

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
William Shakespeare  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

---

## CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

*Books of enduring scholarly value*

### Literary studies

This series provides a high-quality selection of early printings of literary works, textual editions, anthologies and literary criticism which are of lasting scholarly interest. Ranging from Old English to Shakespeare to early twentieth-century work from around the world, these books offer a valuable resource for scholars in reception history, textual editing, and literary studies.

### King John

John Dover Wilson's New Shakespeare, published between 1921 and 1966, became the classic Cambridge edition of Shakespeare's plays and poems until the 1980s. The series, long since out-of-print, is now reissued. Each work is available both individually and as part of a set, and each contains a lengthy and lively introduction, main text, and substantial notes and glossary printed at the back. The edition, which began with *The Tempest* and ended with *The Sonnets*, put into practice the techniques and theories that had evolved under the 'New Bibliography'. Remarkably by today's standards, although it took the best part of half a century to produce, the New Shakespeare involved only a small band of editors besides Dover Wilson himself. As the volumes took shape, many of Dover Wilson's textual methods acquired general acceptance and became an established part of later editorial practice, for example in the *Arden* and *New Cambridge Shakespeares*. The reissue of this series in the Cambridge Library Collection complements the other historic editions also now made available.

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
William Shakespeare  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

---

Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection will bring back to life books of enduring scholarly value across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
William Shakespeare  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

---

# King John

*The Cambridge Dover Wilson Shakespeare*

VOLUME 16

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE  
EDITED BY JOHN DOVER WILSON



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
William Shakespeare  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

---

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge New York Melbourne Madrid Cape Town Singapore São Paulo Delhi

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781108005883](http://www.cambridge.org/9781108005883)

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2009

This edition first published 1936, 1954

This digitally printed version 2009

ISBN 978-1-108-00588-3

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
William Shakespeare  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

---

THE WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE

EDITED FOR THE SYNDICS OF THE  
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BY

JOHN DOVER WILSON

KING JOHN

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
William Shakespeare  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

---

# KING JOHN



CAMBRIDGE  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1969

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
William Shakespeare  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

---

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,  
São Paulo, Delhi

Cambridge University Press  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by  
Cambridge University Press, New York

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)  
Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9780521094832](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521094832)

© Cambridge University Press 1936, 1954, 2008

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written  
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1936  
\*Reprinted 1954  
First paperback edition 1969  
Re-issued in this digitally printed version 2009

\* Places where editorial changes or additions intro-  
duce variants from the first edition are, where possi-  
ble, marked by a date [1954] in square brackets.

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

ISBN 978-0-521-07540-4 hardback  
ISBN 978-0-521-09483-2 paperback

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	PAGE vii
STAGE-HISTORY	lxii
TO THE READER	lxxxi
KING JOHN	i
THE COPY FOR THE TEXT OF 1623	91
NOTES	95
GLOSSARY	195



## KING JOHN

Shakespeare's *Life and Death of King John* is not from the literary standpoint one of his best or most interesting plays, and though, as I am told by actors who have played it, by no means ineffective in the theatre, it is rarely seen upon the modern stage. Nor is there any external evidence of its popularity during the lifetime of its author. It was, however, essentially a topical play, and there were occasions during the period 1590–1610 when it might well have secured excited audiences. Probably, as we shall find, first performed quite early in his career, it seems to have been originally drafted in haste, though the inconsistencies and confusions of the received text may possibly be due in part to later revision.

‘The tragedy,’ writes Dr Johnson, ‘is varied with a very pleasing interchange of incidents and characters. The Lady’s grief is very affecting, and the character of the Bastard contains that mixture of greatness and levity which this author delighted to exhibit.’ It is full also of lines and passages which only Shakespeare could have penned. Yet we seldom feel that the pen was dipped in his own heart’s blood; and if the much-praised, and over-praised, portrait of the boy Arthur be really the dramatist’s obituary notice of his own son, as many have supposed, his paternal affection must have been conventional and frigid to a degree which is very difficult to reconcile with the tender and passionate nature that gives warmth and reality to his later dramas. Indeed, if the death of Hamnet Shakespeare in 1596 meant anything to Shakespeare, Constance’s lamentations must surely have been written before that event taught him what true grief was. In a word, our lack of interest in *King John* seems chiefly due to a certain lack of interest on the part of the author. It was, we may guess, one of

Cambridge University Press  
 978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
 William Shakespeare  
 Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

viii

## KING JOHN

those plays which he originally wrote to supply the needs of his company for a special occasion, while his mind was engaged elsewhere, perhaps with the composition of *Richard II*, which seems to be closer to it than any other of his plays.

Nevertheless, there are two points of special interest about *King John*: (i) it is, as I shall endeavour to show, an indisputable example of textual revision, and the only one in which the source-play has come down to us<sup>1</sup>; and (ii) it is the only occasion on which Shakespeare deals directly with the main issue of his age, viz. the religious question and the conflict between the English monarchy and the Papacy. The introduction that follows will be principally concerned with these two matters, which have a connecting link in the relation between Shakespeare's *King John* and the John of history—history in Shakespeare's day and our own.

## I

*King John in history, modern and Elizabethan*

King John, perhaps the most gifted, certainly the wickedest and most tyrannical, king who ever sat upon an English throne, would make a popular subject for a modern film-play. Latest born of a long family, he reached power as unexpectedly as the disinherited youth who is the favourite hero of fairy story and romance. Short of stature and, if the effigy on his tomb at Worcester is to be trusted, a little effeminate in appearance, he had something childlike about him which appealed for an indulgence he in no way deserved. He was pitifully nicknamed Lackland in his cradle by a father who had settled all the Angevin dominions upon his elder brothers

<sup>1</sup> *King Leir and his Three Daughters*, the other extant drama he is known to have used, is not a source-play in this sense.

## INTRODUCTION

ix

before he was born at Oxford in 1167; he was still drawing upon the same pity twenty-six years later when Richard I pardoned a treacherous rebellion with a brotherly kiss and the words 'Thou art but a child, and hast been left to ill guardians'; and one may suspect that the fascination of women for his comely person, a fascination he exploited to the full, called out the mother in them as much as the mistress. For his vices were also those of a spoilt child. He had his full share of the violent passions of his race but never learnt to control them; he would grovel upon the ground in insane fits of anger, screaming aloud and gnawing at straws; while he shewed neither mercy nor pity for those who crossed the desire of his eye or the lusts of his flesh.

In an epoch when the power of the Church and the glory of kingship were at their height he seemed to be entirely lacking in reverence or a sense of personal dignity. He scoffed publicly at sacred things, bandying lewd jests upon them with his cronies in Rouen cathedral at the very moment of his coronation as Duke of Normandy, and welcoming the papal interdict as an opportunity for the greedy enjoyment of church property. The most brilliant strategist of his age, he nevertheless preferred the amusement of harrying the peaceful countryside and burning cornfields to pitched battles, in which he seldom engaged until he had first made sure that ample desertions from the opposing force would give him victory. Insensitive to the claims of honour, amazingly devoid of self-respect, and yet gifted with an intellect as subtle and as powerful as any in Europe, he baffled friends and enemies alike from first to last. He knew when he was beaten; found small attraction in defending a losing cause; shrank from no humiliation to save his skin or to gain his ends; and was never more dangerous than when he seemed most at a loss. Even when finally at bay, with a French army on English soil, his treasure engulfed in the Wash and himself

Cambridge University Press  
978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
William Shakespeare  
Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

x

## KING JOHN

deserted by all save mercenaries, he might not impossibly have contrived one more chicane and perhaps played a winning hand for many years, had he not chosen that moment to overeat himself like a gluttonous schoolboy, and so brought on the fit of dysentery from which he died. Yet his exit was probably well-timed; for he had at last met his match in Stephen Langton, a man as clever as himself, but with a sense of values and an understanding of human nature quite beyond his ken. Indeed, the entry on the stage of Nemesis in the person of Langton, representative of the best traditions of our character and statesmanship, and founder of our liberties, brings the tragedy of the English Nero to a magnificently appropriate catastrophe.

It is not surprising that such a man seemed in the eyes of his contemporaries a monster who beggared description: 'Nature's enemy' is how one chronicler sums him up, while another exclaims 'Foul as it is, hell itself is defiled by the fouler presence of John.' And modern historians echo the verdict in modern terms. 'The closer study of John's history,' writes John Richard Green in a passage that John's best-known biographer, Kate Norgate, takes as her text, 'clears away the charges of sloth and incapacity with which men tried to explain the greatness of his fall. The awful lesson of his life rests on the fact that the king who lost Normandy, became the vassal of the Pope, and perished in a struggle of despair against English freedom was no weak and indolent voluptuary but the ablest and most ruthless of the Angevins.' And a living historian, Professor Powicke, draws substantially the same portrait, though in slightly different perspective<sup>1</sup>.

What Green called the awful lessons of history are the dramatist's opportunity; and the character of John might have set Marlowe dreaming of an addition to his gallery

<sup>1</sup> *Cambridge Medieval History*, vi, 219–20.

Cambridge University Press  
 978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
 William Shakespeare  
 Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xi

of supermen or Shakespeare fashioning a villain who would combine the foppery of Richard II with the devilry of Richard III, had either of them been allowed to catch sight of 'nature's enemy' in the mirror they held up to nature. But John's real features, as seen by Roger of Wendover, Kate Norgate and Professor Powicke, were obscured for most Elizabethans by the preoccupations of the age in which they lived. His iniquities had brought two forces stronger than himself into the field: the Papacy, which he angered by his high-handed dealing with ecclesiastical affairs, and the English baronage, temporarily united, and protesting in the name of the whole English people against his tyrannical practices. This second issue, which culminated in the Great Charter of 1215, had no special meaning for Shakespeare and his contemporaries. With the Wars of the Roses immediately behind them, and rejoicing like Nazi Germany in a strong executive as the only security against social anarchy and national decay, they regarded the Charter, if they thought about it at all, as the treasonable innovation of a rebellious nobility, a point of view, indeed, not unlike that of a recent French scholar, who speaks of it as 'essentially an act of feudal reaction against the progress of an encroaching royal administration and an arbitrary fiscal system<sup>1</sup>.' For, what another historian of our time has called 'the myth of Magna Carta<sup>2</sup>' did not begin to take hold of men's

<sup>1</sup> Charles Petit Dutaillis and Georges Lefebvre, *Studies and Notes Supplementary to Stubbs' Constitutional History*, iii (Manchester University Press, 1929), 316.

<sup>2</sup> E. Jenks, 'The Myth of Magna Carta' (*Independent Review*, Nov. 1904, pp. 260-73). A corrective to these extreme views may be found in Professor Powicke's chapter on John already cited from the *Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. vi. While admitting that 'the real history of the Great Charter belongs to a later age,' he points out that 'as a whole it reflected the best and most stable feeling of Englishmen, of the moderate barons, the bishops and the trained admini-

Cambridge University Press  
 978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
 William Shakespeare  
 Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

minds until Parliament found itself at loggerheads with the Stuarts, or become an accepted corner-stone of English political philosophy until the Hanoverians had acknowledged the Whig successors of John's barons as partners in the Constitution. Englishmen of Tudor times were fascinated by the other issue. To most of them John appeared, not as the enemy of liberty, but as its champion, as the one medieval king who had openly withstood the Pope for many years and who, according to a legend they accepted with avidity, met his death from poison administered by a treacherous monk. It is as a valiant precursor of the Reformation that John makes his first appearance in dramatic literature.

On January 2, 1539, six years after the marriage of Henry VIII to Anne Boleyn and the elevation of Cranmer to the see of Canterbury, a company of actors under the direction of one 'Bale' were performing a play 'in Christmas time at my lord of Canterbury's,' from which might be 'perceived King John was as noble a prince as ever was in England, and...that he was the beginning of the putting down of the Bishop in Rome.' The company probably belonged to my Lord Cromwell; the 'Bale' who led it was with little doubt John Bale, a clerical writer of violent Protestant moralities who was later created Bishop of Ossory; and the interlude spoken of can hardly be any other than Bale's *King Johan*<sup>1</sup>. In this strange, formless blend of

strators,' as is proved by 'the fact that in its revised form it was issued after John's death by the legate, William the Marshal, Hubert de Burgh and other royalists,' in which form 'it was regarded as a definite settlement of the law which regulated the relations between the Crown and the vassals and the administrators of justice and finance,' *ibid.*

p. 245.

<sup>1</sup> v. pp. xvii-xviii, Introduction to Bale's *King Johan* (Malone Society Reprints).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16

William Shakespeare

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xiii

morality-play, chronicle and Protestant pamphlet, which has come down to us in a version dating from the early days of Elizabeth, John's beatification finds its most fervent celebration, and to what lengths Bale's zeal carried him may be seen from the words of the Interpreter at the conclusion of the first part:

Thys noble kynge Iohan, as a faythfull Moyses  
withstode proude Pharao, for hys poore Israel,  
Myndynge to brynge it, out of the lande of Darkenesse  
But the Egyptyanes, ded agaynst hym so rebell  
That hys poore people, ded styll in the desart dwell  
Tyll that Duke Iosue, whych was our late kynge Henrye  
Clerely brought vs in, to the lande of mylke and honye.

Bale was a fanatic; and actually represents Langton planning John's death with the poisoner. Yet he was honest according to his lights, and firmly believed that John's character and actions had been grossly misrepresented by the monkish chroniclers of the middle ages in their anxiety to defend the Roman Church. 'Veryte,' a character whom he brings on to the stage after the death of his hero, trounces the chroniclers in long speeches, the tenour of which may be gleaned from two brief extracts:

I assure ye fryndes, lete men wryte what they wyll,  
kynge Iohan was a man, both valeaunt and godlye  
what though Polydorus, reporteth hym very yll  
At the suggestyons, of the malicyouse clergie  
Thynke yow a Romane, with the Romanes can not lye?

And, again, this time addressing the 'Romanes' direct:

ye were neuer wele, tyll ye had hym cruelly slayne  
And now beyng dead ye have hym styll in disdayne;  
ye haue raysed vp of hym most shamelesse lyes  
Both by your reportes, and by your written storyes<sup>1</sup>.

Nor is the point of view peculiar to Bale. We are not surprised to find it running as an undercurrent through

<sup>1</sup> Bale's *King Johan*, *op. cit.* ll. 2145-49, 2239-42.

the chapters on John in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. But it is rather remarkable that Holinshed, the greatest of Elizabethan historiographers, with the medieval chronicles before him and concerned to write history and not a Protestant homily, should go further out of his way to defend the 'Moses' of the Reformation than the martyrologist himself. Witness his summary of John's character, which runs as follows:

He was comely of stature, but of looks and countenance displeasent and angry; somewhat cruel of nature, as by the writers of his time he is noted; and not so hardy as doubtful in time of peril and danger.

But this seemeth to be an envious report uttered by those that were given to speak no good of him whom they inwardly hated.... Verily, whosoever shall consider the course of the history written of this prince, he shall find that he hath been little beholden to the writers of that time in which he lived; for unneeth can they afford him a good word, except when the truth enforceth them to come out with it, as it were, against their wills. And the occasion, as some think, was for that he was no great friend to the clergy.... Certainly, it should seem the man had a princely heart in him and wanted nothing but faithful subjects to have wroken himself of such wrongs as were done and offered to him by the French king and others. Moreover, the pride and pretended authority of the clergy he could not well abide, when they went about to wrest out of his hands the prerogative of his princely rule and government. True it is, that to maintain his wars which he was forced to take in hand, as well in France as elsewhere, he was constrained to make all the shift he could devise to recover money, and because he pinched at their purses, they conceived no small hatred against him; which when he perceived, and wanted peradventure discretion to pass it over, he discovered now and then in his rages his immoderate displeasure, as one not able to bridle his affections, a thing very hard in a stout stomach, and thereby he missed now and then to compass that which otherwise he might very well have brought to pass<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Holinshed, *Chronicles*, ed. 1577 (ii, 606).



Cambridge University Press  
 978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
 William Shakespeare  
 Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xv

Though more judicial in tone than Bale, the argument is the same. Nevertheless, there were points in the *acta Johanni* as related by Holinshed which were difficult to square with the portrait of a Protestant saint and martyr. And in *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, the next dramatic study of John's character, to be considered immediately, we shall find the lines drawn with less confidence, while the entirely fictitious account of his pursuit of the unhappy Matilda which forms the main interest of Munday and Chettle's *Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon*, printed in 1601, brings us nearer to the real John of history than any of the earlier dramatic portraits<sup>1</sup>, except perhaps Shakespeare's.

Holinshed, who wrote without a thought of the stage in his mind, was nevertheless the father of many plays; and the publication of his *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* in 1577, which gathered together and completed the efforts of previous Tudor chroniclers, marks a turning-point in the history of Tudor drama. For the book, inspired by the new-found sense of national unity and purpose which was the mainspring of Elizabethan activity in every field, immensely quickened that sense in thousands of English playgoers by providing the dramatists of the day with material for a corpus of drama which mirrored the history of England with scarcely a break from before the Conquest to the defeat of the Spanish Armada. Indeed, in his 'defence of plays' written four years later than that victory, Nashe gives pride of place to their patriotic interest, seeing that

the subject of them (for the most part).. is borrowed out of our English Chronicles, wherein our forefathers valiant

<sup>1</sup> As author of the play *Sir Thomas Moore*, to say nothing of *The English Roman Life*, Munday may be suspected of possessing a better understanding of the Catholic standpoint than violent Protestants like Bale and the dramatist responsible for *The Troublesome Reign*.

Cambridge University Press  
 978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
 William Shakespeare  
 Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

xvi

## KING JOHN

acts (that have line long buried in rustie brasse and worm-eaten bookes) are reuiued, and they themselues raised from the Graue of obliuion, and brought to pleade their aged Honours in open presence: than which, what can be a sharper reproofe to these degenerate effeminate dayes of ours<sup>1</sup>?

That Holinshed and those who distilled his *Chronicles* for the benefit of the public at large held a conception of history very different from our own is nothing to their dishonour. Living in a prescientific age, when prodigies and heavenly portents were credited in the opinion of the best and wisest with an influence upon the fortunes of states and monarchs as undoubted as it was incalculable, they were in duty bound to record all such phenomena as they could learn of. Lord Chancellor Bacon himself does not hesitate to do so in his *History of Henry VII*. Accepting without question, for reasons already glanced at, absolute monarchy as the highest form of human polity, it did not occur to them that anything much besides the doings of kings, whether at home or in the field, was worth a chronicler's pains. Apparently the only extant play of the time which represents parliament upon the stage is Shakespeare's *Richard II*, and even there it figures merely as the shadowy background to a king's deposition<sup>2</sup>. The silence, then, of Shakespeare's *King John* and its dramatic precursors on the subject of the Magna Carta needs neither excuse nor explanation. It should not be forgotten, moreover, that political prepossession and theatrical convenience were alike served by the blindness of the age to the constitutional struggles and social movements which give history its meaning in our eyes. Such topics are not readily amenable to stage-representation; the fortunes of

<sup>1</sup> *Pierce Pennilesse*, v. R. B. McKerrow, *Works of Thomas Nashe*, i, 212.

<sup>2</sup> v. W. Creizenach, *The English Drama in the time of Shakespeare*, p. 177.

## INTRODUCTION

xvii

monarchs are<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, it was largely because the Elizabethans thought of politics, and the working of the universe at large, in terms of personality that the theatre became their characteristic means of literary expression. It is no accident that the greatest age of English drama took a purely dramatic view of history.

## II

*The source of Shakespeare's play*

Fourteen years after the publication of Holinshed's *Chronicles* an anonymous drama came into the printer's hand and was published in two parts during 1591 under the title of *The Troublesome Raigne of Iohn King of England, with the discoverie of King Richard Cordelions Base sonne (vulgarly named, The Bastard Fawconbridge): also the death of King Iohn at Swinstead Abbey. As it was (sundry times) publikely acted by the Queenes Maiesties Players, in the honourable Citie of London. Imprinted at London for Sampson Clarke, and are to be solde at his shop, on the backe-side of the Royall Exchange. 1591.* Sampson Clarke was a respectable publisher and the imprint is perfectly normal. The text also is straightforward enough and contains roughly about 2800 lines, which makes it some 100 lines shorter than *Edward I*, a drama almost certainly by the same playwright, and some 300 lines longer than Shakespeare's play. The only peculiarity about it, indeed, is its publication in two parts, there being no obvious dramatic reason for the division. It seems that having secured a single play, the publisher attempted to make double profit out of it

<sup>1</sup> Elizabethan dramatists were, of course, alive to the existence of the 'commons' and popular political aspirations, and their attitude towards these may be seen in the Jack Cade scenes of *2 Henry VI* or the insurrection scene of *Sir Thomas Moore*.

by issuing it as two books. Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, a genuine two-part play, had appeared from the press of Richard Jones in the previous year, so that the play-reading public would be ready to be thus deceived. It looks, moreover, as if the author of the play lent a hand in the deception by pretending that it formed a kind of sequel to Marlowe's. Each part is prefaced with an address in verse 'To the Gentlemen Readers,' which though specially written for the publication<sup>1</sup> is in a style very similar to that of the play; and the first of them, beginning

You that with friendly grace of smoothed brow  
 Haue entertaind the Scythian Tamburlaine,  
 And giuen applause vnto an Infidel:  
 Vouchsafe to welcome (with like curtefie)  
 A warlike Christian and your Countreyman,

deliberately recalls Marlowe's famous twin-drama, which had taken London by storm on the stage, had probably been a great success when it appeared in print, and was also furnished with a brief prologue to each part<sup>2</sup>.

The point is important as regards date. If the lines just quoted belong to a dramatic prologue, then *The Troublesome Reign* must have been written for performance shortly after *Tamburlaine* was first acted, that is to say before the end of 1587<sup>3</sup>. But, once they are seen to have been written for publication in 1591, the need for

<sup>1</sup> This is proved by the last line of the first address.

And think it was prepared for your disport,  
 which is clearly a request to readers to imagine themselves as spectators.

<sup>2</sup> The fact that Marlowe's *Edward II* was likewise called 'The Troublesome Raigne' on the title-page of 1594 suggests further possibilities of catch-penny faking. The date of *Edward II*'s first performance is, however, unfortunately unknown.

<sup>3</sup> v. letter by Sir E. K. Chambers in *Times Literary Supplement*, Aug. 28, 1930.

## INTRODUCTION

xix

linking the composition of the play to that of Marlowe's disappears. Nevertheless, as Sir Edmund Chambers notes, 'the tone is that of the Armada period<sup>1</sup>,' and a play so fervently patriotic and so fiercely anti-papal may well belong to 1588 or 1589.

It is generally assumed that *The Troublesome Reign* owes nothing to Bale's play, though the hatred of the Papacy which it breathes, together with the claim of the prologue just quoted that John was

A Warlike Christian and your Countreyman,  
 and that

For Christs true faith indur'd he many a storme,  
 And fet himfelfe against the Man of Rome,  
 Vntill bafe treason (by a damned wight)  
 Did all his former triumphs put to flight,

indicates that it follows the same tradition. But it belongs to a different artistic category. It is a play, which Bale's amorphous dramatic tract never succeeds in becoming. Indeed, Courthope thought so highly of it that he refused to believe that anyone but Shakespeare could have written it, arguing that 'in the energy and dignity of the State debates, the life of the incidents, the variety and contrast of the characters, and the power of conceiving the onward movement of a great historical action, there is a quality of dramatic workmanship... quite above the genius of Peele, Greene, or even Marlowe<sup>2</sup>.' This is one of the curiosities of criticism, and the attribution to Shakespeare has found scant support elsewhere. But it serves to bring out the virtues of a play which is in some ways better constructed than *King John*.

Most critics who have written upon the subject take for granted that Shakespeare derived his play from *The Troublesome Reign*. Close affinity between the two is undeniable; but the priority of the inferior text no longer

<sup>1</sup> *Elizabethan Stage*, iv, 24.

<sup>2</sup> W. J. Courthope, *History of English Poetry*, iv, 465.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16

William Shakespeare

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xx

## KING JOHN

goes without saying, as it used to in the days before Dr Pollard recognised 'bad quartos' as a special class by themselves, Dr Greg demonstrated that the extant text of Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, published in 1594, was printed, not from the author's manuscript or even from an authorised prompt-book, but from a garbled and reported compilation got together by actors who had taken part in the authentic play<sup>1</sup>, and Professor Peter Alexander put up a strong case for believing that *The first part of the Contention betwixt the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster* (pub. 1594), *The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke* (pub. 1595) and *The Taming of a Shrew* (pub. 1594) were bad quartos which stood in similar relationship to parts 2 and 3 of Shakespeare's *Henry VI* and *The Taming of the Shrew*<sup>2</sup>. From the bibliographical point of view *The Troublesome Reign* is not a 'bad' quarto; but is there not something suspicious about it? May it not be derived from Shakespeare's play, instead of the other way about? Is it not perhaps an attempt by some unscrupulous person to make profit out of Shakespeare's success by furnishing a rival company with another text closely modelled upon his? Or was it even designed for the stage at all? Is it not rather a vamped up playbook, written expressly for publication, as its prologues undoubtedly were; a catch-penny production, possibly of some needy playwright like Peele, sold to a publisher at a time when Shakespeare was making *King John* famous in London, and intended to be accepted by ignorant readers as his? This last intention is indeed patent in the second quarto, published in 1611, with the words 'Written by W. Sh.' on its title-page, and unblushing in the third quarto of 1622, which shamelessly expands the 'W. Sh.' to 'W. Shakespeare.'

<sup>1</sup> *Alcazar and Orlando*, W. W. Greg, 1923.

<sup>2</sup> *Shakespeare's Henry VI and Richard III*, Peter Alexander, 1929.

## INTRODUCTION

xxi

Yet it is very difficult to disbelieve that *King John* is based upon a text which, if not identical with *The Troublesome Reign* as printed in 1591, was another and closely related version of it, for the simple reason that there are a number of points common to the two plays which are far clearer in *The Troublesome Reign* than in *King John*, some of them indeed being quite unintelligible in the latter without reference to the former. Here are a few of the more striking instances, most of which have been noted by previous investigators:

(i) Shakespeare's Bastard, spoiling for a fight, is naturally annoyed in 2. 1 when the proposed marriage between Blanch and the Dauphin seems likely to bring about peace. Yet his insulting parody of the Dauphin's lovemaking and his description of the Dauphin himself as 'so vile a lout' seem both impolitic and excessive until we discover from *The Troublesome Reign* that he had himself been promised the lady's hand by Queen Elinor<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore, as Professor Moore Smith has noted, the Bastard's threat in *The Troublesome Reign* that he will make a cuckold of his rival the Dauphin loses its point when directed, as it is by Shakespeare, against Austria<sup>2</sup>.

(ii) Shakespeare never accounts for the poisoning of John. 'Just when his fortunes are at their most critical point, the hero, without rhyme or reason, dies: some one comes in casually and says that the king is dying, murdered by an anonymous monk, who is indeed described as a 'resolved villain' but is not shown to have any motive whatever for his deed<sup>3</sup>.' In *The Troublesome Reign*, on the other hand, the poisoning, which is circumstantially

<sup>1</sup> v. 'Shakespeare as an Adapter' by Edward Rose, printed in the Introduction to *The Troublesome Reign*, 1 (Practorius facsimile), p. xv.

<sup>2</sup> v. p. 335 of *An English Miscellany presented to F. J. Furnivall* (Oxford, 1901).

<sup>3</sup> Rose, *op. cit.* p. xv.

depicted, occurs as the natural outcome of that harrying of the monasteries which is so prominent a feature of the old play, but which Shakespeare almost entirely suppressed. This point seems almost sufficient by itself to demonstrate the priority of *The Troublesome Reign*.

(iii) In 4. 3. 11 of *King John* Salisbury and the other 'revolts' speak of joining the Dauphin at St Edmundsbury. Shakespeare gives no reason why they should meet there, though at the beginning of 5. 2 and at 5. 4. 18 he refers to solemn oaths between Lewis and the English nobles exchanged at that place. All is made clear, however, as Professor Moore Smith observes, when 'in *The Troublesome Reign*, as in Holinshed, we see...the lords...disguised as palmers on pilgrimage to a famous shrine, the better to cloak their rebellious designs from the King<sup>1</sup>.'

(iv) Shakespeare's John informs the nobles that he has already 'possessed' them with 'some reasons' for the second coronation (4. 2) which they find 'superfluous,' but he does not so possess us, and we are not prepared in any way for the event. In *The Troublesome Reign* the ceremony is not merely led up to by a long speech from the King explaining that he finds it expedient to seek a second assurance of his subjects' loyalty after his revolt from Rome, but is followed by another speech hinting broadly that his fears of Arthur had also prompted his action. These fears are indeed also hinted at in a line of *King John* but so obscurely that editors have hitherto failed to notice it<sup>2</sup>.

(v) All but one have also strangely overlooked a glaring inconsistency in Shakespeare's play, which on the face of it appears only to be explained by supposing that he misunderstood a passage in *The Troublesome Reign*. His most famous scene is that in which John in a couple

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to *King John* (Warwick Shakespeare), p. xxvii.

<sup>2</sup> v. note 4. 2. 42.



Cambridge University Press  
 978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
 William Shakespeare  
 Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xxiii

of suddenly uttered words suggests to Hubert the assassination of Arthur (3. 3); yet when we find Hubert two scenes later (4. 1) on the point of executing these commands, it is blinding and not murder he is about, and the warrant he shows is to this effect also. No explanation is offered for the change; nor does Shakespeare seem to be aware that any change has taken place. Turn to *The Troublesome Reign* and once again all is explained. In 1. ix<sup>1</sup> of that text, which corresponds with Shakespeare's 3. 3, John gives Arthur into Hubert's charge with these words:

Hubert keepe him safe,  
 For on his life doth hang thy Soueraignes crowne,  
 But in his death confists thy Soueraignes blisse:  
 Then Hubert, as thou fhortly hearft from me,  
 So vse the prifoner I haue giuen in charge.

The second and third lines express John's dilemma, as understood and later again emphasised<sup>2</sup> by the unknown author, which may be thus rendered in modern English: 'It is as much as my crown is worth to have him killed, though I should dearly love to see him dead.' John is, therefore, obliged, as we find in 1. xii, to content himself with putting out his rival's eyes, which would at least render him incapable of ruling. All this, it appears, Shakespeare misunderstood as he rapidly revised the old play; he interpreted John's hinted desire for Arthur's death as an instruction to murder him; and when he came to the blinding scene he followed it, quite forgetting what he had himself written two scenes earlier! Nor does the confusion stop here. As Professor Moore Smith, the only previous critic who seems to have

<sup>1</sup> I.e. scene ix of part I, as numbered in the Praetorius facsimile.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 1. xiii. 236-43:

His death hath freed me from a thousand feares,  
 But it hath purchast me ten times ten thousand foes, etc.

Cambridge University Press  
 978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
 William Shakespeare  
 Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

xxiv

## KING JOHN

perceived it, notes<sup>1</sup>, it continues into 4. 2, where Pembroke speaks of a death-warrant shown by Hubert to a friend of his, while John and Hubert discuss the death of Arthur for sixty-six lines and assume throughout that both the warrant and the oral instructions were for death not blinding, which is never once mentioned. Yet this all takes place in the scene immediately after that which begins 'Heat me these irons hot.'

(vi) A misunderstanding of a different kind may be seen at 3. 1. 107, where Shakespeare makes the cheated Constance say:

Arm, arm, you heavens against these perjured kings,  
 although it is Philip alone not John who is perjured.  
 The error, as Liebermann<sup>2</sup> shows, seems to have its source in the corresponding speech of *The Troublesome Reign* (1. iv. 205-10):

If any Power will heare a widdowes plaint,  
 That from a wounded foule implores reuenge;  
 Send fell contagion to infect this Clyme,  
 This curfed Countrey, where the traytors breath,  
 Whose periurie as prowd Briareus,  
 Beleaguers all the Skie with mifbeliefe.

Here her indignation is directed against France alone and the 'traytors' she refers to are Philip, Lewis and Austria. Shakespeare, however, in revision has overlooked this and has assumed that 'traytors' refers to both the kings she hates. It is a small point but very significant of the relationship between the two texts.

(vii) Apart from dramatic confusions and inconsistencies, *King John* contains several curious and obscure expressions which are best understood on reference to

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to *King John* (Warwick Shakespeare), p. xxvi.

<sup>2</sup> F. Liebermann, 'Shakespeare als Bearbeiter des *King John*,' *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, cxlii, 181.

Cambridge University Press  
 978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
 William Shakespeare  
 Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

xxv

*The Troublesome Reign*. When Chatillion, for instance, at 1. 1. 9–11 declares that Philip, in the name of

Arthur Plantagenet, lays most lawful claim  
 To this fair island and the territories,  
 To Ireland, Poictiers, Anjou, Touraine, Maine,

we are puzzled by the rather odd use of the word ‘territories’ in the sense of dependencies. The corresponding speech in 1. 1 of *The Troublesome Reign* runs ‘Philip . . . requireth in the behalfe of the said Arthur, the Kingdom of England, with the Lordship of Ireland, Poitiers, Aniow, Torain, Main,’ which offers the same material but no illumination. Turn on however to 1. 11., which opens with the following address by Philip to Arthur himself:

Now gin we broach the title of thy claime  
 Yong Arthur in the Albion Territories,

and we find the words ‘claim’ and ‘territories’ once again combined, the latter in this case being used in a perfectly ordinary sense. Similarly, the rather forced use of ‘lineal’ by Shakespeare in John’s reference to

Our just and lineal entrance to our own

at 2. 1. 85 may be accounted for as an echo of the Bastard’s reference at 1. 1. 353 to his brother who ‘holds my right, as lineall in difcent.’ But the most remarkable instance of the kind occurs in 5. 2. 103–4.

Have I not heard these islanders shout out  
 ‘Vive le Roy!’ as I have banked their towns?

the Dauphin enquires, and we should be entirely without a clue to the meaning of ‘banked’ had we not *The Troublesome Reign* to inform us (without any warrant from Holinshed) that Lewis sailed up the Thames, receiving the homage of the towns along the banks as he did so<sup>1</sup>. Indeed, so closely do the words of the two

<sup>1</sup> v. note 5. 2. 104.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16

William Shakespeare

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xxvi

## KING JOHN

texts often correspond that we may even at times make use of *The Troublesome Reign* in dealing with textual corruption in *King John*, as a glance at my notes on 5. 6. 12 and 5. 7. 16 will show.

(viii) The foregoing links and parallels are only a small portion of a large body of verbal coincidence or similarity which is one of the most remarkable features of the problem we are studying. It is usually stated that the texts contain only a single line in common, viz. 5. 4. 42:

For that my grandsire was an Englishman.

That this is not precisely true will be seen from the parallel to 2. 1. 527–8 quoted immediately below. And if we seek for less exact parallels—for lines almost though not quite identical, or for identical scraps of verse—we get proof of wide borrowing on the one side or the other. I quote some of the more obvious of such correspondences, giving the Folio text of *King John* first and that of *The Troublesome Reign* second:

- |               |  |
|---------------|--|
| 1. 1. 11      | To Ireland, Poyctiers, Aniowe, Torayne,<br>Maine   |
| 1. i. 33–4    | of Ireland, Poiters, Aniow, Torain, Main   |
| 2. 1. 65      | With them a Bastard of the Kings deceaft   |
| 1. ii. 69     | Next them a Bastard of the Kings deceaft   |
| 2. 1. 191     | <i>Que.</i> Thou vnaduifed scold, I can produce<br>A Will, that barres the title of thy sonne.<br><i>Con.</i> I who doubts that, a Will: a wicked will,<br>A womans will, a cankred Grandams will. |
| 1. ii. 98–100 | For prooffe whereof, I can inferre a Will,<br>That barres the way he urgeth by difcent.<br><i>Constance.</i> A Will indeede, a crabbed Womans<br>will  |
| 2. 1. 203     | You men of Angiers, and my louing subiects   |
| 1. ii. 192    | You men of Angiers, and as I take it my loyall<br>Subiects (prose)   |
| 2. 1. 422     | Speake on with fauour, we are bent to heare  |
| 1. iv. 65     | Speake on, we giue thee leaue  |

## INTRODUCTION

xxvii

2. I. 423 That daughter there of Spaine, the Lady Blanch  
Is neece<sup>1</sup> to England
- I. iv. 83 The beauteous daughter of the King of Spaine,  
Neece to K. Iohn
2. I. 527 *Iohn.* Then do I giue Volqueffon, Toraine,  
Maine,  
Poycitiers and Aniow, these fiue Prouinces
- I. iv. 158 *Philip* Then I demaund Volqueffon, Torain,  
Main,  
Poitiers and Aniow, these fiue Prouinces.
2. I. 530 Full thirty thousand Markes of English coyne  
I. iv. 172 And thirtie thousand markes of stipend coyne
2. I. 538 For at Saint Maries Chappell presently  
I. iv. 188 Which in S. Maries Chappell presently
3. I. 202 Philip, what faist thou to the Cardinall?  
I. v. 110 Brother of Fraunce, what say you to the  
Cardinall?
3. I. 300 *Daul.* Father, to Armes  
I. v. 133 (*Phil*) Nobles, to armes
3. 4. 20 I prethee Lady goe away with me  
I. x. 34 come Constance, goe with me
3. 4. 183 If you say I  
I. x. 41 The Pope sayes I
4. 2. 1 Heere once againe we sit: once againe crown'd  
I. xiii. 88 Once ere this time was I inuested King
4. 2. 68 Hubert, what newes with you?  
I. xiii. 207 How now, what newes with thee
4. 2. 215 Heere is your hand and Seale for what I did  
I. xiii. 262 Why heres my Lord your Highness hand  
& seale
5. I. 30-31 nothing there holds out / But Douer Castle  
II. iv. 14-15 not a foote holds out / But Douer Castle
5. 4. 39 If Lewis, by your afsistance win the day  
II. v. 18 if Lewes win the day

Many more parallels will be found in my notes, and so frequently do they occur that I have probably overlooked not a few. Most of them are taken from

<sup>1</sup> Misprinted 'neere.'

Cambridge University Press  
 978-1-108-00588-3 - King John, Volume 16  
 William Shakespeare  
 Frontmatter  
[More information](#)

xxviii

## KING JOHN

corresponding scenes or closely related passages; but not all. It is remarkable, for instance, that the words of Shakespeare's Pandulph, as he excommunicates King John (3. 1. 176–79):

And meritorious shall that hand be called,  
 Canonizéd and worshippéd as a saint,  
 That takes away by any secret course  
 Thy hateful life,

closely resemble those placed in the mouth of John's actual murderer in *The Troublesome Reign* (II. vi. 94–95), as he soliloquises before the deed:

Now if that thou wilt looke to merit heauen,  
 And be canonizd for a holy Saint.

It is interesting too to compare the following passages, taken from parallel scenes, though from quite different contexts:

(a) Arthur, speaking of the cold iron and the dead coal, says to Hubert in *King John*, 4. 1. 118–19:

All things that you should use to do me wrong  
 Deny their office.

(b) Hubert, shrinking from the deed he has to do, says to Arthur in *The Troublesome Reign*, I. xii. 46–47:

My heart my head, and all my powers beside,  
 To aide the office haue at once denide.

Here it is clear that the linked words 'office' and 'deny' (like 'claim' and 'territories' noted above) have been unconsciously borrowed by one of the two writers from the other; unconsciously, I say, because they are used in slightly different senses and placed in different mouths. And that the bulk of these verbal borrowings are also unconscious is, I think, shown by the fact that the words borrowed are very seldom anything but trivial, and that they often occur at points of the dialogue which communicate important historical facts or names, as if they had been caught up with them in the effort of