. In K.J., III.i.8, Shakespeare reverses history by having Faulconbridge claim that it was he who had rescued Eleanor.

cene ix]

The word "fanzen" appears to have been the result of a turned letter "u" during the setting of type. Bullough suggests that the word might refer to "Franciscan"; however, I have been unable to find another instance of "fanzen".

cene x]

See Tilley, p. 200: "No faith with heretics." This was a Roman Catholic doctrine that was despised by Protestants. See also Honigmann, p. 64, n.100.

cene xi]

This scene does not take place in Shakespeare's play. It should

[Scene xi]

also b
this s
the pe
gay,
comes

2. The co
out

3. "Warm"
in
for

4. The c
"W
se
It
wo
a
o

[Scene

1. Th

2. A

3.

[Sc

1.

ne xi]

also be noted here that the occasional doggerel verse in this scene is of the type used in anti-Catholic plays of the period. See, for example, Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, ix, 21-2: "By your leave, nobile decus,/ for here comes Doctor Bacon's pecus."

The consistent use of "Philip" instead of "Bastard" throughout this scene might indicate a different author here.

"Warm" seems to complete the notion suggested by "Purgatory" in the previous line, and it rhymes with "harme." Therefore, no emendation is needed.

The context here suggests no good reason for emending to "Vintners" as both Q2 and Q3 did. Both make equally good sense, and both would have been the usual duty of monks. It could be argued that the implication with "Vintner" would have been more deprecatory and hence would have added more to the satire of the scene; however, emendation on this principle alone is unwise.

ene xii]

Throughout this scene Arthur's appeal is to Hubert's conscience, and the fear that he might lose his soul. In Shakespeare's play, on the other hand, Arthur makes an appeal for mercy, a positive virtue.

Arthur is appealing his case; he has not even been fairly tried, so that his sentence is totally unjust and illegal. During the time of the Angevins, however, the King was the court of final appeal.

In Shakespeare's play Hubert desists from putting out Arthur's eyes because of pity, not out of fear of going to hell.

ene xiii]

This phenomenon is described, but not actually seen in K.J., IV.ii.182-5. Shakespeare relates the appearance of the five moons directly to Arthur's death, rather than to the prophecy of Peter.

Part II

[Scene i]

1. Warren
most
Willi
tured
of th
the
plie
impl
Thus
and
han
the
ing
hav

2. The
pl
i
a
o
P
s

3. P

4.

[Sc

1.

II

e i]

arren (p.83) suspects that the Annals of Margam tell the most authentic story of Arthur's death. For it had been William de Briouze, lord of Brecon, who had actually captured Arthur. Warren notes that the Briouzes were patrons of the Cistercian Abbey of Margam in Glamorgan, and that the annals seem to contain much information probably supplied by William. Arthur's death, as found in the Annals, implicates John in a foul murder: "...After dinner on the Thursday before Easter (3 April, 1203), when he was drunk and possessed by the devil, he slew him with his own hand, and tying a heavy stone to the body, cast it into the Seine." Since John had definitely been at Rouen during this time, Warren suggests that this could easily have been a "typical fit of Angevin drunken rage."

The spelling Hughbert occurs only three times in the entire play, all on the same page (A4r) of Q1. Professor Honigmann suggests the possibility of corruption by associating the spelling of a similar corruption in The Death of Robert, Earle of Huntington (see Honigmann, p.175). However, it is very likely that the spelling was the result of dictation in the course of transcribing the play for the press. Besides, if The Reign were memorially reconstructed, this same form should appear more frequently.

Pity is not the reason Hubert gives in I.xii for refusing to carry out the order to blind Arthur. Rather, it was his conscience, the fear that he would be committing a grievous sin, that made Hubert release Arthur.

Wilson (p.170) notes that the bodies of princes were not buried in the ground, but embalmed and placed in a sepulchre or vault.

ene ii]

Here the author of The Reign appears to have confused the time sequence of Peter's prophecy, which stated that John was to lose his crown by noon of Ascension Day (I.xiii. 184-7). John is under the impression, however, that he still has twelve more hours to endure before the danger is completely over. And the prophet mysteriously confirms this in lines 133-4. See also Honigmann, p.172.

[Scene ii]

2. Both Holi
as one

3. It is int
conbri
ii.167
Arthur
matio
embas
oppor
thei
have
this
infe
heri
fer

4. Tully
Fl
Pe
th
Ti
p
c
r

5. In

[Sc

1.

ene ii]

Both Holinshed (ii. 165) and Foxe (II. 321) mention this as one of the ways in which Arthur might have died.

It is interesting to note that in Shakespeare's play Faulconbridge had earlier been dispatched to the nobles (IV. ii.167) before Hubert's confession that he had not killed Arthur. As McDiarmid (pp.437-8) points out, this information was exactly what John needed to make Faulconbridge's embassy successful. But John mysteriously ignores this opportunity and simply tells Hubert: "I have a way to win their loves again" (IV.ii.168). Here Shakespeare seems to have been confused, for there is absolutely no logic in this sequence of events. McDiarmid says that"Shakespeare's inferiority in this respect...is due to his being the inheritor of a scheme that he could not adapt to his different conception without evident distortion."

Tully was the name by which Renaissance England knew Cicero. Fleay tries to derive some support for his theory that Peele had a hand in authoring The Reign by alluding to the use of the name Tully in 2 Henry VI, IV.i.136, and in Titus Andronicus, IV.i.14, which he also suspects were partly written by Peele. Methods such as this for discovering authorship are highly unreliable without corroborative information.

In the Renaissance, meteors were considered an exhalation formed in the lower region of the atmosphere. It was believed that their fall was caused by the instant cold of the middle region which turned them back as they tried to rise. The darts were no doubt figuratively perceived as the fire which appeared to shoot out from the spinning mass. See S.K. Heninger, Jr., A Handbook of Renaissance Meteorology (Durham, N.C., 1960), p.96.

Scene iii]

According to Holinshed (iii.180) the nobles met at the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds in 1214, "under the colour of going thither to doo their devotions to the bodie of St. Edmund...." At this time they took a solemn oath to make war on John if he would not "grant to the same liberties, with others which he of his owne accord had promised to confirm to them." Both the author of The Reign and Shakespeare rearrange history, as Honigmann points out. For Lewis did not land in England until 1216.

[Scene iii]

2. The label
out th
Arthur
of Pom
bad ne
the la
same
had b
John'
the
evid
whic
not
con
sch
of
imm

3. This
ea
w
p
J

4. Es

5.

ne iii]

The label tyrant is applied to John numerous times throughout the rest of the play, mainly because of his part in Arthur's death, but also for his execution of the Prophet of Pomfret, who committed no crime other than bringing bad news. Tyrant was an epithet familiar to audiences of the late 1580's, to whom John, no doubt, manifested the same cruelty and injustice as Richard III, whose reign had been made a byword for tyranny by the Tudors. But to John's contemporaries, the word was not applicable to the king. As Jolliffe (p.88) notes: "It must at least be evident that Angevin monarchy was exercising something which was other and more than conventional jurisdiction; not realized tyranny and less than sovereignty." He later concludes (p.302) that if "vis et voluntas were for the schoolman the vice of royalty, they were the vital force of Angevin kingship, and of all that kingship did for an immature age without a concerted mind and will of its own."

This is another aberration of history. Ranulph de Blundeville, earl of Chester, was the most powerful of John's barons with fiefs in Normandy. He had been suspected by John of plotting with the disaffected Bretons, and in April, 1203, John formally charged him with treason. However, nothing ever came of this, and Chester, instead of being banished, was later designated one of the executors of John's will. See Warren, pp.109, 255.

Essex's long speech advocating rebellion against the king is omitted in Shakespeare's play. Since he was an apparent admirer of the contemporary Essex in the middle 1590's, Shakespeare quite understandably did not want the man's name associated with treason in any way.

Paul's Epistle to the Romans provided the archetypal law for the Renaissance: "Recompense to no man evil for evil... for it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." The teaching of the scriptures included both a command and a promise that God would indeed repay. This notion was reinforced in the pamphlet literature of the 1570's and 80's, and in the Sunday Homilies. The "Homilie Against Disobedience and Wylfull Rebellion" (1571) pointed out that the King was a god under God, and accountable only to God. Deuteronomy, 32:35 and Hebrews, 10:30 were also frequently cited. See Campbell, pp.143-56.

[Scene iv]

1. According
crown
sion.
John's
Day,
situa
patib

[Scene vi]

1. Note
and
3 H
che
wo
re
Ir

[Scene

1. Hol

[Scen

1.

2.

ne iv]

According to Holinshed (iii. 177) Pandulph had kept the crown for a period of five days as a token of possession. There is a dramatic compression of history here. John's surrender of the crown took place on Ascension Day, May 16, 1213, at Dover. In the play, however, the situation at the time of his surrender is more compatible with the events preceding John's death in 1216.

ene vi]

Note the verbal parallels between this speech by Philip and Warwick's account of his defeat at St. Albans in 3 Henry VI, II.i.50-204: measure, scandal by retire, cheer'd, of Troy, Saint George, fear, captivated, lamb, wolf, heartless, fled, short tale to make, amongst the rest, the eager foe, head, swallow'd up, to tell this tragic tale (see Cairncross, ed., Appendix V, p.187).

ene vii]

Holinshed mentions the following about Dover Castle (iii.191): "Lewis, being advertised that King John was retired out of Kent, passed through the countrie without anie incounter, and wan all the castles and holds as he went, but Dover he could not win...." Dover Castle was built on a cliff 350 feet high, and was considered to be impregnable.

ene viii]

Holinshed provides two versions of John's death. He writes that after the disaster at the Wellstream, John developed a fever which was provoked by the heat and by his eating raw peaches and drinking new cider. In this version he dies in the castle at Newark. In the second version, Holinshed describes the poisoning by a monk, as we have it in The Reign.

In 2 Henry VI, III.iii.27-8, Cardinal Beaufort dies a "bad death" because he is unable to respond to the King's order to raise his hand to beg God's forgiveness.

Alexander,
193

Bale, John
fo

Bond, Wil
t
S

Bonjour,
1

Boswell

Bowers

Bull

Burc

Ca

Ca

BIBLIOGRAPHY

xander, Peter. Shakespeare's Life and Art. London, 1939.

.e, John. Kynge Johan. Malone Society Reprint, Oxford University Press, 1931.

ıd, William H. "Casting Off Copy by Elizabethan Printers: A Theory," Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 42 (1948), 281-91.

njour, Adrien. "The Road to Swinstead Abbey," E.L.H., XVIII (1951), 253-74.

swell-Stone, W.G. Shakespeare's Holinshed. London, 1896.

wers, Fredson. On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists. University of Pennsylvania Library, 1955.

_____. "Notes on Running Titles as Bibliographical Evidence," Library, 4th series, XIX (1938-9), 315-38.

llough, Geoffrey, ed. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. 4 vols., London, 1966.

rckhardt, Sigurd. "King John: Ordering of this Present Time," E.L.H., 33, no.2 (June, 1966), 133-53.

irncross, Andrew S., ed. New Arden 2 Henry VI. Harvard University Press, 1957.

mpbell, Lily Bess. Shakespeare's Histories. San Marino, California, 1947.

Collier, Joh
to th
Stage
1879

Courthope,
192

Elson, Joh
Qui
bra

Farnham,
Tr

Fleay, F
J
I

Foxe, J

Furness

Furniv

Greg,

———

———

———

Ha

Ha

H

lier, John P. The History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of Shakespeare: and Annals of the Stage to the Restoration. 2nd edition, London, 1879.

rthope, William J. History of English Poetry. London, 1926.

son, John. "Studies in the King John Plays," in Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies. The Folger Library, 1948, pp. 183-97.

rnham, Willard. The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy. Oxford, 1956.

eay, Frederick G., ed. The Troublesome Reign of King John, in Collins' School and College Classics. London, 1878.

xe, John. Actes and Monuments. London, 1583.

rness, Horace H., Jr. ed. The Life and Death of King John. London, 1919.

rnivall, F.J. and Munro, John, eds. The Troublesome Reign of King John. London, 1913.

reg, W.W. A Companion to Arber. Oxford University Press, 1955.

_____. The Shakespeare First Folio. Oxford University Press, 1955.

_____. Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgments. London, 1922.

_____, and Boswell, Eleanor, eds. Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1576-1602. London, 1930.

Hall, Edward. The Union of the Two Noble and Illustre Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke. London, 1548.

Hart, Alfred. Stolne and Surreptitious Copies. London, 1942.

Hill, T.H. "Spelling and the Bibliographer," Library, 5th series, vol. XVIII (1963), pp.1-28.

Holinshed,

Honigmann,
sity

———.
sit

Hook, Fra
Ge

Hoppe, Ha
It

Horne, D
N

Jolliff

Keeton,

Kirsch

———

———

Law,

McD

Mc

—

Holinshed, Raphael. Chronicles. London, 1587.

Honigmann, E.A.J. New Arden King John. Harvard University Press, 1954.

_____. The Stability of Shakespeare's Text. University of Nebraska Press, 1965.

Hook, Frank S., ed. Edward I in The Dramatic Works of George Peele. New Haven, 1961, pp.1-212.

Hoppe, Harry. The Bad Quarto of Romeo and Juliet. Ithaca, N.Y., 1948.

Horne, David. The Life and Minor Works of George Peele. New Haven, 1952.

Jolliffe, J.E.A. Angevin Kingship. London, 1955.

Keeton, George W. Shakespeare's Legal and Political Background. London, 1967.

Kirschbaum, Leo. Shakespeare and the Stationers. Columbus, Ohio, 1955.

_____. "A Census of Bad Quartos," R.E.S., XIV (1938) 20-43.

_____. "An Hypothesis Concerning the Origin of Bad Quartos," PMLA, 60 (1945), 697-715.

Law, Robert A. "On the Date of King John," Studies in Philology, vol. 54 (1957), pp. 119-127.

McDiarmid, Matthew. "Concerning The Troublesome Reign of King John," Notes and Queries, n.s. IV (1957), 435-39.

McKerrow, Ronald B. A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers. London, 1910.

_____. "The Elizabethan Printer and Dramatic Manuscripts," Library, 4th series, XII (1932), 253-75.

_____. An Introduction to Bibliography. Oxford University Press, 1928.

_____. "A Suggestion Regarding Shakespeare's Manuscripts," R.E.S., XI (1935), 459-65.

Maxwell, J.C
Unive

Paris, Matt

Parrott, T.
in

Pinciss, G
doc
196

Pitcher,
sh
St

Price, G
T

Reese,

Ribner

Richm

St.

Sam

Se

S

Maxwell, J.C., ed. New Arden Titus Andronicus. Harvard University Press, 1953.

Paris, Matthew. Historia Maior. London, 1571.

Parrott, T.M. A Review of the New Arden King John, in J.E.G.P., vol. LV (1956), pp. 297-305.

Pinciss, Gerald M. The Queen's Men 1583-1592 (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Columbia University, 1967.

Pitcher, Seymour. The Case for Shakespeare's Authorship of The Famous Victories. New York, The State University, 1961.

Price, George R. "Dividing the Copy for Michaelmas Term," Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 60 (1966), 327-336.

_____. "Setting by Formes in the First Edition of The Phoenix," Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 56 (1962), 414-27.

Reese, M.M. The Cease of Majesty. New York, 1961.

Ribner, Irving. The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. Princeton University Press, 1957.

Richmond, Hugh M. Shakespeare's Political Plays. New York, 1967.

St. Claire Byrne, Muriel. "Bibliographical Clues in Collaborate Plays," Library, 4th series, 13 (1932-33), 21-48.

Samply, Arthur M. "Plot Structure in Peele's Plays as a Test of Authorship," PMLA, vol. 51 (1936), pp. 689-701.

Sen Gupta, S.C. Shakespeare's Historical Plays. Oxford University Press, 1964.

Sibly, John. "The Anomalous Case of King John," E.L.H. 33 (1966), 418-21.

Sykes, H. Dugdale. Sidelights on Shakespeare. Stratford-on-Avon, 1919.

Taylor, Rupe
and
(193

Ulrici, Hei
187

Warren, W.

White, Ri
18

Wilson,
s

Wilson,

Taylor, Rupert. "A Tentative Chronology of Marlowe's and Some Other Elizabethan Plays," PMLA, LI (1936), 643-688.

Ulrici, Hermann. Shakespeare's Dramatic Art. London, 1876.

Warren, W.L. King John. London, 1961.

White, Richard Grant. Shakespeare Studies. Boston, 1886.

Wilson, John Dover, ed. King John. Cambridge University Press, 1936.

Wilson, Frank P. Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare. Oxford, 1953.

Taylor, Ru
and
(19

Ulrici, He
18

Warren, W

White, R
1

Wilson,

Wilson,

Taylor, Rupert. "A Tentative Chronology of Marlowe's and Some Other Elizabethan Plays," PMLA, LI (1936), 643-688.

Ulrici, Hermann. Shakespeare's Dramatic Art. London, 1876.

Warren, W.L. King John. London, 1961.

White, Richard Grant. Shakespeare Studies. Boston, 1886.

Wilson, John Dover, ed. King John. Cambridge University Press, 1936.

Wilson, Frank P. Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare. Oxford, 1953.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1293 03071 5183